Exploring Perceptions of Leadership for School Staff

Constance Oterkiil

University of Stavanger

Abstract. *The study presented here uses Q methodology to explore the perceptions of teachers, paraprofessionals, administrators, and head teachers about leadership. Altogether, 84 employees from four different Norwegian primary schools were asked to rank-order 27 statements related to leadership. The aim of this study was to explore perceptions of leadership for the staff of a primary school. The results present two perspectives:* Appreciates Faculty *and* Appreciates the School. Appreciates Faculty *seems to prefer leadership that has a focus on individual staff development over management practices and setting directions. The people whose sorts loaded significantly on* Appreciates the School, *on the other hand, had quite the opposite view. These people saw management practices and setting directions as the most important leadership traits, as opposed to leadership with an individual staff focus which they saw as least important. The findings are discussed in light of research and theory on the topic of transformational and transactional leadership. This study contributes to the literature on subjectivity and school leadership by revealing the opinions about what leadership practices are important.*

Introduction

The literature reveals that as many as half of the evidence-based programs introduced in schools will fail to reach their expected outcomes due to poor implementation (Gingiss, Roberts-Gray, & Boerm, 2006), and more will fail to provide sustainable change (Datnow & Stringfield, 2000; Ertesvåg, Roland, Vaaland, Størksen, & Veland, in press). In order to understand why some schools succeed in implementing and sustaining change and some fail, we need to take a closer look at the schools' capacity to implement change. A number of studies have found leadership to be one of the most forceful factors influencing a school's capacity to change (Adelman & Taylor, 2000; Elliott & Mihalic, 2004; Fullan, 2007; Kam, Greenberg, & Walls, 2003; Lethwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008; Leithwood, Jantzi & Steinbach, 1999; Midthassel & Ertesvåg, 2008; Mortimore, 1998; Rohrbach,

Graham & Hansen, 1993; Sobeck, Abbey, & Agius, 2006; Varlaam, Nuttall, & Walker, 1992). One of the reasons why leadership appears to be such an important factor is that it serves as a catalyst for unleashing the potential capacities that already exist within the school (Leithwood et al., 2008). Hence, leadership is like the water and soil needed in order for the seeds of capacity to sprout and the school to grow.

Leadership support is important, as the nature of the support may influence how successful a change initiative is (Burke, 2008; Greenberg, Domitrovich, Graczyk, & Zins, 2005). Research show that a strong, continuous and systematic focus on leadership by the head teacher is one of the keys to successful implementation of change initiatives in schools (Larsen & Samdal, 2007; Midthassel & Ertesvåg, 2008). However, research indicates that in order for change initiatives to be sustainable and strong, supportive leadership has to be present at many levels (Ertesvåg et al., in press). A distributed perspective on leadership was chosen for this study, in an attempt to illustrate the complex and dynamic nature of school leadership. This view acknowledges that leadership can be performed by a number of different people within the school, not just by the head teacher. Hence, leadership is distributed among several members of the organization (Fletcher & Kaufer, 2003), and expands over the school's social and situational contexts (Spillane et al., 2001).

Although the need for leadership performed by the head teacher is important for school improvement (Fullan, 2007; Larsen, 2005), there is reason to believe that leadership performed only by people in formal leadership positions is inadequate. Although earlier studies have focused mainly on the principal as the key leader (Louis, 2003; Midthassel et al., 2000), there has recently been an increasing focus on distributed leadership (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). Leading today's schools is simply too complex and challenging for one single person to do by themselves. One way to solve this problem is by distributing leadership throughout the school by building leadership capacity among the teachers (Stoll, 2009). A hierarchical leadership structure with one sole leader may not be the most effective in organizations such as schools, as this type of organization demands a continuous focus on a number of complex projects and leadership tasks (Leithwood et al., 2008). Ertesvåg and Roland (submitted) found that whole school prevention programs that are complex in both content and range of participants will demand a strong focus on leadership, especially on the head teacher's ability to promote collective leadership among staff members. This type of leadership is necessary, but also a great challenge, especially since it will demand a strong formal leader who manages to create a culture and structures that enable the development of sustainable leadership on many levels within the school (Ertesvåg &

Roland, submitted).

Stoll (1999) claims that the single most important person when it comes to school improvement is the individual teacher, as the teacher's capacity to continuously learn may directly influence what he or she chooses to teach the students. In this regard, it is important to unveil what types of leadership practices influence the individual teacher's ability to engage in and sustain continuous learning. One such leadership practice may involve the head teacher providing opportunities for leadership roles among school staff and engaging them in decision making. Such opportunities may lead to increased empowerment which again may help build greater optimism, commitment, and motivation to change among staff (Greenberg et al., 2005; Stoll, 1999). Leadership that is involving and promotes a caring and supportive emotional climate may contribute to successful change initiatives (Stoll & Fink, 1996). Moreover, communicating that the teachers are resourceful, capable, and able to manage new tasks may build their self-esteem and motivation. Also, the effects of change initiatives appear to be greater when individual teachers or teams are given the opportunity and responsibility to lead their colleagues through the change process (Stoll & Fink, 1996).

A top-down communication style between the head teacher and teachers seems to have the opposite effect, as it may lead to increased resistance and reduced efforts to implement change (Greenberg et al., 2005). Hence, in order to create successful and sustainable change, the head teacher as a key resource must work to create a culture and climate where the teachers feel ownership and support for the change. Based on an extensive synthesis of research, Leithwood et al. (2008) make the claim that most successful leaders seem to have one thing in common: they all draw on the same set of four core leadership practices. These practices may be described as building a vision and setting directions, understanding and developing people, redesigning the organization, and managing the teaching and learning programme (Leithwood et al., 2008), all of which can be seen as part of a transformational or transactional leadership style. The first three leadership practices closely resemble what Burke and Litwin (1992) call transformational leadership, while the fourth practice resembles what they call transactional leadership.

Transformational and Transactional Leadership

Research shows that transformational leadership practices can be widely distributed across the organization (Leithwood, Jantzi, Earl, Fullan, & Levin, 2004) and may therefore be seen as part of a distributed leadership perspective. The constructs of transformational and transactional leadership were originally created by Burns (1978) and

later developed into a two-factor model by Bass (1985). This model has since been changed and refined a number of times (Bass, 1996; Bass & Avolio, 1990) and used in a number of different organizational settings. Based on the original construct of transformational leadership as well as their qualitative and quantitative research on school leadership in particular, Leithwood, Tomlinson, and Genge (1996) developed their own model of transformational leadership. This model was different from earlier models in that central features associated with transformational leadership (such as charisma) were excluded, new dimensions of leadership practices were added, and the concept of transactional leadership was given very different significance (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). The model has evolved over time and their current model of transformational leadership is used as a theoretical framework in this study (Leithwood et al., 2008) supported by Burke and Litwin's (1992) definitions of transformational and transactional leadership.

Building Vision and Setting Directions

Building vision and setting directions carries the bulk of the effort to motivate staff, and primarily involves motivating employees to do their job by creating a common purpose and building a shared vision (Leithwood et al., 2008). Moving the organization forward encompasses leadership practices that specifically aim to build a collective understanding among school staff and to increase their commitment and feeling of ownership of the school's vision and goals. Furthermore, this type of leadership involves demonstrating high-performance expectations (Leithwood et al., 2008). The most fundamental explanations as to why building vision and setting directions is such an important aspect of leadership practices are goal-based theories of human motivation (e.g., Bandura, 1986). These kind of theories build on an understanding that people are motivated by goals that they personally find desirable and challenging, yet achievable.

Understanding and Developing People

Understanding and developing people is about offering individualized support, providing professional challenges and developing staff capacity. Moreover, it is about motivating staff by providing intellectual stimulation and opportunities for them to develop new skills, and by modelling appropriate values and behaviours (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). Developing staff capacity is an important element when implementing changes in schools, as it is the staff members, who ultimately carry out the change initiatives. Hence, leadership needs to have a focus on utilizing and developing each individual staff member's qualifications, creating conditions that increase their commitment and capacities, resulting in greater efforts and accomplishments. Research

indicates that a leader devoting personal attention to employees and utilizing their individual capacities may increase their level of optimism and motivation, reduce frustrations and give the employee a sense of mission, indirectly leading to increased performance (McColl-Kennedy & Anderson, 2002).

Redesigning the Organization

Redesigning the organization involves leadership behaviours specifically aimed at building a collaborative culture and working conditions that allow school staff to make the most of their motivations and capacities (Leithwood et al., 2008). The school as an organization in continuous development is a crucial contribution to the staff's professional growth and student learning. This view of the school builds on the comprehension that in order to make work easier for the staff, leaders should strive to develop the school culture and existing structures. New tasks and structures will then impact what organizational changes are going to be prioritized.

Managing the Teaching and Learning Programme

Managing the teaching and learning programme involves creating productive working conditions for school staff by strengthening the school's infrastructure and monitoring school activity (Leithwood et al., 2008). Furthermore, this type of leadership practice involves developing written plans regarding the practical implementation of developmental school activities and ensuring that necessary resources are available in order to practically carry out the work tasks to satisfaction.

Method

The purpose of this study was to determine the leadership practices that are perceived as most important by primary school staff using the four types of leadership presented above.

Because of the intent to capture school staff members' subjective opinions about what they personally perceive as the most important school-leadership traits, it became natural to make use of Q methodology. For this study, a Q sample was developed based on a theoretical framework featuring transformational and transactional leadership (Leithwood et al., 2008). In order to ensure a salient and diverse Q sample, 27 statements derived from questionnaires and earlier research were placed approximately equally within the four main leadership headings of building a vision and setting directions, understanding and developing people, redesigning the organization, and managing the teaching and learning program (see Appendix).

P-Set Participants

The study participants were 84 staff from four different primary schools in the county of Rogaland, Norway. The participants consisted of head

teachers, leaders, teachers and teacher's aides. The aim was to ensure that the range of staff members from different professions/positions within the school was thoroughly represented. The participants were selected through a few different approaches. Some of the head teachers instructed the leaders at each grade level to appoint a certain number of teachers to participate, while others made a list of participants ensuring the inclusion of both women and men from a range of different grade levels and work positions. All participants were anonymous in the sense that they did not report their names and ages. They did however, give information about gender, years working within the school system, and current position within the school (teacher, teacher's aide, head teacher, leader, other). Altogether, 17 of the participants were men and 61 were women, while six participants did not provide information about their gender. Among the participants were 55 teachers, three head teachers, nine leaders, six teacher's aides, five "other position", and six with no position reported. Furthermore, 26 participants had 21 or more years experience working in schools, 29 had 11–20 years, eight had 6–10 years, 14 had 0–5 years, and seven did not report on their work experience.

Procedure

The 27 statements were sorted into a matrix ranging from −4 to +4, where one statement was to be placed under −4 and +4, two under −3 and +3, three under −2 and +2, and five under −1, 0 and +1. The reason for the small number of statements to be placed in the outer edges of the matrix was to force the participants to prioritise just a few statements about leadership that they found most important and least important. However, Cottle and McKeown (1980) argue that the factor structure will in no way be affected by the shape of the matrix, whether it is bell-shaped, flat or having more statements on the extreme ends. What is more important is that the placements around each of the extremes carry much more weight in this analysis than the relatively weightless placements around zero (Brown, 1980). This means that the statements placed in the outer edges of the matrix will strongly inform the different perspectives that appear in this study.

Results

After completion by all 84 participants, the data was analyzed by the PQMethod 2.11 program (Schmolck, 2002). Two distinct factors emerged based on the principal component analysis and varimax rotation. However, 20 people failed to load significantly on either of the first two factors that emerged. Further exploration of multiple factors revealed that these participants did not form clusters on one or two additional factors, but were rather scattered across multiple factors. Based on these observations, only two factors were used in the final

analysis for this study. Moreover, the factor loadings for three sorts were fairly similar for both factors. They were therefore regarded as confounded and excluded from interpretation. Three other sorts were ·found to load significantly negative on the second factor. This indicates that they sorted the items opposite from the rest of the participants loading significantly on that factor. Two of the participants who loaded negatively on this factor were administrators and one was a teacher. We will now take a closer look at some of the defining, distinguishing, and consensus statements for the two factors, based on the factor arrays in the Appendix.

Appreciates Faculty

The first factor represents the view of 46 school staff, with two of these being administrators and the rest being teachers, paraprofessionals or "other". Defining statements for *Appreciates Faculty* on the positive end of the matrix include "Encouraging a supportive atmosphere among the school's staff" (+4), "Showing an interest in my competence and how it best can be utilised at the school" (+3), and "Giving me support through the appreciation of my contribution to the school" (+3).

On the negative end of the matrix the defining statements for this factor include "Making sure that the individual staff member is given clear instructions of what their responsibility is regarding a specific project/assignment" (−4), "Working out clearly written plans on how projects can be carried out" (−3), and "Contributing to clarify why we should participate in a new school development activity" (−3).

The data indicate that the participants who loaded significantly on *Appreciates Faculty* seem to prefer leaders who encourage a supporting atmosphere among the school's staff. This may be interpreted as a sign that these participants attach great importance to teamwork, collaboration and a spirit of solidarity among their colleagues. Furthermore, these people seem to value leadership that is supportive of their contributions to the school, and leaders who show an interest in their individual competences and makes an effort to utilise them within the school. All of these preferences point to individuals who value leaders who are people-oriented, who make an effort to promote a school climate that is supportive, where teachers cooperate and learn from each other, while at the same time giving attention to the special resources that exist within each individual staff member. What *Appreciates Faculty* participants find less important are leaders who provide them with clear instructions as to what their responsibility is regarding a specific project. Moreover, providing clearly written plans as well as clarifying why staff should participate in a new school development activity are leadership traits that *Appreciates Faculty* participants find less important. It may seem like these people perceive

leadership that provides clear and precise instructions as to how staff should execute their tasks to be less important than leadership that focuses on developing the individual staff member's capacities and encourages a supportive school climate.

Appreciates the School

The second factor represents the views of 18 school staff, consisting of 10 teachers, paraprofessionals or "other", and eight administrators, two of whom loaded negatively on this factor. Defining statements for *Appreciates the School* on the positive end of the matrix include "Effectively utilising the resources that exist among the staff" (+4), "Encouraging us to improve and further develop school practices" (+3), and "Involving staff in debates concerning the school's goals and visions" (+3).

On the negative end of the matrix the defining statements for this factor include "Expressing high expectations of the work that is performed when carrying out school development exercises" (−4), "Giving me individual support on my work with school development activities" (−3), and "Setting a good example of how I can carry out new tasks" (−3).

Appreciates the School participants seem to perceive leadership that effectively utilises the existing resources among staff as the most important leadership practice. Furthermore, they want leaders who encourage them to improve and further develop school practices, as well as leaders who involve the staff in discussions around goals and visions of the school. The leadership practices preferred by *Appreciates the School* participants are all about effectiveness, school development, reaching goals and pushing the staff to improve their practices. These people appear to thrive under conditions where school leaders are task-oriented, encouraging the whole workgroup to use their resources in order to reach goals and improve their school. What *Appreciates the School* participants do not find as important are leadership practices that express high expectations to the work performed when carrying out school development exercises. They also view leadership practices that involve giving them individual support with school development activities and leading by example as less important. These results may indicate that more important to *Appreciates the School* participants is having leaders who keep a "whole-school" focus, rather than leaders who focus on the individual teacher.

Distinguishing Statements and Areas of Consensus

Altogether *Appreciates Faculty* contributed to 22 percent of the explained variance, and *Appreciates the School* to 11 percent. The correlation between the factors was r = 0.26. The differences between participants who loaded significantly on *Appreciates Faculty* and

Appreciates the School are best shown by looking at those statements that seem to distinguish the factors most. Two of the statements that most significantly distinguish between the two factors are statement number 5 "Showing an interest in my competence and how it best can be utilised at the school" and statement number 26 "Giving me support through the appreciation of my contribution to the school", which both got a high rank (+3) on *Appreciates Faculty* and a rather low rank (–1) on *Appreciates the School*. Furthermore, statement number 1. "Giving me individual support on my work with school development activities" got ranked (1) on *Appreciates Faculty* compared to the low rank (–3) on *Appreciates the School*. Statement number 4, "Ensuring that when a decision is made it is carried out" however, got a low rank (–2) on *Appreciates Faculty* but a high rank (+2) on *Appreciates the School*. All of the statements above had factor scores that differed significantly between *Appreciates Faculty* and *Appreciates the School*. There are, however, four statements for which the factor scores were not significantly different. Statement number 6, "Motivating the staff to get involved in school development activities" got ranked (+1) on *Appreciates Faculty* and (0) on *Appreciates the School*, and statement number 22, "Coordinating the tasks that need to be done" ranked (–1) on *Appreciates Faculty* and (0) on *Appreciates the School*. Statement number 24, "Arranging so that challenges can be discussed constructively among colleagues" ranked (+2) on *Appreciates Faculty* and (+1) on *Appreciates the School*. Statement number 21, "Making sure that new employees get an understanding of the school's way of working" received the same rating (0) on both *Appreciates Faculty* and *Appreciates the School*. What we can see from all of these four statements is that none were rated very high or very low, but were perceived as rather "neutral" statements by participants on both factors. The data presented here help to clarify the different views that the two factors represent and provide valuable information for the implications of the study.

Discussion

The results show some clear distinctions between the preferences of *Appreciates Faculty* participants and *Appreciates the School* participants, in relation to transformational and transactional leadership, and the four categories of leadership presented by Leithwood et al. (2008). While *Appreciates Faculty* participants seem to prefer transformational leadership practices related to the categories of "understanding and developing people" and "redesigning the organization," *Appreciates the School* participants prefer a combination of transactional leadership practices related to "managing the teaching and learning programme" and transformational practices related to "building vision and setting directions". When we look at what the two groups perceive as the least

important leadership practices, we can see distinct differences between the participants. *Appreciates Faculty* participants perceive a combination of transactional leadership practices related to "managing the teaching and learning programme" and transformational leadership practices related to "building vision and setting directions" as least important. *Appreciates the School* participants however perceive transformational leadership practices related to "building vision and setting directions" and "understanding and developing people" to be of least importance. When comparing the factors we can clearly see how they represent two very different and almost totally opposite views of what are perceived to be the most and least important leadership practices.

In one of the schools, 82 percent of the participants loaded on *Appreciates Faculty*, while only 4.5 percent loaded on *Appreciates the School*. This was however, unique for this particular school, as results from the other three schools were more balanced. Why so many of the staff members loaded on *Appreciates Faculty* in this specific school is not known, and it would therefore be interesting to investigate this further. However, looking at the data collected on gender, position, and years of working within schools, no specific differences have been found to indicate why this school should differ from the rest. Also, looking at these data, no typical patterns were discovered that could indicate that any of them affected if a person ended up loading on *Appreciates Faculty* or *Appreciates the School*. What these final results do tell us, however, is that every school differs and that the people working within schools all have their own individual needs and perceptions about what are important leadership practices. Moreover, these findings support previous research suggesting that there is no "one size fits all" type of leadership, but instead every leader will have to adjust their leadership practices to fit the individual school's unique context, applying situational and contextually sensitive combinations of the basic leadership practices described above.

Ertesvåg and Roland (submitted) found that leadership in general, and formal leadership specifically, may be a possible explanation as to why some schools are more successful than others in carrying out leadership at different levels during implementation of evidence-based prevention programs. Hence, more schools may experience better effect of these programs, if a stronger focus is put on factors that promote a school's ability to execute leadership on many levels. Moreover, not only is it important "who" executes leadership it is just as important "how" this leadership is carried out. Midthassel and Ertesvåg (2008) found that schools that carried out successful implementations had leaders who were both transformational and transactional. Unsuccessful schools, however, had leaders who either lacked one or both of these leadership styles (Midthassel & Ertesvåg, 2008). These findings are in accordance

with those of Larsen and Samdal (2007), who discovered that head teachers who managed to balance both leadership and management strategies, focusing on individual factors such as teacher alignment and commitment as well as organizational factors such as formalisation into policy and allocation of sufficient resources, were able to motivate teachers to use the program being implemented, which of course is a necessity in order to gain any systematic effect. Furthermore, Kallestad and Olweus (2003) found that teachers indeed seemed to be the key agents of change when it came to both the adoption and implementation of a school-based anti-bullying program. Findings like these help shed light on the importance of leadership and how it may motivate teachers to get involved in change efforts and bring these changes into their classrooms. Moreover, it highlights the importance of steering the focus towards teachers' subjective perceptions of what they believe to be good leadership practices. Being able to identify what teachers expect and need from their leaders may be one of the keys to understanding what motivates them to engage in change initiatives and improve their classroom practices.

Making use of Q methodology may give us a better understanding of what staff members within a particular school look for in their school leaders. This may be particularly important in struggling schools, as previous research indicates that those schools struggling with implementing change efforts are those in most need of change (Fullan 2005; Stoll, MacBeath, Smith, & Robertson, 2001). School improvement may for some schools involve a firm focus on developing motivation among the teachers, by raising their confidence levels so that they are willing and able to get involved in the change process. Furthermore, they need to be provided with the tools to become experts in the new teaching strategy (Stoll 1999). It takes capacity to build capacity, and since leadership may serve as a catalyst for unleashing the potential capacities that already exist within the school (Leithwood et al., 2008) it seems only natural to start here. Providing leaders of struggling schools with a picture of what their staff members perceive as the most important leadership traits at the beginning of a change process may give these leaders valuable information about where to put their efforts in order to move their school forward.

The author hopes that the results of this Q study may provide researchers and school leaders with new insight into the complex task of leading school staff. Not only is it important for leaders to be sensitive to factors such as culture, climate, resources, and so on, school leaders also need to be sensitive to the fact that their staff members all have individual needs that may differ from person to person and from one stage in the change process to the next. As the results of this study show, there seem to be groupings of staff members who have similar

perceptions of what leadership strategies are more important to them than others. These findings further indicate that Q methodology may be an effective method to include in the complex work of helping schools build their capacity to improve.

As the measuring unit in Q methodology is "importance to me," conventional reliability and validity known from R methodology is not central here. Representativeness however, is an issue of uppermost importance in Q methodology (Brown, 2006). In this regard, the present study could have been improved by including statements derived from interviews with school staff about important school leadership traits and practices. This could add to or refine the already existing statements within each of the four types of leadership categories; *Building vision and setting directions, Understanding and developing people, Redesigning the organization, and Managing the teaching and learning programme.* Making use of a balanced block design when narrowing down the number of statements for the Q sample could also have improved this study. Future research making use of Q methodology may want to take these issues into consideration. A future Q methodology study that makes use of two conditions of instruction such as "sort the statements according to what you believe is most important and least important when it comes to school leadership" and "sort the statements according to what you perceive as most typical and least typical for leadership practiced at you school", could result in some interesting findings. By analyzing the results from both types of Q sorts, we might get some indications as to whether leaders at a school should change their existing leadership strategies and more specifically, what strategies they will need to make use of in order to improve their school.

References

Adelman, H. S., & Taylor, L. (2000). Moving prevention from the fringes into the fabric of school improvement. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 11*(1), 7–36.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Barbosa J. C., Willoughby P., Rosenberg C. A., & Mrtek, R. (1998). Statistical methodology: VII. Q-methodology, a structural analytic approach to medical subjectivity. *Academic Emergency Medicine, 5*, 1032–1040.

Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1996). *A new paradigm of leadership: An inquiry into transformational leadership*. Alexandria, VA: US Army Research Institute for the Behavioural and Social Sciences.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development, 4,* 231–272.

Brown, S. R. (1980). *Political subjectivity: Applications of Q methodology in political science.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Brown, S. R. (2006). Q methodology and naturalistic subjectivity. In B. D. Midgley, & P. A Morris, (Eds.), *Modern perspectives on J. R. Kantor and interbehaviourism.* Reno, NV: Context Press.

Burke, W. W. (2008). *Organization change.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Burke, W. W., & Litwin, G. H. (1992). A causal model of organizational performance and change. *Journal of Management, 18,* 523–545.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Cottle, C. E., & McKeown, B. F. (1980). The forced-free distinction in Q technique: A note on unused categories in the Q sort continuum. *Operant Subjectivity, 3,* 58–63.

Datnow, A., & Stringfield, S. (2000). Working together for reliable school reform. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 5*(1&2), 183–204.

Elliott, D. S., & Mihalic, S. (2004). Issues in disseminating and replicating effective prevention programs. *Prevention Science, 5*(1), 47–53

Ertesvåg, S., & Roland, P. (submitted), Leiing I skuleomfattande tiltak. (Leadership in school-based programs).

Ertesvåg, S., Roland, P., Vaaland, G. S., Størksen, S., & Veland, J. (in press), The challenge of continuation: Schools' continuation of the Respect program. *Journal of Educational Change.*

Fletcher, J. K., & Kaufer, K. (2003), Shared leadership: Paradox and possibility. In C. L. Pearce, & J. A. Conger, (Eds.), *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership* (pp. 21–47). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fullan, M. (1992). Visions that blind. *Educational Leadership, 49*(5), 19–22.

Fullan, M. (2007). The new meaning of educational change. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Gingiss, P., Roberts-Gray, C., & Boerm, M. (2006). Bridge-it: A system for predicting implementation fidelity for school-based tobacco prevention programs. *Prevention Science, 7,* 197–207.

Greenberg, M. T., Domitrovich, C. E., Graczyk, P. A., & Zins, J. E. (2005). *The study of implementation in school-based preventive interventions: Theory, research, and practice.* Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

Kallestad, J. H., & Olweus, D. (2003). Predicting teachers' and schools' implementation of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program: A multilevel study. *Prevention & Treatment, 6*, Article 21. Retrieved from http://www.journals.apa.org/prevention/volume6/pre0060021a.html.

Kam, C.-M., Greenberg, M. T., & Walls, C. T. (2003). Examining the role of implementation quality in school-based prevention using the PATHS curriculum. *Prevention Science, 4*(1), 55–63.

Larsen, T. (2005). Evaluating principals' and teachers' implementation of second step. Doctoral thesis. University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway.

Larsen, T., & Samdal, O. (2007). Facilitating the implementation and sustainability of Second Step. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 52*(2), 187–204.

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership and Management, 28*(1), 27–44.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times.* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 17*(2), 201–227.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., Earl, L., Fullan, M., & Levin, B. (2004). Leadership for large-scale reform. *School Leadership and Management, 24*(1), 57–80.

Leithwood, K., Tomlinson, D., & Genge, M. (1996), Transformational school leadership. In K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger, & A. Hart, (Eds.), *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration* (pp. 109–128). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

McColl-Kennedy, K., & Anderson, R. D. (2002) Impact of leadership style and emotions on subordinate performance, *Leadership Quarterly, 13*, 545–559.

Midthassel, U., Bru, E., & Idsøe, T. (2000). The principal's role in promoting school development activity in Norwegian compulsory schools. *School Leadership and Management, 20*(2), 147–60.

Midthassel, U. V., & Ertesvåg, S. K. (2008). Schools implementing Zero: The process of implementing an anti-bullying program in six Norwegian compulsory schools. *Journal of Educational Change, 9,* 153–172.

Mortimore, P. (1998). *The road to improvement: Reflection on school effectiveness.* Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Rohrbach, L. A., Graham, J. W., & Hansen, W. B. (1993). Diffusion of a school-based substance abuse prevention program: Predictors of program implementation. *Preventive Medicine, 22*: 237–260.

Schmolck, P. (2002). PQMethod (Version 2.11). Retrieved from http://www.lrz-muenchen.de/~schmolck/qmethod.

Sobeck, J. L., Abbey, A., & Agius, E. (2006). Lessons learned from implementing school-based substance abuse prevention curricula. *Children & Schools, 28*(2), 77–85.

Stephenson, W. (1953). The study of behavior: Q-technique and its methodology. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Stoll, L. (1999). Realising our potential: Understanding and developing capacity for lasting improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 10,* 503–532.

Stoll, L. (2009), Capacity building for school improvement or creating capacity for learning? A changing landscape. *Journal of Educational Change, 10,* 115–127.

Stoll, L. & Fink, D. (1996). *Changing our schools: Linking school effectiveness and school improvement.* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Stoll, L., MacBeath, J., Smith, I., & Robertson, P. (2001). The change equation: Capacity for improvement. In J. MacBeath, & P. Mortimore, (Eds.), *Improving school effectiveness* (pp. 169-90). Florence, KY: Taylor & Francis.

Varlaam, A., Nuttall, D., & Walker, A. (1992). *What makes teachers tick? A survey of teacher morale and motivation.* Clare Market Papers No 4. London, UK: Centre for Educational Research, London School of Economics.

Appendix: Statement and Factor Arrays

No	Statement	Appreciates Faculty	Appreciates the School
1	Giving me individual support on my work with school development activities. (U)*	1	–3
2	Encouraging us to improve and further develop school practices. (B)	0	3
3	Setting a good example of how I can carry out new tasks. (U)	–1	–3
4	Ensuring that when a decision is made it is carried out. (R)	–2	2
5	Showing an interest in my competence and how it best can be utilised at the school. (U)	3	–1
6	Motivating the staff to get involved in school development activities. (B)	1	0
7	Making sure that the individual staff member is given clear instructions of what their responsibility is regarding a specific project/assignment. (M)	–4	–1
8	Encouraging us to evaluate our practice and change it when necessary. (B)	–1	1
9	Working out clearly written plans on how projects can be carried out. (M)	–3	0
10	Involving staff in decisions that concern the whole school. (R)	2	1
11	Making clear that I can try again if I don't succeed the first time around. (U)	–1	–2
12	Making sure that our work is progressing. (M)	–2	0
13	Regularly evaluating and if necessary, changing school goals and priorities. (B)	–1	2
14	Making sure there are adequate resources to carry out planned tasks in a satisfactory way. (M)	1	2
15	Expressing high expectations of the work that is performed when carrying out school development exercises. (B)	–2	–4
16	Encouraging me to try new things in my work. (U)	0	–2
17	Contributing to clarify why we should participate in a new school development activity. (B)	–3	–1

No	Statement	Appreciates Faculty	Appreciates the School
18	Making sure that staff have the information they need in order to participate in decisions at the school. (R)	0	1
19	Assisting me if I experience problems with a new task. (U)	1	–1
20	Encouraging a supportive atmosphere among the school's staff. (R)	4	1
21	Making sure that new employees get an understanding of the school's way of working. (R)	0	0
22	Coordinating the tasks that need to be done. (M)	–1	0
23	Encouraging me to further develop my competence. (U)	0	–2
24	Arranging so that challenges can be discussed constructively among colleagues. (R)	2	1
25	Effectively utilising the resources that exist among the staff. (M)	2	4
26	Giving me support through the appreciation of my contribution to the school. (U)	3	–1
27	Involving staff in debates concerning the school's goals and visions. (B)	1	3

Note: The Codes (B), (U), (R), and (M) refer to the follows themes used to ensure a representative Q sample:
(B) Building Vision and Setting Directions
(U) Understanding and Developing People
(R) Redesigning the Organization
(M) Managing the Teaching and Learning Programme