

Lorraine Devereaux

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto

Espousing Democratic Leadership Practices: A Study of Values in Action

This article examines principals' espoused values and their values in action. It provides a reanalysis of previously collected data through a values lens. The original research study was an international quantitative and qualitative investigation of principals' leadership approaches that was based in 15 schools. This particular excerpt of the research provides a qualitative lens into two European principals' espoused values versus values in action in a site-based management environment. The study demonstrates that principals' espoused values can be different from their values in action as perceived by themselves and others. This has implications for the practical application of modern school restructuring site-based management theory, and it shows the need for a value-based component to principals' leadership training.

Cet article porte sur les valeurs que les directeurs d'écoles épousent en principe et les valeurs qu'ils manifestent par leurs gestes. En s'appuyant sur une optique axée sur les valeurs, on y présente une nouvelle analyse de données déjà recueillies. Le projet de recherche original consistait en une étude quantitative et qualitative des styles de leadership des directeurs dans 15 écoles. Cet extrait de la recherche fournit un portrait qualitatif des valeurs que deux directeurs européens épousent en principe par rapport aux valeurs qu'ils manifestent par leurs gestes dans un contexte de gestion sur les lieux. L'étude révèle que les valeurs adoptées par les directeurs peuvent se distinguer des valeurs qu'ils manifestent par leurs gestes, telles qu'elles sont perçues par eux-mêmes et par les autres. Les implications de cette conclusion touchent l'application pratique de la théorie moderne de la gestion sur les lieux de la restructuration scolaire. De plus, les résultats démontrent le besoin d'ajouter une composante fondée sur les valeurs dans la formation au commandement des directeurs d'écoles.

As it has been for decades, change remains a continual preoccupation for today's practitioners and researchers in educational administration (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Fullan, 1995; Lieberman, 1995; Schlechty, 1997). In response to new trends toward heightened educator accountability, many suggest that the traditional, hierarchical management structure is no longer applicable (Beck & Murphy, 1996; Devereaux, 2000; Duma, 1998; Fullan, 1997; Murphy, 1996). The contemporary, decentralized, local level site-based management involving all stakeholders is touted as the currently acceptable decision-making framework (Clark & Clark, 1996; Decoux & Holdaway, 1999; Devereaux, 1995, 1997a, 1997b; Henderson, 1994; O'Toole, 1995). This new form of cooperating school management is internationally recognized as a viable improvement initiative and is considered an alternative, workable management structure (Bullock & Thomas, 1997; Nova Scotia Department of Education, 1994).

Lorraine Devereaux has held positions as principal and teacher in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador for the past three decades. She is currently completing a doctoral degree in educational administration. Lorraine can be reached by e-mail at ldevereaux@stemnet.ca.

Yet Murphy and Hallinger (1993) conclude, "At neither the theoretical nor the conceptual levels was there much evidence to link ... restructuring efforts (such as site-based management) with changes in classrooms, relationships between teachers and students, and/or student outcomes" (p. 254). As a case in point, the Ontario Education Improvement Commission (1998) suggests that school councils in Ontario have not lived up to expectations and clearly state that councils "expressed frustration over the current advisory role of school councils, feeling that school ... administrators do not listen to their advice." They add that although "many ... principals now encourage and support a high level of input from their school councils and parents. Others do not. Some actively avoid seeking advice" (p. 7). A *Review of Policy/Program Memorandum No. 122* (Peel District School Board, 2002) in Ontario requires that principals support council activities, seek its advice in appropriate areas, and act as a resource. In Ontario, one key area where school councils seek involvement as identified by the Ministry of Education (2000) is in

the selection of principals, including the review of board policies on principal selection ... In addition, school councils are still looking for ways to have meaningful input into decisions that affect the education of their children at the local level. They want boards and principals to listen and respond to their concerns. (p. 4)

As a result of this, a Ministry of Education (2000) *Guideline* outlines strategies "for boards to involve their school councils when considering the placement of principals in schools; and to help school councils identify the characteristics desired in a principal for their school" (p. 4).

Site-based management in the form of school councils is currently a blanket government-legislated reform effort in Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada and responsibility for council establishment and implementation has been placed directly with school principals. However, the Royal Commission (1992) cautions, "Competent leadership is critical for any major restructuring to work" (p. 211). Realization that a shift in organizational management theory also requires a change in leadership paradigms is of utmost importance for the success of school councils. To make the transition in management approach, the essential role of the school principal as change agent is widely recognized (David, 1996; Fullan, 1997; Scribner, Cockrell, Cockrell, & Valentine, 1999; Trafford, 1997).

Because "a principal's current obligation to the school community and its stakeholders is colossal" (Devereaux, 2000, p. 10), "authentic" leadership could probably be the contributing factor that determines the success of new school improvement initiatives such as site-based management (Begley, 2000a). Begley describes "authentic leadership" as that which is necessary to properly guide today's education system. But then again, recent research studies on values in educational leadership suggest that there may be a difference between principals' espoused values and their values in action (Begley, 1996; Coombs, 2001; Roche, 1999). Roche obviously sees this as a serious problem as determined by data gathered through research, and contends,

Critics of administrators might well point to the numerous examples within this study's data where articulated values stand as an obvious contradiction to the

lack of commitment to those same values. When a school community perceives a significant dissonance between what school leaders say and what they do, the apparent hypocrisy often results in a credibility or authenticity crisis for the principal concerned. (n.p.)

Begley (2000a) confirms this fear and suggests that the conflicting problem of principals advocating one value while demonstrating another in action increases the likelihood that one cognitive knowledge schema could show commitment to one set of values while a preferred procedural schema could communicate a response to another value set.

However, Bhindi and Duignan (1996) suggest that “authentic leaders breathe the life force into the workplace and keep the people feeling energised and focused. As stewards and guides they build people and their self-esteem. They derive their credibility from personal integrity and ‘walking’ their values” (p. 29). Black (1998); Devos, Van den Broeck, and Vandenhayden (1998); Ontario Education Improvement Commission (2000); Murphy (1996); and Ricciardi (1997) suggest that principals need special democratic skills to work effectively with school councils. Training in authentic, ethical, value-based leadership is seen as an essential prerequisite for the success of today’s educational system (Boeckman & Dickinson, 2001; Boyd & Martinez, 1997; Campbell, 1997a, 1997b; Day, 2000). In discussing critical principals’ leadership practices, Leithwood (1994) suggests that “clarity about one’s values, with *consequences for students* at the apex of the values hierarchy” (p. 513) is essential to success, and it is also widely recognized that this value of increased student outcomes purports to be the main purpose behind school councils.

It is somewhat expected, then, that many would suggest that if other than structural change is to take place, training must be provided to principals (Devereaux, 2000; Richardson, Blackbourn, Ruhl-Smith, & Haynes, 1997; Morris, 1999; Odden & Wohlstetter, 1995). In view of this, it becomes crucial to determine if school principals really adhere to the needed values, democratic processes, and participatory decision-making required for today’s effective professional work settings.

The Problem

Current literature reveals “value-added” reflective leadership as a necessary administrative lens to move education into the future. Scholars and practitioners alike promote a model of values-led leadership as needed for difficult times (Begley, 1999a, 1999b, 2000a, 2000b; Begley & Johannson, 1997; Begley & Leonard, 1999; Brown & Townsend, 1997; Creighton, 1999; Day, Harris, & Hadfield, 2001; Ferrandino, 2001; Starratt, 1994). Hodgkinson (1991) defines values as “a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means, and ends of action” (p. 110), and Willower (1992) contends that “because a significant portion of the practice in educational administration requires rejecting some courses of action in favor of a preferred one, values are generally acknowledged to be central to the field” (p. 369). Yet Begley (1996) believes that although Hodgkinson (1991) argues that motivational bases are at the core of being and that individuals’ values reflect these

motivational bases, there can be significant differences in espoused values of individuals or groups and their values in action.

This study attempts to expand our knowledge about how leaders can increase the chances for successful site-based management in schools. The research questions used to guide the study are as follows.

1. Is there a difference between principals' espoused values and their values in action as perceived by self?
2. Is there a difference between principals' espoused values and their values in action as perceived by others?

A Framework for Inquiry About Values

The original research on which this reanalysis of data is based focused on the espoused values and the values in action of two European principals as perceived by self and as perceived by teachers and council members. The data collection was carried out using a qualitative research methodology. Observation, interviewing, and document review, which are the three most widely used techniques by qualitative researchers informed the researcher of this study (Greene, 1994; Janesick, 1994; Punch, 1994). Fontana and Fay (1994) contend that "you cannot ... except through interviewing, get the actor's explanation" (p. 65). Eisner (1991) sees the presentation of rich "thick description" as, "an effort aimed at interpretation, at getting below the surface" (p. 15).

The original study was conducted in a European context during spring 1995. The data were gleaned through interviews with eight participants. Participants in the study consisted of two principals, the senior and junior teacher, and one parent from each school. To preserve confidentiality and to increase the clarity and simplicity of the study, the data presented refer to Principal One as male and Principal Two as female. These two schools were selected based on one school's long history of involvement in site-based management that was Board-controlled (local education authority), and the other school (grant-maintained) was completely autonomous, receiving funds directly from government.

Taped interviews were conducted with all participants over a one-month period, and the investigator wrote responses on the interview schedules. There were approximately two weeks of interview and observation time per school as well as daily shadowing of the principals. In addition to interview and observation, policy documents and other school-related materials were presented for examination. The investigator was provided the opportunity to attend staff and council meetings. These materials and experiences informed the researcher's analysis.

The researcher was informed by Hodgkinson's (1991) values conceptual framework and by Begley's (2000a) Values Syntax and Arenas of Administration while sorting and categorizing values collected in the data. Hodgkinson provides a three-tiered hierarchical values paradigm. "Affective values of preference" (p. 4) are representative of Type 3, the lowest values level, and these sub-rational values are "rooted in our emotive structure and include any instinctual patterns" (p. 4). Next are type 2b rational values, "which because of their quality of consensus, acquire a quasi-rational justification or cachet" (p. 4). Type 2a rational values are placed higher than consensus because they are

considered “authentically rational in that they rely for their grouping or justification upon some form, however primitive, of utilitarian or cost benefit analysis” (p. 4). At the top of the hierarchy are the most controversial Type 1 trans-rational values, which are “essentially matters of faith, belief and will” (p. 4).

To provide further insight into values structure, Begley (2000a) uses a spherical figure derived from Hodgkinson’s theoretical framework. Begley provides a values terminology by peeling back the layers, as of an onion, thus exposing a values syntax. The rings include action, attitude, value, motive, and self.

The first ring represents the action and speech of the individual, which is the only way by which anyone can make empirical attributions about the value orientations of any other individual.... [The second ring, attitudes are] outward and visible signs of inward and invisible inclinations.... With a modest amount of cooperation from a subject, it is relatively easy to catalogue ... the specific values. [The third ring] a person holds or manifests for whatever reasons.... Between the values layer and motivational base layer of the figure is a separate layer labeled “available knowledge” ... which is acquired through life experiences, training and reflection and provides the linkage between the basic motivational bases of the fifth layer ... and the specific values adopted and manifested by the individual. [The self is] the inner core of the individual ... the soul, the life-force or spark of life. (pp. 235-236)

Begley (2000a) also provides a second onion-like schema of seven valuation arenas in educational administration that he describes as the interactive environment in which valuation processes and administration occur. These are self, group, profession, organization, community, culture, and transcendental. The *self* is in the middle, signifying the immense influence of the individual leader to distribute leadership and as the conduit for growth and development within groups, organizations, communities, and cultures. The second ring represents the arena of collective *groups* in which are found family, peers, friends, and acquaintances. The third ring, *profession*, represents formal administration and authentic leadership as a professional activity. The fourth ring is representative of the organization. The next rings represent the community as a relevant source of influence on school leadership. Finally, the seventh ring accommodates the transcendental—God, the Holy Spirit. This syntax is invaluable for explaining value conflicts and clearly delineates sources of administrative value conflicts within and among the various arenas.

Hodgkinson (1991) posits that “a values audit is a stocktaking of one’s own values. It is a reflective and contemplative effort which seeks to bring into the light of consciousness the range, depth and breadth of one’s preferences, conditioning and beliefs” (p. 136). In this particular study, as well as stocktaking the principal’s own values the researcher includes others’ views on their principals actual at-work values as observed in action. The study is considered to have great significance toward aiding school principals to become more aware of the critical importance of enacting the values they espouse.

Presentation and Analysis of Data

Data gathered through Kouzes and Posner's (1989) Leadership Practices Inventory and Chapman's (1982) Attitude scale are presented and analyzed below through Hodgkinson's (1991) and Begley's (2000a) values lens outlined above.

Principal One

Principal One stated that leadership

should be enabling ... interested in the people that are being led ... to the point of caring for them as people as well as them as task achievers. Leadership is about a light touch for heavy purposes. It's about being direct and honest and open, approachable and preparing the ground for people.

This school administrator's values, as articulated by self, appear quite principled.

Ethically, he seems to be paving the way to empowerment of followers through honesty and openness. However, a council member has a totally different view and suggests that "even if we have something to say, we get knocked down." A parent maintains, "we all have our little pigeonholes.... We just do what the principal tells us all the time" (*International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning [IEJLL]*, 2000). This suggests that in his dealings with others, Principal One appears not to worry about values of consensus or even consequences. However, we must be mindful that a "cultural isomorph" may be at play here. Begley (2000b) defines cultural isomorphs as

conditions in schools that appear to share the same shape or meaning from district to district or country to country, but actually are often composed of quite different elements. As a result, practices may be espoused even when they may not have a good fit in a particular community or leadership context. (p. 25)

This particular school is grant-maintained and completely autonomous. Therefore, in this professional arena Principal One may feel that he can limitlessly assert his authority. This appears to be a credible observation as one parent council member alleges, "The ... council has a wide range of different people and the principal seeks their advice. He doesn't really take it."

In this school setting there seems to be a distinct difference between the articulation and attribution of values from the first-person, second-person, and third-person perspective. For example, in the following quote, which is a second-person attribution by a council representative of values manifested by the principal, this person suggests, "At the moment, we are not allowed contact with parents. We are told things by parents and then we go to the principal and we don't go back to parents." Thus this organizational setting is experiencing interpersonal value conflict. The principal's espoused values of enabling and caring for others and approachability are not only in conflict with the perceptions of others, the principal also appears to be experiencing intrapersonal value conflict by contradicting himself about enabling others. In a first-person articulation of a value position by the principal, he expresses his own values by stating,

I have one area of difficulty here with one ... council member. I ... find it irksome when a person says: You can do so and so when I know perfectly well what I can

do ... I find it irksome for the school council to be run through elementary ways of doing things. (IEJLL, 2000)

When questioned if clashes on school council are over important issues or if disputes are more idiosyncratic, this principal replies, "I hope they're never based on personalities, though clearly there is personal interaction."

Principal One declares, "Most school council members rely on the information they get from the school," adding, "all policy decisions are made by them ... They approve it. We make the recommendations and that is one of the areas of problem ... in that they feel it's sewn up." These data on the surface appear to show values of consensus, yet the principal adds, "Council members have recognized that I am prepared to take on the management role in the fullest extent.... I recognize that it can be seen as a block, a stitch up, but it hasn't been challenged" (IEJLL, 2000).

These data indicate this principal's personal preference and could cause one to wonder if there might not be a fear of consequences over outward disagreement with the principal on the part of other value actors in this school community. In the preceding paragraph, the researcher attributes a value to the principal from a third party perspective, and it is realized that, due to the subjective nature of the account, the researcher does not claim infallibility regarding these assertions about the principal's motivations and values.

Regarding consultation with teachers, this principal explains that because "we sometimes make decisions on the hoof," all participants are not involved in decision-making. The biggest area of mistake is omitting to tell people or to consult. Yet when questioned to what extent the principal is prepared to use his expertise to influence decision-making, Principal One responds, "I think that's something we do as fully and as often as we need." However, regarding school council, he explains, "Councils who do not consult with the principal are doomed." This principal's espoused values and his self-perception of values in action are completely contradictory. He expects others to consult with him, but appears to believe that he is above consultation himself. Principal One espouses inclusion and honesty and appears certainly to "talk the talk" of democracy; however, the other value actors express their sentiments that this principal does not "walk the walk" of inclusive administrative practices.

When questioned if he experiments with new ideas even to the point of risking failure, Principal One replies, "I think that's true. There are certain innovations that we have introduced that have been risky." A teacher and a council member suggest that the principal has introduced the "Writer's Initiative" and add that this was in direct response to the national curriculum. Thus it was a required change in program. Here the principal's values are those of consensus and are based on consequences. The principal claims that if an idea or program experienced failure he "would have to say, what's next, and get on with it." He believes that he practices the philosophy "by mistakes we learn" and explains, "we have to be prepared to acknowledge that we have made a mistake." Contrary to this, one interviewed teacher believes the principal would become "upset" if he made a mistake. A second teacher believes Principal One would become "very defensive," suggesting this principal "does very much like things to be successful and if they're not he is not easy to deal with."

When questioned about professional development, Principal One reports that he attends six to 10 sessions each year that are usually one-day events, and he stays up to date on the most recent developments affecting the organization. A teacher suggests that Principal One has many "out of school" commitments, but wonders where he spends so much time, stating, "I think he certainly attends an awful lot of things out of school and I don't know what they are. We have requested that we are informed about it." The principal alleges that he encourages professional development for teachers, but "they're not compulsory." However, regarding teachers' professional development, one teacher maintains that this principal "allows it, but does not encourage it."

Principal One declares that he has a vision for the school, suggesting, "I'd like this school to offer children the opportunity to have a development in music that is not easy to provide in primary schools anywhere." He affirms that teachers are encouraged to share in this goal, declaring, "We've talked about it and we've also talked about it with school council.... It is a very long, distant dream." Yet a council member contends she does not know the principal's vision for the school, adding that she "hasn't seen that much development," and a teacher declares that this principal does not share a common vision for the school with her. Another teacher pondered at length before answering how she thought the principal feels about future prospects at this school. Finally she replied, "I can't imagine anything being different. If he stays here, it would be a greatly enhanced school with regard to physical changes.... I worry about the ethos." Thus the cultural arena of administrative decision-making appears to be neglected by the principal.

Principal One contends that "One of my frustrations is my failure yet to get people to take more decisions." However, when asked if ideas put forth by teachers are used, Principal One responds, "I think it's true to say that most initiatives are top-down.... The agenda is largely determined by me" (IEJLL, 2000). A teacher contends that teachers' ideas are not used by the principal, stating, "Generally, as a whole, no. I think the principal would modify ideas.... You know he develops his own ideas, tends to actually think of his own focus first." In regard to how the school should be run, the principal declares, "We should all treat each other in a courteous manner, with respect. I hope that nobody would say of me that I don't treat them with respect and I do not treat them with courtesy." One teacher suggests that Principal One wants to believe he is a facilitator, but

on occasions is more autocratic than he would like to be. I don't think he recognizes this in himself. The principal feels he is very approachable, but there are people who have worked with the principal who don't feel that way.

When questioned whether the principal always practices the values he agreed on with others, one teacher says Yes, whereas a second teachers says she does not really know the principal's values, adding that at one point the principal said class size would be kept low, "but this did not happen." Yet Principal One believes that he follows the values agreed on with teachers of this school, claiming, "I hope so. I mean I think it's true of all of us that from time to time we may revert to some gut feelings." He maintains that he celebrates with teachers at the end of a successful project, stating, "I always try

to express thanks to people who have successfully brought about a project. I write notes ... have sent flowers to teachers. They felt it was part patronizing but I didn't mean it that way." When questioned if the principal is supportive of teachers' contributions to the school, one teacher said Yes, whereas another replied, "I have felt that because Principal One is not very supportive of my views, there have been certain constraints on the amount of support." Although he appears to take time to celebrate accomplishments, and he makes sure some people are recognized for their contributions to the success of projects, people seem to be praised and feel valued only when their ideas are in agreement with the principal. There appears to be a bartering system in place where support is given in exchange for loyalty. When conflict arises, support is constrained.

Throughout the data presented above there is a considerable amount of paradox and conflict regarding Principal One's espoused values, his self-perception of values in action, and others' perceptions of his values as observed in action. There appears to be a pattern of repeated observed action that suggests that he appears to talk the higher ethical values, but acts out values of personal preference. It seems that he prefers to behave authoritatively although he aspires to be enabling. He appears to espouse the values of consensus that are critical to the success of a school council setting or the community arena, yet acts consensually only when decisions appear in the organizational arena, for example, compulsory curriculum passed down through national standards. Because this is a grant-maintained school, he appears unafraid of the consequences of his actions with the various stakeholders, as he is essentially accountable only to government.

Unfortunately, it is possible that the conflict in this school community might be resolved only by removing the principal. The traditional, authoritarian management structure that educators and researchers so strongly advocate leaving behind appears to be alive and well in this school setting. It appears to be the administrative choice of Principal One as he exhibits leadership qualities more suitably linked to the past.

Principal Two

Principal Two concisely sums up her personal leadership beliefs as, "the iron fist in the velvet glove." Yet regarding leadership, this same principal declares,

It's got to be democratic ... I had a dictator for a principal before I came here. I swore if I ever became principal, I would never be like her. She ruled her staff with a rod of iron and they all resented it. (*IEJLL*, 2000)

When addressing principals' influence on council, she asserts, "I think most councils, and I'm speaking for my own, they do listen to the principal. I mean 99.9% of the time the principal has her way" (*IEJLL*, 2000). In reference to what extent this principal is prepared to use her expertise to influence decision-making, she declares,

We'll use it all the time. If it's something you really want you're obviously going to try to influence the school council to your side.... The wise council member will listen to the principal. They know we know what we're talking about.

However, in response to the same question as to whether the principal uses her expertise on council, a parent representative suggests, "She just has her say as anyone else involved. She doesn't try to lay down any laws." According to these data, Principal Two obviously espouses democracy, yet sees herself as exerting her own influence to the hilt on decision-making. Conversely, however, others perceive her to practice democracy in action. It appears that council members in this school do not detect the principal's use of expertise in influencing them.

This principal suggests that "The attitude of the principal toward council members is an important factor. It's a two-way relationship. They support us if they're given lots of information." A council member describes the relationship between Principal Two and council as "very good" and adds that the ideal relationship exists when both parties are "able to approach each other if there's a grievance ... in fact, actually in practice we can." Again, Principal Two appears to "practice what she preaches." The council member adds that they know their principal well, declaring, "We know that she is good and fair ... We know her character to be honest." Others with whom she works appear to observe visible signs of Principal Two's espoused value of honesty in her daily practices.

When asked if the council would support her if she objected to something, Principal Two insists, "I think so, because we're the ones who've got to put things into practice, aren't we?" She adds though that "democracy, I think is very, very important [for] the whole community of the school, whether they're teaching staff, non-teaching staff or school council members. You know you need to listen to each other." However, one school council member declares, "Sometimes I feel that we sit there and things are debated, but at the end of the day, I don't feel like we've had a great input" (IEJLL, 2000) and another council representative suggests that although "every aspect of the school is discussed" by school council members, but "I think they would probably take the principal's side, because we know her so well." It appears that council members feel like they can contribute to discussions, but due to this principal's more than two decades of educational experience, they may feel she is better equipped to make school decisions. Therefore, they may willingly allow this principal to use values of personal preference and thereby overrule their suggestions.

Principal Two believes there are particular characteristics of a school that may affect relationships, suggesting that these are "tolerance, respect, and willingness for the school to listen to people, willingness to lend a helping hand.... Obviously if the opposite of these things are true, you haven't got an effective school, have you?" When asked about the relationship between herself and council, the principal says, "It's excellent. The school council members are very supportive." A council member states,

In this school ... we wouldn't say the principal knows best and leave it at that. It would still be a case of let's talk it out first, but more often than not it would be the way that the principal considers the right way of running the school.... (IEJLL, 2000) If it was something the principal really wanted and council was against it, I really don't think that would go down too well with the principal. I

think it would be very hard for her to accept something like that, but it's never arisen.

In conclusion, a council member declares, "I think we're very fortunate here. We don't have any problems, but I'm sure other schools do though," and the principal contends that council members always accept the alternatives proposed by her, stating, "Normally it's been discussed ... but on the whole, yes they do." According to these data, Principal Two tries hard to appear to practice the rational values based on consensus that are considered to be an extremely important element for effective school councils, but in reality uses her positional power when solving council issues.

Principal Two maintains that experimentation with new ideas or programs is done "only after staff consultation and we're pretty sure of our ground. If we thought it would be a failure I think we would say no." A teacher suggests, "The early years class is something which has been her initiative. We didn't get funding for that at all. That's an initiative she has." Yet Principal Two could not give examples of programs where she would take risks, declaring, "Not off the top of my head, no.... Things that we have tried we have been fairly sure of because it's after a lot of consultation, really looking at what we're doing." A fear of consequences appears to hinder the principal's risk-taking ability. This is plausible as this particular school is School Board-controlled.

The principal maintains that she enjoys challenge in her work "to a certain extent but I tend to want to be safe." Principal Two contends, though, that she "challenges teachers all the time to strive to do better." A teacher maintains that the principal challenges her to perform at higher levels, stating,

Science is my area and I need support to do it. It's a challenge, and one that I might not have wanted to have, to be honest, but I didn't really have a lot of choice in the matter. I was given a double increment for taking on science.... I was financially rewarded for taking on something I was not too keen on doing.

Principal Two appears to promote an arena of professional development for teachers in her school. However, she uses manipulation to do this through use of extrinsic rewards. Thus she appears to behave authoritatively when it is to her advantage.

Principal Two declares that her vision for the school is

to make it the best school possible. This is the age where every child should be at their best.... The staff should work well together. The parents should be happy with what's going on and feel they can approach the school with any problems ... People have to have confidence in us.

A teacher suggests, "Our vision is that every child is happy and fulfilled, learning at their own pace," and another teacher believes that "here ... we try to give each child high self-esteem so that they've all done well, according to their own ability."

Regarding giving teachers autonomy over managing their classrooms, the principal comments, "Teachers are diverse, but you have a common policy, so the ethos is the same." She maintains that teachers' ideas are used, stating, "If the ideas are good then you use them because this is the only way you get variety in the school." A teacher suggests, "I'm free to plan and arrange what goes on in that classroom according to the needs that I see." However, Principal

Two believes that teachers do what is expected of them, asserting, "The planning is based on policy.... so then, slipdshod work isn't going on." But she also states, "You make sure that teachers do know their work is valued." One teacher explains, "The principal shows every confidence in my ability." The principal appears to empower and value the contributions of teachers, always ensuring, though, that they work within school or board policy guidelines, yet giving them enough freedom to feel they are creative and innovative in their approach. It appears that this principal possesses the ability to empower others, yet uses it when she personally prefers to do so herself. With regard to following the values she agreed on with teachers, Principal Two declares, "Well, we try. There's nothing perfect in this world, is there? We try." This suggests that the principal believes she may not always be consistent in practicing the values she espouses.

Principal Two suggests that others know her beliefs on how best to run the school, and states,

I've never met the average child. They're all very different ... Teachers need to cater to those children's needs, right from the bottom of the scale right to the top. There should be a general order and calm ... that is how I like to see the school.

A teacher contends that the principal believes "in encouraging us to develop our own ideas. She believes in leading from the front and takes an active part in teaching children. If you have trouble with a child or a parent, the principal will back you up." A second teacher affirms that Principal Two "does discuss things with us. She is not so completely autonomous." Both interviewed teachers perceive that Principal Two follows the values she agreed on with them. A council member maintains that the principal "is very fair with people. This principal expects the children to ... respect each other and care about each other. She is like that all the time. The principal values children ... and you can notice that all the time." These data suggest that Principal Two appears to enjoy much credibility with her staff.

A teacher states what she believes are this principal's beliefs about how the school should be run declaring, "It's support, valuing your opinion, valuing the children's opinion." Another teacher contends that Principal Two "discusses things with us," and regarding curriculum the principal is "as one of the staff then, chipping in and talking as everybody else does." This suggests that Principal Two models the way through active participation and thus spends time and energy on making sure that other people adhere to the values that they have agreed on. A school council member contends that Principal Two always stands by her values, stating, "The principal has a code that she reiterates to staff, to parents." According to others, Principal Two appears to lead through a code of ethics. Principal Two insists that she tries to stand by her values of how the school should be run, yet adds, "Sometimes things happen and you have to, perhaps, turn a blind eye ... Teachers are human. Things do go wrong. Sometimes you have to curb your tongue and not say what's on the tip of it."

Principal Two contends that she openly praises teachers individually and in the group when they have done a good job on a project, declaring, "Obviously you must praise. Again, it shows that you value what they're doing." This

principal explains that she makes herself part of the staff by mixing with them, "I am part of the staff.... I like to hear that we're friends as well as colleagues. It makes a very good atmosphere in the school." As perceived by self, Principal Two appears to foster a team spirit and promote a collective group valuation arena.

The findings in this research study suggest that in the European environment, it is quite possible that principals' espoused values can be different than their values in action, as perceived by themselves and other school stakeholders. According to the data, Principal One claimed to be inclusive and open with stakeholders, yet practiced exclusion. Other stakeholders believed that he was probably unaware that he was doing this, yet concluded that it was certainly happening in their school setting. This has implications for the need for principals to become reflective practitioners (Coombs, 2001; Sergiovanni, 1995). Principals must be brought to an awareness of the possibility of inner conflict between values and actions. If principals do not practice the democratic leadership they espouse, then new school improvement initiatives such as site-based management that require school community stakeholder input and participation for success are doomed to failure.

Conversely, Principal Two felt that she was not always consistent in practicing the values she aspired to, yet others believed this principal was true to her word and to her code of ethics that she openly shared with them. According to the data presented in this study, although by her own admission many times she faltered, others perceived that Principal Two tried hard to live by her values. Thus as perceived by self, she did not always adhere to the democratic processes and participatory decision-making considered essential for success in today's professional work setting, yet to others she appeared to live by a code of ethics. Thus in contrast to stakeholders' clearly visible perception of Principal One as not practicing the values he espoused, in Principal Two's case, the community did not perceive a "significant dissonance" between her espoused values and values in action. Therefore, in this organizational arena a "credibility or authenticity crisis" (Roche, 1999) was not evident. Principal Two appeared to experience interpersonal conflict related to her espoused democratic and participatory decision-making values and her actual practices. However, there appeared to be no interpersonal conflict between Principal Two and other stakeholders in this site-based managed school setting. This suggests that a veteran principal's established personal credibility can highly influence the perceptions of other school stakeholders.

Conclusion

Findings of this study support the suggestion that some leadership practices, especially those described in the data presented above, may deter rather than promote contemporary school restructuring models such as site-based management. It also can serve to explain why some schools may be enjoying success with site-based management, whereas others are not. The various perspectives and descriptions presented throughout the article provide no assurance that all principals are willing to share power or that they even support site-based management as a means to successful change.

Therefore, although some might argue that values cannot be taught in professional development sessions, the researcher contends that exposure to

this type of training is essential for success in today's professional school setting. It is imperative that principals become more aware of the benefits of modern management theories and that they be enabled to develop reflective practices that help readjust traditional mindsets. This underscores the importance of increasing theoretical and practical exposure and reflection on personal espoused values and how to align these espoused values with values in action as seen through the eyes of self and others.

It is critical to the effectiveness of emerging restructuring efforts that governments, school board officials, principals, school councils, and researchers are made aware of the need for principal training that stresses a values component. In particular, the training should concentrate on how to counteract the possibility that principals' espoused democratic values may not correspond with their values in action.

References

- Beck, L., & Murphy, J. (1996). *The four imperatives of a successful school*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Begley, P. (1996). Cognitive perspectives on values in administration: A quest for coherence and relevance. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32, 403-426.
- Begley, P. (1999a). Guiding values for future school leaders. *Orbit*, 30(1), 19-23.
- Begley, P. (1999b). *Values and educational administration*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Begley, P. (2000a). Values and leadership: Theory development, new research, and an agenda for the future. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 46, 233-249.
- Begley, P. (2000b). Cultural isomorphs of educational administration: Reflections on Western-centric approaches to values and leadership. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 20(2), 23-33.
- Begley, P., & Johansson, O. (1997). *Values and school administration: Preferences, ethics and conflicts*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Begley P., & Leonard, P. (1999). *The values of educational administration*. London: Falmer Press.
- Bhindi, N., & Duignan, P. (1996). *Leadership 2020: A visionary paradigm*. Paper presented at the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration International conference, Kuala Lumpur.
- Black, S. (1998). Research: A different kind of leader. *American School Board Journal*, 185(6), 32-36.
- Boeckmann, M., & Dickinson, G. (2001). Leadership: values and performance. *Education*, 121(3), 494-497. Retrieved from: <http://vweb.hwwilson.com/cgi-bin/webspirs.cgi>
- Boyd, L.A., & Martinez, Y. (1997). School-based decision making. In J. Paul, N. Berger, P. Osnes, Y. Martinez, & W. Morse (Eds.), *Ethics and decision making in local schools: Inclusion, policy, and reform* (pp. 27-47). London: Paul H. Brookes.
- Brown, J., & Townsend, R. (1997). *Developing an ethical framework. Thrust for Educational Leadership*, 27D, 12-14. Retrieved from: <http://vweb.hwwilsonweb.com/cgi-bin/webspirs.cgi>
- Bullock, A., & Thomas, H. (1997). *Schools at the centre? A study of decentralization*. New York: Routledge.
- Campbell, E. (1997a). Ethical school leadership: Problems of an elusive role. *Journal of School Leadership*, 7, 287-299.
- Campbell, E. (1997b). Administrators' decisions and teachers' ethical dilemmas: Implications for moral agency. *Leading and Managing*, 3, 245-256.
- Chapman, J. (1982). *Relationship between principals and members of school councils: An attitude scale*. Clayton, Victoria, Australia: Monash University.
- Clark, D., & Clark, S. (1996). Building collaborative environments for successful middle level school structuring. *NASSP Bulletin*, 80(578), 1-16.
- Coombs, C. (2001). *Reflective practice: Developing habits of mind*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.
- Creighton, T. (1999). Spirituality and the principalship: Leadership for the new millennium. *International Electronic Journal For Leadership in Learning*, 3(11), 1-8. Retrieved from: <http://www.ucalgary.ca/~iejll>
- David, J.L. (1996). The who, what, and why of site-based management. *Educational Leadership*, 53(4), 4-9.

- Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M.W. (1995). Politics that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76, 597-604.
- Day, C. (2000). Beyond transformational leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 7(7), 56-59. Retrieved from: <http://vweb.hwwilsonweb.com/cgi-bin/webspirs.cgi>
- Day C., Harris, H., & Hadfield, M. (2001). Challenging the orthodoxy of effective school leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 4(1), 39-56.
- Decoux, B., & Holdaway, E. (1999). Some aspects of leadership in independent schools in Alberta. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 45, 67-84.
- Devereaux, L. (1995). *The leadership approach that facilitates adoption of school councils*. Unpublished master's thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Devereaux, L. (1997a). Structural change combined with training can deliver effective site-based management. *Morning Watch*, 24(3-4). St. John's, NL: Memorial University. Retrieved from: <http://www.mun.ca/edu/faculty/mwatch.htm>
- Devereaux, L. (1997b). *Tapping site-based management experiences of veteran participants: What can we learn?* Paper presented at the annual conference of the Canadian Society for Studies in Education, St. John's, NL.
- Devereaux, L. (2000). Principal training: The missing link for successful school councils. *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning*. Retrieved from: http://www.acs.ucalgary.ca/~iejll/volume4/devereaux_v4n9.html
- Devos, G., Van den Broeck, H., & Vanderheyden, K. (1998). The concept and practice of a school-based management contest: Integration of leadership development and organizational learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34, 700-717.
- Duma, D. (1998). Is parental involvement on school councils working? *Education Canada*, 38(3), 14.
- Education Improvement Commission. (2000). *The road ahead 111: A report on the role of school councils*. Toronto, ON: Government of Ontario. Retrieved from: <http://eic.edu.gov.on.ca/eicroot/english/counc/report/road3/report.asp>
- Eisner, E. (1991). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. New York: Macmillan.
- Ferrandino, V. (2001). Challenges for the 21st-century elementary school principals. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82, 440-442.
- Fontana, A., & Fay, J. (1994). Interviewing: The art of science. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 361-376). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Fullan, M. (1995). The school as a learning organization: Distant dreams. *Theory Into Practice*, 34, 230-235.
- Fullan, M. (1997). *What's worth fighting for in the principalship?* New York: Teachers College Press.
- Greene, J. (1994). Qualitative program evaluation. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 530-544). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Henderson, A. (1994). School-based management: An ideal setting for community education. *Community Education Journal*, 21(2), 7-8.
- Hodgkinson, C. (1991). *Educational leadership: The moral art*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- International Electronic Journal For Leadership in Learning. (2000). *Principal training: The missing link for successful school councils*. Retrieved from: http://www.acs.ucalgary.ca/~iejll/volume4/devereaux_v4n9.html
- Janesick, V.J. (1994). The dance of qualitative research design: Metaphor, ethodolaty, and meaning. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 209-219). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1989). *Leadership practices inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: TPG/Learning Systems.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1995). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 3, 498-518.
- Lieberman, A. (1995). Practices that support teacher development. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76, 591-596.
- Ministry of Education. (2000). *School councils: A background paper*. Retrieved from: www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/document/discussi/scouncils/scbg.html
- Morris, R. (1999). School leadership for the 21st century: Seeds for change. *Educational Horizons*, 77(2), 95-100.
- Murphy, J. (1996). *The privatization of schooling—Problems and possibilities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (Eds.). (1993). *Restructuring schooling: Learning from ongoing efforts*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

- Nova Scotia Department of Education. (1994, May). *Restructuring Nova Scotia's education system, preparing all students for a lifetime of learning: A discussion paper*. Halifax, NS: Author.
- Odden, E.R., & Wohlstetter, P. (1995). Making school-based management work. *Educational Leadership*, 52(5), 32-36.
- O'Toole, G.C. (1995). Hearing the voices of parents. Advocating active parental involvement in schools. *Indirections*, 20(2), 24-36.
- Ontario Education Improvement Commission. (1998). *A discussion paper: The future role of school councils*. Toronto, ON: Ministry of Education and Training.
- Peel District School Board. (2002). *A review of policy/program memorandum No. 122*. Toronto, ON: Ontario Ministry of Education and Training. Retrieved from: <http://www.peel.edu.on.ca/councils/policy/min.htm>
- Punch, M. (1994). Politics and ethics in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 83-97). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ricciardi, D. (1997). Sharpening experienced principals' skills for changing schools. *NASSP Bulletin*, 81(585).
- Richardson, M., Blackburn, Ruhl-Smith, C., & Haynes, J. (1997). *The pursuit of continuous improvement in educational organizations*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Roche, K. (1999). Moral and ethical dilemmas in Catholic school settings. In P. Begley (Ed.), *Values and educational leadership*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Delivery of Programs and Services in Primary, Elementary, and Secondary Schools. (1992). *Our children, our future*. St. John's, NL: Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Education.
- Scribner, J., Cockrell, K., Cockrell, D., & Valentine, J. (1999). Creating professional communities in schools through organizational learning: An evaluation of a school improvement process. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35, 130-160.
- Schlechty, P. (1997). *Inventing better schools—An action plan for educational reform*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1995). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sheppard, B., & Devereaux, L. (1997). Leadership training is essential to effective site-based management. *Canadian School Executive*, 16(8), 3-8.
- Starratt, R. (1994). *Building an ethical framework*. London: Falmer Press.
- Trafford, B. (1997). *Participation, power-sharing and school improvement*. Bramcote Hills, UK: Educational Heretics Press.
- Willower, D. (1992). Educational administration: Intellectual trends. In *Encyclopedia of educational research* (6th ed., pp. 364-375). Toronto, ON: Macmillan.