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The purpose of this study was to investigate the Stages of Concern (SoC) that school principals have toward change and then report participants' behavior relevant to their Level of Use (LoU) of an innovation. An understanding of principals' concerns regarding change suggested a variety of factors that impede educational leaders' implementation of innovations and change within the school environment.

The researcher studied principals' perspectives regarding change implementation in the course of their daily administrative activities. Although many principals are aware and knowledgeable of the current standards for school leadership, difficulties arise when innovations and change are implemented. This study was designed to inform current research on successful change management in education.

The use of surveys, interviews, and participant debriefing provided for a triangulation of the data. The survey results were used to develop a framework for the semi-structured interviews. The research problem was founded upon the need to more thoroughly understand the difficulties that school leaders have in facilitating change in their leadership practices. Therefore, the following questions guided this study:

1. What are principals' top three concerns related to change?
2. What are principals' predominate Stages of Concern?
3. Are there relationships between principals' Stages of Concern and their years of service?
4. Are there relationships between principals' Stages of Concern and the percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch in their school?

5. Are there relationships between principals' Stages of Concern and school size?

6. Do principals' Stages of Concern affect their ability to manage change and improve capacity-building within the school?

The researcher found that principals were concerned with the acceptance of innovations as well as the resources of funding and time. The Stages of Concern questionnaire results supported that principals' concerns complicate the implementation of an innovation. A significant relationship exists between Stage of Concern 3, Management, and principals' years of service as well as Stage of Concern 6, Refocusing, and the percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunches. The Levels of Use interview data supported that principals' Stages of Concern affect their ability to manage change and improve their capacity-building within the school.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

With the ever-increasing growth of knowledge, the changing contexts and environments of schools, and the changing federal and state educational policies, the ability of principals to adapt to change and to foster a school culture of learning is imperative. The ability to change and to create a school culture that is characterized by learning is becoming increasingly important to student success (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008). Many researchers agree that principals should be described as agents of change and that change responsive to school context, educational policy, and program innovation is essential (Dinham, 2007; Fullan, 2005; Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Harris & Townsend, 2007; Trybus, 2011).

Although much research supports the principal as leader of change, a 2001 report published by the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) on leading school improvement described changes in student achievement and school innovations as “slow at best” (Hoachlander, Alt, & Beltranena, 2001, p. i). Since the time of that publication, the SREB has expressed concern that the billions of dollars spent on education have yet to yield desired changes (Bottoms & Fry, 2009).

Effective school leadership is vital to school improvement and meeting the needs of every student (CCSSO, 2008; Harris & Allen, 2009). The SREB literature review
offers some explanations for the sluggish improvement in schools (Hoachlander et al., 2001). First, stronger leadership is needed. An abundance of school leadership literature recognizes that specific leadership qualities are needed to facilitate growth in the schools of today. Also, the definition of an effective school leader lacks clarity. The changing context of today's schools, higher standards, and increased accountability necessitates a definition of school leadership which is established upon a principalship of adaptability, change, learning, and relationships. It is imperative that today's principals are knowledgeable of the change process. What then, should a school principal know and be able to do?

Bottoms and Fry (2009) acknowledged that principals needed to have assistance in carrying out the innovations necessary to create schools characterized by learning communities, shared vision, and collaborative leadership. The principal, as the prime facilitator of school reform, was unlikely to realize success without the assistance of a supportive district central office. This premise recognized the pervasive effect of change leadership upon an educational organization (Adelman & Taylor, 2007). Supported by a district office that encouraged knowledge management, shared vision, and collaborative leadership, principals were able to focus upon those same characteristics within their own schools to realize systemic reform and change.

The principal's understanding of the change process is deemed critical. Principals not only need to understand the process of change, but need to be effective managers and facilitators of change sensitive to their school context (Day, 2007; Lindahl, 2007). Fullan (2001) explained that principals must create school conditions favorable to change. School leaders were at the epicenter of school improvement for teachers, students, and
community (Epstein, 2008; Gardiner, Canfield-David, & Anderson, 2009; Sparks, 2009). The ability to facilitate change that supports school improvement requires effective collaborative skills, knowledge of curriculum, use of data, and a readiness to learn. Bottoms and O’Neill (2001) suggested various strategies for developing leadership preparation programs as well as recognizing existing potential leaders within a district. Their suggestions described changes in university leadership programs, leadership certification processes, and leadership opportunities open to educators. Professional mentoring was also advocated as an important means of professional development for tenured principals (Duncan & Stock, 2010; Fullan, 2005; Harris, Ballenger, & Leonard, 2004; Robertson, 2009).

Over a decade ago, Bottoms and O’Neill (2001) warned that much needed to be done. They explained that little progress had been made even though many principals had been trained to be change agents knowledgeable of leadership standards. Therefore, principals’ approaches toward change need to be examined. Could a current inspection of educational leadership claim that appreciable changes had occurred? How would principals knowledgeable of the change process respond to questions regarding their facilitation and management of change? What are some of the barriers or challenges that principals face when attempting to lead change within their school context?

Many current educational leadership programs are based on the standards set forth by the National Policy Board for Education Administration (NPBEA) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) in the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards (CCSSO, 2008). The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP, 2007) and the National Association of Elementary School
Principals (NAESP, 2010) use the ISLLC standards as a framework for principal leadership development. The SREB supports standards-based principal leadership, but explain that it will take more than standards to promote change (Hoachlander et al., 2001).

After a review of educational leadership literature, the SREB described 13 Critical Success Factors (CSFs) for higher-risk demographic schools (SREB, 2007). Three leadership competencies provided the overall framework for the 13 Critical Success Factors and were foundational to the SREB Learning-Centered Leadership Program. These competencies focused upon a principal’s need to understand school and classroom practices, to effectively collaborate, and to provide effectual support to school staff so that increased student achievement results. Hence, it is desirable to further probe principals’ management of change within the context of standards-based educational leadership. What obstacles prevent school leaders who have been trained in standards-based leadership programs from facilitating and managing change in this high stakes accountability era? How would principals who have been trained as agents of change describe their difficulties in facilitating change in a school?

**Problem Statement**

Problems have occurred for even the most well-meaning and progressively minded principals as they consciously applied standards-based leadership in daily practice. One hindrance to facilitating the process of change for educational leaders was the unstable and informal educational policies that related to the communities of practice within schools (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011). The learning processes for principals and teachers have evolved according to changing school structures and
development of policy. Relationships and collaborative learning environments were signs of a non-linear, democratic style of leadership (Fennell, 2005; Morrison, 2008). However, creating collaborative relationships within schools was not always easy. Morrison underscored the complexity of collaboration because it merged relationships with peoples’ affective and cognitive aspects of their being. Effective collaboration necessitated that school principals had a keen awareness of the social, political, cultural, economic, and legal environment of their schools so that they empowered their teachers rather than overwhelmed them (Johnson & Uline, 2005; Trybus, 2011). Firestone (2009) wrote that the current era of high stakes accountability affected the educational culture of school districts. He asserted that accountability-focused school districts which had closely defined educational goals and routine teaching methods were less effective in achieving school improvement than districts characterized by student-centered learning. A culture of student-centered learning empowered teachers and views teachers as professionals.

ISLLC Standard 1 describes a school principal as a leader who promotes the success of all students (CCSSO, 2008). This standard requires that educational leaders create student-centered school cultures. The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law of 2001 expects U.S. schools to provide access to effective education to all students. The 2010 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) expects all students to progress toward college and career readiness (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). The second ISLLC policy standard guides principals toward the responsibility of shaping the teaching and learning culture of schools (CCSSO, 2008). To advance our understanding about principals who are trained and knowledgeable of these expectations,
it is essential to ask what principals trained in standards-based programs have to say about facilitating and managing change within a school.

This present mixed-methods research project proposed to answer some of these questions relevant to leadership preparation, policy, and school context. Eacott (2010) suggested that conventional educational scholarship should be challenged with new ideas. Research was needed that informs educational leadership of new ideas for implementing change within the school structures and organization. This study investigated a cohort of principals who were participating in or who had completed standards-based educational leadership programs or professional development activities. This study investigated principals’ current concerns regarding the change process within their schools. Subsequent interviews provided a deeper level of understanding of principals’ behaviors toward their unique innovations implemented within the school context.

**Background**

With an emphasis of policy on school improvement, there is a responsibility to understand how principals trained in standards-based leadership programs respond to the process of change. Questions pertinent to this study are: Once in a leadership position, how does a principal whose training is based upon educational leadership standards facilitate and manage change? Does knowledge of the ISLLC standards and the SREB competencies influence how a principal manages the change process?

An innovative principal may have used leadership standards and policy to get the change process started. Has adequate change and school improvement moved schools effectively toward greater global and political responsiveness? George, Hall, and Stiegelbauer (2006) metaphorically described the implementation of change as a type of
journey that was measurable by the unique and discrete steps of its process. Have principals achieved sufficient progress on this journey? How have principals managed these steps? In a fluid environment of increased accountability, how did principals, educated as change agents, build the capacity of those around them to new and rigorous standards? Research of educational change may provide insight into circumstances that hinder principals from undertaking change.

The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (C-BAM) (Hall & Hord, 1987) provides a conceptual framework to describe educational leaders’ facilitation of change. Two dimensions, or instruments, of the C-BAM are used to present a descriptive picture of the person engaged in the change. The Stages of Concern (SoC) dimension depicts the feelings of the individual and the Levels of Use (LoU) dimension describes the behaviors of the individual relative to the innovation (see Appendices A and B). The seven stages identified by C-BAM are: (a) Stage 0-Awareness, (b) Stage 1-Informational, (c) Stage 2-Personal, (d) Stage 3-Management, (e) Stage 4-Consequence, (f) Stage 5-Collaboration, and (g) Stage 6-Refocusing. Stages 0, 1, and 2 focus on self concerns. Stage 3 focuses on task concerns, and Stages 4, 5, and 6 focus on impact concerns. The Levels of Use interview protocol identifies eight levels of use of an innovation. The eight levels are: (a) Level 0-Non-Use, (b) Level I-Orientation, (c) Level II-Preparation, (d) Level III-Mechanical Use, (e) Level IVA-Routine, (f) Level IVB-Refinement, (g) Level V-Integration, and (h) Level VI-Renewal.

Marzano, Waters, and McNulty’s (2005) meta-analysis of research literature on leadership confirmed earlier research results that demonstrated the considerable effect that leadership had upon student achievement; however, the goal of their study was to
extend these findings on the effect of leadership to principles that were applicable to current educational settings. The findings of their study both supported previous leadership theorists and offered fresh insights to the study of school leadership. Marzano et al. recognized 21 leadership responsibilities of the school leader. The authors described a principal with Situational Awareness as one who acted on existing and future problems based upon a heightened awareness of the current conditions. A principal characterized by Ideals/Beliefs was one who was regulated by personal beliefs and the sharing of beliefs regarding the school, teachers, and students. Intellectual Stimulation, Change Agent, Flexibility as well as numerous other principal responsibilities related to either first-order or second order change. It was necessary that the principal understand the social composition of the school and the overall school context to effectively manage the magnitude of change that their school was experiencing. These principles relate to the theoretical framework known as constructivism.

Central to the ideas of constructivism is the active engagement of the learner in the learning process (Dewey, 1915; Van der Veer & Valsiner, 1994). The active engagement of the learner continues to be immensely relevant to the contemporary change process. Fullan (1991) explained that individuals could be effective, responsible, and active participants when they were knowledgeable of the change process. Active participants needed an awareness of the inherently dynamic and personal nature of change. For successful change leadership to occur, Fullan stated, “The only fruitful way ahead is to carve out our own niche of renewal and build on it” (p. xiv). However, change was a function of society, and as Fullan further explained, it cannot be forced upon
others. Drago-Severson (2006) further stressed the importance of complementing each person's unique construction of knowledge within his or her distinct situation.

Educational leadership literature increasingly uses the term authentic to describe leadership behaviors that individuals interpret from the environment (Begley, 2004). Authentic leadership recognizes self-awareness, environmental awareness, and sensitivity to others. Dewey (1938) and Starrat (2001) explained that experiences vary in their value and usefulness to the learner. According to Gladwell (2008), the value and influence of one's cultural background cannot be overemphasized. Constructivism in educational leadership was necessarily a social construct and knowledge was the amalgamation of the learner's internal and external realities (Drago-Severson, 2006; Seaman & Gingo, 2011; Starrat, 2001; Van der Veer & Valsiner, 1994).

Research Purpose, Problem and Questions

The purpose of this study was to investigate the Stages of Concern (SoC) that school principals have toward change and then report participants' behaviors relevant to their Level of Use (LoU) of an innovation. An understanding of principals' concerns regarding change provided information about the factors that impede principals' implementation of innovations and change within their school environments. Principals' Stages of Concern and their Levels of Use of innovations were studied through a mixed-methods research approach. Initially, a demographic survey elicited the top three concerns of each participant regarding change in his or her role as a principal as well as his or her years of service, familiarity with leadership standards, and school configuration (see Appendix C). Next, the 35-item Stages of Concern questionnaire was used to gain insight into each principal's Stages of Concern, the group's predominate Stage of
Concern, as well as the effect of demographic factors upon the Stages of Concern (see Appendix D). Lastly, a subgroup of principals participated in the Levels of Use interview process to provide depth of understanding of principals' behaviors relevant to their implementation of innovations (see Appendix E).

The use of surveys, interviews, and participant debriefing provided for a triangulation of the data. The demographic survey and the Stages of Concern questionnaire results provided a framework for the semi-structured interviews. The research problem was founded upon the need to more thoroughly understand the difficulties that school principals have when facilitating change in their leadership practices. Therefore, the following questions guided this study:

1. What are principals' top three concerns related to change?
2. What are principals' predominate Stages of Concern?
3. Are there relationships between principals' Stages of Concern and their years of service?
4. Are there relationships between principals' Stages of Concern and the percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch in their school?
5. Are there relationships between principals' Stages of Concern and school size?
6. Do principals' Stages of Concern affect their ability to manage change and improve capacity-building within the school?

**Theoretical Framework**

This study was framed on the two theoretical concepts of constructivism and change theory. These approaches share the components of learning, knowledge-sharing,
and collaborative relationships. These commonalities are also essential elements of effective educational leadership; therefore, are relevant to this study.

**Constructivist Approach.** Constructivism refers to a compilation of theories about how knowledge is constructed. Piaget, Vygotsky, Dewey, and other early constructivist theorists, primarily described the manner in which children constructed knowledge. Dewey’s (1938) form of constructivism related to children’s meaning-making from social interactions yet continues to be a point of reference for contemporary theorists when studying adults’ construction of knowledge. Fullan (2006) credited Dewey when discussing reflective action as a critical premise of change theory. To emphasize the cognitive aspects of learning, Fullan explained that one does not just learn from practice, but must think about learning during the practice. From the constructivist’s perspective, Fullan (1991) advocated the importance of meaning-making and stated that, “Real change, then, whether desired or not, represents a serious personal and collective experience characterized by ambivalence and uncertainty; and if the change works out it can result in a sense of mastery, accomplishment, and professional growth” (p. 32).

Socially constructed knowledge comes about through relationships and interactions within school cultures. Sergiovanni (2005) explained that hope for a shared vision can motivate others to action. He also reasoned that hope could ultimately change the culture of a school and increase the capacity of staff when the principal responsibly moved from mere hope to substantive actions. Furthermore, as a principal moves toward action, possible roadblocks to change are identified. Identifying barriers enable the validity of the goal and the efficacy of the change to be assessed. Given that change inevitably involves learning, Sergiovanni charged that principals were the responsible
forces for providing school cultures characterized by trusting and collaborating relationships.

Change Theory. Starrat (2001) explained that the cultural and ethnic diversity within schools elicited a more refined process of knowledge-building. In the school context, a committed principal developed an awareness of the school culture (Ylimaki, Jacobson, & Drysdale, 2007), as well as a discernment of how others feel (Fullan, 2001; Hargreaves, 2004; Leithwood and Beatty, 2009). Moore (2009) conducted a review of educational change literature and related the value of understanding the effect of change upon others: He also suggested that principals had an advantage in supporting their staff during times of change and reform when they were aware of the mind-sets and feelings of their staff. Constructivism underlies the concepts of collaborative leadership, capacity building, influence of school context, and change leadership.

Fullan’s (2001) regard for collaboration and networking as essential elements of leadership supported the social aspect of constructing knowledge within the concept of constructivism. Shared leadership changed the roles and the responsibilities of principals as they became facilitators instead of the individuals in charge (Dinham, 2007; Doyle, 2004; Glatter, 2006). Robertson (2009) explained that the principal’s willingness to be discerning of the school context and to relationships produced more effective learning results. She stated that a principal must enthusiastically listen, adjust to change, and collaborate with others. Providing learning opportunities for teachers as well as creating student-centered learning cultures supported both teacher and student learning (Drago Severson, 2006; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2000).
The construction of knowledge as a socialization process is reflected in mentor-mentee relationships. A principal’s relationship with other principals is becoming increasingly important. Mentoring facilitated knowledge-sharing and situated the principal as learner (Harris et al., 2004; Robertson, 2009). Furthermore, Harris et al. contended that mentoring programs should select principals that model standards-based leadership behaviors.

Effective principals exhibit a style of leadership that is cognizant of the social elements within schools (Fullan & Hargreaves, 2012). Rogers wrote of the school leaders’ responsibility to facilitate the social processes of trust and safety in a school setting in a manner conducive to the group experience (as cited in Smith, 2011). The development of effective collaborative leadership called for a greater awareness of how other people responded to problems and to situations (Senge, 2006). Leading without a keen awareness of others diminishes the ability to lead. These leadership behaviors and dispositions reflect the underlying concepts of the constructivist approach.

**Justification of Study**

This study investigated principals’ Stages of Concern regarding change and was based upon the need to understand the processes that principals implemented when attempting innovations in their administrative practices. The advancement of society requires a better understanding of principals’ difficulties in managing change so that quality innovations and school reforms successfully prevail. This process involved investigating the Stages of Concern of standards-educated school principals who have facilitated change and their Levels of Use of innovations that they have initiated. This study sought to understand principals’ concerns as they affected their ability to manage
change and to improve capacity-building within the school. The principal’s role as change agent and collaborator are pertinent to the discussion of change.

An in-depth picture of principals’ change processes was presented through the demographic survey, the Stages of Concern questionnaire, and the Levels of Use interview process. The Stages of Concern data provided insight into each principal’s individual concerns regarding the implementation of change as well as the group’s predominate Stage of Concern. Data from the demographic survey, the Stages of Concern questionnaires, and the Levels of Use interviews were used to describe factors that were problematic for principals when initiating change. The subsequent focused Levels of Use interviews provided a more thorough understanding of each participant’s behavior relative to the use of an innovation.

Many educational leadership programs are based upon the standards developed by the ISLLC standards (CCSSO, 2008). Louisiana is one of 44 states that base their educational leadership standards on the ISLLC Performance Expectations and Indicators (Louisiana Administrative Code, 2011). These guidelines expound the importance of building educational programs founded upon a principles-based accountability system and seek to maximize the achievement and success of all students through accessible quality education (CCSSO, 2011). The CCSSO describes the underlying assumptions that support the goal of educational accessibility as: (a) the development of educational programs that prepare students to be ready for college and a career; (b) the recognition that school performance should provide supports and interventions for the neediest students; (c) the use of data-based educational programs and interventions to insure meaningful actions; and (d) the cultivation of school-wide innovation and reform. This
current study focused on the CCSSO assumption regarding the cultivation of innovation management. Innovation and continuous school improvement depend upon principals as successful leaders of change.

The NASSP (2007) advocates the ISLLC standards as the guiding framework for secondary principal leadership development. The NAESP standards describe what elementary principals should know and be able to do as successful leaders of learning communities. These six standards state that educational leaders should: (a) focus on the learner; (b) develop the affective and cognitive aspects of learners; (c) ensure rigorous and relevant curriculum; (d) base decisions and progress on relevant data; and (e) advocate for community partnerships (NAESP, 2010). The concepts of vision, capacity-building, school context and culture, and school accountability are embedded within effective school leadership standards and are some of the dominant foci of innovators and change agents.

Innovation and continuous school improvement depend on principals as successful facilitators of change. Hoachlander et al. (2001) argued that standards were vital for clarification; however, it could not be assumed that these principles of change were the driving forces of action. Standards-based educational leadership programs and professional development training prepare principals to be cognizant of their role as change agents. An investigation of the factors that hinder principals who are knowledgeable of leadership standards may potentially benefit principal leadership training programs.

The goal of the final research question was to provide more in-depth information about how principals managed change and built capacity within their schools. Even
though these principals were knowledgeable of standards-based leadership practices, it was beneficial to understand how they promoted knowledge-sharing and collaborative leadership within their schools. The answers gained from this research question may benefit principals' professional development, leadership mentoring programs, and school leadership networking.

Harris and Townsend (2007) stated that the existing pressures from accountability policies and the top-down structure of reform measures called for a new approach to change and innovation. Many educational leadership programs and leadership professional development activities are standards-based and prepare school administrators to be cognizant of their role as change agents. From an opposing view, Hoachlander et al. (2001) challenged that standards were vital for clarification; however, it could not be assumed that these principles of change were the driving forces of action. Darling-Hammond (2010) contended that the accountability system promoted by the American educational system had produced students who achieved less-than-average success on the international rankings of reading, science, and math. Will standards-based leadership preparation programs merely lead to mediocre educational leaders in the same way that the standards-based educational reforms have thrust the U.S. school systems toward an educational decline? As many variables are involved in school success, numerous practices and ideas are relevant to successful school leadership. Investigating the factors that hinder principals' efforts to implement change in this era of high accountability may potentially benefit principal leadership training programs.

Networking and collaborating are two catchphrases used in current educational leadership writing. The principal as a distinct, go-it-alone leader has gradually been
displaced by the principal-as-networker. Networking has produced unique tensions (Evans & Stone-Johnson, 2010), but has increasingly been recognized as fundamental to the systems-focused leadership necessary for today’s complex problems (Fullan, 2001; Senge, 2006). The principal, as the school’s primary change agent, has encouraged collaboration and knowledge-sharing. A school culture characterized by learning and collaboration presented novel administrative practices and is vital to change, innovation, and effective school reform (Leone, Wamimont, & Zimmerman, 2009). Fullan (1991) explained that before systemic reforms could be realized, the principal must first reflect upon his or her understanding that change begins with self.

In his discussion of a sustainable future, Senge (2009) suggested the need to advance change proactively. Fullan (2001) explained that change can be led, but not controlled. A limited, imprudent view of the future stifled the innovative, collaborative opportunities extant in school systems. Sparks (2009) believed that quality school reform resulted when educational leaders were effective change agents. Leadership development that considers both the affective and behavioral dimensions of a school leader may offer a broader training experience. The answers gained from the research questions in this study may inform principal professional development, leadership mentoring and networking programs, and school collaboration. From the constructivist’s perspective, Bruner (2004) proposed that individuals become their unique selves as a result of the stories they tell about themselves. He stated, “...the culturally shaped cognitive and linguistic processes that guide the self-telling of life narratives achieve the power to structure perceptual experience...” and thus, “...we become the autobiographical narratives by which we ‘tell about’ our lives” (p. 694). This exhortation encourages the discussion about
innovativeness and the perspective of principals as decisive change agents in a time of sustained educational growth.

Limitations

Most of the current educational leadership programs and professional development activities are based on leadership standards. Principals are aware of the rapid advancement of technology and exponential growth of knowledge, as it is often cited in news articles, current literature, and experienced in daily life. Since some of this study's data were from a self-reporting survey, principals with an awareness of their responsibilities as change agents may have responded in a manner unrealistic of their actual day-to-day leadership.

Although the Stages of Concern questionnaires and the Levels of Use interviews were conducted with principals who had received standards-based leadership training, it was also necessary for these principals to voluntarily respond to the request for participant involvement. Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007) stated that within a target population, volunteer research participants tend to provide biased responses. For the purposes of this study, the volunteers were more likely to be progressive in their responsibilities as agents of school change and reform.

It is commonly considered that the culture of a school district often prevails over the authentic leadership values of an individual principal. Consequently, another type of sample bias may have occurred when a principal participant desired to act as an agent of change, but his or her decision-making was hindered by the stagnant, antiquated authority of district supervisors. These principals may have responded either as change agents or as principals acting within less desirable organizational constraints.
The research topic, the survey, and the interview tools reaffirmed the importance of the principal’s responsibility to lead change and innovation. Although this was a mixed-methods research study and not a true experiment, the Hawthorne effect may have resulted from the participants’ knowledge of the value of change. Gall et al. (2007) explained that this condition concerns a study’s ecological validity and its generalizability to different environmental conditions. Lastly, the participants were principals from north Louisiana; therefore, they may not represent principals from other areas of Louisiana or greater metropolitan areas.

**Definition of Terms**

1. **Capacity-building** describes school leadership that creates an environment supportive of teaching and learning. The principal is deliberate and informed when implementing school improvement initiatives and professional learning activities for the staff (Hallinger & Heck, 2010).

2. **Collaborative leadership** is when actions toward school improvement are school-wide and shared among the principal, teachers, and others. The school organizational structure encourages the empowerment of school staff and student. Decision-making, accountability, and student learning are shared responsibilities (Hallinger & Heck, 2010).

3. **Concerns-Based Adoption Model (C-BAM)** is a model conceptualizing change that was created by the Research and Development Center of the University of Texas (Hall et al., 1979).

4. **Implementation** is the real use of an innovation.
5. **Innovation** for the purposes of concerns-based research is the generic term used for a situation that is the focus of the concerns study.

6. **Levels of Use of the Innovation (LoU)** is a component of the C-BAM (Hall et al., 1979). This interview-based procedure is used to describe an individual’s behavior as their familiarity and skill with an innovation are increased (see Appendices B and E). The eight Levels of Use identified are: (a) Level 0-Non-Use, (b) Level I-Orientation, (c) Level II-Preparation, (d) Level III-Mechanical Use, (e) Level IV A-Routine, (f) Level IV B-Refinement, (g) Level V-Integration, and (h) Level VI-Renewal.

7. **Second High Stage Score** is the identification of the second highest stage score.

8. **Stages of Concern (SoC)** refer to a comparative level of affective experience or skill toward the implementation of an innovation by an individual that is determined through the Stages of Concern questionnaire (see Appendices A and D). The Stages of Concern identified by the C-BAM are: (a) Stage 0-Awareness, (b) Stage 1-Informational, (c) Stage 2-Personal, (d) Stage 3-Management, (e) Stage 4-Consequence, (f) Stage 5-Collaboration, and (g) Stage 6-Refocusing. Stages 0, 1, and 2 focus on self concerns. Stage 3 focuses on task concerns, and Stages 4, 5, and 6 focus on impact concerns.

**Summary**

This research may add to the literature on how principals act as agents of change and support standards-based leadership programs and professional development activities. The explanations supply evidence regarding principals as they advance collaborative school environments, develop school cultures of learning and knowledge-sharing, and promote school capacity-building. A study of principals’ concerns about
change and innovation may provide an increased understanding of the change process in
the educational setting.

The research questions were developed to better understand the daily practices
and activities that principals used to implement change. The principal has become the
chief school facilitator of change. Rogers (as cited in Smith, 2011) explained that in terms
of group and organizational leadership, the leader was initially responsible for creating
group norms that promoted trust and well-being. His position supported Vygotsky’s
socially constructed nature of learning and leadership (as cited in Seaman & Gingo,
2011) and Fullan’s (1991) holistic description of the principal’s leadership role.

This study focused on principals’ concerns regarding change and how they
implemented their unique innovations. Principals had the opportunity to apply the
processes of change on a daily basis throughout the school year. The C-BAM was used
during the school spring term to assess and measure change. Chapter two includes a
review of literature on the principal as change agent, constructivism in change leadership,
Concerns-Based Adoption Model, school culture, capacity-building, and educational
policy.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Change is pervasive in the milieu of education. School demographics are becoming increasingly diverse. Policies affecting the educational scene are continually advancing the need to narrow the achievement gap and to prepare students for careers and college in a global society. Technological progress continually changes the way a teacher presents curriculum and affects the manner in which a student learns. Although ample discussion promotes collaborative school leadership, the principal needs to be the vanguard of school change. Studies of principals may provide a better understanding of how they effectively promote innovativeness and change in their schools.

Principals promote a culture of change within their schools and are the necessary catalysts of school improvement and success for all students. Goleman (2002) explained that it is not merely one style of leadership that achieves the desired results. He believed that leaders could develop a variety of leadership styles in order to be prepared for a range of situations. A more recent study investigated measures of successful school leadership (Mulford, Kendall, Edmunds, Kendall, Ewington, & Silins, 2007). For many years, successful school leadership was identified by the various processes put in place by the principals. In contrast, current accountability and policy-driven educational reforms promote the use of student outcomes as the critical criteria of success in contemporary
leadership. Mulford et al. argued that the definition of successful school leadership should consider more than the academic and cognitive aspects of educational outcomes. They used the Tasmanian Successful School Principalship Project (SSPP) to support their study of a broadened critique of successful school leadership. Citing the U.S. context, Mulford et al. explained that local, national, and international standardized test scores provide convenient data for comparison and analysis, but do not support success school leadership in what education values most. Australia, as does the current educational trend in the U.S., expects students to be prepared for citizenry in a global society. Social and affective aspects of education are vital components of successful schools and should be studied together with academic and cognitive measures; therefore, Mulford et al. investigated successful school leadership from this broader perspective.

The researchers gathered surveys from 131 school principals and 494 teachers from secondary and elementary schools in Tasmania for the SSPP study (Mulford et al., 2007). The surveys focused on decision-making, demographics, capacity-building, leadership characteristics, values and beliefs, tensions, and perceptions of school success. The SSPP developed a measure of social success to gauge the non-academic aspects of school success and the Tasmanian Department of Education provided student test results for the cognitive research component. The results of this study only weakly supported a link between school success measures and principal characteristics; however, the success measures had a strong relationship to school capacity (Mulford et al.). The authors concluded that contemporary measures of successful school leadership were too narrowly stipulated.
The principal effects change over the various situations that arise within the school context, but as Hallinger and Heck (1998) pointed out, a reciprocal effect exists. The characteristics that portrayed the principal as a change agent were varied and depended greatly upon the school context. The history and current context of schools motivated successful principals to apply a variety of strategies that are socially, culturally, and globally sensitive (Day, 2007). Unless a more complete understanding of the diverse characteristics that enable a skillful principal to successfully manage change are known, it is unlikely that overcoming roadblocks to implementing change will be achieved. This chapter consists of a literature review for this research. Six themes guided this literature review: the principal as change agent, constructivism, educational policy, school culture, collaboration, and capacity-building. A primary and secondary source literature review was carried out through the Academic Search Complete database using the keywords and terms: constructivism, educational leadership, change leadership, innovation, collaboration, capacity-building, and demographic influences.

The School Principal as Change Agent

The term change agent was used in the mid-1970s by Schein to describe the practices and skills needed by the human resource manager. During this era, management roles were shifting and new knowledge necessitated a fresh view of the human resource manager function (Schein, 2010). The National Training Laboratory (NTL) also wrote of change agents during the 1950s as they studied group dynamics and leadership (Smith & Lemming, 2011). Smith and Lemming associated the term change agent with Lewin’s theory of experiential education because he believed leaders could motivate a group toward change, and then advance the change through a series of choices. Attributes of
change agents required systems thinking and the ability to effectively convey a shared vision to stakeholders (Schein). Educational leadership theory is replete with ideas that originated in the world of business; therefore, it was only a matter of time before the responsibilities of a school principal would call for an agent of change.

Although educational leadership incorporates many fundamental concepts of modern business leadership, Senge (2006) acknowledged that organizations were in a position previously never experienced throughout history. Never before have decisions made by individuals and organizations affected others in remote places. New educational standards recognize the need to prepare U.S. students for a global society; however, education has continued to be one of the nation's challenges to its economic growth and global competitiveness (U.S. GOA, 2007). Innovation and change management are critical to the well-being of a knowledge-based economy; therefore, it is imperative that principals help prepare students for a continually unstable and flexible environment. Principals are needed to prepare students for a world that they have not yet learned to manage themselves.

How does one manage change and instability when the only constant is change? Day (2007) explained that the skills and talents characterizing principals of improved schools were not readily discernible. Day's case study of one female principal in a low-performing, inner-city primary school in England illustrated that persistent change and progress were a consequence of multiple and complex occurrences. This successful principal exhibited the ability to adjust her leadership practices to the varied needs of the school. Over a seven-year span of administration her interactive style of leadership led to a four-phase progression of school improvement. The principal's focus of improvement
throughout each phase was contingent upon her awareness of the school’s specific contextual needs. Day concluded that successful educational leadership was a non-linear application of non-discrete, yet influential leadership strategies. This study illustrated the fluid, context-relevant characteristics of a successful school leader discussed by Fullan (2001). She was able to face persistent pressures and challenges by working with school staff (a) to raise expectations for success through improved school environments and teaching, (b) to encourage students’ future-oriented view of life, and (c) to increase students’ motivation and self-confidence toward success. Day’s case study did not reveal specific strategies for a static school environment; inversely, it did confirm the complexity of improving school achievement.

Nagle, Hernandez, Embler, McLaughlin, and Doh (2006) conducted a case study research project of 13 high-poverty, high-performing, rural elementary schools in Delaware, Maryland, and Pennsylvania that exhibited effective successful special education practices. The purpose of the study was to identify the successful practices of principals and teachers in the unique setting of rural schools serving high numbers of special needs students. The initial data were gathered by multiple researchers from classroom observations and in-depth interviews to provide added vigor and insight. After the preliminary qualitative data analysis, the researchers carried out a cross-case analysis of the interview and observation data. The cross-case analytic framework produced four themes of effective school characteristics: (a) academic success and availability of general education curriculum to all students; (b) collaborative and established school community; (c) effective school-community partnerships; and (d) efficient use of resources that support special needs students (Nagle et al.). The results of this study
supported the impact of principals’ administrative practices on student success in settings with a high number of special needs students relevant to shared vision, collaboration, use of resources, and relationships. Successful principals, as agents of change, exhibit administrative characteristics sensitive to the needs of each unique school setting and student population.

Outcomes-based measures may have polarized the identification of key school factors and leadership characteristics extant in successful schools (Coppieters, 2005). In a study of the theory of learning organizations, Coppieters explained that knowledge-sharing and organizational learning were germane to the dynamics of organizational change because they acknowledged its complexity, holistic nature, and unpredictability. The organizational nature of school environments was non-linear and often entailed new, uncharted territory; therefore, learning within this new context was important. Organizational learning may have been context-specific or driven by educational policy; thus, leadership heavily influenced by learning was regarded as a necessary change in education (Moller, 2007). Isolating factors of improved schools does not fully account for differences in context or explain the vibrant forces of change.

Knowledge-sharing and organizational learning were revealed in a number of ways. Shared vision, professional development, networking, learning communities, lifelong learning, and high expectations disclosed the reciprocal, interactive qualities of learning as well as supported the concepts of systems thinking and shared vision discussed by Senge (2006). Although the concept of learning would seem an immutable point in educational leadership, numerous standards of educational leadership reinforced learning as fundamental to the role of the principal and school improvement (CCSSO,
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Schein (2010) argued that sooner or later someone would have to be responsible to interpret new data and problems that emerged. This position supported a basic belief that learning was an inherent part of organizational leadership and change.

For leaders to stimulate change, Senge (2006) stated they need to increase their learning of systems-thinking and seeing into the future. He asserted that leaders talk of interdependency without an adequate knowledge of what that really means. He further suggested that it is necessary to understand relationships within a school as a responsibility of global citizenry and a prerequisite of change. As schools are heralded to prepare students as global citizens, it is expedient for principals to comprehend systemic patterns and the interdependent nature of education with the economy, culture, and environment. Senge explained that leaders need to be skilled appraisers of the current state of the organization and able to assess its future movement.

Marzano et al. (2005) investigated the responsibilities of successful school leaders through a meta-analysis of educational leadership literature. The researchers used the technique of meta-analysis to improve the accuracy of their findings and to produce a distinct set of guiding leadership behaviors. After considering literature written over a 35-year time span, 69 studies were identified that involved: (a) K-12 students; (b) schools in the United States or schools with similar cultures; (c) studies that directly or indirectly examined the relationship between the principals and student academic achievement; and (d) effect sizes in correlation form (Marzano et al.). The authors reported that the average correlation extracted or computed from the 69 leadership studies was .25.

Of the 21 school leadership responsibilities identified by Marzano et al., (2005) several addressed principals who exhibited qualities conducive to change.
implementation. The authors described a change agent as a leader prepared to disrupt the balance of a school. The principal as change agent directly spoke of a principal who was a willing and active innovator and disciple of change. Additionally, the responsibilities of intellectual stimulation, focus, flexibility, optimizer, and situational awareness characterized a principal who stayed informed of current educational knowledge, clearly articulated school goals, exhibited adaptive leadership styles, guided the school through new and challenging innovations, and was keenly aware of issues and information that affect the school (Marzano et al.).

**Constructivism in Change Leadership**

Early constructivists wrote about the environment’s influence on the learner. The theory of constructivism undergirds the reciprocal nature of learning and change. Murphy, Elliott, Goldring, and Porter (2007) reviewed the literature on successful school and school district leadership. Murphy et al. argued that components of successful leadership were not random; rather, effective leadership was shaped by the school leader’s personal characteristics, values and beliefs, and leadership behaviors that supported school, classroom, and student success. Leadership for learning required many abilities, each dependent upon the school context and needs. Murphy et al. characterized these abilities as eight major dimensions: (a) vision for learning; (b) instructional program; (c) curricular program; (d) assessment program; (e) communities of learning; (f) resource acquisition and use; (g) organizational culture; and (h) advocacy. An effective principal focused upon changes relevant to the school’s core concerns in curriculum, teaching, and assessment, as well as the organizational aspects of the school. The school’s vision, instructional program, and organizational culture reflect the
constructivist view of a school leader as learner who is influenced by the internal and external context of the school environment.

Although the ability of a principal to create a shared vision is crucial, it is imperative that the stakeholders concur on the direction and content of change (Fullan, 2001). School values and educational mission should be agreed upon by all stakeholders and be guided by the demands and conditions placed upon the principal by the external and internal forces of the school (Murphy et al., 2007). The value of shared beliefs, effective communication, and personal relationships resonated throughout the responsibilities of principals (Fullan; Marzano et al., 2005). The principal and stakeholders creating a shared vision as a facet of change illustrates the constructivist approach.

Elkind and Flavell (1969) described the acquisition of knowledge within the framework of Piagetian theory. In their study, the developmental levels and cognitive modalities of the learner affected the individual learning processes. Just as Piaget believed that teachers should be mindful of the learner’s developmental level and cognitive modalities, it would be beneficial for principals to have an awareness of the teachers’ concerns regarding innovations. This understanding affects the kinds of innovation implemented, as well as the types and scheduling of professional development.

In Gutierrez, Field, Simmons, and Basile’s (2007) study of principals’ knowledge management within school-community partnerships, the meaning-making concept underlying constructivism was evident. The authors held a multi-session Partner Principal Institute involving 23 school principals who were collaborating with two universities
during the 2004-2005 academic year. With the goal of improving principals’ management of knowledge, participants discussed various indicators of human capital and identified the components of “...growth, renewal and innovation, efficiency and utilization, and risk and stability” (Gutierrez et al., p. 337). Although these components were described as imprecise measures of human capital, they stimulated the conversation between partner principals to become better managers of accessible information and to identify potential problems relevant to their school context. Gutierrez et al. indicated that the principal was responsible for creating value from the knowledge capital that resulted from school partnerships.

The management of information is an inherent component of knowledge construction. The principal is expected to provide relevant knowledge to school staff through professional development opportunities (Fullan, 2001; Leone et al., 2009). In a case study comparison between two types of instructional leadership during times of school improvement initiatives and reform, Burch (2007) explained that in the market model, information was a vital factor in stimulating school change and motivating school principals. In contrast, the polis model of instructional leadership reflected the manipulation of information that was incomplete and polarized. During the 2003 academic year, interview, observation, and document data were gathered from 59 staff members within three high-poverty school districts to better understand how the instructional leadership of school administrators informed their everyday administrative responsibilities. The results of this qualitative study revealed that a larger percentage of schools followed the market model indicating that these school principals prioritized knowledge management as an important dimension of their administrative
responsibilities. The study also supported Senge’s (2006) concept of systems-thinking as these principals considered the sharing of data as an important aspect of their school improvement.

Understanding the Stages of Concern during the implementation of change relates to Gardner’s (1983) concepts of personal intelligences. Gardner’s intrapersonal intelligence originated with one’s internal awareness of pain and pleasure. As a person’s intellectual competence improved, so did his or her interpersonal intelligence. This growth resulted in an increased attention outward that attended to the personal characteristics and motivations of others. An awareness of the personal needs and issues of others was a responsibility that assisted effective principals as they carried out their many duties (Marzano et al., 2005). Changing the culture of the school is an overarching goal of the principal as a collaborative leader (Fullan, 1991). With this notion of constructivist learning in mind, principals become aware of personal concerns regarding change. Furthermore, they become cognizant of teachers’ concerns regarding innovations in light of their own personal feelings, drives, and intentions.

The Concerns-Based Approach

C-BAM was initially drawn from the pioneering research of Fuller regarding teachers’ concerns about innovations (Fuller, 1969). The qualitative data provided by Fuller’s in-depth studies revealed the problems and anxieties of preservice and inservice teachers. Her research led to an understanding that concerns were developmental in nature and not a direct result of a specific teacher training program. With this discovery, Fuller offered three developmental phases of concerns: pre-teaching phase (non-concern); early teaching (concern with self); and late concerns (concern with pupils).
During the late 1960s, Fuller documented similar concerns for teachers and professors involved in change (Hall, George, & Rutherford, 1998). With this observation, a hypothesis was developed that reflected concerns in a developmental, logical progression. Ultimately, seven Stages of Concern were defined which serve as the basis for first dimension of the C-BAM: (a) Stage 0-Awareness, (b) Stage 1-Informational, (c) Stage 2-Personal, (d) Stage 3-Management, (e) Stage 4-Consequence, (f) Stage 5-Collaboration, and (g) Stage 6-Refocusing (see Appendix A).

The second dimension of the C-BAM is the Levels of Use (see Appendix B). This measure involves a specifically defined interview procedure that focuses upon the individual’s performance relative to his or her use of an innovation (see Appendix E). The Levels of Use protocol identifies eight levels as: (a) Level 0-Non-Use, (b) Level I-Orientation, (c) Level II-Preparation, (d) Level III-Mechanical Use, (e) Level IVA-Routine, (f) Level IVB-Refinement, (g) Level V-Integration, and (h) Level VI-Renewal. The Stages of Concern, in conjunction with the Levels of Use data, offer a powerful tool for understanding the forces at work upon an individual throughout the change process.

Several suppositions underpin the C-BAM. Initially, individuals prioritize and show greater or lesser interest to the various aspects of their surrounding environment (Hall et al., 1998). The prioritizing of these internal and external stimuli is dependent on each person’s personality and characteristics. An individual’s history, make-up, and knowledge create a unique response to a given issue. This uniqueness is the basis of different kinds of concerns. Concern about something is a condition of mental excitement or stimulation and is either positive or negative in nature. Importantly, the person’s arousal is based upon perceptions, not necessarily his or her reality. The degree of
intensity of arousal varies according to the individual's proximity and involvement with the innovation. The movement of intensity across different types of concern appears to be in a logical pattern; however, this progression cannot be stimulated by someone other than the affected individual. Individual interventions may be developed based upon the recognition of concerns; however, it is critical to understand that it is the individual who ultimately exhibits a willingness to change.

The Change Agent and Educational Policy

The current agenda of high accountability in education presents a range of leadership challenges never before addressed in global education (Day, Sammons, Hopkins, Leithwood, & Kington, 2008; Yin, 2010). Yin detailed the school-level developments for which school leaders were responsible based on the current, rapidly changing educational environment. Furthermore, he explained that the current wave of educational reform called for strategic leadership that was context-specific and responsive to rapid changes. Yin conceptualized education as first-class, accountability-driven, and decentralized.

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law (P.L. 107-110) of 2001 and the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 2010 provide the major policy agendas for the American educational system. Through the NCLB law of 2001 and its reauthorization, all students in the U.S. have access to effective education and to the opportunity for advancing toward college and career readiness. Standards state that educational leaders are responsible for shaping the teaching and learning culture of a school in response to current policies (CCSSO, 2008; NAESP, 2010).
Policy and accountability issues have presented educational leaders with opportunities for trust-building and collaboration. Supportive principal-teacher relationships have provided the collaborative structure that has encouraged an intrinsic motivation toward a results-driven educational system (Noddings, 2006). On the other hand, Noddings explained that these same issues of high accountability, such as the stipulation of rewards and punishments, may have lured extrinsically-motivated educators and leaders toward unethical practices. Toward this notion, Starratt (2001) expressed that educational leaders must restrain behaviors of self-indulgence, envy, and intolerance, and instead exhibit a demeanor of integrated maturity and composure. To more comprehensively address a principal’s underlying motivation for decision-making, Begley (2004) viewed the concept of ethics as one component of a leader’s values-making process. Fullan (2001) explained that leaders can have mixed motives and be quite effective. Hence, viable, sustainable changes in a school culture of accountability require the principal to balance the mandated policy initiatives and reform objectives with the ideals and purposes of the school context (Evans & Stone-Johnson, 2010; Noddings).

Policy and initiatives may act as motivational forces or hindrances to school improvement. The educational systems of other countries have not been without their reform and restructuring efforts; therefore, whatever the national context, policy has existed as an external antecedent of educational leadership efforts (Day et al., 2008). A goal of current educational initiatives and reform is to prepare students for their global citizenry. Similarly, relevant educational leadership research and training may help to support principals in the global context of school leadership.
Day et al. (2008), through a mixed-methods research design, studied the impact of various models of school leadership upon student achievement in England. Some underlying assumptions that guided this study were the effects of administrators' personal traits, as internal variables, and the administrators' experiential and professional development activities, as external variables, upon their leadership practices. The data were gathered through a three-phase process with equal consideration given to both the qualitative and quantitative areas of the study. National data sets of student attendance, achievement, and behavior provided an extensive range of leadership contexts. The information gathered from the national data sets guided the school selection process and reduced the initial 1,591 primary and secondary schools that responded to questionnaires to a sample of three groups of schools. Twenty school administrators and key staff members were selected to participate in the in-depth interview process. Day's study reinforces that current regulatory mandates and accountability frameworks pose challenges beyond school administrators' existing responsibilities of guaranteeing balanced curriculum, effective behavior management, and quality resource management.

Policy also addresses the accountability issues of student achievement, teacher performance, and school structures. Leithwood et al. (2008) claimed that school leaders achieved sustained changes only when negotiated within a school's relevant contextual framework of accountability policy. The optimizer, as a principal responsibility described by Marzano et al. (2005), has the opportunity to create positive emotional overtones that encourage others during innovation and change. Consequently, when new educational policy is handed down, the principal creates an environment more receptive to innovation and to change by empathizing and responding to the feelings of his or her teachers.
Marzano et al. (2005) explained that in the local context, effective school policy provided the everyday scheduling, routines, and structures that created an orderly learning environment. For their meta-analysis, order was a principal responsibility defined as the degree to which a leader sets forth basic rules for operations and routines (Marzano et al.). Accordingly, the principal was the primary educational leader accountable for establishing fertile ground for educational innovations receptive to national or local policy initiatives. An important responsibility of an educational leader is to determine if policies and performances are aligned to learner-focused teaching and adequately support quality professional development opportunities (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011).

Fullan (2001) described an effective leader of change as a slow learner who carefully absorbed important information about the school context and situation. In their review of school reform models, Fleischman and Heppen (2009) stated that no one reform sufficiently addressed the complex needs of low-performing schools. Implementation of change, they concluded, was a decisive factor of successful school reform efforts. The principal responsibilities of flexibility and situational awareness described a school leader who promoted school reform through an adaptive leadership style and sensitivity to the specific school contexts (Marzano et al., 2005). The innovative efforts of school principals would benefit from policy-makers who consider the varied reform options and how those models affect the various school structures.

The Relevance of School Culture to the Change Process

The culture of a school district provides a framework for the culture within individual schools. Firestone (2009) described three types of district culture: (a) loosely
coupled culture; (b) accountability culture; and (c) student learning culture. The loosely coupled culture has few shared goals for teaching and learning. One school within a loosely coupled culture may be academically successful, while others may be failing. In schools with loosely coupled cultures, greater differences exist based upon race and socio-economic status. The NCLB law has fueled a school culture of accountability where student test scores are highly prioritized. Instructional methods are often dictated by policy or other factors extrinsic to the school. Firestone described a district characterized by a culture of student learning as one that implements collaboration and creates a shared vision. He furthermore stated that the student learning culture encourages the teacher as a professional. Although these cultures describe districts as entities, the district culture affects each school principal’s approach to administration.

What defines innovative principal leadership prepared to educate a global society? Goleman (2002) chose to avoid specific lists of effective school and leadership characteristics because they ignored the dynamic processes involved within educational institutions. In a commentary on the highly qualified principal, Aguerrebere, Houston, and Tirozzi (2007) challenged that idea of state-defined principal qualifications. The use of state standards, years of service, or course credits potentially led to a plethora of principal leadership descriptions that lacked the depth of skill requirements essential to accomplished administrators. In support of a nationally advanced certification process to meet the needs of the national curriculum standards for students, Aguerrebere et al. explained the value of a voluntary certification process that promotes a higher degree of principal professionalism. Their idea of an advanced certification process emphasized the
need for principals to promote collaborative school cultures that increase the instructional capacity of all teachers.

Collaborative School Culture. In a school district with a culture of student-centered learning, the principal more readily incorporates collaborative administrative policies and shared vision. Importantly, the principal implements change and innovation in a thoughtful manner that values relationships with school staff. In contrast, Firestone (2009) explained that within an accountability culture driven by policy and a top-down hierarchy, the environment was less conducive to noticing the concerns incurred during change. In an article describing the Finnish approach to improving student achievement, Sahlberg (2007) argued that an alternative to consequential accountability systems could be an educational professionalism founded upon trust. Sahlberg described several global reform movements in education since the 1980s. Initially, standards-based education dominated school improvement initiatives. Later, the general global trend turned toward educational policies that stressed literacy and numeracy.

The more recent direction in education, Sahlberg (2007) explained, was the focus on accountability systems which targeted standardized assessments and evaluative practices which deemphasized other important facets of classroom practice and student achievement. Creativity and innovation characterize the Finnish educational system and are also the foci of a comprehensive education (Sahlberg). The current trend in global educational systems contradicts an educational leadership style characteristic of innovative, systems-thinking principals.

School reform movements and mandated policies may diminish the imaginative and resourceful participation of creative, energetic teachers. Therefore, principals are
responsible for reenergizing collaborative, creative school cultures. Drawing from a larger case study that investigated teacher collaboration, Levine and Marcus (2007) conducted a single case study of teachers pursuing to close the achievement gap in one west coast high school of underserved students. The metaphor of multiple trajectories was used to describe how teachers' actions were responsive in varying degrees to a range of influences (Levine & Marcus). The influential trajectories studied were collaboration, school-family partnerships, and instructional modifications for English-language learners. Although the investigation had initially noted these three trajectories as disconnected, the authors suggested that school leadership could have influenced multiple trajectories that increased the energy and productivity of teachers' collaborative practices.

Robertson (2009) explained that the personal learning experiences of school leaders influence the way in which they construct professional learning situations for their teachers. A principal may possibly have to ponder his or her own personal belief and value system prior to building an effective, collaborative school culture. For a school leader experienced in the traditional go-it-alone style of leadership, the idea of collaboration may involve an entire new methodology of leading. The author challenged the perceptions of leadership training and leadership definitions. Traditional leadership programs may fall short of preparing school administrators for an innovative, globally-focused educational system. Creatively designed leadership programs are needed to prepare principals to competently develop effective, collaborative school cultures. Innovative principals with an awareness of their school environment and a willingness to consider new paths of leadership may promote collaborative school cultures.
An analysis of longitudinal data gathered from 198 U.S. elementary schools over a four-year period was used to describe the way in which leadership contributed to school improvements (Hallinger & Heck, 2010). The authors developed four conceptual models that showed the effects of leadership upon school improvement: (a) leadership directly impacts learning; (b) leadership acts as a mediator in capacity-building; (c) school growth acts as a mediator in school change; and (d) leadership is a mutual influence process. The authors’ conclusions supported previous studies indicating the positive relationship between collaborative leadership and change in school capacity. Since longitudinal data established the significance and stability of a relationship over time, this research emphasized the importance of a principal’s effect upon student learning. The reciprocal effects model exhibited that collaborative leadership was a mediating effect upon the student achievement and improvement capacity of schools (Hallinger & Heck).

**The Principal and Capacity-Building.** Day (2007) stated that successfully implementing sustained change within a school is not an independent effort. Moreover, Stoll and Temperley (2009) explained that the creative ability of a principal to provide an environment rich in learning opportunities was imperative to change and to increase the capacity of teachers. Using a qualitative research design, these authors studied 11 school leadership groups and one local authority team in south-west England to better understand how school leaders promoted creativity in their schools. A variety of data from surveys, interviews, and documents were gathered between September 2006 and February 2008 to inform the research question of how to define creative leadership. Their project-based inquiry provided both principal and teacher reflections on some fundamental aspects of creative leadership. Three broad categories of creative leadership
were identified through this research: (a) innovative curriculum; (b) capacity building; and (c) broad use of data (Stoll & Temperley). The authors explained that creative leadership for modern principals, however, is not a random or arbitrary process, yet could be deliberately developed and nurtured. The principal’s responsibility of creative leadership is non-linear and futuristic, yet remains focused upon core values.

Harding (2010) argued that principals must develop creative thinking, so that they may, in turn, increase the future leadership capacity of others. He suggested that students must be taught how to imagine change and to behave creatively so that they are prepared for the global society which looms ahead. This innovative notion called for educational leaders to proactively provide the required instruments and training (Harding). In other words, many have reflected in a creative manner, but few have learned to translate creative ideas into action. Moreover, it was a responsibility of principals who aimed to meet the needs of a complex society to instill creativity in others and to allow room for that creativity to flourish. A comprehensive awareness of school context, social conditions, and relationships was realized within creative leadership.

Although a principal may have recognized the need to increase the teachers’ capacity and to enrich the school’s environment through professional development, Gilson’s (2008) research noted that much of a principal’s time was spent with student discipline and classroom management issues. The author surveyed 332 principals of secondary schools in Iowa to quantitatively analyze how principals spent their time. The survey was generated from a research of previous literature on principals’ time management. Eleven critical issues were generated from this literature review and served as the basis for the survey questions. Most of the voluntary participants were white male
principals who had been in their positions at least 15 years. Most of the respondents served in small high schools with almost 50% receiving free or reduced lunches. The school’s percentage of reduced or free lunches potentially affected the amount of time that a principal dealt with management issues rather than instructional leadership issues (Gilson). Although planning and preparing professional development that supported instruction was vital to school improvement, almost 89% of the respondents indicated spending less than 30% of their time weekly preparing for these activities.

When Gilson’s (2008) final survey question asked principals which of the Iowa Standards for School leadership (ISSL) took most of their time, nearly 60% of the principals responded with the third standard that described organizational leadership. The majority of respondents indicated that a principal’s effective facilitation of teaching and learning was of utmost importance; however, many lamented that educational policy and other roadblocks inhibited that goal. Gilson concluded that school administrators should pay focused attention to issues that have an enduring effect. Day (2007) explained that enhancing the capacity of teachers did pay long-term dividends and led to the sustainability of change that would otherwise been hindered. Mentoring relationships may provide needed time management assistance for novice principals.

The ability to discern the emotions of teachers and staff is an essential skill for principals as successful agents of change (Fullan, 2001; Moore, 2009). Moore’s review of literature on school improvement identified dealing with emotions as a common theme and an important attribute of skillful leaders. Emotional intelligence was defined as the ability to understand one’s own emotions and the emotions of others. The emotions that were invariably intertwined within the processes of change and school reform were often
related as feelings of frustration (Fullan; Hargreaves, 2004). When the capacity of teachers is enhanced during the change process, their motivation and enthusiasm are increased.

Principals that value the capacity-building of their school staff increase their potential to innovate, change, and respond to school reform in a positive manner. Leithwood and Beatty (2009) suggested that school leaders should have been keenly aware of teachers' emotions since their leadership practices directly or indirectly affected student achievement and learning. They noted that teachers' feelings of empowerment, professionalism due to quality learning opportunities, and self-efficacy, or capacity-building, were affected by leadership behaviors (Leithwood & Beatty). Successful principals developed a school capacity that encouraged effective communication and the effectual implementation of change (Fullan, 2001; Gurr, Drysdale, & Mulford, 2006).

Capacity-building was an important component of Ylimaki, Jacobson, and Drysdale's (2007) findings from research on high-poverty schools in the USA, Australia, and England. The authors found that teachers in demanding schools benefitted from serving under principals who were more creative with a dearth of resources. Along with their creativity, determination, and motivation, these principals were characterized as emotionally aware of the hardships caused by impoverished conditions. Although the principals from these three countries approached capacity-building in various ways, each supported their teachers in a manner that enhanced instructional practices and led to school improvement despite the challenging conditions.

The research of MacNeil, Prater, and Busch (2009) supports the positive effects that leaders have on the culture of a school. Principals enhance their schools when they
increase their focus on learning and improve their school and community relationships. Principals, as change agents, who realize the importance of school culture increase teacher motivation and produce environments for improved student learning (MacNeil et al.). Additionally, the principal’s decision to lead a school rather than manage is vital to organizational culture and to student success. Louis and Wahlstrom (2011) warn that the efforts of school leaders as change agents may be hindered by the urgency of the problems dealt with on a daily basis.

**Demographic Influences upon a School**

Fullan (2006) stressed the importance of context to school leadership. He explained school leaders must be knowledgably aware of their particular context and exert deliberate influence over that context. Furthermore, Fullan explained that for conditions such as collaboration and capacity-building to be successful, the overall school organization must be able to change. An astute school leader could change the context of a school through the calculated creation of learning opportunities and staff capacity-building. Sergiovanni (2000) argued that it was essential to understand and act upon what changes should be prioritized and what changes should be relinquished. Therefore, principals may benefit by understanding that change is not a stopgap solution or simplistic reform, but an enduring mindset.

Duke, Tucker, Salmonowicz, and Levy (2007) studied the assumptions of ten elementary school principals and nine middle school principals in high-poverty, low-performing schools who had participated in the initial phase of the Virginia School Turnaround Specialist Program (VSTSP). The guiding research question of Duke et al. was whether certain perceived situations within low performing schools received more
attention from newly assigned principals over other perceived situations. These perceived assumptions of principals potentially shaped their leadership style. The first stage of data analysis identified five clusters of conditions that received the attention of principals: (a) students' academics and behaviors, (b) school programs and organization, (c) school staff, (d) school system, and (e) school community (Duke et al.). The second stage of analysis reduced the qualitative data to 24 conditions believed by one or more principals to impact low school performance. The data gathered from the principals' interviews support principal preparation programs that provide both context-relevant training, contingent upon comparable perceived conditions, as well as some general training, based upon a certain level of generic conditions. Their study suggested that context is an important component of principals' ability to innovate and to change and should be duly considered in educational leadership training.

Kelley, Thornton, and Daugherty (2005) explained that effective school leadership is essential since leadership is inexorably linked to the school context. Their study of 31 principals and 155 teachers investigated the relationship of a principal's prioritized leading style, the teachers' perceptions of the principal's leadership style, and the teachers' perceptions of their school's climate. The researchers used the Staff Development and School Climate Assessment Questionnaire by Zigarmi and Edeburn (1980) to evaluate the six measures of communications, innovativeness, advocacy, decision-making, evaluation, and attitudes to staff development. Their study was conducted at small rural schools with an average enrollment of between 100 and 650.

The results indicated a significant positive relationship between the perceptions of teachers regarding their principals' effectiveness scores and the six measures of school
climate; however, the teachers’ perceptions of the flexibility scores of the principals were negative (Kelley et al., 2005). The results suggest that principals lack the ability to analyze effective, competent leadership.

Summary

The concepts of school context, high-stakes accountability and policies, capacity-building, collaboration, leadership standards, and demographic influences are central to the discussion of educational change and innovation. Learning demands change, thus change is ubiquitous in nearly every facet of education. Change leadership signals the need for school leaders who are adeptly cognizant of the unique qualities and situations of their individual schools. Furthermore, the current, pervasive demands of a globalized society challenge principals to a heightened level of innovative and systemic organizational prowess. The principal, as an agent of change, is in a pivotal position to construct a school environment ready to learn, to adapt, and to innovate through collaboration and increased capacity.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Purpose

Principals with standards-based educational leadership training have a foundation of change and innovation management in schools. Even though principals may support change, various factors cause them concern. As principals implement innovations, they exhibit differing individual Levels of Use (LoU) of the innovation. The purpose of this study was to investigate the Stages of Concern (SoC) that school principals have toward change and then report participants’ behaviors relevant to their Level of Use of an innovation. The following research questions directed the study:

1. What are principals’ top three concerns related to change?
2. What are principals’ predominate Stages of Concern?
3. Are there relationships between principals’ Stages of Concern and their years of service?
4. Are there relationships between principals’ Stages of Concern and the percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch in their school?
5. Are there relationships between principals’ Stages of Concern and school size?
6. Do principals’ Stages of Concern affect their ability to manage change and improve capacity-building within the school?
Research Design

This study was carried out as a mixed-methods research design. Gall et al. (2007) explained that the complementary aspects of mixed-methods offer increased insight into a phenomenon. Quantitative methods were used for measuring relationships by means of statistical data analysis, whereas qualitative methods were used to better understand the social and behavioral aspects of the participants. The qualitative portion was appropriate for this study because it was an investigation of the concerns of principals regarding the implementation of change in their leadership roles. This study also provided descriptive data about the principals and their schools, so that in combination with the qualitative data, it further informed the body of knowledge on change leadership.

A demographic survey informed the first research question (see Appendix C). This survey questioned principals about their familiarity with and utilization of standards for educational leaders, their top three concerns regarding change in their school, and their years of administrative service. The individual and group scores from the Stages of Concern questionnaire informed the second research question (see Appendix D). The researcher converted the individual participant’s raw scores from the Stages of Concern questionnaire to percentile scores to determine his or her highest stage. The raw scores from each Stage of Concern for all participants were then averaged and converted to percentile scores to illustrate the predominate Stage of Concern of the group (see Appendices F and G).

The third, forth, and fifth research questions were informed by analyzing the relationships between the Stages of Concern data and the demographic data of the principals (see Appendix H). The variables of principals’ years of administrative service,
percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch, and school size were entered on
a correlation matrix to determine whether a relationship existed with the seven Stages of
Concern. The final research question was informed by narrative interviews and guided by
the principal’s top concerns regarding change implementation, demographic data, and
Stages of Concern data.

Prior to initiating the study, the researcher provided project information to the
human subjects committee and was subsequently granted permission to conduct the
research (see Appendices I and J). A cover letter accompanied the Stages of Concern
questionnaire that explained the context and purpose of the study to the participant (see
Appendix K). A Human Subjects Consent form (see Appendix L) provided by the
Louisiana Tech University Research Department was included in the packet that
explained the human-rights compliance information, the procedures, and the confidential
nature of the participant’s responses. The publishers of the C-BAM instruments granted
permission for the use of the Stages of Concern questionnaire and the Levels of Use
interview protocol prior to the project (see Appendix M).

The Stages of Concern questionnaire introductory letter (see Appendix N)
explained the purpose of the questionnaire, the directions for filling in the Likert scale,
and the definition of the term “innovation” to the participant. A code was placed in the
upper right corner of the introductory letter to expedite data management and to confirm
the receipt of the surveys. The cover letter explained that after the survey was returned to
the research the code would be cut off and discarded.

During the spring 2011-2012 school term, descriptive data were gathered using
the demographic survey (see Appendix C). These data included questions about
participants' years of administrative service, gender, age group, education level, and questions relating to their specific innovation. Free and reduced lunch data were obtained from the Louisiana Department of Education (http://www.doe.state.la.us/dag/) (see Appendix H).

The Stages of Concern questionnaire is used to collect data about principals' concerns regarding change on an 8-point Likert scale (see Appendix D). The Likert-like scale elicits participants' responses on a scale of 0 to 7, with (0) as Irrelevant and (7) as Very true of me now. The Stages of Concern questionnaire is a 35-item survey tool that measures the C-BAM Stages of Concern: (a) Stage 0- Awareness, (b) Stage 1- Informational, (c) Stage 2-Personal, (d) Stage 3-Management, (e) Stage 4-Consequence, (f) Stage 5-Collaboration, and (g) Stage 6-Refocusing (see Appendix A).

The Levels of Use is a generic, focused interview process that was conducted subsequent to the demographic survey and the administration and analysis of the principals’ Stages of Concern questionnaires. The eight Levels of Use are: (a) Level 0- Non-Use, (b) Level I-Orientation, (c) Level II-Preparation, (d) Level III-Mechanical Use, (e) Level IVA-Routine, (f) Level IVB-Refinement, (g) Level V-Integration, and (h) Level VI-Renewal (see Appendix B). It is generic in the sense that the interviewer asks questions relevant to each principal's particular innovation (see Appendix E). Hall, Dirksen, and George (2006) described the interview process as a branching technique. The interviewer first determined through open-ended questions whether the participant was a user or non-user. Subsequent questions determined the respondent’s extent of implementation of the innovation.
Participants' responses on the Levels of Use interview were rated to determine their particular Level of Use of an innovation. Additional interview questions were based on the individual participant's responses to the demographic survey and the Stages of Concern questionnaire. The interview responses informed the researcher about the behaviors of participants as they increased in their use of an innovation.

Instrumentation

Demographic Survey. The first phase of this study was a demographic survey sent to principals in seven northern Louisiana school districts (see Appendix C). This survey elicited the individual principal's demographic information, top three concerns regarding change, and an innovation of focus for the Stages of Concern questionnaire.

Stages of Concern Questionnaire (SoCQ). The second phase of this research implemented the Stages of Concern questionnaire (see Appendix D). The Stages of Concern questionnaire was constructed upon the strategy of a quick scoring pencil and paper survey (Hall et al., 1998). The authors developed the 35-item questionnaire from the initial 195 question pilot survey that was conducted in 1974. The Stages of Concern data provided raw scores and percentile scores. During a one-week test-retest study conducted by the authors, six of the seven stages had estimates of internal consistency with coefficients above .70 (p<.01). Previous longitudinal data supported the overall conclusion that the Stages of Concern questionnaire reliably and validly measures Stages of Concern about an innovation.

Hall et al. (1998) developed the percentile scores as a result of a Stages of Concern study conducted in 1974 using 830 participants. The percentile scores had an internal reliability ranging from .64 to .83 for the seven stages. The percentile scores
compare the relative intensity between the Stages of Concern for each individual. A higher percentile score suggests greater concern at a particular stage. Percentiles are not absolute; therefore, they are not used to compare stages among individuals. The authors recommend averaging the raw scores and then referring to the percentile table (George et al., 2006).

The Stages of Concern questionnaire was used as a diagnostic tool to focus on the feelings, thoughts, and needs of individuals involved in change (Loucks, Newlove, & Hall, 1998) and recognized that individuals prioritize their experiences in unique ways (George et al., 2006). The authors noted that although the C-BAM was developed in the mid-1970s during an educational movement defined by product innovations and expected outcomes, its applicability continues in the current age of high-stakes accountability and systemic school change. The Stages of Concern questionnaire was used in this study to survey school principals’ Stages of Concern regarding the implementation of change as a part of their regular administrative duties.

Levels of Use of the Innovation (LoU). The final phase of this study utilized the Levels of Use of the Innovation, a generic interview protocol (see Appendix E). The semi-structured interviews were developed in accordance to the Levels of Use protocol and were focused on each principal’s unique responses to the demographic survey and the Stages of Concern questionnaire. The branching technique guided the interviewer to ask questions based on the previous responses of the interviewee. Each narrative was rated according to the Levels of Use criteria: (a) knowledge, (b) acquiring information, (c) sharing, (d) assessing, (e) planning, (f) status reporting, and (g) performing (see Appendix O). Lastly, the interviewer assigned an overall Levels of Use rating.
Participants and Setting

The researcher initially contacted participants through the snowball or chain sampling strategy (Gall et al., 2007). Communication was made with three administrators who served in school leadership positions. Two of these contacts responded with a total of 12 school principals that they considered suitable for this study. The third contact did not respond. To increase the number of participants, the researcher then used the strategy of typical case sampling. Gall et al. defined typical case sampling as a group of participants that are representative of the average of the experience being studied.

The researcher contacted superintendents in 10 northern Louisiana school districts. A study description and a Stages of Concern questionnaire was provided to each superintendent (see Appendix P). Seven of the superintendents consented to the research request, two denied request, and one did not respond. The two superintendents that denied access to the researcher expressed that their principals were too busy with testing, end-of-year activities, and new policies to participate in a survey. Demographic surveys were sent by electronic mail to all the school principals of regular pre-kindergarten through 12th grade schools in the seven parishes for which contact permission had been granted. Surveys were not sent to the principals of alternative schools. One principal was not contacted due to an extended sick leave. Three surveys sent by electronic mail were undeliverable due to invalid addresses that resulted from position changes or school reconfigurations. One principal declined sharing his electronic mail address. Out of 119 electronically mailed demographic surveys, 110 were successfully sent to 110 principals. To improve the rate of response, the researcher sent the initial demographic survey and then followed up with three reminder requests. There was a zero response rate from
principals in one parish to which access had been allowed. Of the remaining parish
principals contacted, there was an overall 37% response rate, ranging from 19% in one
parish to 67% in another parish.

Since the research questions were not specific to any certain school configuration,
principals of all the regular pre-kindergarten through 12th grade schools were considered
potential participants. A total of 30 principals from six northern Louisiana school districts
that served as principals during the spring 2011-2012 term responded to the demographic
survey. To ensure their suitability to this study, the principals were asked whether they
were familiar with educational leadership standards or had participated in standards-
based leadership training. Each of the 30 principals was then sent a Stages of Concern
questionnaire packet. From the Stages of Concern questionnaire participants, a random
sample of six principals was selected for the Levels of Use interviews.

Data Collection

Initially, the demographic survey was used to collect descriptive data, evidence of
experience with educational leadership standards, and top three concerns of participants.
Next, the Stages of Concern questionnaires were sent via regular postal service to the 30
respondents of the demographic survey. The Stages of Concern questionnaire had a 97%
response rate. Lastly, six participants were randomly selected for the Levels of Use
interviews. To obtain the random sample, the Stages of Concern questionnaire code
numbers were written on individual cards and turned so they could not be identified. The
cards were then mixed so that they were not in numerical order. Random selection was
achieved by placing all 30 cards in a row and every third card pulled. Thus, the sample
group consisted of 10 cards (interview candidates), of which six were needed to conduct
interviews. The additional four cards were selected to use if one of the initial participants
drawn was unavailable for an interview. The first four contacts came from the first four
cards pulled. Cards 5 and 6 were unavailable for interviews; therefore, participants
represented by cards 7 and 8 were used for the interviews.

Data Analysis

The top three concerns of the 30 participants were copied verbatim from the
demographic survey, distributed, and then read by the researcher and two volunteer
raters. One rater was familiar with the project and the other was not. The individual raters
independently read the concerns and created a category for each individual concern. Each
rater counted the frequency of each category. Once the raters had independently
categorized and counted the frequencies of the top three concerns, they discussed the
categories and reached consensus.

The scoring of the Stages of Concern questionnaires involved two steps: (a)
determining raw scores (see Appendix F) and (b) finding the percentile rank for each
score in a table (see Appendix G). The Stages of Concern questionnaire data were hand
scored using the quick scoring device (see Appendix Q). For this 35-question survey,
each of the seven Stages of Concern was represented by five questions. If a respondent
left a question unanswered, the average of the answered items for that stage was used in
its place.

Each participant’s percentile scores for the seven Stages of Concern were placed
in a table where his or her highest stage scores were identified and circled (see Appendix
G). When two scores for one Stage of Concern were within one or two points of each
other, both were circled, representing a tie of the participant’s highest stage. The
participants' raw scores for each of the seven Stages of Concern were averaged and then changed to percentile scores according to the Stages of Concern instrument to find the group’s predominate stage. The demographic survey provided principals’ years of service and school configuration. The Levels of Use interview narratives were rated to determine the participants’ behaviors regarding their level of use of an innovation.

Summary

This mixed-methods research study was conducted with the voluntary participation of pre-kindergarten through 12th grade principals serving in north Louisiana public schools. A demographic survey and two dimensions of the C-BAM facilitated gathering data. The Stages of Concern questionnaire was used to provide raw scores and percentile scores. These scores supplied individual as well as group data regarding the Stages of Concern. The Levels of Use interview protocol was used to collect information about the behaviors of participants relevant to their level of use of an innovation. The interviews provided in-depth information regarding the demographic influences of principals’ concerns regarding change and further supported the constructivist perspective of educational research.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Chapter 4 presents the results and analysis of the study. This study investigated principals' concerns regarding change and how they implemented their unique innovations. The results and analysis were organized around each research question. The data were collected in three phases. Initially, principals participated in a demographic survey. The principals that responded to the demographic survey were sent the Stages of Concern questionnaire. After the Stages of Concern questionnaires were returned, six principals were randomly selected for the Levels of Use interview protocol.

Research Questions

The research questions that guided this study are:

1. What are principals’ top three concerns related to change?
2. What are principals’ predominate Stages of Concern?
3. Are there relationships between principals’ Stages of Concern and their years of service?
4. Are there relationships between principals’ Stages of Concern and the percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch in their school?
5. Are there relationships between principals’ Stages of Concern and school size?
6. Do principals’ Stages of Concern affect their ability to manage change and improve capacity-building within the school?

The demographic survey was used to elicit each principal’s top three concerns regarding change when carrying out his or her administrative duties (see Appendix C). The directions of the demographic survey did not instruct the principals to prioritize their top three concerns; therefore, their comments were considered of equal concern. The demographic survey elicited the top three concerns of principals, gave voice to each school principal’s individual definition of the construct of innovation for the subsequent Stages of Concern questionnaire, and created a link to the Levels of Use interview process. All principals have been given alias names for the section describing the results of the demographic survey.

**Principals’ Top Three Concerns Related to Change.** Three raters independently read and assigned category names to the top three concerns of the 30 respondents to the demographic survey. All three raters identified acceptance of the innovation, or buy-in, as the most frequent concern. The raters had independently defined the terms innovation and buy-in as synonymous descriptions of people who would agree to, or be willing to participate in the innovation. Four of the principals included the community and all stakeholders in their concern for buy-in. Sally, a junior high school principal, stated her concern as, “Teacher buy-in on the new innovations. Something is only as good as what you put into it.” Teachers’ acceptance of the innovation, resistance to the change, and the reception of the faculty were included in this category. Teachers’ comfort level, feelings, and morale regarding change concerned three principals. One principal was particularly concerned about the presentation of the change. Josie asked,
What is the best method for presenting implementation to staff for positive buy-in and what supports will be needed to assist teachers in the early stages and throughout to sustain program[s]?

The second most frequent concern mentioned by principals was the resource of funding, or the availability of money. One elementary principal with nine years of experience questioned, “As always, change many times requires the commitment of funds. Are they available?” Luke, an elementary principal of seven years, lamented that there is a, “financial burden that comes or may come with these changes.” A high school principal also noted the dearth of funding. “Money!!! Many innovative ways of teaching require money which is at a premium in most public schools.”

The principals’ third highest concern regarding change was the resource of time. Recognizing this resource as naturally limited, one principal expressed her concern as,

Time restraint for teachers...teachers work hard and their job is never finished.

There is always something to do, so when a change demands more of the teacher’s time, I feel as if I need to do whatever possible to help make that change easier.

Four principals discussed professional development and training in the context of time. The same high school principal that described the premium of money for school projects was also concerned about the “…time to actually inservice and train teachers on how to use new technology.” Winston, an elementary school principal, noted that time for professional development was a concern.

Some principals had concerns that were unique and not as frequent as the top three concerns. Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007) explained that the voice of the dominate
culture is often assumed to be the prevailing consideration. As well, the demographic survey was not for the purpose of presenting instrumental rationality (Gall et al., 2007) or reaching a specified end or predetermined list of concerns. With this in mind, the comments of principals that did not fall within the most frequently counted categories were briefly described.

Florence was concerned that, “Some of the changes mandated by the state are given without enough information for us to follow up with the faculty.” Vern questioned, “Will it [the innovation] make a difference in the child’s education?” “Do the promised results justify the increase in work load and stress to the faculty and students?” voiced Roy’s concern. Russell, a high school principal, was concerned about the results. He was uncertain of how to express disappointment “…when the changes did not produce the anticipated results.”

State policy and mandates concerned several of the principals, whereas central office support was the concern of another principal. “The longevity of the program these changes will bring,” concerned Don, a middle school principal. Moreover, he stated, “If these changes are political, will future politicians drop changes for other new education programs? This has been a trend for years and years in education.” Linda, an elementary principal with 20 years administrative experience, was also concerned about the, “constant changes from the state.”

“Identifying the highest priorities which need to be addressed,” concerned Alton, an elementary school principal. He explained that, “Staff has their own perceptions of needs based on their individual situations. Identifying needs based on school-wide issues needs to be considered.” Another elementary school principal wondered whether the
proposed change would disrupt existing programs that are already a part of the school improvement plan. Although the state’s newly adopted educational reform package affects a broad range of education issues, it was noted as a concern of only one principal.

**Principal Stages of Concern.** The Stages of Concern questionnaire data were used to inform the second research question. A frequency count of principals’ predominate Stage of Concern was developed by counting the number of participants who had their highest score at each stage. Stage 0, Awareness, was the group’s predominate Stage of Concern with a total of 14 principals, or 47%, of the total number of participants. The second highest stage, with a total of 5 principals, or 17%, was Stage 1, Informational. When the raw scores were averaged and converted to percentile scores, Stage 0, Awareness, was at 91 percentile and Stage 1, Information, was at 80 percentile (see Appendices F and G).

**Principal Stages of Concern and Their Years of Service.** The goal of the researcher was to investigate whether there was a relationship between principals’ length of administrative service and any of the seven Stages of Concern. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the descriptive data provided by the participants. The data were analyzed using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient and were used to create a correlation matrix. The correlation analysis revealed that a significant positive relationship existed between Stage of Concern 3, Management, and years of administrative service, $r(30) = .32, p < .05$ (see Table 1). All other correlations with years of service were not significant and thus were not discussed.
Principals' Stages of Concern and Free and Reduced Lunch. The correlation analysis showed that a significant positive relationship existed between Stage of Concern 6, Refocusing, and free and reduced lunch, $r(30) = .37, p < .05$ (see Table 1).

Principals' Stages of Concern and School Size. The correlation matrix informed the researcher that no significant relationships existed between the seven Stages of Concern and school size. The analysis did reveal that a negative relationship existed between school size and the percentage of students in the school receiving free and reduced lunch, $r(30) = -.52, p < .05$ (see Table 1). All other correlations were not significant and thus were not discussed.
Table 1

Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Free and Reduced</th>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>School Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free and Reduced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>62.31</td>
<td>19.59</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Service</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Size</td>
<td>461.30</td>
<td>260.48</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoC 0</td>
<td>15.53</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoC 1</td>
<td>21.83</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoC 2</td>
<td>22.37</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoC 3</td>
<td>19.73</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoC 4</td>
<td>24.43</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoC 5</td>
<td>25.03</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoC 6</td>
<td>17.97</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>.37*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $N=30$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$
Principals’ Stages of Concern, Change Management, and Capacity-Building.

The Levels of Use interview protocol is a tool that measures the interviewees’ behaviors regarding the implementation of an innovation along a continuum of use (see Appendix E). The eight levels are: (a) Level 0-Non-Use, (b) Level I-Orientation, (c) Level II-Preparation, (d) Level III-Mechanical Use, (e) Level IVA-Routine, (f) Level IVB-Refinement, (g) Level V-Integration, and (h) Level VI-Renewal (see Appendix B) (Hall et al., 2006). After the interview narrative was transcribed and member-checked by the interviewee, the researcher rated the responses according to the criteria on the Levels of Use rating sheet (see Appendix N). The individual nature of each principal’s innovation of concern and top three concerns created a link between the demographic survey, the Stages of Concern questionnaire, and the Levels of Use interview.

Levels of Use Interviews. The researcher conducted the Levels of Use interviews in person, at the principal’s school site, with a digital recorder. The principals were first asked to review their top three concern regarding change that they had provided on their demographic survey. Next, each principal described the innovation that he or she had considered when completing the demographic survey and Stages of Concern questionnaire. For the remainder of the interview, the Levels of Use basic interview protocol provided by Hall et al. (2006) was followed (see Appendix E). These ensuing interview questions asked about the strengths and weaknesses of the innovation, the collaborative efforts of the principal, the effects of the innovation, and the future plans for the use of the innovation. The recorded interview was transcribed and electronically mailed to the interviewee as a member check later that same day. After the researcher reviewed the narrative, it was rated according to the C-BAM Levels of Use rating sheet.
(see Appendix N). The following narratives referred to the participants with an alias to maintain their anonymity.

**Interview #1.** With one year of administrative experience as a principal, and ten years as an assistant of the previous principal, Ellen served in a prekindergarten through 5th-grade school. She had been abruptly moved into her position due to the unexpected departure of the previous principal. Her school served 403 students of which 83.9% participated in free and reduced lunch. She had achieved her master's degree plus 30 additional education credits and had participated in approximately 40 hours of professional development during the year.

Ellen expressed her top three concerns when attempting to implement change in her school: (a) How will the change improve the overall learning process of the student body, (b) How does the staff feel about the changes and will they properly implement the changes, and (c) Will proper training and assistance be provided during the implementation of the program?

*Levels of Use Interview Narrative.* Ellen’s innovation was parental involvement as a means toward school improvement. “I basically try to get parental involvement, because we have to communicate between home and school. If we can’t get involvement, we can’t achieve some of the goals we have in mind.” Ellen’s first concern related to the school’s overarching goal of increasing student improvement. She described her parental involvement program as parent workshops for iLEAP, LEAP, and GEE testing. “We had little turnout on some…but at least we put it out there and offered.” Ellen explained that the parents need to know about the state standardized testing and be informed about grade-level activities. She indicated that some of the parental involvement activities had
never been done at the school prior to her principalship. A Drug Abuse Resistance Education program (D.A.R.E. America, 2012) had been initiated during her administration. A graduation at the end of the program was a strategy to stimulate parental involvement.

The primary effect that Ellen hoped to experience from the parental involvement program was increased communication between the school and the parents. "Trying to improve the students’ education and their social skills," summed up the purpose of the program. Another goal was to communicate to parents about the new CCSS so that, "all the parents can be aware of what's going on, to help their child so it won't be so hard on the teachers." Furthermore, she yearned to reach out to parents by, "trying to get them more involved to help the children so that they will be more serious in their education."

The students enjoyed their first ever field day. Ellen indicated that evidence of the students’ approval and feedback came through their enthusiasm and excitement.

When commenting about the changes she planned to make to her program, Ellen expressed that she expected to continue the same parental involvement activities throughout the next school year. Although undecided about specific changes to the program, Ellen reflected on the potential changes when asked about the strengths and weaknesses of the program. After considering the program’s weaknesses, she explained,

The main parents that need to be here are the ones that didn’t come. The cycle of the stronger students have more parental involvement than the weaker continues. It takes a lot to get them. We’ve tried different things, but we just can’t seem to get them here. We invited them and even when the children have behavior
problems or they have problems with their homework and not doing their homework, the teachers have to call.

Collaboration with other principals had provided Ellen with examples of diverse parental involvement programs. She expressed that her communication with others assured her of the potential benefits of her program. Ellen had continued to gather new information about the innovation. She explained that teacher websites were a great source of helpful information. Ellen said that she used this feedback to improve her program. She offered that other principals had benefitted from listening to her parental involvement experiences.

Ellen was anticipating growth of the parental involvement program during the next school year. She explained that she hoped to invite parents to the school “So that we can go over the rules and regulations of what the students are supposed to do, so they can’t say, ‘well, I didn’t know about whatever’” She was encouraged to implement this idea by another principal who thought it was a profitable suggestion, but personally had not done it that way. “We just need to come up with a way to get those parents who really need to come to come.”

As Ellen elaborated about her future plans for the innovation, she expressed some uncertainty. Ellen and the assistant principal had considered how the student discipline situation could affect the parental involvement program. She described an ineffective in-school suspension program and anticipated a change of staff in that classroom. After explaining that behavior problems are of concern at her school she said, “So we’re contemplating having after-school detention. Children would just have to stay until the parents came, so I guess it’s just kind of like forcing them to participate.”
Ellen had concerns about the feelings of the staff and the way they implemented the parental involvement program. She elaborated on these concerns as she discussed her future plans for the innovation. “I’ve tried to have the teachers on each grade level to come in and give input on the things they would like to do... to improve the child’s education. So we have little group meetings.” Ellen explained,

I want them to meet as a grade level and as a subject area every three weeks so we can discuss kids who are falling behind. This way we can come up with something to try to help them every third week. It will give them time to work on it before the end of the six weeks.

“The strength of the innovation would be the way it helps the students,” explained Ellen. She then revisited the weaknesses of the program by explaining that some teachers returned to the classroom without doing the strategies that had been discussed and agreed upon. Ellen stated,

And you have some teachers that are weaker than others and are not implementing like they should. But like I said, this last year was a learning experience for me so this year I have in my head that we’re going to have a better year than we had last year. It wasn’t that bad last year, but a lot of things I was a little lenient on because I was first coming in and I didn’t want to say, “My way, or no way.” But this year coming up, I plan to be a little tighter and get the teachers a little more involved and hold them accountable, because we’re all accountable.

In her attempt to improve teacher responsiveness and follow-through, Ellen turned to her third concern on the demographic survey which focused on professional
development. "Will proper training and assistance be provided during the implementation of the program?" When discussing this matter, she described the assistance she gave her teachers in terms of a wish list. Ellen encouraged the teachers to let her know their requirements for their job. "Whatever you feel that you need, you may not get it, but I'll do my best. I even ordered some things that they didn't ask for because we're here for the children."

_Stages of Concern Scores_. Ellen's highest stage score was Stage of Concern 0, Awareness, with a percentile of 96. This score described Ellen as either a typical nonuser of the innovation or having little concern about the innovation. Concerns are characteristically developmental in nature (George, Hall, & Stiegelbauer, 2006). With this in mind, it is typical that her second highest score was Stage of Concern 1, Informational. However, since Ellen was leading her innovation, the highest Stage 0, Awareness, score may appear to be an anomaly. The inconsistency alluded to evidence of Ellen's predominate concerns and beckoned further investigation. The Levels of Use interview provided depth to the respondent's Stages of Concern and use of the innovation.

_Levels of Use Interview Rating_. The Levels of Use rating sheet was used to determine Ellen's overall Level of Use of the innovation. She had initiated the parental involvement program during the first year of her principalship. The Levels of Use interview was conducted at the end of the first year of implementation. The Levels of Use was used to rate the areas of knowledge, acquiring information, sharing, assessing, planning, status reporting, and performing based upon specific interview questions. The initial question identified Ellen as a user of the innovation; therefore, the subsequent
questions were used to rate her Level of Use of the innovation. The interview branching
technique informed the interviewer whether the respondent was working with others at a
Level V, Integration, or the lower Levels III, Mechanical Use, IVA, Routine, and IVB,
Refinement. Ellen’s responses supported her level of collaboration below Level V,
Integration. Ellen was rated at Level of Use III, Mechanical Use, for knowledge,
assessing, planning, status reporting and performing. The area of sharing was rated as
Level IVA, Routine. She collaborated with others, but made no reference to ways of
changing its use. Level of Use III, Mechanical was Ellen’s overall rating. The behaviors
of an individual at Level III, Mechanical Use, are operationally defined as,

State in which the user focuses most effort on the short-term, day-to-day use of
the innovation with little time for reflection. Changes in use are made more to
meet user needs than client needs. The user is primarily engaged in a stepwise
attempt to master the tasks required to use the innovation, often resulting in
disjointed and superficial use. (Hall et al., 2006)

Stages of Concern and Levels of Use Summary. Demographic data and the Levels
of Use interview narrative provided a reliability check on the Stages of Concern
questionnaire. Ellen initiated the innovation of parental involvement during the first year
of her principalship. During the interview, she confided that she had been too lenient
during her first year as a school principal and planned to tighten up during the upcoming
year. She explained that she had to adjust to a sudden learning curve since she had been
unexpectedly thrust into the position with the resignation of the previous principal. These
comments supported Ellen at Stage 0, Awareness. She was a user of the innovation,
although she had intense concerns about other tasks and initiatives besides parental involvement.

Ellen explained her adjustment to her new position and the teachers' adjustment to her leadership. Demographic data and Levels of Use interview data supported her secondary high score at Stage 1, Informational. Because Ellen had just finished her first year as a principal as well as her first year of the innovation, her concerns were primarily substantive in nature. This corroborated that her primary focus was on the structure and function of the innovation (George et al., 2006).

The Levels of Use interview provided depth to the Stages of Concern data and suggested that Ellen's highest Stage of Concern was Stage 1, Informational, rather than at Stage 0, Awareness. Based on this information, her second highest stage was either at Stage 0, Awareness, or Stage 2, Personal. Hall et al. (2006) suggested that when Stages 1, Informational, and 2, Personal, are also high, an inference can be made that the respondent wanted to learn more about the innovation. High scores at Stage 1, Informational, supported Ellen's Level of Use III, Mechanical. Ellen explained that she was learning all that she could about the innovation with the goal of improving the teachers' implementation of the parental involvement program.

**Interview #2.** With five years of administrative service in a prekindergarten through 5th-grade school, Gloria participated in approximately 50 hours of professional development yearly. The school enrollment was 378 and 83.3% of the students received free or reduced lunches. In Gloria's first year as principal she realized that, "There were things that needed to change, but you can't do all that at one time." When listing her top three concerns on the demographic survey, Gloria explained that she did not consider just
one program or entity. She described her concerns: (a) The pace of implementing changes. Everyone is not ready at the same time. I adjust based on the teacher’s comfort level and urgency for the students, (b) Support from Central Office, and (c) Funding to support required changes for programs and professional development.

*Levels of Use Interview Narrative.* Gloria’s innovation focused on teacher professional development. When reflecting on her personal professional development experiences, she exclaimed,

I hate sitting there and listening to something that doesn’t apply to me. If it’s a strength for me, and we all have to go do it, then you can maybe take one thing away from it. Whereas you could have taken 15 if it was something that you needed.

Accordingly, Gloria wanted to have appropriate professional development for her teachers. “But we are very interested in doing observations and providing the appropriate feedback so that we can get professional development for the teachers in exactly what they needed.” She had been hopeful that her school could participate in the TAP program (Teacher Advancement Program), because it was her preferred model of professional development. She explained that Professional Learning Communities and additional support were two benefits of TAP.

Gloria was disappointed when the majority of her teachers voted against the TAP model; however, she understood that everyone progresses toward change at an individual rate. Gloria explained that, “I do a lot of reading as well; so I knew what was coming from the state with our value added.”
When discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the innovation, Gloria related her concern for individual teachers and change. “Not everyone is ready at the same time.” She was willing to adjust the pace of changes for her teachers and explained, “So you just have to take a breath and as all these new things come in you have to not do a ‘told you so’ at the same time.” The comfort level of teachers and urgency for students concerned Gloria. She discussed the difficulty regarding the teachers’ comfort level toward change, then stated,

So you have to mature in that aspect and sometimes it’s hard, especially when you knew that’s what you really needed. So now we have to do it anyway without the additional coaches and incentive pay that we would have gotten through the TAP program. We could have used our Title I funds with that. So we just have to change and go a different route.

The lack of time was another weakness of the professional development program. Gloria already had plans to reduce paperwork for the fall. “I’m not a paper person… but I can do it on the computer.” Combining the time deficit with the teacher’s individual readiness for change, Gloria restated her desire to “run at a faster pace than what I’m allowed with my staff.”

Gloria believed that the strength of their professional development program was the way it met individual needs through the use of technology.

So I want to be able to use my iPad to do my observations and email them their [teachers] feedback instantly. Whether the State has that ready or not, we have that capability through the PD 360 Tool and the Observation 360 where we can do
an observation based on our form and then they can go in and select videos to watch that will meet their professional development needs.

When explaining her perspective on educational issues and future changes to the program, Gloria commented,

The State has given us the CCSS, so that's pretty much all of what they're going to have to do, but the teachers know pretty much that nothing is going to stay the same from year to year with me.

Furthermore, Gloria did not encourage her teachers to become too comfortable with their classroom assignments. “It kind of keeps them on their toes, keeps them ready. I don’t like them to get settled.”

Principal-teacher collaboration was important to Gloria. She expected improved communication to result from the professional development program. Although close collaboration was important, she felt that as a principal, “you’re kind of on your own little island.” Teachers had the opportunity to communicate with Gloria in the hallways, the classrooms, and via a suggestion box. She realized that some of the suggestions in the box were emotionally charged. “I know some of it’s going to be raw material. They were upset or something like that.” Even though the suggestions could have been submitted anonymously, she reminded teachers that, “I need to be able to communicate that with you. I need to be able to say, ‘Ok, what exactly did you mean about this type of implementation of a program?’” Gloria promised her staff that she would not be easily offended. She explained, “I have the perspectives of 47 adults in the building; secretaries, paras, and teachers to draw on. Everybody sees the school from their points of view. And if I don’t listen to that, then I don’t know my school!”
Gloria’s communication and collaboration with others was not limited to the school level. She described her support from the central office as diverse and contrasted her personnel director with her superintendent. Her personnel director understood her enthusiasm and desire to grow; however, she believed the superintendent considered her inconsistent and “jumping from one thing to another.” She furthermore explained, “I think that the personnel director understands me and he knows that it’s all a logical process.” In further contrast she described the personnel director as a “data-driven person” and the superintendent as “a social person.”

I have a director…a supervisor for Title I. She was a former principal, so that’s wonderful. So her approach is, “if you have a problem, let me know. I’m not going to come in and tell you what to do.” My director was a principal. She knows.

The third concern on Gloria’s demographic survey related back to her initial disappointment of not getting teacher support for the TAP program and also answered the question about her plans for her collaborative effort in the future. “We could have funded our bonuses and things like that. I have still not let that go. That is still in my mind.”

Undaunted by the lack of support, Gloria indicated,

It's just that when you believe in something and you know that 40% of your teachers want it too. The rest will come on board later. I do like to run at a faster pace than what I'm allowed with my staff, but it keeps the peace by slowing down.

Gloria worked beyond the school district and beyond her initial relationships in the use of her innovation. This response provided a decision point for determining
whether to progress to the Levels of Use V probes. Gloria responded that she had, indeed, worked with others beyond her first contacts. "We did have a consulting firm come in. They kind of assisted us in getting through and helped me become aware of that immediate feedback and how important that was."

*Stages of Concern Scores.* Stage 3, Management, was Gloria’s highest Stage of Concern with a percentile score of 88. Her second highest was Stage 2, Personal, with a percentile of 85. Gloria’s scores supported that her most intense concerns were with managing the innovation. Her scores also suggested an individual who was very concerned about the personal effect of the innovation and who passionately believed the innovation could be carried out differently.

*Levels of Use Interview Rating.* The Levels of Use rating sheet was used to determine Gloria’s overall Level of Use of her on-going professional development program. Following the branching technique (Hall et al., 1998), the interview proceeded from the Levels of Use III, Mechanical Use, IVA, Routine, and IVB, Refinement, to Level of Use V, Integration, based on the Gloria’s responses about collaborative-based innovation and changes. The areas of knowledge and acquiring information were rated at Level IVB, Refinement. Sharing, assessing, planning, status reporting, and performing were each rated at Level V, Integration, which provided an overall Level of Use V, Integration. The behaviors of an individual at Level V, Integration, are operationally defined as, "State in which the user is combining own efforts to use the innovation with the related activities of colleagues to achieve a collective effect on clients within their common sphere of influence" (Hall et al., 2006).
**Stages of Concern and Levels of Use Summary.** Gloria’s stage scores supported her intense desire toward change and innovation communicated through her Levels of Use interview, but thwarted by the teachers’ majority vote of no on her desired program. During the interview, Gloria’s dialog supported the high Stage 3, Management, due to her intense focus on the processes and tasks of quality professional development as well as the best use of the information and resources that she gathered. She was also strongly focused about her role in the innovation which supported her second highest score at Stage 2, Personal.

The interview narrative supported Gloria’s overall rating of Level of Use V, Integration. She passionately described how she originally wanted her school to be involved in the TAP program. However, when the majority of teachers were not ready for that particular model of professional development, Gloria expended great personal effort to draw together an alternative model. The goal of the professional development program was an effective program for all of her teachers.

**Interview #3.** Lauren had served five years as a high school principal. She had attained a master’s degree in education and had participated in approximately 30 hours of professional development yearly. Lauren’s high school housed grades 7 through 12; therefore, it was configured as a combination junior high and high school. The student enrollment was 326 with 29.8% of the students receiving free or reduced lunches.

Since the passing of a property bond, the school’s temporary buildings were being replaced by new construction. The environment had a feeling of revitalization. As Lauren discussed her concerns regarding innovation, it became evident that she had capitalized on this configuration as a powerful venue of continuity in learning and experience.
Lauren described her top three concerns regarding innovation and change: (a) Time restraints for teachers...teachers work hard and their job is never finished. There is always something to do, so when a change demands more of the teacher’s time, I feel as if I need to do whatever possible to help make that change easier, (b) Often changes result in costs, and (c) I want to make productive and essential changes in my school and not just change to have change.

Levels of Use Interview Narrative. Changing from a seven-period class day to an eight-period class day was the focus of Lauren’s concerns regarding innovation. She explained, “It isn’t going to add any time to our day. We are shortening our periods five minutes, taking off time in-between classes, and starting just a few minutes early.” Although the new schedule was going to take effect at the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year, Lauren and her staff had been closely involved in its preparation. Lauren explained the strengths and potential benefits of the innovation.

It is to improve junior high school performance scores, junior high student achievement, actually. And so by doing that, by going to an eight period day, every student will have the opportunity, or will be required, to take two math classes a day, because they already have an English class and a reading class. So they will have two math periods per day. So we feel like that will definitely help. And in high school it will help us be able to offer more electives for areas of concentration and it will also help the top students to be able to take more AP and dual enrollment classes.

The weaknesses of the innovation were already being addressed. Lauren described the primary weakness as buy-in. “I feel like we’ve done a good job selling it to
our faculty already, but it’s just going to be if the outcome is what we expect...what we’re hoping for.” Lauren explained that the high school students are already sold on it, “...because they are at such a greater advantage with being able to take more classes, the dual enrollment or recovery.” The challenge was with the junior high students understanding that, “…overall two math classes will be important, beneficial.” Lauren and her staff took a proactive approach to selling the innovation. “We have met with the students. We have presented PowerPoints. We spoke with faculty members. We announced all of those. We met with every group, basically.”

Lauren was aggressively searching for any information about the innovation. She explained that she had avidly read about the innovation and had visited another school district that had been using the eight-period class schedule for several years. This information enabled her to discuss the innovation with her staff, parents, students, and other administrators. She explained that information was gathered on various scheduling options.

We actually gave three different options for schedules and let the teachers vote, trying to get their input. One [schedule] was starting late, one was going late, and one was just tweaking things that we already had in place. And that has seemed to go really well as far as faculty buy-in.

The teachers’ acceptance had been a recurrent concern to Lauren. “I want the teachers to feel that they have a say-so in it. It will not be successful if they don’t, and so I’m looking for teacher buy-in.”

Lauren shared her enthusiasm about the innovation with others. She regularly collaborated with other principals about the innovation. Optimistically, she commented,
"We share and talk about the opportunity we have to hopefully increase student achievement in junior high and we also share the advantages for high school students."

When asked about plans for evaluating the program effectiveness, Lauren stated,

> What we will be doing, and of course just about everything now is based on assessments, will be giving nine-week assessments. The district is actually piloting that [evaluation] program as part of preparing that foundation. This revamping of our curriculum will help us meet the CCSS.

The first concern on Lauren's demographic survey involved the scarcity of time for teachers and the unfinished nature of their work. This concern provided further detail to the weaknesses of the innovation. She stated,

> We are certainly on “go” for this program. We are in the middle of preparing a master schedule. Because, understand, teachers have taught six classes and one planning period. Now they will be teaching seven classes and one planning period. And so what we're hoping to do is limit the number of preps they have, so we don't just have one person doing seven different preps. So we're working really hard on that right now...and student schedules.

Lauren was positive about the potential effects of the innovation. Although her second concern on the demographic survey was the costs resulting from changes, she did not dwell on what would be expended, but rather, focused on the innovation's prospective rewards. Closely related to her second concern was her concern that the changes would be productive and essential. She indicated that the benefits could outweigh those costs. "You know, I think change is good as long as it is productive..."
change. And I will be the first one to admit that if this doesn’t work I’ll say, ‘We’ll go back to the seven-period day.’” Lauren enthusiastically exclaimed,

I like change. I like trying new things. I like experimenting. So I was happy to be able to say, “I will do this for us!” Whether the district as a whole decides on an eight-period schedule seems to rest in the results of this school’s pilot program. If this is successful this year, and we meet our goals that we’re hoping to meet, it will not only be a pilot, or experimental thing, it will become permanent. Like I said, I feel like the other schools in [this] parish will follow suit, especially the junior high and high schools.

*Stages of Concern Scores.* Level 5, Collaboration, was Lauren’s highest Stage of Concern with a percentile of 98. Her second highest score was Stage 4, Consequence, with a percentile of 66. The demographic data and the Levels of Use interview provided depth for interpreting Lauren’s predominate concerns. Although the eight-period schedule had not been instituted in her school at the time of the interview, Lauren had management concerns that related to the innovation’s preparation and initiation.

*Levels of Use Interview Rating.* Lauren’s innovation of concern was a pilot program implementing an eight-period school day schedule. The areas of knowledge and sharing were rated at Level III, Mechanical Use, and the areas of acquiring information, assessing, planning, status reporting, and performing were rated at Level II, Preparation, for an overall Level of Use II, Preparation. The behaviors of an individual at Level II, Preparation, are operationally defined as, “State in which the user is preparing for first use of the innovation” (Hall et al., 2006).
*Stages of Concern and Levels of Use Summary.* Lauren’s Stage of Concern scores provided potential support to her enthusiasm toward their new school schedule. Although Lauren was a user of the innovation, her Levels of Use narrative described an implementation still in its infancy, hence the overall Levels of Use rating of II, Preparation. Her highest score at Stage 5, Collaboration, was supported by her interview data that described her relationships with administrators within and outside her school district. Lauren also described her collaborative effort aimed at teacher and student buy-in. Lauren responded with high scores on questions that related to gaining more information and future improvements. She commented that she avidly read about the eight-period schedule and was eager to learn how it would increase student achievement. Lauren desired student buy-in as well as the realization of the innovation’s benefits.

*Interview #4.* After eight years of administrative experience in the high school setting, Rose became the principal of a prekindergarten and 6th-grade school. Rose had received her doctoral degree in education and had participated in approximately 20-25 hours of professional development yearly. The school enrollment was 334 students with 67.1% of the students receiving free or reduced lunches. Rose expressed her top three areas of concern: (a) teacher buy-in, (b) funding, (c) appropriate and adequate professional development.

*Levels of Use Interview Narrative.* The innovation or change that was the focus of Rose’s concerns was the reconfiguration of her school. She explained,

*Basically, I was looking at the major change our parish went through last year.* Teachers, as well as administrators, were switched to different schools. Along
with that change came teachers moving to different spots and so forth. I was looking at buy-in with what was occurring at the school and adapting to change. The changes affected her personally, "And that’s what happened to me. I was high school, and I had to change my mind set to middle school." As for the teachers, Rose explained, "They need to be responsive to the needs of the middle school students versus the high school students…because they’re not quite where high school students are yet."

Rose believed that she encouraged buy-in from the teachers that remained from the previous middle school configuration. "One of the buy-ins is utilizing the teachers already here. I’m using those teachers as mentors to help us get to that type of mindset and get to doing some of those things that are successful with middle school."

Rose discussed the strengths of the innovation. She indicated that the mentor teachers were a strength of the innovation for her school such that,

The mentor teachers that I’m using, they are very, very strong in their subject areas. They are very strong in those practices that we are trying to hone in on and to improve on. So they are very good with working with their fellow teachers, and they are very good with working with me. Anything I ask them to do they are more than willing to share their expertise. So, that is very strong.

Teachers’ implementation of the reconfiguration was noted as a weakness of the innovation. Rose explained, “The other teachers knowing how to exactly put those strategies into place and making them work.” Frequent meetings provided time for collaboration and modeling. “We have monthly meetings and sometimes more than
that...we are working with our strategies and showing, ‘This works and this did not work. Let’s try it a different way this time.’”

The search for new information on the innovation was an unrelenting mantra for Rose. She reiterated her goal to change the mindset of the teachers and then added the implementation of the incoming CCSS. She explained that teams of teachers would attend professional development workshops and then redeliver to the other teachers. “We talk constantly. I think that this goes back to the buy-in, the professional development, the finances, and stuff like that because next year we are expected to do a lot with the core curriculum.” Furthermore, Rose used collaboration to ease teachers’ fear of change.

A lot of people are very afraid of it because they see it as another change or something else that they have to do. And it really hasn’t been explained a whole lot. We’ve been given a lot of materials and a lot of it we have to kind of muddle our way through ourselves and try to figure out what is going on. And some of it is confusing. So I think that is going to be part of the buy-in, as I call it, or acceptance of it, and working through it. I just tell them that it’s going to work. We’re going to be patient and we’re going to work through it a little bit at a time and that’s all we can do.

As for implementing the CCSS, Rose explained, “I don’t think it’s going to be difficult. I’m going to push professional development.” Sharing new information on the CCSS was a priority to Rose. “First of all I go through it and try to get a good understanding of it. Then I disseminate, pass it out to my teachers, and make sure that we have an opportunity to meet and talk.”
Future plans for the innovation involved increased teamwork. Rose elaborated, “We’re going to continue with helping each other...like when one teacher has something that’s really working.” The use of substitute teachers would enable department meetings to be held even though the departments do not have common planning times. Rose also explained that she networked with others outside her school. “I’m using those sources and working to get outside people in other parishes at the state level that I would be able to go to for answers when I don’t understand something.”

Within-school collaboration encouraged teacher buy-in. Rose explained that the School Improvement Team was made up of core subject department heads. “We meet, we strategize, and we take it back to the departments.” She discussed information with the group leader before the meeting, but shared her authority. “So I’m in there more as a facilitator, not as the leader or guru of what’s going on.” Rose believed that sharing responsibility helped the teachers accept changes.

I don’t have to try to meet with each teacher to tell them we’re going to do this, this, and this. I leave and they’re sharing some of the responsibility. And that helps with the buy-in, because once we have the meetings, I’m not in charge.

Rose believed that the innovation would positively affect student achievement. She related her first concern of teacher buy-in to her third concern of professional development through collaboration with teachers. She elaborated that collaboration supported student growth.

It is not only me passing that responsibility on to the teachers, but the teachers passing that responsibility on to the students...making them responsible for their learning, for helping each other with that type of learning. I think that we’ll be
more successful doing it that way. Again, that goes back to ownership for all of us.

Rose commented on her concern about funding. "I was coming in as a new administrator, from a situation where we had Title I funds, to no funds being available. I was very apprehensive last year." However, the school was reverted to a Title I funded school for the next school year. She related back to her previous remark and exclaimed, "With that Title I funding, I already have about three different professional development deals that we're going to go to... we couldn't do that last year."

Stages of Concern Scores. Highest scores for Rose's Stages of Concern were Stage 0, Awareness, Stage 1, Informational, and Stage 2, Personal, and were within 2 points of each other. The Levels of Use interview narrative provided depth to these scores.

Levels of Use Interview Rating. The Levels of Use rating sheet was used to determine the participant's overall Level of Use of the innovation. Rose's primary innovation of concern was a new school configuration. She also considered the implementation of the CCSS within the new configuration. Assessing was rated at Level of Use II, Preparation. The ratings for knowledge, acquiring information, sharing, planning, status reporting and performing were rated at Level of Use III, Mechanical Use. The behaviors of an individual at Level III, Mechanical Use, are operationally defined as, State in which the user focuses most effort on the short-term, day-to-day use of the innovation with little time for reflection. Changes in use are made more to meet user needs than client needs. The user is primarily engaged in a stepwise
attempt to master the tasks required to use the innovation, often resulting in disjointed and superficial use. (Hall et al., 2006)

Stages of Concern and Levels of Use Summary. During the Levels of Use interview, Rose carefully described her desire to change mindsets regarding the innovation and to provide professional development appropriate to the implementation of the innovation. Her comments during the interview were predominately focused on the innovation of the new school configuration; however, she occasionally mentioned the incoming CCSS. The overall rating for the interview at Level of Use III, Mechanical Use, supported an innovation still in its infancy and reflected the day-to-day use of the innovation. The interview narrative also supported Rose’s concern regarding the benefits of the innovation on students and teachers as well as her strong focus on working with her staff.

Interview #5. During his time as the principal of a prekindergarten through 5th-grade school, Winston had achieved his doctoral degree in education and had participated in approximately 30 hours of professional development yearly. The school had an enrollment of 634 and 65.5% of the students received free and reduced lunch. He had 11 years of school administrative experience. He indicated that his school recently received Smartboards for all teachers and that they were in the midst of training for the new technology. Winston explained that his top three concerns were informed by current curricular reforms: (a) morale of teachers, (b) time for professional development, and (c) if change will be effective.
Levels of Use Interview Narrative. The implementation of the CCSS was the focus of Winston’s concerns. He explained that with the CCSS come common concerns. Well, within the State we have the CCSS, and that’s going to probably be anybody you talk to with the changes coming along. The biggest fear among the teachers and myself is we don’t have all the information yet on exactly how we’re going to do this.

Cohesiveness and depth were the strengths of the innovation. Winston optimistically remarked, “And everything I’ve read about it, and the more I read, the fears are lessened, I could say. Because I think it’s going to be a good thing.” Furthermore, he described the strength of the new curriculum as “putting everybody on the same page.” Another strength of the new curriculum was its “…breadth to depth. For these kids, we’re going to go deeper into fewer things so that they can master those things, as opposed to covering a lot and really not being good at any of it.”

Winston believed that teacher morale was a weakness of the innovation. Furthermore, he felt that veteran teachers would likely have a difficult time with the new curriculum. Winston explained that he wanted to ease teachers’ anxiety toward CCSS. “Just trying to reassure their fears that they continue to do what they do. But there’s going to be a few little tweaks and reassure them that it’s not a bad thing.”

Winston also considered time for professional development another weakness of the innovation. That weakness was being addressed through several scheduled district professional development days for the upcoming school year. Adding to the innovation weaknesses, Winston remarked, “The biggest fear among the teachers and myself is we don’t have all the information yet of exactly how we’re going to do this!”
Although Winston felt strongly about the weaknesses of the new curriculum, he also felt strongly about its strengths. He appreciated the continuity between the old curriculum and the new. Furthermore, he explained that the breadth and depth of the curriculum was important. “And we’ve been preaching that for years. Teachers, if they [students] don’t get it, go back and reteach it. So this is going to kind of force us to do that.”

Talking with others about the innovation was important to Winston. He explained that networking at district meetings and with other principals provided him with learning opportunities. “And if we have a teacher that’s an expert, in the past what we’ve done on certain things is, ‘I’m having a faculty meeting on this day, can you send them over to present to my faculty?’” He also shared any new information he received with other principals. “There are three or four elementary schools that I consider our sister elementary schools that I’ll pick up the phone and call them.”

A sense of ambivalence was communicated when discussing the probable effects of the innovation. Winston reflected back to his third concern, the effectiveness of change in educational reforms, and stated,

I think originally the morale was low when they [teachers] heard all these changes were coming...because of all these changes. But not just these changes, the CCSS, but the more they hear, the more they like. But with the other educational changes that [have been] just kind of ramrodded through, they’re leery of what’s really in the best interest of the kids. But I think the more they hear on the CCSS, the more I hear, we like it. So I think heading forward, what I’ve told the teachers
is, "Let's embrace this with open arms, and I think it'll be a good thing." And if not, it'll be scraped and we'll start over on something.

**Stages of Concern Scores.** Winston’s highest score was Stage 0, Awareness, and his second highest was Stage 3, Management. Stage 0, Awareness, indicated that other tasks or initiatives were competing for his concern. The second high score of Stage 3, Management, indicated that he had strong concerns about the time and logistical processes of the innovation.

**Levels of Use Interview Rating.** The innovation that concerned Winston was the implementation of the Common CCSS. The areas of knowledge and performing were rated at Level I, Orientation, and the areas of acquiring information sharing, assessing, planning, and status reporting were rated at Level II, Preparation, for an overall Level of Use II, Preparation. The behaviors of an individual at Level II, Preparation, are operationally defined as, "State in which the user is preparing for first use of the innovation" (Hall et al., 2006).

**Stages of Concern and Levels of Use Summary.** The Levels of Use narrative supported that Winston may have had other concerns that competed with his innovation. Winston commented that the teachers would be receiving new Smartboards. New technology provided a potential confounding concern. The overall rating at Level II, Preparation, supported the implementation of the new curriculum at the Stage 0, Awareness. Winston’s interview narrative indicated that he had concerns regarding teacher morale and professional development. These confounding concerns reinforced Winston’s highest score at Stage 0, Awareness.
Interview #6. Luke had 11 years of experience as a principal in a sixth through eighth-grade middle school setting. The school had an enrollment of 275 with 33.8% of the students receiving free or reduced lunches. He estimated his yearly participation in professional development at 20 hours. Luke explained his top three concerns when implementing changes in his school: (a) “buy-in” by most stakeholders that changes will impact, (b) financial burden that come or may come with these changes, and (c) longevity of the program these changes will bring. If these changes are political, will future politicians drop changes for other “new” education programs? This has been a trend for years and years in education.

Levels of Use Interview Narrative. The innovation that was the focus of Luke’s concerns regarding the implementation of change was the purchase of Smartboards for all teachers. When discussing the Smartboard technology, Luke exclaimed, “I’m still a learner... It’s as new to me as it is to anyone here.” He happily remarked that every teacher in the building has a Smartboard. Some teachers received their boards during the middle of the previous school year. The second deployment of boards followed during the spring. Only one board was not yet installed.

Luke explained that training was an area of strength for the innovation. Some teachers who had received their Smartboards mid-year had an opportunity to gain familiarity with the new technology. The upcoming school year would provide a baseline for their use of new technology. Professional development with a focus on Smartboard technology had been a priority since receiving the boards. Furthermore, he indicated that,

All of our teachers have gone through their second round on the Smartboard training and they’re beginning to develop their own lesson plans, share, and
collaborate their lesson plans with people within the district, and hopefully share
with people outside the district.

Stakeholder buy-in was the innovation’s weakness as well as Luke’s first concern
regarding the innovation. The teachers were impacted as they learned to implement new
technology. A few of the teachers showed greater enthusiasm for using the Smartboards,
and thus provided a cadre of teacher-leaders for this principal.

So I have a couple of folks who are ahead of the curve. They really want to stay
ahead of it. And I’m very fortunate. I have two or three teachers who have a really
strong technology background and want to utilize that. So I will utilize those folks
to go back and help the other teachers who may not be as comfortable with it even
after the training.

Plans had already been made to address the weaknesses of the innovation. Luke
expected that the successful buy-in of technologically adept teachers would encourage
the technologically reticent teachers. “Sometimes you need a little push. Sometimes
people are a little more willing to take a risk with technology.”

Since the school was in the early stages of Smartboard implementation, no formal
or informal evaluation had been conducted. Pondering future evaluations, Luke stated,

We’ll know what we have when we get to the end of the year. I suspect that a lot
of the teachers already have their own ideas about where they want it to go. As
long as those ideas mesh, we’re fine.

Luke appreciated discussing the innovation with others. The prevalent theme of
the middle school conference he had just returned from was collaboration. “I have
encouraged all of the core teachers here to be involved. ‘Open a Twitter account so that
we can collaborate among ourselves and with folks around the country who have already seen this and done this.” He stated that he has had a personal account for over two years and had recently opened a professional account. “I’ve aligned myself with other educators, administrators, and national associations.”

The future of the innovation was linked to the upcoming transition to the CCSS. Luke expected the technology component of teacher evaluations to increase. He stated, "Hopefully, we’ll just be noting that the Smartboard is being used a lot, or being used as part of the lesson. From a personal standpoint, I don’t want a Smartboard teaching any classes here. I want a teacher teaching the classes with the Smartboard as a component or a resource.

Luke considered the stakeholders when asked about the potential effects of the innovation. He explained, “As far as the stakeholders go, our parents want what we want, so I don’t think that’s going to be an issue.” Luke has had a personal interest in his students and has followed their progress through their high school years. Regarding technology, he has told parents, “This is where the future is, this is where we’re going.” Parents have heard this from Luke at school meetings and have been reminded of their responsibility. “The more information I give you, the less I’m responsible for it.”

The financial burden that came with the innovation was Luke’s second concern. He also considered funding a weakness of the innovation. “We...most schools...just can’t keep up with the technology as far as the finances go.” The second deployment of boards was uncertain because of money shortages. “We just didn’t know because of the money.” However, some of the financial burden has been compensated by professional development opportunities. A strength of the innovation has been the training provided
by the central district office. "They've been very good about providing multiple levels of training. And then, on top of that, teachers who wanted to come back on their own to receive additional training...that has been made available." Luke expressed his surprise that teachers were given stipends for some of the training even though the district is experiencing a funding crisis.

Luke shared his concern about the longevity of new programs and stated that political motives cast doubt on the sustainability of changes. However, he countered his concerns with optimism, "I think this is just the beginning. I see things beginning to improve. I think this innovation will have a stronger foothold on what we do in teaching."

*Stages of Concern Scores,* Stage 0, Awareness, was Luke's highest Stage of Concern with his second highest at Stage 3, Management. The high Stage 0, Awareness, score indicated that there may have been other initiatives that concerned him. The second highest score of Stage 3, Management, suggested that Luke was concerned about the time, management, and logistics of the innovation.

*Levels of Use Interview Rating.* The implementation of Smartboard technology was Luke's innovation of concern. The Levels of Use interview was conducted during the summer prior to the first full year of implementation. His interview was rated at Level of Use II, Preparation, in all areas for an overall rating of Level II, Preparation. The behaviors of an individual at Level II, Preparation, are operationally defined as, "State in which the user is preparing for first use of the innovation" (Hall et al., 2006).

*Stages of Concern and Levels of Use Summary.* Luke expressed concern about the implementation of new technology during their transition to the CCSS. This concern in conjunction with his Levels of Use interview narrative supported his highest score at
Stage 0, Awareness. The interview rating of Level II, Preparation, supported his second highest score at Stage of Concern 3, Management, indicating that he had concerns about the practical aspects of the innovation as well as the basic issues of management.

**Interview Summary.** The Stages of Concern questionnaire scores of four of the interviewees were at Stage 0, Awareness. Two of these had interview ratings of Level of Use II, Preparation, and two had Level of Use III, Mechanical. For Winston, a highest score at Stage 0, Awareness, and a Level of Use rating of II, Preparation, suggested that he had many concerns vying for his attention as he prepared to implement an innovation. This elementary school principal explained his concerns about the implementation of the new CCSS. With some vacillation, he noted the curriculum’s strengths, but he also expressed that he knew very little about the CCSS. This principal’s concerns about his older teachers who had successfully taught the old curriculum for many years competed with his initiation of the CCSS.

Luke was also at Stage of Concern 0, Awareness, with a Level of Use rating of II, Preparation. His primary innovation of concern was the implementation of new Smartboard technology; however, he too, was concerned about the new CCSS. The unique context of each principal as they initiated the CCSS potentially intensified their Stage of Concern 0, Awareness, scores.

Two principals were at Stage of Concern 0, Awareness, and Level of Use III, Mechanical Use. At the time of the interview, Ellen had just completed her first year as principal as well as the first year of her innovation. Her one year of experience with the innovation enabled her to attain a higher Level of Use rating; however, her concerns of strengthening her leadership skills conflicted with her innovation. Although Rose’s
innovation was different than Ellen's, their competing concern was the same: the CCSS. Rose was at Stage 0, Awareness, even though she was at the end of her first year with the innovation, because of CCSS concerns. She had progressed to Level of Use III, Mechanical Use, due to her one-year experience with the reconfiguration of the school and close collaboration with the teachers.

Gloria's Stage of Concern 3, Management, and Level of Use V, Integration, suggested her length of involvement and experience with the innovation of professional development. She viewed the new CCSS as something to be integrated within the overall implementation of teacher training and not as a competing concern. Her Level of Use also suggested this greater degree of development. Lauren's Stage of Concern 5, Collaboration, supported her many hours of preparation for her innovation, but her rating of Level of Use II, Preparation, indicated that she had not yet implemented the new eight-period schedule.

These five principals provided an illustration that competing concerns potentially hinder the implementation of change and innovation. A lower Stage of Concern suggested a lower Level of Use of the innovation. For one principal, the implementation of the new curriculum was the innovation of concern against which other issues competed. Four other principals explained that the new curriculum was the concern competing against their innovation. Accordingly, for two principals, the higher Stage of Concern suggested a higher rating for their Level of Use of the innovation. Gloria allowed the new curriculum to harmonize with, rather than compete with her innovation, resulting in a higher Stage of Concern commensurate with her Level of Use rating. Lauren did not discuss the implementation of the CCSS at great length, suggesting that
the curriculum was not an intense concern to her. Her lesser concern about the CCSS may have been due to the fact that the seventh and eighth grades would transition to the new curriculum during the 2013-2014 school year.

The interview data of Gloria and Lauren suggested that principals at higher Stages of Concern and higher Levels of Use have greater potential to improve the capacity of their teachers. These interviewees spoke of their collaboration and networking with staff. They also talked about the substantive effects of innovation on the students. Furthermore, they did not merely focus on their own personal concerns, but were aware of the feelings and concerns of teachers and students.

Themes

The dominant theme of relationships became evident through the analysis of the demographic surveys and Levels of Use interviews. On the demographic survey, the theme of relationships was expressed as acceptance and buy-in of the innovation. Many principals were concerned about how their teachers managed change. Some principals were concerned about the way that the parents and community dealt with the change. Student morale and buy-in concerned one principal. These principals recognized and responded to the emotions, commitment, and behaviors of others.

The Levels of Use interviews also highlighted the concern of relationships. The focus of Ellen's innovation was parental involvement. She recognized not only the relationship issue in terms of the parents, but also understood the value of an improved parental relationship upon the student. Furthermore, she expressed that increased parental involvement was a help to the teachers. Lauren understood that the success of the eight-period class day was contingent upon the buy-in teachers. Even though this change put
additional demands on the teachers, she was keenly aware about their involvement with the change.

Rose discussed the fear that some teachers had concerning teaching middle school rather than high school students; however, she bolstered their confidence with encouraging words and learning opportunities. Relationships concerned Winston and Luke. Winston hoped to ease teachers’ anxiety toward changes due to the implementation of the new CCSS. Reticent teachers were the focus of Luke’s relationship concerns. He understood the individual comfort level that teachers had regarding change. Luke hoped that his technologically progressive teachers would be able to mentor his reluctant teachers. These vignettes of relationship issues validated the importance of others in their connection to the innovation.

Many principals were concerned about the resources of money and time. Funding for school programs and use of time were issues of allocation. These concerns related to capacity-building. Building the capacity of others is the provision of learning opportunities as well as the provision of necessary supports to help learning happen. Capacity-building requires funding and time to provide essential materials and training. A first-year elementary principal shared her concern and questioned, “Will proper training and assistance be provided during the implementation of the program?” Training and professional development were a recurring element of the Levels of Use interviews. Gloria recognized the need for increased and improved professional development in her school. Although all teachers needed the training, she was aware of teachers’ individuality and their differing stages of readiness for change. Principals recognized that
teachers’ increased capacity would improve the implementation of changes in the context of their school.

Even though it was not counted as one of the top three concerns on the demographic survey, the effect of current political trends and education reform emerged as a theme of the demographic survey and Levels of Use interviews. To varying degrees, all of the interviewees described the introduction of CCSS as a concern. One principal recognized it as the prevailing focus of his concerns. Four of the other principals identified the new standards as a concern that coexisted with their innovation. The relationship between the principals' innovations and the CCSS suggested that any innovation was situated within the ubiquitous environment of policy changes.

Summary

Although change is certain in any environment, how a principal, or anyone, reacts to change is altogether uncertain. Principals have concerns that relate to their particular innovations within their school environments. These individual concerns are confounded by their relationships with others, the specifics of the innovation, and the existing political agenda. Innovations require commitments of time and money. Teachers need appropriate training to share in the responsibilities inherent in the innovation. Acceptance and buy-in are more likely when the innovation is expected to be an enduring benefit for teaching and student success.

Acceptance, or buy-in, was the most frequent top concern of principals. Most of the principals were concerned about how the teachers accepted the innovation and handled the change. Some principals expressed concern about how the parents, students, and other stakeholders responded to the change. These principals realized that innovation
within a school was not an isolated event, but situated within the greater context of community.

Next, in order of frequency were two concerns relating to resources. The funding and time needed to enact change were fundamental to its successful implementation. Funding was on-going concern. The initiation, durability, and longevity of an innovation required money. A potentially effectual change may falter due to lack of foresight and planning. One principal was particularly concerned about the money that would be needed to keep up with the rapid pace of technology growth. Even though his school had received Smartboard technology for every classroom, he understood that money would be needed to keep their new technology updated and in working order.

Time was the other resource of concern of principals. Many aspects of change and innovation required the principal's time. The principals were concerned about their own time commitments and were also concerned about their teachers' time constraints. Initially, principals committed time when investigating the implementation of a new innovation. Next, the principal understood that teachers not only have to commit time to professional development and training, but also to the utilization of the innovation in their individual classrooms.

The predominate group Stage of Concern was Stage 0, Awareness, with a mean percentile of 91. The second highest was Stage 1, Informational, with a mean percentile of 80. High Stage 0, Awareness, scores suggested the amount of priority the respondents placed on the innovation and the relative intensity of their concern about the innovation (George et al., 2006). In other words, the high mean percentile of Stage 0, Awareness, supported that for these principals, other initiatives, tasks, and changes were of concern.
A second highest Stage of Concern 1, Informational, supported that most of the principals were in the early phases of their innovation. More information about the innovation would be needed to inform the questionnaire data.

Of the six participants interviewed, three were at Level of Use II, Preparation. Two of these participants were at Stage of Concern 0, Awareness, supporting that they were in the initial phase of their innovation and were concerned about issues other than their innovation. The third participant at Level of Use II, Preparation, was at Stage of Concern 5, Collaboration. Two participants were at Level of Use III, Mechanical, and Stage of Concern 0, Awareness. One principal was at Level of Use V, Integration, and Stage of Concern 3, Management.

The demographic surveys, the Stages of Concern questionnaires, and the Levels of Use interviews described principals who were mainly initiating new programs and innovations. Many were concerned about how their teachers and stakeholders responded to their innovation. The resources of time and money were a concern. There was sometimes doubt as to the consequences and the effectiveness of a change. State mandates and policy presented an unpredictable influence. The top three concerns, the questionnaire data, and the interview ratings illustrated the individuality of each principal's implementation of an innovation and his or her trek through change.
CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion of Findings

The implementation of change in an organization may be fundamental to its growth and success. Change involves multiple complex issues. Schools are expected to prepare students to enter a globally competitive workforce. Principals are needed that can manage schools within an ever-changing, ever-learning educational environment. Furthermore, change does not occur through passivity, but through action. With the growth of knowledge, the increase in technological advances, and the unrelenting interplay of state and federal educational legislation, effective principals thrive and lead despite ambiguity. Action, context, and uncertainty position principals in their challenge of change implementation.

Fullan (2008) broadened Senge's (2006) concept of systems-thinking leadership to systems-doing leadership. Fullan challenged leaders to, "Develop your own theory of action by constantly testing against situations and ideas" (2008, p. 17). This concept relates to the importance of learning in context (Day, 2007; Mulford et al., 2007; Murphy, 2007; Nagle et al., 2006). Relationships are important to meaningful and lasting change. A principal has an obligation to include everyone in the pursuit of organizational success. The interactions of the principal, the teachers, and the students create the distinct individual classrooms of a unique school culture situated within the global context.
The purpose of this study was to investigate the Stages of Concern (SoC) that school principals had toward change and then report participants’ behaviors relevant to their Level of Use (LoU) of an innovation (see Appendices A and B). Principals’ top three concerns toward the implementation of change were investigated through the use of a demographic survey (see Appendix C). The C-BAM Stages of Concern questionnaire informed the research of the principals’ attitudes, feelings, and emotions regarding the change (see Appendix D). The Stages of Concern data further informed the researcher of whether principals’ years of administrative service, school size, and percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch had an effect upon their Stages of Concern. Lastly, the Levels of Use interview was used to gain understanding of the principals’ behaviors toward the innovation (see Appendix E).

The role of the researcher was fundamental to this study. This relationship enabled the collection of principals’ top three concerns and Stages of Concern questionnaire responses. The interaction between the researcher and the participant was minimal during these data collection processes. The Levels of Use interview process provided an increased level of interaction. Although increased contact and familiarity aided the researcher’s understanding of the participant’s view so valued in qualitative research, it may have compelled the principals to respond according to their expectations for agents of change. The triangulation of multiple data sources and the theories of constructivism and change provided a framework by which the corroboration of findings was strengthened (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007).
Research Questions

1. What are principals’ top three concerns related to change?

The demographic survey informed the first research question and was administered to principals in northern Louisiana school districts in April and May 2012 (see Appendix C). This survey elicited principals’ top three concerns as acceptance/buy-in, funding/money, and time. Some principals noted the interrelatedness of resources and professional development, and questioned whether adequate funding and time would be available for the teachers to be properly trained in the use of the innovation. Another principal related quality results to teacher training and explained that an innovation is only as good as what the teacher puts into it.

The top concern regarding acceptance and buy-in of teachers, students, and other stakeholders reinforced the importance of relationships. Formerly, the principalship was considered a go-it-alone position, but the contemporary concept of principal leadership has been defined by close working relationships. Educational leadership literature, as well as leadership theory in general, has used terms such as collegiality, collaboration, communities, collective responsibility, and teamwork (Hargreaves and Fullan, 2012; Marzano et al., 2005). Positive, productive relationships may produce many fruits for an organization. Principals are in the position to provide capacity-building opportunities for their teachers through trusting relationships. When a teacher’s capacity is increased and appreciated, there is rich ground for creativity to flourish.

Concerns regarding change are inherently formidable situations; therefore, it was vital to evaluate whether a change was beneficial to an organization or undesirable. The demographic survey demonstrated that these principals were concerned about how their
teachers, students, and stakeholders responded to innovation and change. Principals understood the interrelatedness of their decisions and activities in relation to others. As principals nourished their teachers through healthy, collaborative relationships, the organization thrived. Teacher acceptance and buy-in were not passive issues. Principals purposively developed real opportunities for collaboration and sharing.

Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) describe how relationships contribute to change and impact our culture. School cultures reflect a myriad of beliefs. The NCLB law promotes a culture of accountability; however, a culture of student learning encourages teacher professionalism. When people spend time together, their beliefs have a mutual effect. When a person continually spends time in the same relationships, little change can occur. Hargreaves and Fullan explain that one needs to examine the relationships that impact the school culture stating,

What you believe (the substance of a culture) is, in other words, profoundly affected by your relationships with who does or doesn’t believe it. Change the form of a culture (the relationships among people) and you have a good chance of changing its content too. (2012, p. 104)

Just as the concept of relationships is not abstract, the principals’ concern of resources is real and authentic. Funding and time were two stressors expressed by principals throughout this study. Nationally, many school districts have experienced budgetary cuts and have been expected to produce quality results with less funding. A shortage of time constrained principals and teachers from seeking opportunities for collaboration and welcoming opportunities for change and growth. The concerns of funding and time directly related to the concern regarding professional development.
During a Levels of Use interview, one principal mentioned his surprise when the school
district provided stipends for teachers attending Smartboard technology workshops.
Although training stipends were once the norm, they were noted as a rarity in current
school budgets.

2. What are principals' predominate Stages of Concern?

The highest and second highest group Stages of Concern were Stage 0,
Awareness, and Stage 1, Informational, respectively. Stage 0, Awareness, indicated the
intensity of concern participants had toward the innovation. Since the principals'responses were based on their individually selected innovation, they were all considered
users of their innovation. Considering the self-selection of the innovation by each
participant, the highest group stage score at Stage of Concern 0, Awareness, seemed
incongruous. On the contrary, this inconsistency indicated that the principals were
concerned about many other things in addition to their particular innovation. The
interviews provided depth into the nature of these self concerns. Two principals with
highest Stage 0, Awareness, and Stage 1, Informational, scores had the Levels of Use
rating of II, Preparation. Two other principals with highest Stage 0, Awareness, and Stage
1, Informational, scores were rated at Level of Use III, Mechanical. These four principals
were all in the beginnings of their innovation. Rose and Ellen, who were both highest at
Stages 0, Awareness, and Stage 1, Informational, had completed one year of their
innovation; therefore, they were at Level of Use III, Mechanical. Luke and Winston
planned to begin their innovations during the upcoming school year; hence, their highest
stage scores were at Stage 0, Awareness, and Stage 1, Informational, and the Level of
Use II, Preparation. Even though these two principals mentioned other concerns besides
their innovation of focus, they were improving their general awareness of the program and seeking more information about it.

3. Are there relationships between principals' Stages of Concern and their years of service?

Table 1 showed a low positive relationship between Stage of Concern 3, Management, and principals' years of service; however, the remainder of the data may have explained the reason for the weak relationship. Of the 30 participants, 47% scored highest Stage of Concern 0, Awareness. A principal with as few as four years administrative service was highest at Stage of Concern 0, Awareness, as was a principal with as many as 20 years of administrative service. Indeed, principals at 7, 10, 11, and 15 years of service also had highest Stage of Concern 0, Awareness.

These data support the value of the qualitative aspect of this research project by delving deeper into the underlying concerns and complex issues facing contemporary principals. The researcher attended to the perspectives and social processes of the individuals involved when collecting data. Each principal experienced a renewal of concern with each new endeavor that was situated within a complex, ever-changing environment. These data did not show whether principals' years of service had a relationship to their progression through the developmental Stages of Concern, but indicated their stages at one point in time.

4. Are there relationships between principals' Stages of Concern and the percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch in their school?

The low positive relationship between Stage of Concern 6, Refocusing, and free and reduced lunch did not provide sufficient evidence to explain how the percentage of
free and reduced lunch students in a school had an effect on the principal’s Stages of Concern. However, this one relationship may have alluded to the decision-making characteristics of principals in high poverty schools (see Table 1).

Previous research showed that a higher percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunches had a potential impact on the culture of the school. Jensen (2009) documented the varied deficiencies that students of lower economic families bring to school. He explained that principals in poorer schools need a mind-set of enrichment that emphasized relationships. Studies have also been conducted on high performing high poverty schools in Louisiana (HPHP Project, 2008). The Louisiana project found that principals who supported both student and teacher success, provided the quality, effectual leadership needed in high poverty schools. These qualities attended to the principal’s ability to nurture relationships and build teachers capacity.

5. Are there relationships between principals’ Stages of Concern and school size?

No relationships existed between the Stages of Concern and the size of the school (see Table 1). A review of the Stages of Concern results suggested the uniqueness and temporal dimension of quantification. For example, one principal with seven years of experience at a school of 1,124 students was highest at Stage of Concern 5, Collaboration, while another principal with 17 years of experience in a school of 1,003 students was highest at Stage of Concern 1, Informational. In contrast, another principal with 14 years of experience in a school with 1,132 students was highest at Stage of Concern 5, Collaboration, while the principal with 17 years of experience and 1,003 students was highest at Stage of Concern 1, Informational. The inconsistency of these
data supports the uniqueness of each principal’s context of school environment, teacher and student relationships, and demands of educational policy.

6. Do principals’ Stages of Concern affect their ability to manage change and improve capacity-building within the school?

The Levels of Use interview process support that principals’ Stages of Concern affect their ability to manage change and improve their capacity-building within the school. The principals’ unique innovation of concern, their top three concerns, and their highest Stage of Concern, in conjunction with the Levels of Use interview narrative data provide an in-depth perspective of principals’ behaviors regarding change implementation and capacity-building.

Concerns regarding relationships and the resources of time and funding reverberated throughout the narratives. The recurring themes revealed through these interviews informed the group’s predominate highest Stage of Concern at Stage 0, Awareness; followed by Stage 1, Informational. Principals were concerned about their innovation, but due to the complexity of relationships, current political forces, and dearth of resources, other intense concerns interrupted their innovation as a primary focus.

The Levels of Use interviews gave depth to the programs and tasks that potentially concerned principals. The introduction of the new CCSS provided a unique backdrop to this study of principals’ concerns regarding change. Although policy changes are seemingly constant in education, the CCSS initiative reflects an all-encompassing change in student education as well as student, teacher, and principal evaluation practices. Not surprisingly, the transition to the CCSS for the 2012-2013 school year was noted as a prevailing influence throughout the six interviews.
One principal had an integrated approach to the initiation of the CCSS. By melding the new standards into the implementation of their innovation, rather than viewing it as a separate initiative, this principal scored a higher Stage of Concern as well as a higher Level of Use rating. Other principals, who commented on the new standards as unrelated and independent of their primary innovation, were at lower Stages of Concern and Levels of Use. It behooved principals to incorporate policy changes into the framework of their unique school improvement goals and initiatives.

Knowing all the details of a situation was an unlikely picture. Unexpected events often curtailed even the most well thought out plans. Winston expressed his concern regarding his lack of information about the CCSS. This principal’s concerns provided support to the theme of relationships. Mentoring relationships may have helped sustain and secure principals who were stymied by not having all the information. On the other hand, Luke characterized a principal preparing to adapt to a new situation. With the innovation of new Smartboards for all of his teachers, he was considering the possible technology standards that could be introduced within the CCSS.

Some principals were more singly-focused in their approach. Although Ellen’s innovation was a prime venue to present the new standards to her school and parents, she gave little mention to the CCSS initiative. On the other hand, Lauren had effectively positioned herself to communicate information about the CCSS to students and teachers through previously created collaborative groups.

These principals illustrate a range of comfort levels. Some were able to effectively implement a program with a lack of facts and information. It would have been advantageous for superintendents and district personnel to have a familiarly with their
principals so that they could have provided appropriate support during policy changes and new initiatives. Every principal needed to end up on the same page, but it took different supports to get them there. The capacity-building of principals resonated within the concept of mentoring and principal support.

Although change is constant, not everything must change. Some principals need the reassurance that certain areas of education remain steady and unchanging. That reminder may prevent those principals from feeling contemptuous toward frequent policy changes. The principals who have a positive view toward the CCSS endeavor to acquire more information about its implementation than those who look at the new standards as an imposition.

Conclusions

The demographic survey and Stages of Concern questionnaire provided descriptive data about principals’ concerns regarding change, but did not explain causality. The Levels of Use interview narratives supplied a deeper resource for understanding the principals’ perceptions regarding their concerns toward change. The recorded interviews documented principals’ personal convictions and viewpoints about their specific objectives or implementation goals. The themes of relationships, resources of funding and time, and changing educational policies emerged. Conclusions are offered below:

1. Principals were not likely to differentiate between a specific innovation and other activities and tasks due to the multiple concerns extant in their leadership role.
2. Principals did not consider any one change or innovation in isolation due to the complexity of their school context.

3. Understanding and utilizing educational leadership standards in their daily duties provided principals a strong foundation, but were not the end-all of resources needed during their implementation of change.

4. Considering the developmental nature of concerns, the concurrent implementation of the CCSS and each principal's particular innovation may have prevented him or her from moving beyond the early Stages of Concern.

5. These data suggested that variables of influence may not have been school size, years of administrative experience, or possibly even the percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunches. The intensity of the concern may have related to each individual's particular innovation and change within its unique context.

Limitations

Situated within six public school districts in northern Louisiana, this mixed-methods research project provided the top concerns and highest Stages of Concern of 30 principals using the demographic survey and the Stages of Concern questionnaire. The Levels of Use interview process provided an in-depth perspective of six principals' behaviors regarding their implementation of change. Although three investigative instruments were used to collect and to triangulate these data, some limitations should be offered:

1. Although the correlation analysis revealed a relationship between Stages of Concern 6, Refocusing, and the percentage of students receiving free or
reduced lunches, the sample size was small (n = 30). Therefore, the conclusion that a positive relationship existed between Stage of Concern 6, Refocusing, and free and reduced lunch should be taken with caution.

2. Six principals were selected for the Levels of Use interview process. The researcher must be cautious when making assumptions based on the Stages of Concern data without an understanding of the behaviors relevant to that participant's implementation of an innovation.

3. The participants were aware that effective change implementation was central to this study; therefore, their responses may have been biased.

4. Although policy changes are constant in education, the implementation of the CCSS had a larger-than-usual impact upon principals’ beliefs, feelings, and behaviors regarding change.

5. Data were collected during a two-month span of time at the end of the school year. The months of April and May presented many challenges to principals as they closed out one school year and anticipated the new.

**Recommendations**

When a connection was made between constructivism and change theory, the role of a principal as change agent within a unique school culture provided rationale for additional professional development on change implementation of a constructivist approach. Based on the findings of this study, principals would benefit from training that focuses on change implementation.

On the basis of the findings of this study and the discussion in the previous section, the following recommendations are offered:
1. Principal professional development of a constructivist approach may support principals in building and strengthening all levels of relationships within their school, (i.e., teachers, staff, students and stakeholders).

2. Principal-to-principal mentoring relationships may include focused discussions on change implementation. These relationships would provide valuable support for principals reminding them that change is a collaborative venture.

3. An instrument for monitoring change implementation, such as the C-BAM Stages of Concern, may benefit principals’ initiation and progress through change. The resulting data may assess principals’ progress through new program implementation so that appropriate and timely support can be provided.

4. Basic concerns of relationships and resources may be given priority when new programs and innovations are being implemented.

5. Leadership training and professional development may regularly reinforce the standards of educational leadership.

Future Research

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations for future research are offered:

1. Research could continue on these same principals to provide increased insight into the developmental nature of change. Interviews could occur periodically to determine the attitudes, feelings, and behaviors relevant to innovations in schools over a period of time.
2. A study using a larger cohort of principals would improve the applicability of the findings to support principals’ implementation of change.

3. Although the findings of this study did not support that principals’ years of service have a relationship to their highest Stage of Concern, additional research may indicate otherwise.

4. Although this study provided inconclusive results about the relationship between the Stages of Concern and the percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunches, additional research may provide decisive results.

5. An investigation into how educational leadership standards influence principals’ daily administrative practices as well as their implementation of an innovation over time may benefit principals’ training and professional development.

6. A study of how principals’ leadership practices and innovations lead to increased student achievement may add to the research on principals’ implementation of change.

Principals are the responsible driving force of change within their schools. With an inherent understanding of their schools’ culture, principals are poised to positively promote reform that filters down from federal or state educational laws. Principals are positioned to nourish strong relationships among teachers and students. The findings of this study support principals’ need for assistance in creating and sustaining collaborative relationships that promote policy reform and instill a culture of change. Amidst constant change, able, secure, and knowledgeable principals may lead their schools toward globally sensitive educational achievement.
APPENDIX A

C-BAM SEVEN STAGES OF CONCERN
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Stages of Concern About an Innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The individual focuses on exploring ways to reap more universal benefits from the innovation, including the possibility of making major changes to it or replacing it with a more powerful alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The individual focuses on coordinating and cooperating with others regarding use of the innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The individual focuses on the innovation's impact on students in his or her immediate sphere of influence. Considerations include the relevance of the innovation for students; the evaluation of student outcomes, including performance and competencies; and the changes needed to improve student outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The individual focuses on the processes and tasks of using the innovation and the best use of information and resources. Issues related to efficiency, organizing, managing, and scheduling dominate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The individual is uncertain about the demands of the innovation, his or her adequacy to meet those demands, and/or his or her role with the innovation. The individual is analyzing his or her relationship to the reward structure of the organization, determining his or her part in decision making, and considering potential conflicts with existing structures or personal commitment. Concerns also might involve the financial or status implications of the program for the individual and his or her colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The individual indicates a general awareness of the innovation and interest in learning more details about it. The individual does not seem to be worried about himself or herself in relation to the innovation. Any interest is in impersonal, substantive aspects of the innovation, such as its general characteristics, effects, and requirement for use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The individual indicates little concern about or involvement with the innovation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

LEVELS OF USE OF AN INNOVATION
Levels of Use of the Innovation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>Nonuse</strong>: State in which the use has little or no knowledge of the innovation, has no involvement with the innovation, and is doing nothing toward becoming involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Orientation</strong>: State in which the user has acquired or is acquiring information about the innovation and/or has explored or is exploring its value orientation and its demands upon the user and the user system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Preparation</strong>: State in which the user is preparing for first use of the innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Mechanical Use</strong>: State in which the user focuses most effort on the short-term, day-to-day use of the innovation with little time for reflection. Changes in use are made more to meet user needs than client needs. The user is primarily engaged in a stepwise attempt to master the tasks required to use the innovation, often resulting in disjointed and superficial use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Routine</strong>: Use of the Innovation is stabilized. Few if any changes are being made in ongoing use. Little preparation or thought is being given to improving innovation use of its consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Refinement</strong>: State in which the user varies the use of the innovation to increase the impact on clients within immediate sphere of influence. Variations are based on knowledge of both short- and long-term consequences for clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Integration</strong>: State in which the user is combining own efforts to use the innovation with the related activities of colleagues to achieve a collective effect on clients within their common sphere of influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Renewal</strong>: State in which the user reevaluates the quality of use of the innovation, seeks major modifications or alternatives to the present innovation to achieve increased impact on clients, examines new developments in the field, and explores new goals for self and the system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographic Survey

Date:

To: Participating Principal

From: Terry Pelfrey, Graduate Student
Louisiana Tech University

Please fill in or circle the appropriate response.

Years of Administrative Service .............................................................

Level of Education .............................................................................

School Configuration ...........................................................................

Approximate time in professional development (yearly) ..................

Age Group (Circle) <30 30-40 41-50 51-60 61-70 >70

Gender (Circle) Male Female

Please circle your response:

Question 1: Are you familiar with the ISLLC Standards and/or the SREB criteria for school leaders?

Yes No

Question 2: Do you consider these standards when conducting your regular administrative duties?

Yes No

Question 3: Please list your top three concerns you have when attempting to implement changes in your school:

1. ...........................................................................................................

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

2. ...........................................................................................................

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

3. ...........................................................................................................

   ........................................................................................................
Concerning the above changes/innovations:

1. How long have you been involved with the above-mentioned changes?
   Never ____ 1 year ____ 2 years ____ 3 years ____ 4 years ____ 5 or more ____

2. In your use of the innovation, do you consider yourself to be a
   Non-user ____ Novice ____ Intermediate ____ Old hand ____ Past user ____

3. Have you received formal training regarding the innovation (workshops, courses)?
   Yes ____ No ____

4. Are you currently in the first or second year of use of some major innovation or program other than this one?
   Yes ____ No ____

5. If yes, please describe briefly:

   ___________________________________________________________

   ___________________________________________________________

   ___________________________________________________________

   Thank you for your help!

   Terry Pelfrey
APPENDIX D

STAGES OF CONCERN QUESTIONNAIRE
Stages of Concern Questionnaire

Name (optional): ____________________________________________

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine what people who are using or thinking about using various programs are concerned about at various times during the adoption process.

The items were developed from typical responses of school and college teachers who ranged from no knowledge at all about various programs to many years' experience using them. Therefore, many of the items on this questionnaire may appear to be of little relevance or irrelevant to you at this time. For the completely irrelevant items, please circle "0" on the scale. Other items will represent those concerns you do have, in varying degrees of intensity, and should be marked higher on the scale.

For example:

- This statement is very true of me at this time. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- This statement is somewhat true of me now. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- This statement is not at all true of me at this time. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- This statement seems irrelevant to me. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Please respond to the items in terms of your present concerns, or how you feel about your involvement with this innovation. We do not hold to any one definition of the innovation so please think of it in terms of your own perception of what it involves. Phrases such as "this approach" and "the new system" all refer to the same innovation. Remember to respond to each item in terms of your present concerns about your involvement or potential involvement with the innovation.

Thank you for taking time to complete this task.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not true of me now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Somewhat true of me now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Very true of me now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Circle One Number For Each Item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I am concerned about students' attitudes toward the innovation.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I now know of some other approaches that might work better.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I am more concerned about another innovation.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I am concerned about not having enough time to organize myself each day.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I would like to help other faculty in their use of the innovation.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I have a very limited knowledge of the innovation.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I would like to know the effect of reorganization on my professional status.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I am concerned about conflict between my interests and my responsibilities.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I am concerned about revising my use of the innovation.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I would like to develop working relationships with both our faculty and outside faculty using this innovation.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I am concerned about how the innovation affects students.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I am not concerned about the innovation at this time.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I would like to know who will make the decisions in the new system.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I would like to discuss the possibility of using the innovation.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I would like to know what resources are available if we decide to adopt the innovation.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I am concerned about my inability to manage all that the innovation requires.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I would like to know how my teaching or administration is supposed to change.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I would like to familiarize other departments or persons with the progress of this new approach.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I am concerned about evaluating my impact on students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I would like to revise the innovation's approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I am preoccupied with things other than the innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I would like to modify our use of the innovation based on the experiences of our students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I spend little time thinking about the innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I would like to excite my students about their part in this approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I am concerned about time spent working with nonacademic problems related to the innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I would like to know what the use of the innovation will require in the immediate future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I would like to coordinate my efforts with others to maximize the innovation's effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I would like to have more information on time and energy commitments required by the innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I would like to know what other faculty are doing in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Currently, other priorities prevent me from focusing my attention on the innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I would like to determine how to supplement, enhance, or replace the innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I would like to use feedback from students to change the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I would like to know how my role will change when I am using the innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Coordination of tasks and people is taking too much of my time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I would like to know how the innovation is better than what we have now.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

LEVELS OF USE INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
## The Basic Interview Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you using the innovation?</td>
<td>To distinguish between users and nonusers; to break LoU 0-11 from LoU III-VI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **IF YES**                                                               |                                                                         |**
<p>| What do you see as the strengths and weaknesses of the innovation in your situation? Have you made any attempt to do anything about the weaknesses? | To probe Assessing and Knowledge Categories.                              |
| Do you ever talk with others about the innovation? What do you tell them? | To probe Sharing Category and check Decision Point E.                    |
| What do you see as being the effects of the innovation? In what way have you determined this? Are you doing any evaluating, either formally or informally, of your use of the innovation? Have you received any feedback from students? What have you done with the information you get? | To probe Assessing Category.                                             |
| Have you made any changes recently in how you use the innovation? What? Why? How recently? Are you considering making any changes? | To distinguish between LoU III (user-oriented changes), LoU IVB (impact-oriented changes), and LoU IVA (no or routine changes); to probe Status Reporting and Performing Categories. |
| As you look ahead to later this year, what plans do you have in relation to your use of the innovation? | To probe Planning and Status Reporting Categories.                      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you working with others (outside of anyone you may have worked with from the beginning) in your use of the innovation? Have you made any changes in your use of the innovation based on this coordination?</td>
<td>To separate LoU V from III, IVA, and IVB. If a positive response is given, LoU V probes (below) are used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you considering making or planning to make major modifications or to replace the innovation at this time?</td>
<td>To separate LoU VI from III, IVA, IVB, and V.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LoU V Probes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do you work together? How frequently?</td>
<td>To verify Decision Point E; to probe Performing Category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the strengths and the weaknesses of this collaboration for you?</td>
<td>To probe Knowledge Category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you looking for any particular kind of information in relation to this collaboration?</td>
<td>To probe Acquiring Information Category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you talk to others about your collaboration, what do you share with them?</td>
<td>To probe Sharing Category?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you done any formal or informal evaluation of how your collaboration is working?</td>
<td>To probe Assessing Category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What plans do you have for this collaborative effort in the future?</td>
<td>To probe Planning Category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you summarize for me where you see yourself right now in relation to the use of the innovation? (Optional Question)</td>
<td>To get a concise picture of the user’s perception of his/her use or nonuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you made a decision to use the innovation in the future? If so, when?</td>
<td>To separate LoU 0 from I; to probe Status Reporting, Planning, and Performing Categories; to separate LoU I from II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you describe the innovation for me as you see it?</td>
<td>To probe Knowledge Category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the strengths and weaknesses of the innovation for your situation?</td>
<td>To probe Assessing Category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this point in time, what kinds of questions are you asking about the innovation? Give examples if possible.</td>
<td>To probe Assessing, Sharing, and Status Reporting Categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you ever talk with others and share information about the innovation? What do you share?</td>
<td>To probe Sharing Category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are you planning with respect to the innovation? Can you tell me about any preparation or plans you have been making for the use of the innovation?</td>
<td>To probe Planning Category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you summarize for me where you see yourself right now in relation to the use of the innovation? (Optional Question)</td>
<td>To get a concise picture of the user’s perception of his/her use or nonuse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

STAGES OF CONCERN RAW SCORES TABLE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Percentile| 91 | 80  | 78  | 77  | 48  | 68  | 57  |
Percentile Scores Indicating Highest Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentiles Scores Indicating Highest Stage (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note SoC Questionnaire #29 was not returned.*
APPENDIX H

PARTICIPANTS' DEMOGRAPHIC TABLE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant #</th>
<th>School Configuration</th>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Yearly Hours in Training</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Free or Reduced Lunch</th>
<th>School Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3-5th</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3-5th</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PreK-2</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PreK-2</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PreK-2</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: SOC Survey #29 not returned*
APPENDIX I

HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE FORM
STUDY/PROJECT INFORMATION FOR HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE

TITLE: Principals’ Concerns Regarding Change

PROJECT DIRECTOR(S): Theresa Pelfrey (graduate student/researcher); Dr. Dawn Basinger (Committee Chair)

EMAIL: Terry.Pelfrey08@gmail.com

PHONE: (850) 549-6705

DEPARTMENT: Louisiana Education Consortium, Educational Leadership

PURPOSE OF STUDY/PROJECT: To investigate the concerns of K-12 principals as they implement changes relevant to their activities as school principals.

SUBJECTS: Louisiana Pre-K through 12th Grade Principals in Claiborne, Richland, Lincoln, and Ouachita Parishes

PROCEDURE: Approximately 30 principals from northern Louisiana schools will voluntarily complete a packet of self-report questionnaires on concerns regarding innovations and changes in their active role as school principals. Each principal will be asked to complete a demographic questionnaire. Data will be analyzed to determine each principal’s area (stage) of concern and second greatest concern regarding change and innovation. Approximately six participants will be selected to interview. Interview narratives will inform the research about principal’s concerns regarding change in greater depth.

INSTRUMENTS AND MEASURES TO INSURE PROTECTION OF CONFIDENTIALITY, ANONYMITY: Copyright permission has been granted to use the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (C-BAM) 35-item survey called the “Stages of Concern Questionnaire” (SoCQ) (see attached copyright permission letter). Human Subjects Consent Form will be distributed to each participant. A Demographic page will be sent with the survey packet (Cover Letter, Introductory Page, Survey, Demographic Page, and Human Subjects Consent Form). All collected information will be held confidential and only viewed by the researchers.

RISKS/ALTERNATIVE TREATMENTS: The participant understands that Louisiana Tech and/or the researcher is not able to offer financial compensation as a result of participating in this research.

BENEFITS/COMPENSATION: None

SAFEGUARDS OF PHYSICAL AND EMOTIONAL WELL-BEING: This study involves no treatment or physical contact. All information collected from the survey will
be held strictly confidential. No one will be allowed access to the survey other than the researchers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you plan to publish this study?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will this study be published by a national organization?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are copyrighted materials involved?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have written permission to use copyrighted materials?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Ms. Theresa Pelfrey and Dr. Dawn Basinger
FROM: Barbara Talbot, University Research
SUBJECT: HUMAN USE COMMITTEE REVIEW
DATE: April 24, 2012

In order to facilitate your project, an EXPEDITED REVIEW has been done for your proposed study entitled:

"Principals' Concerns Regarding Change"

HUC 968

The proposed study’s revised procedures were found to provide reasonable and adequate safeguards against possible risks involving human subjects. The information to be collected may be personal in nature or implication. Therefore, diligent care needs to be taken to protect the privacy of the participants and to assure that the data are kept confidential. Informed consent is a critical part of the research process. The subjects must be informed that their participation is voluntary. It is important that consent materials be presented in a language understandable to every participant. If you have participants in your study whose first language is not English, be sure that informed consent materials are adequately explained or translated. Since your reviewed project appears to do no damage to the participants, the Human Use Committee grants approval of the involvement of human subjects as outlined.

Projects should be renewed annually. This approval was finalized on April 24, 2012 and this project will need to receive a continuation review by the IRB if the project, including data analysis, continues beyond April 24, 2013. Any discrepancies in procedure or changes that have been made including approved changes should be noted in the review application. Projects involving NIH funds require annual education training to be documented. For more information regarding this, contact the Office of University Research.

You are requested to maintain written records of your procedures, data collected, and subjects involved. These records will need to be available upon request during the conduct of the study, and retained by the university for three years after the conclusion of the study. If changes occur in recruiting of subjects, informed consent process or in your research protocol, or if unanticipated problems should arise it is the Researchers responsibility to notify the Office of Research or IRB in writing. The project should be discontinued until modifications can be reviewed and approved.

If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Mary Livingston at 257-4315.
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STAGES OF CONCERN QUESTIONNAIRE LETTER
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Date:

To: Principal
Participating School
Address

From: Terry Pelfrey
Graduate Student
Louisiana Tech University
26081 Summerfield Highway
Bernice, LA 71222

Subject: Research

Thank you for your willingness to assist me in my research study efforts. I am currently involved in studying the process of change in education, what happens to individuals in change and why. Because you have been involved in leadership programs and training that recognizes and promotes professional educator leadership standards such as the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards, the National Association of Elementary School Principals standards, and the leadership criteria set forth by the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), I feel that your insights and experience will be a valuable source of information as I seek to learn more about the process of change.

I am asking you to fill out the attached 35-item questionnaire which seeks to measure your present concerns about implementing innovations. Please place the completed questionnaire in self-addressed envelope included and return it to me. As you will notice, I do not ask for your name, but I have coded the packet in the upper right corner. Once I have confirmed receipt of all packets, the code will be removed from the corner and destroyed.

Thank you for your help. I will be certain to report my finding to you in the hope that they will be of value to you in your leadership role.

Sincerely,

Terry Pelfrey
Graduate Student
Louisiana Tech University

Attachments
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HUMAN SUBJECTS CONSENT FORM
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HUMAN SUBJECTS CONSENT FORM

The following is a brief summary of the project in which you are asked to participate. Please read this information before signing the statement below.

TITLE OF PROJECT: Principals’ Concerns Regarding Change

PURPOSE OF STUDY/PROJECT: To investigate the concerns of K-12 principals as they implement changes relevant to their activities as school principals.

PROCEDURE: Approximately 30 principals from northern Louisiana schools will voluntarily complete a packet of self-report questionnaires on concerns regarding innovations and changes in their active role as school principals. Each principal will be asked to complete a demographic questionnaire. Data will be analyzed to determine each principal’s area (stage) of concern and second greatest concern regarding change and innovation. Approximately six participants will be selected to interview. Interview narratives will inform the research about principal’s concerns regarding change in greater depth.

INSTRUMENTS: Copyright permission has been granted to use the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (C-BAM) 35-item survey called the “Stages of Concern Questionnaire” (SoCQ) (see attached copyright permission letter). Human Subjects Consent Form will be distributed to each participant. A Demographic page will be sent with the survey packet (Cover Letter, Introductory Page, Survey, Demographic Page, and Human Subjects Consent Form). All collected information will be held confidential and only viewed by the researchers.

RISKS/ALTERNATIVE TREATMENTS: The participant understands that Louisiana Tech and/or the researcher is not able to offer financial compensation as a result of participating in this research.

BENEFITS/COMPENSATION:

I, ____________________, attest with my signature that I have read and understood the following description of the study, “Principals’ concerns Regarding Change”, and its purposes and methods. I understand that my participation in this research is strictly voluntary and my participation or refusal to participate in this study will not affect my relationship with Louisiana Tech University in any way. Further, I understand that I may withdraw at any time or refuse to answer any questions without penalty. Upon completion of the study, I understand that the results will be freely available to me upon request. I understand that the results of my survey will be confidential, accessible only to the principal investigators, myself, or a legally appointed representative. I have not been requested to waive nor do I waive any of my rights related to participating in this study.

_________________________  ______________________
Signature of Participant               Date
CONTACT INFORMATION: The principal experimenters listed below may be reached to answer questions about the research, subjects' rights, or related matters.
Theresa D. Pelfrey: (850) 549-6705 (cell); terry.pelfrey08@gmail.com
Dr. Dawn Basinger: dbasing@latech.edu

Members of the Human Use Committee of Louisiana Tech University may also be contacted if a problem cannot be discussed with the experimenters: Dr. Les Guice (257-3056; Dr. Mary M. Livingston (256-2292 or 257-4315)
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C-BAM COPYRIGHT PERMISSION LETTER
To: Theresa Pelfrey (Licensee)
Summerfield High School
26081 Summerville Highway
Bernice, LA 71222

From: Nancy Reynolds
Information Associate
SEDL
Information Resource Center-Copyright Permissions
4700 Mueller Blvd.
Austin, TX 78723

Subject: License Agreement to reprint and distribute SEDL materials

Date: January 13, 2012

Thank you for your interest in using the excerpts from the books 1) *Measuring Implementation in Schools: The Stages of Concern Questionnaire* written by Archie A. George, Gene E. Hall, and Suzanne M. Stiegelbauer and 2) *Measuring Implementation in Schools: Levels of Use* written by Gene E. Hall, Deborah J. Dirksen, and Archie A. George. Both of these books were published by SEDL in 2006. You have asked to use excerpts as follows:

1. From *Measuring Implementation in Schools: The Stages of Concern Questionnaire*, Stages of Concern Questionnaire (SoCQ) published as Appendix A, pages 79-82 and also available as a PDF document on an accompanying CD-ROM.

2. From *Measuring Implementation in Schools: Levels of Use*, The Basic Interview Protocol published as Appendix A Pages 53-56

These excerpts will be referred to as the "works" in this permission agreement. SEDL is pleased to grant permission for use of the works cited above by the Licensee who is a doctoral student at Louisiana Tech University in Ruston, LA. The Licensee will use the works in her dissertation on the topic of perceived challenges of principals promoting school change. The following are the terms, conditions, and limitations governing this limited permission to reproduce the works:

1. All reprinting and distribution activities shall be solely in the media in which the works have been made available for your use, i.e., copy made from a print copy or a PDF document, or in the case of the Stages of Concern Questionnaire, SEDL's online version, and shall be used for educational, non-profit use only. Precise compliance with the following terms and conditions shall be required for any permitted reproduction of the works described above.

Voice: 800-476-6851
Fax: 512-476-2286
2. No adaptations, deletions, or changes are allowed with the exception in the Stages of Concern Questionnaire to substitute the words “the innovation” with a word or phrase that participants will recognize, such as the name of the innovation or initiative, and questions can be added to identify demographic indicators of participants before or after the instrument, but otherwise, the wording and order of items cannot be changed. No derivative work based on or incorporating the works will be created without the prior written consent of SEDL.

3. This permission is non-exclusive, non-transferable, and limited to the one-time use specified herein. This permission is granted solely for the period January 13, 2012 through January 13, 2013, inclusive. SEDL expressly reserves all rights in this material.

4. You must give appropriate credit: "Reprinted by Theresa Pelfrey with permission of SEDL," or attribute SEDL as appropriate to the professional style guidelines you are following. All reproductions of the materials used by you shall also bear the following copyright notice on each page of use: "Copyright © 2006, SEDL."

5. An exact copy of any reproduction of the work you produce shall be promptly provided to SEDL. All copies of the work produced by you which are not distributed or used shall be destroyed or sent to SEDL, save and except a maximum of three archival copies you are permitted to keep in permanent records of the activity you conducted.

6. This License Agreement to reproduce the works is limited to the terms hereof and is personal to the person and entity to whom it has been granted; and it may not be assigned, given, or transferred to any other person or entity.

7. SEDL is not charging the Licensee a copyright fee to use the works.

I'm e-mailing you a PDF of this agreement. Please print and sign one copy below, indicating that you understand and agree to comply with the above terms, conditions and limitations, and send the original back to me. If you wish to keep a copy with original signatures, please also print, sign, and return a second copy and, after I receive and sign it, I'll return it with both of our signatures to you.

Thank you, again, for your interest in using excerpts from SEDL's publications Measuring Implementation in Schools: The Stages of Concern Questionnaire and Measuring Implementation in Schools: Levels of Use. If you have any questions, please contact me at 800-476-6861, ext. 6548 or 512-391-6548, or by e-mail at nancy.reynolds@sedl.org.

Sincerely,

Nancy Reynolds for SEDL

Agreed and accepted:

Signature: Theresa Pelfrey

Printed Name: Theresa Pelfrey

January 27, 2012

January 24, 2012
APPENDIX N

SOCQUESTIONNAIRE INTRODUCTORY LETTER
Stages of Concern Questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine what principals who desire to implement change and innovations are concerned about at various times during the change process.

The items were developed from typical responses of school and college participants who ranged from no knowledge at all about various programs and innovations to many years' experience using them. Therefore, some of the items on this questionnaire may appear to be of little relevance or irrelevant to you at this time. For the completely irrelevant items, please circle "0" on the scale. Other items will represent those concerns you do have, in varying degrees of intensity, and should be marked higher on the scale.

For example:

- This statement is very true of me at this time. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- This statement is somewhat true of me now. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- This statement is not at all true of me at this time. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- This statement seems irrelevant to me. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Please respond to the items in terms of your present concerns, or how you feel about your involvement with this innovation. For the context of this survey, please think of the term innovation as anything new or innovative that you do with the goal of improving education and learning. Phrases such as "this approach" and "the new system" all refer to the same innovation. Remember to respond to each item in terms of your present concerns about your involvement or potential involvement with the innovation.

Thank you for taking time to complete this task.

Terry Pelfrey
APPENDIX O

LEVELS OF USE RATING SHEET
# LEVEL OF USE RATING SHEET (CBAM, 1975)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Acquiring Information</th>
<th>Sharing</th>
<th>Assessing</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Status Reporting</th>
<th>Performing</th>
<th>Overall LoU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonuse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Point A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Point B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Point C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Use</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Point D-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>IVA</td>
<td>IVA</td>
<td>IVA</td>
<td>IVA</td>
<td>IVA</td>
<td>IVA</td>
<td>IVA</td>
<td>IVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Point D-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinement</td>
<td>IVB</td>
<td>IVB</td>
<td>IVB</td>
<td>IVB</td>
<td>IVB</td>
<td>IVB</td>
<td>IVB</td>
<td>IVB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Point E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Point F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User is not doing:</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information in interview:</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is the individual a past user? Yes No If so, what was their last LoU? ___________________

How much difficulty did you have in assigning this person to a specific LoU? None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very much

Comments about interviewer—

General comments—
APPENDIX P

LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS
Bernice, LA 71222

March 2012

Superintendent

Dear Superintendent,

I am a graduate student at Louisiana Tech University pursuing my doctoral degree in educational leadership. As a part of my dissertation process, I will be surveying 30 Louisiana school principals on several aspects of implementing changes and innovations in their leadership role. Currently, I am preparing a list of principals to whom I would like to send surveys. Prior to conducting these surveys, I request your permission contact the following principals:

Initially, each principal will receive a demographic survey asking whether their leadership role is influenced by the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) criteria for educational leaders and/or the ISLLC standards. The demographic survey will also ask each principal to list their top three concerns regarding change.

After the demographic surveys, the principals will receive a survey packet containing a cover letter, introductory page, Human Subjects Consent form, SoC Questionnaire, and demographic page. The questionnaires will be coded so that the relationship of participants will not be connected to a particular school or parish. Once the receipt of the packet has been confirmed, the code will be removed and destroyed. The 35-item questionnaire will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

The survey instrument I will be using is the *Measuring Implementation in Schools: Stages of Concern (SoC)*, questionnaire which is one dimension of the *Concerns-Based Adoption Model*, originally developed by Hall, Wallace, and Dossett in 1973. The SoC questionnaire was updated in 2006 and continues to be a useful measure of the concerns that administrators have when implementing changes in their practice. After the surveys are complete, I will ask six principals to participate in an interview.

These principals were recommended by my colleagues due to their forward-looking perspectives on change and leadership in a time of increased accountability. I would greatly appreciate your permission to utilize the valued time of these principals. If you have any further questions regarding this study, please feel free to contact me at (850) 549-5705.

Sincerely,

Terry Pelfrey
Terry.pelfrey08@gmail.com
APPENDIX Q

STAGES OF CONCERN QUICK SCORING DEVICE
### Stages of Concern Quick Scoring Device

#### Stage 0-6 Raw Score Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentile Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Raw Score Totals

**Raw Score Totals**

**Percentile Scores**

---
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