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ABSTRACT

Leadership Challenges Encountered by Elementary School Principals in The Process of Creating, Implementing, and Sustaining Shared School Visions in Clark County, Nevada Elementary Schools

by

David A. Price

Dr. Gerald C. Kops, Examination Committee Chair
Professor of Educational Law
University Of Nevada, Las Vegas

Creating, implementing, and sustaining a shared vision is a complicated task for any leader. The Elementary School Division of the Clark County School District (CCSD) expects elementary school principals not only to develop a shared vision for their schools, but also to implement and sustain this shared vision with the aid of their constituencies—other administrators, staff, students, parents, and the community-at-large. Leaders, in this case principals, generally are responsible for developing a shared vision.

The concept of visionary leadership has been defined in the literature, and principals can be tested to determine the degree to which they align themselves with the attributes of visionary leadership (LeSourd & Grady, 1991). Creating a shared
vision also requires political savvy, consensus building, shared decision-making procedures, strong communication skills, effective use of time, administrative renewal, and insightful understanding of group processes (Chance & Grady, 1994).

In CCSD where creation of a shared vision is a specific leadership task of every elementary school principal, the challenges encountered in the creation, implementation, and sustenance of a shared school vision have not been identified. It was the goal of this study to collect data that assist in identifying these challenges.

All 132 district elementary school principals, except for the investigator, were surveyed using The Visionary Leadership Attitude Survey (Grady & LeSourd, 1990) to determine their attitudes toward visionary leadership. Six principals aligning with visionary leadership attributes and six principals aligning with managerial style leadership, as identified by the survey, were selected for in-depth interview to identify patterns and themes in challenges to the creation, implementation, and sustenance of shared school visions.

The crucial issue in this study was to identify challenges to creating, implementing, and sustaining shared school vision. Two-thirds of principals saw teachers as a challenge, especially those teachers who were holdovers from a previous administration. Three-fourths of the principals had difficulty in engaging support staff in the shared vision. While the principals felt that involving support staff is important, they also suggested that these employees may not be qualified or interested, nor do they have the time to participate. Available time was also a challenge for parents,
although two principals did not see parents as a challenge in the shared vision process at all. Only one principal provided participation for students. The others cited issues such as lack of maturity of elementary school children and scheduling problems. Community partners were seen mostly in their roles as financial and other resource contributors.

Money did not appear to constrain the process of shared vision creation, implementation, and sustenance. Nine principals reported adequate funding; three indicated no funds available. Half the principals reported adequate training opportunities and models. Responses indicated a lack of clarity about who should be trained—themselves, other administrators, teachers, staff, students, parents, community partners, and so on. The issue of time was challenging for seven of the principals. In reporting the amount of time spent on the visioning process, three principals reported spending all of their time, two about half their time, and seven did not allocate much time.

No clear patterns or themes of applications of definition, purpose, or guidelines could be detected as differences between the selected visionary leadership attribute aligned or managerial leadership attribute aligned principals in analysis of their responses.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

When the American colonial forebears left England, they had a vision of a country where all would be equal and free. This noble experiment has evolved into the current democracy of the United States and represents an immense visionary goal. One uniquely American feature is mandatory public education based on the belief that a democratic citizenry must be educated for responsible government. One founding father, Thomas Jefferson (1816; cited in Bartlett, 1980), articulated this vision for democratic education: "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be" (p. 389). In the name of preventing ignorance, the American educational system has developed into a mammoth enterprise thus ensuring continued freedom and a democratic lifestyle for all the people of the United States.

Perhaps as a result of the perception of the educational system as one of mass production, a great deal of public outcry has recently sounded a call for change. Chance (1992) depicted the reforming, restructuring, and redesigning elements of this call as factors leading to a public judgment that the country's educational system is
"second rate, outmoded, and decrepit" (p. 3). What was once a shared vision has become increasingly fragmented as the needs of administrators, educators, parents, children, businesses, politicians, and communities become increasingly diverse. Unfunded mandates, inequitable funding, and scarce resources have become the bane of the system. Negative public perceptions are forcing public school officials, more specifically principals, into "a response mode that is both managerial and reactive" (Chance 1992, p. 3).

Successful leadership is frequently defined as that which is visionary. Examples then come to mind of historical figures who were visionary leaders. Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Alfred P. Sloan, and Moses (Nanus, 1992) are a few. In discussing the notion of shared vision, Senge (1990) reported the stories of Spartacus, Henry Ford, Apple Computers, and John F. Kennedy. As another case in point, Kouzes and Posner (1987) described leaders as those who "... breathe life into visions. ... They communicate their hopes and dreams so that others clearly understand them and accept them as their own" (p. 79). As examples of leaders who created shared visions and inspired others to follow, Kouzes and Posner (1987) cited Arlene Blum, who led a group of women in their quest to conquer the summit of Annapurna, Christopher Columbus, Vince Lombardi, and Don Bennett, the first one-legged amputee to climb Mount Rainier. In addition, in his discussion of the process of communicating and actualizing a vision, Chance (1994) proffered Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s speech, "I Have a Dream," as a model of "metaphorical statements and
symbols" that represented Dr. King's vision of America (p. 46). Dr. King's speech, in fact, epitomized the notion of shared vision as an extraordinarily powerful force (Senge, 1990), since it was a leading factor in moving the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s forward.

One can learn leadership skills, but real leaders such as Gandhi, Jesus Christ, or Joan of Arc appeared intrinsically to possess charisma or magnetism that inspired people to follow. Gardner (1995) stated that "... by far the rarest individual is the visionary leader" (p. 11), and he defined the visionary leader as one who is "not content to just relate to a current story or reactivate a story drawn from a remote or recent past, this individual actually creates a new story" (p. 11). Management, on the other hand, is not necessarily directed at people. Instead, inventory and accounts are managed. In education, administration may not even refer to people or things; in today's bureaucracy, administration has frequently been reduced to pushing paper.

Why, then, is development of a shared school vision a requirement for elementary school principals in Clark County School District, in Nevada? The American system of education, under the pressure of criticism and cries for reform, currently seeks solutions to and answers for the problems perceived by the public it serves. As a result, the lives of prominent visionary leaders, the financial success stories of great corporations, the operational and technological successes of innovative industries, and the perceptive observations of organizational researchers are all suddenly of extreme interest to those who are in educational leadership roles.
The process of creating a vision for a school and the trait of visionary leadership are being used as evaluative tools for principals. Boston City Schools superintendent, Thomas W. Payzant, reviewed principal performance in his district during the 1995-96 school year. As a component of that performance review, each principal was required to compose a written vision statement for his or her school. Payzant commented that, based on these reviews, he would "... decide by the end of the year which of them will keep their jobs" (Archer, 1996, p. 5). In this case, visionary leadership skills are being required, evaluated, and used as performance indicators.

In the quest for effective and efficient management as well as for a shared vision of leadership, school authorities have looked to business management trends for guidance. For example, Tewell (1996) pointed out that business studies at Harvard have tended to underscore the critical influence of visions, belief statements, and shared cultural values on the success or failure of organizations. Along the same lines, Tewell maintained that "In the school world, too, vision and belief are essential" (p. 16), but he also strongly cautioned that once school visions are articulated, they generally become both the beginning and ending of the visioning process. Educational interest in including visionary leadership concepts in principal expectations has produced a multitude of school visions in recent years, containing many thousands of words which represent tens of thousands of hours of time invested by school staffs, students, families, and other community stakeholders.
This pressure on the creation of vision has caused principals to wear two hats—leader and administrator (Starratt, 1995). As leaders, principals nurture the vision that expresses the school's core values; as administrators, they develop the structures and policies that institutionalize the vision. Yet, Tewell (1996) went on to stress the importance of making vision and beliefs a part of everything that a school district does to give itself a chance for success. He stated, "A school system's fundamental beliefs and vision about teaching and learning must be incorporated into the district's goals, strategies, policies, processes, cultural practices, management behavior, and accountability systems" (p. 16).

Clark County School District

Clark County School District (CCSD), located at the southern tip of Nevada and centered in Las Vegas, encompasses nearly 8,000 square miles, enrolls approximately 179,000 students, and operates about 200 schools. Now the tenth largest school district in the nation, CCSD consists of urban, suburban, and rural environments with multicultural settings. Enrollment and diversity of the student population have increased rapidly during the last five years as shown in Table 1.
Table 1


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td>136,188</td>
<td>145,327</td>
<td>156,329</td>
<td>166,332</td>
<td>178,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Enrollment Increase</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The district is divided into 11 administrative divisions: (a) Alternative Education, (b) Business and Finance Services, © Community Relations, (d) Compensatory Education, (e) Elementary Education, (f) Facilities and Transportation, (g) Human Resources, (h) KLVX Communications Group, (l) Secondary Education, (j) Special Student Services, and (k) Superintendent's Office. One division is headed by the superintendent, eight by assistant superintendents, one by a director, and one by a general manager. With an annual budget of about $1.4 billion, the district is governed by an elected seven-member Board of School Trustees.

The Elementary Education Division under the direction of Assistant Superintendent Dr. P. Kay Carl is further subdivided into six geographic areas each
headed by an area superintendent. Elementary school principals report directly to the area superintendents. When the 1995-96 school year opened, Dr. Carl, in her welcoming newsletter, challenged division administrators to create a shared vision of successful implementation of school programs (Carl, 1995, p. 1). At that time, the Elementary Education Division operated 127 schools of various grade configurations and planned to open 12 more during the 1995-96 school year. The framework for guiding instruction, growth, and school improvement processes in Clark County is the System for Quality Schools (1995). This document specifically defines Quality Standards (1995, sec. III, pp. 2-16) and Quality Indicators (1995, sec. IV, pp. 2-18).

The System for Quality Schools (1995) pointed to the importance of building a shared school vision in the process of improving the school. Further, it specifically directed elementary school administrators to create shared school visions. Elementary administrators were also reminded that all segments of the school community are reflected in the creation of a shared vision and that it is the principal's responsibility to devise strategies to include the entire school community in the development of a "... meaningful school vision" (1995, sec. IV, p. 23).

Vision has been defined repeatedly in the literature. Chance (1992), however, summarized several definitions and concluded, "Vision is intangible. . . . It cannot be touched, felt, or seen, but it is essential that it exist. . . . Vision is a powerful force that guides, cajoles, directs, and facilitates accomplishment" (p. 52). He further underscored the fact that strong evidence suggests the importance of shared vision in
the success of today's schools. In addition, he pointed to the need for research and training to teach principals how to create, implement, and sustain shared visions.

Once the words are in place that represent visions or "... mental images of success" (Iverson, 1995, p. 2), schools are faced with the task of ensuring those words represent concepts that are dynamic and self-renewing. This task of sustaining the vision is complicated by the constant changes in many school communities--changes that include transfer of administrators, new staff members, family mobility, and shifting school boundaries.

The Elementary Education Division of Clark County School District has defined its vision and its mission (see Figure 1). Rather than beginning and ending "... their restructuring efforts with their vision and belief statements" (Tewell, 1996, p. 16), the Elementary Education Division has mandated that every principal develop a shared vision with his or her own constituents within the context or guideline provided at the division level. Chance (1992) stated, however, that "Without an effort to sustain the vision process, the organizational sense of direction can become muddied and eventually lost" (p. 105). The goal of this study, then, was to identify challenges to shared vision creation, implementation, and sustenance, and as a result of identifying those challenges, discover strategies principals use to accomplish the Clark County School District Elementary Education Division mandate of a shared vision.
VISION

The Elementary Education Division envisions an environment of equitable learning in which all students have equal access to, participate in, and benefit from educational opportunities.

MISSION

Therefore, the mission of the Elementary Education Division is to nurture in all schools attainment of the following education conditions:

- Alignment of the school's curriculum with the Curriculum Essentials Framework.
- The learning of essential skills and concepts and the development of essential competencies by all students.
- Positive, orderly, and academically focused learning conditions in the instructional environment.
- Proficiently provided instruction that aligns content with students' learning needs and encompasses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies and learning experiences.
- A structured planning process incorporating participation for continuous school improvement.
- Supervision and evaluation processes that actuate teaching for learning.
- Proficient educational leadership.
- A school climate that promotes positive working and learning conditions.
- School-community cooperation with and confidence in educational enterprises.
- Efficient and effective management of school operations and programs.

Figure 1. Vision and mission of the Clark County School District Elementary Education Division (CCSD Elementary Education Division, System for Quality Schools, 1995).
Creating, implementing, and sustaining a shared vision is a complicated task for any leader. The Elementary Education Division of the Clark County School District expects elementary school principals not only to develop a shared vision for their schools, but also to implement and sustain this shared vision with the aid of their constituencies—other administrators, staff, students, parents, and the community-at-large. Leaders, in this case principals, generally are responsible for developing a shared vision.

The concept of visionary leadership has been defined in the literature, and principals can be tested to determine the degree to which they align themselves with the attributes of visionary leadership (LeSourd & Grady, 1991). Creating a shared vision, also requires political savvy, consensus building, shared decision-making procedures, strong communication skills, effective use of time, administrative renewal, and insightful understanding of the group process (Chance & Grady, 1991).

Statement of the Problem

This study will identify the challenges that elementary school principals in the Clark County School District (CCSD) face when addressing the required task of creating, implementing, and sustaining a shared school vision.
Research Questions

The following research questions were used as guides to collect data for the study:

1. What challenges do elementary school principals encounter in creating shared school vision, and is there a difference among principals based on their attitude towards visionary leadership?

2. What challenges do elementary school principals encounter in implementing shared school vision, and is there a difference among principals based on their attitude towards visionary leadership?

3. What challenges do elementary school principals encounter in sustaining shared school vision, and is there a difference among principals based on their attitude towards visionary leadership?

Definition of Terms

The following definitions were used consistently in this study:

Vision: "... a sweet dream of the future regardless of organizational or environmental constraints. ... It provides a sense of direction" (Chance & Grady, 1994, p. 23).

School vision: "... a dream conceptualized, an idea whose time has come, the present in focus with the future" (CCSD, 1995, sec. IV, p. 23).

Shared school vision: The shared school vision is "... an expression by the school community of what it considers to be ideal. ... It is a brief statement of the desired condition that the administration, staff, students, parents, and community have constructed for their school" (CCSD, 1995, sec. IV, p 29).
Challenges: "... something which tests a person's qualities" (New Lexicon, 1989, p. 162).

Visionary leadership: Leadership based on strong personal convictions (Blumburg & Greenfield, 1980; Manasse, 1985), characterized by observed examples of shared ideologies which include shared beliefs, values, articulated metaphors of an organization's image (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Deal & Kennedy, 1982), and is recognized by members of the organization as innovative (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). This working definition as well as an analysis of visionary leadership at work in all organizations including education comes from research by Grady and LeSourd (1990).

Conceptual Rationale

This study was based on the premise that the development of a shared school vision is a key element for the successful administration of an elementary school program. This assumption has been supported in leadership, organizational success, and effective schools research and has also been identified as a required administrative task in school districts across the country. The proposed study utilizes current research on organizational vision to develop a set of interview questions to solicit direct responses from selected elementary school principals in Clark County School District regarding the challenges that they encounter in creating, implementing, and sustaining a shared school vision.
Owens (1995) provided support for the conceptual rationale for this study in his discussion of leadership and vision. He described a process where leaders take their own personal visions, charisma, and perceptive insights to a higher level by creating a process for change and growth. "By participating in the never-ending process of creating, maintaining, and evolving a vision of the future of the school, teachers are themselves involved in a process of self-development and growth" (p. 129). This collaborative emphasis on the growth and change process in schools through sustaining the shared school vision focuses on reviewing, rethinking, and reaffirming of visions in light of new information and realities. Owens (1995) called this "reflective practice" (p. 129) and considered it vital to the success of school leaders.

An expert in organizational behavior in education, Owens (1995) also found a strong base for sustaining school visions in the behaviors of school administrators in McGregor's Theory Y. This theory points to the need for participatory leadership and the subsequent increased effectiveness of members of an organization when their personal visions are reflected in the overall visions of the organization. The inclusion of personal visions in the creation has been described as the process of building shared and compelling school vision. The process of keeping individuals committed to the shared vision has been referred to as sustaining the vision.
Sustaining a vision is also critical (Nanus, 1992): "A vision is not—or at least should not be—static, enunciated once and for all time . . . Rather, vision formulation should be seen as a dynamic process, an integral part of the ongoing task of a visionary leader" (p. 32).

Essential, too, is the notion of the renewal process within organizations, underscoring the need to be prepared for the "... swift transitions ahead" (Gardner, 1990, p. 137). Gardner further stressed the importance that organizations have shared visions and shared values in place that allow adaptation to accommodate change.

Significance of the Study

This study focused on the identification of challenges that principals encounter when working to create, implement, and sustain a shared school vision. Data drawn from the study may give all principals a better perspective on the development of strategies to assist them in addressing challenges to the school vision process successfully. Principals need to discuss the visioning process from their own experience and to identify challenges in order to set the stage for the identification of successful resolution strategies.

Current practices result in the creation of school visions as merely a set of words which are then left both unchanged and reaffirmed. A principal's use of a shared school vision would be enhanced by the identification of problems or obstacles to the development of that vision. Further, through application of strategies to
improve the creation, implementation, and sustenance of a shared school vision, any
district which places a high value on the visioning process will benefit. As a result,
districts can formulate staff development programs for administrators charged with
this task.

Higher education institutions responsible for preparing school administrators
will find interest in the responses of practicing administrators as they identify
challenges and obstacles to their visionary leadership activities. As professors review
and restructure the conceptual and applied content of course work that includes the
study of the role of visionary leadership in administering schools, they can include in
discussions concepts and theories that address the possible solutions of these
problems.

This study has the potential to assist school boards, superintendents, central
administrators, and school principals to utilize more effectively the process of
creating, implementing, and sustaining shared school visions in their educational
organizations. It can assist institutions of higher learning to develop course work and
learning experiences designed to prepare school administrators to integrate the shared
visioning process effectively into their leadership skills.

Summary

This study will focus on the concept of visionary leadership, its definition, a look at
models of successful application of visionary leadership skills in private industry, in
government, and in creating social change. Specifically, the study will extend to the arena of public education and the role of visionary leadership in attempts to meet the challenges and criticism being leveled at schools on a regular basis.

The Clark County School District in Nevada requires its elementary principals to create, implement and sustain shared school visions using current research in successful school leadership to support that requirement. This study will identify various levels of visionary leadership alignment within the current ranks of assigned principals in the Clark County School District, and select individual principals to be interviewed. The interview questions will focus on identifying challenges that elementary principals encounter in the process of meeting the shared vision requirement in their school assignments.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Creating, implementing, and sustaining a shared vision is a complicated task for any leader. The Elementary Education Division of Clark County School District, centered in Las Vegas, Nevada, expects elementary school principals not only to develop a shared vision for their schools, but also to implement and sustain this shared vision with the aid of their constituencies—other administrators, staff, students, parents, and the community-at-large. Leaders, in this case principals, generally are responsible for developing a shared vision.

The concept of visionary leadership has been defined in the literature, and principals can be tested to determine the degree to which they align themselves with the attributes of visionary leadership (LeSourd & Grady, 1991). Creating a shared vision, also requires political savvy, consensus building, shared decision-making procedures, strong communication skills, effective use of time, administrative renewal, and insightful understanding of group processes (Chance & Grady, 1994).
This study will identify the challenges that elementary school principals in the CCSD face when addressing the required task of creating, implementing, and sustaining a shared school vision. The following research questions will be used as guides to collect data for the study:

1. What challenges do elementary school principals encounter in creating shared school vision, and is there a difference among principals based on their attitude towards visionary leadership?

2. What challenges do elementary school principals encounter in implementing shared school vision, and is there a difference among principals based on their attitude towards visionary leadership?

3. What challenges do elementary school principals encounter in sustaining shared school vision, and is there a difference among principals based on their attitude towards visionary leadership?

All 132 district elementary school principals, except for the investigator, were surveyed using the Visionary Leadership Attitude Survey (Grady & LeSourd, 1990) to determine their attitudes toward visionary leadership. Six principals aligning with visionary leadership attributes and six principals aligning with managerial style leadership were selected for in-depth interview to identify patterns and themes in challenges to the creation, implementation, and sustenance of shared school visions.

The literature which applies to this study focused on the process of creating, implementing, and sustaining shared vision in an organization. Although the emphasis in the present study is on the elementary school, research in business, marketing, and personal growth also appeared to have application.
The Visioning Process

Peter Senge (1990) presented a clear picture of the importance of understanding visioning as a process in learning organizations in his discussion of the human side of organizational behavior. He stressed that organizational visions are created and maintained by "... how we think and how we interact" (p. xiv), and as visions are built on mental models, the process of visioning is faced with the challenge of "... redesigning mental models" (p. xv). In addition, Senge (1990) reaffirmed the importance of understanding the process of systems-type thinking as he described the building of learning organizations: "... there is no 'there', no ultimate destination, only a lifelong journey" (p. xv).

The relationship of systems thinking to schools as learning institutions, according to Senge (O'Neil, 1995), has to do with the fact that schools are filled with cynics just like other learning organizations. However, schools are generally populated with high numbers of people who entered the profession with a "... high sense of purpose" (p. 22). Schools, unfortunately, quickly turn teachers who have a high sense of purpose into cynics. As a result, American schools are a fertile ground for redirecting these buried senses of caring and purpose particularly among teachers.

This fertile ground is full of personal visions, and it is here that Senge stressed the importance of building trust, communicating, and creating shared visions. It is at this point, too, that Senge (O'Neil, 1995) wove together the school visioning process,
the importance of the understanding of systems thinking, and his criteria for the success of the American education system.

Actually having shared visions exist is so profoundly different from writing a vision statement that it's really night and day. It takes a long time, and it is a process that involves a lot of reflection and a great deal of listening and mutual understanding. It always involves those two dimensions.

_Some people are skeptical of this whole "vision" idea. Those who have been through "visioning" sometimes feel that it is a contrived exercise, a diversion from their real work, and not an especially potent process._

The problem is that usually it's _not_ a process; it's an event. We all go off and write a vision statement and then go back to work. It's absolutely pointless; it can even be counterproductive because people think, "we've done the vision stuff, and it didn't make any difference." For anybody really serious in this work, you'll spend 20 to 40 percent of your time--forever--continually working on getting people to reflect on and articulate what it is they're really trying to create. It is never ending. (O'Neil, 1995, p. 22)

In _The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook_ Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, and Smith (1994) collaborated to create a guide for organizations interested in focusing on their learning and growth abilities. They stressed the importance of building shared visions and underscored the significance of including all participants in the organization and of emphasizing the process and not the event. They claimed,

... at the heart of building shared vision is the task of designing and evolving ongoing processes in which people at every level of the organization, in every role, can speak from the heart about what really matters to them and be heard—by senior management and each other. (p. 299)
Also discussed was the importance of keeping the vision "... fluid... visions are always evolving; they are an expression of our heart's desire" (Senge et al., 1994, p. 305).

In an address to a small group of colleagues in Grafton, Vermont, Senge (1990) explained the thinking involved in his concepts of organizations and their potential to learn. He defined the first two disciplines as being involved with building shared visions and developing personal mastery. It is important to remember that the process of building shared vision is ongoing and this process rises above a set of words, brings it alive for people, and enables them to reflect continually upon it in their minds and in their hearts. Also tied to the ongoing process of visioning is the second discipline—personal mastery. People need to have their own personal visions before they can take a responsible part in a shared vision. Those without personal vision can just follow rather than take part, and Senge (1994) suggested that this represents compliance rather than commitment (pp. 1-8).

In another definition of vision, Bennis and Nanus (1985) maintained that "... a vision always refers to a future state, a condition that does not presently exist and never existed. With a vision, the leader provides the all-important bridge from the present to the future of the organization" (pp. 89-90). Bennis and Nanus (1985) further emphasized that visions are the responsibility of the leaders of organizations, and they can never be "offered once and for all" (p. 109). The vision must be blended
throughout the organization and constantly evaluated and re-evaluated as the situation and needs in organizations change.

Leadership and vision are interwoven concepts. Owens (1995), for example, claimed that leadership is more than style and techniques; in fact, he asserted that it is more involved with relationships and understanding. Specifically, he identified the importance of motivating people to a shared vision, gaining commitment to the vision, and organizing the work environment to facilitate the visioning process as key ways that leaders relate the visioning process to followers.

Owens (1995) also provided another perspective on visioning as a process:

The vision that leaders seek to share is a protean thing, continually being revised and annotated by changing values, emerging developments, and events that vindicate or repudiate aspects of the world view previously held by either leader and followers, or both. (p. 128)

In another instance, Kouzes and Posner (1987) observed that long-term process thinking is required of visionary leaders. They further pointed out that in many organizations, bottom-line profits, industry trends, and pressure from outside sources force the focus of decisions to short-term situations. They reiterated, however, that they have found that the effectiveness of leadership is related to the ability to have a "long term future orientation. . . . Leaders look beyond the horizon of the present" (Kouzes & Posner, 1987, p. xvi).

Thompson (1989) delineated two ways to view the leadership visioning processes of school principals. First, she described the narrow view of one specific
plan for one certain school. Then, she portrayed the all-encompassing total process of visioning that begins with creation of a vision and results in implementation. This may also be extended to the never-ending process of vision self-renewal. Thompson (1989) went on to identify three basic components to categorize strategies used by principals in the process of school visioning: "... communication, involvement, and commitment" (p.10). The present study applied these three categories to assist in the process of sorting and compiling data to create a critical attributes model for the visioning process.

In any organization, change can be upsetting. In discussing the concept of organizational change, Fullan (1995) reinforced the importance of process application to visioning. Shared visions, he maintained, come in the latter stages of organizational change. Fullan (1995) further emphasized that "... shared vision, which is essential for success must evolve through the dynamic interaction of organizational members and leaders. ... This takes time and will not succeed unless the vision-building process is somewhat open-ended" (Section B, p. 9).

Motivation for change may emanate from a variety of sources. Sparks (1995), discussed the process of motivation for change from the perspective of current research on the working of the human brain and how it responds to change and the idea of change. Two types of motivation were mentioned. The first draws people to a new idea or direction, and the second pushes people back and away from the same new ideas. As a result, Sparks contended that it is critical to create values that include all
of the learning modalities. In that way, opportunities to motivate both those who are
drawn to and those who are pushed away from new ideas are available. In addition, he
suggested that the power of a compelling vision comes from a common value base and
deep commitments. In terms of the process of visioning as applied to the present
study, Sparks (cited in Iverson, 1995) purported that "... those values, principles, and
visions must be regularly revisited so that they stay in the forefront of everyone's
thinking and guide planning" (p. 3).

Leadership requires the ability to sway people to action or shared thought.
Sergiovanni (1994) has compared leadership in schools and characteristics of proven
leaders in other segments of society. He listed common skills as (a) the importance of
standing for values, (b) the ability to share ideas and to draw others in to similar
thinking, (c) the ability to get people to agree on shared ideas, and (d) the ability to
improve the quality of life of people involved in the organization(pp. 6-9).
Sergiovanni further argued that schools are moral communities; therefore, principals
must stress the connections of moral commitments accepted by teachers, students,
parents, and the community as a whole. Most important, Sergiovanni called for
teachers, parents, students, and principals to come together in a "... shared
followership" (p. 9).

Once a vision is written, it is critical to maintain focus on it. Bullock (1986),
for example, contended that once visions are written, it is the responsibility of the
leader to become a "... knight to a cause" (p. 6). In addition, vision process research
has underscored the importance of sharing the vision and revisiting it to maintain renewal. In order to create successful visions for organizations, the steadfast commitment of a leader needs more to address the concept of process as opposed to the practice of "single-mindedness and discipline" (Bullock, 1986, p. 6).

The importance of process thinking when it comes to creating shared and compelling school visions has been spelled out as researchers have applied new concepts within the arena of learning organization theory. The entire concept of organizations as learners, for example, is based on process, continual growth, ongoing reflection, and self-renewal. Learning organizations promote sharing, collaboration, and a safe environment to risk blending personal visions with organizational visions. This blending defines the visioning process.

Particularly unique support for the importance of viewing visioning as a process has come from the field of quantum physics (Wheatley, 1992). If the concept of vision is perceived as a force field permeating organizational space rather than as an image drawing people forward in a linear fashion, the importance of employing continuous strategies linked to the omnipresent force of the vision field in an organization becomes clear.

The evidence of synergistic relationships within organizations can be traced throughout the literature on the effects of shared and compelling visions in successful organizations. Consistently reiterated have been the importance of the process of blending personal and organizational visions which is then linked to systems thinking,
renewal concepts, personal mastery, learning organizations, and collective intelligence (Barker, 1993; Covey, 1993; Gardner, 1990; Kline & Saunders, 1993). For example, Bennis (1991) stressed the importance of giving a vision life by referring to it as the management of an organizational dream in which the key management techniques include "... communicating, recruiting meticulously, rewarding, retraining, and reorganizing" (p. 25). Senge (O'Neil, 1995) maintained that school administrators should devote 20-40% of their administrative time to the shared visioning process.

Visionary Leadership

Grady and LeSourd (1990) have cited extensive research which supported the identification of many principals as outstanding educators because they exhibited a strong visionary leadership style. In response, they posed general research questions in the areas of principals' attitudes towards visionary leadership, preferred visionary leadership qualities, and differences in attitudes between principals in California and Nebraska. The authors maintained that previous research affirming that good principals have visionary leadership attributes has been targeted primarily at principals with outstanding reputations rather than with the general principal population. They further suggested that the data from their instrument were drawn from a more representative population, and that, in general, the principals of public schools had a high regard for visionary leadership. While the instrument did not attempt to pursue the ways that the responding principals applied visionary leadership strategies in their
schools, the subjects did recognize the importance of a sense of direction and future vision for their schools.

From this initial research, Grady and LeSourd (1990) extended their study by identifying 20 principals from among those tested on visionary attitude to take part in interview sessions designed to elicit personal descriptions of their leadership style. The goal was to investigate any possible correlation between the survey and the interview data and at the same time to identify the visionary attributes that principals used to describe their leadership style. The results indicated that the principals used minimal visionary language to describe their leadership style, and most were oriented to the ongoing task of helping people and taking care of direct human needs.

The National School Boards Association, at their 1992 Delegate Assembly in Orlando, Florida, identified four primary themes of governance for local school boards in the decade of the 1990s. Three specifically identified activities that called for visionary thinking and leadership. The delegates to that assembly said that school boards must (a) set a vision for their local communities, (b) create an environment and structure to implement visions, and (c) continually assess progress towards achieving visions (Powe, 1992, pp. 1-3). Along the same lines, the literature reviewed in this chapter emphasized (a) leadership, (b) vision, (c) the visioning process, and (d) the inter-relationship between vision and leadership. Clearly, once a vision is written and implemented, it must be sustained and renewed in order to promote the intended change in any organization.
Summary

Based on the literature, the goal of this study was to determine what challenges impede the visioning process for elementary school principals in Clark County School District, Las Vegas, Nevada, and to categorize those challenges as they apply to the required tasks of creating, implementing, and sustaining shared visions for schools. The identification of these challenges may provide some insight and a research base upon which to create strategies and skills to meet those challenges effectively and to strengthen the school visioning process.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Creating, implementing, and sustaining a shared vision is a complicated task for any leader. The Elementary Education Division of the Clark County School District (CCSD), Las Vegas, Nevada, expects elementary school principals not only to develop a shared vision for their schools, but also to implement and sustain this shared vision with the aid of their constituencies—other administrators, staff, students, parents, and the community-at-large. Leaders, in this case principals, generally are responsible for developing a shared vision.

The concept of visionary leadership has been defined in the literature, and principals can be tested to determine the degree to which they align themselves with the attributes of visionary leadership (LeSourd & Grady, 1991). Creating a shared vision, also requires political savvy, consensus building, shared decision-making procedures, strong communication skills, effective use of time, administrative renewal, and insightful understanding of group processes (Chance & Grady, 1994).
In CCSD where creation of a shared vision is a specific leadership task of every elementary school principal, the challenges encountered in the creation, implementation, and sustenance of a shared school vision have not been identified. It is the goal of this study to collect data that assist in identifying these challenges. The following research questions will be used as guides to collect those data:

1. What challenges do elementary school principals encounter in creating shared school vision, and is there a difference among principals based on their attitude towards visionary leadership?

2. What challenges do elementary school principals encounter in implementing shared school vision, and is there a difference among principals based on their attitude towards visionary leadership?

3. What challenges do elementary school principals encounter in sustaining shared school vision, and is there a difference among principals based on their attitude towards visionary leadership?

All 132 district elementary school principals, except for the investigator, were surveyed using the Visionary Leadership Attitude Survey (Grady & LeSourd, 1990) to determine their attitudes toward visionary leadership. Six principals aligning with visionary leadership attributes and six principals aligning with managerial style leadership were selected for in-depth interview to identify patterns and themes in challenges to the creation, implementation, and sustenance of shared school visions.

In order to answer the research questions, a combination of descriptive and qualitative research methods were used in a descriptive study of the elementary school principals of Clark County School District. Blending two research paradigms is
supported as a technique that may be superior to either one by itself (Reichardt & Cook, 1979).

The first phase of the study was descriptive. An attitudinal survey based on that used by Grady and LeSourd (1990) was administered to all 132 elementary school principals in the district. This survey, grounded in research, identified the dominant qualities of visionary leadership in the following five areas:

(a) a high motivation by personal beliefs
(b) a commitment to attaining personal goals in a school
(c) a value placement on a prominent, shared school ideology
(d) a predisposition towards innovation
(e) a vision of a better future (Grady & LeSourd, 1990, pp. 104-105)

For their pilot survey, Grady and LeSourd (1990) created an instrument of 28 items written to reflect a visionary leadership style and another 28 items written to reflect a managerial leadership style. A 5-point Likert scale was used to establish agreement or disagreement with each item. The entire survey population consisted of two groups of 1,250 K-12 principals, one in Nebraska and the other in the central and coastal regions of California. The pilot survey was then distributed to two groups of 250 randomly selected principals from each of the two geographical regions.

Expert judges in educational administration reviewed the instrument for content validity, and 100 additional randomly selected principals were included with the original pilot study groups. The item analysis resulting from the expert panel
review and the pilot study led to the selection for the validation study of 24 vision statements with a response pattern of highest agreement and 11 managerial statements with a response pattern of the highest disagreement.

The revised instrument consisting of 35 items was mailed to 500 randomly selected principals in Nebraska and California. The response rate of 77.4% yielded 387 returned surveys. Cronbach's α was used to calculate estimated reliability coefficients of .65 for the Vinson subscale, .55 for the managerial subscale, and .65 for the total instrument. The data were also subjected to a series of factor analyses and substantiated a two-factor vision and management solution. Grady and LeSourd (1990) stated that the findings of the validation procedure supported the "creditability of the instrument as an aid to research and instruction" (p. 10) and that the instrument may be used for "empirical substantiation of a generalization of visionary leadership style, for diagnostic purposes and as a screening tool" (p. 10).

Based on the validity and reliability of the Visionary Leadership Attitude Survey as determined by Grady and LeSourd (1990), it was used for the present study as a screening tool, and it was scored according to the rubric provided with it by its creators. The goal was to identify principals with varying degrees of alignment with visionary leadership styles for the second phase of the study. The scores of the principals on the survey were ranked from highest to lowest. The higher scores indicated a greater inclination towards visionary leadership implying a strong visionary
leadership style. Lower scores, on the other hand, suggested a managerial leadership style, which is perceived to be the opposite of visionary leadership.

The second phase of the project involved interviews. The six highest and the six lowest scorers on the visionary leadership survey were interviewed in person by the investigator using a script of interview questions. These questions were developed from the review of the literature, submitted to a review panel selected for their expertise resulting from experience in the public school visioning process, and refined through a series of pilot applications.

Interviews were tape recorded, transcribed, and subjected to analysis by computer. A computer program, *The Ethnograph* (Seidel, Kjolseth, & Seymour, 1988), was used to assist in identifying patterns and themes as well as differences among the responses through a coding system of recurring words, phrases, and concepts. The goal of this qualitative component was to identify challenges to creating, implementing, and sustaining a shared vision and to determine what strategies have been used to overcome them. Identifying and selecting the highest and lowest scorers on the survey implied disparate leadership styles and enabled the investigator to ascertain clearer distinctions in challenges that may be unique to leadership style.

The data were analyzed using two subprocesses of inductive analysis, unitizing and categorizing, as defined by Rudestam and Newton (1992). These required that all transcribed data be coded and key categories defined with strong attention paid to the
key attributes of visionary school leaders as identified by Chance (1994), Grady and LeSourd (1990), and Iverson (1995). Guidelines developed by Tesch (1990) provided insight and rationale for the application of the unitizing and categorizing functions within the computer processing program.

This study, combining the Visionary Leadership Attitude Survey to select the n of cases for the qualitative collection of data through interviews, is modeled generally after the two data-collection research procedures with the same survey instrument used by Grady and LeSourd (1990). In that study, they mailed out 200 surveys and intended to interview 20 respondents, roughly 10% of number of surveys sent out. Grady and LeSourd (1990) defined the criterion of high scores and decided that those were the respondents they wished to interview.

Glesne and Peshkin (1992) also provided guidance in the number of survey respondents to be interviewed. They believed that "...the strategy of participant selection in qualitative research rests on the multiple purposes of illuminating, interpreting, and understanding—and on the researcher's own imagination and judgement" (p. 27). In addition, Glesne and Peshkin (1992) stressed the fact that, although qualitative researchers do make generalizations, they do not rely on a specific numerical basis for generating them.
Permission to Conduct Research

The Clark County School District policy on research including observations, interviews, questionnaires, surveys, and other instruments required screening of the project by the CINTER Advisory Committee at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, to review the proposed research procedures. The researcher then had to submit the research proposal for approval to Dr. Judy Costa, Director of the District's Testing and Evaluation Department. The approval process for the administration of both surveys and individual interviews required for this study was initiated in a timely fashion to permit approval for conducting the study during the 1997 calendar year. The letter of application (Appendix C) for approval included a request to administer the *Visionary Leadership Attitude Survey* to all elementary school principals and to select the principals to be interviewed based on the data collected from the survey.

Informational meetings were held with Dr. P. Kay Carl, Assistant Superintendent, Elementary Education Division, Clark County School District; Dr. Carla Steinforth, East Area Elementary Superintendent; and all remaining area superintendents as a group.

All informational meetings were designed to provide background for the research project and to increase the credibility and trust level of the researcher (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992).
Population

The population under study was all of the elementary school principals, except for the researcher, in Clark County School District, centered in Las Vegas, Nevada. The number used was 132; however, several new schools were added during the year. The researcher limited the study to the 132 elementary schools identified during the 1996-1997 school year.

The purpose of the study was to identify challenges, barriers, hindrances, and obstacles to elementary school principals in the process of creating, implementing, and sustaining shared vision for their schools. In addition, strategies for overcoming those difficulties were sought. Therefore, the first phase of the study consisted of a survey to discover which are the most visionary and the most managerial elementary school principals in the district (Grady & LeSourd, 1990). The population for the second phase of the study was those six principals with the highest and those six principals with the lowest scores on the Visionary Leadership Attitude Survey.

Instruments

LeSourd and Grady (1990) developed an instrument to screen principals for visionary leadership attributes. They sought to identify highly visionary principals for
case studies to codify specific language that principals use to describe their own visionary leadership styles. The Visionary Leadership Attitude Survey (1990), then, was designed to be a screening tool to select candidates for further research. This instrument was used in the first phase of the present study.

In order to obtain data for the second phase of the study, a script containing 15 open-ended questions (Appendix A) was developed from extensive review of the literature. A draft of the interview script was mailed to a panel of five selected resources for review (see Appendix D). The review panel was selected for their expertise in a variety of areas including visionary leadership in schools research, visionary leadership in schools workshop presentations, development of qualitative research questions, supervision of principals required to develop shared school visions, development of qualitative interview questions, and construction of grammatically correct, open-ended interview questions.

The review panel received a letter with specific instructions for review of content, mechanics, relevance to the study, and applicability to the proposed interview process. Prepaid return mailers were included in the mailing. Suggestions for change and improvement were solicited, and each question was reviewed, evaluated, strengthened, and changed based on the input from the panel of experts. The validated interview questions were then pilot tested on retired principals prior to use in the investigation itself with 12 subject principals.

Discussions with Committee chairperson, Dr. Gerald Kops, resulted in further
refinement of the interview script prior to presentation of the proposal to committee for approval.

Procedure

In the first phase of the study, the Visionary Leadership Attitude Survey (Grady & LeSourd, 1990), was distributed to all approximately 132 elementary school principals in Clark County School District (see Appendix B). The instrument consists of 24 vision items representing 5 dominant qualities of visionary leaders. Additional items were inserted as distractors to check for response bias. The entire survey has a total of 35 statements for rating agreement or disagreement on a 5-point Likert scale.

The Visionary Leadership Attitude Survey was scored according to guidelines provided by the test designers (Grady & LeSourd, 1990). From these scores, the approximately 132 elementary school principals were ranked from highest to lowest to determine the degree to which they identify themselves as visionary leaders. The six highest and the six lowest scorers were selected for interview. The interview was used to identify the barriers and obstacles to as well as the strategies used for creating, implementing, and sustaining a shared school vision. In addition, the presence or absence of a difference in response between the high and low scorers was examined.

This study was descriptive in nature and combined both quantitative and qualitative measures. It may also be described as a case study which involved
"... a detailed examination of a single subject or a group or a phenomenon" (Borg & Gall, 1983, p. 488). While the purpose of a case study design may be to find a single or a small group or a case which may provide data that may then be generalized to a larger population, in reality, case studies tend to produce "... rich subjective data that can aid in the development of theory and empirically testable hypotheses" (Borg & Gall, 1983, p. 489). Yin (1984) and Stake (1978) further provided solid rationale for the use of case studies as a primary research methodology, pointing to their application in policy analysis, public administration, community psychology and sociology, organization, and management as well as for public service agencies.

For the present case study, qualitative data on the specific leadership activities and strategies employed by high and low visionary elementary school principals in CCSD in accomplishing the administrative task of creating, implementing, and sustaining a shared school vision were gathered. The interviews used for qualitative data collection were semi-structured yielding ethnographic data following guidelines available in the literature on this methodology (Goetz & LeCompte, 1982; Measor, 1985; Spradely, 1979).

Limitations

Clark County School District has increased enrollment by 6-8% every year of the last decade. This rapid growth rate and consequent opening of several new schools nearly every year have combined to create a large number of school programs in
transition. This unusual set of circumstances along with the enormous size of the district which forces frequent mobility among elementary school principals provides a unique situation which may not necessarily be generalized to other districts which may also be required to create, implement, and sustain a shared vision.

Because of administrator mobility, recently trained principals are often moved into the trenches in the middle of the visioning process. New principals must quickly articulate their own personal vision and visioning process and then integrate them into the process already in place in that school. They are then directed to plan and implement strategies that sustain a shared school vision in their new location. The impact of principal interchange and natural attrition has not been considered in the directive concerning shared vision.

The researcher has identified several limitations that apply to the data collected in this study. The size of the population selected for interviews was determined by the researcher in order to provide a manageable data base, yet offer rich enough data to identify patterns and trends. Larger or smaller interview populations could produce contrasting data. The researcher also recognizes that all data collected in personal interview procedures are dependent upon the assumption that all interviewees are offering truthful responses. In addition, the demographic profile of the elementary principals in CCSD, specifically gender, age, in-district experience, out-of-district experience, and ethnicity may have influenced all data collected.
The principal investigator of this study has been employed as an elementary school principal in Clark County School District since 1991 and excluded himself from participating as a subject in this study. As a result of his conducting the study, data gathered in interview sessions may well have been biased by previous and ongoing personal- and work-related interactions between the researcher and the subjects. Although anonymity was assured and guarded closely to minimize any potential restrictions in the flow of information, contamination may have been present in the reticence of the subjects to discuss their opinions openly.

Summary

This study sought to identify challenges to the creation, implementation, and sustenance of required shared visions by elementary school principals in Clark County School District. The proposed methodology combined both descriptive and qualitative paradigms. The descriptive phase of the study necessitated the administration of the Visionary Leadership Attitude Survey (Grady & LeSourd, 1990) to approximately 132 elementary school principals to determine the degree to which they aligned themselves either with visionary leadership at the one extreme or managerial leadership at the other. The six highest (visionary) and the six lowest (managerial) scorers were invited to interview in the second phase of the study. An interview script was designed
specifically for this study to identify patterns and themes about the application of visionary leadership through *unitizing* and *categorizing* (Rudestam & Newton, 1992), by means of *The Ethnograph* (Seidel et al., 1988) software. Data were then analyzed to respond to the two research questions.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Creating, implementing, and sustaining a shared vision is a complicated task for any leader. The Elementary Education Division of the Clark County School District (CCSD), Las Vegas, Nevada, expects elementary school principals not only to develop a shared vision for their schools, but also to implement and sustain this shared vision with the aid of their constituencies—other administrators, staff, students, parents, and the community-at-large. Leaders, in this case principals, generally are responsible for developing a shared vision.

The concept of visionary leadership has been defined in the literature, and in this study, principals were tested to determine the degree to which they aligned themselves with the attributes of visionary leadership (LeSourd & Grady, 1991). Creating a shared vision also requires political savvy, consensus building, shared decision-making procedures, strong communication skills, effective use of time, administrative renewal, and insightful understanding of group processes (Chance & Grady, 1994). In-depth interviews were conducted with selected principals to identify
challenges they faced as they created, implemented, and sustained required shared school visions. The following questions guided the research:

1. What challenges do elementary school principals encounter in creating shared school vision, and is there a difference among principals based on their attitude towards visionary leadership?

2. What challenges do elementary school principals encounter in implementing shared school vision, and is there a difference among principals based on their attitude towards visionary leadership?

3. What challenges do elementary school principals encounter in sustaining shared school vision, and is there a difference among principals based on their attitude towards visionary leadership?

All CCSD elementary school principals—132 in all—were surveyed using the Visionary Leadership Attitude Survey (Grady & LeSourd, 1990) to determine their attitudes toward visionary leadership. Ninety-one surveys were returned to the researcher. Based on the results of the survey, six principals aligning very strongly with visionary leadership attributes and six with strong managerial leadership influence on their visionary alignment were selected for in-depth interview. The purpose of the interview was to identify patterns and themes met by these principals as they faced challenges to the creation, implementation, and sustenance of shared school visions.

The interview script was developed from the review of the literature and was reviewed by a panel (see Appendix D). The review panel was selected for their expertise in visionary leadership in schools research and workshop presentations, in development of qualitative research questions, in supervision of principals required to
develop shared school visions, and in constructing grammatically correct, open-ended interview questions.

The review panel members were supplied with specific instructions for review of content and mechanics, applicability to the interview process, and relevance to the study. Prepaid return mailers were included in the mailing, and all responded. Suggestions for change and improvement were offered, and each question was reviewed, evaluated, strengthened, and changed based on the input from the review panel (Appendix D). The validated interview questions were then tested in a pilot study using retired principals as subjects prior to the present investigation and further revisions were made to improve the flow of data in the interview process.

The Survey

The *Visionary Leadership Attitude Survey* (Grady & LeSourd, 1990) was the instrument used for this study. The survey is composed of 35 questions organized in the form of a four-page survey booklet printed on goldenrod stock paper. The survey included simple and clear directions, and the color and organization were intended to catch the attention and maintain the interest of the respondents.

Process

The investigator met with administrative team leaders in the CCSD Elementary Education Division. Present were the assistant superintendent for the Elementary Education Division, all eight area superintendents, the director of teacher assignment,
the elementary administrative liaison, and the director of academic services. The proposal abstract, the survey, the interview questions, and a self-scoring rubric for the survey were distributed and discussed. After a brief overview of the study, the administrative team leaders were asked to support the investigation and to refer principals with questions to the researcher.

After gaining support of the division leadership, the investigator coded the surveys and mailed them to 132 CCSD elementary school principals. Included with the surveys were a personally addressed letter of introduction and explanation (see Appendix E) and a stamped envelope addressed to the home address of the researcher. The packet was then mailed.

The initial response totaled 72 principals for a return rate of 54.5%. Two weeks after the first mailing, permission was granted to use the Elementary Superintendent’s e-mail system to remind all 132 principals to respond to the survey. The process of renotifying all principals was necessary to ensure confidentiality. After another 3.5 weeks, 19 additional principals responded for a total of 91 (68.9%) usable surveys.

**Scoring**

Of the 35 questions on the survey, 24 specifically addressed visionary leadership attributes. Based on the rubric supplied with the survey (Grady & LeSourd, 1990), the highest possible visionary score was 120. This number was obtained by
summing the responses on the 5-point Likert scale for each of the 35 questions specifically addressing visionary leadership. The range of visionary scores of the respondents was from 85 to 119 with a mean score of 100.6.

Eleven managerial leadership attribute statements were included in the survey as detractor items. They were scored in the same manner. A perfect score for alignment with the managerial leadership style statements was 55, based on responses on a 5-point Likert scale. The highest score on the managerial statements for the 91 respondents was 42, and the lowest score was 16, with a mean score of 24.0.

In order to obtain an adjusted visionary score, the managerial detractor scores were subtracted from the visionary leadership attributes scores. The adjusted scores ranged from 53 to 95 with a mean of 76.6 (Table 2). Based on adjusted survey scores, six principals who ranked highest on alignment with visionary leadership attributes (Table 3) and six principals who ranked lowest (Table 4) were selected for interview. Their surveys were decoded to identify them by name, and the 12 selected principals were contacted by telephone to arrange for the interview.

The mean adjusted visionary leadership attribute alignment score for the six highest scoring respondents was 93.8. The range of scores was from 93 to 95. These adjusted scores were calculated from a range of visionary item scores from 111 through 119 with a mean score of 114.5. On managerial items, scores for this group ranged from 17 to 25 with a mean score of 20.7.
The mean adjusted visionary leadership attribute alignment score for the six lowest scoring respondents was 57.2. The range of scores was from 53 to 61. These adjusted scores were calculated from a range of visionary item scores from 85 through 97 with a mean score of 87.7. On managerial items, scores ranged from 25 to 42 with a mean score of 30.5. A summary of scores of the highest and lowest groups in relation to the total group is shown in Table 5.

Table 2

Summary of Scores of 91 Clark County School District Elementary School Principals on the Visionary Leadership Attitude Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Visionary Item Score</th>
<th>Managerial Item Score</th>
<th>Adjusted Vision Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Visionary Item Score</td>
<td>Managerial Item Score</td>
<td>Adjusted Vision Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Visionary Item Score</td>
<td>Managerial Item Score</td>
<td>Adjusted Vision Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Visionary Item Score</td>
<td>Managerial Item Score</td>
<td>Adjusted Vision Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,152</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,181</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,971</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Summary of Scores of Six Clark County School District Elementary School Principals with the Highest Visionary Scores on the Visionary Leadership Attitude Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Visionary Item Score</th>
<th>Managerial Item Score</th>
<th>Adjusted Vision Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>114.50</td>
<td>20.70</td>
<td>93.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4

**Summary of Scores of Six Clark County School District Elementary School Principals with the Lowest Visionary Scores on the Visionary Leadership Attitude Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Visionary Item Score</th>
<th>Managerial Item Score</th>
<th>Adjusted Vision Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>526</strong></td>
<td><strong>183</strong></td>
<td><strong>343</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>87.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

**Summary of Highest and Lowest Scores in Relation to Total Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Scores</th>
<th>Highest Group</th>
<th>Lowest Group</th>
<th>Total Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vision Items</strong></td>
<td>111 - 119</td>
<td>85 - 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Managerial Items</strong></td>
<td>17 - 25</td>
<td>25 - 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Adjusted Score</strong></td>
<td>93 - 95</td>
<td>53 - 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vision Items</strong></td>
<td>114.5</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Managerial Items</strong></td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Adjusted Score</strong></td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Interviews

Process

The second phase of the research involved selecting a total of 12 elementary school principals for interview based on their adjusted visionary scores on the survey. The six highest and six lowest scorers were selected to try to identify differences in challenges to the creation, implementation, and sustenance of shared school visions based on high and low visionary attributes. High scorers are referred to as visionary attribute aligned leaders while low scorers are called managerial attribute aligned leaders for ease of discussion. Selected principals were contacted by telephone for scheduling. Interview sessions, held in the office of the principal being interviewed, were audio taped, and an interview script was used to assure the consistency of questioning. At the beginning of each interview, the principal was provided a letter of explanation and an informed consent release form ensuring confidentiality, giving permission to tape the interview, and authorizing the use of data in the research project. At the same time, the researcher presented a brief synopsis of the project and shared the criteria for selection for interview. The interview script was followed with minimal elaboration or comment by the interviewer. Following each interview, the researcher sent a thank you letter to the participant.
Participant Demographics

The 12 elementary principals selected for interview were asked for some demographic information concerning the number of years in education, the number of employees supervised, and the configuration of the school. These data are shown in Table 6.

The average number of years in the field of education for both visionary and managerial principals was just over 23 years. In terms of experience in administration, however, the average for visionary principals was 16.00 years, while for managerial principals it was only 7.33 years. The visionary principals had been assigned to their current schools for a longer period as well—5.50 years for visionary and 3.25 years for managerial principals. The visionary principals reported more responsibility for supervising teachers, but the managerial principals supervised, on average, more administrators, support staff, and other employees. All principals administer either pre-kindergarten- or kindergarten-grade 5 schools. The average school size of the visionary principals is 915.83, and that of the managerial principals is substantially lower at 600.00.
Table 6

Number of Years in Education, Number of Employees Supervised, and School Configuration of Elementary School Principals Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Years in Education</th>
<th>Number of Employees Supervised</th>
<th>School Configuration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educat</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Current School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1V^</td>
<td>31.50</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2V</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3V</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4V</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5V</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6V</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total V</td>
<td>139.50</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean V</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1M^</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2M</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4M</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5M</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6M</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total M</td>
<td>141.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean M</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280.50</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td>52.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V = Visionary
M = Managerial
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Interview Analysis via *The Ethnograph*

The 12 interviews were transcribed from cassette audiotape to computer text. The tapes had been labeled alphabetically and in chronological order of the scheduled interview. In addition, they were identified with a v for high alignment with visionary leadership attributes and an m for having a lower visionary alignment score and a stronger alignment with managerial leadership attributes. The interviews were then copied onto computer disks into WordPerfect 6.1 format. The disks were labeled as follows:

- INTAV: Interview Data, Respondent A, Visionary Alignment
- INTBM: Interview Data, Respondent B, Managerial Alignment
- INTCV: Interview Data, Respondent C, Visionary Alignment
- INTDM: Interview Data, Respondent D, Managerial Alignment
- INTEV: Interview Data, Respondent E, Visionary Alignment
- INTFM: Interview Data, Respondent F, Managerial Alignment
- INTGV: Interview Data, Respondent G, Visionary Alignment
- INTHV: Interview Data, Respondent H, Visionary Alignment
- INTIM: Interview Data, Respondent I, Managerial Alignment
- INTJV: Interview Data, Respondent J, Visionary Alignment
- INTKM: Interview Data, Respondent K, Managerial Alignment
- INTLM: Interview Data, Respondent L, Managerial Alignment

The text of each interview was then reformatted into ASCII TEXT, the margins were set at 40 spaces, and the interviews were saved as ETHNOTXT file data. Each
interview text was processed individually through *The Ethnograph* (Seidel et al., 1988) numbering program which numbered each line of text in preparation for coding. The total number of text lines was 8,753.

**Coding Concepts**

Initial coding followed the interview question format. Only those line segments referring to challenges, obstacles, or problems identified by the respondents as they talked of creating, implementing, and sustaining their shared school visions were recorded. The initial codes selected for the text review are displayed in Table 7.

**Table 7**

**Initial Codes Used to Analyze Interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description of Code Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SVDEF</td>
<td>Respondents' definitions of a shared school vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHCH</td>
<td>Teacher-related challenges to the shared visioning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSTFCCH</td>
<td>Support staff-related challenges to the shared visioning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUCH</td>
<td>Student-related challenges to the shared visioning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARCH</td>
<td>Parent-related challenges to the shared visioning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDCH</td>
<td>Funding-related challenges to the shared visioning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTOFFCH</td>
<td>Central administrator-related challenges to the shared visioning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINCH</td>
<td>Training challenges to the shared visioning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPRTCH</td>
<td>Community partner challenges to the shared visioning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMECH</td>
<td>Time challenges to the shared visioning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVSUCSS</td>
<td>Role of shared vision in overall success of a school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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After coding, data were analyzed in terms of the individual, of the group, and between visionary and managerial groups.

Results

Definitions of Shared School Vision

Table 8 contains the definition of shared school vision of the respondents as identified through *The Ethnograph* (Seidel et al., 1988).

Table 8

Definitions of Shared School Vision from the Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visionary</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J: ...I see it as a mental journey. It is where I worked really hard over the years to invent or mentally invent our future. I feel it is important to have the big picture and a very global picture of what a school needs to do.</td>
<td>D: Looking ahead at something in the distance and trying to find the best route toward that destination and I may want to go one way, somebody may want to go another way, but yet at the same time we all need to focus in on that one spot and we will finally arrive hopefully one day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: The leader of the building has to have a vision where they have to go and how to get there...it is coming from within and they are developing it and we are doing it first with the visual and then with the written parts, but I think it has to be shared by all of the stakeholders. It is the leader's responsibility to keep the vision in effect and motivate it.</td>
<td>I: ...like a triangle. Parent, community, teachers, administrator developing the focus of the way the school should go. That is basically what I think the vision is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: You first must have a vision, and vision is a philosophy. We have philosophies about life. We have a philosophy about how to run a school and that is the vision. From the vision comes your mission. The vision is the umbrella and the mission is where you hang all of those spokes on that umbrella to keep it open.</td>
<td>F: ...typically the idea of the goal is getting from point A to point B, and that is having the kids achieve as much as they can, so that is kind of what I spell out to the staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definitions of a shared school vision from all respondents indicated the common strands of collaboration including working together, setting goals, and identifying a common purpose. Four of the six visionary respondents focused directly on the fact that the principal needs to have a vision for the school first prior to creating a shared vision; none of the managerial principals did. The remaining two visionary principals and all six of the managerial principals gave definitions that included participation by the stakeholders in the process without stressing the principal’s personal vision as a starting point.
The guiding definition of a shared school vision for Clark County School District (CCSD) elementary school principals is set forth in *Systems For Quality Schools* (1995):

A clear vision of destination is essential to the process of school improvement. Just as an ocean liner sets sail knowing its destination, a school community must begin the journey of school improvement with a clear picture of the end in mind. Unless the school community has a shared vision of what it wants the school to be, it is certain the quality anticipated will never be achieved.

The responses of the principals demonstrated a partial and varied application of the research based guidelines presented in the *Systems For Quality Schools*. Those guidelines point to the importance of building a shared school vision as a part of the process of improving the quality of a school. Further, they specifically direct elementary school principals to create a shared school vision. In addition, principals are reminded that all segments of the school community must be reflected in that vision. Finally, it is specifically the principal's responsibility to devise strategies to include the entire school community in the development of "... a meaningful school vision" (Clark County School District, 1995, sec. IV, p. 23).

**The Role of Shared School Vision in the Success of an Elementary School**

One interview question asked, "What role does a shared school vision play in the overall success of an elementary school program?" Table 9 indicates the responses of the principals.
Table 9

The Role of Shared School Vision in the Success of an Elementary School from the Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visionary</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>J:</strong> I think it is paramount. Under my telephone I have a little folder tab that says focus and it is just stuck under my phone because we have to focus. If you don’t focus, you are like a rat in a maze. You don’t get anything done. ...it is just crucial, I can’t imagine functioning without a shared school vision...so I just, you know, feel the vision is just, you can’t exist without it. Otherwise we just run in place and I am not real good at that.</td>
<td><strong>D:</strong> I think it is important because you have the buy-in from a lot of people...anybody can come out if they want to participate in something or get an idea of what is going on, and a lot of teachers do that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H:</strong> I think it is the most vital element in any setting whether it be work, in a business community, or in an elementary school. If you don’t know where you are going, you can’t get to your destination.</td>
<td><strong>F:</strong> I think it is everything. I think the school needs that common vision, the working vision that everyone buys into, everyone is tied into, everyone has a piece of it. I do not think you can move forward unless you have something that solidifies the teacher, the student, the parent, the administrator, together. I think it is the focus. You need the vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G:</strong> ...it’s student achievement, staff collaboration, staff teamwork. You can feel it, you can feel the vision in a successful school.</td>
<td><strong>E:</strong> Well, we have overcome that because now we have overcome all of those original problems, and now our challenge—I find the biggest challenge is getting people to assume responsibility and accountability for a shared governance. It is a little like stirring cement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K:</strong> Success of the school? Boy, I never thought about it that way. I think we need to have a common goal to be successful, and I guess that I really do think that everyone is here for the kids to learn.</td>
<td><strong>F:</strong> I think it is kind of funny. [There are] too many leaders here. I love it when somebody says that. That’s what we want. I want people who are out there kind of chewing at the edges of things and bringing back some ideas. I even praise the data, and discuss it. I want to do that. Is it going to be good for us? Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>Managerial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: I think it has a real powerful effect. When I came to [this school] five years ago, I did not see that the staff was real split, it was very splintered. There were different philosophies, but I did not see people with any sort of a common thread going in some sort of a direction. ...[change]...It is healthy for you, it is healthy for me, and it is healthy for these kids, and what is best for my kids will always come first. So it is by that ongoing change process this school is alive and well. It is not stagnant.</td>
<td>B: I have been knocking wood- I have been rather successful at bringing people who share my vision and I have hired people who have been very successful. As far as the success of the vision for the school I think all of us have that including the community, the custodial staff. This is a pretty place; this is a nice place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: The biggest role a shared vision plays is that it creates an atmosphere of learning. It creates an atmosphere of shared commitment by the staff, students, and community. When we are all pulling in different directions, we tend to contradict. So to get the maximum out of education, I think a shared vision is one of the most productive things.</td>
<td>L: ...to the overall success of the school? I think that it is very important. I really do. I think that if you have buy-in to what it is that we feel is what we are trying to reach, then it is going to happen, and if you don’t—it is not.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The general consensus of the principals was that, to varying degrees, shared school vision has an important role in the success of an elementary school. Words indicating descriptive power, intense feeling, and major importance were used by five of the visionary style respondents: “paramount, crucial, can’t exist without it” (J); “most vital element” (H); “most productive” (A); “powerful effect” (C); and “...student achievement, staff collaboration, staff teamwork ...You can feel it, you can feel the vision in a successful school”(G); and by two of the managerial style respondents: “very important” (L) and “... it is everything” (J). Managerial principal D indicated that a shared vision was “important” to the overall success of a school. The remaining respondents in both categories talked more specifically about their own experiences,
referring to the problems of getting stakeholders to "assume responsibility" (E); "... too many leaders. . . . I love it when somebody says that" (F); "... we have to have a common goal to be successful" (K); and "... I have been successful at bringing in people who share my vision"(B).

**Challenges Relating to Teachers in the Shared Vision Process**

Principals were asked to identify the teacher-related challenges involved in creating, implementing, and sustaining shared school visions. Their responses are reported in Table 10.

Table 10

**Teacher-Related Challenges to Shared School Vision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visionary</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>J:</strong> I have a hard time with schools being hotels for teachers where teachers come in, get their keys, go to their room, close the door, and leave at 3:26 or whatever....you need to have teachers that have the same feeling, and I spent a lot of time hiring, you know, the best....but I have worked really hard because I know that is the secret to a well-run school. It is important for us not to get too content and complacent with what we have.</td>
<td><strong>D:</strong> Getting everyone involved, yes....there are some people out there that really do not want to participate in this kind of thing. They would rather have others do it. Keeping the children in focus, and what the needs of the children are and how to identify those needs. A lot of people have different opinions of what those needs are...to make sure the people understand the importance of continuing. Just because they have done it once and we have been successful does not mean that is over. Again, like I mentioned before, getting more people involved, getting everybody into it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visionary</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H:</strong> ...they really wanted to just clock in their job and did not really want to be a part of that vision or really want to be here for the right purposes and the right reasons. I realized that they were not prepared to make decisions that were for improving student achievement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F:</strong> Before I came here, there were 11 principals in 9 years at this school, so the staff was used to top-down administration where they were just told what to do by the administrator. So when the idea of a shared vision came to them, they did not know what it was. They thought it was just another trick, just another way of getting them to do what the administrator wanted them to. One of the first challenges was just getting them to join committees; they wanted no part of committee assignments. They wanted to be told what to do. They did not want to put forth any effort in moving this school forward. They thought that was the administrator’s job to do all—both academically and socially. There is a core who—no matter what, no matter if it is the majority, no matter of where the community is at—you can not do anything right. I think it is an obstacle, a challenge in moving this core in the direction that the school wants to go.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G:</strong> Yes, my biggest trouble and I want to say the biggest piece of this puzzle of trying to implement anything is that people will normally say, “Well, it’s not my responsibility to make those decisions.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F:</strong> I see 16 things that we need to be looking at and doing, but I have to back up and just let the process work. Could you do it faster by yourself instead of running it through committees? Oh, absolutely. Would it be as effective? No, not at all, because you would not have the body.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E:</strong> ...the biggest challenge is getting people to assume responsibility and accountability for shared governance. They don’t want to take responsibility for doing things. They will be on the learning improvement team and then they will say, “We don’t want to do this because it makes us look like we are running the school.” They want it, they want to have a say and that is all they want.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K:</strong> It is enticing the people to become a part of it. I guess getting them to buy into it. Sometimes I see that they want to be told what to do. Boy, part of it is that we have been very conservative and traditional...sometimes those of us in the field a long time are reluctant to change and we have done this for the last hundred years so this is the way we need to do it so I am going to have some challenges in doing things a little differently.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both groups underscored the feeling that some teachers are not motivated, interested, prepared, or concerned about being involved in the shared school vision process. Statements from the visionary principals like "Some teachers like to be told what to do; they do not like the responsibility of decisions" (A) and from the managerial group like "Sometimes I see that they want to be told what to do" (K)
represented a challenge identified specifically by 8 of the 12 respondents, equally divided between the two groups.

Teachers inherited by new principals presented another challenge. This group of teachers expressed their discomfort or were directly opposed to attempts by the new principal to create the required shared vision. The six principals newest to their assignments, three in the visionary category and three in the managerial category, indicated challenges directly attributed to the reluctance of teachers to follow their lead in the shared vision process. The descriptions by principals of those challenges are exemplified by statements like “You have holdovers from the previous staff who are openly defiant in support of your ideas” (B), “There is a core, who no matter what, no matter of the majority, no matter of where the community is at, you can not do anything right.” (I), and “. . . did not really want to be a part of that vision or really want to be here for the right purposes and right reasons” (H).

Challenges Relating to Support Staff in the Shared Vision Process

The principals were asked to identify challenges to the creation, implementation, and sustenance of shared school vision related to support staff. Their responses are reported in Table 11.
Table 11

Support Staff-Related Challenges to Shared School Vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visionary</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J: ...they are so very busy, all the support staff, I just don't know how they do it. I would not want their job</td>
<td>L: ...the support staff have a tendency to only be involved in the social-related types of activities at the school....they don't feel that they are qualified or capable, or--I am not sure what the right word is—of being involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: I am talking about equality, not egality. Egality assumes that everybody is the same and they are not. Equality assumes that everybody has the right to receive and they should</td>
<td>F: The difference there has to do with degree of their knowledge background, their basic background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: They are not used to being involved, so I say they are shy about being invited in.</td>
<td>K: I believe they are an integral part of our school and it is not so much like 30 years ago of running off papers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: I think that one of the real dangers inherent with support staff is the fact that we talk in jargon and the support staff don't live in that world of jargon....in so many ways support staff can get left out of that big circle unless you are very careful to keep them included.</td>
<td>B: Some lack the experience and the ability to be involved, and if they are in aide positions, the one who is directly supervising them may not be pushing them forward in that way....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: The biggest problem I have with support staff is getting a time set up for a physical organization to get them involved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only nine principals—five visionary and four managerial—identified challenges in the involvement of support staff in the creation, implementation, and sustenance of a shared school vision. Three managerial principals mentioned the lack of preparation and history of involvement of support staff in school decision making as challenges. Specifically, they said support staff “...lack the experience and the ability” (K), “...lack knowledge background” (F), and “...they don’t feel that they are qualified or
capable" \((L)\). One visionary principal identified the same challenge: "They are not used to being involved, so I say they are shy about being invited in" \((E)\). Yet another visionary principal discussed the levels of preparation for involvement in terms of "egalitity" and "equality," \((G)\) stressing the non-equal roles in school that limit the involvement of support staff in the shared school vision process.

A review of the responses of all 12 principals suggested a general consensus on the importance of the involvement of support staff. Several pointed to support staff as leaders and key players in the process. Table 12 contains a cross-section of comments by principals on the importance and successful roles that support staff members are observed to play in the programs described by the principals interviewed in this study.

Table 12

<p>| Comments by Principals on the Importance of Support Staff in the Shared Vision Process |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visionary</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>J:</strong> I try to bring them in on everything, too. At the beginning of the year, they are part of our faculty meetings. We go through the team concept....I am very pleased with our support staff.</td>
<td><strong>D:</strong> Sometimes support staff, I think, takes a back seat to licensed personnel and it should not be that way...Most of them are in direct contact with children and their opinions are relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H:</strong> My greatest challenge has not been with my support staff because I have them in on the planning process, and I change or flex their hours...so that they will know where we are going and what we are working on and everything.</td>
<td><strong>I:</strong> A must, none, support staff easily jumped right into the idea....I had about 16 or 17 support staff people that help run this school so they have an active voice. They were easily ready to work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both the visionary and the managerial group of principals placed importance on the involvement of support staff in the shared school vision process. They also identified specific steps to make them more comfortable with that role. For instance, they included support staff in all meetings, involved them in planning committees, trained and educated them in the creation and implementation of a shared school vision, took care to explain school jargon, and placed a clear and strong emphasis on the importance of their involvement.
Challenges Relating to Parents in the Shared Vision Process

The principals were asked to identify challenges to the creation, implementation, and sustenance of shared school vision related to parents. Their responses are reported in Table 13.

Table 13

Parent-Related Challenges to the Shared School Vision Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visionary</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G: That's another big puzzle. By-and-large, I got support, but when you start concentrating on the handful that make life miserable, the suits and such....</td>
<td>D: The parents are working during school time. I think there is an ingrained, especially in our area here, an ingrained fear of school. School may not have been a very successful place for some of these parents, and they just don't want to participate. Not that they don't want to, they are not sure how perhaps would be a better response to that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: I felt like because our parents are real quiet and not the influential ones, I can not get the support I need out there....they are working all of the time. How do I get them actively involved in their children's organization?...how are we going to bring them back in?</td>
<td>I: Another one is the resistant parent and no matter what I do, that is the hardest one for this administrator, the resistant parent who is not willing to try new things, you know, thinks everything should be the old way, the old traditional school, you know, “You're the principal, why don't you make the decisions?” That was told to me several times last year by several parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: ...you tend to look for the parents who aren’t working....but it is hard because you tend to always get the same people, it is the same point of view, it is always the same, because of the time constraints that are out there.</td>
<td>K: Sometimes we get interest groups out here, and I think that is what I think of as far as hurdles...Parents may be the obstacle due to their educational baggage or biases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: We have a community that gets involved very little at school. Many of our parents, if they work, are blue collar workers who are just barely surviving....It is just a real big problem, particularly in an at-risk school.</td>
<td>B: There were some difficulties with some old members of the PTA because some of the staff who had been here for a long time were not willing to make changes....they were able to funnel stories to parents that were not accurate and they were influential. This interfered with the school community, not the whole community, but with the little group that were negative, all five or six of them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ten of the principals—five from each group—reported challenges relating to parents. They identified time (A), parent fear based on past negative experiences with schools (D), resistant parents (A, K, I, B, G), and working parents (H, C, E, D) as specific challenges. Two principals, J from the visionary category and F from the managerial category, identified no challenges involving parents. In fact, they considered parent involvement to be a strong component in their total school program as well as in the shared school vision process.

**Challenges Relating to Students in the Shared Vision Process**

The principals were asked to identify challenges to the creation, implementation, and sustenance of shared school vision related to students. Their responses are reported in Table 14.
Table 14

Student-Related Challenges to the Shared School Vision Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visionary</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong>: It is just something we built in. It is built into our mission statement... We know that children have to be involved, so we find ways to do that.</td>
<td><strong>D</strong>: No they were not.... I have done it with older children, but not with elementary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong>: We have a lot of children who are having difficulties in their own personal life.... I don't think they always have a clear vision, especially the younger ones. The main issues were not issues as far as academic issues for the students. They were respect issues—the school should show us respect—they should not yell, that the teachers talk to them and listen to them.... the biggest challenge is being able to accept their answers without getting defensive.</td>
<td><strong>I</strong>: ... it is not that it is a problem, but as a first year administrator, I thought that I had better just take chunks at a time, so I thought I would not tackle the whole thing first, but I am not close-minded about involving students on the team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong>: ... same with students. Trying to get them to believe in themselves has always been the biggest obstacle....</td>
<td><strong>F</strong>: ... the things from the kids themselves. In the course of the day, somebody feels like they have been wronged by something, you need to respond or be available to do that. Plus, just interacting with kids, just kind of sitting down and getting to know them, visiting with them, as far as [to ask them] “How’s life going?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong>: I have really found that it varies from school to school and your population, some school populations tend to be a little less mature.... unless you have some exceptionally mature children, it is hard for them to grasp what it is that you are wanting their input on.... I find it very difficult at this age level to make them contribute as members in some way.</td>
<td><strong>K</strong>: They can say something profound and later not remember that they said it. I think part of it is experience and the direction that they want themselves to go in. I think the big challenge is just their maturity level, and I guess I try to talk to all of the kids on the playground and that is how I find out what is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong>: When our enrollment jumped from 900 to 1,200, we went to year-round, and just the tracking in and out has made it more difficult to establish any level of consistency among the students for communication and involvement as to where we are going. A lot of it has to do with the student leadership as well.</td>
<td><strong>B</strong>: It is primarily the level of maturity, I think. That is primarily what it is, but it takes a long time and in Las Vegas with the growing population, you get such a tremendous turnover....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong>: ... no, not at the level we have, we have involved students in a few committees as indicated by the district... admittedly the minimum level.</td>
<td><strong>L</strong>: I don’t even know that I can tell you for sure what the challenges are because we haven’t tried it here. It didn’t happen at the last school....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All but one of the principals provided minimal or no formal opportunity at all for student involvement in the shared school vision process. Five principals (K, B, E, F, D) indicated that the maturity level of elementary students is a challenge to their involvement. One principal cited minimal participation (A), a second felt the timing was wrong (I), a third indicated the issue of tracking in the move to a year-round schedule (C), a fourth admitted not having tried it (L), and a fifth thought that just “believing in themselves” was a major obstacle for elementary students (G). One managerial principal informally involved students by talking with them on the playground and took other opportunities to interact with them during the school day (F). A visionary principal (J) formalized student involvement in the shared school visioning process through administering surveys, compiling the survey data, and including the accumulated data into the school improvement process.

**Challenges Relating to Community Partners in the Shared Vision Process**

The principals were asked to identify challenges to the creation, implementation, and sustenance of shared school vision related to community partners. Their responses are reported in Table 15.
Table 15

Community Partners-Related Challenges to the Shared School Vision Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visionary</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{J:} Our Rotary Club has been very gracious to us, so we have been able to get some grants for different things.</td>
<td>\textit{D:} Yes we have had a number of community partners and those are the ones that I can think of off the top of my head, but I know that I sent out about 30 letters after school pride day thanking all of the participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{H:} I spoke everywhere. I begged them for assistance and help. Out of all of them, we got no response, nothing, but I know what they did for other schools.</td>
<td>\textit{I:} Are you talking businesses? No, none.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{G:} I was able to establish here a partnership with Champion Homes and that was a benefit to both.</td>
<td>\textit{F:} Yes we have a real nice working relationship with several different groups in the community....The PTA are the ones out there cultivating all of that stuff and we kind of put them on it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{E:} Yes, what we had, actually, was the store manager from Von's down the street approached us and came to us with a written vision of community action between his employees and the use of his facilities and our school and invited us there....looking for ways that he could take what we do in here and bring it to the community....he has been reassigned so we are working with a new store manager, and any time you do that there is a change in focus. They had a very strong vision about what they wanted to do for and with this school and it aligned with what we wanted...but it was hard to get him here physically...you never could get him out to lunch because he always would cancel.</td>
<td>\textit{K:} I don't see them in a day-to-day involvement because I know they all have busy schedules as well, and I would look at it as support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{C:} No, none.</td>
<td>\textit{B:} We requested for [a casino] to adopt us, but they were very indifferent, and they would only do things to assist themselves....they did donate $10,000 towards a traffic light, but as far as asking them for other things we have not been supported. We have had some help, if not financial, from other groups. We have had community participation. Most people have been good when asked.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three visionary (H, A, C) and three managerial (K, I, L) principals have not yet included community partners in the shared vision process in their schools. Three visionary principals (E, G, J) and three managerial principals (D, F, B) described participation by community partners in the form of financial and resource donations. Two principals (H, L) were working on plans to involve community partners in a financial support role.

Challenges Relating to Allocation of Funds in the Shared Vision Process

The principals were asked to identify challenges to the creation, implementation, and sustenance of shared school vision related to allocation of funds. Their responses are reported in Table 16.
### Table 16

**Allocation of Funds-Related Challenges to the Shared School Vision Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visionary</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>J</em>: I think in this neighborhood we are very fortunate and we are very blessed... so I know that we have funds...but I also know that there are grants available. The funds are there, I think, if anybody wants to be real creative and persistent about it, the money is there.</td>
<td><em>D</em>: A lot of that funding comes from Title I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>H</em>: There are no funds. I am writing several grants right now, so I am learning.</td>
<td><em>I</em>: Yes, from our PTA. We are the proud recipients of a major award, so we got some big bucks on that, so the PTA actively helps and supports our vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>G</em>: ...the district that first year came up with $13,000 for the project, which I lay thanks to Kay Carl. Basically after that, when it comes to finances, it was out. You know they are pretty well strung out. I do not really count on them.</td>
<td><em>F</em>: ...everything that we do here we go looking for dollars and cents. Whether it is our own school budget, whether it is student- and school-generated funds, or PTA funds; my thing with those monies is anybody who wants to spend it, they have to tell me what it is going to do for kids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>E</em>: ...we were one of the Nevada 2000 schools this year, and we used all of our money for substitute days and for our LIT Team to write our plan....I did not find any in my budget....I usually ask the school general funds committee....Some of the in-services that the district had outside consultants come in, they have paid for subs for people to go to that. That is usually where I have been able to find money.</td>
<td><em>K</em>: ...no, and I have to say I don’t think I’m there yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>C</em>: We have done a couple of things this year....a $15,000 grant in the area of science.....I had requested additional monies to be put into staff development which allow me to do a lot of internal in-house training....the system’s divine staff development office did a lot of support, too.</td>
<td><em>B</em>: No, we spend none.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A</em>: They come from school-generated funds, PTA funds. Of course, budgeted funds are used to drive the vision....to finance the process and creation of the vision, we had adequate funds.</td>
<td><em>L</em>: Well, we were a Nevada 2000 school this year and we received 10 substitute days....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One visionary principal \((H)\) and two managerial principals \((B, K)\), indicated that no funds are available to facilitate the shared vision process. The remaining nine principals reported adequate funding.

The primary sources of funding identified by principals focused on CCSD individual school funds \((A, G)\), grant based funding \((C, L, E)\), Title I \((D)\), and PTA assistance. \((A, F, I)\)

### Challenges Relating to Training and Staff Development in the Shared Vision Process

The principals were asked to identify challenges to the creation, implementation, and sustenance of shared school vision related to training and staff development. Their responses are reported in Table 17.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visionary</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(J:) ...let my master teachers go out and observe other schools....Finding some royal time like that, buying some sub time. But as far as having people come in, I have not done much of it. I feel that it is important to grow from within so that when somebody comes in and anoints the water, so to speak, they leave and then we do not have anybody here. I want depth in the building where our teacher leadership comes in.</td>
<td>(D:) A lot of the Title I funding is for planning....we have had training on all of the programs and the new equipment. We have been allowed to do that by having it before school even started last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>Managerial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H:</strong> ...for my school governance council, I am doing four training sessions this year. They have not had training needs before and so what I realized is they really were not prepared to make decisions....</td>
<td><strong>J:</strong> I had this wonderful mentor that put this book in front of me called <em>Renewing America’s Schools</em> by Glickman, and I read it cover to cover and I saw what this individual was doing at his school and I knew that when I got to my school that is what I wanted to do. [Our school] now belongs to the <em>Nevada League of Professional Schools</em>. We have just created our vision, a mission, and a charter. We are on a roll, we are on the train.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G:</strong> You know I did not have any formal courses, seminars, or training. This is stuff that I picked up here and there reading.</td>
<td><strong>F:</strong> I am not a big person on models or labels. I think a lot of what we do is pretty much common sense, and if you always have it in the back of your head, is it good for kids, you are not going to make a whole lot of mistakes...train them? We learn by doing....we have not identified a particular model that we say—that is us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E:</strong> ...we were given copies of various models [Lezzotte]. It was an excellent day; we had a parent go with us....actually, we copied several of the plans and a lot of the information that we got at that in-service and my LIT team here used that....you know because my background is special education, and by virtue of that you have a lot of parent involvement.</td>
<td><strong>K:</strong> No, I have not [had training] other than workshops and things I have gone to....I see it all done by brainstorming and putting things on paper....Let’s come with a common goal and I think that is the only way to do that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C:</strong> I don’t think that training like that comes from an institution of higher learning, I think it comes from the heart. Everything that I am and I do is based on passion and belief. Yes, I have had some incredible training...however, for me, making the judgements, making the decisions I make, they are based pretty much 90% emotion and 10% logic. I let the emotion run it and I let the emotions handle it; I am very successful.</td>
<td><strong>B:</strong> They want to promote themselves, these people in workshops. Sometimes I get something I can use, but not usually. It is mostly by talking to other people like yourself. Just doing it and getting on with it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A: In about 1993 or so, I was involved in a pilot school with Effective Schools, with Larry Lezotte's program. We had a representative from the State Department come down and work with our staff, and we were mentored by another school. Other than that and a few workshops and listening to a few speeches on it—that is the only formal training that I have had in it.

L: ...we talk about site-based governance and working towards the vision, so I feel that we do have to have training, and we do have to look at models, and we do have to look at what other people are doing...and you know, whether you buy into an Accelerated Schools model, or whatever it is, you know that you have to come up with a plan. We looked, we researched, we read articles, we looked at journals, we reviewed what was in the Systems for Quality Schools, and then the recommendation was a plan that we thought would work within our system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visionary</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A:</td>
<td>L: ...we talk about site-based governance and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>working towards the vision, so I feel that we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do have to have training, and we do have to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>look at models, and we do have to look at what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other people are doing...and you know, whether</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>you buy into an Accelerated Schools model, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>whatever it is, you know that you have to come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>up with a plan. We looked, we researched, we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>read articles, we looked at journals, we reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>what was in the Systems for Quality Schools, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>then the recommendation was a plan that we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thought would work within our system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Half the principals, three of the visionary (I, D, L) and three of the managerial (H, E, A) readily found training opportunities and models. The remaining six principals, three from each category, focused on personal reading (G), talking to others (B), growing from within the staff (J), brainstorming (K), passion and emotion (C), and learning by doing and common sense (F).

**Challenges Relating to Adequate Time to Devote to the Shared Vision Process**

The principals were asked to identify challenges to the creation, implementation, and sustenance of shared school vision related to the amount of time available to devote to the task. Their responses are reported in Table 18.
Table 18

Time-Related Challenges to the Shared School Vision Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visionary</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>J:</strong> You have to get up early in the morning. I get to school between 6 and 6:30. It is a quiet time....you have to be very focused. You have to realize it takes time, and it took me a while to understand that. I don’t make too many mistakes and have to backtrack because I have a hard time—we don’t have time for that...I spend very little time on discipline so I can spend a lot of time bringing all of that together....I collect a lot in terms of material and pass it on to teachers. I have time to do that...finding some royal time like that...I think that we are limited by our own creativity sometimes and we know that we all have the same number of minutes in the day, but how do we maximize that?...finding the time to keep meeting...other obstacles being the time to dialogue with teachers...finding the time to talk....</td>
<td><strong>D:</strong> I think the focus is on time spent at school so it has to be working with the children....It is very easy to say let’s do this. It is more difficult to actually do it and that is where the time is spent....It is not a totally meshed thing, but I don’t have a problem with time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H:</strong> Time is my greatest challenge. I look at it almost as an enemy right now....I play defense for the school. I am supposed to be the instructional leader, but I don’t have time to be....it goes back to time, getting everybody to a common meeting and having the time to do it. That is my greatest challenge.</td>
<td><strong>I:</strong> You bet! It is part of my day. It is part of being a principal. I make it [time].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G:</strong> Whether I am going through classrooms or I am talking with the kids on the playground, in the lunchroom, in meetings, out of meetings, it is all where the school is going....</td>
<td><strong>F:</strong> But it is all of the other things that kind of come and stick and smack and try to knock your vision out of the way or impact on your time...I see time being a hurdle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E:</strong> But it is hard because you tend to always get the same viewpoint; it is always the same, and that is because of the time constraints that are there...the time frame limited us when we were on double sessions. All we could do was get in, teach, and get out....Well, just the time factor...unfortunately, most of the time you need to meet during school time.</td>
<td><strong>K:</strong> Time, I think, is the biggest one. It is making sure that we are all able to meet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Five visionary (A, C, E, H, J) and three managerial (K, L, F) principals identified the management and allocation of time as a challenge to the process of creating, implementing, and sustaining a shared school vision. Two managerial principals (B, D) gave responses that indicated the daily routine and schedules of taking care of kids and school left little time for the shared vision process. One managerial (I) and one visionary principal (G) indicated that it was necessary that they make time for the shared vision process and that it was just an ongoing part of their job.
Estimation by Principals of the Amount of Time Devoted to the Shared Vision Process

All interviewed principals were asked to estimate the amount of time that they spent in their administrative day for the creation, implementation, and sustenance of a shared school vision. Table 19 supplies those responses.

Table 19

Amount of Administrative Time Devoted to the Shared School Vision Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visionary</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J: 100%</td>
<td>D: ...not all that much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: 20%</td>
<td>I: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: 100%</td>
<td>F: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: 10%</td>
<td>K: 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: 50%</td>
<td>B: ...no time when kids are here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: 10%</td>
<td>L: 10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The range of time spent by visionary principals on the shared vision process was from little (10%) to all (100%) of their time. Two managerial principals (B, D) did not quantify the time, but they implied a small amount. Two managerial principals devote a small amount of time (10%) (K, L), one allocates half (F), and the last (I) reported a 100% time commitment.

The responses to time investment were interesting and no probing questions were used to clarify the principals' responses. Their answers came as quick responses, as we were nearing the culmination of 40 to 70 minutes of interview centering on the
process of creating, implementing, and sustaining shared school visions. All respondents seemed comfortable in estimating their time investments in that process and did so without offering qualifying questions prior to their responses.

Summary

In this chapter, the results of the survey and the interview were reported and tabulated. Of 132 Clark County School District (CCSD) elementary school principals, 91 responded to the survey. Their adjusted visionary scores (visionary - managerial) ranged from 53 to 95 with a mean of 76.6. The six highest and the six lowest scorers were contacted for interview. The six highest scorers were referred to as the visionary principals, while the six lowest were referred to as managerial principals.

Twelve interviews were conducted and reported. In addition, demographics regarding length of years in education, number of employees supervised, and school configuration were gathered and tabulated. While the length of time in education was similar between the two groups at about 23 years, the managerial group had much less experience in administration—7.33 years as opposed to 16.00 years for the visionary principals. The visionary principals had been in their schools for a longer period—5.50 years against 3.25 years for the managerial group. The visionary principals reportedly supervised more teachers, but the managerial principals have greater responsibility for administrator, support staff, and other staff supervision. All schools are either PreK-
or K-5 grades. The size of the schools of the visionary principals averaged 916 students; for the managerial, 600.

In the interviews, the 12 principals defined shared school vision in a way somewhat different from the clear definition provided by the district (CCSD, 1995, sec. IV, p. 23). In identifying the role of the shared school vision in the success of an elementary school, the principals agreed that it does, indeed, play a role, but they differed in terms of the degree of importance.

The crucial issue in this study was to identify challenges to creating, implementing, and sustaining shared school vision. Two-thirds of principals saw teachers as a challenge, especially those teachers who were holdovers from a previous administration. Three-fourths of the principals had difficulty in engaging support staff in the shared vision. While the principals felt that involving support staff is important, they also suggested that these employees may not be qualified or interested, nor do they have the time to participate. Available time was also a challenge for parents, although two principals did not see parents as a challenge in the shared vision process at all. Only one principal provided participation for students. The others cited issues such as lack of maturity of elementary school children and scheduling problems. Community partners were seen mostly in their roles as financial and other resource contributors.

Money did not appear to constrain the process of shared vision creation, implementation, and sustenance. Nine principals reported adequate funding; three
indicated no funds available. Half the principals reported adequate training opportunities and models. Responses indicated a lack of clarity about who should be trained--themselves, other administrators, teachers, staff, students, parents, community partners, and so on. The issue of time was challenging for seven of the principals. In reporting the amount of time spent on the visioning process, three principals reported spending all of their time, two about half their time, and seven did not allocate much time. Conclusions and recommendations for further study are discussed in the final chapter.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Introduction

Creating, implementing, and sustaining a shared vision is a complicated task for any leader. The Elementary Education Division of Clark County School District, centered in Las Vegas, Nevada, expects elementary school principals not only to develop a shared vision for their schools, but also to implement and sustain this shared vision with the aid of their constituencies—other administrators, staff, students, parents, and the community-at-large. Leaders, in this case principals, generally are responsible for developing a shared vision.

The concept of visionary leadership has been defined in the literature, and principals can be tested to determine the degree to which they align themselves with the attributes of visionary leadership (LeSourd & Grady, 1991). Creating a shared vision, also requires political savvy, consensus building, shared decision-making procedures, strong communication skills, effective use of time, administrative renewal, and insightful understanding of group processes (Chance & Grady, 1994).
This study identified some challenges that elementary school principals in Clark County School District (CCSD) face when addressing the required task of creating, implementing, and sustaining a shared school vision. The following research questions guided the study:

1. What challenges do elementary school principals encounter in creating shared school vision, and is there a difference among principals based on their attitude towards visionary leadership?

2. What challenges do elementary school principals encounter in implementing shared school vision, and is there a difference among principals based on their attitude towards visionary leadership?

3. What challenges do elementary school principals encounter in sustaining shared school vision, and is there a difference among principals based on their attitude towards visionary leadership?

All 132 district elementary school principals, with the exception of investigator, were surveyed using the Visionary Leadership Attitude Survey (Grady & LeSourd, 1990) to determine their attitudes toward visionary leadership. The 91 usable responses were scored according to the rubric provided by the authors. Based on the scores, the six highest- and the six lowest-scoring principals were selected for interview. The six highest scorers were deemed leaders aligned with visionary leadership attributes, while the lowest scorers were considered leaders aligned with managerial leadership attributes to facilitate the discussion. The goal of the interview, which followed a script, was to identify challenges to the creation, implementation, and sustenance of shared school visions.
Discussion

Maintaining Research Perspective

The research technique used in this study combined both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. The survey produced quantifiable, scored data used to select the \( n \) of cases for in-depth interview. The qualitative data collected in the 12 interviews and the research analysis procedures produced a large quantity of diverse data focusing on words and ideas. Lincoln and Guba (1985) noted that "...the art of naturalistic data processing is far from well developed" (p. 354). Whether data are gathered in a quantitative or in a qualitative manner is not the issue. Rather, the concern is the determination of the best means to make sense of the problem and analyze the data in ways that will facilitate the unfolding of the inquiry. Ultimately, the goal of the research is to lead to the greatest understanding (in the sense of \textit{verstehen}) of the phenomenon being studied (p. 224).

\textit{The Ethnograph} (Seidel et al., 1988) was used in this study to provide computer-assisted analysis of the text-based data. During the course of coding, reading, and analyzing text segments, it became clear that words and ideas were indeed being categorized and unitized as a result of the process itself (Rudestam & Newton, 1992). The data lacked the perspective of context, however. Therefore, prior to the discussion of the findings, the pre-analysis interview audiotapes and their related transcripts were revisited. This activity enriched the available volume of data.
Definition of Shared School Vision

The definition of shared school vision was reviewed in the *Systems for Quality Schools* (Clark County School District, 1995), the research-based document used by the school district for informing elementary school principals of the nature of their responsibility in creating, implementing, and sustaining a shared school vision at their schools. In addition, the responses of the interviewed principals regarding their definitions of shared school vision were re-examined.

According to *Systems for Quality Schools* (CCSD, 1995),

>A school vision is a dream conceptualized, an idea whose time has come, the present in focus with the future. The vision of the school represents a unity of purpose, an expression by the school community of what they consider to be ideal. The ideas of everyone involved with the school such as the school administration, school staff, parents, students, district personnel, and business community members are reflected within a shared vision. (Sec. I, p. 23)

The 12 principals who were interviewed supported this definition in various degrees. For example, three of the visionary principals gave definitions that emphasized the importance of the principal as a leader and stressed the importance of the leader’s having a guiding vision. The remaining nine principals included in their definitions the concept of goals mutually developed by all the school’s stakeholders in the community. They described the goal setting process in a variety of formats and community interactions, and all nine offered definitions that described shared vision processes that evolved from the sharing of ideas.
Barker (1993), in his videotape *The Power of Vision*, described the visioning process as one that starts with the vision of a leader and then grows as organizational members become involved and share the leader’s vision by finding a productive role for themselves in the implementation of that vision. Visionary principals (*J, H, G*) described applications of the shared vision process as defined by Barker.

Smith (1994) described five roles that bosses (leaders) assume in the process of building a shared vision. Those five roles include telling (leader initiated and driven), selling (leader initiated but needing buy-in), testing (leader shares vision and modifies it from input), consulting (leader seeks input to change a vision), and co-creating (leader works as a collaborative partner to build a shared vision (p.314). In the case of the interviewed elementary school principals, their definitions of shared school vision set the stage for the identification of challenges and the various degrees of their involvement in the shared school vision process in their respective schools. It also enabled identification of their roles as Smith may have described them.

Other than the emphasis on the importance of a personal vision by three visionary principals, no major differences in the working definitions of shared school vision were found between the two groups. This finding is in concert with Starratt (1995) who maintained that pressure for the creation of vision has caused principals to wear two hats—leader and administrator. As leaders, principals nurture the vision that expresses the school’s core values; as administrators, they develop the structures and
policies that institutionalize the vision. Therefore, one would expect evidence of combined visionary and managerial leadership alignment.

The Role of Shared School Vision in the Overall Success of an Elementary School

Clark County School District’s *Systems for Quality Schools* (1995) pointed to the importance of building a shared school vision in the process of improving an elementary school. In the introduction, principals are reminded that one of the primary challenges of their job is managing change and that “Building a compelling vision and corresponding images of achievement in the form of goals is the most important and far reaching part of the improvement planning process” (Section 1 p. 3).

Similarly, Tewell (1996) stressed the importance of making vision and beliefs a part of everything that a school and its district does to give itself a chance for success. He stated, "A school system's fundamental beliefs and vision about teaching and learning must be incorporated into the district's goals, strategies, policies, processes, cultural practices, management behavior, and accountability systems" (p. 16). Chance (1995) also asserted that strong evidence that suggests the importance of shared vision in the success of today's schools. In addition, he addressed the need for research and training to teach principals how to create, implement, and sustain shared visions.

All principals participating in the interview process acknowledged the importance of a shared school vision in the overall success of a school. In fact, 11 out
of 12 provided words that indicated they place a high value on school vision. Words indicating descriptive power, intense feeling, and major importance were used by five of the visionary style respondents: "paramount, crucial, can’t exist without it" (J); "most vital element" (H); "most productive" (A); "powerful effect" (C); and "...student achievement, staff collaboration, staff teamwork...You can feel it, you can feel the vision in a successful school" (G); and by two of the managerial style respondents: "very important" (L) and "...it is everything" (I). One principal equated the shared vision to a common goal, noting its necessity for success. The principals, regardless of visionary or managerial influence group, appeared to agree with the literature on the importance of a shared school vision for the overall success of a school.

Teacher-Related Challenges to the Creation, Implementation, and Sustenance of a Shared School Vision

Seven principals, four visionary and three managerial, noted that some teachers do not want to share in decision making and planning. In fact, one visionary principal (A) and one managerial principal (K) both stated specifically that some teachers like to be told what to do. Eleven of the 12 principals described situations where some teachers were reluctant to assume responsibility to become involved either because of time, interest, lack of buy-in for a new administrator, or lack of trust. One visionary principal (C) stated that teachers are overworked and underpaid, but in spite of that, some teachers were willing to assume leadership roles in the shared school vision.
process. C cautioned other principals to take care not to overburden already busy teachers.

Challenges related to teachers in the shared vision process were similarly identified between the two groups. Patterns included the challenges of effective communication, creating trust with members of the staff who preceded the present principal, time, buy-in to the principal’s vision, interest in the shared school vision process, and willingness to take on extra work and assignments. This finding is aligned with Senge (O’Neil, 1995) who stated that schools are generally populated with high numbers of people who entered the profession with a “... high sense of purpose” (p. 22). Schools, unfortunately, have a way of turning teachers who have a high sense of purpose into cynics. As a result, American schools are a fertile ground for redirecting these buried senses of caring and purpose particularly among teachers. Both visionary and managerial principals identified these cynical teachers as challenges to the shared school vision process.

Support Staff-Related Challenges to the Creation, Implementation, and Sustenance of a Shared School Vision

Both visionary and managerial principals identified the involvement of support staff in the shared school vision process as important. In fact, two principals from each group indicated that support staff were no challenges to the process but were leaders with key roles in the success of the shared school vision. Specific challenges to the involvement of the support staff as identified by the remaining eight
principals were allocating time for meeting, communicating to support staff that their ideas and opinions are valuable and needed, defining or limiting educational jargon to ensure a common vocabulary for communication, creating confidence in support staff in sharing their ideas, and providing training for their participation in the shared school vision process.

**Parent-Related Challenges to the Creation, Implementation, and Sustenance of a Shared School Vision**

Data collected from the principal interviews indicated that the major challenge to involving parents in the shared school vision process was the allocation of time by the parents and the scheduling of meetings by parents and committees. Similar patterns of responses appeared among both the visionary and the managerial principals. They said that more and more working parents are finding less time to be involved in school activities for their children, let alone dedicating time to the shared school vision process. Their comments also underscored the varying comfort level of parents in being involved with school activities, much less with a task perceived to be the responsibility of school staff. For example, parents with unsuccessful memories and experiences in school both as students themselves and as parents are difficult to involve in the shared school vision process or, for that matter, any school activities.

Another reported problem concerned the principal's previous involvement with a resistant or complaining parent on other issues. Working with negative parent concerns leaves less time for soliciting positive parent involvement in all school
activities including the shared school vision process. One visionary principal (J) and one managerial principal (F) were unable to identify any challenges to involving parents in the shared school vision process. In fact, these principals considered parent involvement to be a strong component in their total school program as well as in the shared school vision process.

**Student-Related Challenges to the Creation, Implementation, and Sustenance of a Shared School Vision**

Both visionary and managerial principals indicated minimal or non-existent student involvement in the shared vision process. The major challenges emerging from interviews included the perception that elementary students lack maturity, exhibit inappropriate timing, and have no collaborative experience necessary for committee and group work. One visionary principal has formalized student input to school planning and procedures, including the shared school vision process, by regular survey assessments of opinions and suggestions for improvement. The data accumulated through survey were used extensively in the school improvement planning process.

**Community Partner-Related Challenges to the Creation, Implementation and Sustenance of a Shared School Vision**

The general perception of community partners on the part of the interviewed principals was that these individuals and organizations provide money and/or other resources for the school. Half of the principals, three from each category, believed that they had successful community partner models in place. The other 50% of the
principals identified the biggest challenge of involving community partners was the problem of obtaining money and donated materials from them to support school programs. Only one visionary principal described community partner involvement that included membership on key committees or community partner volunteer hours in school programs. No other patterns or differences between the two groups emerged from the interview transcripts.

Challenges to the Creation, Implementation, and Sustenance of a Shared School Vision Presented by Allocation of Funds and Existence of Training Programs

Only one-fourth of the 12 principals in the interview process identified challenges to identifying and allocating funds to support the shared vision process in their schools. Two managerial principals and one visionary principal indicated that either they could identify adequate funds or that they chose not to allocate funds to the shared school vision process. When funds were identified, the primary use was to provide staff in-service training for the shared vision process.

The principals participating in the interviews all identified outside training, experiences, and models, or internal communication and sharing models that they sensed were important to their shared school vision process. Only one managerial principal identified a mentor principal as a key role model and resource for planning and training in the shared vision process. Reading, personal vision, and collaboration were identified as supportive learning practices for the creation, implementation, and
sustenance of shared school visions. Those principals who had been involved in specific school improvement models indicated the closest alignment between school improvement planning and the shared school vision process.

None of the principals identified college course work as the source of training in clarifying or strengthening their skills to better prepare themselves to meet the challenges of the shared school vision process.

**Allocation of Time as a Challenge to the Creation, Implementation, and Sustenance of a Shared School Vision**

Eight of the 12 principals participating in the interview process indicated that their major challenge in the shared school vision process is the allocation of time. This includes the allocation of personal time and the facilitating of timely involvement by the community stakeholders in the shared school vision process. Two principals, one visionary and one managerial, perceived the allocation of time for the shared school vision process as just a routine requirement of the administrative task. Two managerial principals stated that they were so busy taking care of routine matters at school each day with required things that they could not afford to spend time on the shared school vision process during the school day. Major challenges relating to the allocation of time included personal time, meeting time, arranging mutual meeting time for all stakeholders, and the immense variety of time demands on all of the individual school community stakeholders each day.
The identification of challenges related to the allocation of time provided noteworthy data from the two categories of principals interviewed in this study. Five of the six visionary principals indicated major difficulties with the management and allocation of time for the shared school vision process, while only three of the management principals stated that this was a problem. In addition, two managerial principals indicated that they were so busy managing the daily requirements of a busy school that they did not have time for the shared school vision process.

The principals were also asked to estimate the amount of time they allocate each day to the shared vision process. Senge (O'Neil, 1995) maintained that between 20% and 40% of a principal's administrative time should be spent on the shared vision process. Two visionary principals and one managerial principal purported that 100% of their activities on a school day is a part of the shared school vision process. On the other hand, two of the managerial principals asserted that they spend no time on the shared vision process during the school day. Four visionary principals indicated time allocation in concert with Senge, and two managerial principals exhibited similar time allocations. The mean estimated time allocation for the visionary principals was 48.3%, and for the managerial principals, it was 28.3%.

Implications for Practice

The principals interviewed in this study are all required to create, implement, and sustain a shared school vision as specified in the Clark County School District
Division of Elementary Education's *Systems for Quality Schools* (1995, Sec. I, p. 23). The definition of a shared school vision, justification for requiring the process, and guidelines for the creation and implementation of a shared school vision are clearly presented in *Systems for Quality Schools* and research data is clearly offered to support the importance of this process. All 12 principals—six visionary and six managerial—indicated that they felt a shared school vision was very important to the overall success of their school, as required by the school district.

The definitions presented by the principals in the interview process and their practices of involving community stakeholders from a variety of categories as set forth in *Systems for Quality Schools* however, indicated only partial alignment of field practices with the research based guidelines. No patterns or themes of applications of definition, purpose, or guidelines could be detected between the visionary and the managerial group. This may be explained by Owens (1995) who, for example, claimed that leadership is more than style and techniques; in fact, he asserted, it is more involved with relationships and understanding. Specifically, he identified the importance of motivating people to a shared vision, gaining commitment to the vision, and organizing the work environment to facilitate the visioning process as key ways that leaders relate the visioning process to followers.

The principals who were interviewed identified the same variety of challenges in involving the diverse stakeholders proffered by the *Systems for Quality Schools*. No specific patterns or themes emerged related to the alignment of the principals with
either visionary or managerial leadership attributes; however, a wide variety of leadership applications of the involvement process was evident. The specific challenges of allocating time effectively, building trust, identifying time, communicating effectively, training and involving non-certificated participants, training parents, drawing from a wide cross-section of parents, dealing with student immaturity, involving community partners as decision makers rather than just as providers of money and materials, and providing a process that funnels all of these efforts into a shared school vision became obvious. Also clear is the wide range of field practices and broad interpretation of the Systems for Quality Schools (CCSD, 1995) guidelines for the creation, implementation, and sustenance of a shared school vision.

As the researcher looks back over the past 3 and one-half years of reading, conversations, review, observations, and writing that focused on the concept that leaders need to know where they are going (visioning), the initial mysticism of the visioning process becomes definable in the simple reality of creating a common organizational purpose. While it may be too simplistic to assume that you cannot be a leader unless you know where you are going and you communicate a common purpose, the leadership tasks required by principals in today's public schools make the labels "successful school" and "successful school principal" difficult to define and thus difficult to achieve. The researcher believes that assisting principals to meet the
challenges of creating, implementing and sustaining a shared school vision will assist
them in creating a clear common purpose and a successful school.

The 12 principals interviewed in this study all clearly wanted their schools to
be successful and they were able to describe their efforts to reach the images of
success that they held in their minds. All were familiar with the *Systems For Quality
Schools*, and the guidelines that it provides to support the school improvement process.
All 12, regardless of the level of alignment with visionary or managerial leadership
attributes, consistently focused on the complexity of their school improvement tasks
as they discussed the challenges they faced in the shared school visioning process.

Their interviews included acknowledgment of a wide variety of challenges
outside the task of creating, implementing and sustaining a shared school vision. A
review of the interview scripts underscores the concern, energy, time, and expertise
invested by principals in meeting all school challenges, and the analysis of data
collected in this study indicates that principals are seeking solutions to a myriad of
problems by envisioning success and sharing images of what they feel success looks
like. It is clear that they are seeking any assistance that they can identify to assist them
in meeting these challenges.

Dr. Carl, Elementary Division Superintendent, writing in the introduction to
the *Systems For Quality Schools* (1995), noted that the document will “...unify efforts
of individual schools in formulating a vision for the school” (p. ix), and that it is a
shared vision “...is the force that bonds students, teachers, and others together in our
common cause” (p. ix). She also stated that the “Systems For Quality Schools is the springboard from which principals launch the process of involving important school constituencies in vision building” (p. ix).

Dr. Merv Iverson, a major force in the creation and implementation of the Systems For Quality Schools (1995), equated its Elements and Standards of Quality to “...fixed stars”(p. x), giving guidance in our journey in the “…planned processes for achieving quality and equity in the learning vision for all students” (p. x).

The researcher observed that the Systems For Quality Schools is well grounded in current effective schools research, and supported by the research of current experts on the importance of the role of visionary leadership in creating successful schools. The blueprint that it provides for principals to meet the challenges that they identify in their process of creating, implementing and sustaining a shared school vision is not only a model for the effective school visioning process, but also a model for creating, implementing and sustaining a successful elementary school.

It is also important to note that college course work in leadership style recognition, identification of visionary leadership skills, practice with the creation, implementation, and sustenance of shared visions, and the extension of that data to the specific process of shared school visions would be of benefit to practicing principals, future principals, teachers, and all school administrators.
Recommendations for Further Study

1. A study identifying successful shared school vision processes and models for training to provide common definitions and experiences should be undertaken.

2. Further investigation of visionary alignment leadership attributes using the respondent’s personal assessment of success may help shed light on the concept of visionary leadership and its role in creating successful school principals and successful schools.

3. The number one challenge to all principals in the creation, implementation, and sustenance of shared school vision in Clark County School District elementary schools was time. Therefore, the issues of time, time management, and creative time allocation and scheduling to involve the wide variety of stakeholders needed to provide input for a successful shared school vision are worthy of new research.

4. Identification of successful practices is critical to the creation and implementation of a shared school vision. From such a study could come training models for staff development that may also lead to input on the critical task of sustaining vision. It is suggested that such a study could focus on schools and principals identified as successful such as Blue Ribbon Schools, Schools Of Excellence, and State Principals Of The Year.
Summary

This study focused on the elementary principals of the Clark County School District, one of the ten largest and fastest growing school districts in the country. The 132 elementary principals were surveyed to determine their alignment with visionary or managerial leadership attributes, and 12 principals were selected for in-depth interview to identify the challenges that they encountered in creating, implementing, and sustaining a shared school vision. Six of the selected principals demonstrated a high alignment with visionary leadership attributes and 6 demonstrated a high alignment with managerial leadership attributes.

Analysis of the interview data identified challenges in time allocation, involvement of teachers, involvement of support staff, involvement of students, involvement of parents, involvement of community partners, identification of training models, identification of supportive funds, and the variety of personal definitions of the role of the shared school visioning process in the overall success of a school.

The researcher notes that the Clark County School District’s blueprint for principals to effectively manage the school change process at the school level, *The Systems For Quality Schools*, is based in current effective schooling research, and that its guidelines continue to be reinforced by leading researchers looking at the role of visionary leaders in the creation of successful schools.

The researcher points to four areas to be considered for further research, including the identification of models of successful shared school vision process; the
identification of training models; a study of the relationship of visionary leadership
and a principal’s personal definition of success; a study involving an in-depth look at
time management for elementary principals; and a study of schools and principals
identified as successful by state and national awards focusing on the importance of a
shared school vision in that definition of success.

The researcher’s vision is that this study is a step towards the effective
blending of current research on visionary leadership; field applications of guidelines
contained in the Systems For Quality Schools, CCSD (1995), visionary leadership
training components in school improvement models, and higher education coursework.
That vision extends to a result of this synthesis that offers principals achievable images
of success and support in meeting their challenges.
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APPENDIX A

OUTLINE OF INTERVIEW SCRIPT
OUTLINE OF INTERVIEW SCRIPT

A. Personal Data

1. How many years of experience do you have in the field of education?
   ________ years

2. How many years have you been a school administrator?
   ________ years

3. How many years have you been an elementary school principal?
   ________ years

4. How many years have you been on your current assignment?
   ________ year

B. School and Community Information

1. What grades are included in your school? ____________________________

2. Approximately what is your enrollment? _____________________________

3. How many employees do you supervise?
   ___ Certified
   ___ Administrative
   ___ Support staff
   ___ Other ____________________________
C. Interview Questions

1. Has your school developed a shared vision—and, if yes, what was the process of
development? May I have a copy of your school vision?

2. What kinds of challenges, if any, have you encountered in the process of creating a
shared school vision?

(Areas for prompting questions)

___ Teachers
___ Support staff
___ Students
___ Families
___ Supervisors and/or central office administrators
___ Community partners
___ Funding
___ Allocation of time
___ Other ________________________________

3. What kinds of challenges, if any, have you encountered in the process of
implementing a shared school vision?

(Areas for prompting questions)

___ Teachers
___ Support staff
___ Students
___ Families
___ Supervisors and/or central office administrators
___ Community partners
___ Funding
___ Allocation of time
___ Other ________________________________
4. What kinds of challenges, if any, have you encountered in the process of sustaining a shared school vision?

(Areas for prompting questions)

_____ Teachers
_____ Support staff
_____ Students
_____ Families
_____ Supervisors and/or central office administrators
_____ Community partners
_____ Funding
_____ Allocation of time
_____ Other ________________________________

5. In your opinion, what role does a shared school vision play in the overall success of an elementary school?
APPENDIX B

VISIONARY LEADERSHIP ATTITUDE SURVEY

(Grady & LeSourd, 1990)
As a UNLV doctoral student, I am completing my dissertation research on visionary leadership and its role in the daily routine of elementary school principals. My goal is to identify challenges principals encounter in the required task of creating, implementing and sustaining shared school visions in their communities. Ultimately, I hope to find direction for the development and implementation of training and resources to support principals in that process.

I need your help. Would you please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed Visionary Leadership Attitude Survey and return it to me in the enclosed stamped, addressed envelope. I assure you that confidentiality will be strictly maintained through appropriate security measures and coding.

The research project has been reviewed and approved by the Clark County Cooperative Research Committee and all guidelines for research in CCSD will be met.

After the surveys have been scored, I plan to select 12 principals for interview. The face-to-face contact will enable us to discuss in depth the challenges that principals face in creating, implementing, and sustaining shared school visions. These meetings, too, will remain strictly confidential.

Thank you so much for your assistance and I know how busy you are. I appreciate your input and support in this project. For any of you who are interested, I would be happy to share a summary of this study at your request.

Sincerely,

Dave Price
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Educational Leadership
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
LEADERSHIP ATTITUDE SURVEY (Grady & LeSourd, 1990)

**Directions:** Please circle the number that most closely indicates your degree of agreement or disagreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Principals should avoid taking risks.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Leaders should be driven by their vision of a better future.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Principals should not let their goals interfere with functioning programs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Principals are committed to attaining their personal ideas for their school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The stability of school operations is more important than activity for change.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Principals are leaders, if they accept existing standards.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The character of life is generally the same in each school, because basic beliefs about students and learning do not differ.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Principals should do what is needed to get the results they want.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The principal does not have the authority to decide what's right for the school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Some principals become well-known because they are heroic, visionary leaders.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Principals should spend time actively planning for the future.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The values and beliefs of the principal are the major influence upon the work of the people in the school.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Principals' actions should be consistent with their own beliefs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Temporary disruption of school operations is sometimes necessary to achieve progress.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The principal's own beliefs should be prominent in the atmosphere of the school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Principals should communicate school goals in subtle ways.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Wise principals focus their school on an image of what the school should be in the future.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Principals who are doing their job well, do not have time to think about the future of their school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. A good principal can be expected to take innovative actions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The principal should create an atmosphere of creativity in the school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Teachers work hard when the principal makes school goals clear.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Principals must actively work to promote their ideals in the school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. It is important for principals to do what others expect them to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Principals should introduce new practices only after they have been tried in other schools.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. Principals are reflective thinkers as well as action oriented. | Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
26. Principals should vigorously articulate school goals at every opportunity. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
27. In good schools, the principal and the teachers are committed to common purposes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
28. The principal should not impose personal beliefs upon the school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
29. Good principals are driven by a desire to create new ideas. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
30. School principals should have a view of a future which is better than the present. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
31. School climate is different in each school because of the strong influence of each school staff's beliefs about students and learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
32. Principals must be willing to take risks. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
33. Successful schools have a clearly understood philosophy. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
34. Principals should maintain personal goals even if some school patrons complain. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
35. Goals will be attained in a school in which everyone knows what is important for success. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
APPENDIX C

APPLICATION FOR HUMAN SUBJECT RESEARCH
UNLV PROCEDURES FOR RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS PROTOCOL APPLICATION

DESCRIPTION OF STUDY

I. Subjects

Approximately 136 elementary school principals employed by Clark County School District will be surveyed regarding their alignment with attitudes ascribed to visionary leaders. From those surveyed, 12 will be selected for interview. Gender and ethnic ratios are pre-determined by Clark County School District employment policies.

II. Purpose, Methods, Procedures

This research project is designed to identify elementary school principals who align themselves with visionary leadership characteristics. From the population, 12 subjects will be selected for interview—the six highest and the six lowest scorers on the survey. It is expected that patterns and themes will emerge regarding the types of problems the principals face in creating, implementing, and sustaining a shared school vision which is required by the district.

III. Risks

All subjects will be assured of confidentiality on survey responses and in interview sessions. Anonymity will also be assured in the compilation of data and in reporting. Coding will be used whenever appropriate to safeguard confidentiality.

IV. Benefits

Currently, Clark County School Districts requires elementary school principals to create, implement, and sustain a shared school vision for their schools. The results of this research should be helpful in providing information from which to develop planning tools, training sessions, and other resources to facilitate completion of the shared vision process.
V. Risk-Benefit Ratio

Professional research practices and appropriate data analysis will produce benefits without the hazard of risk.

VI. Cost to Subjects

No financial cost will be required of the subjects. They will, however, be asked to devote a short period of time to complete the initial survey. Those selected for interview will need to make time for that and for the completion of the exit survey.
DATE: January 10, 1997

TO: David A. Price (ED)
M/S 3002

FROM: Dr. William E. Schulze, Director
Office of Sponsored Programs (X1357)

RE: Status of Human Subject Protocol Entitled:
"Problems Encountered in Sustaining Shared School Visions: Case Study Interviews Elementary School Principals Who Align Themselves with Visionary Leadership Attributes"

OSP #303s0197-162e

The protocol for the project referenced above has been reviewed by the Office of Sponsored Programs and it has been determined that it meets the criteria for exemption from full review by the UNLV human subjects Institutional Review Board. This protocol is approved for a period of one year from the date of this notification and work on the project may proceed.

Should the use of human subjects described in this protocol continue beyond a year from the date of this notification, it will be necessary to request an extension.

cc: G. Kops (ED-3002)
OSP File
February 5, 1997

David A. Price
Richard J. Rundle Elementary School
425 North Christy Lane
Las Vegas, Nevada 89110

Dear Mr. Price:

At its meeting on Friday, January 31, 1997, the Clark County School District's Committee to Review Cooperative Research Requests reviewed your proposal entitled, "To Identify Principals Who Align Themselves with Visionary Leadership Attributes and to Conduct In-depth Case Studies to Identify Problems that Principals Encounter in Sustaining Shared School Visions." However, we are unable to proceed with our review of your application until your proposal has been reviewed by the UNLV College of Education's Center for Inservice, Training, and Educational Research (CENTER) Advisory Council. We are also interested in reviewing the final form of your documents, including the follow-up interview questions you have developed.

Dr. Carla Steinforth, a member of this committee, has offered to share additional insights and observations that may strengthen your research.

Thank you for inviting the Clark County School District to participate in your research.

Sincerely,

Judith S. Costa, Chairman
Committee to Review Cooperative Research Requests

JC/sc
cc: Don Anderson  
    Tom Barberini  
    Kevin Crehan  
    Bill Hoffman  
    LeRoy Hurd

Craig Kadlub  
Lauren Kohut-Rost  
Connie Kratky  
Charles Rasmussen  
Carla Steinforth
Memo
To: Dr. Judy Costa, Director
   Testing and Evaluation
From: Dave Price
Re: Research Application
Date: 2/11/97

Here is the Human Subject Protocol approval from Dr. Schulze in sponsored programs. I talked with Dr. Steinhoff and he directed me straight to the CINTER Committee, chaired by Dr. Randall Boone. I talked with Dr. Boone who was very patient in explaining the committee’s work, and he gave me some suggestions for my application.

I am also sending you the results of the review of the original interview questions by the panel of experts and the new set of interview questions incorporating their suggestions.

I am continuing to refine the questions in practice as I am working with retired principals in pilot surveys and interviews. Your advice for patience as I work through this project is well taken as the time line keeps stretching. Dr. Boone will take the materials to his committee the first week in March and have their comments and recommendations to you for your March meeting. Thank you for the information you shared and the guidance through this process. Please let me know if you think any other conceptual or methodological data is needed by the committee.
Dr. Randall Boone, Director
CINTER Committee
College Of Education
UNLV

Dear Dr. Boone:

I am enclosing materials for review by your committee, as I make application for approval to conduct my research in the Clark County School District. The proposed project has been reviewed, revised, and approved by the Human Subjects Protocol Committee, and I made application to the Research Committee of the Clark County School District without knowledge of the new CINTER process. The research committee reviewed the project proposal, requested the updated interview questions, and directed me to your committee. If you need additional materials, or more detailed information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Dave Price
Doctoral Candidate
FROM: CINTER ADVISORY COMMITTEE, UNLV
RANDALL BOONE, DIRECTOR

TO: Dave Price

RE: APPLICATION FOR COOPERATIVE RESEARCH WITH CCSD

The CINTER Advisory Committee has reviewed your application for cooperative research with the Clark County School District. Based on our understanding of the current criteria, editorial and substantive revisions are suggested. You may want to work with your committee chair to revise the application. A copy of this report has been sent to Dr. Judy Costa, chair of the CCSD proposal review committee.

Do not return your application to the CINTER office. It is your responsibility to submit the application to: Dr. Judy Costa, Testing and Evaluation, Clark County School District. The CCSD committee meets the last Friday of each month. Dr. Costa requests that proposals be forwarded to her at least 10 working days prior to their committee meeting.

Remember that a copy of the UNLV Protocol Form for Research involving Human Subjects must be attached to your application to CCSD.

Areas suggested for revision include:

1. A description of the connection between the purpose and the design would strengthen the proposal.

2. There is no discussion of data analysis. You have described the data collection instruments, but not how you will use the data to answer your research questions.

3. An exit survey is mentioned but not discussed in the consent forms.

4. There are inconsistencies in the number of subjects, both teachers and principals who will participate in the study (132 -- 160).

5. Method for selection of principals is unclear: Will all principals in CCSD receive the form? Also in one section you say the 6 highest visionary and the six highest management scores will be selected for the interviews. In another section you say the six highest and the six lowest scoring participants will be selected. Which is it?
Memo
To: Dr. Judy Costa, Director
Testing and Evaluation, CCSD
From: Dave Price, Doctoral Candidate
UNLV
Re: Permission To Conduct Research In CCSD
Date: 4/18/97

I am submitting an updated packet of materials to your test committee. I have been working closely with my committee chairperson, Dr. Gerald Kops and with my dissertation committee. We have refined the problem statement, clarified the methodology and narrowed the interview script.

I am enclosing those new sections of my proposal, along with the planned procedures for ensuring clear communications and a high trust level in the survey responses and interview data. I am also enclosing a complete copy of the dissertation proposal in case you or members of your committee have any further questions. If you need any further information prior to your meeting on April 25, let me know.

The study has been approved by Human Resources at UNLV, and the CINTER Committee has forwarded their suggestions to your committee.
May 1, 1997

David A. Price
Richard J. Rundle Elementary School
425 North Christy Lane
Las Vegas, Nevada 89110

Dear Mr. Price:

I am pleased to inform you that at its meeting on Friday, April 25, 1997, the Clark County School District’s Committee to Review Cooperative Research Requests reviewed and approved your proposal entitled, "Problems Encountered in Sustaining Shared School Visions: Case Study Interviews with Elementary School Principals Who Align Themselves with Visionary Leadership Attributes." As we discussed in our telephone conversation on Thursday, May 1, 1997, we are most appreciative of the measures you have taken to ensure that all the relevant parties are kept informed of the progress of your research.

Thank you for inviting the Clark County School District to participate in your research.

Sincerely,

Judith S. Costa, Chairman
Committee to Review Cooperative Research Requests

JSC/sc
cc: Don Anderson
    Tom Barberini
    Kevin Crehan
    Bill Hoffman
    LeRoy Hurd

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
APPENDIX D

REVIEW PANEL
REVIEW PANEL

Dr. Merv Iverson, Visionary Leadership Consultant
5048 Champions Avenue
Las Vegas, NV
(702) 431-2312

Raenelle Lees
Retired Middle School English Teacher and Librarian
Currently Instructor of Children's Literature
University of Montana
532 Kieth Avenue
Missoula, MT 59801
(406) 543-6733

Dr. Michael Robison, Area Superintendent
Clark County School District
Elementary Education Division—Northwest Area
Las Vegas, NV
(702) 799-8920

Dr. Carla Steinforth, Area Superintendent
Clark County School District
Elementary Education Division—East Area
Las Vegas, NV
(702) 799-8497

Vee Wilson, Principal
Elizabeth Wilhelm Elementary School
Clark County School District
Las Vegas, NV
(702) 799-1750
LETTER TO REVIEW PANEL WITH INSTRUCTIONS

FOR INSTRUMENT REVIEW

December 19, 1996

Mr. Vee Wilson, Principal
Elizabeth Wilhelm Elementary School
Clark County School District
Las Vegas, NV 89030

Dear Vee:

Thank you for agreeing to assist in the development and review of a survey and an interview script which I am constructing in connection with my doctoral study at UNLV. As I explained when we talked, I am investigating the concept of visionary leadership among elementary school principals and the identification of problems they might have in creating, implementing and sustaining shared school visions.

The first step of the research will be to distribute a survey (Grady & LeSourd, 1990) to all elementary principals that measures the extent to which principals align themselves with the attributes of visionary leadership. From those surveyed, 12 will be selected for interview to discover the problems inherent in the creation, implementation, and sustenance of a shared school vision. Following the interview, each subject will be asked to complete an exit questionnaire regarding problem identification.

I have enclosed a draft of the interview script for your review. Please scrutinize the questions and provide comments on content and format. In addition, if you would like to comment further on the research in any way, I welcome the input.

Enclosed also is a self-addressed stamped mailer for you to return the items when you have completed the task. I can be reached at school (702-799-7380) or at home (702-656-5756) if I can assist you in any way. Please call me at any time.

Again, thank you for your help with this project, and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

David A. Price
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Educational Leadership
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Principal, Richard J. Rundle Elementary School
Clark County School District
Las Vegas, NV
SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW SCRIPT REVIEW

BY SELECTED PANEL

Based on input from the Review Panel, questions were rephrased or reworded where it made sense to do so. The following table summarizes the responses. N means no change was suggested, N+ means the comments were complimentary, N- means that the question might need strengthening, and the number indicates where to find the suggestion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Question</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What does the term visionary leadership mean to you?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What names come into your mind as models of visionary leaders?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What role does visionary leadership play in operation of today's educational systems?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N+</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What is your personal vision for a successful school?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Has your school developed a shared vision and what was the process for its development?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N+</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What training have you had in the planning and implementation of a shared school vision? College course work, workshops and conferences, books, articles, videos, audio materials, or other?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How long have you been in your present school? Were you involved in the creation of the vision in place at this school? Have you been involved in the creation of a vision at another school?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What problems have you encountered in the process of sustaining a shared school vision? Teachers, support staff, students, families, supervisors, central administrators, community partners, others?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do you allocate funds to sustain your shared school vision?</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How much of your administrative time is spent on sustaining your shared school vision?</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How does a shared school vision affect school discipline?</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Question</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How does a shared school vision affect the quality of instruction in a school?</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How does a shared school vision affect student achievement in your school?</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Do you need to be a visionary leader to be a successful school principal?</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. What values do your supervisors place on visionary leadership?</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Suggested placing the term *visionary leadership* in quotation marks.

2. Avoid leading questions, rephrase to include who or what and be consistent with term of visionary leadership.

3. Concern that the word "models" might be misleading.

4. Questioned sphere of knowledge being measured--local, national, or international.

5. Rephrase question to avoid leading interviewee and ask for explanation.

6. May be combined with questions 11, 12, 13, and 14.

7. Replace "does" with "should."

8. Suggested rewording to tie personal vision to current school assignment.

9. Cited Spradely (1979) and suggested rewording to a "grand tour question" form-- Describe your school vision and reconstruct your role in its development. Consider eliminating the word "shared."

10. Consider combining questions 5 and 7.

11. Cited A. Schultz (1967), *The Phenomenology of the Social World*, with suggestions to reword the question with a focus on the participants' subjective experiences: Have you had training in the planning and implementation of a school vision and what was the training like for you?
12. Reword the question to differentiate between employer- and self-initiated workshops.

13. Cited J. P. Spradely (1979), *The Ethnographic Interview*. Also suggested the use of *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researcher in Education and the Social Sciences* (1991). Suggested the use of questions like, "What was your involvement and how has the vision changed?"


15. Reword to replace "problems" with "experiences."

16. Suggested rewording if more than one side of the question was being solicited.

17. Reword to replace "sustaining" with "compels," "motivates," or "drives."

18. Noted that all problems listed are related to people. Suggested expanding to include finances, school size, and school culture.

19. Reword question to eliminate "you" and ask "how."

20. Combine with question 15.

21. Questioned use of "sustain."

22. Ask how much is allocated.

23. Reword to ask, "What do you do administratively to sustain your vision and how much time is involved?"

24. Combine questions 11, 12, and 13, and reword so that they are not leading questions.

25. Combine questions 11, 12, 13, and 14.

26. Use "might" in place of "does."

27. Reword and combine.

28. Combine.
29. Reword and combine.
30. Combine.
31. Reword and combine.
32. Combine.
33. Reword to define "success."
34. Reword to elicit how the interviewee feels about his or her values.
35. Reword to broaden concept.
36. Reword to apply to individual school.
37. Concerned about common definition of "values."
APPENDIX E

CORRESPONDENCE WITH DR. SANDRA LeSOURD

AND DR. MARILYN L. GRADY
Dear Dr. LeSourd:

Dr. Ed Chance, Educational Leadership Program, listed your name as a resource for my research project on visionary leadership in schools. I requested and received a copy of Validation of a Visionary Leadership Attitude Instrument Using Factor Analysis, from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. I would like your permission to use the Leadership Attitude Instrument in my Doctoral research project here in the Clark County Schools, Las Vegas, Nevada.

I plan to distribute your survey to the 156 principals in the Elementary Division of the Clark County School District with the intent of identifying their degree of alignment with visionary leadership attributes. My specific interest is in identifying the problems that visionary principals face in sustaining a shared and compelling school vision, and I will do case study interviews with six principals who score high in alignment with visionary leadership attributes as defined by your instrument.

I am also interested in your insights and conclusions as you have used the findings of your research in your teaching and ongoing projects.

Sincerely,

David A. Price

Dave Price, Principal
Richard J. Rundle
Year-Round Elementary School
425 N Christy Lane
Las Vegas, Nevada 89110
Phone: 702-799-7380
Fax: 702-799-7327
Home Phone: 702-656-5756
e-mail address: DPRICE-LASVEGAS@worldnet.att.net
Dear Dr. LeSourd:

Dr. Ed Chance, Educational Leadership Program, listed your name as a resource for my research project on visionary leadership in schools. I requested and received a copy of Validation of a Visionary Leadership Attitude Instrument Using Factor Analysis, from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. I would like your permission to use the Leadership Attitude Instrument in my Doctoral research project here in the Clark County Schools, Las Vegas, Nevada.

I plan to distribute your survey to the 156 principals in the Elementary Division of the Clark County School District with the intent of identifying their degree of alignment with visionary leadership attributes. My specific interest is in identifying the problems that visionary principals face in sustaining a shared and compelling school vision, and I will do case study interviews with six principals who score high in alignment with visionary leadership attributes as defined by your instrument.

I am also interested in your insights and conclusions as you have used the findings of your research in your teaching and ongoing projects.

Sincerely,

David A. Price

Dave Price, Principal
Richard J. Rundle
Year-Round Elementary School
425 N Christy Lane
Las Vegas, Nevada 89110
Phone: 702-799-7380
Fax: 702-799-7327
Home Phone: 702-656-5756
e-mail address: DPRICE-LASVEGAS@worldnet.att.net
March 17, 1997

Dr. Marilyn L. Grady  
Department of Educational Administration  
University of Nebraska, Lincoln  
Lincoln, NE 68588-0638

Dear Dr. Grady:

Thank you for taking the time to discuss your survey and interview data collection process with me last week. I have completed the Comprehensive Exams and the Oral Exit Interview for exams and presentation of my dissertation proposal. Dr. Chance is on my committee and he suggested that I include some national visionary leadership research expertise in the content validation process for my interview questions, to lend more credibility to my research.

I selected the current panel of experts based on their insights and expertise in the Clark County School District and as guides to grammatical construction of the questions. I have enclosed the names of the panel I used and a few notes as to their backgrounds.

I have enclosed the interview questions, and a summary of the panel's input on each item and the resulting revisions that I made based on that review. I have also included a packet of information that includes an abstract, my problem statement, and proposed methodology for the research. I would welcome any suggestions on any phase of the research, and I am specifically requesting that you review my interview questions and offer suggestions for improvement and change.

I have enclosed a pre-posted envelope for you to use to return your review summary. Please feel free to call me at school if you have any further questions or you would like to offer direct advice.

Thank you in advance for your time and guidance in this visionary process of mine that sees me moving to the data collection phase of this research project. The ultimate vision is to finish, with perhaps a little more insight into the process of visionary leadership in today's elementary schools.

Sincerely,

[Signature]  

David A. Price
APPENDIX F

LETTER TO PRINCIPALS TO BE INTERVIEWED

AND INFORMED CONSENT
Dear Survey Respondent:

Thank you for completing the leadership survey regarding the role of visionary leadership. The data have been analyzed anonymously from 91 respondents. The original mailing covered 132 elementary principal in the Clark County School District. 12 surveys were selected for interview through the coding process.

Congratulations! You are one of the 12 principals who has been chosen for the interview phase of the research. As I explained on the telephone, the interview will last approximately 40-60 minutes. I will ask you a series of questions from a script, and the session will be recorded by audiotape. In addition, I will request some school demographics and a copy of your shared school vision. All notes and recordings will be maintained in my home in a strictly confidential manner. Transcriptions will also be kept in private, and they will be destroyed immediately upon completion and acceptance of the study by the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Data will be summarized in the dissertation in order to maintain anonymity and confidentiality of all participants. Ethnographic techniques focusing on key concepts will blend the data so that identification of individuals or specific schools will not be possible.

UNLV research procedures require that I obtain your informed consent for participation in this study. Please complete and sign the attached informed consent verification which I will accept from you at the start of our interview.

Again, I thank you for your time and support of this project.

Dave Price
Doctoral Candidate
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Department of Educational Administration
and Higher Education
4505 Maryland Parkway • Box 453002 • Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-3002
(702) 895-3491
INFORMED CONSENT VERIFICATION

I understand that the procedures to be used in the collection of data during this interview, and I have been assured that my responses will be kept confidential and my anonymity maintained in all summaries and reports of this study.

Signature of Participant

Signature of Investigator/Student

This form and all data will be kept secured in the personal residence of the researcher.

Department of Educational Administration and Higher Education
4505 Maryland Parkway • Box 453002 • Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-4002
(702) 895-3481
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