

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF PRINCIPAL INNOVATIVENESS AND
LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR

by

SHAWN J. DAVITT

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Department of Educational Leadership
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Education

June 2008

University of Oregon Graduate School

Confirmation of Approval and Acceptance of Dissertation prepared by:

Shawn Davitt

Title:

"An Exploratory Study of Principal Innovativeness and Leadership Behavior"

This dissertation has been accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in the Department of Educational Leadership by:

Diane Dunlap, Chairperson, Educational Leadership
Philip McCullum, Member, Educational Leadership
Keith Hollenbeck, Member, Educational Leadership
Alan Meyer, Outside Member, Management

and Richard Linton, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies/Dean of the Graduate School for the University of Oregon.

June 14, 2008

Original approval signatures are on file with the Graduate School and the University of Oregon Libraries.

© 2008 Shawn J. Davitt

An Abstract of the Dissertation of
Shawn J. Davitt for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the Department of Educational Leadership to be taken June 2008
Title: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF PRINCIPAL INNOVATIVENESS AND
LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR

Approved: _____
Diane Dunlap, Advisor

The relationship between principal's scored levels of innovativeness and shared leadership behaviors was studied using an embedded case study methodology. The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between a scale of principal innovativeness and reported shared leadership behaviors. Using a research-based self-report questionnaire, the principals reported their perceived innovativeness preferences. Semi-structured interviews with the principals and literacy coaches gave insight into shared leadership behaviors. Principals reported similar levels of innovativeness, though shared leadership behaviors varied between participants. Variances were relative to the extent that each principal shared decision-making power with informal leaders within their respective buildings.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Shawn J. Davitt

PLACE OF BIRTH: Chicago, Ill.

DATE OF BIRTH: January, 18th, 1972

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon

Portland State University, Portland, Oregon

Concordia University, Portland, Oregon

DEGREES AWARDED:

Doctor of Education, Educational Leadership, 2008, University of Oregon

Master of Science, Counselor Education, 2000, Portland State University

Bachelor of Science, Secondary Education, 1994, Concordia University

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

Organizational Learning

Diffusion of Innovations within School Systems

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Student Management, Beaverton School District, Current

Counselor, Beaverton School District, 8 years

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply grateful to Diane Dunlap for her support, encouragement and patience throughout this process. I also wish to thank Keith Hollenbeck, Phil McCullum and Alan Meyer for their feedback, thoughts and collaboration on this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. PRINCIPAL INNOVATIVENESS AND LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS	1
II. LEADERSHIP THEORY AND RESEARCH	6
Overview of Educational Leadership Theories	6
Transactional Leadership	6
Transformational Leadership	7
Shared Leadership	8
Relinquishing Power in Decision Making	9
Create Structures and Interactions	11
More Than Collaboration.....	13
Innovation Theory and Innovativeness Research	15
Attributes of an Innovation	15
Innovativeness and Decision-Making	17
III. METHODOLOGY	26
The Context of the Innovation	26
Methods	27
Participants	28
Measures	28
Procedures and Data Analysis	29
Potential Threats to Validity	29
IV. DATA REPORT AND ANALYSIS	31
Change in Methods	31
Similarities in Innovativeness Score	32
Brookfield Middle School	33

Chapter	Page
Clear Creek Middle School	36
Pine Crest Middle School	41
Riverview Middle School	44
Sunnyside Middle School	46
Summary of Results	49
Innovativeness and Extent of Shared Leadership	49
Summary of All Schools	51
Targets as an Innovation	51
Relevance of Hurt's Innovativeness Scales	52
V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	54
Similarities in Contexts	54
Building-Wide versus Classroom-Level Decision Making	54
Conclusions	55
APPENDICES	63
A. HURT'S INNOVATIVENESS SCALE	63
B. PRINCIPAL SURVEY PROTOCOL	64
C. LITERACY COACH SURVEY PROTOCOL	65
REFERENCES	66

CHAPTER I

PRINCIPAL INNOVATIVENESS AND LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS

Who are the people who chose to be principals in schools, and how do they succeed in their roles? School performance is always under intense scrutiny by people and agencies both within education and surrounding education in the broader political context, and the principal is the formal leader at each school site and has formal responsibility for guiding the success of the school. As research informs education leaders about best practices, new programs are developed and promoted for improving student learning. As new school and district leaders come into place, new policy initiatives are issued that also influence behaviors in schools. So principals must both guide the school in known practices, but do so in an ever-evolving atmosphere of high stakes scrutiny and confusing new practices.

Performance on state standardized achievement exams has become the primary measure that many communities and critics use to determine future financial support of local schools, as well as being the foremost gauge legislators refer to in determining appropriateness of funding. Multiple stakeholders also use academic performance measures to judge schools on adequate yearly progress, such as how effective districts are in closing achievement gaps between racial and economic groups. Again, the school principal is the designated formal leader in making sure that students learn, that teachers teach, and that achievement goals are met. The consequences of failure to meet goals can cost the principal his or her position.

To meet various stakeholder demands, school districts try to implement policies for schools to alter professional practice and, hopefully, raise student achievement. District policies are ultimately implemented at the building level, placing school principals at the heart of educational change. Principals are charged with implementing the policies that change the way educators do their work – changes that not only impact how curricula is taught in the classroom, but changes that impact how schools function as a whole. Silins (1994) posited that the focus for educational change was no longer merely on the classroom, but on entire schools, making the school organization as the unit of measure of educational change. Silins (1994) also suggested that as the focus for change moved from the classroom to the school, the role of the principal changed as well, shifting from more of a manager of the building site to that of an instructional and motivational leader.

Leaders are required to navigate their staffs through the opportunities and pitfalls of change, while still being held accountable to multiple stakeholders. Leithwood (1994) argued that change calls for leadership, and leadership manifests in the context of change. Principals, by nature of their status, power and authority, are in a position to utilize leadership strategies that influence school improvement (Silins, 1994). The current landscape of change, however, requires leaders to be flexible, skilled and “versed in a variety of approaches to address unique problems inherent in the multiple contexts in which school leadership finds itself” (Friedman, 2004, p. 206). Consequently, principals wield much influence over processes and strategies that could lead to school improvement, and their leadership actions, or inactions, can greatly impact school

performance. The question that drove this study was whether this complex and ever changing environment was better for people who are creative and innovative in their basic leadership persona, or whether a personal tendency toward innovativeness behaviors was more problematic for the individual principal and individual school. How does innovativeness fit into the changing roles and demands for the school principal?

There is an additional complication for the school principal today. The literature suggested that the principal leadership role may need to be shared to be effective. Harris (2007) posited that the changing landscape of education created a demand on schools that one individual cannot bear alone, as the system's needs are too great. Consequently, many schools are moving toward sharing this load among staff and reallocating responsibility among teachers (2007). Spillane, Halverson and Diamond (2001) suggested there are more to a leadership system than principals alone, stating "while individual leaders and their attributes matter...they are not all that matters" (p.27). Rather, collective leadership is necessary to practice leadership. This reduction of principals as the sole important leader is echoed in research from England and Wales, with findings that suggested that "principals are key, but not exclusive leaders", for leadership is, and needs to be, manifested in a variety of leaders (Wallace, 2002, p.167). Printy and Marks (2004) asserted that multiple leaders are needed within a school in order to provide the necessary leadership required to enhance student performance.

Further, in their synthesis to recent research, they suggested that the most effective schools are those that have principals who facilitated leadership among their staff (Printy & Marks, 2004; Goldman & Dunlap, 1993; Dunlap & Goldman, 1991).

Gronn (2000) asserted that by sharing leadership, expertise and advice are “pooled,” granting access to a greater level of “intelligence and resourcefulness” (p.334). Dunlap and Goldman (1991) stress that leadership in schools is distributed by nature, as no single person owns all the power and knowledge in schools, a charge echoed by Spillane (2006). Consequently, a leader must act as a shared leader because he or she does not own all this power and knowledge, and autocratic behaviors in a distributed environment may reduce trust (Goldman & Dunlap, 1991).

Innovation theory suggested that an individual’s attitude about change, or about innovations, in general, predispose a person toward adopting or rejecting an innovation. Some individuals typically try new innovations more readily than others. These individuals are said to possess more innovativeness. In 1975, Corwin studied 131 schools to determine characteristics of innovative schools. Corwin found that principals accounted for 22% of initiated change within schools. Further, in schools described as more innovative, the principals were more likely to take exclusive initiative of innovations than the principals in less innovative schools. Is there a relationship between the innovativeness level of the principal and the breadth/depth of leadership behaviors that he/she engages in while implementing policy? Will principals with higher levels of innovativeness exhibit more leadership behaviors than principals who have lower levels of innovativeness?

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between a scale of principal innovativeness and reported shared leadership behaviors. Grounded in innovation theory and shared leadership theory, this study assessed reported individual

levels of innovativeness for six middle school principals and then described and analyzed shared leadership behaviors they reported that they took toward implementing one district-wide curricular innovation. Chapter II is an overview of theories of innovativeness and related prior research. The methodology for the study and limitations of the design are outlined in Chapter III. Chapter IV report the data and Chapter V analyzes the data in the context of prior research and theory, and draws conclusions for further research on the innovativeness construct.

CHAPTER II

LEADERSHIP THEORY AND RESEARCH

The research and practice literatures suggested the existence of a variety of educational leadership styles that can be successful. Each form encapsulates unique behaviors that describe how a principal might perceive his or her own purpose as a leader, and how he or she might work to advance the goals of the state, district or staff. Three leadership styles appear prominently in schools today: (a) transactional, (b) transformational, (c) shared, or distributed, leadership. Each style possesses unique paradigm and behavioral elements. I will briefly describe next the primary leadership behaviors that are typically attributed to each of the three leadership styles. After describing these three educational leadership theories, I briefly review innovation theory, define innovativeness and then critique how innovativeness theory may add further understanding to the four leadership theories and how specific leadership styles may have a unique influence on decision-making.

Overview of Educational Leadership Theories

Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership is typically described as the more managerial form of educational leadership, where the leader motivates followers to specific levels of performance (Burns, 1978; Silins, 1994). Leithwood (1994) described transactional leadership as having two dimensions: the first dimension is *contingent reward*, where the leader clarifies the performance expectations and the behaviors that are rewarded for staff. The second dimension is *management by exception*, where the leader either

monitors for problematic behaviors from the staff or responds to problematic behavior that has drawn his or her attention. Because the transactional leader is concerned primarily about the completion of tasks and compliance to expectations, transactional leaders act to clarify goals, make explicit standards and tasks, construct ways to monitor progress, and utilize negative feedback to minimize problematic practices (Friedman, 2004). Transactional leadership models are most closely aligned with classic notions of Weberian authority structures and have dominated the study of educational leadership to this day (Callahan, 1962; Culbertson, 1988, English, 2003).

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership theories focus on improving organizational functioning by moving individuals to a common sense of purpose and meaning beyond personal self interest (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1990; Hoy & Hoy, 2008). This endeavor of transforming attitudes is done primarily by identifying where there is common purpose, charismatically inspiring followers toward addressing the common purpose, by meeting the needs of others on staff so that individual needs do not get in the way of the common purpose, and by intellectually stimulating employees (Bass, 1990).

Leithwood and Jantzi (2006) suggested transformational leadership encompassed three broad categories: (a) setting directions, where the leader builds school vision, develops goals and sets priorities; (b) developing people, in which the leader provides intellectual stimulation and individual support to meet the common goals; and, (c) redesigning the organization, where the leader develops a school culture of collaboration and participatory decision-making.

Silins (1994) provided a similar definition of transformation leadership elements, which included:

1. Inspiration: the degree to which a leader creates enthusiasm in followers and transmits a sense of mission;
2. Intellectual stimulation: The degree to which the leader arouses followers to think in new ways and question the status quo;
3. Individualized Consideration: the degree to which the leader responds to follower needs for growth and development.

Common leader behaviors are the espousing of his or her values and encouraging followers to question their own values – and the values of the organization – in open discussion (Bass, 1990). Because the aim of transformational leadership is to foster personal commitment toward organizational goals, authority is not necessarily allocated to formal administrative positions but is located more in the moral and ethical “high ground” expressed by the leader (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999). Power is attributed to individuals who can inspire personal aspirations to collective commitments and contributions (1999). With leadership influence being open to those inspired, the transformational leader must make certain that policies provide opportunity for employees to question the status quo and attempt new ideas and innovations in a mutual effort to achieve success (Bass, 1990).

Shared Leadership

Shared leadership occurs when the principal and other formal leaders deliberately share decision-making power among teachers and staff (Weiss & Cambone, 1994; Little,

1988). Consequently, formal leaders take on the role of facilitator rather than controller. To be effective, the literature suggested that principals must purposefully create the organizational structures that are necessary for collaboration and shared decision-making to succeed.

Relinquishing Power in Decision-Making

Shared and distributed leadership are alike in that leadership is, in effect, distributed among more than those in formal leadership positions (Spillane, 2006). The concept is based in the notion that formal leaders relinquish their role as ultimate decision-maker and trust decision-making to others within the system (MacBeath, 2005; Harris, 2004), thereby creating a shared leadership culture. Harris (2004) defined distributed leadership as "...a form of collective leadership in which teachers develop expertise by working together" (p. 14). Shared leadership is a deliberate practice of allowing informal leaders who share values and goals of the formal leaders to share in decision-making practices (Spillane, 2006). In an embedded case study by Caron and McLaughlin (2002), the researchers studied four elementary and two middle schools that had been reporting high achievement results. The researchers wanted to identify indicators of school success that could be translated to student achievement. Twelve special education teachers, seventeen general education teachers, and the building principals participated in the study. Data were collected from interviews, focus groups, site visits, classroom observations and document reviews. The findings of the study suggested a number of insights into successful power-sharing behaviors between principals and teachers in decision-making processes. The study found that some

principals involved teachers in determining school goals, yet held on to their own authority and power as the final decision-maker during the process. Another group of principals worked collaboratively with teachers to determine goals and drew upon the expertise of staff members to work toward those goals. Further, the researchers noted, in two of the six schools, “power and leadership was distributed across the faculty and the variable skills of the entire professional community were tapped to address school goals” (p. 309). However, there were two other schools that exhibited “traditional leadership and decision making structures in which the power rested primarily with the principal even though collaborative processes were in place (p.309). In half the schools, the principal took on the primary role as supporter rather than controller. In one school, the teachers were responsible of creating staff development plans while the principal took on the role of garnering the resources necessary to carry out the development goals. This form of principal role was also found in two other schools where the principals viewed their role as “supporters and coordinators who provided their teachers with the necessary resources to do what they needed to do” (p.304).

Blasé and Blasé (1999) provided insights into principal perspectives around shared leadership, especially regarding the issues of power and decision-making. After interviewing 26 principals, the researchers noted that the principals who felt more comfortable with sharing power described the process as “backing off” or “letting go” (p.483). The findings also gave insight into an extent of shared leadership, as data revealed that teachers’ roles in decision-making ranged from consultation (giving feedback) to making decisions. The authors proposed that the sharing of decision-making

power calls principals to “extract themselves from decision-making processes to a great extent” (p. 483). This sharing of power also required principals to encourage wide, voluntary participation and avoid contradicting staff decisions (1999).

Create Structures and Interactions

Leaders who are seeking to lead from a shared and/or distributed perspective must be cognizant of the interactions between individuals and groups, and engage both formal and potential informal leaders in conversation. Harris (2004) noted that the key to distributed leadership is the involvement of teachers in institutional development, as more “top-down” approaches actually inhibit shared leadership. This restructuring required a commitment to teachers and to generating a teacher-leader culture by the formal leaders (Muijs and Harris, 2003). Fundamentally, the formal leaders need to empower others to lead (Harris, 2004). The formal leaders can increase distributed leadership by creating designed formal leadership positions, or by “creating structures and routines that enable teachers to take on leadership responsibilities” (Spillane, 2004, p. 44).

Printy and Marks (2004) echoed the need for principals to create structures if they desired to maximize shared leadership among teachers. In their synthesis of recent research, Printy and Marks concluded that the manner in which principals engage their teachers, and the structures in which they engaged them, was critical in developing shared leadership. Principals created the conditions in which teachers interact. Harris’ (2007) review of research also concluded that principals, and other formal leaders, needed to “influence and develop” the structures to support distributed leadership (p.322).

Created structures can take a variety of forms, such as formal work groups, teams, and ad hoc groups that offer leadership opportunities (Harris, 2004). As long as the structures created represent a change from traditional “command and control” processes, they can encourage teachers to participate in decisions at the school-level as well as in their individual classrooms (p. 15). Anderson and Pellicer (1998), in their case study of three elementary and one middle school, studied elements of successful school programs and their impact on low SES students. Through document reviews, interviews of teachers and principals, and classroom observations, they found that a common element in the successful school programs was evidence of shared leadership practices. Shared leadership was seen structurally by committees, advisory groups and teachers as team leaders. Blasé and Blasé (1999) noticed a similar need for supportive structures. The researchers observed that some of the principals interviewed had to create specific structures in order to give up their power. Those structures included school governing councils, school liaison groups and task forces, and policy structures that supported democratic decision-making (1999).

It is important to mention that the existence of a shared leadership structure may not equate to shared leadership. Wallace (2002) discussed this data in the findings of a study of a shared leadership structure in England and Wales, called Senior Management Teams (SMT’s). The SMT’s were comprised of both teachers and the principal, organized to discuss site-level issues. One finding in the study was that some SMT’s had a “top-down” approach, being run by the head teacher’s agenda, while other SMT’s had a “bottom-up” approach with issues being raised primarily by staff (p. 171). Neither of the

processes necessarily resulted in the decisions being made in a shared fashion or by a designated group. Final decisions often still resided with the formal leader.

More Than Collaboration

Collaboration is crucial in order for shared leadership to take place, as collaboration provides the necessary interactions for leadership to emerge (Muijs and Harris, 2003). Spillane (2006) noted that, in these collaborative interactions, “positional leaders, teachers or indeed others such as parents or school boards can take responsibility for leadership functions or routines that are not being fulfilled by others” (p. 46). In fact, Gronn (2000) argued that leadership, in principle, is emergent and fluid depending on the circumstance and context. Because leadership emerges from interaction, without this social interaction, leadership cannot be effectively distributed (Scribner et al., 2007). Leadership does not reside in one person, but is actually a residual function of the whole group and can only arise when the whole group interacts.

Shared leadership, however, is more than just the planned collaboration of teachers, but it is the allowance for the natural emergence of leaders through staff interaction (Harris, 2004). Interaction is a key component for distributed leadership, as leadership interaction is practiced among all individuals and not only between those in formal leadership roles. (Spillane, 2006). In distributed leadership, interaction within collaborative dialogues engages expertise on many levels of the organization allowing for informal leaders to contribute to decision-making (Scribner, Sawyer, Watson & Myers, 2007).

Harris (2004) argued that it is this activity of interaction and conversation that delineated it from merely team-working and collaboration. Harris posited that through activities such as team-working, collegiality and collaboration, leadership emerged from many individuals – though not because of the group itself, but because of the interactions that took place within the group. It is within these interactions that individuals perceive areas where they can contribute and lead.

While leadership theories and case studies of education leaders have yielded insights into elements of educational decision-making, researchers and practitioners still struggle to put boundaries around the phenomenon of leadership and have still been only partially successful (Rost, 1993). Most scholars agree that leadership relationships are substantially different from other types of human relationships, but researchers continue to find it difficult to articulate exactly what those differences might be. Leadership is clearly related to influencing others. Rost argued that the net result of all our efforts to demarcate leadership resulted in this definition:

Leadership is great men and women with certain preferred traits influencing followers to do what the leaders wish in order to achieve group/organizational goals that reflect excellence defined as some kind of higher-level effectiveness. (p.180)

It is that summary definition that brought me to my particular interest in innovativeness behaviors in successful principals as related to shared decision-making. Thus, I turn to an overview of innovation theory.

Innovation Theory and Innovativeness Research

Innovation theory offers a unique perspective on decision-making processes.

Rogers (2003) stated that innovation diffusion research dates back to the 1940s when researchers began documenting adoption rates of new seeds among farmers. Since that time, the body of knowledge has grown about the adoption of innovations, innovation diffusion and the construct of *innovativeness*. Innovation theory asserted that decisions to innovate, or adopt a change, are influenced by attributes of the innovation itself as well as by an individual's personal propensity for innovativeness behavior. In this study, I was interested more in the properties of innovativeness behaviors than in a particular innovation itself. However, a discussion of research on personal innovativeness characteristics must be framed within innovation theory in order to understand the theoretical relationship between an innovation and an individual's decision to adopt an innovation.

Attributes of an Innovation

Rogers (2003), the leading researcher and theoretician in this field, defined *innovation* as an idea, practice or object that is perceived as new. Individuals form opinions about an innovation based on the attributes of the innovation itself. In Rogers' (2003) synthesis of innovation diffusion research, he found that many researchers identified that an individual will judge an innovation along five attributes: a) relative advantage, b) compatibility, c) complexity, d) trialability, and e) observability. Relative advantage was the determination of what was gained by the new adoption over what was lost from changing familiar behavior in order to adopt the innovation. Innovations that

granted the most benefits for the least perceived sacrifices have more promise of being adopted.

Compatibility referred to the relationship between the innovation itself and an individual's held beliefs, values and past experiences. Innovations that were more compatible with an individual's values had a greater chance of being adopted. Innovations that were compatible with the individual's current successful practices were more likely to be adopted.

Complexity referred to how easy or difficult the innovation was to use. Less complex innovations were more likely to be adopted. Trialability was the degree to which an innovation can be temporarily used, tested and experienced in order to determine if the innovation had relative advantage and was perceived as compatible with current practices or desired outcomes. If an innovation can be observed working effectively in a comparable situation, the innovation has a greater chance of being adopted. Finally, observability referred to the degree to which an innovation yielded observable results. Innovations that garnered results that can be seen, touched or experienced have a higher chance of being adopted. (2003).

Individuals make decisions and construct opinions about an innovation based on characteristics of the innovation itself. Individuals determine if the innovation was easy to learn and easy to implement, as well as considering how well the innovation matched their already held values or beliefs. Consequently, an innovation that has appealing attributes has a greater chance to be adopted. For any innovation, individuals usually have a variety of opinions regarding any one of these attributes. The decision to adopt an

innovation in part or wholly will be influenced by each individual's perception of these attributes and the willingness or motivation of each individual to adopt something new. The process of innovation adoption is ultimately about many individuals making choices and decisions regarding an innovation.

Innovation adoption does not solely rest upon perceptions of the innovation itself, however, as personal attributes of individuals come into play. Individual predispositions to change and thinking about new ideas also influences innovation adoption. This personal predisposition construct is called *innovativeness* and has been defined and measured in prior research.

Innovativeness and Decision Making

Rogers (2003) described innovativeness as “the degree to which an individual or other unit of adoption is relatively earlier in adopting new ideas than the other members of a system” (p.22). For Rogers, innovativeness was defined by how early or late an individual adopts an innovation within any given system. In a seminal study of innovations adopted by Iowa farmers, Rogers (1958) advocated that innovation diffusion typically appeared as a normal distribution, with each standard deviation being a category of individual. Rogers gave each category of name, ranging from *innovators* (the earliest of adopters), early adopters, early majority (the immediate right of the mean), late majority (immediate left of the mean), and “laggards.” Hence, each category described the overall innovativeness of individuals within that category based on their relative time of adopting the innovation within their system.

A general criticism of this method of categorization is that it was retrospective, in that data is not collected until after the diffusion process has been completed. Because innovation diffusion can take years, data collected and categorized can also significantly be impacted by the recall of the individuals involved in the innovation adoption. Further, some researchers, like Midgley and Dowling (1978), believed that time-of-adoption methods ignored the important, and central, interpersonal networking aspect of diffusion.

Other researchers characterized innovativeness as a measure of personal traits possessed by individuals. Gillie (1971), in his study of innovativeness, concluded that innovators are by their personality more “adventuresome” and “deliberate and thoughtful” than most people while later adopters are “sceptical’ (sic) about new ideas (p.13). Hirschman (1980) conceptualized that the trait of “novelty seeking” was a core individual trait central to the construct of innovativeness. Hirschmann defined novelty seeking as “the desire to seek out the new and different” (p.285). She made distinctions, however, between inherent novelty seeking and actualized novelty seeking. Inherent novelty seeking pertained to the mere desire for something new and different, while actualized novelty seeking referred to the “initiation of behaviors intended to acquire new information” (p.285). One problem regarding trait models was the assumption that all people possessed such traits to some extent. Additionally, the actual definition of the traits themselves was inconsistent among researchers, offering little to further the definition of innovativeness (Hurt, Joseph & Cook, 1977). Goldsmith and Hofacker (1991) attributed innovative trait definition to behaviors and preferences, while Midgley and Dowling (1978) defined innovativeness on how an individual made decisions in

relation to personal network influences. Hirschman (1980) described innovativeness as a level of seeking novel experiences. Hurt, Joseph and Cook (1977) defined innovativeness as the extent in which a person was willing to change. This study uses Hurt, Joseph and Cook's concept of innovativeness as the working definition for the construct.

Goldsmith and Hofacker (1991) advanced the notion of trait influences a step further and tied traits to behavioral tendencies. In a series of six studies, Goldsmith and Hofacker utilized marketing research students to collect data from various individuals in the community regarding their preferences for different products. From this data, they constructed the Domain Specific Innovativeness Scale (DSI). The DSI was a measurement of consumer initiative which Goldsmith (2001) described as a "short, reliable, and valid self-report scale" that was used to measure consumer's innovativeness in relation to a specific product (p. 149). The DSI measured an individual's behaviors around specific products, such as how often a product-type was used. The result of research using this scale was a reliable measure of an individual's level of innovative behavior toward a specific product type. Goldsmith asserted that the DSI can be used in a variety of research settings and can be customized to measure innovativeness around different products. Goldsmith and Hofacker (1991) also claimed that the DSI was more reliable than time-of-adoption measures, as it was not limited by recall confounds, but rather yielded point-in-time data.

However, Goldsmith and Hofacker (1991) also noted a shortcoming of the DSI measure. It was limited to measuring consumer levels of innovativeness in regards to products used (1991). Because the DSI measured consumer innovativeness based on how

frequently a consumer used a certain product-type, the DSI could not accurately predict consumer behavior if the DSI referred to products rarely used by the consumer.

Midgley and Dowling (1978) defined innovativeness in terms of how one engaged in the social context of diffusion. They noted that innovativeness was a “hypothetical construct” that only existed in the context of innovation diffusion (p. 230), a construct measured in varying levels of abstraction. Midgley and Dowling commented that trait-behavior models, such as that embedded in the DSI, and time-of-adoption models as described by Rogers (2003) and others, did not encapsulate the diffusion process as they ignored the “situational and communication effects” that “intervene between individual innovativeness and their observed time of adoption” (p. 230). They suggested that diffusion behavior was affected by communication. Time-adoption measures will not capture this. Communication patterns also mediate one’s personal traits and rates of adoption in this framing of the construct.

Midgley and Dowling (1978) proposed that the most innovative individuals are those that evaluated innovations outside social processes. These individuals did not display a dependence on interpersonal communication when making decisions. Rather, they evaluated innovations independently. Midgley and Dowling asserted, then, that innate innovativeness was “the degree to which an individual makes innovation decisions independently of the communicated experience of others” (p. 235). Goldsmith and Clark (2006) also studied individual innovativeness and its susceptibility to interpersonal influence. Using a self-report questionnaire, 305 undergraduates at a university responded to items measuring personal innovativeness, their susceptibility to

interpersonal influence, the attention typically paid to social comparisons, and the extent to which each individual ignored interpersonal influences when making decisions. The findings suggested that innovators are less susceptible to interpersonal influence regarding innovation decisions in relation to less-innovative individuals.

Midgley and Dowling (1978) further asserted that individuals with a high degree of the characteristic of innovativeness presented more actualized innovativeness (observable innovative behavior, such as the trial of a new product). These *innate innovators* can thus be observed in action because they act independently from their interpersonal network. Huotilainen, Pirtila-Backman, and Tuorila (2005) studied 1,156 people in Finland to evaluate the relationship between levels of individual innovativeness, the awareness of foods, and food use. They found that the more innovative individuals were more aware and more willing to try new foods, while the less innovative were only willing to use familiar foods. Their results suggested that innovativeness could be considered a way of *doing*, and that product awareness and understanding were but pre-requisites for choosing, acting and doing. These findings underscored Midgely and Dowling's construct that a personal high level of innovativeness translated into researchable actions or behaviors.

Manning, Bearden and Madden (1995) attempted to measure innovativeness based on the innovativeness constructs of innate innovativeness suggested by Midgley and Dowling (1978) and the novelty seeking concept offered by Hirschman (1980). They constructed a questionnaire comprised of two sections: (a) measuring Consumer Novelty Seeking (CNS) and (b) Consumer Independent Judgment Making (CIJM). The measure

contained 13 Likert items, with 7 items measuring CNS, and 6 measuring CIJM. The CNS and CJIM measures were administered to 74 adults. The adults were also given a questionnaire measuring their awareness and usage of a variety of local products. Their findings, as proposed by Hirschman, were that those ranking higher on the CNS tended to be more interested in seeking information than trying new products. Alternately, those measuring higher on the CJIM had related more to new product trial than information seeking, as Midgley and Dowling (1978) had presumed.

Hurt, Joseph and Cook (1977) defined innovativeness as a personality construct that can be interpreted as a willingness to change. They designed an instrument to measure innovativeness, founded on the concept of the five innovativeness categories proposed by Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) (*early adopter, early majority, late majority and laggards*). Hurt, et al (1977) first administered a 53 item survey to 231 college students, and then again to 431 public school teachers. The survey was comprised of questions and statements that asked each respondent their level of agreement with a statement. The result of the measurement analysis resulted in a 20-item instrument that the authors argued was useful for measuring an individual's level of innovativeness and willingness to change, as well as predicting an individual's tendency to adopt innovations. The authors also tested a 10-item short survey constructed from items contained in the 20-item survey that also yielded high reliability scores (.92 correlation). Hurt noted concern that the Innovativeness Scales may not be able to predict behavior across populations, however. Further, in a study of the Innovativeness Scales, Pallister and Foxall (1998) found that the instrument may not be unidimensional as proposed by

Hurt, but rather other factors may exist that contribute to adoptive behaviors which are not measured by Hurt's scale. Pallister and Foxall administered Hurt's (1977) instrument to 308 adults who purchased financial products (mortgages, life insurance, pensions, etc.). The results affirmed a high internal reliability of the measure (especially for the 10 item short survey), but because the adults made decisions to purchase/not purchase for a variety of reasons, the unidimensionality of the measure was in doubt – Hurt's scales could not cover adequately the reasons people adopted certain products, which could, in turn, hinder the scales' predictive ability (Pallister, et al., 1977). However, this instrument remains the most valid developed instrument at this time.

There have been no research studies attempting to use the instrument in a non-product oriented setting, where the innovation under consideration is not so much a product as a change in procedure and process. No research studies were identified on the use of innovativeness scales in educational settings to predict or determine an individual principal or teacher's likelihood to adopt a particular innovation, based on particular personality behaviors of innovativeness.

Most research around the adoption of innovations in public schools has used either the change theoretical construct of Michael Fullan (1991, 2003) or the learning organization construct largely attributed to Senge (1990), where change or innovation was largely viewed as something to be managed by the leaders of the school and not as an attribute of the leader *per se*. Innovativeness has largely been defined as one way to describe an organization, a program, or teachers, but not characteristics of an individual principal (Fairman et al, 1979; Cunningham & Cordeiro, 2009). Salisbury and McGregor

(2002) found the reported characteristic of innovativeness in a principal correlated to successful inclusive elementary schools. However, they did not use a scale to measure it nor did they define what it means specifically. Hite et al (2006) looked at perceptions of innovativeness in a school administrator network but did not use a scale to measure the construct and found no association between administrator characteristics and perceptions of others.

While the characteristic of approaching leadership with a creative and innovative mind was implicit in many leadership models, creativity and innovativeness are seldom named directly. Instead, phrases like “behaving as leaders” (Schlechty, 2000), “create a supportive environment” (Kyle, 1988), “recognizing the need for fundamental change” (Odden, 1995), having an “educational improvement perspective” (Marsh, 1997), or “having a nose for the right problems” (Deal and Kennedy, 1982) are phrases scattered throughout the leading literature. Little explanation was given as to exactly how those outcomes were to be achieved, and less was given about the particular personal traits that predisposed a leader to act in certain innovative ways. Instead, the assumption was that all leaders were innovative and that innovativeness was probably a key necessary characteristic for a school leader. In most descriptions of leaders in the educational leadership literature, leaders often sounded like Rogers’ (2003) “early adopters” or “innovators” but were seldom described in that language. Perhaps our understanding of what a good leader does can be at a deeper level if we adopted the stance of innovativeness and looked to see what relationship existed between personal

characteristics of an innovativeness predisposition and behaviors of leadership around a particular innovation. That gap in the literature was what led me to this study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In Yin's (2003) typology of case studies, this was an embedded, exploratory single case study in which I looked at the relationship between a measure of principal innovativeness and shared leadership behaviors surrounding the implementation of one district policy in a single district. An embedded case study, as in any case study, allows for studying a phenomenon using multiple sources of evidence. The embedded case study has the purpose to describe context and processes of a phenomenon, allowing both quantitative and qualitative methods as necessary. The embedded approach is particularly useful in examining phenomenon where complete contexts are not obvious.

As described in Chapter II of this study, much of the prior research on individual innovativeness has come from the business realm where innovativeness has primarily been measured by the relative speed of adoption of a product or product type. In this study, I explored the relationship between a widely-accepted definition of innovativeness and principal behaviors and perceptions around the implementation of an educational policy initiative. Because there was no prior research directly related to the use of this measure in a policy context in a school setting, especially as it relates to leadership behavior, this was appropriately an exploratory study.

The Context of the Innovation

The policy that I chose as the focus of principal behaviors was the Literacy Curriculum Learning Targets (Beaverton School District, 2006), which is referred to throughout this study as the "literacy targets." In November of 2006, the Beaverton

School District in Oregon approved and adopted literacy targets as a function of accomplishing the school board's stated goal of improving literacy gains for each student. These learning targets represented, for the district, the objectives and best practices for literacy instruction at every grade level, Kindergarten through grade 12. According to the district's timetable, December of 2006 represented the month in which each school should have begun the process of implementing the adopted literacy targets. Every principal received the list of literacy targets at the end of November.

The school district is located in a suburb of a metropolitan area. Each school varies in size and demographics. Schools ranged from 900 – 1,200 students, and were comprised of multi-ethnic, multi-racial populations of varied socio-economic status.

Methods

I measured principal innovativeness using the Innovativeness Scales constructed by Hurt et al. (Appendix A) and compared results to each principal's self-reported leadership behaviors around the innovation using a standard report protocol (Appendix B). I also interviewed each building's literacy committee chair-person and a literacy committee member regarding their perceptions of leadership behavior surrounding the literacy targets (Appendix C). My primary research question was: What is the nature of the relationship, if any, between the measure of innovativeness of principals and the shared leadership behaviors they exhibited surrounding the implementation of the literacy targets?

Participants

Intended participants were six middle school principals in the Beaverton School District. Participants also included the literacy committee chair-person and a literacy committee member from each school (total n-18). Each principal was in his or her current position at the time of the district's implementation of the literacy targets. Of the six principals, 4 were female, 2 were male.

Measures

To measure the innovativeness of principals, I used Hurt et al (1977) Innovativeness Scale (Attachment A) at the beginning of the study time period. For each statement, principals ascribed a number ranging from 1-7, with each number having a meaning as follows: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = moderately disagree, 4 = undecided, 5 = moderately agree, 6 = agree, and 7 = strongly agree. These rating are per the Innovativeness Scale as constructed by Hurt et al. It is important to note that on the Hurt's scale short form, items 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8 and 10 are reversed reporting, meaning that, according to the questionnaire, the most innovative individuals will ascribe a "1" to each item. The remaining three items, 5, 7 and 9, are scored 1-7, with the most innovative individuals ascribing a 7 to each item. For the purposes of analysis, all items are scored 1-7, with a "1" for the least innovative response to a 7 for the greatest innovative response, respectfully. The scored responses are then totaled, with the higher the higher score denoting a higher the level of innovativeness. Using the 10-item short form, the innovativeness range would be from 10 (lowest innovativeness) to 70 (highest

innovativeness). The scale does not attach labels or descriptions of innovativeness for specific scores (Hurt et al, 1977).

To identify leadership behaviors, I used a self-constructed semi-structured interview protocol that was designed to gather data specifically regarding leadership behaviors around the literacy targets. In an effort to triangulate self-reported leadership behaviors, the literacy committee chair-person and a literacy committee member were interviewed at each site.

Procedures and Data Analysis

Over the course of four weeks, I met with each of the principals individually to administer the short form Innovativeness Scale and to conduct an interview. Over the same time frame, I interviewed each school's literacy coach individually. I digitally recorded each interview. Responses to the interviews were transcribed and coded for themes. Responses from the Innovativeness Scale and coded responses from the interviews were compiled and patterns between leadership behaviors and reported innovativeness were identified within each school for each principal and across schools. It is expected that there will be considerable variation between principals regarding their innovativeness scores as well as their reported leadership behavior. This variation should allow correlation between the principal's innovativeness scores and leadership behavior.

Potential Threats to Validity

First, there may be reactive effects from the Innovativeness Scale. The scale may cause principals to feel judged or defensive as the measure inquires about their level of innovativeness. Second, they may or may not judge this to be a quality they find

important in their role as principal or that they think they do well. Third, knowing that I was a member within this school district, principals may have inadvertently responded more positively in regard to implementation behaviors than they might have if I was not a member of the district. Lastly, the collected data is retrospective and, therefore, possibly inaccurate, as principals and others were asked to recall behaviors over the past several months.

Because there were no prior studies in schools using this scale, it is not possible to check the findings of this study against that of prior researchers. The sample size is small and was also not random. Therefore, the study must be considered exploratory and therefore limited in generalizability to other settings or personnel. I have attempted to make my procedures and analysis as explicit as possible so future readers can make their own determination about the generalizability of these findings to a particular setting.

CHAPTER IV

DATA REPORT AND ANALYSIS

Change in Methods

For this study, I had intended to study six middle school principals, using the literacy committee chairperson and another individual from the building's literacy committee in interviews as a check against the reported perceptions and behaviors from the principal. I subsequently learned, however, that not all of these schools used a literacy committee. All schools did have a literacy coach, and these individuals were used instead. In addition, one school had to be dropped from the study, primarily due to time commitments of the principal. Thus, my planned sample size (n=18) ended up being smaller (n=10) by the time I had completed the study. It is also important to note that three of the five interviewed literacy coaches were not serving as literacy coaches when the district's literacy targets were scheduled to first be implemented, as originally planned in the proposed research design. One was not serving in the building in any capacity at the time of beginning implementation and, thus, responses might differ from the others because I was not able to hold the time frame stable as planned. The other two literacy coaches who were not literacy coaches when the project started had both been language arts teachers in their respective buildings and had participated in the initial stages of the implementation in that role. The tenure of the literacy coaches was not identified in any setting to protect confidentiality of all participants.

Similarities in Innovativeness Scores

It was expected that innovativeness scores would be considerably varied.

Principals' innovativeness scores, however, were similar. According to Hurt et al (1977) *Innovativeness Scales*, the highest possible innovativeness score is 70, and the lowest innovativeness score is 10. The principals' scores were fairly close to each other, being 56, 56, 58, 61 and 61. In terms of innovativeness, most principals appear to be more innovative than not, scoring in a more innovative range on the continuum.

Reported leadership behavior had limited variance as well. Leadership behavior typically consisted of meeting with or within similar structures, such as with teams or small groups or a committee, or with similar people, such as interactions with the literacy coach. Variance of leadership behavior between principals was seen in how many structures were used, the types of staff involved within those structures (formal or informal leaders), how often those structures met, and in the extent of decision making power allowed to the staff within those structures (consultant versus shared decision making power).

Results are next presented for each middle school. The principal's innovativeness score is presented first, then results of the interview data. Interview data is presented in the order of:

1. The level of importance that the principal placed on the literacy targets in regards to student achievement.
2. Data that gives insight into the extent the literacy targets are an innovation and,
3. Data giving insight into the principal's leadership behavior.

In an effort to protect confidentiality, some items had to be changed or omitted in the process of reporting results. First, pseudonyms are used to identify each middle school. Second, the tenure of principals is not reported, though all were present in their buildings at the time the district's literacy targets were implemented. Further, all principals are referred to as "she" and all literacy coaches are referred to as "he."

Individual School Data

Brookfield Middle School

Principal Innovativeness Score: 61

Perspective of Literacy Targets. The principal stated that she believed that the literacy targets were "core" and "essential" to literacy achievement, as the targets provided a framework to have conversations with teachers around achievement and the assessment of achievement. She said, "We [middle schools] don't have anything to assess, and we can't have a common language around it." Consequently, she believed that the literacy targets provided the building blocks for a common language for literacy assessment. The literacy coach shared this value of the literacy targets. He stated, "[The targets are] very important, because that's what we're supposed to be teaching...they are vitally important."

Targets as an innovation. When the targets were explained to the staff, the principal stated the targets represented a "huge change" for staff. She stated the importance of literacy itself was not new, but the processes it required were new, such as the necessity to spread literacy instruction across the curriculum. She stated:

The fact that the targets came out as 'literacy targets' instead of 'language arts targets'...one of our language arts teachers stood up and

said, ‘hallelujah, finally...this is not just owned by language arts’... and I think that is the biggest change.

She remarked that “some” are embedding literacy strategies in their curriculum, but that this is an ongoing effort. She also commented that she does know that “everyone’s talking the language of [of literacy], and I don’t know if we’ve ever been there [previously]”.

The literacy coach echoed the principal’s sentiments, stating “I don’t think there are any surprises in the targets” as “we did have matrices before the targets, which kind of played the same role.” He noted, however, that the formality of the literacy targets brought the issue of literacy instruction “to the top.” He added, “I think the literacy targets caused more conversation on how we are meeting, or not meeting, those targets”. He believed these discussions were a change in themselves, as they used to be informal, but now they were formal and meetings were designed to have conversations about implementation as the targets are “right there in front of you.”

Formal leaders and decision-making. The principal stated that the literacy coach was “a partner” who was “heavily involved” in the literacy effort. She stated that the literacy coach constructed a literacy team that facilitated conversations on how to align the literacy targets. The principal stated that having the literacy coach lead the implementation of the literacy targets was “so natural” as she was the literacy leader in the building, but mentioned “it’s not like I handed it [the literacy effort] off to him and didn’t have a handle on it...we met every single week so we could talk about strategies.” The principal commented that the literacy coach coordinated other staff in the building to strategize implementation of the targets. The literacy coach explained that he initially met

with the language arts teachers and facilitated conversations around articulation of the targets, and that this conversation was ongoing.

The principal stated that she collaborated with other formal leaders (other coaches), in addition to the literacy coach, to strategize the literacy target implementation. This collaboration took place mostly in monthly meetings. The literacy coach also stated that this collaboration took place about once per month to discuss how to proceed with implementation. The literacy coach noted that participation on the literacy committee had dropped off somewhat due to the staff's current focus on a different building priority. He expected this to change as the other project was completed. He stated that the literacy committee had been comprised of language arts teachers, the principal, a librarian, a parent, a social studies teacher and an art teacher.

Structures and interactions. The principal noted that she had conversations with staff primarily at staff meetings, where information was given regarding the literacy effort. She also stated that staff meetings were used to gather an understanding of how staff were dealing with implementation. She stated she used this time to re-frame any issues to help staff adjust to the changes, especially at the inception of the targets strategy. The literacy coach commented that these meetings were primarily used (by the literacy coach) to present strategies to improve literacy instruction, but due to the other efforts inside the building, these staff meetings have needed to be used for other purposes as well.

The principal also mentioned that she has had many additional conversations with staff outside official staff meetings in attempts to gather feedback regarding adjustments

to the school improvement plan, especially in how it related to the literacy efforts. She stated that she plans to gather this feedback and have staff make recommendations for the site council as to specific school improvement efforts in the future.

The literacy coach remarked that one of his primary responsibilities was to “be in charge of developing staff on literacy strategies,” but this has primarily been a system of providing “support and modeling to teachers who request it,” or a system that has been “completely voluntary.” He does not see his role as mandated from the principal, but one that has grown from how he sees his role inside the building – a role that he feels supported in, “She’s [the principal] giving us [the coaches] the license to do what we think is important...not just ‘here is my agenda, now go out and fulfill it’.”

Clear Creek Middle School

Principal Innovativeness Score: 56

Perceptions of Literacy Targets. The principal said that she felt that the targets were important and played a significant role in education, stating: “Philosophically, they’re incredibly important. It sends a message that K-12 literacy is the responsibility for all teachers.” The literacy coach agreed, stating, “I think they [the literacy targets] are the top thing...they are our guiding principal.”

Targets as an innovation. The principal believed it was a change, but the degree to which it was a change depended upon the individual. She stated: “I think it varies. For some, who are more content trained [science, math], there was some uncomfortableness (sic) and uneasiness.” The uneasiness, she said, rested in how to support literacy skills as a content teacher. The literacy coach echoed this sentiment,

stating: “I think initially people were freaked out about it, but once they looked at it and began to understand them...I think they thought, ‘this is what I’m already doing.’” He expounded on that point: “The initial thought was of inadequacy,” as content teachers were afraid they would have to be reading teachers. That’s where the targets come into play...people understand that it’s all our responsibility.”

Though she said that the content teachers had some difficulty at first in accepting the targets, the principal suggested that uneasiness was dissipating over time, stating: “I think we have very few teachers now, if, that would not embrace the idea that everyone here is responsible for literacy.” The literacy coach responded similarly, stating: “I think the staff have done a really good job adopting those, and being willing to...step outside their comfort zones...especially for some people. They’ve been really accepting of them.”

Formal leaders and decision-making. The principal said that she used the literacy coach to help meet the needs of staff. The role of the literacy coach came through conversations between the principal and coach. The principal stated: “I had some direction from central office...ultimately it’s been me sitting down with [the literacy coach] and having a conversation with him about our specific needs. I tried to cater it [his service] based on his skills and our needs.” The literacy coach was specific in his job description: “My job is to help implement the targets. That’s what my job revolves around.” However, he noted that the practical function of the job had been evolutionary:

It’s still a work in progress. The directive came from district that they didn’t want the coaches teaching. At that point...[the principal] and I sat down...and hashed it all out about what my roles were going to be.

He commented that he took some time to ask his own questions about what he could and should be doing, and there were things he had in mind regarding what he'd like to do. He mentioned that the principal set out some general principles of what she liked to do, and he used his judgment in fulfilling those principles.

One of the ways the principal used her coaches was by trying to have them function as a team. One thing she said she felt helped this was by referring to them as "the coaches" instead of "the math coach" or the "literacy coach." She thought they served a global purpose among the staff: "they are to serve anybody at any time" – a perspective she believed helped the literacy effort.

One of the way's in which we've pushed the targets is by not having the coaches being strictly [by content area].

The literacy coach confirmed that sentiment: "The math and literacy coach work together. She wanted us to function as a team."

Structures and Interactions. The principal stated she held that staff should be active participants in the direction of initiatives within the school. She commented: "I don't believe it has to be me who's doing it.

It has to be staff. They're the one's who are doing it.

My job is to find out who can do it, who has the trust of staff. It's not that I'm not involved, but it has to appear coming from them.

One structure she used was the Principal Advisory Committee (PAC). This was a committee comprised of about a dozen staff members. She noted how she used the PAC in the initial phases of implementing the literacy targets.

We talked about it in Principal's Advisory Committee" to gauge the staff. I've always used PAC as a form of sounding board.

After discussing it in the PAC, she “brought it to staff, then to department meetings.”

The principal mentioned having a literacy committee. The committee was made up of interested teachers who volunteered to serve. The literacy committee met once per month to discuss strategies and ways to support teachers. The principal conveyed the importance of having the committee: “In order [for the targets] to be embraced by staff, I wanted a committee of staff members who were really guiding that project.” The literacy committee discussed the targets, strategies and curriculum supports as well as designed a literacy period dedicated to direct instruction. The principal noted, “I needed a committee of teachers, not me, but teachers, to design that literacy period.”

The literacy coach detailed the literacy committee and the opportunity it posed to staff:

There’s people who’ve asked to be part of the committee...because they liked to see where things were moving. There were people who really wanted to be part of it and...lead staff development, either with me or on their own. And there have been other people who’ve taken a role on their team, or in their grade level. The committee has done a great job of spotlighting them and asking them to present what they do.

The coach noted the role of the committee and the principal on the committee:

The literacy committee was to guide the literacy process. She has let us lead things. She’s part of the committee, but she doesn’t lead it. She’s an active participant. The teachers [on the committee] wanted to make changes, and the principal was a part of that group but didn’t direct it.

The principal mentioned a time during the initial phases of implementation when she believed that implementation meant restructuring the master schedule and perhaps adding curricular support in place to bolster the effort. The principal referred to the ad hoc restructuring committee she created to tackle this restructuring:

I developed a committee for restructuring. There were 17 staff members on the committee. We opened the door for everything - what is it that we think as a group are the 3, 4 or 5 main things we'd like to try to address? One of the things I kept pushing was literacy instruction for all students. Now there were others, but again, I was willing to compromise on those...[the committee agreed] we could not continue to do business the same way. I had mid to high 20's [volunteer]. I took 17. I took the others I didn't select and used them as a sounding board.

So, with the main group, we would meet and come up with some things to talk about, I would take the other 8 people and meet with them separately and gather feedback, suggestions and ideas. I was the person to go between, to go back and forth.

The literacy coach recalled the beginning for the literacy targets: "On staff development day, we broke into groups...mixed content areas...and sat with them and talked about some things". This time was used to come to agreements on the team, and to determine needed resources. He said that the teams also divided up the literacy targets between the content areas and "sharing the workload." The spirit of the conversations was about making decisions on how each team would implement the targets.

It was left to the teams to decide; our administration has been more hands off about telling you what you have to do, and so it was more about idea sharing and then you could go back to your team...and say this is what other groups are doing, what can we do?

The principal also commented on the use of data teams and staff meetings. Data teams met twice per month, were comprised of small grade level teams and other staff, and provided a time to collaborate on literacy interventions. Staff meetings were once per month, at which time a staff member, not necessarily someone from the literacy committee, presented a literacy strategy.

The literacy coach noted involvement of informal leaders in the literacy effort: "people are coming to me...a ton of people...who hear somebody talking [about a

strategy] and want to try it, too. A number of staff have informally modeled strategies for other teachers in the building.”

Pine Crest Middle School

Principal Innovativeness Score: 61

Perceptions of the Literacy Targets. The principal said, “It’s [the targets] important, we recognized the need to have targets.” She stated that, without the targets, “you don’t know what to plan for, or what direction. The learning targets helped focus that discussion around literacy goals and outcomes.” The literacy coach confirmed the targets’ relative importance to the staff, “They come up...everyone feels they are important.” He continued, “they are important. They guide decisions on what to teach and set your priorities, though I don’t know what each staff member would say about them.”

Targets as an Innovation. The principal observed some degree of change when the literacy targets were introduced to the staff, but not a significant change. “They [the targets] weren’t revolutionary”. She stated, “There was agreement that, yes, those [targets] are things that we need to work on. The issue was...when do we do that, and how do we get there?” She mentioned there were also questions about the time and resources needed for implementation. She noted that the targets represented a paradigm shift: “We are all teachers of literacy...that was a new twist.” The coach echoed this change: “All our content teachers...realized they are not just a science teacher, or a social studies teacher.”

Formal Leaders and Decision-Making. The principal remarked that literacy decisions were made initially between the literacy coach and herself: “Decisions usually began with the literacy coach and me. We had regular discussions...and the vice principal was a part of the discussions as well, on occasion. Then it goes to committee [to discuss] how staff embraced the idea and what kind of support can we give teachers.” The literacy coach noted that he met with the principal about every two weeks, along with the math coach, to get feedback regarding ideas and strategies in implementing the targets.

The literacy coach was primarily used for the development of staff at this site. The literacy coach stated that the principal would give him time if needed to present information to staff, and that the principal gave freedom for decision-making: “She’s very hands off. She allows staff freedom for choices and supports efforts.”

Structures and Interactions. The principal mentioned the use of staff meetings and staff development days for staff development: “On a regular basis at the staff meetings and staff development times was presenting specific strategies to use.” In fact, staff development days were used to introduce the literacy targets to the staff. The principal reported: “Our literacy coach basically presented the information...that how they were rolled out. It wasn’t a major event...there wasn’t any reluctance to do it.” Presently, staff meetings and staff development days are used to provide literacy strategies. The principal remarked: “We make sure we have some sort of learning, some sort of update or support from the coaches.”

The principal reported that a literacy committee was involved in the literacy effort. She commented that the literacy committee discussed ideas and how they could

best be implemented by staff. She noted that ideas start from the literacy committee and then go back to the staff. The principal reported that the role of the staff, at this point, was to give feedback about the usefulness of the strategy, but the primary role of the staff was “to actually try out the strategies being presented – to make it happen.” The principal stated that the committee members would report out to staff the results of that strategy. The literacy coach mentioned that the literacy committee met in November and had not met since. He noted that the committee served to support teachers, but “as far as a clear vision, clarified or explained, that isn’t so much there.”

The principal reported that teachers collaborated. She stated that the language arts teachers met to discuss the literacy effort – something those teachers initiated: “It was a grass roots thing, that was not something I set up...because they recognized it [the need to meet].” The literacy coach detailed some of this collaboration between the language arts teachers: “Our language arts teachers looked at the literacy targets...to try to see where they are overlapping and gaps were they were teaching. In the fall the whole staff got involved in where we can address some of the gaps.” He added: “They initiated the conversation themselves.”

The principal mentioned that teachers used formalized collaboration time when the monetary resources were available for teachers to use. She stated that teachers now get together informally when they can. The literacy coach also reported: “teams come together all the time to plan team [literacy] things.” He mentioned the school had content area meetings and hall meetings. However, according to the literacy coach, literacy was

discussed usually only at the language arts meetings. However, he added, “it [literacy] might pop up in a hall meeting. I don’t know if it’s always on the agenda.”

Riverview Middle School

Principal Innovativeness Score: 56

Perspective of Literacy Targets. The principal of Riverview said that she believes the literacy targets to be “very important,” as they highlight the message that literacy development is continuous and does not stop with one grade level. She added that the literacy targets have also allowed the conversation that literacy is not just owned by one content area. The literacy coach shared the value of the targets, stating that the targets were “hugely important” because they “spread responsibility across all contents.” With the targets, he added, “we can philosophically be accountable for addressing these within their content areas.”

Targets as an Innovation. The principal said that she felt that the literacy targets were “not that great of a change” as they had “validated previous work” in literacy. Whether it was due to new teachers being prepared for literacy work, or the cadre of teachers she had working on literacy in the building, she felt that when the literacy targets were presented that they “didn’t seem too outrageous of a concept” to the staff.

The literacy coach had a different perspective on the level of change the literacy targets represented for staff, stating it was a “huge change” especially in regards “on what to do with the most needy of students.” Because of what he saw as the magnitude of this change, he mentioned encountering some “mumbles and grumbles” during implementation efforts.

Formal Leaders and Decision-Making. The principal stated that she met with staff to plan the initial implementation of the literacy targets. She stated: “I had a group of people look at the data and we determined...for the school improvement plan...that the focus would be on writing.” The people primarily used to direct the effort were her coaches, with whom she would meet to discuss overall strategy of implementation of the writing targets. She also stated that she primarily wanted her literacy coach to implement data teams and bring the literacy target discussion to the teachers. Of the literacy coach, she said: “We met all the time. We laid out how to...we had a timeline. The goal was to get the teams self-directed.”

The literacy coach stated that he met weekly with the principal for the purpose of reviewing implementation progress and to lay out strategies on working with particular staff members. He added that “we tag-teamed regarding the direction we needed to go” and “the purpose of the meetings was to get feedback.” He noted that in the meetings they “worked together on an agreed upon strategy and came to a decision. I was there to say, ‘have you thought about this?’”

Structures and Interactions. The principal commented that she spoke with the humanities teachers to assist them in re-defining their roles in the literacy effort, and gave them permission to not be the sole purveyors of literacy content. She stated that she had conversations with staff and promoted writing instruction “all the time, non-stop.” The principal stated she had conversations with the leaders of the humanities department and moved the conversation to the broader group of content teachers. She had these

conversations in neighborhood meetings, staff meetings, staff development meetings, and school leadership teams.

The literacy coach reported that it was the principal's charge to have him get data teams "up and running." It was in these data teams that the literacy coach connected with staff, and looked to support the teachers, either through gathering resources, consulting, or modeling behaviors. The coach stated that in these meetings he looked to do "anything...to ease the teachers into effective instructional practices."

The literacy coach reported that even though he did meet with individual teachers, this represented "a bit of a challenge...everyone is super busy." Consequently, the data teams were the primary forum for literacy target conversation: "All conversations about the implementation of the literacy targets happen in the data teams." Still, he noted that "I talk with everybody and I meet with everybody."

The literacy coach remarked that the data teams "provided a sense of team support, focus and external support [from] me and the principal". He also described the data teams as a place where "people would propose something [regarding instruction]." He added that conversations from data teams would, at times, move to staff meetings where teachers would show data and convey strategies.

Sunnyside Middle School

Principal Innovativeness Score: 58

Perspective of Literacy Targets. The principal believed that the targets were "very important." In fact, the staff had instituted a class for literacy instruction which all content areas taught three days per week, before the district made literacy a formal thrust

of instruction via the literacy targets. The principal said that she held that the district's literacy targets helped solidify the effort in the building: "[the targets] gave us the extra push to broaden the effort into all content areas." The literacy coach stated that the literacy targets were "not that big of a shock," because there had been a previous goal of the building to infuse literacy into each content area.

Targets as an Innovation. The principal said that she believed the targets have been a very "significant change," as staff recognized the need to change their practices. The literacy coach, however, did not feel the literacy targets represented much of a change. He stated, "[the targets] were not that big of a shock. A goal had been to infuse literacy in each content area." The principal mentioned that she administered a survey to the staff regarding literacy instruction. She stated that "85% believed it was important, while others were unsure on what they were doing or how to do it." This teaching of new practices was ongoing, as the principal stated, "We are still doing development to help teachers [to learn] how to embed literacy targets into their content area."

Formal leaders and Decision-Making. The principal reported that she met once per month for formal meetings with the literacy and math coaches, along with the vice principals. She used both the vice principals and the coaches for suggestions. A decision to create a "literacy workshop" was made by this team, while a decision to make an ESL student reading group was made between the literacy coach and the principal. Of the literacy coach, the principal noted: "He has a set thing that he's expected to do, but...can also say, 'try this.'" The literacy coach echoed her sentiment, stating, "she trusts my professional judgment."

Initially, the literacy coach looked at the literacy targets and “helped assess what common practices were necessary.” The literacy coach would meet with the principal and, at times, also with the vice principals, and strategize on how to develop and build skills with the staff. Regarding the literacy coach, the principal said, “We did the strategizing.”

Structures and Interactions. During the initial introduction of the literacy targets, the principal utilized “school improvement teams” who made recommendations. The teams presented eight recommendations to the whole staff, of which the staff chose three to implement.

The principal mentioned that the literacy teams folded into the created school improvement teams and defined the teams as “ad hoc literacy teams” where literacy was an integral part of their broader instructional conversations. She described critical friends groups – a form of collaboration team – that met and had a literacy focus. The teams followed a protocol and were typically voluntarily facilitated by a teacher or staff member.

The principal commented on the use of various meetings within the building in which literacy was part of the conversation. The principal mentioned the use of professional learning teams (PLTs), broken up by content area. The administration had given them the “dilemma of identifying the essential learning targets and necessary interventions.” Regarding these PLT’s, she noted lack of teacher leadership at this point in its implementation: “We still don’t have the teacher leadership in the PLT’s. We still

need an administrator or coach involved or else the agenda doesn't always get set or accomplished.”

The principal also reported the use of data teams – teams made up of teachers and staff - that considered literacy data and assisted in the decision-making of how to proceed with interventions and strategies. Classroom teachers were used to go over practices with staff during staff meetings and staff development days. The principal stated: “we have some teachers who have come forward [to present material], and some are recruited.”

Summary of Results

Innovativeness and Extent of Shared Leadership

Brookfield Middle School (Principal Innovativeness Score: 61)

Decision-making around the literacy effort primarily involved the formal leaders of the literacy coaches and herself, with the data suggesting she shared decision-making power with the coaches. She collaborated with them regularly to make decisions about the overall literacy strategy for the staff. She involved staff in a consulting relationship, gathering feedback regarding implementation decisions.

Clear Creek Middle School (Principal Innovativeness Score: 56)

The principal met regularly with the literacy coach and math coach as a team to strategize building-wide implementation strategies. She shared building-wide decision-making power with the principal advisory committee, and had created ad hoc committees comprised of volunteer staff with which she also shared building-wide decision-making power. The literacy committee had the freedom to make building-wide and classroom-

level decisions around literacy implementation. Data teams and content area meetings were given decision-making power for classroom-level decisions.

Pine Crest Middle School (Principal Innovativeness Score: 61)

Building-wide literacy decisions primarily rested with the principal and the literacy coach, with a decision process that sometimes included the vice-principals. The data suggests the principal shared decision-making power with the literacy coach. There was a structure of the literacy committee which was used in a consultation role for building-level decisions and given the freedom to make decisions regarding classroom-level implementation. However, it did not meet regularly. Staff efforts to self-organize and collaborate as needed were supported, if not encouraged, by the principal.

Riverview Middle School (Principal Innovativeness Score: 56)

Decision-making power was shared between the principal and the literacy coach, with whom she meets regularly. She had the structure of the data team, comprised of teachers and the literacy coach, to make classroom-level literacy intervention decisions. The principal used ad hoc teams, comprised of formal and informal leaders, to determine the overall direction of the literacy effort. She involved the staff as a whole during meetings or within team forums, in a consultation role.

Sunnyside Middle School (Principal Innovativeness Score: 58)

Decision-making power around the literacy effort was shared between the principal and a team comprised of the literacy and math coach and sometimes included the vice-principals. The principal utilized the structure of school improvement teams comprised of teachers to make decisions regarding the direction of the building-wide

literacy effort. The principal also shared decision-making power with the staff in determining the direction of the building-wide literacy effort. She supported data teams, allowing teacher-led, classroom-level literacy decisions to be made by the teams.

Summary of All Schools

All of the principals, literacy coaches and other staff members demonstrated both a willingness to innovate in both formal and voluntary efforts to design the literacy targets so they made sense in the particular school setting. The principals all demonstrated at least some commitment to shared and distributed decision-making in the manner in which they formed and shared power with their different staff teams. Some principals utilized formal structures (literacy committees, formal decision-making groups, ad-hoc groups) with which they shared power. Some principals relied on informal conversations with staff, or utilized formal structures informally, having irregular meeting times or meeting on an *as needed* basis.

All participants interviewed identified the literacy targets as at least, in part, an innovation. Some described the literacy targets as substantial innovations that represented a substantial challenge for the staff to alter practices, while others described the innovation as more in line with, or an extension of, previous literacy efforts. The data indicates that the principals were unanimous in the belief that the targets represented a positive addition to the work in education.

Targets as an Innovation

To revisit, Rogers (2003) defined *innovation* as an idea, practice or object that is perceived as new. The data from the principals and literacy coach's statements suggest

that the spirit of the targets was not new for the principals, as they all agreed upon the importance of literacy achievement. In light of that fact, it may be that the literacy targets themselves may not be considered an innovation as defined by Rogers. Consequently, the district adoption of the literacy targets may not be innovative in and of itself, nor school-wide efforts to focus on the concepts within the literacy targets may be innovative, as per Roger's definition. Yet, each principal recognized the new concept within the targets that all content teachers were responsible for helping each student's literacy achievement, prompting change of practice among staff.

Though principals welcomed this change of practice, this change of practice meant moving staff to accept the changes - a challenge that left each principal finding her own unique way to create and navigate her approach to interacting with staff, garnering support, and devising actions for implementation. Consequently, the literacy targets appear to be an innovation for the principals as it translates to changing practice. The conceptual change that content teachers are also literacy teachers was new, and the necessity for principals to find unique ways to interact with staff for implementation purposes was new as well.

Hurt's Innovativeness Scale and Relevance to Educators

Four of the five principals believed the scale was very relevant in measuring innovativeness. Those principals appeared to agree that education is fundamentally about change and being comfortable with change, thereby making the questionnaire items relevant to them. One principal was not comfortable with the questions, however. She said that she believed 'innovativeness' should be attached to an outcome or value-added

product; consequently, if one has not produced anything that is beneficial, one is not innovative. As such, to that principal, the questionnaire falls short in measuring a useful personal construct of innovativeness.

Reported innovativeness score and behavior do not seem to be related.

Riverview's principal, who scored a 56, demonstrated similar leadership behavior as principals who had more innovative scores (Pine Crest and Brookfield, each with 61). Further, Pine Crest and Brookfield principals had higher scores than principals who exhibited more shared leadership behavior (Clear Creek, 56). Additionally, there did not appear to be any differences between a principal's reported score and the literacy coach's perception of her as principal.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The data suggests there were similarities in contexts and innovativeness scores, as well as similarities in leadership behavior. The data also appears to indicate differences existed in the breadth and depth of shared leadership which manifested in building-wide versus classroom-level decision-making.

Similarities in Contexts

According to the data, all of these principals agreed with the spirit of the targets and agreed they were necessary. In fact, the principals mentioned that the literacy targets helped bolster the conversation about literacy achievement among their staffs.

Additionally, all of the principals worked with staff in which literacy and literacy achievement were deemed as important. Further, all principals and literacy coaches mentioned efforts to increase literacy achievement before the 2006 literacy targets were implemented. Similarly, each school had many staff who needed to learn new tasks and new procedures. Collaboration and staff development focused around implementing the literacy targets. Each principal reported having to deal with content teachers who were resistant to the new literacy effort, perhaps supporting the common theme among principals and literacy coaches that the literacy targets represented a change in practice.

Building-wide versus Classroom-Level Decision Making

All of the principals utilized and supported structures that allowed for teacher-driven decisions for classroom level implementation. The number of structures available

varied from school to school, but all schools had some structure in which teachers could make decisions around classroom-level implementation.

Regarding building-wide decisions, all principals shared building-wide decision-making power with their formal leaders of literacy coach and/or a team of the literacy coach and math coach. Similarly, only two principals, namely from Clear Creek and Sunnyside, involved the whole staff for building-wide decision-making, with the other principals involved whole staff on a consultation basis, retaining decision-making among the formal leaders. The data suggests that, while all principals were comfortable is allowing teachers to exercise autonomous decision-making power regarding classroom instructional strategies, some principals were more comfortable in sharing building-wide decision making power with informal leaders. Building-wide decision-making appears to be the demarcation line were most principals did not provide access for shared decision-making power; either there were no structures for this building-wide process to take place (e.g. a literacy committee), or a structure was used to provide feedback regarding building-wide decisions (e.g. staff meetings, team consultation, literacy committees that offered suggestions only).

Conclusions

The question that drove this study was, how does innovativeness fit into the changing roles and demands for the school principal? The data suggests that personal innovativeness, as defined as a willingness to change, matters little in influencing how a leader chooses to lead.

In light of the gathered data, there may not be any relation between a principal's innovativeness and exhibited shared leadership behavior. The data implies that the principals felt comfortable with change (as per the measure's construct). Some expressed themselves as slightly more so than others, but the principals shared similar scores. The principals all tackled the innovation in similar contexts within their buildings. Yet, for the most part, the data indicates each principal used some level of shared leadership decision-making structures. The principals from Clear Creek and Sunnyside, I would posit, exhibited a greater breadth and depth of shared leadership behaviors, for they utilized numerous informal leaders in power-sharing forums. These principals showed evidence of designing structures that allowed for informal leaders decision making power (Spillane, 2004; Harris, 2004), involved informal leaders in building-wide decision making through democratic processes (Harris, 2004), and empowered informal leaders to lead (Muijs and Harris, 2003). Their innovativeness score, however, was similar to peers who did not exhibit as much behavior, as in the comparison between Clear Creek and Riverview principals, both reporting a 56, yet both exhibiting different leadership behavior. The Riverview Principal did not exhibit the same level of shared leadership by utilizing fewer structures and involved staff in a consultation, rather than power-sharing, role. The Sunnyside principal reported a 58, yet exhibited more shared-leadership behavior than both the Pinecrest and Brookfield principals, who each reported a 61.

The data suggests that comfortability with change (innovativeness) has little to do with comfortability with sharing power with informal leaders – not that principals are fearful of sharing power, rather a comfortability grounded in the beliefs of roles regarding

who should retain decision-making power in certain contexts. Blasé and Blasé (1999) observed in their study of principals and leadership that the principal's beliefs regarding who should be involved in decision making impacted the extent of leadership behavior. Wallace (2001) noticed in his study that principals were "gatekeepers" of who is involved in decision making (p. 167). This reluctance to share power may also rest in not trusting informal leaders to make decisions (MacBeath, 2005) or perhaps the principal not sharing the goals and values of informal leaders (Spillane, 2006). Hence, principal beliefs around power sharing and their perceptions of informal leaders may be more influential to leadership behavior rather than merely a *willingness to change*.

The data may also indicate that principals may be more akin to sharing power when it comes to classroom-level decision-making, and perhaps because of perceived role definition, retain building-wide decision-making. Interview questions designed to probe principals' perceptions of their role in decision-making would have gained greater insight into their behavior for this study. This leadership tendency was noted in the study by Wallace (2002), where some informal leadership teams were relegated to management of tasks and activity germane to the classroom, rather than building-wide decision making.

A congruence of similar innovativeness scores was unexpected. We may have seen such a congruence of innovativeness scores due to a number of reasons, including the measure being a self-report form and interaction effects with the researcher. Being a self report form, principals may perceive themselves to be more open to change than what they truly were, especially when innovativeness and openness to change is an

attribute frequently attached to effective leadership. Further, the principals knowing that I was a current an employee in the district may have influenced questionnaire responses. Likewise, perhaps principals, living up to a symbolic stereotype that leaders must be innovative, were influenced to answer more innovatively than they actually are, especially if innovative principals are highly regarded within the district. Triangulation of principal innovativeness would have helped in this respect. Consequently, additional measures would be necessary to gain more reliable data into principal innovativeness, perhaps a survey of the formal leaders or key informal leaders who work and know the principal in more than a casual capacity. Issues with the congruence of innovativeness scores may also be a result of innovativeness, as a construct, not being a useful concept in which to measure principals.

Another explanation for the congruent innovativeness scores could exist within the context of the district. The district may highlight change and the willingness to change in district-level conversations. Hiring practices may have influenced decisions regarding the type of individual placed in principal roles, leading to individuals of similar dispositions being principals. The questions asked in the interviews, and the sample of only building-level participants, were elements that limited collection of district-level data. The study could benefit from district-level questions and a sample that included district-level participants.

Further, regarding the scales, it would be beneficial if Hurt et al (1977) were to norm scores on the constructed short form. Currently, reported short-form scores were left to be interpreted subjectively on an unclear continuum. Because the authors asserted

that, like Rogers (2003), innovativeness existed on a normal distribution, it would seem fitting to norm short-form scores and note where specific scores and its measure of variability and deviation exist. This would allow researchers using the scales to construct meaning as to the level of relative innovativeness between responders, depending where on the distribution a particular score fell. Perhaps after norming, there may be a defined meaning between a score of 56 (Riverview and Clear Creek) and 58 (Sunnyside), allowing research to draw more reliable conclusions from reported scores.

The lack of a normed short-form scale prompts further research in two ways: first, using the normed long-form, scale responses could have been more varied. It may be that the short-form scale has limited usefulness due to its limited ability variability of responses. Perhaps future research could norm a short-form scale, enhancing its usefulness.

A larger sample size may have yielded more reliable results. A wider sample may have garnered more variance in innovative scores and a broader perspective of leadership behavior of principals. Further, the use of the short-form may have yielded low variability of innovative score due to the inherent limitations of a mere 10-item scale. Perhaps using the long-form, along with a wider sample, would have yielded greater variance of scale scores. This variance could help minimize the impact of district-wide, school specific or individual influences, allowing for more definitive insight into the innovativeness/leadership behavior relationship.

Future research may include want to include other grade-level contexts. English (2003) asserts that context drives our behavior. Though the broad literature does not

suggest that leadership behavior is grade-level dependent, it may benefit the leadership literature to study leadership behavior from a multi-grade level perspective to note any differences, challenges, limitations or predominance of any particular leadership behavior, or challenges for leadership, at any one grade level.

Unfortunately, being a retrospective case study in-part, interview data was not as reliable as point-in-time data, as principals were called to recollect information since 2006. While interviews with literacy coaches were valuable in confirming principal interview data, literacy coach data was undermined by inconsistencies in the position itself within the buildings. For two schools, the literacy coaches were not literacy coaches at the time of the district roll-out; instead, they were language arts content teachers. While still garnering valuable data, their perceptions of the initial implementation were not those of a formal leader literacy coach. Further, for one school, the interviewed literacy coach was not on staff at the time of the implementation, but joined the staff during this year, limiting the reliability of his interview data.

Despite this study's limitations, the data does give some insight into leadership behavior, especially in regards to the process of decision-making. There did seem to be evidence that some principals kept building-wide decision-making among formal leaders, while others openly shared power with informal leaders. It may be helpful to further probe reasons why this is so, and to the extent this behavior exists surrounding other innovations and/or policies. It may also be useful to study the power-sharing tendencies of principals in relation to relative academic gains of the students within those buildings.

This study is founded on the assumption that principal leadership behavior may be directly influenced by his or her personal innovativeness. The data provides insight into the collaborative nature of schools and leadership. Even the principals who demonstrated the least extent of shared leadership, having worked only with formal leaders in decision making capacities, still involved themselves in teaming and collaboration, if only for consultation purposes. As such, perhaps innovativeness is better defined in terms of behavior within a social context, much like Midgley and Dowling (1978) proposed. Because principal leadership behavior constitutes interacting with social structures (collaborative teams, committees, ad hoc groups), it may be that innovativeness is best described as behavior within social networks as opposed to one's willingness to change. That said, it may be beneficial in studying principal innovativeness as a social network construct and the leadership behavior exhibited within those social contexts. Consequently, expanding the study to include studying the social networks that exist within schools may give greater insight into principal leadership behavior.

Principals clearly must navigate toward outcomes in a changing, demanding environment filled with the complexities of structures, social networks and interpersonal dynamics. This navigation requires many leaders to make numerous decisions on how to lead. The willingness to change may not significantly impact those decisions, but perhaps a closer look into the social networks in schools will provide deeper insight into how and why leaders choose how they lead, how they navigate, toward goals. By studying leadership behavior as it exists in social contexts, perhaps leaders can make more

effective leadership decisions through understanding the interplay between their own choices and the social networks that exist in his or her building.

APPENDIX A

HURT'S INNOVATIVENESS SCALE

For each item below, please ascribe a number (1-7) on how each statement describes you:

1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = moderately disagree, 4 = undecided,

5 = moderately agree, 6 = agree, and 7 = strongly agree.

1. _____ I am generally cautious about accepting new ideas
2. _____ I rarely trust new ideas until I can see whether the vast majority of people around me accept them.
3. _____ I am aware that I am usually one of the last people in my group to accept something new.
4. _____ I am reluctant about adopting new ways of doing things until I see them working for people around me.
5. _____ I find it stimulating to be original in my thinking and behavior.
6. _____ I tend to feel that the old way of living and doing things is the best way.
7. _____ I am challenged by ambiguities and unsolved problems
8. _____ I must see other people using new innovations before I will consider them.
9. _____ I am challenged by unanswered questions.
10. _____ I often find myself skeptical of new ideas.

APPENDIX B

PRINCIPAL SURVEY PROTOCOL

- C. In your opinion, how important are the BSD's Literacy Targets as a tool for student achievement?
2. In your opinion, how much of a change would implementing the literacy targets be for your staff?
 3. Once the district approved the literacy targets, how did you proceed with the policy? How did you decide on how to proceed with the literacy target policy in your building?
 4. How did you plan to go about implementing the literacy targets?
 5. What challenges have you faced in implementing the literacy targets? How did you deal with those challenges?
 6. Compared to what you were hoping for, do you think your strategies for implementation have been successful? What would you do differently or what do you hope to try in the future?
- C. What do you think of the measure of innovativeness scale? Do you think Innovativeness is important for a principal? Does this scale ask the appropriate questions relevant to innovativeness for a principal?

APPENDIX C

LITERACY COACH & LITERACY COMMITTEE MEMBER PROTOCOL

1. In your opinion, how important are the BSD's Literacy Targets as a tool for student achievement?
2. In your opinion, how much of a change would implementing the literacy targets be for your staff?
3. Once the district approved the literacy targets, how did you proceed with the policy? How were decisions made on how to proceed with the literacy target policy in the building?
4. How did the staff go about implementing the literacy targets?
5. What challenges have been encountered in implementing the literacy targets? How were the challenges dealt with?
6. Do you think the strategies used for implementation have been successful so far? What would you like to see tried in the future?

REFERENCES

- Anderson, L.W. & Pellicer, L.O. (1998). Toward an understanding of unusually successful programs for economically disadvantaged students. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 3, 237-263.
- Bass, Bernard M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18, 19-31.
- Beaverton School District Division of Teaching and Learning (2006, October). *Literacy curriculum learning targets K-12*. Beaverton, OR: Author.
- Blasé, J. & Blasé, J. (1999). Implementation of shared governance for instructional improvement: Principals' perspectives. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 37, 476-500.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Callahan, R. (1962). *The cult of efficiency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Caron, E. A. & McLaughlin, M.J. (2002). Indicators of beacons of excellence schools: What do they tell us about collaborative practices? *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 13, 285-313.
- Clarke, S.R.P. (2000). The principal at the centre of reform: Some lessons from the field. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 3, 57-73.
- Corwin, R. (1975). Innovation in organizations: The case for schools. *Sociology of Education*, 48, 1-37.
- Cross, R. (2001). A description of decision-making patterns of school principals. *Journal of Educational Research*, 154-159.
- Culbertson, J. (1988). A century's quest for a knowledge base, in Boyan, N. (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration*. New York: Longman.
- Cunningham, W. G. & Cordeiro, P. A. (2009). *Educational leadership: A bridge to improved practice*. 4th ed. Boston: Pearson.
- Deal, T. & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). *Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Dempster, N. & Berry, V. (2003). Blindfolded in a minefield: Principal's ethical decision making. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33, 457-477.

- Dunlap, D. M. & Goldman, P. (1991). Rethinking Power in Schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 27(1), 5-29.
- English, F. (2003). *The postmodern challenge to the theory and practice of educational administration*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.
- Fairman, M., Holmes, M., Hardage, J., & Lucas, C. (1979). *Manual for the organizational health instrument*. Fayetteville, AR: Organizational Health: Diagnostic and Development.
- Fields, D. & Herold, D. (1997). Using the leadership practices inventory to measure transformational and transactional leadership. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 57, 569-579.
- Freidman, A.A. (2004). Beyond mediocrity: transformational leadership within a transactional framework. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 3, 203-224.
- Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M. (2003). *Change forces: With a vengeance*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Gillie, A. (1971). Diffusion of knowledge, research findings and innovative practices in educational institutions. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, 8, 12-16.
- Golanda, E. & Evans, C. (1995). Decision-making practices of principals: Implications for practitioners and preparation programs. *People and Education*, 3, 351-370.
- Goldman, P., Dunlap, D. M., & Conley, D. T. (1993). Facilitative Power and Nonstandardized Solutions to School Site Restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 29(1), 69-92.
- Goldsmith, R.E. (2001). Using the domain specific innovativeness scale to identify innovative internet consumers. *Internet Research: Electronic Networking Applications and Policy*, 11, 149-158.
- Goldsmith, R.E. & Clark, R. (2006). Interpersonal influence and consumer innovativeness. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 30, 34-43.
- Goldsmith, R.E., & Hofacker, C. (1991). Measure consumer innovativeness. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 19, 209-221.

- Gronn, P. (2000). Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership. *Educational Management Administration Leadership*, 28, 317-338.
- Harris, A. (2004). Distributed leadership and school improvement: Leading or misleading? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 32, 11-24.
- Harris, A. (2007). Distributed leadership: Conceptual confusion and empirical reticence. *International Journal Leadership in Education*, 3, 315-325.
- Hendrickson, G. (1989). Theory-based decision making: A survival tool for principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 73, 17-21.
- Hirschman, E.C. (1980). Innovativeness, novelty seeking, and consumer creativity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 7, 283-295.
- Hite, J. M., Williams, E. J., Hilton, S. C., & Baugh, S.C. (2006). The role of administrator characteristics on perceptions of innovativeness among public school administrators. *Education and Urban Society*, 38(2), 160-187.
- Hoy, A.W. & Hoy, W.K. (2008). *Instructional leadership: A research-based guide to learning in school*. 3rd ed. Boston: Pearson.
- Houtilainen, A., Pirttila-backman, A.M., & Tourila, H. (2006) How innovativeness relates to social representation of new foods and to the willingness to try and use such foods. *Food Quality and Preference*, 17, 353-361.
- Hurt, T., Joseph, K., & Cook, C. (1977). Scales for the measurement of innovativeness. *Human Communication Research*, 4, 58-65.
- Kyle, R. M. (1988). *Innovation in education: A progress report on the JCPS/Gheens professional development academy*. Louisville: Gheens Foundation.
- Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30, 498-518.
- Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (1999). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38, 112-119.
- Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17, 201-227.

- Little, J. W. (1988). Assessing the prospects for teacher leadership, in Lieberman, A. (Ed.). *Building a professional culture in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- MacBeath, J. (2005). Leadership as distributed: A matter of practice. *School Leadership and Management*, 25, 349-366.
- Manning, K., Bearden, W., & Madden, T. (1995). Consumer innovativeness and the adoption process. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 4, 329-345.
- Marks, H.M. & Nance, J. P. (2007). Contexts of accountability under systemic reform: Implications for principal influence on instruction and supervision. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43, 3-37.
- Marsh, D. D. (2000). Educational leadership for the twenty-first century: Integrating three essential perspectives. Pp 126-155. In *The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Midgley, D.F., and Dowling, G.R. (1978). Innovativeness: The concept and its measurement. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 4, 229-242.
- Muijs, D. & Harris, A. (2003). Teacher leadership – improvement through empowerment?: An overview of the literature. *Educational Management Administration Leadership*, 31, 437-448.
- Nystrand, R. (1981). Leadership theories for principals. *Theory into Practice*, 20, 260-263.
- Odden, A. R. (1995). *Educational leadership for America's schools*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pallister, J.G. & Foxall, G.R. (1998). Psychometric properties of the Hurt-Joseph-Cook scales for the measurement of innovativeness. *Technovation*, 18, 663-675.
- Printy, S. & Marks (2004). Shared leadership for teacher and student learning. *Theory Into Practice*, 45, 125-132.
- Rivera, M. & Rogers, E.M. (2006). Innovation diffusion, network features, and cultural communication variables. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 4, 126-135.
- Rogers, E. M. (1958). Categorizing the adopters of agricultural practices. *Rural Sociology*, 23, 346-354.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of Innovations*, 5th ed. New York: Free Press.

- Rogers, E.M. & Shoemaker, F.F. (1971). *Communication of innovations: A cross-cultural approach*. New York: Free Press.
- Salisbury, C. L. & McGregor, G. (2002). The administrative climate and context of inclusive elementary schools. *Council for Exceptional Children*, 68(2), 259-274.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of learning organization*. New York: Doubleday Currency.
- Schlechty, P. C. (2000). Leading a school system through change: Key steps for moving reform forward. In *The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Scribner, J.P., Sawyer, R.K., Watson, S.T., & Myers, V.L. (2007). *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43, 67-100.
- Silins, H.C. (1994). The relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and school improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 5, 272-298.
- Spillane, P., Halverson, R. & Diamon, J.B. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed practice. *Educational Researcher*, 23-28.
- Spillane, J.P. (2006). *Distributed Leadership*. San Francisco, California: Josey-Bass.
- Tewel, K. (1988). The best child I ever had: Teacher influence on the decision making of three urban high school principals. *Urban Education*, 23, 24-41.
- Wallace, M. (2002). Modeling distributed leadership and management effectiveness: Primary school senior management teams in England and Wales. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 13, 163-186.
- Weiss, C. H. & Cambone, J. (1994). Principals, shared decision making and school reform, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 16(3), 287-301.
- Wildy, H. & Louden, W. (2000). School restructuring and the dilemmas of principals' work. *Educational Management & Administration*, 28, 173-184.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.