University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

1994

Transforming Leadership in the California Literature Project: Ethnographic Narrative as True Fiction

Jon S. Davies EdD
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Davies, Jon S. EdD, "Transforming Leadership in the California Literature Project: Ethnographic Narrative as True Fiction" (1994). *Dissertations*. 591.

<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/591>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

TRANSFORMING LEADERSHIP IN
THE CALIFORNIA LITERATURE PROJECT:
ETHNOGRAPHIC NARRATIVE AS TRUE FICTION

by
Jon S. Davies

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Education
University of San Diego

August 1994

Dissertation Committee

Joseph C. Rost, Ph.D., Director
Kathryn D. Bishop, Ph.D.
Robert B. Kottkamp, Ph.D.

©
Jon S. Davies

DEDICATION

My eight year old son Jared asked me recently, "Dad, how long have you been working on this paper?" I replied, "As long as you have been on the planet." His eyes widened in amazement as he attempted to remember all the way back to his origin. I began the doctoral program in the spring of 1986 and for too long my family has had to deal with the manic depression that came with the territory. To my soul mate Jodee, who kept the family together throughout the journey, and to our children Jared, Flynt, Blake, and Kai, who have joined us along the way, I dedicate this dissertation as a tribute to their unconditional love and support.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Oedipus: Such a clever tongue!
 I never knew an honest man
 who could dissertate at random so.

Creon: Dissertations do not always hit
 their mark.

Sophocles
Oedipus at Colonus

Many people contributed to insure that my dissertation did not miss its mark. My wife and colleague Jodee Flynt-Davies managed to tolerate my self-doubts and self-pity as we wound our way through the three years of drafting and redrafting, continually engaging me in dialogue, offering support and powerful insights, raising difficult questions, and never losing faith.

Joe Rost demanded clarity of expression and pushed against the limits of my thinking, both in the course work at the university and throughout the dissertation process. Bob Kottkamp, whose office down the hall at Hofstra University always remained open, tolerated my false starts and lofty ruminations, and helped to stay my course. Katie Bishop agreed to join my reconfigured committee late in the dissertation process and gave generously of her time to insure my passage into the academy. My colleague and friend Michael O'Loughlin in the Department of Curriculum and Teaching at Hofstra University continued to fan my spirit even as the vultures circled the dying carcass.

Finally, I thank the California teachers and administrators and California Literature Project members who opened their lives to me and shared stories of their commitment to improve English language arts instruction.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE	1
Introduction	1
The Issue	4
Purpose	6
Research Questions	9
Definition of Terms	10
Outline of the Study	12
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	14
Introduction	14
Contemporary Leadership Theories	15
Limitations of Transforming Leadership	19
Power and Influence	24
Change	29
Organizational Culture	30
The Trivialization of Transforming Leadership	34
Educational Leadership	39
Summary	44
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	45
Introduction	45
Background Assumptions	46
Overview	56
The Shifting Context of the Field	57
Researcher/Author/Persona	62

Constructing a Translation from Experience to Text	64
Ethical Considerations	66
CHAPTER 4 A NARRATIVE OF LEADERSHIP	69
Prologue	69
Dramatis Personae	70
Setting	72
Leadership	108
Intending Changes and Developing Common Purposes	125
Influence and Power	153
Epilogue	170
CHAPTER 5 LEADERSHIP REDUX	172
Introduction	172
Initial Research Questions	173
Original Purposes	181
Methodological Possibilities and Constraints	183
New Directions in Leadership Research and Practice	186
REFERENCES	189
APPENDICES	204
A. Participant Consent Forms	204
B. Human Subjects Committee Approval	207
C. CLP Summer Institute Curriculum Outline	208
D. CLP Position Descriptions	210
E. 1990 CLP Academy Agenda	211
F. 1990 CLP San Diego Summer Institute Plans	214

CHAPTER 1

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

Introduction

Stories of leadership permeate popular culture and portray how people ordinarily understand leadership processes and content. Usually, the main characters of these stories are men in powerful positions in government, business, or military arenas who lead by example and remain resolute as they make decisions in the heat of crisis. Courage, strength, and intelligence, whether used to protect citizens from outside threats or inspire employees to embody organizational goals, are predominant characteristics that leaders display in stories of their actions.

In the twentieth century, for example, men such as Theodore Roosevelt, Douglas MacArthur, Lee Iacocca, and John Kennedy are subjects of leadership stories that elevated them to heroic stature. According to popular accounts, Teddy Roosevelt, in a fit of bravado, led his Rough Riders in a bloody charge up San Juan Hill during battle in the Spanish-American War. Later, as President Roosevelt, he urged the people of the United States to support a regional foreign policy in Latin America based on *talking softly but carrying a big stick*. General MacArthur, faced with retreat in response to the Japanese military invasion during World War II, told Philippine Islanders, "I shall return!" and he did. Later, many people admired and respected him as a leader with uncompromising integrity when he resigned his command during the Korean

War to protest a policy of military restraint ordered by President Truman. In another story Lee Iacocca appeared to rescue Chrysler Corporation from certain bankruptcy, thereby saving thousands of jobs. His risk-taking, tough-talking, no-nonsense media image reflected familiar leadership qualities.

These stories and others like them depict leadership as the heroic actions, usually performed in isolation, of larger than life individuals. For example, the well-known magazine photograph profiling President Kennedy, apparently alone in his office and agonizing over the next move by the United States during the Cuban missile crisis, suggests that leadership is solitary, heroic performance--*it's lonely at the top*.

However, becoming larger than life occasionally has its drawbacks, especially for those who begin to believe the propaganda of their own mythology. Witness the rise and fall from mythic leadership stature of H. Ross Perot, the former unannounced United States presidential candidate who abruptly withdrew from the race in July 1992. His sudden departure confused, dismayed, and disillusioned many people, but perhaps no one more sarcastically than A. M. Rosenthal (1992), who stated in the *New York Times*, "Happily for the Republic, Americans [*sic*] do not court-martial political contenders. In return for this grace, former Lieutenant Perot should not add to the list of charges by continuing to impersonate a leader" (p. 19). Later, when Perot re-entered the race, his earlier withdrawal continued to cast doubts in the voters' minds about his leadership capabilities.

Leadership stories also portray leaders as those who use superior power resources, either material or spiritual, to rescue passive or impotent victims from harm. In other words, ordinary people seem to need leaders to save them from the torment of the human condition. Whitney (1992), for example, in an article about civil war in the former Yugoslavia, suggested that leadership, which he equated with power and resolute action, can bring to an end long-simmering hostility between historic enemies.

What [President Bush and other world leaders] really need to do is to demonstrate clear leadership, which is still something best provided by leaders of powerful nation-states. . . . The challenge before the leaders of the industrialized democracies is how to help build a new structure of security that can help prevent disasters like the one in the Balkans. . . . Mr. Mitterand [by flying into Sarajevo under heavy artillery fire] reminded the world that international organizations can be galvanized into effective action against renegade states only by strong leadership from individual nation-states. (p. 3)

In another example, Judson (1992), who documented one church's long-term process to hire a new pastor, suggested that leadership as powerful, resolute action provided moral and spiritual certainty.

On a recent Sunday, someone new was called to stand at [Bethany Congregational's] head; after an 18-month search, the congregation had found a new pastor. . . . Seeking a pastor who would embody tradition and offer a steady guiding hand, they encountered men and women

unsettlingly like themselves, wrestling with the same social, moral and religious issues that perplexed the congregations looking for leadership.

(p. 1)

Apparently, a church leader should be someone who does not struggle with the ambiguities of life; instead, the spiritual shepherd essentially should guide the flock unerringly along the *straight and narrow* path.

Popular stories of leadership contribute to the formation of background assumptions that inform how scholars in universities and other organizations investigate leadership. The goal of much of the research is to devise leadership measurement scales or leadership personality inventories that can predict and control the development of leadership activities (Bass, 1985; Bauman, 1988; Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 1985; Darling, 1990; King, 1989; Rost, 1991). The difficulty, of course, is that it is one thing to examine past events to attempt to identify leadership characteristics, and quite another thing to distill these characteristics into universal, context-free generalizations for present and future use. This difficulty has led to several competing definitions of leadership that confound current leadership research (Bass, 1981; Burns, 1978; Graumann & Moscovici, 1986; J. Hunt, 1984a, 1984b; S. Hunt, 1984; Kellerman, 1984; Rost, 1991). Ultimately, though, most researchers continue to search for a unified theory.

The Issue

Even though scholars and practitioners focus attention and resources on leadership studies, the concept of leadership itself remains ambiguous and

elusive. Since leadership constitutes a fundamental component of social and organizational culture, this confusion is troubling. Burns (1978), for example, suggested that the concept of leadership presents a fundamental intellectual crisis for modern Western society. Moreover, Astin (1989) pointed out that this leadership crisis pervades all major social institutions, including government, business, religion, and education.

Part of the problem that contributes to this crisis stems from how scholars and practitioners frame an investigation of leadership: they focus on individual leaders. According to Fink (1988), for example, "All too often authors and researchers have focused on how individuals function within leadership relationships without first presenting a clear picture of the core of that relationship" (p. 3). This overemphasis on how individuals function is evident whether researchers and practitioners define leadership by the accomplishments of a great person, by a set of personality traits, by types of behaviors, by particular management tasks contingent on specific situations and organizational team members, or even by individual acts of organizational or societal transformation (Ackerman, 1985; Adams, 1986; Bennis, 1984; Burns, 1978; Foster, 1989; Iacocca, 1984; Roberts, 1989; Rost, 1991; Sheive & Schoenbelt, 1987; Smith & Peterson, 1988; Tichy & Devanna, 1986; Vroom & Yetton, 1973).

However, to investigate leadership only through the activities of individual leaders is to miss its essential feature, namely, that leadership is a particular kind of *relationship* into which leaders and followers enter and

through which leaders and followers create changes. Rost (1991), for example, defined the leadership process as "an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes" (p. 102). Foster (1989), in delineating four components essential to the content of leadership relationships, suggested that leadership relationships must be critical, transformative, educative, and ethical (p. 50). For both scholars, leadership relationships, and not individuals acting as leaders, formed the basis of their investigations.

Purpose

My intention in conducting this research is to construct a thick, rich description (Geertz, 1973; Ryle, 1971) of the processes of leadership relationships occurring in a particular educational setting, the California Literature Project (CLP). I chose to study leadership in the CLP in part because, according to internal documents, since its inception in 1985 the CLP has used a collaborative model of leadership to explain how it provided support for California teachers as they work to improve instruction in the English language arts areas of the curriculum. For example, CLP documents state that members of leadership relationships collaboratively design and review all program strategies directed toward the support of teachers, including four-week annual institutes and follow-up support meetings, professional development services for schools and districts, regional and statewide resources networks, and regional and statewide forums.

If CLP documents are accurate, then the organization would provide fertile ground to describe processes of leadership relationships. To that end, during 1990 and 1991 I became a participant observer in the CLP. In part, I attended the statewide academy held in Los Angeles and the summer institute held at San Diego State University. Also, I interviewed selected members of the project, including the executive director, several regional directors and policy board members, a member of the California Department of Education who acted as liaison between the CLP and her department, and teachers who attended the statewide academy and San Diego area summer institute.

I had several reasons for conducting this kind of study. First, this research contributes to the emerging literature of an alternative paradigm of leadership that many scholars and practitioners consider crucial for our culture as we enter the twenty-first century: a postindustrial model emphasizing the fundamental importance of *individuals in community* (Astin, 1989; Ferguson, 1980; Foster, 1989; Harman, 1988; Rost, 1989, 1991). MacIntyre (1981) and Sullivan (1986) suggested, for example, that a dominant problem facing Western society today is individualism run rampant, a result of an overly narrow focus on individual freedom without the counterbalance of social responsibility. (See also Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton, 1985.) According to Rost (1991), "There is more and more evidence to conclude that the industrial paradigm is losing its hold on the culture of Western societies . . . and that some kind of postindustrial paradigm will dominate these societies in the twenty-first century" (p. 181). A description of nontraditional leadership occurring in a

particular organization, then, offers information crucial to counteract the pervasive emphasis on individualism currently at the core of modern Western values.

Second, this research contributes to the growing body of socially constructed, qualitative studies. For example, my background assumptions reflect a view of knowledge in which the participant observer and participants collaboratively construct multiple realities, rather than a view of knowledge in which the researcher discovers an objective reality through value-free, unbiased investigation. The purpose of qualitative research is to construct and portray plausible interpretations of actions in the field, rather than simply to affirm or deny what the researcher believes is there already (Bleich, 1978; Guba & Lincoln, 1985, 1989; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1989; Merriam, 1988; Polkinghorne, 1988).

Third, this research represents a challenge to the dominant view of educational leadership currently practiced in the field. Critics question the content and process of education and urge educators to create fundamental changes to alter the structure of the system (Apple, 1979, 1982; Blackmore, 1989; Blount, J. M., 1994; California Commission on Public School Administration and Leadership, 1988; Cherryholmes, 1988; Cohn & Kottkamp, 1993; Davies & Foster, 1994; Foster, 1986a, 1986b, 1989; Giroux, 1983; Goodson, 1988; Grundy, 1987; McKinney, J. R. & Garrison, J. W., 1994; Miron, L. F. & Elliott, R. J., 1994; Popkewitz, 1991; Shannon, 1992; J. Smith, 1989; Smyth, 1989; Spring, 1988; Wrigley, 1992; Young, 1990).

Mainstream educational researchers and practitioners typically respond to this call for action, however, by offering models such as school-based leadership or instructional leadership (Ekholm, 1992; Hallinger, 1992; Hallinger & Anast, 1992; Heck, Larsen, & Marcoulides, 1990; Jacobson & Conway, 1990; Marsh, 1992; Reitzug & Reeves, 1992; Smylie & Brownlee-Conyers, 1992). They base these leadership models on the idea that administrators in authoritative management positions can perform leadership by following a set of management behaviors and activities. The assumption is that significant changes can occur in systems through a proper application of principles of management science expertise (Foster, 1986a, 1986b; MacIntyre, 1981; Rost, 1991). Other researchers and practitioners support the development of teacher leadership models (Barth, 1988; Bascia, 1991; Broyles, 1991; Conley, 1991; Howey, 1988; Lieberman, Saxl, & Miles, 1988). The focus of this research, however, remains on individual, positional leaders, rather than on members of leadership relationships.

Research Questions

Since I wanted to describe processes of leadership relationships in the CLP in this study, the following questions emerged from my initial hunches (Marshall & Rossman, 1989) and helped to set the parameters for investigation:

1. How do leaders and followers initiate and sustain leadership relationships?
2. How do leaders and followers influence one another?
3. What real changes do leaders and followers intend?

4. How do leaders and followers develop and maintain common purposes?

5. How do leaders and followers develop and maintain ethical, critical perspectives to transform educational practices?

Definition of Terms

Three related terms provided the initial working definitions and background assumptions for this investigation: leadership, relationship, and change.

Leadership is a collective effort, a relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect mutual purposes (Davies, 1989; Fink, 1988; Rost, 1989, 1991). Because leadership represents a complex relationship, researchers cannot separate it from the context, the organization or community, in which it occurs. In fact, as Foster (1989) pointed out, "The idea that leadership occurs within a community suggests that ultimately leadership resides in the community itself" (p. 49).

The concept of *relationship*, however, presented particular problems for this inquiry. According to K. Smith (1982), "We cannot actually see relationships; we can only infer them" (p. 327). Members of leadership relationships, then, perform actions that are visible, but the relationship boundaries that define the interactions themselves are not. Moreover, "if [relationship] does not exist in any concrete form, then the only way we can talk about it is metaphorically" (p. 328). My observations of, and experiences, conversations, and interviews with, CLP members, then, provided the basis to

infer the presence of leadership relationships. I then constructed a first-person narrative of those events, incorporating excerpts from conversations, interviews, and my own impressions as the primary conduit of information, to portray the essence of those relationships.

Real changes are the intention of leaders and followers engaged in leadership relationships. According to Rost (1991),

The word *real* means that the changes which the leaders and followers intend must be substantive and transforming . . . in people's lives, attitudes, behaviors, and basic assumptions as well as in the groups, organizations, societies, and civilizations that they are trying to lead. (pp. 115)

The difficulty of addressing change in leadership research, however, is that evidence of real change always lies in the future; the present only reveals the descriptions of changes that leaders and followers intend to enact.

The concept of change itself is quite difficult to grasp. According to K. Smith (1982), change has metaphorical as well as concrete levels. An investigation of the *real changes* that leaders and followers intend, then, requires an examination of language as well as actions. Moreover, "How do metaphors change, and in particular how does a metaphor come to incorporate within itself its historically antecedent conditions?" (p. 351). For example, in the CLP what metaphors were embedded in the language leaders and followers used to describe the changes they intended? How did these metaphors differ from the metaphors used to describe earlier practices?

A description of intended real changes in the present also requires in part an examination of what Goodman and Kurke (1982) referred to as planned organizational change. "Planned organizational change refers to a set of activities and processes designed to change individuals, groups, and organizational structure and processes" (p. 4). The real changes intended by leaders and followers at the CLP, then, were evident both in the language they used to describe what they intended to do and in the planned and unplanned actions in which they engaged.

Outline of the Study

The focus of this study, which is to develop a description and construct a framework of leadership processes in the California Literature Project, raised particular conceptual and methodological issues. In Chapter Two I discuss the conceptual issues through an exploration of mainstream and contemporary leadership definitions and examine the ideas of power, influence, change, and organizational culture within a leadership context. In addition, I explain the limitations of current transforming leadership concepts and ultimately, how scholars and practitioners trivialize its essential features through a reconstructed rhetoric that diminishes the language of possibility. I conclude the chapter with an analysis of educational leadership and point out that educators predominantly define leadership as good management.

In Chapter Three I explore the methodological issues raised in the study and provide a rational basis for how I attempted to resolve them. I discuss the background assumptions that informed my research methods through

examining the implications of socially constructed truths, the narrative paradigm, and the reconstruction of field experiences into textual form. I then describe how these background assumptions shaped the development of the research methods by addressing the shifting context of the field setting, the multiple parts I played as researcher, author, and persona, and the ethical implications for participants.

In Chapter Four I present the textual translation of my field experiences into a leadership narrative. The chapter contains elements of story, including a prologue, epilogue, *dramatis personae*, and setting, and portrays detailed descriptions of the themes that emerged from the CLP leadership relationships.

In Chapter Five I reframe the leadership narrative in light of the initial research questions and original purposes for the study, suggest methodological possibilities and constraints, and offer new directions for leadership research and practice.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

For years leadership scholars have defined leadership as a process of extraordinary individual initiative in which leaders have motivated others to achieve. The definitions attempt to explain and generalize for the purpose of replication how a leader motivated others: by actions of great persons (predominantly men), by an assortment of leadership behaviors, by a matrix of personality trait/situational matching schemes, by a set of scientific management techniques, or by striving for excellence (Ackerman, 1985; Bass, 1981; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Burns, 1978; Chemers, 1984; Foster, 1986a, 1986b; Green, 1988; J. Hunt, 1984a, 1984b; Miller, Hotes, & Terry, 1983; Rost, 1985, 1991; Smith & Peterson, 1988; Stodgill, 1974).

According to Astin and Leland (1991), for example, "Past studies of leadership have focused mainly on positional leaders. These studies describe the characteristics and attributes of leaders, the leaders' effects on followers, and the tasks of leadership" (p. 115). Chemers (1984) argued, "Leadership involves a job to do and people to do it with" (p. 105). Dressel (1981) observed, "Leadership . . . is achieved through respect for the individual's knowledge and ability to analyze institutional problems, reinforced by the model of objectivity set by the individual in dealing with these problems" (p. 184).

Contemporary Leadership Theories

During the past 10-15 years, due to what many scholars believed was the inadequacy of previous definitions to address the needs of contemporary society and the future, alternative concepts of leadership have emerged that served to broaden the focus of the leadership debate (Adams, 1986; Adams & Spencer, 1986; Blackmore, 1989; Burns, 1978; Davies, 1989; Foster, 1986a, 1986b, 1989; Henrickson, 1989; Karmel, 1978; Kellerman, 1984; Rost, 1989, 1991; Smircich & Morgan, 1982; Smyth, 1989). Primarily by moving away from studies of individual leaders, these alternative concepts examine the interactions and relationships between leaders and led, the dynamics of leadership and organizational or societal change, and the process of leadership itself. According to Chemers (1984), for example, "The contingency approaches do provide us with a stable platform from which to step into the next set of issues. However, these issues are quite complex and will require a more integrated, multifaceted, and systemic view of leadership process" (p. 106). Rost (1991) pointed out,

The leadership narratives may have served their purposes since the 1930s in reflecting the industrial paradigm, but they are no longer acceptable as our understanding of leadership is transformed in the twenty-first century to reflect a postindustrial paradigm. Leadership scholars need to develop a new leadership narrative with revised myths and rituals that fit the postindustrial paradigm. And practitioners of leadership need to adopt postindustrial leadership models that help them

make sense of what they do as leaders and followers in the postmodern world of the twenty-first century. (p. 36)

Alternative concepts of leadership arose in part as a result of James MacGregor Burns' (1978) comprehensive work on leadership. While still focused mainly on historical examples of powerful, charismatic individuals (e. g., Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Mao Tse-Tung), Burns stated that leadership must take into account the wants and needs of both leader and led.

Leadership, unlike naked power-wielding, is thus inseparable from followers' needs and goals. The essence of the leader-follower relation is the interaction of persons with different levels of motivation and of power potential, including skill, in pursuit of a common or at least joint purpose. (p. 19)

Burns argued that there were two broad forms of leadership: *transactional* and *transforming*. Transactional leadership, which had been discussed by other scholars (see Hollander, 1978a, 1978b; Jacobs, 1970, for example), is based on political exchange theory, in which a leader offers something, tangible or intangible, to followers in exchange for the followers' support (Burns, p. 258). "But beyond this the relationship does not go. The bargainers have no enduring purpose that holds them together" (p. 20).

However, the concept of transforming leadership departed significantly from mainstream concepts of leadership. "Transforming . . . leadership occurs when one or more persons *engage* with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality" (Burns,

1978, p. 20, emphasis in original). Further, “[Transforming] leadership brings about real change that the leaders *intend*” (p. 414, emphasis in original). Transforming leadership, then, engaged in creating real changes, must result in mutual elevation of motivation and morality (the latter a subject of much controversy, given the context of the industrial paradigm informed by rationalism and objectivity). “Transforming leadership ultimately becomes *moral* in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both leader and led, and thus it has a transforming effect on both” (p. 20). The introduction of moral values into a leadership definition has been anathema to an academic tradition of value-free scientific rationalism (Foster, 1986a, 1986b, 1989; MacIntyre, 1981; Rost, 1989, 1991; Sullivan, 1986).

Other scholars have developed transforming leadership theories that described essential interactional dynamics among leaders and led and the role of leadership in addressing organizational and social change. Astin and Leland (1991), for example, viewed a leader as someone who provided the impetus for collective action.

Leadership is a process by which members of a group are empowered to work together synergistically toward a common goal or vision that will create change, transform institutions, and thus improve the quality of life. The leader--a catalytic force--is someone who, by virtue of her [*sic*] position or opportunity, empowers others toward the collective action in accomplishing the goal or vision. (p. 9).

According to Sergiovanni (1990), "In transformative leadership . . . leaders and followers are united in pursuit of higher-level goals common to both When transformative leadership is successful, purposes that might have started out as separate become fused" (p. 24). Foster (1989) argued,

Leadership is founded on the fact of moral relationships; it is intended to elevate people to new levels of morality. . . . Leadership carries a responsibility not just to be *personally* moral, but to be a *cause* of *civic moral education* which leads to both self-knowledge and community awareness. (pp. 55-56, emphasis in original)

Vonder (1989), after suggesting that a paradigm shift in society is moving "from an individualistic industrial era to a community-based postindustrial era" (p. 4), pointed out that this paradigm shift requires community-based leadership.

The [community-based] leader responds to the needs of the community and the encouragement of its members by using his or her skills and resources to clear a path so that followers can work effectively to achieve purposes and goals which are in support of the common good (Nicoll, 1986). This relationship is one where leaders and followers exchange roles whenever it is in the best interest of the community to do so.

Leaders become followers and followers become leaders. It may be said that instead of being at the front of the pack, the leader is at the center where he or she can interact more fluidly with others in the relationship. (p. 8)

According to Foster (1986a), then, "Leadership can spring from anywhere; it is not a quality that comes with an office or with a person. Rather, it derives from the context and ideas of individuals who influence each other" (p. 187). Astin and Leland (1991) added,

People are not isolated entities, but their life experiences are closely intertwined with those of others. Once we are aware of this interdependence, it is logical to view leadership as a process of collective effort rather than as something one person does in a vacuum. (p. 8)

These transforming leadership concepts share a common characteristic that I suggested was problematic in Burns' transforming leadership definition, at least in terms of research methodology informed by value-free scientific rationalism. They all describe leadership using language that alludes to a strong moral values component. Astin and Leland, for example, described leadership as improving the quality of life. Sergiovanni envisioned leaders and followers united in the pursuit of higher level goals. Foster described leadership as a moral relationship. Finally, Vonder described leadership as supporting the common good.

Limitations of Transforming Leadership

Some scholars have pointed out problems in transforming leadership concepts, stemming particularly from Burns' definition. Nicoll (1986), for example, stated,

Our newest and best approaches to leadership [including transforming leadership] . . . are still rooted in Newton's hierarchical, linear, and dualistic thinking, so much so that they do not provide us with completely satisfactory models for the world we face. To our detriment, we still see a leader as one person, sitting at the top of a hierarchy, determining, for a group of loyal followers, the direction, pace, and outcome of everyone's efforts. (p. 30)

Foster (1986a) queried, "Even the idea of transformative power and the vision that it sparks neglects a predominant dimension of modern social relations: whose vision is it?" (p. 182).

Rost (1991) criticized two aspects of Burns' transformational definition: the requirement that leaders and followers must be morally uplifted and the requirement that leadership achieve the intended changes of the leader. In response to the moral requirement, Rost argued, "There are no moral criteria in the postindustrial definition of leadership. . . . While there is a requirement that the process of leadership be ethical . . . the changes that the leaders and followers intend can fall along a continuum of morality" (p. 124).

Rost, as well as other scholars, criticized the moral basis of transforming leadership itself. According to Rost (1991), "To limit the notion of transformation to those changes that take the higher moral ground . . . is unacceptable because in many situations and for many issues there is no consensus as to what the higher moral ground is" (pp. 124-125). Burns based the moral dimension in transforming leadership, the idea that leaders and followers would

advance to a higher moral plane, on Kohlberg's (1981) theory of moral development. Kohlberg's theory, however, has come under attack in part because of its middle class, white, male bias (see Gilligan, 1982, for a noteworthy criticism).

In response to the requirement that transforming leadership achieve the changes intended, Rost (1991) argued that leadership, then, never could be studied as it occurs because scholars would have to wait to see if leaders and followers achieved their intentions before acknowledging that what transpired was in fact leadership. "Burns's test of leadership . . . is in the past tense. It is primarily a test for analysts . . . who want to look back on a series of events and decide whether leadership took place" (p. 114).

Rost developed a definition of leadership that attempted to overcome the limitations of transforming leadership as well as to provide a clear direction for future leadership studies: "Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes" (p. 102).

In Rost's definition, influence in leadership relationships is multidirectional and noncoercive, flowing from leaders to followers, from followers to leaders, and among leaders and followers, rather than solely flowing from the top down (p. 102). Moreover,

Influence . . . is defined as using persuasion to have an impact on other people in the relationship. . . . It is not based on authority, power, or dictatorial actions but is based on persuasive behaviors, thus allowing

anyone in the relationship to freely agree or disagree and ultimately drop into or out of that relationship. (p. 107)

The idea of multidirectional and noncoercive influence among leaders and followers differed significantly from other, more hierarchical views.

Another important aspect of Rost's definition is that "leaders and followers are the people in leadership relationships" (p. 102). Followers, who Rost argued must comprise a number greater than one, then, are active creators rather than passive recipients in leadership relationships. According to Rost, the term *follower* connoted active participation to a greater extent than do the terms *the led* or *subordinates*, for example (p. 107). While followers must number more than one, leaders may number one or more than one and are distinguished from followers primarily because their power resources enable them to exert greater influence than do followers (p. 112).

Change is another important aspect of Rost's definition.

Leaders and followers intend real changes. . . . *Intend* means that the changes are purposeful and in the future. . . . *Real* means that the changes the leaders and followers intend are substantive and transforming. . . . [However] leadership does not require leaders and followers actually to accomplish the changes. (pp. 103, 117).

By accepting the intention of changes as sufficient for leadership relationships, scholars and practitioners can investigate leadership as it occurs. "The present tense allows [leadership scholars and practitioners] to recognize leadership as

it is happening--to distinguish leadership from other human relationships in the here and now" (p. 114).

Finally, leaders and followers engaged in leadership relationships intend real changes that "develop mutual purposes" (p. 103). According to Rost, these mutual purposes display the following characteristics:

1. The mutuality of these purposes is forged through the noncoercive, influence relationship.
2. Leaders and followers develop purposes, not goals. Purposes are more overarching and holistic than goals, and they are less oriented to quantification. Purposes allow for the development of more mutuality; goals tend to be more fixed and rigid.
3. The leaders and followers reflect, not realize, their purposes.
4. Mutual purposes become common purposes because the followers and leaders engage in leadership together. Independent goals mutually held do not qualify for what is meant here as mutual purposes. Mutual purposes are common purposes held by a community of believers. (p. 123)

Rost's postindustrial model of leadership has contributed greatly to clearing up much of the confusion surrounding leadership study in the twentieth century. By insisting that the process of leadership is relationships among leaders and followers, Rost has created, according to Burns, "a whole new force and direction in leadership theory" (Rost, 1991, p. xii).

Power and Influence

Power and influence are issues central to leadership studies. Whether scholars and practitioners describe leaders as great persons, as managers in positions of authority, or as members of leadership relationships, how leaders interact (i. e., engage in power and/or influence behaviors) with followers or subordinates is fundamental to leadership studies. As Carroll (1984) pointed out, "In politics and in political science, the concepts of power and leadership have been closely linked" (p. 140). According to Burns, "Power is ubiquitous; it permeates human relationships" (1978, p. 15).

Historically, the concept of power has been narrowly defined as *authority*, *control*, or *domination* (Carroll, 1984; Dahl, 1968; Harstock, 1981; Kreisberg, 1992; Lehman, 1969; McClelland, 1975; Neustadt, 1960; Russell, 1938; Schein, 1985; Watkins, 1989). As Kreisberg (1992) observed,

The predominant images and interpretations of power in our culture embody power as the ability to impose one's will on others as the means toward fulfilling one's desired goals. It is the ability to direct and control and to manipulate and coerce if need be, sometimes for the good of all, most often for the good of the few. (p. 45)

According to Harstock (1981),

Most social scientists have based their discussions of power on definitions of power as the ability to compel obedience, or as control and domination. They link this definition with Bertrand Russell's statement that power is the production of intended effects, and add that power must

be power over something--something possessed, a property of an actor such that he [*sic*] can alter the will or actions of others in a way that produces results in conformity with his [*sic*] own will. (pp. 3-4)

Carroll (1984) added, "Power, as discussed in social science literature and practiced in contemporary American politics, has generally been equated with domination and control" (p. 140). Schein (1985) stated, "Power is defined in terms of actual control of resources, the ability to reward or punish, and the possession of critical items of information" (p. 308).

Many contemporary social science scholars, particularly critical theorists, have raised concerns about this narrow view of power. According to Watkins (1989), for example, "The [mainstream] leadership perspective operates in an authoritative way to sanitize the unequal power relations within an organization" (p. 11). Angus (1989) added, "This notion of power, as being institutionalized in existing relationships and organizational arrangements, helps us to understand power as a conserving and stabilizing force, as a way of maintaining unequal relationships, despite increased participation" (p. 83). Mumby (1988) concurred.

Power is usually conceived of as one of the processes through which stability is maintained. As such, the exercising of power becomes the legitimate maintenance of the structure of hierarchy. . . . This orientation toward power . . . basically enables [mainstream] social theorists to ignore questions of domination and repression in social structures. (p. 61)

Recent studies of leadership and of power in the social sciences called into question this predominant view of power as control and domination (Angus, 1989; Apple, 1982; Astin & Leland, 1991; Bachrach & Lawler, 1980; Blackmore, 1989; Brenkman, 1987; Burns, 1978; Carroll, 1984; Foster, 1986a, 1986b; 1989; Freire, 1985; Kreisberg, 1992; Miller, 1990; Nyberg, 1981; Rost, 1989, 1991; Watkins, 1989; Weiler, 1988). Instead, these studies either incorporated a redefinition of power as *empowerment* or *the capacity to do something*, or altered the focus from power to *influence*. According to Carroll (1984), for example,

[An increasing number of feminist scholars], concluding that the elimination of leadership and power relationships was neither possible nor desirable . . . began working toward a reconceptualization of power and political leadership. . . .

Supportive and cooperative relationships rather than relationships based on domination are stressed. . . .

An effective leader is one who empowers others to act in their own interests, rather than one who induces others to behave in a manner consistent with the goals and desires of the leader. . . . [Leaders] should always be sensitive to the feelings and desires of their followers, and their actions should reflect such sensitivity. . . . Leaders should nurture the potential of followers and help to build their confidence so that they, too, will attempt leadership. (pp. 141-143)

Astin and Leland (1991) suggested that members of leadership groups are empowered to work synergistically to accomplish the goals of the group, even as they realize their own goals as well.

The definition of power as empowerment treats power as an expandable resource that is produced and shared through interaction by leader and followers alike. This conception views power as energy that transforms oneself and others, and identifies the effective leader as one who empowers others to act in their own interests. (p. 1)

Moreover, "A leader does not have to exercise power over others, that is, *control*. Instead she [*sic*] can mobilize power and engage in leadership activities that empower others--in other words, she [*sic*] can exercise power *with others*, or *shared power*" (p. 8).

Kreisberg (1992) expounded on this alternative conception of power, which he connected to particular kinds of relationships.

Power with is manifest in *relationships of co-agency*. These relationships are characterized by people finding ways to satisfy their desires and to fulfill their interests without imposing on one another. The relationship of co-agency is one in which there is equality: situations in which individuals and groups fulfill their desires by acting together. It is jointly developing capacity. The possibility for *power with* lies in the reality of human interconnections within communities. (pp. 85-86)

Some leadership scholars have abandoned the term *power* altogether in favor of the term *influence*. Rost, for example, clearly articulated in his definition

of leadership that influence, and not power, was central to the relationship (1991, p. 102). Other scholars studying leadership and organizational dynamics emphasized the importance of influence as well (Cialdini, 1988; Cohen & Bradford, 1990; J. Hunt, 1984b; Pfeffer, 1992). According to J. Hunt (1984b), for example,

Using a definition of *leadership* as an influence process means that anyone who influences someone else can be a leader in that particular instance. Thus, we can speak of *informal* leaders in work groups as well as the group's formally designated manager, who would be expected to exercise *formal* leadership. Informal leaders are also sometimes referred to as *emergent* leaders--those who emerge to exert influence for certain kinds of activities. . . . Informal and emergent leadership are also considered important in organizations. (pp. 117-118)

Cohen and Bradford (1990) added, "[Influence is] a tool for building solid, mutually beneficial relationships to accomplish vital organizational goals, rather than as a manipulative *technique* for acquiring power for its own sake" (p. 4). Moreover,

It is the process of give and take that governs influence. Making *exchanges* is the way to gain *influence*; and that process leads to *cooperation* rather than retaliation or refusal to engage. People cooperate because they see something of value that they will gain in return. (p. 23)

Pfeffer (1992) delineated several ways in which influence is manifest in organizations.

We are not simply influenced by the context of the situation . . . we are also influenced directly by the actions of others. Organizations are not collections of isolated individuals making decisions and taking action in splendid solitude. They are, above all, social settings in which people interact with their colleagues. We are influenced by what our colleagues are saying and doing--the effect of social proof--and we are swayed by the things others do to get us to like them and feel good about them. We are also influenced by the emotions that are created and used in social settings. (p. 207)

Many contemporary leadership studies, then, which reject the unquestioned authority of position, emphasize the collaborative dynamics of organizational members exercising power with others or influencing one another. The conception of power, at least in the traditional sense of domination and control, is replaced by noncoercive influence and shared power.

Change

Rather than the status quo orientation of hierarchical views of leadership, change is an integral feature of transforming leadership definitions. Rost (1991), for example, argued that intending changes is essential for a definition of leadership and the intended changes must be real and transformative in

nature (pp. 117-118). According to Foster (1989), "Leadership . . . is oriented toward social vision and change" (p. 46). Moreover,

Social change can be accomplished without the complete restructuring of any given society; in fact, social change occurs frequently, in small doses, in the actions and activities of various groups and individuals who hope to make a difference. (p. 53)

In addressing change specifically within organizations, Bergquist (1992) made a distinction between first-order and second-order change, a distinction which parallels differences between status quo and transforming leadership definitions (p. 173). First-order change basically helps members of an organization do more or less what they are already doing or doing what they are doing better. Second-order change, however, requires a reframing of the context in which it is formulated. "The focus is directed less on the content (for example, a new curriculum or administrative policy) than on the process of change. . . . [Second-order change] represents a profound transformation in the institution: a paradigm shift" (p. 173, 179). Leithwood (1992) agreed, stating that second-order changes result from "building a shared vision, improving communication, and developing collaborative decision-making processes" (p. 9).

Organizational Culture

In the last fifteen years, researchers and practitioners have described the cultural aspects of organizations and made connections between leadership and organizational culture (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Bergquist, 1992; Bolman &

Deal, 1991; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Pettigrew, 1979; Schein, 1985). According to Bergquist (1992), for example,

It has become increasingly fashionable to describe organizations as cultures. Anthropologists, management consultants, organizational psychologists, and other social scientists have become enamored of this concept and have helped to popularize the notion that cultural analyses yield important insights about the life and dynamics of an organization.

(p. xi)

Foster observed, "This [cultural] approach to organizations focuses on how a particular organization establishes its culture through central features like symbols, rituals, sagas, and myths" (1986a, p. 135).

Schein (1985) suggested that organizational culture serves as a means for orienting new members into an organization.

Organizational culture is a pattern of basic assumptions that a given group has invented, discovered or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, and that has worked well enough to be considered valid, and therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 9)

The essential message of these mainstream views of organizational culture is that cultural aspects in organizations are objects available for creation and manipulation by those in authority. According to Foster (1986a), for example, "Managers can manipulate the culture so that it is both innovative and

productive at the same time" (p. 135). Schein (1985) argued,

Organizational cultures are created by leaders, and one of the most decisive functions of leadership may well be the creation, the management, and--if and when that may become necessary--the destruction of culture. Culture and leadership, when one examines them closely, are two sides of the same coin, and neither can be understood by itself. In fact, there is a possibility--underemphasized in leadership research--that the *only thing of real importance that leaders do is create and manage culture* and that the unique talent of leaders is their ability to work with culture. (p. 2, emphasis in original)

Angus (1989) critiqued these mainstream views of organizational culture and leadership.

By asserting and defending particular values, it is argued, leaders so strongly articulate and endorse their vision that it becomes also the vision of followers, and so bonds leader and followers together in a shared covenant (Bennis & Nanus, 1985), which incorporates what then comes to be the non-negotiable core values and beliefs of the organization (Sergiovanni, 1987; Starratt, 1986). This core, according to the argument, amounts to an organizational culture in which effective leaders can utilize particular rituals and values to "mobilize and focus the energy and commitment of employees on organizational goals" (Starratt, 1986, p. 11). (p. 70)

Foster (1986a) suggested that these mainstream views of culture are limiting. Instead of describing culture as a set of objects, he argued, "Culture is the lived and experienced collection of beliefs that are not really amenable to rationalistic intervention by managers" (p. 136). Angus (1989) agreed.

There is virtually no sense [in the mainstream view of culture in organizational literature], for instance, of an anthropological concern with culture as a shifting and contested concept which is continually being constructed and reconstructed and which must be subjectively understood. . . . [Also], there is a taken-for-granted assumption that the appropriate cultural expectations of those associated with the organization will be embodied in the particular values of the leader. (p. 71)

Smith and Peterson (1988) outlined the importance of examining concepts of organizational culture and their implications for leadership.

The study of organizational culture may nonetheless be equally important in creating a model of leadership which gives adequate coverage to the context of the leader's actions. . . . According to Van Maanen and Barley [1985], cultures are not necessarily fixed and immutable. . . .

A . . . more radical group of writers about organizational culture criticize the notion that culture can be thought of as a separable quality which organizations possess. Smircich (1985), for instance, asserts that organizations *are* cultures. What is required in her view is cultural

analysis of organizational life. This entails discovering the meanings which organization members give to events. Since not all meanings will be within the conscious awareness of organization members, some of the methods of traditional anthropology may be more valuable than questionnaires or interviews. Particular attention can be given to symbols, myths and rituals, since it is these which most closely embody the ideologies and belief systems which sustain the organization. . . . The focus . . . is mostly upon myths or stories which are widely known within the organization. . . .

[According to] Meyer (1984), formal organizational structures such as those depicted by organization charts can be thought of as organizational myths. . . . The organization chart is to be studied as a myth providing clues to the implicit ideology of the organization, and the role of individual manager is seen as symbolic of the organizations's rationality and control. (pp. 101, 102, 103, 104)

The Trivialization of Transforming Leadership

Even though recent leadership concepts have attempted to reflect a new paradigm for the twenty-first century, with profoundly different ways of describing the dynamics of persons in leadership relationships and urging significant restructuring of organizations and society, many scholars and practitioners have reduced the significant qualities of transforming leadership to mere rhetoric. As a result, the existing hierarchical relationships of power and authority are rarely challenged or significantly altered.

This trivialization of transforming leadership reflects an inherent dichotomy about contemporary leadership research. Some leadership studies attempt to explore new possibilities for how members of organizations might interact to transform themselves, their communities, or societies (as I already have documented above), while other leadership studies remain grounded in traditional organizational structures and relationships and view change basically according to what Bergquist (1992) described as helping members of an organization do a better job of what they are doing already.

According to Foster (1986a), "These theories often posit that leadership flows from an individual in a position of power, that the leader has an idea or a vision, and that the leader's communicated ideal changes followers in some way" (p. 181). The powerful features of transforming leadership, the acknowledgement of the importance of followers to share in the construction of ideas or visions and the imperative for profound organizational or social change, are diminished or ignored.

Much of this diminishment is evident in the words these scholars and practitioners use to describe what they call transforming leadership. Basically, these scholars and practitioners define transforming leaders in organizations as those who inspire subordinates to want to do what the leaders want them to do. Popper, Landau, and Gluskinos (1992), for example, described three-day transforming leadership workshops they conducted for Israeli army cadets and argued that transforming leaders have an extraordinary effect on their subordinates because they create a meaning for them--a meaning that affects

their commitment, not just their motivation. Nieoff, Enz, and Grover (1990) agreed, describing what leaders must do to create meaning for followers.

Transformational leadership . . . involves the process of obtaining *extraordinary* efforts from followers, resulting in *excellent* organizations. To accomplish those ends, organizational leaders must first take actions directed at mobilizing the commitment of the followers to the goals, objectives, and values of the organization. (pp. 349-350, emphasis in original)

According to Avolio, Waldman, and Yammarino (1991), transforming leadership is really nothing more than an enhanced contingency model. They argued that individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence were the hallmarks of transforming leadership. And so, followers, then, do not resist self-development and frequently demonstrate, through personal sacrifice, an enhanced commitment to their job, coworkers, and the organization.

According to Seltzer and Bass (1990), "Transformational leaders may inspire their followers, may deal individually with subordinates to meet their developmental needs, and may encourage new approaches and more effort toward problem solving" (p. 694). Bass (1990) argued that this occurred when managers broaden and elevate the interests of their employees, when they generated awareness and acceptance of the purposes and mission of the group, and when they motivate their employees to look beyond their own self-interest for the good of the group.

Haddock (1989) described one method for getting employees to move beyond self-interest. For him, transforming leaders motivate others to act out of commitment to a higher ideal or transcendent goal. He described a nonpunitive method of employee discipline, called discipline without punishment, which encouraged worker commitment and facilitated transforming leadership.

Several scholars described transforming leadership as a set of techniques. Matey (1991), for example, observed that health care managers should use transforming leadership techniques in order to address the health care crisis. Fram and Pearse (1991) described a case study of an executive for a nonprofit organization who completed a self-assessment and concluded that his success was due partly to applying sound transforming leadership techniques. Kuhn (1991) argued that the insurance industry needed transforming leaders with the personality and moral capacity to empower subordinates to answer the needs of others.

Rossner (1990) suggested that transforming leadership is gender specific. According to her, in response to an International Women's Forum survey of men and women leaders, men described themselves in ways that characterize transactional leadership, exchanging things for support. Women, however, "described themselves in ways that characterize 'transformational' leadership--getting subordinates to transform their own self-interest into the interest of the group through concern for a broader goal" (p. 120).

According to Hughes (1990), "Transformational leaders take companies into new directions by providing a vision, mobilizing the organization to work

toward this vision, and changing technical, political, and cultural systems to assure the permanence of the new directions" (p. 51). Waldman (1987) pointed out, "Leadership is an unavoidable responsibility for most managers" (p. 23), but transforming leadership had its rewards for the diligent manager.

[Transforming leadership is] an active, time-consuming process in that much time is initially devoted to subordinates. . . . [However], the inspiration of a transformational leader produces subordinate effort and performance beyond normal expectation. . . . [For example], subordinates willingly expand their job descriptions. . . . [But] perhaps the biggest payoff of transformational leadership is that employees are not resistant to the occasional sacrifice of self-interest and have an enhanced commitment to their work and organization. (p. 28)

As is evident from these examples, some scholars and practitioners have managed to trivialize the profound possibilities of transforming leadership by selectively choosing ideas from Burns and others to fit their existing organizational mindsets. According to these writers, transforming leadership techniques and processes serve the already-established interests of organizational top management and persuade employees to do more in the interest of the organization. None of the writers, for example, alluded to the concepts of multidirectional influence among leaders and followers, shared decision making, or profound organizational or social change.

Educational Leadership

At the risk of being labelled another “one-discipline scholar” (Rost, 1991, p. 1), a term used to describe scholars who “put an adjective in front of the word *leadership*” (p. 1), I now address how leadership is researched and practiced in educational organizations. Unlike one-discipline scholars, however, I do not “hold the assumption that leadership as practiced in [education] is different from leadership as practiced in other professions” (p. 1). On the contrary, concepts of leadership in education exhibit the diversity and complexity existing in leadership studies in general. However, maybe not surprisingly given the conservative bent of educational institutions, leadership studies in education usually do not describe or explore issues raised by new concepts of transforming leadership framed by the postindustrial paradigm. Instead, almost all of the leadership models are positional, hierarchical, and geared toward managing educational organizations and producing results. According to Mitchell and Tucker (1992), for example,

Like most Americans, educators tend to think of leadership as a matter of taking action and getting results. They see real leadership as a rare and wonderful capacity to *take charge* and *get things done* in the face of complex and trying circumstances. Leaders . . . are people who can overcome resistance, shore up the weaknesses of their followers, and produce effective action--accompanied by a great sense of accomplishment and satisfaction. (p. 30, emphasis in original)

With few exceptions, most notably critical theorists and feminist reconstructionists (Angus, 1989; Apple, 1982; Bates, 1989; Blackmore, 1989; Codd, 1989; Foster, 1986a, 1986b, 1989; Miller, 1990; Rizvi, 1989; Smyth, 1989; Watkins, 1989), much of the educational leadership literature describing transforming leadership diminishes the language of possibility and remains grounded in traditional organizational structures and power relationships (Acheson & Gall, 1987; Bauman, 1988; Brandt, 1992; Burlingame, 1987; Darling, 1990; Fullan, 1992; Greenfield, 1987; Hodgkinson, 1991; Hoy & Forsyth, 1986; King, 1989; Lane & Walberg, 1987; Leithwood, 1992; Little & Bird, 1987; Miller, Hotes, & Terry, 1983; Mitchell & Tucker, 1992; Raywid, 1990; Roueche, Baker, & Rose, 1989; Sergiovanni, 1992; Webb, Greer, Montello, & Norton, 1987). According to Angus (1989), for example, "Inequality in power relationships in education also tends to be disguised by the rhetoric of new leadership, for it assumes that opportunities for participation are offered in an education structure which is legitimate and neutral, and free from power" (p. 82).

Transforming leadership in schools usually is described as part of the principal's job description, by virtue of the position of administration in the hierarchy of the institution. According to Leithwood (1992), for example,

Instructional leadership is an idea that has served many schools well throughout the 1980s and the early 1990s. But in light of current restructuring initiatives designed to take schools into the 21st century, *instructional leadership* no longer appears to capture the heart of what school administration will have to become. *Transformational leadership*

evokes a more appropriate range of practice; it ought to subsume instructional leadership as the dominant image of school administration, at least during the '90's. (p. 8)

Raywid (1990), in describing schools of choice, argued that leadership is part of principals' performance: "They may be called upon to perform more often as instructional and as symbolic leaders than most principals seem to do, with leadership generally becoming at least as important as the management functions" (p. 194).

Fullan (1992) described transforming leadership as the means for building collaborative work cultures.

To build collaborative work cultures, principals must concentrate on fostering vision-building; norms of collegiality that respect individuality; norms of continuous improvement; problem-coping and conflict-resolution strategies; lifelong teacher development that involves inquiry, reflective practice, collaboration, and technical skills; and restructuring initiatives. (p. 19)

Somewhat ironically, then, as is typical of concepts of school principal leadership, individual principals are responsible for ensuring that collaborative processes occur.

The literature on teacher leadership, on the other hand, rarely addresses issues of transforming leadership at all. While teacher leadership largely remains positional and located primarily within the context of delivering instruction in the classroom, teacher leadership as part of school restructuring

and educational reform usually casts teachers as wanting to expand their role beyond the classroom to do more of what administrators want them to do, as was the case so often for subordinates in trivial transforming leadership relationships (Barth, 1988; Broyles, 1991; Conley, 1991; Goodlad, 1984; Howey, 1988; Hynes & Summers, 1990; Keedy, 1991; Lieberman, Saxl, & Miles, 1988; Mertens & Yarger, 1988; Romerdahl, 1991; Smylie & Brownlee-Conyers, 1992; Smylie & Denny, 1990).

Barth (1988), for example, compared teacher leadership to successful worker participation strategies.

Teacher-leaders . . . will become more invested in the school and in its success. By sharing leadership, teachers will feel more ownership and commitment to the implementation of decisions. And by providing teachers with leadership opportunities, one accords them recognition. Therefore, they will work harder and better and longer. In short, research suggests that the greater the participation in decision making, the greater the productivity, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. (p. 134)

Smylie and Denny (1990) also described teacher leaders as individuals who assume expanded positions in the school setting.

Although there is substantial variety in the roles and functions envisioned for teacher leadership, the prevailing pattern of leadership development has focused on the level of the individual teacher leader. Generally, new positions are created to which teachers are appointed and *anointed*.

Preparation for the exercise of these roles is limited typically to training and building skills of teacher leaders . . . There is an implicit assumption that other teachers and administrators understand and support these new roles. There is a second assumption that, as individuals, teacher leaders can act as effective change agents, even in the absence of such understanding and support. (p. 237)

Angus (1989), however, offered a warning to those in education who maintain a traditional view of leadership that is embedded in hierarchical positions in organizations.

If leadership is to contribute to educational reform that goes beyond offering more of the same in disguise, it will be necessary to conceive of school leadership as something other than part of a top-down hierarchy. Leaders are not necessarily those in *positions of leadership*, and people may exercise leadership or perform an act of leadership on some occasions but not on others. From a broad social and political perspective an act of leadership would be one that was influential or potentially influential, and which contained a degree of penetration or potential penetration of the broader social and political context so that some aspect of education might be seen more clearly within that context. The type of leadership suggested here is one that celebrates human agency (Giddens, 1981, 1984), and the possibility of participants in education having a sense of control over the practices and *rules* of education. (p. 86)

Summary

The literature review serves to outline current trends in leadership studies, to separate new, real possibilities from mere rhetoric, and to provide a context for my own study of leadership in the CLP. The emphasis on change-oriented leadership research, especially Rost's definition of leadership, an extended exploration of the distinction between noncoercive influence and traditional concepts of power, and the connection between leadership and organizational culture highlight key elements of the present study, which I describe in Chapter Four. The sections on the trivialization of transforming leadership and on educational leadership provide a basis for how I address the concept of leadership and how that concept is distinguished from how other scholars usually depicted it in educational settings.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

“Researchers . . . must explore leadership differently . . . [by] looking beyond the variables controlled by managers, below the surface, and behind the formal policies in educational organizations” (Marshall, 1985, p. 70). How does a researcher look beyond controlled variables, below the surface, and behind formal organizational policies? While this kind of exploration does not have a simple solution, Marshall unequivocally asserts that new methods are needed to study leadership, methods that challenge traditionally accepted ways for conducting research. An analysis of controlled variables or formal organizational policies, while useful for other purposes, perhaps, does not reveal much about leadership, especially contemporary concepts of leadership that emphasize relationships among leaders and followers.

My exploration of leadership relationships in the California Literature Project, then, required that I implement research methods that would support the construction of detailed descriptions of transforming leadership processes. These methods developed in part out of three background assumptions I have about social science research: (1) social truths are socially constructed and represent only a partial reality; (2) the narrative paradigm and related concepts of *true fiction* and *story* shape how a researcher reads and interprets the experiences in the field and, later, authors the text; and (3) the researcher's

experiences in the field setting and the written reconstruction of those experiences constitute two distinct components of the research process.

Background Assumptions

Socially Constructed Truths

Many social science scholars and practitioners are dissatisfied with natural science methodology, especially with the procedural constraints a pursuit of value-free, objective truth imposes on studies of social and cultural phenomena. According to Bleich (1978), for example,

Kuhn's idea that paradigms govern science has led to the suspicion in many and the conviction in some that the notion of objectivity is itself *only* a paradigm, and that consensually validated perception is a more useful way of understanding what is real at this time. . . . [Consequently] reality is invented and not observed or discovered by human beings. (p. 11)

Since people invent or construct social reality through agreement about what is real, then the concept of objective, decontextualized truth must give way to constructed truths. Bruffee (1986) argued, for example, "A social constructionist position in any discipline assumes that entities we normally call reality, knowledge, thought, facts, texts, selves, and so on are constructs generated by communities of like-minded peers" (p. 774). Social truths, then, are based on agreement, rather than on discovery.

Anderson (1990) suggested that the notion of invented, consensual reality reconstructs how researchers should explore organizational phenomena. "Naturalistic or qualitative approaches . . . treat organizations as

either the process or product of shared meanings, in which the goal is to create a social reality characterized by a consensus of meaning among members" (p. 43). Foster (in press) concurred, pointing out that "organizations as such are . . . held together by the glue of individual perception and . . . constructed by the activities of their members." Research on organizational phenomena, then, must focus on how members of organizations construct consensually validated perceptions of reality.

Consensual meanings lead to "a recognition . . . that all knowings are partial, that there are fundamental things each of us cannot know" (Ellsworth, 1989, p. 304). Knowings are partial, according to Eisner (1988), because "knowledge is rooted in experience and requires a form for its representation. Since all forms of representation constrain what can be represented, they can only partially represent what we know" (p. 15). Clifford and Marcus (1986) pointed out, however, that an acknowledgement of the partiality of representation can be a source of freedom for both researchers and participants.

In cultural studies at least, we can no longer know the whole truth, or even claim to approach it. The rigorous partiality . . . may be a source of pessimism for some readers. But is there not a liberation, too, in recognizing that no one can write about others any longer as if they were discrete objects? (p. 25)

Consensual meanings and the partiality of knowledge, then, suggest that researchers cannot consider social phenomena as static objects whose truths

await discovery. Instead, researchers and participants share in the construction of meanings, meanings that, at best, offer one or several interpretations of reality from among many possibilities.

Since people construct reality primarily through the uses of language, researchers should make forms of language expression the focus of social and cultural studies. According to Foster (1990), for example, "It is our language that constructs our realities" (p. 11). Bruffee (1986) noted, "Placing language at the center of our understanding of knowledge and of the authority of knowledge . . . thereby places reading and writing unequivocally where . . . it belongs, at the center of . . . the whole educational process" (p. 778). Bleich (1978) added,

The use of language, even by all of us who are now literate, depends on the *belief* in meanings. These beliefs have no other source than the accumulated social uses of language. . . . New truth is created by a new use of language and a new structure of thought. (pp. 7, 18, emphasis in original)

The Narrative Paradigm

The pivotal role language plays in the construction of meanings leads researchers to consider an exploration of narratives and stories, for narratives and stories are primary forms of human expression. According to Fisher (1987), for example, "All forms of human communication need to be seen fundamentally as stories--symbolic interpretations of aspects of the world occurring in time and shaped by history, culture, and character" (p. xi). In addition, an exploration of

stories provides the basis for constructing new understandings of human behavior within institutional settings because

the narrative paradigm sees people as storytellers, as authors and co-authors who creatively read and evaluate the texts of life. . . . A narrative perspective focuses on existing institutions as providing *plots* that are always in the process of re-creation rather than existing as settled scripts. Viewing human communication narratively stresses that people are full participants in the making of messages. . . .

[Moreover] to view discourse and action as occurring within “the human story” will allow us to account for human behavior in ways that are not possible using the theories and methods of . . . those social sciences that attempt to approximate the paradigm of the natural sciences. (pp. 18, 20)

Ethnographers, as well, suggest that stories and fiction provide a basis for portraying constructed realities. According to Clifford and Marcus (1986), for example,

To call ethnographies fictions may raise empiricist hackles. But the word as commonly used in recent textual theory has lost its connotation of falsehood, of something merely opposed to truth. It suggests the partiality of cultural and historical truths, the ways they are systemic and exclusive. Ethnographic writings can properly be called fictions in the sense of *something made or fashioned*, the principal burden of the word's Latin root, *fingere*. It is important to preserve the meaning not

merely of making, but also of making up, of inventing things not actually real. . . . Interpretive social scientists have recently come to view good ethnographies as *true fictions*. . . .

Ethnography itself [is] a performance emplotted by powerful stories. Embodied in written reports, these stories simultaneously describe real cultural events and make additional, moral, ideological, and even cosmological statements. (pp. 6, 98)

Clifford (1988) observed, "The best ethnographic fictions are . . . intricately truthful; but their facts, like all facts in the human sciences, are classified, contextualized, narrated, and intensified" (pp. 112-113). Shore (1988) added that the contextualized, narrated reality in the social world required that researchers "approach cultural phenomena as living texts and contexts of meaning" (p. 161).

The narrative paradigm, then, provides a basis for an account of multiple, partial realities and multiple points of view in complex social organizations. In fact, as Mink (1987) noted, "Narrative is a primary cognitive instrument--an instrument rivaled, in fact, only by theory and by metaphor as irreducible ways of making the flux of experience comprehensible" (p. 185). A narrative depiction of dialogues and other interactions among researchers and participants portray significant social and cultural truths. Bakhtin (1986) cautioned, however, that "at any moment in the development of the dialogue there are immense, boundless masses of forgotten contextual meanings" (p. 170).

In addition to portraying socially constructed reality and multiple points of view in the field, ethnographic narratives themselves are open to multiple interpretations by readers. Clifford and Marcus (1986), for example, noted,

The meanings of an ethnographic account are uncontrollable. Neither an author's intention, nor disciplinary training, nor the rules of genre can limit the readings of a text that will emerge with new historical, scientific, or political projects. But if ethnographies are susceptible to multiple interpretations, these are not at any given moment infinite, or merely *subjective* (in the pejorative sense). (p. 120)

Cinnamond (1991) added that scholarship and research are fictions as well, for they provide only interpretive, partial approximations of the phenomena under investigation. He based his argument on the Derridian position, which in part states that writers and readers negotiate meanings through the medium of the text. (See Cherryholmes, 1988, for a commentary on the implications of Derrida's ideas for educational research.) The author, then, no longer is solely responsible for a text's possible meanings. In fact, the idea of negotiated meanings suggests that the text is, in fact, multiple texts, for each new reading transforms the reader as well as the text. Ultimately, the narrative paradigm acknowledges that representation in the social world is mythic (Clifford & Marcus, 1986).

Reconstruction of Field Experiences into Text

In order to explore social phenomena, researchers need to participate with others to construct meanings, and one way to do that is to engage in

fieldwork. Clifford (1988) pointed out, for example,

Ethnographic fieldwork remains an unusually sensitive method [to investigate the social world]. Participant observation obliges its practitioners to experience, at a bodily as well as an intellectual level, the vicissitudes of translation. . . . [However,] there is, of course, a myth of fieldwork. The actual experience, hedged around with contingencies, rarely lives up to the ideal; but as a means for producing knowledge from an intense, intersubjective engagement, the practice of ethnography retains a certain exemplary status. (pp. 23-24)

Marshall and Rossman (1989) described how researchers and participants construct meanings through the process of intersubjective engagement.

Ethnographic research is a process that

entails immersion in the everyday life of the setting chosen for study, that values participants' perspectives on their worlds and seeks to discover those perspectives, that views inquiry as an interactive process between the researcher and the participants, and that is primarily descriptive and relies on people's words. (p. 11)

Jacob (1988) agreed, noting that "ethnographers gather empirical evidence directly themselves through *fieldwork*, usually involving participant observation and informal interviews . . . to document the participants' points of view" (p. 18).

Harstrup (1990), though, pointed out that the process of engaging with others in the field is difficult and disconcerting. She commented that "fieldwork is diacritical in the anthropological practice. While it lasts, it is a radical

experience of estrangement and relativism. Afterward, it becomes memory" (p. 45).

What a researcher does with memories of field experiences is to translate them into written reconstructions. Clifford (1988) remarked, for example, "In analyzing this complex transformation one must bear in mind the fact that ethnography is, from beginning to end, enmeshed in writing. This writing includes, minimally, a translation of experience into textual form" (p. 25). Nader (1985) added, "The validity of ethnography then becomes not a product of fieldwork or theory but of writing" (p. 152). Harstrup (1990) concurred, pointing out that "ethnographic comprehension . . . is better seen as a creation of ethnographic *writing* than as a consistent quality of ethnographic *experience*" (p. 49, emphasis in original).

A written reconstruction, then, attempts in part to persuade readers that the narrative is plausible. According to Geertz (1988), for example,

The ability of anthropologists to get us to take what they say seriously has less to do with either a factual look or an air of conceptual elegance than it has with their capacity to convince us that what they say is a result of their having actually penetrated (or, if you prefer, been penetrated by) another form of life, of having, one way or another, truly *been there*. And that, persuading us that this offstage miracle has occurred, is where the writing comes in. (pp. 4-5)

Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggested that the researcher's ability to compose a convincing narrative results in readers vicariously experiencing the events in the field. They pointed out that

the aim of the case report is to so orient readers that if they could be magically transported to the inquiry site, they would experience a feeling of *deja vu*--of having been there before and of being thoroughly familiar with all of its details. For the reader the case report is likely to appear grounded, holistic, and lifelike. And, perhaps most important, the case report provides the reader a means for bringing his or her own tacit knowledge to bear. (p. 215)

By bringing their own tacit knowledge to the text, readers, then, must assume part of the responsibility for constructing meaning. Eisner (1988) agreed, stating that "meaning is not located in . . . propositional language . . . independent of a competent and creative reader" (p. 16).

So, experiences in the field are separate and distinct from narrative reconstructions of those experiences into textual forms. This distinction occurs in part, Clifford (1988) pointed out, because

the text, unlike discourse, can travel. If much ethnographic writing is produced in the field, actual composition of an ethnography is done elsewhere. Data constituted in discursive, dialogical conditions are appropriated only in textualized forms. Research events and encounters become field notes. Experiences become narratives, meaningful occurrences, or examples. . . .

To unify a messy scene of writing it is necessary to select, combine, rewrite (and thus efface) these texts. . . . Ethnographies are both like and unlike novels, but in an important general way the two experiences enact the process of fictional self-fashioning in relative systems of culture and language that I call ethnographic. (pp. 39, 110)

The narrative, then, as a result of a researcher's enactment of fictional self-fashioning by reconstructing field experiences, becomes allegory.

Ethnographic texts are inescapably allegorical, and a serious acceptance of this fact changes the ways they can be written and read. . . .

The very activity of ethnographic *writing*--seen as inscription or textualization--enacts a redemptive Western allegory. . . .

A recognition of allegory emphasizes the fact that realistic portraits, to the extent that they are *convincing* or *rich*, are extended metaphors, patterns of associations that point to coherent (theoretical, esthetic, moral) additional meanings. . . .

Allegory prompts us to say of any cultural description not "this represents, or symbolizes, that" but rather, "this is a (morally charged) *story* about that." (Clifford & Marcus, 1986, pp. 99, 100, emphasis in original)

While ethnographic allegory can assume many guises, Geertz (1973) likened it to a particular kind of manuscript.

Doing ethnography is like trying to read '(in the sense of constructing a reading of) a manuscript--foreign, faded, full of ellipses, incoherences,

suspicious emendations, and tendentious commentaries, but written not in conventionalized graphs of sound but in transient examples of shaped behavior. (p. 10)

Overview

How did these background assumptions shape my development of methods that supported the construction of detailed descriptions of transforming leadership processes in the CLP? Socially constructed concepts central to this exploration, namely, leadership, relationship, leader, follower, influence, intended change, common purpose, and organization are responsive to methods of interpretive ethnography, especially since such methods draw out phenomena that otherwise would remain beyond, below, and behind the surface of social and cultural formulations. Moreover, as K. Smith (1982) pointed out, relationships only can be inferred from the actions and behaviors of participants through the metaphorical qualities of language. An ethnographic narrative, then, emerging from my conversations, observations, and experiences at the CLP and my continued engagement with the literature of leadership and interpretive ethnography, provided rich, thick descriptions of transforming leadership processes.

Also, since an ethnographic researcher constructs the text through a reconstructed translation of field-based experiences, this dissertation itself is an enactment of fictional self-fashioning. And so, not only does this exploration of transforming leadership processes construct a narrative about leadership in the CLP, but also it documents my own process of reconstructed translation.

Finally, scholarship and research as socially constructed concepts suggest that the construction of this dissertation itself is an example of redemptive Western allegory--my journey into intellectual enlightenment and professional status through the academy's tradition-bound rite of passage.

The connections between these research issues and the background assumptions formed the basis for how I explored leadership in the CLP. The following sections in this chapter describe how I resolved other important issues that developed during the course of the exploration.

The Shifting Context of the Field

According to Van Maanen (1988), "Fieldworkers are . . . being drawn increasingly to familiar places with the slightly ironic intention of making them strange. . . .These are all important and close-to-home studies that deflate stereotypes and help us see the world with fresh vision" (pp. 126-127).

Marshall and Rossman (1989) added,

The ideal site is where (1) entry is possible; (2) there is a high probability that a rich mix of many of the processes, people, programs, interactions, and/or structures that may be a part of the research question will be present; [and] (3) the researcher can devise an appropriate role to maintain continuity of presence for as long as necessary. (p. 54)

The initial context for my exploration of transforming leadership relationships, the English language arts reform movement in California schools, met all of these conditions. An exploration of leadership in the curriculum reform movement, then, provided me with an opportunity to merge two separate

worlds that had co-existed for over four years, my day-time profession as teacher-practitioner and my night-time profession as doctoral candidate-scholar. As a California high school English teacher, department chairperson, and school district English coordinator, I was an active proponent of curriculum reform in my own district and well aware of the political controversies and competing pedagogies saturating the world of practice in California's English classrooms. My background as a classroom teacher also facilitated my credibility with other teacher participants, as is evident in one person's account of our taped conversation.

I felt like you value my opinion, you are interested, and there is a real connection. No one can understand the experience except someone else who went through it. I wouldn't have had as much respect for you if you were an administrator or if you were a spokesperson for the institute itself, and I wouldn't have been as willing to candidly discuss my feelings and perceptions. (M. Peters, personal communication, August, 1990)

As a doctoral candidate-scholar, I was familiar as well with concepts of transforming leadership and issues in social research methodology. My prior knowledge, then, of both worlds--the world of practice in California schools and the world of theory in a university doctoral program, led me to believe that the California English language arts reform movement contained examples of transforming leadership relationships in action.

My experiences in the field conformed to a qualitative case study format (LeCompte, Preissle, & Tesch, 1993; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall &

Rossman, 1989; Merriam, 1988), following a naturalistic three-phase model, which included taped conversations, participant observations, and an examination of documents. According to Lincoln and Guba,

In contrast to the conventional inquirer, who usually approaches a study *knowing what is not known*, the naturalist adopts the posture of *not knowing what is not known*. Hence the study goes through several phases in order, first, to get some handle on what *is* salient (that is, what one needs to find out about); second, to find out about it; and third, to check the findings in accordance with trustworthiness procedures and gaining closure. (p. 235, emphasis in original)

I began in December, 1989, with countless questions and immense intentions. In retrospect, I had no indication of the enormity of what it was I did not know. Thousands of uncaptured moments--the false starts, the changes, the frustrations, despair, hopelessness, and ultimately, the optimistic fulfillment of this research process--have disappeared into the memories of lived experience. What I am left with, echoing Captain Marlow's recollection in Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, is "a kind of light" (1973, p. 11).

I spent my early days in the field by conducting open-ended conversations with two educators, Mary Barr and Charles Cooper, who, based on my prior knowledge, seemed to be members of transforming leadership relationships. Mary Barr was director of the CLP, a statewide project whose purpose has been to create and implement models of teaching methods and curriculum reflecting an integrated English language arts approach, a major

component of the English language arts reform effort. Charles Cooper was a professor at the University of California at San Diego, co-director of the San Diego Area Writing Project, and policy board member of the CLP, and was instrumental in the design and implementation of the direct writing component of the California Assessment Program (CAP) statewide assessment system. Both were members of two key state-level committees, the CAP Executive Planning Committee and the CAP English Language Arts Advisory Committee.

These first conversations enabled me to compare my initial research questions and definitions about transforming leadership to the actual context of the study, looking for possible fits and appropriate modifications. These conversations also initiated me to the experience of ethnographic fieldwork. It was apparent to me after these initial conversations, however, that I needed to shift the focus of the study and the field. While I intended to study leadership relationships, it appeared, instead, that I was drawn into the same trap that snared other investigators of transforming leadership, namely, an inordinate focus on individual leaders, rather than on relationships among leaders and followers. However, from our conversation Mary Barr appeared to place a high value in her work on developing an ethos of collaboration and empowerment with her associates, an issue that is central to an exploration of transforming leadership. Charles Cooper, on the other hand, viewed himself as a solitary scholar, immersed in ideas and only occasionally, somewhat reluctantly, drawn into the politics of statewide reform. While Mary Barr appeared to love the

challenges present in the political arena of educational policy making, Charles Cooper clearly did not.

Mary Barr invited me to attend the CLP statewide academy in February, 1990, in Los Angeles. There, I had the opportunity to meet and observe members of the project, including regional directors, workshop presenters, summer institute directors and group leaders, and teachers who had attended the summer institutes. As a result of these meetings and observations, it impressed me that the CLP provided fertile ground for an exploration of leadership relationships. Later in the spring, I attended several state conferences on English language arts reform, sometimes as a participant and other times as a presenter, and observed CLP members at these conferences. At one of the conferences, I taped a conversation with Mae Gunlach, who was the California Department of Education's liaison with the CLP.

In the summer, 1990, I attended the CLP four-week summer institute at the San Diego State University site as a *full participant* (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). I became a member of the *Silver Stars* (there were 17 of us in all), one of six small groups that constituted the institute's enrollment of 115 teachers. I conducted taped conversations with Jim Sieg, the Silver Stars' teacher leader (a CLP term); several other members of the Silver Stars group, including Lori Anderson, B. J. Brown, Lisa Damato, Shelley Overstreet, Suky Reilly, and Wendy Washington; Jan Gabay, the institute director at the San Diego site; and several participants from other small groups, including Bill Kelly (a pseudonym by request), Katherine Nichols, and Monte Peters. Some of these

conversations occurred during the institute, while others occurred after the institute ended. Also, I attended teacher leader planning meetings.

In the fall, 1990, I taped conversations with Mel Grubb, CLP regional director in Los Angeles, and Gretchen Laue, a middle school teacher, former summer institute team leader, and policy board member. During the 1990-1991 school year, I attended follow-up group meetings with Silver Star members and also assumed a state-level position as Outreach Program Coordinator for the Middle Schools Demonstration Program, a joint effort of the CLP and the California Department of Education. In December, 1991, I moved to my present position on the east coast as assistant professor in the Curriculum and Teaching department at Hofstra University, where I developed this narrative.

Researcher/Author/Persona

In addition to the shifting context of the field, the parts I played as researcher became another important methodological issue. This is not surprising since according to Clifford and Marcus (1986), for example, “With the *fieldwork account* the rhetoric of experienced objectivity yields to that of the autobiography and the ironic self-portrait. . . .The ethnographer, a character in a fiction, is at center stage” (p. 14). Nader (1985) added, “Anthropologists have moved from insisting that the anthropologist stay out of the ethnography to having the anthropologist's presence dominate the ethnography” (p. 53).

One reason for this shift is a recognition, according to J. K. Smith (1983), that ethnographic studies are based on “interpretive understanding . . . [which] involves the need to *live through*, or recreate, the experience of others within

oneself" (p. 7). Crawford (1987) added that the quality of the ethnographer's relationships with participants in the field had an enormous influence on the quality of those recreated experiences.

In order to develop the ability to recreate the experiences of others within oneself, Van Maanen (1988) pointed out, "This process begins with the explicit examination of one's own preconceptions, biases, and motives, moving forward in a dialectic fashion toward understanding by way of a continuous dialogue between the interpreter and interpreted" (p. 93). Berg and Smith (1988) added,

As social investigators, it is our responsibility to be researching our methods while we are applying them . . . [thereby] placing the scrutiny of self in the center stage of social inquiry. . . .We are obligated to struggle to understand the complex emotional and intellectual forces that influence the conduct of our inquiry. (pp. 9, 11)

Therefore, I played several parts in this exploration of leadership. I am researcher, the one who was involved for nearly two years in field experiences. Also, I am author-translator, the one who takes this initiator stance to reconstruct the field experiences into textual form. And, I am narrative persona, a disembodied voice moving back and forth between third-person limited omniscient and first-person, a character in this leadership narrative.

As the ethnographer, I was the primary filter of the experiences in the field, able to "respond to the situation by maximizing opportunities for collecting and producing meaningful information" (Merriam, 1988, pp. 36-37). I was prepared to play this part because I possess the traits required: a tolerance for

ambiguity, an ability to observe keenly and analyze, and an ability to develop rapport and communicate honestly (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1988). I developed these traits through a variety of professional experiences, for eight years as a psychological counselor of Gestalt and Rogerian approaches and for twelve years as an educator. In addition, I was qualified to do fieldwork in the California curriculum reform movement because of my prior knowledge developed through co-directing the reform for the San Dieguito Union High School District in Encinitas, California. These experiences contributed to my tacit knowledge (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and my biases as I began the fieldwork.

Constructing a Translation from Experience to Text

The shifting context of the field and the multiple parts I played, which evolved as the research unfolded, together formed the basis for constructing a translation of field experiences into textual form. This translated textual form, which you, reader, are 60+ pages into, is all the evidence you have of my field experiences. As North (1987) pointed out, for example, "Ethnographic inquiry produces stories, fictions. . . . The phenomena observed are gone, will not occur again, and therefore cannot be investigated again. What remains, then, is whatever the investigators have managed to turn into words" (p. 277). Van Maanen (1988) suggested, in addition, that even the words themselves are an inadequate means to convey the reality of the field experiences. "We can never actually represent other cultures, only evoke them. In language we can encircle the lived reality, but it remains a shadow in our text. Life is no text, and is not

reducible to one" (p. 53). The textual translation of my experiences in the field, then, is an attempt to tell you a story, not only of leadership relationships in the CLP, but also of what happened to me during my encounters with members of that organization. You, reader, and I have fashioned this story together. It is the what and the how of my experiences in the field that I have managed to turn into words, words that you reconstruct for your own purposes, and filtered through your own prior experiences and knowledge.

I chose to tell a story of transforming leadership in the CLP by constructing a narrative primarily based on taped conversations with participants. As Clifford (1988) noted, "It becomes necessary to conceive of ethnography . . . as a constructive negotiation involving . . . conscious, politically significant [participants]" (p. 41). Lofland (1971) added that this constructive negotiation "evokes [a] culturally common sense and shared notion of what constitutes a descriptive report of something happening" (p. 102). The narrative allowed me to evoke the voices of the participants, to portray their multiple views in relation to our mutually constructed understandings of leadership relationships. (See Estrada & McLaren, 1993; Shor & Freire, 1987 for examples of dialogically constructed texts.) I composed the narrative taking into account what Harstrup (1990) called the ethnographic present, for

ethnography always leads to implicational truth that is not outlived when the ethnographer leaves the field. On the contrary, since it is a narrative or written truth it transcends the historical moment and must, therefore, be constructed in the ethnographic present. When this is realized we are

free to invest the ethnographic present with many possible futures. (p. 57)

Ethical Considerations

[Research] should bring deeper meaning into our daily lives without controlling the lives of others. It should not reduce the complexities of human interaction and learning to simple formulas but rather should elaborate and accentuate their richness. As a result of our research, we should become more consciously intentional of our actions and more thoughtful and reflective of their consequences. (Krall, 1988, p. 474)

I wanted participants to come away from our conversations and interactions with, as Krall pointed out above, a deeper understanding of their own learning as a result of participating. Several participants acknowledged that a deeper understanding had occurred. According to K. Nichols, for example, "I learned from our conversations and especially enjoyed reading a transcript later. Your questions were excellent; they helped to bring out ideas I had been thinking about" (personal communication, July, 1990). B. J. Brown added,

It takes commitment and work to affect change. As I think over the questions that you asked me, you made some statements about how leadership occurs--not always by the people who we think are our leaders. I don't mean to say that you were leading me that way or that you had a hidden agenda, but leadership doesn't always come from the people up front who are called the leaders. (personal communication, August, 1990)

Curriculum reform in a statewide organization is, in part, a highly political process. Members of the CLP who revealed candid opinions and observations exposed themselves to possible personal and professional repercussions. As researcher, I had a moral obligation to protect their well-being and professional integrity. To that end I developed informed consent procedures detailing the processes and purposes of the study and including potential risks and benefits, opportunities to ask questions, and assurances that participation was voluntary and could be terminated at any time. Participants had an opportunity to review, comment on, and edit transcripts of their taped conversations. (See Appendix A, for an example of the follow-up letter and transcript consent form.) In addition, I gave pseudonyms to persons not included in the study whom participants portrayed disparagingly.

Participation in this study offered some benefits as well. As pointed out in the examples above, the conversations provided participants with an opportunity to reflect critically on their work. Professional reflection in this way often yields a renewed sense of self and purpose. Participation also provided altruistic satisfaction by contributing important information to the literature on leadership studies and curriculum reform.

Because of the proliferation of dissertations and other forms of research that rely on human participation, universities formed committees to address research on human subjects. The committees developed guidelines for research to ensure that researchers protect participants from possible physical, emotional, or psychological harm. Unfortunately, at the University of San Diego

during the time of my dissertation proposal in December, 1989, the committee's guidelines failed to account for qualitative or ethnographic methods. As a result, research proposals, including my own, continued to be rejected on the basis of fundamentally different views on the nature of knowledge. For example, assuming that all research should be preordinately designed (a concept based on traditional methodology in natural science research), the committee requested protocols of research questions and names of participants prior to the beginning of this study, requests that simply could not be met, given the emergent design based on social science research described above. (See Appendix B for acknowledgment of approval from the human subjects committee.) I hope that the success of my study in protecting the participants from harm will contribute to a greater acceptance by human subjects committees of emergent design research.

CHAPTER 4

A NARRATIVE OF LEADERSHIP

Prologue

This chapter, through what I managed to put into words, is a story about my interpretation of leadership relationships in a particular educational organization at a specific time and place. Thus, the chapter is in part a narrative about what I experienced as a participant and conversant during 1990 and 1991 at the California Literature Project academy in Los Angeles, the four-week summer institute at San Diego State University, and six one-day meetings following the summer institute. The chapter is also a narrative about how I reconstructed those experiences and conversations as I write in 1994. Also, the chapter is a narrative about specific people in specific contexts--formed by personal histories, relationships, and organizational arrangements--as those people struggled to locate their CLP experiences within the particularity of their own personal and professional lives.

This chapter has seven major sections: prologue; *dramatis personae*; setting; leadership; intending changes and developing common purposes; influence and power; and epilogue. The prologue and epilogue provide me, the author, with an opportunity to address you, the reader, directly, in order to orient you to the structure and significance of the chapter within the context of the ethnography as a whole. The *dramatis personae* identifies the characters in this narrative and locates them within the context of people's prior knowledge

about and experiences with educational roles and personalities. The setting places leadership relationships in the context--organization and community--in which it occurred. The remaining sections represent major themes that developed within that leadership context.

Finally, a story metaphor permeates this chapter because even though I base this narrative on the real events, conversations, and interviews that I engaged in several years ago, I make no attempt to generalize about leadership relationships or about the CLP itself beyond my description here. Moreover, those experiences are gone forever, cannot be reproduced, and the people, including the self that I was at that time, are gone as well. What remains are field notes, transcripts, selective memory, and my own true fiction.

Dramatis Personae

Lori Anderson, elementary school teacher who attended the summer institute.

Mary Barr, CLP executive director.

B. J. Brown, junior high school English teacher who attended the summer institute.

Charles Cooper, university professor, CLP policy board member, and co-director of the San Diego Area Writing Project.

Lisa Damato, middle school English teacher who attended the summer institute.

Jan Gabay, San Diego State University summer institute director, San Diego regional director of the CLP, high school English teacher, 1990 National Teacher of the Year.

Mae Gundlach, California Department of Education liaison to the CLP.

Mel Grubb, Dominguez Hills regional director of the CLP, consultant to English language arts programs, Los Angeles County Department of Education.

William Kelly (a pseudonym), school district central office staff member who attended the summer institute.

Gretchen Laue, middle school English teacher, CLP policy board member.

Katherine Nichols, high school English teacher who attended the summer institute.

Shelley Overstreet, elementary school teacher who attended the summer institute.

Monte Peters, high school English teacher who attended the summer institute.

Suky Reilly, elementary school teacher who attended the summer institute.

James Sieg, high school English teacher, summer institute small group leader.

Wendy Washington, high school English teacher who attended the summer institute.

Setting

Origin of the California Literature Project

A climate of reform dominated the California educational landscape during the 1980s, and several events in particular contributed to the formation and growth of the CLP, including the California legislature's passage of Senate Bills 813 and 1882, William Honig's election as state superintendent for education, and the California Writing Project's success in changing how teachers and students in classrooms explored writing and composition. In concert with these events, the California Department of Education developed subject matter (including English language arts) performance standards and frameworks, which established criteria for what California students should demonstrate as a result of their schooling experiences. Based on these standards and frameworks, the education department formed subject matter projects (including the CLP) to provide support for teachers to implement the curricular changes needed to enable students to achieve the new criteria.

Mae Gundlach, for example, offered insight into the contributions of the legislature and superintendent, in particular how Superintendent Honig altered the structure and responsibilities of major divisions within the state education department and how these changes laid the groundwork for the formation of the CLP.

When Honig became superintendent, he separated the instructional services unit at the California Department of Education into new units under each academic subject. At the same time, Senate Bill 813 passed,

which legislatively mandated the department to develop subject matter standards in grades 9-12. Each subject matter unit then began work on standards, which in the English unit evolved into the *English Language Arts Framework* now in place.

As we were completing the standards, Honig wanted to include a recommended list of books that addressed the themes and values reflected in the standards. Then, after we published the standards and the first book list, our unit began to explore several staff development questions, including: What were teachers going to do? How could we make sure that teachers were actually using the books on the list? and How were teachers using the standards and the books in their classrooms?

In 1985, partly in response to questions such as these, Dave Gordon, associate superintendent, Jim Smith, director of the English language arts unit, and Honig developed an English language arts project, patterned after the Writing Project, in which teachers would convene for the summer to develop new classroom strategies that would reflect the standards.

We decided to form the CLP, with Pat Taylor from UCLA as the director, to train 100 classroom teachers. Initially, we decided to work only with secondary school teachers because the standards were completed only for grades 9-12. We wanted to develop a cobweb of

classroom teachers around the state who could take the standards and develop strategies to enable students to achieve them.

Mary Barr agreed that the CLP is linked directly to the *English Language Arts Framework*. Moreover, she pointed out that the content of that framework, based on a constructivist view of knowledge, helped to shape the change-oriented nature of the CLP.

The CLP is a creature of the framework. The education department commissioned us to pull together teachers from across the state to determine how new understandings from curriculum researchers and theorists could be implemented in classrooms. These new understandings are all constructivist based, which requires a very different set of classroom strategies.

Even during these early stages in the establishment and development of the CLP, the education department was concerned about the process of implementing the reform. Mae Gundlach observed that organizing the CLP to provide support for teachers, rather than to implement a top-down reform mandate, made substantive, lasting changes more likely to occur.

Educational reform needs both an institutional support structure and teachers in the classrooms to fill in the structure with their experiences. When teachers feel that institutional structures support them, they are more likely to buy into the reform, which is crucial since classroom teachers give credence to the movement.

In addition to the contributions of the legislature and the superintendent in addressing curricular reform, Charles Cooper outlined the explicit contribution the Writing Project made as a model for the development of the CLP and other subject matter projects. However, in doing so he pointed out an important difference in the Writing Project's origin, noting that the CLP and other subject matter projects developed out of a collaborative effort, and offered a comment on Superintendent Honig's strengths and weaknesses.

The CLP did not have a single visionary (as was the case with the Writing Project's Jim Gray). Notice the idea of the subject matter project, which is the way Honig organized the whole curricular reform effort in California. He took the Writing Project model and said, "It worked for writing and could work for other subjects, so let's do it that way." It's clear that Honig doesn't understand anything about language arts curriculum, but his policies, though, have certainly supported changes in teaching and assessment.

According to Mary Barr, however, the Writing Project model had several shortcomings, which the people developing the CLP needed to alter in constructing its design. In describing these limitations, however, and as a former Writing Project co-director, she emphasized the Writing Project's *significant role in promoting the professional expertise of teacher knowledge*, which is a cornerstone of the CLP philosophy.

The Writing Project (I co-directed one of the original California projects) started at a time when there was absolutely no research in the field of

teaching writing. The whole idea was to bring teachers who were finding success teaching writing together to share ideas. At that time all the attention and resources were focused on reading, which was separated from the other language arts. It was a terrible time and Jim Gray, director of the Writing Project, was a genius to go after what teachers were doing with writing in their classrooms. Out of those meetings with teachers has come an extraordinary understanding about writing and its connection to thinking.

The Writing Project now, however, has concretized itself into a model that values only teacher expertise developed in the classroom. This model, which is based on asking teachers, "What are you doing in your classrooms?" does not seem appropriate in an era filled with so much research on literature and writing. Instead, we should bring together teachers who are teaching literature and writing and ask them, "What are you doing, what would you like to do more of, and what are other people doing?" The reform must move beyond the work of individual teachers to link teachers to the exciting events in their field and support them to look around and try out new ideas in their classrooms. I don't think dealing only with teacher *stars*, which is part of the Writing Project approach, is where we ought to be. Instead, we ought to be dealing with teachers in concert with their schools and their districts to work together to pull us out of the *dark ages*.

Mae Gundlach pointed out that this move the CLP has made away from teacher stars to teachers working collaboratively with schools and districts has generated criticism from some Writing Project members. Her response to the criticism highlights the importance the CLP places on learning by doing and teacher empowerment.

Criticism comes from people in the Writing Project who ask, "Why don't you have master teachers come and do presentations on what they know?" The CLP response is that when star teachers present their ideas, the teachers in the audience are not going to know the ideas through their own experiences of them. Subsequently, the teachers are not empowered beyond that one lesson that was presented to them.

However, in spite of the differences in philosophy between the two projects, Charles Cooper pointed out that the California Department of Education's attempt, through the subject matter projects, to actively involve classroom teachers in the design and implementation of educational change was unprecedented.

I don't know of any other state that's doing this kind of reform. Most are still working through bureaucracies and state education systems, designing new statewide tests, and ignoring teachers. It's true in Texas and North Carolina, for example. Teachers there aren't involved except as token advisors.

Development of the California Literature Project

With the establishment of the *English Language Arts Framework* and support of Superintendent Honig and staff members at the California Department of Education, the CLP began in 1985. For the first three years, the project held a summer institute at one site on the campus of UCLA. The project had three major purposes: (1) to develop teachers who could model strategies in their classrooms that enabled students to achieve the aims of the framework; (2) to develop a core of teachers who would become small group leaders at the summer institutes; and (3) to develop curriculum processes and content and procedural strategies for the summer institutes in years to come. Mel Grubb recalled who was involved in the first summer institute and how teachers were selected to participate. He emphasized that the project always was looking to identify potential teachers to serve as models and institute small group leaders.

Pat Taylor asked me to join a new project she was directing. At our first meeting, I met John Angelo, Lloyd Thomas, and Hortence Thornton. Subsequently, we five became the first directors of the CLP. We held the first summer institute at UCLA in 1985 and Lloyd, Hortence, John, and I were the institute leaders. We each invited twenty teachers to attend that first summer. Out of that pool we selected teachers who then would become summer institute small group leaders in the following summers.

When the CLP started, its purpose was to take the philosophical document, the *English Language Arts Framework*, and work with teachers to see how they could put that philosophy into practice in their

own teaching. In the summer institute we tried to model, in the five weeks, using literature as a base, how teachers might get meaning from text as adults and then make that translation into what they might do in their classrooms.

Mae Gundlach agreed that the institute directors and teachers who attended in the three years at UCLA developed the curriculum and format for the summer institutes. She also described the extent of the exclusive financial commitment Honig and the education department made to the CLP from 1985-87, but pointed out that by the end of the third year of the project, political pressure from other interest groups began to push Honig to redistribute the money to other subject matter projects.

For the first three years of the CLP at UCLA, the education department subsidized all expenses for teachers--lodging, tuition, everything--from Chapter II monies. Since Honig had complete control over these monies, he was able to do what he wanted with them. Of course, as each year passed, educators representing other subject areas began to ask, "When is it going to be our turn to get this pot of money?" By the end of the third year, it was loud and clear that English language arts shouldn't be the only subject area to receive money.

The continued pressure from representatives of other subjects to redistribute the money as well as Governor Deukmejian's decision to reduce significantly the education budget almost resulted in the closing of the CLP. These events occurred during the 1987 summer institute and Gretchen Laue,

who attended that summer, remembered their effects on the institute, including mobilizing teachers to responsive action.

Mary Barr was our small group leader and for about a week and a half we could tell that things were somewhat weird or strange. But we continued to meet until we heard that Governor Deukmejian had blue-lined the CLP out of the budget. We then held a large group meeting and I was just sitting back and saying, "It'll be interesting to see how teachers deal with something like this." At that point, another teacher turned to me and said, "We can't let this happen." Her comment jolted me, and I said, "Yeah, you're right, I can't sit back. I need to do something." So then we organized a big demonstration that brought teachers together, sent letters to Deukmejian, and contacted the media and the press. Even though Deukmejian did not reallocate the money for the summer institute, the UCLA chancellor provided money from his budget so that we could continue with the project that summer. We sent him roses in appreciation!

Mae Gundlach pointed out, though, that even though the chancellor's intervention had permitted the summer institute to finish its program, if the CLP were to survive, then the education department had to enter into partnership with local school districts and share the financial responsibility. At that time, Mary Barr also became the new director of the CLP.

In 1988 the state department had to say that it's time for the school districts to invest some money in this project. In turn, the district people

could select who they wanted as their staff developers to attend the institute. We were really surprised when the districts agreed. It was at that time, too, that Mary Barr took over as the director. She had been the head of the English Language Arts Curriculum Implementation Center and the combination of the center's ending and Pat Taylor going in other directions professionally made it natural for Mary to take over the CLP. Pat's strength was her knowledge of literature content, but she was not good at organizing working relationships with people. Mary, on the other hand, had both knowledge of literature content and people skills. She's always nurturing others and trying to include them.

Mel Grubb described another part of the financial and structural reconfiguration of the CLP. He stated that with the passage of Senate Bill 1882, the subject matter projects officially became part of the University of California (UC) system.

Senate Bill 1882 legislated that the subject matter projects come under the UC's budget as a joint governance between the State Department of Education and the UC system, in concurrence with the California State University and community college systems. The new legislation also stipulates how a new project site can be developed, where sites may be located and that kind of thing. The end result is that the legislation formalized the structure and some support monies to the CLP.

Mae Gundlach added that this legislation served to eliminate the ambiguity and tenuousness of the CLP's economic survival and also heralded a recommitment on the part of the legislature and superintendent to reform.

With the money provided by Senate Bill 1882, there's a concrete financial commitment to the reform. The CLP, for example, now has an operating budget of over one million dollars. That kind of commitment and support by Honig and the legislators demonstrates to teachers that the existing structures are serious about doing their part to help bring about the reform.

With this renewed sense of commitment and infusion of money, by 1990 the directors of the CLP set up the main office at UCSD and expanded the project to seven sites around the state. Mary Barr listed the regional sites and directors and described some of the duties the regional directors performed. She also pointed out that the CLP drew its regional directors from a broad range of constituencies in the educational political arena.

The staff of the CLP breaks down this way: an executive director and seven regional directors. The regional directors and sites include Richard Adams at Sacramento State University, Yette Bradley at CSU Hayward, Jayne DeLawter at Sonoma State University, Jan Gabay at San Diego State University, Mel Grubb at CSU Dominguez Hills, Carol Hendsch at CSU Fresno, and Lloyd Thomas at CSU Northridge. We meet once a month and part of our responsibility is to design the program for the regional summer institutes and follow-up meetings. For example,

we argue about which works of literature participants should read, what instructional strategies we should model, and what services we should offer to the districts.

The regional directors also represent different constituencies in the educational system. For example, one is from a county office, another from a community college district, another from an English department in the California State University system, and another from a school of education in the CSU system. This diverse representation is very important in order to have a statewide project supportive of teacher leadership. Each regional director, because she or he represents a different constituency, views the state English framework from a slightly different angle. Since we all have a good idea where each of us stands on issues, we prepare for the different perspectives in advance of the meetings. We can't really address statewide reform unless we have key people who represent various constituencies.

Regional Summer Institutes and Academy

In order to have classroom teachers actively involved in shaping the reform effort, the CLP directors developed two annual events that enabled teachers to meet to explore ongoing issues related to English language arts curriculum--a four-week regional summer institute and a three-day statewide academy. The institute, which included two years of small group follow-up meetings, convened at the seven regional sites of the CLP and accommodated between 80-120 teachers at each site. The academy convened at one site

each year and teachers who were at least in their second year of follow-up meetings after attending a summer institute are eligible to attend.

The CLP directors shared the responsibility for developing the curriculum for the four-week summer institutes because they wanted to offer essentially the same curriculum to teachers at all seven regional sites in a given summer. For a detailed description of the curriculum for the 1990 summer institutes, see Appendix C. As I stated above, during the first three summers at UCLA, institute directors formulated the process for conducting the daily activities of the four weeks of meetings and then field tested the format with participants. The three years of field tests resulted in a process script that the directors and small group leaders of all seven regional sites followed. Now, the primary task of the directors in preparation for the summer institutes has been to decide on the themes and to select the literature the participants will read. According to Mel Grubb, for example,

In one sense, the hard work of developing the summer format has passed because when we were only at UCLA, the directors would spend hours writing the program, maybe two full weeks before the institute began--non-stop writing to get the format to work together so there would be some consistency in materials and activities. Now, that's completed, and prior to a summer institute we primarily change the texts. We still want adults to experience the same activities for the same purposes, just rearranging them with another text.

The directors have enjoyable discussions about selecting themes and texts. The focus for this summer, for example, is *California: A State of Mind*. We're looking at California writers and people who have written about California. To decide on difficult texts has been a major issue. We've taken several texts away and read them. We also have an ongoing goal to bring in as many writers of different cultures and people who write about different cultures that really are credible to that culture. At the end of April, we will meet with the summer small group teacher leaders to select the supplemental and recreational reading materials that will be suitable for the theme.

Even though the directors of the CLP attempted to make sure that each regional institute followed essentially the same format, the experiences for participants can be quite different. For example, according to Jim Sieg, who attended the summer institute at CSU Dominguez Hills and then served as small group leader at San Diego State University the following summer,

One of the big differences is the stamp the director put on the institute. The director at Dominguez Hills, for example, was very straight, regimented, and linear and maintained an attitude of aloofness. You got the sense that you had to move through the material quickly, that there was a stopwatch on you.

On the other hand, at San Diego, because of our director, Jan Gabay, the National Teacher of the Year, there was a real validation of the whole reform process--the National Teacher of the Year buys into this

whole reform program. That was one major difference--a cool, aloof, hyper business-like attitude at Dominguez Hills, and a more caring, concerned, light-heartedly humorous attitude at San Diego. For some participants, perhaps, the atmosphere at Dominguez Hills might have been more effective for them to learn about the reform movement and for them to have been moved along. I had an excellent teacher leader at Dominguez Hills and that made the experience for me worthwhile in spite of the institute at large.

Another difference at Dominguez Hills was that the leadership really kept the participants in the dark about the overall plan. For example, I was never given a speech by my group leader (like the one I gave at San Diego) about trusting the process and making the leap of faith that everything was going to be all right. Instead, there was a lot of mystery that was never dispelled for us to Dominguez Hills. Until I came to San Diego, I had always thought that the mystery was part of the overall plan to put stress on the participants to change.

As Jim Sieg revealed above, one of the keys to the summer institute's operation was the role the small group leaders played. Each of these leaders was a classroom teacher K-12 who was selected from the pool of participants at regional institutes in years past. For a description of the summer institute director and small group leader positions, see Appendix D. Mel Grubb outlined the selection and preparation process.

Teachers who participated in a summer institute receive a letter inviting them to apply for teacher leader positions. The completed applications are then sent to Mary Barr and include a letter of recommendation from their summer leader and/or the person who's been with them during their follow-up time. From those applications, Mary Barr and the regional directors select the teacher leaders.

At Dominguez Hills, for example, I bring in three past summer leaders to meet with me to select teacher leaders. Sometimes we make telephone calls and spend about half a day to a day selecting the leaders. The institute, in a sense, is dependent upon these people for the next three years to be effective leaders with adults, to have the respect of their peers.

There are many qualified people, so it's important to select the leaders in a fair way. We also try to have a balanced number of elementary and secondary teachers. Sometimes we've selected people who have not had a great deal of leadership experience, but we know enough about them to know that they have the people skills necessary to work positively with others.

Prior to the beginning of the institute, the teacher leaders participate in an extensive training program. In addition, during the institute they meet for an hour prior to the day's beginning and also at lunchtime to discuss how the day is progressing. They receive a lot of support skills so that they can be successful leaders. To lead is very

difficult. To lead a group that you meet with all day long for four weeks requires that you appear confident, and, yet, there are a lot of teachers who have just never had that kind of experience. They've taught students in classrooms, but they've not worked with a group of adults for four weeks.

Participants found their way to the summer institute in a number of ways.

According to Wendy Washington, for example,

I attended the Writing Project at UC Irvine last summer and knew another teacher at my school who attended the CLP a couple of years ago. She thought it was just fabulous. Through our district, teachers can receive mentorship positions to attend staff development workshops and summer programs. Our district wanted to incorporate the Writing Project philosophy and strategies into the curriculum, but district administrators had some differences with the local Writing Project leadership--with the politics of the project. So this summer I attended the CLP instead.

Lisa Damato's story was very similar to Wendy Washington's in that there was an uneasy relationship between her district and the UCI Writing Project.

The problem is basically with the UC Irvine Writing Project. Our district and UCI have had some rifts starting with an intern program that had to be cut off in the middle of the year. In addition, the UCI Project does not like for the participants who complete the project to return to their districts as *experts* and conduct workshops for other teachers without UCI's support. Our district, however, selects teachers to become mentors,

provides resources for them to attend workshops, believes they can become experts, and pays them less than they would have to pay UCI for their support.

According to Wendy Washington, she was attracted as well to the philosophical stance and curricular approaches of the CLP.

I've been teaching three years and I've noticed that some of the things I do just don't work. What attracted me to the CLP was how much of the philosophy is based on students creating their own meaning with texts, how much they participated in constructing meaning. Jan Schmit (a presenter at the San Diego summer institute in 1990) said that's when the text is created--when you read it and experience it.

Lisa Damato pointed out that she was influenced in her decision to attend the CLP summer institute by a presenter at the UCI Writing Project.

Bob Probst, a student of Louise Rosenblatt, made a presentation about reader response strategies to construct meaning in texts. I returned to my classroom and did a unit with my kids based strictly on reader response strategies. The approach was very successful and I thought if I attended the CLP, I would learn more of the same kinds of strategies to enable kids to connect meaningfully with the literature. This approach is an extreme departure from how I experienced literature in the university setting, for example, with the professor telling me the *correct* interpretation after I had tried to glean the interpretation for myself.

Instead, the CLP philosophy stresses that all readers have the ability to come to an interpretation of the text.

Gretchen Laue, who attended the CLP summer institute in 1987 and served as a CLP policy board member, described how she became involved with the CLP.

I returned to teaching five years ago after not having taught for almost ten years. So, I started attending inservices--I went to a California Assessment Program inservice and a Writing Project inservice. While at the Writing Project inservice I met a woman who previously had attended the CLP summer institute at UCLA. She talked about what strong support the CLP provided and what a tremendous learning experience the institute was for her as a teacher.

I attended the CLP summer institute in 1987 and encountered a community of people, of teachers, which I had not experienced at my own school setting. The CLP learning community reaffirmed many of the things I believed needed to happen for teachers and students in classrooms.

In addition to the regional summer institutes, the CLP Academy, an annual statewide event, brought together former summer institute participants, teacher leaders, and CLP directors. Mel Grubb recalled some of the purposes for convening an academy.

The purpose of the academy initially was to bring together educators statewide to build a consensus about the *English Language*

Arts Framework and the CLP so that we don't become isolated into regional clans. The problem now is that the number of eligible participants is growing so quickly; I don't know that we can afford to do it in the way we've done it in the past, or that if we decide to change the forum, the teachers can afford to spend the weekend together. Nearly 1,200 teachers are eligible to attend this year, and that number will grow as more and more people complete the summer institutes.

At the academy participants form groups that address specific issues regarding language arts and literacy development, such as assessment or family literacy. In addition, we bring in outstanding presenters from the language arts field, usually resource people that a specific region or district could not afford bring in on its own. For example, we've been blessed with people like Louise Rosenblatt, Myra Barrs, and Patrick Dias.

The academy, then, provides information to educators around the state as well as a forum for participants to reacquaint themselves with each other and with new discoveries in the world of literacy education.

Los Angeles Academy 1990

The following section contains not only my recollections and impressions about the CLP Los Angeles Academy, but also a detailed portrayal of my entry into an ethnographic field setting. The academy convened approximately one month after I conducted my first two interviews, with Mary Barr and Charles Cooper. In part, then, this section is a narrative of my experiences as a

participant observer at the academy and a portrayal of the difficulty of implementing an emergent design research process. It was during this first intensive immersion in the field, however, that the direction and subsequent form of the dissertation developed. For an overall description of the academy's schedule of events, which I will not address directly in this section because the narrative is more impressionistic than chronological, see Appendix E.

I arrived at the academy site, the Los Angeles Hilton Hotel on Friday afternoon, February 2, 1990, intent on describing leadership and leadership relationships. I felt not unlike a spy or secret agent, attempting to blend into the crowd, yet knowing my purposes for being there were quite different from the others. That sense of otherness would persist throughout the weekend. I watched people arrive, register, and mingle at the social hour before dinner. People began to bond, people who had not seen each other for some time were getting reacquainted. Those in attendance were teachers who completed a CLP summer institute and returned to their classrooms to implement and practice the instructional strategies they learned. Also, some participants were consultants with other schools and districts.

The participants gathered at the academy for an opportunity to discuss the progress of the implementation process. As Mary Barr stated in her opening remarks, teachers were there for renewal and to revisit meaningfully the role literature had in their lives, including the role of storytelling. On Friday night, for example, there was a performance of Alaskan legends by a Native American group, a very powerful portrayal that connected performance art and mythology

and, of course, for teachers in the audience, performance art and literature. To extend the metaphor, the teachers attended the academy in part to recount the myths and stories of their own experiences as agents for change in California classrooms.

Mary Barr also said that not only were teachers there for renewal, but they were there to help clarify the CLP position statewide. Part of the purpose for attending the academy, then, was to formulate possible answers to the question of where the CLP should go next. To that end, Mary Barr pointed out that she and the CLP directors could not determine the future direction of the CLP without the help of academy participants.

In talking with people in small groups at the cocktail hour and over dinner, they reported how impatient they were with the process of implementing changes beyond their own classrooms. They had benefitted from gathering for four weeks during a summer in an intensive learning environment to explore curricular innovations and instructional strategies. Then, they left the summer institutes in the first stages of conversion, excited about spreading the word to others. However, upon returning to their schools and districts, they were alone and unsupported again, and among other teachers who wanted to be left alone and unchanged. The teachers felt that the twelve days of follow-up meetings over a two-year period generally were not enough to counteract their feelings of isolation. The teachers expressed their frustration and impatience with the intransigence of other teachers and administrators.

It was difficult for me as participant observer to know what it was I was looking at or how I should be looking and participating--maybe this was an example of the first days in the field anxiety--where everything was potential data, so which data were the right data? I thought it would be beneficial that I was already acquainted with the English language arts field and with some of the people attending the academy because of my own work in English language arts reform. I felt, however, during the early part of the weekend that perhaps I was not acting in the way a researcher should act. How was I to make the familiar strange?

I decided I needed to become more detached from participation so that I could focus primarily on leadership issues relating to my initial research questions. When I awoke on Saturday morning, it occurred to me as well that I ought to ask people direct questions about their impressions of the CLP. For example, Why had they decided to attend the academy? What did the academy mean to them? What did they want to accomplish? and What role did Mary Barr and other people play in their lives and the development of their professional selves?

I also had ethical concerns about implementing procedures for obtaining informed consent from participants. For example, when I engaged others in conversation, at what point should I stop to present my researcher spiel? Did I whip out my consent form and get a signature right away? What effect would this interruption have on the conversation? I resolved to request informed consent signatures after the conversations, provided I was likely to include them

in the dissertation. In fact, though, as I described in Chapter Three all persons listed in the *dramatis personae* signed an informed consent form after receiving a transcript of our taped conversation. All except one agreed to the inclusion of their real names.

The teachers' frustrations at not implementing changes quickly enough in their own schools and districts highlighted the difficulty in distinguishing between intention and realization. Were the teachers in leadership relationships if real changes had not occurred already? What happened when followers' expectations for change are raised, but not realized? What happened to their confidence in leadership processes at the CLP? If the teachers attended the academy for a sense of renewal, reorganization, and reflection on what their intentions were, then were their frustrations adequately addressed? Moreover, what effect did the experience of the academy have on their sense of self and their sense of involvement in a leadership relationship? For example, was intention for change going to be satisfactory--only to intend and not realize changes in ways they wanted or expected? I was able only to raise these questions at the academy, but they helped to shape the context for my participation in the summer institute later that year at San Diego State University.

On Sunday I ate lunch with a small group of teachers. I asked them to tell me about how they saw themselves as teacher leaders, what that designation meant to them. They responded that as teacher leaders after the summer institute they felt a moral responsibility to return to their districts and share what

they learned about innovative instructional strategies with other teachers. In some instances, however, teachers related that district administrators had co-opted this moral responsibility by applying pressure on them to agree to write new curriculum and help coerce other teachers in the district to change their teaching practices. They expressed dismay and reluctance at being cast as part of a top-down, administrator-initiated reform process.

The teachers also perceived a sense of hierarchy in the organization of the CLP. For example, they expressed confusion over their designation--the CLP directors referred to those that completed the summer institute during the first three summers at UCLA as *teacher leaders* and those that completed the summer institute at regional sites in the last two summers as *the cadre*. The teachers felt that teacher leader held a more exalted status in the organization than one of the cadre. One teacher felt that the CLP was more top down than the Writing Project. Other teachers at the table disagreed, stating that both projects seemed similarly top down. These impressions by teachers tended to contradict the notion expressed by the CLP directors that the academy was a forum for democratic input into CLP policy and new directions.

But aside from the frustrations expressed, the teachers described how the academy provided a sense of renewal and a validation for what they were doing in their classrooms. The experiences during the academy, both formal and informal, provided them with a sense of connectedness and legitimacy that they were not feeling while at their own schools. The teachers recounted how their classrooms were transformed by the instructional strategies they had

learned at the institute, resulting in a classroom climate that was much more student centered, rather than teacher directed.

However, as the teachers shared their impressions, I recalled a point Patrick Dias made during his presentation on Saturday. In illustrating the complexity of issues of power and control in the classroom, he spun a story about a group of people entering a forest in search of animals to photograph. For security, they carried guns hidden beneath their clothing. They were dismayed, however, to encounter no animals during the outing. Later, a person knowledgeable in the ways of animals suggested to them that part of the problem was that because they still carried guns, albeit hidden, the animals knew to remain unseen. It seems that people conduct themselves differently in the forest when they are secure and the animals notice the difference. His point was that teachers who employ student-centered strategies in classrooms still carry with them the predominant share of power and control. Students, then, are still primarily motivated by the desire to please the teacher, rather than to learn for themselves. Teachers who use student-centered instructional strategies, without the concomitant attempt to uncover unequal power relations in classrooms, encourage students to remain hidden.

Susan O'Hanion challenged some of the CLP's basic assumptions as well, particularly the notion of a core list of literature that all students in a given classroom or grade level should read. While she admitted that students would benefit more from a student-centered curriculum than what was traditionally practiced, she remained concerned about the lack of power and control

students possessed regarding curriculum issues and instructional practices. She also cautioned the members of the academy against allowing the enthusiasm for educational change to deteriorate into dogmatism.

As a participant observer, I continued to participate more than observe, partly because these English language arts issues were dear to my heart and vital for the students in my own classroom. I guess an earlier generation of ethnographers would caution me about *going native*. However, as I stated above, my challenge was somewhat different--how to make the familiar strange. This process of interaction and struggle to make the familiar strange created the context for investigating and describing leadership relationships. I noticed, through constant engagement in self-reflection, that the participants at the academy had different insights and levels of investment in helping to transform classrooms, even different levels of vision. For example, in response to asking teachers to describe an ideal student-centered classroom, they listed characteristics such as a classroom in which students were excited to learn, were connected to each other, and were focused on stimulating literature. Their responses were not overly complex or detailed, but they did reflect a common vision.

While driving home on Sunday evening following the academy, I felt completely drained by the experience. I had been inside the Hilton Hotel for almost two and a half days and had given no notice to the world outside. I was consumed and overwhelmed by the volume of potentially meaningful moments in the everyday actions of people. However, I received an encouraging

comment from Win Cooper, one of the issue group leaders. After Susan O'Hanion formally presented her impressions about the CLP, Cooper related to me one participant's reaction.

You know, when O'Hanion joined a small group at breakfast, for example, she didn't ask anybody anything and now she's presenting her impressions. But that other guy, the one doing research for his dissertation, asked us all kinds of interesting questions, asked us how we felt about things, and listened to what we were saying. I wish he had shared his impressions. (personal communication, February, 1990)

In retrospect, during the academy I employed a research approach consisting of walking around, noticing what I encountered, and thinking about what I noticed. How did I select what I selected to notice? How did I frame what I saw? These questions are extremely difficult to answer. I arrived Friday afternoon around 3:45 p.m. As I stated earlier, participants were already registering for the academy. A social hour was scheduled for 5:30 p.m. and dinner was scheduled for 6:30 p.m., followed by a welcoming session, opening remarks, and performance. When I arrived at the conference registration site, I met some people I knew already, and they knew why I was there. I went to my hotel room and dressed in a suit so I would look the part of *Mr. Investigative Researcher*. I returned to the academy and somewhat awkwardly began talking with people. Mary Barr introduced me to some people, for example, to Patrick Dias and Susan O'Hanion, two of the featured speakers.

The setting was a bit chaotic on Friday afternoon. Adjacent to the academy registration site, the Antiquarian Book Fare convened a conference. In addition, there were airline flight attendants and pilots scurrying to make their flights. In the midst of it all this activity, I tried to make mental notes about what I saw. *I felt like a camera with a wide-angle, zoom lens, focusing and refocusing,* moving in and out of small group interactions and conversations. The experience was undifferentiated. I did not know how to look for leadership relationships in such a multifaceted setting. However, I tried to remain calm and reminded myself to trust the process.

I retired to my hotel room on Friday night in a daze. I awoke the next morning and decided to talk into a tape recorder. I was feeling lost, wondering what I was doing there and whether I was going to encounter anything worthwhile. I was reluctant to revisit the academy, but I did anyway. Talking into the tape recorder helped me to find my way back into understanding, and I gained enough confidence and focus to reenter the field.

I began a conversation with a small group of teachers at the breakfast table. They wanted to know why my name tag designated me as guest. I explained and asked them if we could talk. I wrote a summary of our conversation afterwards. I simply moved about from moment to moment and looked for attractions to my attention. Sometimes, the magnet was an unoccupied chair among a small group of people, at other times it was a familiar face. I remember attempting to encounter new people whenever I had the

opportunity. On occasion I met Mary Barr or a regional director in passing and stopped to talk--to ask questions or to reflect on an event. I returned to my hotel room regularly to record impressions on tape, summarizing notes and raising questions.

My participation in the academy, originally at the invitation of Mary Barr, helped me to shift the focus of my research from Mary Barr and Charles Cooper as transforming leaders to leadership relationships in the CLP. That shift occurred because of the difficulty I experienced all weekend trying to understand the dynamics of the relationships swirling about me, like a kaleidoscope that never fixes on any one configuration. I realized that I did not want to produce yet another dissertation describing how those in organizational positions of authority do leadership. Instead, I wanted to describe non-positional, non-hierarchical leadership relationships. My opportunity arose at the CLP summer institute at San Diego State University.

San Diego Summer Institute 1990

In order to explore further the leadership issues generated by my participation at the academy, as well as to create an opportunity to describe non-traditional leadership relationships in an organizational setting, I attended the CLP Summer Institute at San Diego State University from June 25 to July 20, 1990. The summer institute provided me with an opportunity to converse with teachers who were generally at a different stage of professional development from teachers who attended the academy. For some teachers, in fact, the institute represented their initial systematic exploration into issues of English

language arts curricular reform and instructional strategies. For an announcement of the 1990 summer institutes, a detailed outline of the San Diego Summer Institute format and list of invited speakers, and an overview of the two-year follow-up plan, see Appendix F.

I was one of 17 teachers who were members of the *Silver Stars*, which was one of six small groups made up of teachers K-12 who met daily and remained together for the duration of the institute and follow-up meetings. To facilitate the twelve days of follow-up meetings during the next two years, the CLP directors placed teachers in these groups according to where they lived in southern California. Jim Sieg, who attended the 1989 summer institute at CSU Dominguez Hills, was the Silver Stars small group teacher leader and Jan Gabay, the San Diego Regional Director for the CLP, was the San Diego Summer Institute director.

I was surprised to discover that many teachers at the institute had no idea who the CLP executive director was or what her agenda for English language arts reform might be. According to Lori Anderson, for example, "I don't remember anything about what she said. If I were to see her, I wouldn't be able to pick her out." My initial reaction was that perhaps this lack of knowledge at the summer institute about the positional authority of the CLP would create conditions more likely to describe non-traditional leadership relationships.

Jim Sieg recalled his thoughts and feelings prior to the beginning of the summer institute and described the effect the experience had on him professionally.

I had heard some negatives from former teacher leaders about personality problems they had encountered in years past. I was glad to have that forewarning. I guess it's inevitable, really, when you get 15-20 people together in a small group, each with a powerful personality and ego. One of the problems might be some nay-sayers or some people who are scared by the prospect of some pretty radical change, which is what I see the whole reform movement speaking to.

I was pleased to work with someone of the quality of Jan Gabay, the National Teacher of the Year. She put a very positive stamp on the whole institute. And, in my group I had 17 teachers, all of whom I would consider master teachers and people I would recommend to serve in the capacity of teacher leader at a future summer institute, every single one of them. That might have been the roll of the dice that I got so many outstanding people in one group. It was a highlight in my teaching career and served in a synergistic way to boost my career and make me look in other directions for things I can do to contribute.

Jan Gabay portrayed her developmental process from CLP participant to regional director. She also described the teacher leader selection and training process and expressed her frustrations about the conflicts created by serving in two capacities simultaneously during the summer of 1990--as institute director and as National Teacher of the Year.

It was advantageous to me as institute director to have been a participant in the summer of 1985, watching the directors try to build the program on

almost an hour by hour basis; then a CLP consultant for a couple of years, conducting workshops here and there, particularly regarding issues of assessment; and finally teacher leader in the summer of 1988.

All this experience ended up being a mind set, a mental preparation, because about a year ago the CLP directors invited me to join them as a regional director, which included the position of summer institute director. During the year I met with Mary Barr and the other regional directors to resolve regional concerns and plan the summer institute. Since the content of the summer institutes is planned in two-year blocks, then only some minor shaping was needed.

In addition, I had to select the teacher leaders and coordinate their four days of training. Everyone who attended a summer institute received an application inviting them to apply. During the selection process, we used several considerations, such as prior experience in working with other adults and prior leadership roles, and we also attempted to achieve an ethnic, racial, gender, and grade level balance. We asked applicants why they wanted to become teacher leaders and most of them said the CLP had changed their lives and they wanted to share that with others.

The selection process needs to be revised. For example, in our selection meetings someone would comment, "No, this person is really weak" or someone else would say, "This person is really strong." All the information we have on candidates is based on paper and I want to make

a recommendation to do group interviews as well. However, the majority of leaders have been really good.

During the four days of training, the teacher leaders essentially experienced the summer program themselves, reading *The Tempest*, *Gilgamesh*, et cetera, and doing the meaning-making strategies.

When it came down to actually designing the four-week daily program, I looked at what had been done last year and told my six teacher leaders to focus on the first week and discuss how best to implement the plan. It surprised me that they had a lot to say about the first day, but after that, they left the rest of the planning to me. So I looked at all the scripts from the institutes last year and selected according to my experience--having been a participant and a teacher leader and what I thought of as effective teaching. I wanted the institute to be an intense experience for teachers; I wanted them to feel pressed and a bit uncomfortable even to try to get everything done. Also, I wanted sound pedagogy; I didn't want people to sit around and simply discuss ideas but never formulate a plan of action for changing curriculum. I wanted it tightly structured in that way.

My experiences as administrator of the institute, confounded by my having to be away for so much of the time attending public relations functions as Teacher of the Year, confirmed that I would never want to be a school administrator. I was so caught up with taking care of things that I didn't get to do what I had originally planned, which was to go into the

institute classrooms every single day and get to know everybody. That just didn't happen.

As an institute participant, Wendy Washington described some of her experiences as a member of the Silver Stars and her impressions of Jim Sieg, the teacher leader of the group.

I thought at the beginning of the institute, if I were a small group leader, I'd have everything plotted out and would know what's supposed to happen, but Jim Sieg wasn't that way. I appreciate having the time to gestate the process and chew on what's going on and for us to take the time to express our ideas even if we don't get to every activity that we're supposed to accomplish during the day. I have come to appreciate his style; it's helped us to bond as a group.

Experiencing this in our small group has been helpful for my own teaching because I am so task oriented. Rather than press my class to complete the planned activities, sometimes it might be more valuable to put the chairs in a circle and talk about what's going on. So I've gained some new insights about my own professional style as a result of our small group experiences.

I am learning so much about myself and my interactions with my personal and professional insecurities that will unconsciously change the way I am in the classroom. I wish that everybody could be here and experience this.

The institute became for many teachers an opportunity to network and to gather strategies to take back to their classrooms. According to Suky Reilly, for example,

My experiences in the home group, which consisted of teachers K-12, was the best of all the institute's groupings. It is surprising because ordinarily elementary teachers are so funnelled, primary teachers particularly, that they want to be in grade level groups, they want to get very practical--"just give me something I can take back and do tomorrow." That response usually develops from administrative pressure about improving student test scores. As a result, at workshops teachers always want to meet in their grade level groups so they can find out just what's pertinent for their own students. However, at the CLP we benefitted from hearing about so many different perspectives on teaching from teachers at all grade levels.

In recalling her experiences at the San Diego summer institute, B. J. Brown appreciated how the directors structured the four weeks to foster learning in teachers, but she was dismayed by the lack of follow through at times on a day's plans.

As I think back over the events of the institute, I'm beginning to realize why certain things were planned and carried out the way they were. Overall, I greatly enjoyed the experience and learned a lot from it. However, at times I was disturbed by activities being rushed or left

unfinished. These experiences do not reflect sound teaching practice; it was not something I could carry back to my own classroom.

In this section I attempted to portray my thoughts and experiences and those of others about the CLP Academy and San Diego Summer Institute in 1990 as settings for describing transforming leadership relationships. In addition I attempted to portray the ambiguity and uncertainty of my own process as ethnographic researcher. The remainder of the chapter will depict major themes that emerged from interviews with members of the CLP, themes that attempt to illuminate aspects of transforming leadership relationships--concepts of leadership itself; the interaction of influence, power, and conflict; the development of common purposes and intentions; and the connections between educational practice and social change.

Leadership

"The leadership relationship is multidirectional . . . involving interactions that are vertical, horizontal, diagonal, and circular. There are many different relationships that can make up the overall relationship that is leadership" (Rost, 1991, p. 105).

In this section participants offer observations and reflections about leadership as they experienced it in the CLP and surrounding educational community. Their experiences portray the often contradictory aspects of leadership concepts, such as those reflected by descriptions of individual action, collaboration, authority, empowerment, and followership. Some participants hold prominent positions in the CLP, while others are teachers who

attended the summer institute at San Diego State University. Together, though, these perspectives contribute to the development of a complex narrative of multidirectional leadership relationships.

Collaboration, Empowerment, and Followership

One theme that surfaced in conversations about leadership was the necessity for collaboration. Jim Sieg, for example, while recalling what motivated him to assume a teacher leader position, described the collaborative nature of the small group experience at the San Diego summer institute, particularly its effect on developing common purposes among high school and elementary school teachers and providing new insight and appreciation for the contribution of elementary teachers to the educational reform movement.

I wanted to become a teacher leader in the summer institute because I wanted to help make some decisions about the shape of the reform. This experience as small group leader at San Diego State allowed me to influence others and for others to influence me in return. For example, even though I've taught on college campuses and in high schools for 20 years, I was not familiar with what elementary school teachers do. As a result of our collaboration this summer, though, my respect for what they contribute sky-rocketed--I came to realize how important their work is.

I remember one moment in our small group, when some elementary teachers revealed feeling intimidated by the presence of high school teachers because they were somehow professionally superior, that I realized how powerful and important is the responsibility to teach a

young person how to read. At that moment, my respect and esteem for their work went off the charts. That new level of respect was corroborated time and time again by the intelligence, sensitivity, forthrightness, and work ethic of the elementary teachers. They are the ones laying down the first row of bricks, forming the educational foundation for children.

Lisa Damato pointed out that different ways of leading contribute to the overall leadership imperative for change. For her, the concept of co-creators replaces leaders and followers in descriptions of leadership relationships; ideas developed collaboratively evolve by reflecting aspects of all the contributors.

Leadership relationships don't work if one person leads all the time. Instead, leadership is a cooperative/collaborative effort in which many people lead in different ways at different times with different expertise. For example, curriculum reform in a district cannot be mandated from administrators to teachers; rather, reform has to result from teachers and administrators working together. In this collaborative effort some people may lead organizationally, others may lead philosophically, others may lead emotionally, and others may lead curricularly.

In these situations, for example, sometimes I'm a follower, sometimes I'm a leader, and sometimes I'm a co-worker. In fact, I'm not sure that follower is the right word. More than merely following, if I'm working with someone who has creative ideas, then my input contributes by helping those ideas come to fruition. In other words, in those situations I'm not really a follower; instead, I'm a co-creator.

When I have an idea that I'm trying to struggle with, it's necessary to bounce it off colleagues. Those people become a sounding board, but they also become part of that idea. They take it and help me put it into perspective, so that no idea stays by itself within me. It's hard for me to keep an idea within myself and make it work in my classroom. It's much easier for me to say, "I have this idea, or I have this philosophical problem," and to work through it verbally with others giving me their responses and suggestions. The others are not merely followers by any means, but become part of my idea and I become part of theirs.

Shelley Overstreet described how the process of collaboration at the San Diego summer institute, particularly in her small group, enabled her to feel more powerful, competent, and secure in her own professionalism.

While the whole institute experience was empowering, our small group provided the greatest opportunity. It allowed me to feel more competent and the strategies we experienced within an extremely professional atmosphere allowed me to grow professionally.

Lori Anderson described how the collaborative experiences enhanced her self-confidence as they eased her anxieties.

I grew in confidence and now feel better about myself as a person. The team-building strategies and sharing of ideas in the home group served to lessen my anxiety, and our small group leader Jim Sieg really encouraged that to happen. Even though I'm a weak writer, I felt comfortable sharing my writing with other group members. Struggling to

understand *The Tempest* and *Gilgamesh* by using collaborative, meaning-making strategies helped me to realize how to implement this approach with my own students next fall.

Mary Barr reiterated the necessity for collaboration between administrators and teachers in order for changes to occur. In her view collaborative leadership is embedded in a constructivist concept of knowledge, which provides the context for the English language arts reform effort.

School leadership is an important concept when attempting to reform curricular practices. Currently, the concept of school leadership is moving away from a model of top-down hierarchy, which often pitted administrators against teachers. That top-down model fit within a concept of knowledge as objective and final. It contributed to setting up instructional practices in classrooms that only valued knowledge as a set of right answers.

Instead, since learners socially construct and continue to reinvent knowledge, then an administrator versus teacher dynamic no longer makes sense. Teachers and administrators become learners at schools, learners who are reflecting on instructional practices that benefit students. School leadership, then, has to be a joint effort.

Mel Grubb remembered how leadership relationships formed and developed during the CLP's first years and described the extensive network of collaboration among CLP members in the Los Angeles region currently. As

regional director he emphasized that a solely individual initiative could not insure the project's existence and continuation.

When the CLP started, Lloyd Thomas and I did all the leadership in the Los Angeles area ourselves. We were the leaders in the summer institute, we got the books up the hill from UCLA, and we provided all the follow-up. Now our role is somewhat different. As the director in the Los Angeles region, I no longer lead the summer institute. There are teachers who lead the summer institute and the follow-up, and I don't do all the workshops that I used to do because now there are other teachers who do them. In fact, I hardly ever do a workshop with teachers now, except for an introductory workshop covering a theory.

Now when I work with teachers, I try to model what good staff development should look like. Teachers work together to develop workshops that they might give or workshops that they know they're going to give. There are teachers in the project who have specific responsibilities that they're in charge of.

We've gone beyond working only with teachers in schools. Now we are working with parents as well. For example, we began the Home Literature Project, primarily working with Spanish-speaking parents. In this project teachers develop family literacy programs and bring parents into the school setting to work with that same literature book that the kids are reading in the classroom. We're attempting to help them become readers in Spanish because many of them cannot read in their own

primary language. In essence, the CLP in Los Angeles includes a lot of directors taking on projects and working together. At the beginning it was Mel Grubb leading one group of teachers and now it's developed beyond that.

The success of the CLP in Los Angeles is not due to Mel Grubb. If this project is worthwhile, it's because of the teachers who own it. I can't do it all and don't want to control it all, because power is something that doesn't do anyone any good. Even though control is, in a sense, power, it needs to be distributed among many people.

We started this project as a teacher-centered project. It attempts to empower teachers to help their peers bring about changes in classrooms and schools. The summer leaders are the ones who form the nucleus, but there's a whole group even beyond those summer leaders. They're people who have the energy and commitment to help bring about changes. They want to grow from their experiences.

Mary Barr described the collaborative relationships she formed with members of the California Department of Education and, like Lisa Damato, emphasized the importance of having a sounding board for ideas and problems. She also provided a historical account of her professional relationships with members of the California Writing Project and portrayed how leadership relationships aid in her ongoing professional development and understanding.

At the California Department of Education I form alliances and share information with people who can lend support to the CLP. Mae Gundlach, for example, has been involved with the CLP since its beginning and serves as my sounding board and *mole* at the department, a person who tells me when I'm way off base and who interprets *departmental-ese*. Fred Tempes, the State Assistant Superintendent for Staff Development, is forthright. I have resigned three times and he has talked me into coming back by discussing what he sees on the horizon. I depend on his vision.

Ann Vondermedhen, co-director of the San Diego Area Writing Project, and I are good friends. In fact, we started the San Diego Writing Project together and we trust each other. Bob Infantino replaced me when I left to complete my doctorate, and I was very active in recruiting him. Charles Cooper has been a colleague since he came to San Diego. He had a national reputation before he arrived here and I've certainly read all of his writings. In fact, Charles and I just met last Monday with a representative from the president's office at the University of California, San Diego because we need to establish a model of how the CLP and the Writing Project work together. It's a matter of professional interest and also a personal mission to make sure that people understand how the projects intersect, and yet, have their own integrity.

Charles has been part of my own professional growth, especially with his understanding of how literary genres and writing types are one in the same. He has such high regard for teachers, for what the profession is. Charles is one of the few professors of stature who thinks that teachers should be conducting research in their own classrooms. He often acts as a support for the questions I have about where to go next. We disagree sometimes, but we've been able to say to one another, "I don't agree with that." That's been healthy.

Part of the summer institute experience empowered teachers to return to their classrooms and school districts to begin the process of implementing curricular changes and alternative instructional strategies. Several participants defined teacher leadership within this context of empowerment and described aspects of their preparation process. By and large, they portrayed leadership as an individual enterprise and performed in a hostile and unsupportive educational environment. According to Lisa Damato, for example, a teacher leader

Makes herself available and makes her expertise known to others by bringing that expertise to staff development workshops, meeting individually or together with members of departments or grade levels. She also might accept a leadership role in a school by directing a group designated to address change.

In my district, however, everything that I've accomplished has been a result of my own volition; I've had to fight to get things that I

wanted; I've had to make my voice known; and I've had to become a rebel. For example, in my first six months of teaching I threw out the basal textbook and replaced it with student-centered teaching strategies. That was a big deal to a lot of people and I had to struggle to maintain my credibility.

Even though I am fairly new to the teaching profession, as a designated mentor teacher in my district, administrators expect a lot from me. As a mentor teacher, I am hoping to provide support to new teachers in ways that were not provided for me, so that they will not have to struggle as I did.

Wendy Washington, while acknowledging her emergence as a teacher leader, expressed some discomfort with the term and felt that an often overlooked part of a teacher leader's responsibility is to address the emotional aspects of individuals confronting changes.

To acknowledge that I've become a teacher leader seems egotistical to me. But within the home group at the summer institute, I feel that I've emerged as one of the possible leaders. I remember when I first attended the Writing Project summer program, I was so overwhelmed by all the information and the push for change. It was a devastating experience for me and I needed someone there to hold my hand. As teacher leaders we need to be really aware of the kinds of emotional reactions that are tapped in teachers because teaching is such an

emotional endeavor. We can't neglect that part of the person that needs to be nurtured and supported.

Lisa Damato concurred that some participants performed as leaders during the summer institute, but felt that other participants less overtly contributed important information and ideas to the small group mosaic. These different ways of interaction served to empower everyone to take action.

I definitely have seen people emerge as leaders. But there are also quiet influences. For example, I don't see myself as one of the leaders, but then I tend to be a very introverted person on the whole. So in some ways, I sit back and take in what's happening, but when I have something to add, I will. It depends on the dynamics of the group, but if there's an opportunity or a lapse, a void, of leadership, I would feel comfortable fulfilling that role for a time; I can also feel comfortable filling other roles.

Lori Anderson acknowledged that her experiences at the San Diego summer institute prepared her to share new curricular ideas with colleagues in her school and district. To her, performing leadership had to do with providing facilitation and guidance, and she contrasted this view of leadership with the more common view of administrator as leader by virtue of organizational position.

After completing the CLP summer institute, I have many ideas worth sharing with others. I see myself as a teacher trainer, sharing strategies among my staff and friends, serving as a resource for help and support.

I'm not interested in formal administrative leadership. Our principal, for example, shuffles papers and supports teachers in communicating with parents, but he just doesn't know how to help make us stronger as a staff or individuals.

Leadership is providing guidance and disseminating ideas, sharing strategies, facilitating organizing of staff development, using resources appropriately. We have some fantastic resources on our staff that are not being used.

Shelley Overstreet agreed with the ineffectiveness of school administrators to address changes. She pointed out that leadership required a more extensive involvement with teachers in classrooms than administrators were able to provide because formal positional authority does not coincide necessarily with functional authority.

Someone who is in a leadership role needs to be involved with teachers, and unfortunately our administrators have so much paperwork, reports, and requirements. A school needs a business manager in the office and a leader in the classroom. A principal needs to be able to enter a classroom and demonstrate a meaningful lesson with them. I don't equate leadership with authority.

Mary Barr echoed the concerns expressed by Shelley Overstreet and Lori Anderson and emphasized the importance of vision and expertise for a leader. She pointed out that teacher leadership is vital for meaningful changes to occur in schools. Also, she described her own experiences as a follower and

suggested that people and ideas from a variety of sources contribute to the development of leadership.

I have vision, a picture of the form changes are going to take or supposed to take. A leader is somebody who really knows the subject matter, the intellectual leaders, the problems and controversies in the field, and makes decisions about where the field ought to go next. Teachers need to assume leadership roles in the educational processes of schools. You can't have complex instructional practices without having teacher leadership.

Leaders are always following something or someone to some extent. They have to make decisions about which theories and practices make sense to them. My experiences in the British schools and my doctoral work put me in touch with people in another culture, especially the work of Jimmy Britton, who introduced me to the work of Vygotsky and Rosenblatt, for example. He also made me aware of how theories inform practices. Leaders have to follow a coherent set of theories that inform the practices that they intuit. I would say Jimmy Britton is my guru and certainly Gordon Pradl of New York University respected my experiences and was willing to support me. In turn, I also support key teachers, because I have to hear what the problems are as they try to work out this new way of teaching.

Individual Action and Authority

In addition to the portrayals of collaboration, empowerment, and followership, participants described qualities of individual leaders and offered strongly held beliefs connecting leadership and positional authority. Jan Gabay, for example, offered her impressions of Mary Barr as a leader, and described her experiences as National Teacher of the Year as they related to traditional concepts of leadership.

I began working as a resource teacher with Mary. She is very good at delegating, at tapping what people have to offer, and has a high tolerance for ambiguity, for not having answers, for letting events evolve and take shape. One thing Mary and I share--we get real tired once we've done something, then we want to try something else. That's her strength. As CLP executive director, she's become more and more an administrator, but she still has a real human core. She has a real liking, respect, sensitivity, and remembrance of being a classroom teacher. She's a bit of a visionary as well. For example, she tapped Myra Barrs in England, who developed the primary language record as an alternative assessment strategy, and brought her to the CLP as a presenter. Mary's real good at spotting potential problems that are troubling at first, but are issues whose times have come. And, she's given me a lot of freedom.

As National Teacher of the Year, which places me in a national leadership position, I am a commodity. I am a token paraded out and back for photo opportunities and sound bites. My struggle is to say

something of substance while I have the spotlight on me. The teacher's role needs to be expanded; teachers' expertise needs to be developed and valued. I'm struggling not get too cynical or too disillusioned by this experience. The common view is that whenever teachers take leadership roles, they're kissing someone's ass.

Wendy Washington made a strong connection between leadership and egotism. For her, leaders are people who take charge and decide for followers what the next steps are.

There's ego in leadership; "I am the leader and you follow me." Leader is strong and follower is weak. A leader is a guide, someone who is up ahead guiding followers through troubled areas. Followers are somehow deficient because they don't have that leadership ability. I don't think that's accurate, but that's what the terms suggest to me.

Suky Reilly reiterated this view of leadership. She pointed out that a leader is someone who knows what should happen next, but wants followers to make it happen themselves. Ultimately, leaders know where followers need to go and guide them there through humane processes.

A leader knows where he is going and basically where he wants us to go, but he's going to let us go about it in our own way. For example, we would come up with our own plans for reaching a basic objective and if we started to get off track in some way, the leader as a good facilitator, would bring us back on task without chastising us in some way.

Monte Peters offered his impressions of the San Diego summer institute director and small group leaders. He felt that the institute experience lacked basic qualities for success and he held those in authority positions responsible. For him, leadership and positional authority are synonymous.

My impression of Jan Gabay rose and fell with my impression of the institute. I was not particularly happy with the overall lack of organization and direction at the institute, and I lay the responsibility directly at her door. I think her speech to us on the last day was inspiring and I would like to have seen more of that and more of her, but with her selection as Teacher of the Year, she was gone from the institute much of the time. I think that contributed to my distress. When she was gone, there should have been someone left in charge and there wasn't. You don't go away and leave a lot of Indians around with their heads cut off saying, "Well, I don't know what to do, do you?" The small group leaders were extremely unprepared to orchestrate major happenings; they often seemed to be preparing as they walked into the meetings.

Charles Cooper, who often collaborated with Mary Barr and others on statewide educational reform projects, nevertheless viewed leadership as primarily a result of individual initiative.

Leadership in education is a combination of three factors. One factor is the personal qualities of an individual who emerges as leader. Another is knowledge. Does the leader have comprehensive, sound knowledge to offer? And another is timing. Sometimes someone can have the

motive, the qualities, the characteristics, the ambition, the knowledge, and the insight to make a change, but if the timing isn't there, then the initiative is paralyzed.

I think about the California Assessment Program direct writing assessment and the development of the writing guides because that's been the main arena where I've had influence on curriculum and instruction in California schools. Those ideas weren't committee efforts at all. Instead, the idea resulted from the need for a systematic framework of support for composing. I didn't just think it up; I read, went to conferences, and listened to what people were saying about composing. I may have pulled it together at a critical time in just the right way that people looked at it and said, "This makes sense. This is what we ought to do instead of what we've been doing."

With any educational projects, small or large, nothing is going to happen without collaboration and collegial relationships. Maybe it's just a result of my style, but I'm not a gregarious leader who places high priority on developing and maintaining a wide network of personal relationships. Instead, partly due to my academic job and my inability to travel much, I don't have the opportunity to bring people together. So, I tend to see things in terms of individual initiative because that's the way I work.

By referring to individual initiative, I mean that perhaps most of the important ideas in English language arts over that last 30 years in

schools and colleges have come from individuals, or have resulted from important books or insights, or one person's determination to do something right instead of negotiating out *the guts* in order to please boring factionalism.

Intending Changes and Developing Common Purposes

The word *intend* means that the leaders and followers purposefully desire certain changes in an organization and/or in the society. The desire is not accidental or developed by chance. The intention is deliberate and initiated on purpose. . . .

When leaders and followers reflect true mutual purposes, leadership expresses the common good. . . .

Mutual purposes become common purposes because followers and leaders engage in leadership together. (Rost, 1991, pp. 114, 123)

It is difficult, in a sense, to divide a section of narrative into separate parts to address the changes participants intended to make and the common purposes the leadership relationships developed, because the intended changes resulted, in part, from the common purposes the summer institute and other CLP experiences fostered. However, through our conversations participants clearly developed pictures of the changes they intended to implement in their primary work settings as a result of their CLP experiences and also depicted how their individual reasons for involvement in the CLP contributed to the development of common purposes through processes of

collaborative leadership relationships. This section, then, portrays these fundamental characteristics of leadership as members of the CLP embodied them.

Intending Changes

Mary Barr, describing the theoretical basis for the English language arts reform, provided a context for understanding the nature of the proposed curricular changes and accompanying innovative instructional strategies.

Language is not a subject; it's pivotal, the center of all learning. For example, to teach science, to learn science, people have to learn to talk and write like scientists. They just can't absorb science facts; they have to actually use the language of science. Thought and language are so closely interlinked that in learning one is not present without the other.

Unfortunately, the subject matter of English has been trivialized, reduced to a set of skills. There shouldn't be an English class *per se* or English language arts instruction. Instead, language permeates all subjects, one of which is literature. In literature are all the great ideas and human experience framed in an emotion-evoking context. Emotion, intuition, and all those other mystical things are part of the learning process. And so, an English class should be a literature class in which students connect literature with personal experiences and link themselves to great ideas and great human experiences. This personal linkage to language and ideas holds true for all subjects. For example, in

a science class, then, learners link themselves through language to the great ideas in science.

From its beginning the CLP capitalized on the notion that English classes should not be skills based, but rather should be meaning centered. The meanings should come out of human experiences, both personal and those of others in literature. The whole idea of the English language as a subject is suspect because it was introduced, only for snob appeal, in classical education to raise it to the status of Greek and Latin. That seems so foolish now since we realize that it's language, whatever our language is, that let's us have access to our own and other people's ideas.

The *English Language Arts Framework* serves as a constitution, a document that's elastic and allows for interpretation, yet it keeps everyone focused on sound pedagogical and instructional ideas. The CLP has an opportunity to create leadership that will influence the framework so that it remains elastic and always growing, reinforcing the idea that truth is not fixed.

Mae Gundlach suggested that all teachers should have an opportunity to attend a CLP summer institute. She also pointed out that the regional directors often collaborated to develop a shared vision of how they should implement changes statewide.

All teachers of English language arts should attend the CLP so that they would make their classrooms literature based and student centered.

Also, teachers need to implement these ideas in classrooms across the curriculum.

At the CLP directors' meetings the regional directors share and develop ideas for implementing changes that they carry back to their own regions. For example, Richard Adams at Sacramento State University is trying to increase awareness of the reform movement in his region. He has organized programs such as an administrators' symposia in which teachers who have completed the summer institute bring administrators from their schools to a meeting to learn about meaning-centered instructional strategies. Jane DeLawter has organized similar programs in the north coastal region as has Mary Barr in the San Diego area.

Mel Grubb furnished a rationale for the format of the CLP summer institutes. In particular, rather than primarily providing a forum for teachers to exchange information about their teaching practices, he asserted that the summer institutes needed to be places where teachers could experience meaning-centered curriculum and instructional strategies for themselves in order to prepare to use these approaches with students.

It's not that we don't think that teachers have viable experiences to share, it's just that so much needs to be done to help them experience and understand a meaning-centered instructional program instead of a traditional skills-based program. It's hard to find an adult who didn't experience as a student and receive teacher preparation in a skills-based approach to curriculum.

And so, teachers need to experience a meaning-centered curriculum in order to understand how to implement the framework's instructional strategies with their students. During the summer institute, for many teachers the experiences create *ah-ha* responses, when they make important discoveries about themselves as learners and teachers.

The CLP summer institutes continue to function because they make sense to teachers. They provide the only opportunities for making this reform effort come to pass. At some point it comes down to a question of power. Teachers need to allow students to make their own meanings with texts and empower them to move on with their language development and their own development of meaning. The term that Jane De Lawter came up with last summer for lesson plans or units, a *curriculum action plan*, is a good name. The plan has to include ways to help students learn about themselves as they learn about the subject. Students don't experience literature just by knowing about the story. They integrate that learning with the prior knowledge that they bring to the reading.

Jim Sieg pointed out that the reform movement needed more input from teachers at all grade levels. He also cautioned that the reform process had to avoid any semblance of top-down coercion.

I would like to see more elementary school teachers involved in shaping the reform; so far, high school teachers and university professors are the major contributors.

In addition to expanding representation, another difficulty in any reform movement is that a bully pulpit will turn people off. The key is to show, rather than tell, through modelling CLP classroom environments and producing videotapes of sound teaching strategies, for example.

These tactics will do more to further the reform movement than somebody preaching on it. For us to see role models such as Jan Gabay being a devotee of the reform movement contributes more than 100 administrators trying to get staffs to carry out new instructional strategies.

Several summer institute participants described the changes they wanted to make when they returned to their classrooms. Shelley Overstreet, for example, wanted students to develop more self-confidence and empathy. She also suggested that all teachers should participate in CLP experiences.

I would like my students to leave the second grade feeling that this was their best year of school, similar to how I felt when I left the summer institute. I want them to feel strong and compassionate about others and about what they've accomplished. Now, whether or not I'll be able to create that, I don't know.

All teachers need the opportunity to experience the CLP summer institute. Although change is always scary and some teachers will never change, they need to have the intensity of what we just went through in order to understand what the reform is about--to become comfortable with the research on how children learn, for example.

Lori Anderson wanted to implement a literature-based curriculum using small-group, collaborative strategies to diminish competition and promote a sense of mutual respect and cooperation among the members of her class. Through this approach she envisioned empowering the students to take control over their own learning. She also anticipated modelling some of the strategies she learned for her colleagues.

In my fourth grade class I'm going to eliminate most of the competitive activities I usually set up and replace them with cooperative activities. I hope to do that through using small group strategies such as those we practiced at the institute, and I'm going to change the members of the groups frequently in order to foster a sense of oneness among the students. I want them to feel compassionate and caring toward one another. Literature will form the basis for everything.

One of the joys of the whole language approach is the permission to continue to try out new ideas with my students. I really see myself as a teacher/facilitator because I want to empower students to be in charge of their own learning. I would like to be able to stand back and encourage them to make more decisions about what and how they will learn. I'm going to start on day one with the groups, with the literature, with the kids being in charge.

The fourth grade team at my school consists of two other teachers and me. I plan to meet with them before school starts and share some of my summer learning with them. Also, I will invite them into my classroom

to watch how I use whole language strategies; I'm only one of a few teachers in my school who use them.

Wendy Washington wanted to implement an approach to literature that encouraged students to learn about themselves and about the human condition. In her view, the state framework, rather than proposing a set of radical changes, is simply promoting the sound instructional practices good teachers have used for some time.

I want my classroom to be a safe place in which students can explore their humanity. I don't really much care if they remember a novel's plot or author; instead, I want them to learn something about the human experience and themselves. Even though this goal is not readily measurable and the students might not have the insights or make the connections to their own lives until several years later, I will employ whatever techniques or strategies I can to achieve that.

The state framework doesn't seem to propose too much different from what good teachers have been doing for a long time. I guess the framework encourages those other teachers to see a broader perspective and perhaps change as a result.

Lisa Damato expressed her excitement about the curricular approaches espoused in the framework, especially in the freedom they create for teachers, yet cautioned that the approaches are idealistic and difficult to implement. In her view, standardized tests and other traditional assessment strategies are incommensurate with the philosophy of the framework. She also pointed out

that, given the difficulties, district administrators must provide support to teachers to implement curricular changes.

The framework philosophically offers teachers some fabulous ideas, and as a result, they now have opportunities to take curriculum into their own hands. This new freedom has opened up a whole new world, but it's very idealistic and difficult to achieve. When I look at the writing and language arts frameworks and accompanying handbooks, I say, "Yeah, that's what I want," but they overwhelm me.

To implement the framework requires a restructuring of the whole educational system. For example, standardized tests create performance pressures for teachers and students and expectations for what curriculum is. How students are assessed is going to have to change for the ideas in the framework to be feasible.

I like many of the ideas I learned at the summer institute, thematic teaching, the writing workshop, a literature-based program, and student-centered approaches, for example. Some of these terms become buzz words, but they're meaningful. The problem is how to put them into practice. It all boils down to is the district willing to provide the necessary staff development to put through the changes.

Monte Peters pointed out that the summer institute program had a strong influence on helping him redesign how he will teach, both in terms of his teaching style and in the kinds of relationships he wants to develop in the classroom.

During my teaching career, I've used primarily a lecture and recitation approach with students, with mostly skill and drill activities. The more I go through my notes and think about it, the more impressed I am with how the institute made a difference in how I look at what I'm going to be teaching, the material I'm going to be using, and how I'm going to be teaching, the process I'm going to follow. I was disturbed because my usual teaching approach wasn't reaching many students. Instead, it evoked terror in them, especially from my advanced placement kids. They were so tense that they would try to get out of the class because they couldn't handle the stress. I knew there had to be a better way.

The kind of classroom atmosphere I want to create is one where the students are willing to take risks, are willing to make mistakes, and feel engaged in learning. I'm tired of the boring classes where the kids come in, aren't tuned into what's happening, and don't want to engage the literature. I want them to be interested, and so I'm looking to do collaborative small group strategies.

The idea of students as little blank slates awaiting a teacher's imprint is outmoded and wrong. Students are important as individuals in their own right, even though when looking at a class of 34 or 35 students, it's hard to see the individuals within the group. Teachers need to accept students where they are and then move them as far ahead as they can go. I want to use journals and other ways of communicating with students to encourage them to say what they think about.

Katherine Nichols described the difficulties she anticipated as a new teacher in a traditional, conservative school district. She intended to try out new strategies in order to foster a life-long love of learning in her students. She also felt that her success in the classroom will depend on the integrity of her instructional approaches and interpersonal attitude toward her students.

Our school has a reputation of being very traditional with a lecture-oriented, grammar-based English program and multiple-choice tests primarily assessing student performance and progress. Our department chairperson is very much of the *old school*, so I can't imagine returning in the fall and saying to my colleagues, "You people should be doing these new strategies."

There are even some teachers who still spend six weeks covering grammar rules before they allow students to write a sentence. They're so set in their ways, so sure that they know what is right, and so close-minded to other views. Even though all the research supports the English framework, I'm not going to change them because I'm a new teacher and therefore lack credibility. Instead, I plan to develop meaning-centered strategies a few at a time with my own students and try to remain open minded, because ten years from now my training will not be new and I don't want to become another veteran teacher trying to hang on to the old ways.

I want students to be enthusiastic and excited about reading and about learning. When they are adults and sit down with a book, do they

like to read? I don't want to crush that excitement and I want to rekindle it if others have crushed it already. I want students to learn to think better and to gain other perspectives.

B. J. Brown described how the impetus to change affected her and outlined some of the strategies she intended to use with students in the new year. In particular, she wanted to develop alternative assessment strategies that encourage students to become more reflective, independent thinkers and she wanted to expand the possible ways in which readers work through and respond to texts. She felt that her experiences during the summer institute perhaps raised more questions for her, rather than provided answers.

I feel as if I'm going to be a completely different person in the classroom next fall and I'm going to have to tone down that impulse. Since the summer institute, I've read Dan Kirby's *Inside Out* and Nancy Atwell's *In the Middle* and consequently my thinking is all over the place. I have a tendency to want to change everything about how I teach all at once, but I know it isn't practical; it's not the way to make lasting changes happen.

In terms of the strategies we experienced at the institute, I would like to develop ways, perhaps through anecdotal records, for kids to show evidence of collaboration in small groups and of responses to each other's papers after peer editing. I'd like the record to include reflections about how they're feeling about what they're doing.

I'm going to begin class in the fall with a celebration of story by each of us telling stories from our childhood. Then, we'll move into

children's literature and examine some of our best-loved books from when we were kids. From there, we'll move into other kinds of literature. That's a way to start that I never would have done before. In fact, I think we'll stay awhile at folktale and myth and talk about how writing is a record of one's culture and tradition.

I want to explore the idea of speaking what I would normally assign kids to write. I think we're going to do more speaking and sharing. Kids love to do that. Whenever I say, "Was there ever a time when that happened to you?" all the hands go up; they all have a story to tell. Nancy Atwell raises this issue in her book. She begins each day with everyone seated in a circle in which the class talks about their plans for the day and some students talk about what they've written or what they've read recently.

I have many new strategies for working through the literature. I want to do more work in small groups and eliminate the syndrome of discussion, questions, and students come up with the answers I wanted them to come up with. I want to include more art work and more dramatic acting out of stories. In fact, I've started collecting old clothes for costumes and we'll have a big trunk in the room.

In terms of this whole reform movement, people need to feel a part of the change, to feel they have a part to play in it. I don't think I now know the right way. I'm still struggling with questions such as How do kids learn to punctuate sentences if I don't give direct grammar lessons?

and How do they increase their vocabulary if I don't address it directly?

Teaching isolated vocabulary and grammar lessons don't enable kids to learn, but teachers and students need to attend to those issues.

Several participants explored system-wide impediments to change.

They felt that administrators and teachers needed to be genuinely committed to curricular changes in order for the reform to have any chance for success. Lisa Damato, for example, discussed the effects of an uninformed administration on her ability to teach in a meaning-centered framework.

Administrators need to be as informed as teachers about curriculum reform and so far, that has not happened. In my district, for example, when administrators walk into my classroom, I cannot trust that they understand the underlying ideas and philosophies that inform and support the instructional strategies they observe.

The problem, of course, concerns teacher evaluation. For example, to evaluate my performance based on criteria generated in the Madeline Hunter system doesn't fit with the criteria inherent in the state English framework.

Administrators also need to make staff development a priority. A literature-based program requires the development of lists of core books, and teachers need the freedom to choose the readings that go on the lists.

Wendy Washington raised the issue of resistant teachers and offered suggestions for how to encourage them to become involved in the reform.

It's difficult to get resistant veteran teachers to change the way they teach, especially if they've already received their master's degree, advanced to the end of the pay scale, don't need any professional growth, and feel that how they've taught for the last 15 or 20 years has worked.

Perhaps administrators could provide released time for these teachers to observe colleagues who use meaning-centered strategies. But, there already has to be a willingness to want to improve their teaching. If they don't see any problems in their teaching or any way to improve, then they will be reluctant to change.

Suky Reilly speculated as to the reasons why many teachers resist changes and outlined what is needed in staff development for changes to occur. She also explored the impact on teachers of the incompatibility between the a literature-based, meaning-centered curriculum framework and traditional, standardized assessment procedures.

Teachers seem to be rather traditional-minded people and so it's hard for them to make changes. I wish teachers were more open to listening to new ideas, not that they would necessarily implement the ideas quickly, just be open to them. My experience usually is the opposite. For example, people will ask me questions about the framework and when I begin to answer, they stop me and start an argument. It's clear they don't really want to know anything, they just want an affirmation of what they're already thinking.

The biggest impediment hindering teachers from changing how they teach is the set of inconsistent messages that district administrators and community school board members send to teachers. These mixed messages contribute to teachers feeling insecure about how they should teach and reluctant to try new ideas. For example, multiple-choice tests with a set of correct answers based on one right choice does not adequately assess how well students perform in classrooms where they are encouraged to construct their own interpretations; yet members of the school community continue to rely on these tests as indicators of school performance and newspapers publish the test scores to compare the quality of schools.

In addition, teachers who have used multiple-choice tests for years find it difficult to imagine other ways to assess students. For example, it's easy to grade multiple-choice tests because they are filled with questions with right answers such as "What color was Mary's dress?" Students either know what the color was or they don't. The problem is that these kinds of questions do not have much of a place in meaning-centered classrooms where teachers encourage students to interpret by posing open-ended questions such as "Why do you think Mary chose that particular dress for that day?" However, teachers don't know yet how to evaluate student responses to questions like that.

Common Purposes

In this section participants describe how they contributed to and were affected by the design of the summer institutes. Through revelations that depict supportive collaboration and divisive struggle over philosophical and pedagogical issues, participants portray a complex, ambiguous process of forging common purposes.

Mel Grubb, for example, delineated how and why the regional directors and small group team leaders collaborated to design the curriculum and format of the summer institutes. Also, he pointed out that thus far the implementation of the English framework was uneven. The CLP directors plan the summer institute curriculum and, because of the substantial work required, only engage in this process every two years. They select the core readings and some of the extended literature and decide on the themes, based on what works with adult learners.

Unlike other statewide staff development projects, the CLP provides consistent experiences to all teachers. The philosophy and menu of services is similar at all sites across the state. To that end, after the directors finish a draft of the summer format, the teacher leaders from all regional sites meet twice, for two days each time, to explore the instructional strategies and readings themselves, and thereby develop understanding in common.

Each small group within a particular regional institute follows a similar program as well to insure that all teachers engage in comparable

experiences. The directors and small group leaders carefully orchestrate the summer institutes so that teachers enhance their understanding of meaning-centered, literature-based curriculum and instructional strategies.

However, this consensus-building process in no way restricts an individual teacher leader's freedom. For example, beyond the development of structure and understanding statewide, the teacher leaders and summer institute directors at the regional sites select their own outside speakers and develop plans to address regional issues and problems. Further, the sites develop their own identity through the daily planning sessions. So even though a statewide group constructs the general framework for the summer institute, in each region the teacher leaders contribute their own expertise and strategies for working with participants.

Through their summer institute experiences, teachers understand that there is a better way to teach than the one they've been doing, and they learn strategies to help them do that. For most teachers, the experiences free them to become more innovative in their teaching practice.

The field of education is in the middle of a paradigm shift, moving away from the old paradigm, which in English language arts included a reliance on the basal reader as a primary textbook. The new paradigm

has replaced the basal reader with meaningful literature filled with the grand themes of humanity.

Some teachers are moving beyond the framework's ideas. For example, teachers are beginning to understand writing as more than just *the writing process* and teachers in other states as well are adopting a literature-based, meaning-centered approach to language arts instruction.

On the other hand there are teachers who use literature, but just basalize it, and teachers who state, "I don't use spelling books anymore," but develop spelling tests from the most difficult words in a literature piece. These teachers have implemented a literature-based instructional program, but haven't yet incorporated meaning-centered instructional strategies.

Jim Sieg described how the CLP experiences reinforced what he felt was central to teaching, to foster independent thinking in students, and made him more aware of a philosophical context for his teaching practice. He also expressed his disappointment at the extensive disagreement among the teacher leaders on pedagogical issues at the San Diego summer institute.

My philosophy of teaching has always included respect for students as learners and thinkers. For years I arranged my classroom seating in a circle, thereby creating opportunities for students to respond to each other. In writing goals and objectives I stressed the importance of

developing a classroom environment conducive to young people finding out who they are.

With the advent of the framework and through my involvement with the CLP, I've realized that what I value in teaching, and what others sometimes criticized as unorthodox, has a rational, philosophical basis. My CLP experiences forced me to make connections between the philosophical underpinnings of the reform movement and my own approach to teaching.

My only negative experience in the CLP was working with the other teacher leaders during the summer institute. The six of us operated from such different philosophical and political positions, and the experience was particularly disappointing because I had expected it to be so positive. However, we didn't share basic tenets that I assumed anyone who wanted to work in the CLP would agree to.

We rarely discussed heavy issues in depth, not like six friends talking about problems in common. Some teacher leaders did not attend meetings regularly or were late for meetings. I don't know whether or not these issues were good or bad for the institute, having never before been a teacher leader.

Even when we did begin to address important issues or concerns, we never were able to resolve them satisfactorily. For example, some of the teacher leaders expressed that they didn't believe in cross-cultural education or affirmative action, issues that are fundamental to the

framework's commitment to equity. I can't understand why they would want to spend their valuable time working in a program that promoted values that were anathema to their own beliefs; it must be either out of naivete or a desire to hinder the reform movement. As Jan Gabay pointed out in several of her speeches, there are people out there who see the reform movement as a threat and don't want it to succeed. I was troubled, however, because it seemed that some of those people were inside the CLP as well.

Jan Gabay juggled the personalities well. Actually, maybe our struggle to collaborate was a good lesson on the complexity of small group interaction. I'm certainly more aware, and it will affect how I set up small groups in my own classroom. However, we managed to cover the curriculum in spite of our differences and the institute was successful.

The highlight of the summer was working with the members of my home group, Jan Gabay, and the guest speakers. For example, Jan asked the teacher leaders to select the guest speakers, and that selection process made me rethink what the whole institute was about and forced me to make connections between the institute's purposes, the curriculum we were covering, and the speakers' presentations. My contribution to the list was to arrange for Helen Mugambi from CSU Fullerton to speak.

I also valued the process of continual engagement in debate about meaning. For example, to explore questions and issues

surrounding What does text mean? What does literature mean? What is the difference between collaborative and cooperative group strategies? allowed us to critically reflect on how learning occurs and how best to nurture it.

Jan Gabay felt that teachers left the summer institute with renewed optimism about their teaching and equipped with new strategies to foster learning in their classrooms. She also described how teacher leaders attempted to resolve a contentious issue that exposed a deep political rift among them.

The summer institute was successful in that the participants by and large moved from one place of understanding to another. They may not be able to articulate all that they now understand, but they are on the verge of something and are eager to return to their classrooms to try out new strategies with students.

We moved along nicely after a rocky start. The staff and participants represented so many divergent personalities; it was difficult to meet individual needs while creating a feeling of community as members of a team. With the teacher leaders, for example, I made ground rules for acceptable behavior. I told them that we were not here to compete about which group is better or which teacher leader is better. In reality, that will become apparent anyway; some people are just stronger than others as teachers and facilitators.

The teacher leaders expressed insecurities about issues such as not having worked previously with high school teachers or needing others always to hear them when they speak. At an early planning meeting, I asked them to tell me what their strengths were and what role they wanted to play during the summer institute or what they wanted to contribute. Then I made them state what they were not really strong at, what their anxieties were. I told them how I saw myself. For example, I wanted us to move fast so that we could get something done and I wanted to know about problems when they arose. I wanted us to come across to participants as organized, nurturing, and professional. I wanted to develop a clear sense of overall structure--here are the constraints, here are the expectations, here's what we need to accomplish--but within that overall structure I wanted room for individual freedom of expression.

The team leaders experienced a major conflict during a discussion about selecting core texts. We were choosing between *Blood Wedding* and *The Tempest* and some teacher leaders felt that *Blood Wedding* was another *downer* and that we didn't have time to develop the cultural background to understand that magical, spiritual, other-world of Latin American literature. Then, one person said that she was tired of what she suggested was the lack of morality, the promiscuity in Latin American literature. Well, that comment set off other members of the group. Another person responded, for example, "Wait a minute, you can't just attack a culture!" The person upset by the promiscuity added that we

always had to acknowledge every other racial group, to be careful that all our students feel included, yet what about her white, Anglo-Saxon background.

I remember being stunned. I said that we didn't have to decide right now, but that I wanted from each of them something in writing outlining the specific strengths and weaknesses of each work. I said I would make the decision if we could not reach consensus. However, before we met again, each teacher leader came to me individually and one was even in tears. She said, "I don't wear my ethnicity on my sleeve." What I didn't know is that the teacher leaders already had expressed disagreement about cultural issues earlier in the day.

In the end I decided on *The Tempest* because I anticipated that many participants would arrive with a deep-seated fear of Shakespeare. The work didn't strike me as particularly representative of white, Anglo-Saxon literature, either. To add a Latin American component we used *Eye of the Heart* as one of the anthologies.

We scripted the daily plans for the summer program so that participants would have similar experiences, but I don't think that is necessarily a good teaching strategy. But the trade-off is if we permit teacher leaders to develop their own program, then we run the risk of significant disparity among the small groups in the quality of the participants' experiences.

Several San Diego summer institute participants described their impressions of the four-week daily program, particularly regarding the numerous opportunities to interact with colleagues to develop a mutual understanding of the English framework and instructional strategies. Lori Anderson, for example, recalled how the institute established a supportive environment in which to reflect on teaching.

It was a wonderful experience to be with other educators whose professional interests were similar to mine, who loved literature and were interested in exploring ways to encourage that love among our students. A strong sense of comradery developed as a result and affirmed the approaches we value in our classrooms.

I'm naturally shy and attended the summer institute without knowing anyone else there. Living in a dormitory at San Diego State for four weeks served to pull us together. Many of us, it turns out, were from the same school district, but hadn't known each other beforehand. We were so committed to a literature-based curriculum and to a whole language approach. I've made friends I'll have for a long time.

I didn't feel competitive there; instead, I felt that I didn't know very much. However, I discovered that I knew more about whole language than I thought. At first, the educational credentials of many of the participants and their positions as middle school and secondary school teachers intimidated me. I was afraid of making a spectacle of myself.

In reality, though, the secondary teachers readily accepted our ideas as elementary school teachers. Even people who weren't so willing to embrace a whole language philosophy were still legitimate members of the group.

The key was the opportunity to experience meaning-centered strategies ourselves in small groups, rather than to listen to others present ideas about them. I hadn't realized how powerful the strategies could be until I experienced them myself. After reading *The Tempest*, for example, and making sense of it myself, I wanted to read more Shakespeare. That's what I want to foster in my kids.

I want to make children realize that they are responsible for their own learning, that they make the meaning, rather than teachers making it for them. As teachers, we shouldn't stand in front of the class saying, "This is what it's about." Education should be fun and enjoyable; children should read, write, and enjoy.

Suky Reilly pointed out that the institute's emphasis on having participants experience for themselves literature-based, meaning-centered strategies supported her values and enhanced her understanding.

The summer institute was a wonderful experience. I enjoyed the affirmation of what I was feeling and thinking and liked experiencing the strategies as a student myself. To approach language arts this way, by using real literature and encouraging students to construct personal connections with it, just makes sense. It's so much more liberating than a

skills-based approach in which all students must come up with the same right answers.

I want to turn students into strategic readers, learners, and thinkers by integrating all the literacy processes--reading, writing, speaking, and listening. To teach in this way requires using strategies that allow readers to enter a piece of literature, feel it, understand it, and make their own interpretations.

These meaning-centered strategies helped me to develop a much richer understanding of the literature we read this summer, *The Tempest* and *Gilgamesh*, for example, than if I'd merely read the pages on my own and answered questions. These strategies are based on a philosophy of encouraging students to learn in their own way, to provide techniques for them to choose their own paths and make their own connections. This understanding is one of my biggest benefits from participating in the institute.

Katherine Nichols indicated that the institute's program, particularly grade-alike group meetings and a guest speaker's presentation, fostered self-assurance as it deepened her understanding of the framework.

I learned new ideas, but the institute also reinforced knowledge I gained from a colleague who taught me about the framework and whole language instructional strategies during the previous year. Discussions in our grade-alike groups helped to expand my views of the framework. I liked hearing specific ideas about and interpretations of the framework

from other teachers because many issues are nonspecific and ambiguous.

Also, I learned some excellent strategies to teach students to interact with literature, for example, super sentences, grammar in context, character map, character report card, tableau, and sketch to stretch. It was helpful to discuss instructional strategies with other high school English teachers, especially since they face similar political problems in their departments and school districts.

The guest speaker presentation on censorship issues was important, too. During his presentation, we explored simulated censorship problems and found specific passages in the English framework to justify our positions.

B. J. Brown pointed out that the opportunities to write, and make small group presentations to the larger institute community, served to enhance comradery among participants and helped to reconceptualize her role as teacher.

When we wrote and shared our writing with others, it helped to introduce us professionally and personally to our colleagues. Also, we prepared many projects in small groups to present to the large group, and this continual reconfiguration of the small groups helped us to get to know one another. Members of the large group were the audience for the presentations and provided laughter, appreciation, comments, and reinforcement.

From these experiences I learned that students don't need my expertise; instead, they are in control and their ideas need to be brought out through letting them discover meanings. I don't have to check with them to make sure they received my meaning; what's important is the meanings they discover.

Bill Kelly, however, suggested that unlike the Writing Project, the CLP summer institute's emphasis on creating simulations and experiences for participants diminished opportunities for analysis.

In comparison to the Writing Project's summer institute, the CLP emphasized simulation and experience and only to limited degree did participants get into a more analytical phase. Participants developed meaning and developed strategies for their classrooms, but there was no sense of closure or of putting the meaning and strategies into a context. Instead, it was almost pure experience, which is only valuable when there is a sense of the larger context.

Influence and Power

Influence is an interactive process in which people attempt to convince other people to believe and/or act in certain ways. . . .

Influence comes from leaders and followers using power resources to persuade. . . .

How much of one's power resources can one put into the persuasive process before the power of persuasion becomes power wielding? Particulars aside, the answer must revolve around . . . the

freedom to choose alternatives different from what the persuader has in mind. . . . It means the practical possibility of so choosing and still belonging to and being actively involved in the leadership relationship. (Rost, 1991, pp. 157, 160)

Leadership relationships--interactive processes in which leaders and followers develop common purposes and intend substantive changes--are situated in fundamental issues of influence and power. In this section participants related how their CLP experiences encouraged them to become, or reinforced their position as, proponents of English language arts reform. By and large, the anecdotes portray examples of persuasion rather than coercion, and participants held a variety of viewpoints on how to change their teaching practices. The anecdotes also depict conflicts that occurred in the San Diego summer institute, some which participants resolved and others that remained unfinished or ignored.

Mary Barr provided an overview of the long-term transformation process by pointing out that helping teachers develop meaning-centered instructional practices encouraged them to try out the new strategies with their students, which would result in positive student responses. These positive student responses, of course, would make it likely that the teachers continue to participate in the reform. She also emphasized the importance of teachers working in concert with administrators because of their close contact with parents and the community at large.

Teachers are key to change, and once they understand literature-based, meaning-centered philosophy and instructional strategies, they buy in. In most schools, promoting the use of language to construct meanings does not exist. Instead, rigid language forms are imposed on students. In a literature-based program, however, teachers understand that kids link their own personal lives with the literature, reflect on those connections, and use writing and discussion to arrive at diverse interpretations--one interpretation, then, is not final. Teachers in the CLP share ways to organize classroom instruction so that differences are valued rather than punished. Once kids are exposed to this learning environment, they become students and questioners, and teachers who experience these reactions from students buy into a meaning-centered curriculum.

Administrators as well have to be educated about the implications of literature-based, meaning-centered philosophy and instructional strategies because they probably came through the same skills-based, product-oriented training that the rest of us experienced. If administrators don't understand the implications of the reform, then how are they going to answer questions from parents? This whole reform is so radical, and so teachers almost have to put into administrators' mouths the arguments administrators need in order to communicate with parents. However, teachers have to be shrewd about this because it isn't just manipulation;

rather, it's in the spirit of "We're in this enterprise together and we know what you are going to be up against."

Mae Gundlach described how the education department attempted to influence district administrators to advocate the reform movement, and also described how her own opportunity to experience meaning-centered instructional strategies transformed the way she thought about English language arts curriculum. In addition, she reiterated the positive effects such experiences promise for teachers.

The education department really has no power; it can only recommend. Many people don't believe that, but that's the way it is. The education department staff always wanted administrators at the local level to become closely involved in the reform. To that end, when the education department asked school districts to contribute monetary support and choose CLP institute participants, in part the department was encouraging administrators to promote English language arts reform issues.

Originally I was just a bystander, but when I attended the planning meetings and the summer institutes, I actually experienced what teachers were doing and understood the power of the integrated program and what students could do with literature. For example, at a workshop in Sacramento, a presenter used a poetry lesson to illustrate ways to implement the framework. He read two poems to us and after the first poem, he asked questions in the traditional way. Then, he said, "That's

the way we used to do it. Now, I'm going to have you experience some alternative approaches." In response to the second poem, by e. e. cummings, we worked in an integrated way--we heard it, read it ourselves, and then discussed it in an open, participatory way. I still remember the gist of that poem to this day, even though the workshop was five or six years ago.

In that experience I realized the power of an integrated lesson and after that I was sold on the approach. That's one of the strengths of the CLP--teachers are never asked to do anything with their students without experiencing the strategies themselves beforehand. Through those experiences, teachers are convinced that what they are doing is sound.

Jan Gabay pointed out that while the institutes provide innovative curriculum experiences for participants the teachers must decide for themselves whether or not they want to transform their teaching practices.

Ultimately, the teachers change themselves. Whatever we do in the CLP, the choice remains with the teachers about whether or not they want to become a part of the movement. The teachers experience meaning-centered strategies and those experiences affect them, but if the teachers choose to ignore the impact of the experiences, then that's the choice they make. I'd like one hundred percent enthusiasm, but we're not going to get it. For example, there are teachers who say, "This won't work in my classroom," and I say, "Fine. No one's going to twist your arm. You have some choice here; nobody's making you change."

Jim Sieg described how his own process in the CLP, moving from participant to small group leader, served to firmly ground him in the reform movement. He also elaborated on his role in reducing anxiety in institute participants and pointed out how interpersonal bonding among members of his small group contributed to deepening their experiences and developing their professional self-concept.

I was a summer institute participant at Dominguez Hills in 1989 in a small group with a fine teacher leader named Carol Jago, who recommended that I consider becoming a teacher leader myself. I then contacted Mary Barr and Jan Gabay who said there was an opening in San Diego. I was pleased about the opportunity because when I want to learn something new, such as the changes in English language arts, if I put myself in a position to teach it, then I'll understand it at a much deeper level.

As a teacher leader this summer, I told my group on the first day that we would have to make a leap of faith together. By cheerleading and bolstering confidence I tried to create a non-threatening atmosphere that would assuage the fear factor. I pointed out that changes always create anxiety, but perhaps that anxiety could be put to good use.

I wanted to create an environment that was not completely free from risk, but would nurture participants and make them feel comfortable with the unknown. Of course, the whole notion of the unknown is part of this reform movement, and the challenge is to address it directly and turn it into something positive.

The group responded favorably to what we created. For example, the two times they evaluated me, they said they felt comfortable within our small group environment. The group also seemed to bond with one another so quickly. They developed social relationships outside the institute program, going out for drinks or dinner together, for example. About one half of our group stayed together in the dormitory and they often recounted great conversations they had there during the late afternoon or evening hours. The institute wasn't just a nine to three thing; indeed, it covered all the waking hours.

Even though his own small group seemed to mesh well, Jim Sieg pointed out that other small groups were not without problems and tension among members. He also described his experiences coordinating a grade-alike group and commented on the scripting of the institute's daily program. In addition, by the end of the institute, he felt that participants in his home group had decided to change their classroom instructional practices.

Controversy arose during the first week when six or seven elementary school teachers from several of the small groups approached Jan Gabay to say that the high school teachers intimidated them. Jan was very upset about it and wanted to address the issue directly. The teacher leaders and Jan discussed the possibility of using a fishbowl strategy in which each small group would send a representative to discuss the issue in front of the whole institute. I thought it would be a good opportunity to use this strategy to demonstrate a way to publicly address controversy.

However, some teacher leaders objected strongly. There was trepidation about being put on the spot and some finger pointing. They lobbied so hard that Jan chose not to use the fishbowl and instead had all participants write a letter to her discussing how they felt within their group about the high school/elementary school issue. I don't know whether it resolved the issue completely, but participants seemed to feel better about at least having an audience to write to.

In the grade-alike groups, I taught with Cathy Guilfoyle and we have different styles. She's quietly reflective and I'm proactive. Cathy and I complemented each other quite well as we planned and problem solved together. The grade-alike group is a completely different dynamic than the home group, and it's important for people who teach the same grade levels to exchange the epiphanies and the horror stories of practice.

The script by and large was a helpful structure to work from, but I would like it to be tighter. It seemed like we were really flogging the dog toward the end on some of the things we were supposed to be doing. It was getting a bit boring and we lost some of the intensity that we had developed in the home groups. I tried to prioritize what was going on, and sometimes we diverted from the timetable in the script if there was something more important happening that had to be finished. However, I did not make those decisions haphazardly.

In my home group of 17 participants, maybe 15 changed how they see themselves as teachers and believe in the new instructional strategies. I tried to empower them in exactly the same way they need to empower their own students. As a result the teachers now feel more confident, and some want to make presentations at conventions and apply for mentorship positions in their districts. It was a wonderful experience to see them grow in confidence and feel good about the quality of their work.

As a member of Jim Sieg's small group, Shelley Overstreet corroborated how the positive, supportive climate from colleagues as well as from the group leader helped her to take risks and develop a more professional self-concept. She also endorsed the institute's *learning by doing* approach.

The comradery and dynamics of our group helped me to overcome my initial fears. Near the end of the program, Jim Sieg remarked to me, for example, "I can't believe your voice is so much stronger than when you first arrived." In our grade-alike group I found myself being more looked to as a leader. My knowledge and confidence were higher, and I felt empowered through having actually experienced reading difficult texts and using strategies and the support of the group to help me gain meaning. That experience demonstrated the power of this approach for my own students. I've done it and now I understand what they're doing.

It was so powerful to bring personal experience to the reading and writing assignments. When we wrote a professional action plan during

the final week, for example, I felt I had something worthwhile to say, that I am a smart person. So often before, I sold myself short professionally. In fact, this is the most professional thing I've done in a long, long time. I would like to return to college and complete a master's degree because I now feel that I'm ready for it. I feel better academically.

The beauty of this approach is that even though the students are different each year, as a teacher my challenge is to key in on what their reactions and feelings are. That's what Jim Sieg was able to model so well--he really keyed in on us and knew when we were uptight. He made us feel important.

In contrast to the summer institute, in which participants experienced meaning-centered strategies using difficult, adult literature, Shelley Overstreet described her disappointment resulting from an earlier CLP staff development workshop. She also offered a critique of her grade-alike group leader in light of the positive experiences with her small group leader.

Before the summer institute I attended a staff development workshop in which the presenter was a member of the Dominguez Hills regional site. One suggestion I'd make is to have adults experience the meaning-making strategies using adult literature, rather than just describing the strategies using children's literature. So much of the impact was lost that way. I didn't understand the power of the tableau strategy, for example, until I experienced it with adult literature this summer.

At the institute Susan Smith (a pseudonym) was our grade-alike group leader and extremely knowledgeable and experienced. As a facilitator, though, she had some shortcomings. There were times, for example, when our group wanted to address an issue not on the day's agenda and she wouldn't permit it. Also, during a book-sharing discussion she wouldn't let a group member speak because the allotted time had run out. I was angry because I felt we were telling her what we wanted and she wasn't hearing us.

She talked a lot about her experiences and background, in contrast to Jim Sieg, for example, and I saw her put a participant on the defensive. There were other ways to facilitate that encounter, and it made me more appreciative of how Jim Sieg conducted our small group. Lori Anderson also compared the summer institute experiences to an earlier CLP staff development workshop. She critiqued as well several institute teacher leaders and suggested that there is a fine line between influence and manipulation.

Like Shelley, prior to the summer institute, I attended a workshop in which we experienced CLP strategies using children's literature, such as the tableau and hot seat. As a result, I didn't get much out of it. This summer, through using adult literature, we had to stretch a bit and I learned from it.

At the institute the teacher leader Frank Bigelow (a pseudonym) seemed so unorganized and unwilling to stay with his small group until

the end of group meetings. Unlike Jim Sieg, who stayed in our group and made sure we were on task, I often saw Frank Bigelow wandering around as if he were somehow lost. He seemed absent-minded, and not a strong leader. I talked to participants who were in his group and they said that they were often left to their own devices.

In contrast to Frank Bigelow, who never seemed to follow the script, I had Ruth Mitchell (a pseudonym) as a teacher leader on occasion, and she was rigid about adhering to the script. For example, the group wanted to explore other issues and she'd stop us and bring us back to the script's agenda for that particular day. As a teacher leader, she should have been able to let the group go where it wanted to go, to be open to other possibilities.

It's a tough issue because teachers are, in a sense, manipulators. Don't we take our classes and manipulate them to turn out in some way? I guess it's natural that teachers use manipulation to get things across. It's bad, though, when teachers use manipulation to meet their own needs. Jim Sieg probably manipulated our small group at times; however, he let us explore our own ideas as well.

Suky Reilly pointed out that experiencing meaning-based strategies as a student enhanced her understanding of how her own students feel when encountering difficult literature. She also appreciated watching others model how to resolve the decision-making problems that teachers encounter daily.

We were students this summer and I'll have to admit that I really enjoyed that experience, sitting on the other side and watching others worry about time and directions. I liked standing in my students' shoes, understanding how they feel when given a particular task or a particular difficult piece of literature. Even though I will never be teaching *The Tempest* or *Gilgamesh*, the literature my students read will have same effect on them. I enjoyed squirming and having to stretch.

Several participants elaborated on the conflicts and bickering that occurred during the course of the summer institute. While some of the problems arose from the institute's lack of structure and from participants' discomfort with ambiguity and change, conflicts also occurred when CLP staff in authoritative positions overstepped the bounds of influence to make participants do things. Katherine Nichols, for example, felt that the summer institute provided a good set of strategies to use with her own students, but she criticized the lack of structure in the daily program. She also described some of the disputes that arose among group members.

The institute contained a nice mix of different teaching strategies and the teacher leaders really practiced what they preached. The only change I would propose is that participants should know the structure of each day ahead of time. Some of us wanted to invite an administrator from our school to join us and we never could determine which day would be a good one.

In our small group, participants had trouble with Ruth Mitchell, the teacher leader, because they felt that she was cutting them off and not giving them a chance to speak. Some members of the group felt that she didn't like them.

Other participants had conflicts in their grade-alike groups. For example, when we moved into different groups to develop a performance of a scene from *The Tempest*, some participants were in a group that did not jell. Instead, all they did was fight the whole time, with people at each other's throats. I remember just sitting around and twiddling my thumbs for thirty minutes because no one wanted to take control. I was discouraged because usually I'm the type of person that will get a group going, but I didn't feel like being the bitch. Also, I was intimidated because I was the youngest person there. I had the feeling that no one wanted to listen to me because I'm only a second year teacher.

Another problem in the institute was the shortage of men. Men have different perspectives and balance things out better. For example, it's easier when a man takes control of things because no one's going to call him a bitch. Our grade-alike group was well balanced, but our home group had only one man.

The complexity and confusion in the groups made me think about how my students feel and that was one of the best things I learned at the institute. When I was sitting there and feeling very uncomfortable, I thought, "So this is how they feel!" We were frustrated and unsure about

what we were supposed to do. The assignments seemed too big to handle in the allotted time and it was uncomfortable to perform with people I didn't know. However, these experiences were good for me because I'll be a better teacher now.

Monte Peters described how his small group developed a sense of comradery through feeling like outsiders at the institute. He also expressed his dismay and anger at the CLP staff, who as a result of their positional authority, made unilateral changes in the institute agenda and follow-up meetings.

Our group performed a scene from *The Tempest* that diverged from how other groups interpreted the piece, and word got back to us indirectly that one of the other group leaders disapproved of our interpretation. We reacted to that criticism as if it were a badge of honor because in our view we performed as we were supposed to. This experience gave me insight into how students feel when their views on a piece of literature are so different from mine.

I was frustrated when the agenda was altered or the material was not addressed in depth. For example, Jim Sieg, our grade-alike group leader, wasn't very good because rather than addressing issues and concerns in detail, he simply moved quickly through some questions with the group. Every moment was scripted and that affected the quality of the experience. If it wasn't in the script, then it didn't get discussed and that was a problem.

I'm also angry about the schedule change of the follow-up meetings during the school year. The CLP, in a departure from our agreement and as a courtesy to school districts, agreed to change some of the meeting days to Saturday. The participants were not asked for input about that change; instead, the CLP simply issued a dictum. I already signed a contract agreeing to two years of follow-up meetings in which I would receive released time from my teaching to attend. Now it means I have two meetings scheduled on my own time, which the district won't pay for. It's another example of administrators undervaluing teachers and telling them what to do.

B. J. Brown pointed out that in her grade-alike group, since the teacher leader dominated the conversation, there were limited opportunities for other voices to be heard on issues. She also described some of the effects of the tension between elementary and secondary school teachers, particularly on the ability of some teachers to feel good about their work. In addition, she was uncomfortable when the institute staff overstepped their influence resources and denigrated teachers who employed traditional teaching practices.

Unlike our small group of 17 participants, the grade-alike group was too large, with 35-40 participants. Our teacher leader, Judy Inskeep, was positive, full of energy, and listened to what people had to say, but always followed it with a comment of her own. That was irritating at times because it limited our ability to hear from group members, so we were not

discovering for ourselves; instead, she was telling us what we should know.

Some of the elementary school teachers were reluctant to write. To them, writing should be a finished product and they weren't used to strategies, such as quickwrite or drafting, that emphasized writing as a process. Consequently, they didn't want to read their pieces aloud or hand them in. I tried to encourage some of them to relax a bit. I suggested that others wanted to hear their ideas, so their writing didn't need to be in final form--well organized and grammatically error free. In addition, I read them my early draft to show how crappy my own writing was.

School systems often reward teachers by moving them up in the hierarchy--middle school teachers move to high school, for example. This form of promotion only serves to reinforce the tension among teachers because it fosters the idea that teachers at the secondary level are somehow better writers or thinkers. It's ridiculous. Even though the split between elementary and secondary school teachers did not occur in our small group, I heard rumors that some teachers made put-down statements in other groups that reinforced that notion.

The institute staff at times went too far in promoting innovative instructional strategies. For example, they put up lists of good and bad teaching practices and that really bothered me. They made teachers who are more traditional or skills based feel wrong or uncomfortable and that's unfortunate.

Epilogue

In these hundred or so pages of Chapter Four, I attempted to reconstruct a reasonable fiction based on my experiences in the field setting, a fiction filled with thick, rich descriptions of transforming leadership processes. This fiction is one of innumerable stories that other people could have told about leadership in the CLP. Obviously, others would tell other stories, different stories. For me, though, I fashioned the story I told from the accumulation of my experiences, knowing that at each moment other potentially significant events happened to which I never had access. For example, during the four weeks I spent at the summer institute at San Diego State University, six other CLP regional institutes offered similar programs, and in those settings lie many other stories still untold.

In the field setting and during the writing, my challenge was to make the familiar strange. After all, I was not conducting a traditional ethnography in which I entered an unfamiliar culture and spent days struggling to understand the significance of Balinese cock fights or Samoan adolescent rituals, as did Clifford Geertz and Margaret Mead, for example. Instead, as a California high school English teacher who already coordinated my own school district's English language arts reform effort, I was on familiar ground. For example, I knew the difficulties teachers faced as they struggled to transform their teaching practices and understood the politics of institutional infighting that often arose as a result. I knew the content of the *English Language Arts Framework* and understood the differences between transmission-oriented, skills-based

instruction and meaning-centered, literature-based instruction. My participation in the setting, then, was not difficult because the context was familiar to me.

What was strange, however, was to enter a familiar setting intent on reframing the events of an English language arts program through an unfamiliar lens shaped by a definition of transforming leadership relationships. Hence, while participation did not pose a problem, observation did. To observe, then, was to look at the ever-changing kaleidoscope of interactions at the CLP as dynamics of transforming leadership relationships.

I chose to portray my story of leadership relationships primarily through the words of others because I could not observe the relationships directly. Instead, I reconstructed the experiences participants related to me in our conversations and interviews into descriptions of leadership processes, inferring from their accounts the dynamics of leaders and followers intending real changes that reflect their mutual purposes. In Chapter Five, I will reexamine this story in light of the initial purposes and research questions that formed the basis for the study.

CHAPTER 5

LEADERSHIP REDUX

Introduction

In the preceding narrative about particular people associated with the *California Literature Project* during 1990 and 1991, I explored leadership differently in an attempt to uncover dynamics of leadership relationships that often remain hidden from researchers using traditional methods. I fashioned a reconstructed text winnowed primarily from informal interviews and conversations with participants and from my notes and memories of CLP events in order to convince you, the reader, that I had been there and lived through all that I recounted. Also, I wanted to evoke in you the vicarious experience of having been there yourself by developing plausible descriptions of leadership processes.

Collaboration between us to construct meanings, of course, indicates that the nature of the text, in fact, is both partial and multiple. The text is partial--incomplete--until readers reconstruct the narrative by bringing their own tacit knowledge to bear on the words. The text only becomes whole when forged through this intangible relationship between author and reader. In the reenactment of this relationship with each new reader and each new reading, the text multiplies because each reader reconstructs the narrative uniquely.

However, in spite of these textual constraints, in the remainder of this chapter I reconstruct what I find significant in the leadership narrative in light of

the initial research questions and purposes that formed the basis for the study. In addition, I explore possibilities as well as constraints that this methodology posed, and conclude with suggestions for new directions in leadership research and practice.

Initial Research Questions

Developing Leadership Relationships

How did leaders and followers initiate and sustain leadership relationships in the CLP? From its inception in 1985, one of the project's major purposes has been to develop leadership. The project staff attempted to identify and foster teachers who would model instructional strategies that enable students to achieve the criteria established in the *English Language Arts Framework* and would serve as teacher leaders at the regional summer institutes. The developers of the CLP clearly valued teachers as competent and powerful professionals.

It is not surprising, though, given the CLP's origin in the California Department of Education, that its organizational structure was not unlike other traditionally structured educational institutions. In fact, the CLP hierarchy included a policy board, executive director, regional directors, administrative support staff, summer institute directors, and teacher leaders. This hierarchical arrangement created a context in which organizational positions, rather than leadership relationships, shaped some interactions among members. However, what was different about the CLP is that with few exceptions, those who held positions in the organization derived their primary professional

identities from other institutions--namely schools, district central offices, and universities--and these other identities served to influence the interactions as well.

Of course, the presence of hierarchy does not preclude the development of collaborative leadership relationships because leadership depends on the intentions of an organization's members. In the case of the CLP, internal documents describe a collaborative model of leadership that the staff used to provide support to teachers involved in English language arts reform, and for the most part I corroborated that description.

However, the dichotomy between hierarchical authority and collaborative leadership relationships was evident as well, and occasionally posed problems for participants. For example, some participants at the academy expressed confusion over the distinction between the terms *teacher leader* and *cadre member*. The participants felt that teacher leader held a more exalted status in the organization than one of the cadre. While these impressions did not contradict the CLP directors' statement that the academy was a forum for democratic input into policy and new directions, they did serve to contribute to a CLP member's power resources and ability to influence others in leadership relationships.

Somewhere in the mix between the espoused theory of collaborative leadership and the constraints of structural hierarchy lay the reality of leadership relationships in the CLP. All participants associated with the CLP contributed to constructing the context of this mixture, based on their own

expectations about leadership, individual actions, and positional authority. As a result, leadership processes occurred amidst bureaucratic procedures, charismatic initiatives, and management tasks.

Participants in the study offered numerous illustrations of collaborative leadership relationships--among institute and academy participants, CLP directors, institute directors and teacher leaders, and among CLP staff and school administrators. These collaborative processes often made members feel more powerful, competent, and willing to continue to participate in the English language arts reform effort.

Participants in the study also offered examples illustrating CLP members being unable or unwilling to collaborate or holding profound disagreements over philosophy and purposes. At times, CLP members looked to those in positional authority to resolve conflicts or provide guidance while the members remained silent or passive. Sometimes, this passive silence developed into resentment and a willingness to blame others for shortcomings in a CLP program or meeting.

However, in spite of the disagreements and feelings of resentment that occurred occasionally, CLP staff did not remove those members whose viewpoints differed from the majority. Instead, as anyone else they were free to drop into and out of the leadership relationships on their own terms.

Influence

How did leaders and followers in the CLP influence one another?

Leaders are distinguished from followers primarily because their greater power

resources enable them to exert greater influence. In the CLP members accumulated power resources primarily from professional experiences and credibility acquired in the English language arts field, although as I pointed out above, members also accumulated them from their positional authority in the organization.

For participants in the summer institutes, the CLP staff provided a supportive structure to explore innovative instructional practices. Within this supportive structure participants influenced one another in leadership relationships while enacting the meaning-centered curriculum strategies and reflecting on them, not just passively learning about them. This consistent, collaborative process of enactment served to promote a sense of what Kreisberg (1992) described as co-agency, in which participants created jointly developed capacity. Teacher leaders by and large served as credible models while facilitating this enactment because they already had completed the institute themselves and had used the instructional strategies with students in their own classrooms.

By experiencing the strategies themselves in supportive environments while reading difficult, adult literature, the participants understood how powerful the strategies could be with their own students. They came to know the strategies through their own experiences with them. Some participants even felt a moral responsibility to return to their districts and share what they learned about innovative instructional strategies with other teachers.

The CLP regional summer institutes and annual academy also served as a basis for the development of power resources, providing professional experiences and credibility so that participants over time could exert greater influence in CLP leadership relationships. In some instances this development of power resources became an apprenticeship because many of the people in positions of authority in the organization originally experienced CLP programs as participants. Some of the regional directors, for example, had attended summer institutes and served as teacher leaders as well.

Processes of coercion also existed along with influence processes. For example, in an effort to promote the reform movement some CLP teacher leaders set up a dichotomy between good and bad teaching practices that bordered on dogmatism. This dichotomy cast some participants as outsiders if they did not agree. In addition, participants characterized some teacher leaders at the San Diego summer institute as providing either too much or not enough direction. Concerns such as these seemed to arise from participants' lack of confidence in the teacher leaders' power resources--based on professional experiences or credibility--to persuade them.

However, in spite of the ambiguity and diversity of power resources and influence processes, CLP leadership relationships provided members with the capacity to act and the legitimacy to question and become innovative in their own practices.

Intending Changes

What real changes did leaders and followers in the CLP intend? The CLP developed as a way of supporting teachers who wanted to implement the innovative instructional strategies promoted in the *English Language Arts Framework*. CLP leadership relationships, located in this change-oriented context, encouraged members to change both the way they thought about English language arts content and the way they conceptualized and practiced teaching and learning processes, including how they viewed themselves, their students, and the purposes of schooling. These transformative practices encompass what Bergquist (1992) described as first-order and second-order changes.

CLP members intended to change English language arts teaching practices from a skills-based, transmission model to a literature-based, meaning-centered model, and in the process make all learners legitimate members of the classroom. Summer institute participants developed particular plans about how to make these changes and in the two years of follow-up meetings had opportunities to refine their plans.

In discussing intended changes, participants also raised the issue of environmental impediments to change by pointing out the dichotomy between innovative curricular practices and traditional assessment methods. This dichotomy exists because curricular practices and assessment are based on incommensurate paradigms of knowledge. The new curricular practices engage learners in the collaborative construction of knowledge, while the

traditional assessment methods emphasize individual regurgitation of objective facts.

Contributing to this problem is the separation of curriculum and assessment departments in California and the rest of the United States, unlike countries such as Australia, the United Kingdom, and New Zealand for example. With the emphasis in the United States on accountability as measured by traditional assessment methods, performance on standardized tests loom large. As a result, some teachers in the CLP who intended to change their instructional practices jeopardized their students' test scores.

Common Purposes

How did leaders and followers in the CLP develop and maintain common purposes? Common purposes are forged through noncoercive, collaborative influence relationships and the CLP staff and participants promoted common purposes in all facets of the organization, from CLP planning meetings in which the directors collaboratively planned the summer institute programs to summer institute small groups in which participants enacted meaning-based instructional strategies.

For example, the CLP staff developed the annual academy to bring together educators statewide to build a consensus about the project and the *English Language Arts Framework*. The academy provided a forum for participants to develop a sense of renewal, reacquaint themselves with new discoveries in literacy education, and contribute to new directions in the CLP.

Also, the format of the summer institutes contributed to developing common purposes among participants. For example, one of the reasons for the daily script was to insure that all participants would cover and uncover similar curriculum issues. Through collaborative leadership relationships participants attempted to resolve individual questions and confusion, and out of that process developed purposes in common. In addition, some participants even developed a sense of commonality by living together in a dormitory at San Diego State University for four weeks.

The variety of the small group experiences during the summer institute promoted the development of common purposes as well. For example, participants were members of home groups made up of elementary and secondary school teachers. This configuration encouraged participants to look beyond their own level of teaching and to understand the commonalities among all teachers K-12. Participants also had opportunities to meet in small groups made up of teachers who taught similar grade levels. The combination of these small group experiences enhanced comradery and helped participants to reconceptualize their role as teachers.

The outside speakers at the academy and the summer institutes, including educators from other states, Canada, Norway, and the United Kingdom, encouraged participants to feel that they were a part of a larger educational reform movement, international in scope and beyond the petty in-fighting and school-level politics so common in teachers' professional lives.

These experiences valued participants as professionals--intelligent, competent people whose opinions mattered.

Ethical & Critical Perspectives

How do leaders and followers develop and maintain ethical, critical perspectives to transform educational practices? The reform movement, potentially, is about radically changing the way teachers and students engage in language arts curriculum in the classroom. In developing a position on this issue, the CLP also took a stand on larger educational issues that impinge on classroom practices. In most cases, the CLP's positions reflected a liberal to radical view. From formulating a K-12 perspective, rather than the traditional elementary/secondary school separation, to advocating against placing students in classrooms according to ability grouping and tracking, the CLP perspective was critically and ethically one of inclusion and away from the mainstream position of marginalizing students who are different. Notwithstanding some preachy examples, CLP staff attempted to raise these issues within a respectful, collaborative, and educative process, one that provided support to teachers who choose to endorse these positions.

Original Purposes

In addition to exploring the initial research questions, I set out to engage in a research project that had three main purposes: (1) to contribute to the emerging literature of an alternative paradigm of leadership that emphasized the fundamental importance of individuals in community, (2) to contribute to the growing body of socially constructed, qualitative studies, and (3) to challenge

the dominant view of educational leadership currently practiced in the field, including mainstream concepts such as school-based leadership, instructional leadership, and teacher leadership.

In a sense this narrative is a story of leadership in transition in the late twentieth century, emerging from an organization conceived and developed within the twentieth century industrial paradigm enamored with hierarchy and rationality, and portraying a possible twenty-first century postindustrial leadership paradigm that promotes collaborative, communitarian organizational processes. The story of leadership relationships in the CLP is in part an example of individuals in community collaboratively transforming how California's teachers and students engage in English language arts curriculum in schools.

The qualitative methodology I used in this study offers other researchers some promising possibilities as well as some potential constraints, which I discuss in the next section, and the narrative structure contributes to the qualitative research literature in a number of ways. For example, I acknowledged and provided a detailed description of the shifting context of the field setting, the multiple roles I played as researcher, author, and persona, the difficulties in reconstructing field experiences into narrative text, and the ethical considerations that arose during the course of study. As a result I constructed and portrayed plausible interpretations of transforming leadership relationships in particular settings of the CLP and described processes of leadership that are not easily identified using traditional research methods.

I also wanted to engage in research that would challenge the dominant view of educational leadership currently practiced in the field, namely school-based leadership, instructional leadership, and teacher leadership. Because I have focused by and large on relationships rather than individuals and on leaders and followers with power resources independent of positional authority, I do present a challenge to the dominant leadership views in education. In spite of the growing body of literature on transforming leadership, educational leadership research and practice for the most part remains mired in individual, traditional management concepts. Educators still equate leadership with persons in authoritative positions in hierarchical institutions; leadership is individuals doing good management.

Methodological Possibilities and Constraints

The design, deconstruction, and reconstruction of this research process was in part idiosyncratic--just as the events and people in the field setting are gone forever, so too is the specific chronology of my investigative journey. In the midst of the significant moments I captured and portrayed lie many now forgotten moments of decision that influenced the directions I followed, choice points that I was unable to render into text.

Given that caveat, however, this research, in which I employed qualitative methods that emphasized the primacy of language forms to construct meanings and develop detailed descriptions of leadership, presents a range of possibilities and constraints for other researchers. One possibility is researchers using similar methods in order to study other nontraditional ways of

doing postindustrial leadership, for example, groups of volunteers, collaborative teams inside hierarchical organizations, cooperative associations of such organizations as city or county governments, and staff of charter schools or alternative schools. Researchers also can use similar methods to study national and state associations wherein people only get together episodically while other staff members have full-time positions, or to study leadership on boards of organizations whose members are part time.

Since I located this research within the context of narrative truth and the social reality of true fiction, the stories the participants told in a sense stand on their own merit. Insights into nontraditional leadership emerged vicariously from the anecdotes the participants related about their experiences in the CLP. By acknowledging the partiality of socially constructed true fiction I freed myself from the constraints of positivist requirements in the dominant paradigm for what constitutes sound research. Other researchers can free themselves as well to construct plausible narratives of social phenomena.

This research methodology presents some constraints as well for other researchers. For example, in an attempt to describe relationships among leaders and followers, I relied primarily on the descriptions participants provided in our interviews. As a result, I may not have gathered and responded to enough data on what happened in the field setting. In retrospect, I would include more observational journal entries or edited transcripts of tape-recorded impressions made at the end of each day in the field or after the completion of each interview. However, because I reconstructed the research design as it

emerged from my experiences in the field, only hindsight allows me to identify this limitation.

As I was translating the field experiences into text, I wanted to fashion a narrative in which to portray the participants' perspectives as multiple voices, their stories collaboratively constructed and reconstructed. However, to do that would have required that I reenter the field and renegotiate my relationships with the participants, something that limited time and financial resources precluded.

A related constraint is that I needed a long time to complete the research. In fact, my one year stint in the field setting was probably inadequate. Another year in the field would have allowed me more opportunities to follow up on issues raised initially and to attend the academy and summer institute again. However, lengthening the initial time in the field is not necessarily going to bear fruit. Instead, since the composing phase of translating the field experiences into text in effect made me write my way into understanding, I would use my time more productively by revisiting the field setting after composing the text, thereby creating a recursive dialectical relationship between field experiences and narrative reconstruction into text. I fear, however, that such a process would never end. In my case, for example, that would mean I was eternally in the *purgatory of all but dissertation (and unemployed)*.

Since I was a participant observer and at times a full participant in the research setting, I was still an outsider. As is true in all ethnographic research, the issue is: Can an outsider actually find out what happened? There is a point,

however, in social phenomena at which there is no one objective happening. Instead, the persons involved in the events construct their own interpretations. In part this construction of multiple realities diminishes the distinction between outsider and insider access to information. In the last analysis does anyone really know what happened? As in *Rashomon* (Akutagawa, 1952) the characters construct their own true recollections of past events.

A condition of my relationship with the research participants was that they had the right to edit the transcripts of our interviews, to delete or add information as they saw fit. Ethically, I created this caveat to protect participants from making statements or revealing thoughts they did not want others to know about. However, as a result I was privy to information that I could not portray in the narrative text. Similar to an investigative reporter, I have information that must remain *off the record*, although it did serve to point me in worthwhile directions. Because I could not adequately protect the identities of the participants, it was the choice I made.

New Directions in Leadership Research and Practice

Leadership is people bonding together to institute a change in a group, organization, or society. Leadership is [a] community of believers who pursue a transformational cause. Leadership is a group of activists who want to implement a reformist agenda. Leadership is a band of leaders and collaborators who envision a better future and go after it. (Rost, 1994, p. 6)

Developing a narrative of collaborative leadership relationships is partly about creating new metaphors to help reconceptualize how people engage in leadership together. Leaders and followers need to use their power resources within organizations to set up contexts that allow for, value, and promote collaboration. Fostering transforming leadership relationships means carving out a space in the daily activities of organizational life for leaders and followers to develop intended changes that reflect their common purposes.

As I stated above, this dissertation is an enactment of modern Western allegory--a mythic representation of the social world that also represents my own induction into the academy. In a quick perusal of *Dissertation Abstracts OnDisc 1988-1993*, I counted 103 other scholars who were inducted into the academy through a dissertation addressing transforming or transformational leadership and not one studied collaborative leadership relationships. Instead every single one studied individuals in positions of authority who used what they called transforming leadership to get others to do their bidding. The individuals studied in these dissertations included school principals, district superintendents, university presidents, managers of organizations, and the clergy.

Since leadership constitutes a fundamental component of social and organizational culture, the emphasis these scholars placed on individual positional leaders becomes problematic in redefining leadership within a postindustrial paradigm. Rather than contributing information crucial to

counteracting the pervasive emphasis on individualism in late twentieth century society, these scholars simply help to perpetuate this myth.

The California Literature Project model for promoting leadership and change is more time consuming and costly than other staff development models operating in educational systems. Probably less than five per cent of the California teachers attended the summer institutes and annual academy, for example. However, teachers in collaborative leadership processes enacting the instructional strategies insure that real, transforming changes happened in classrooms and schools. Other staff development models, based on individuals in positions of authority transmitting information to passive recipients, do not work.

What is needed is new directions for the practice of leadership and new theoretical constructs for research. Research and practice need to move away from a focus on individualism to a focus on community relationships. In order to change this shift, researchers and practitioners need to stop developing descriptions of individuals as leaders, and instead focus on leadership relationships looking to build the common good and a collective vision of a postindustrial value system.

REFERENCES

- Acheson, K. A., & Gall, M. D. (1987). *Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers: Preservice and inservice applications* (2nd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Ackerman, L. (1985). Leadership vs. management. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 6(2), 17-19.
- Adams, J. D. (Ed.). (1986). *Transforming leadership: From vision to results*. Alexandria, VA: Miles River Press.
- Adams, J. D., & Spencer, S. A. (1986). The strategic leadership perspective. In J. D. Adams (Ed.), *Transforming leadership: From vision to results* (pp. 5-12). Alexandria, VA: Miles River Press.
- Akutagawa, R. (1952). *Rashomon and other stories* (T. Kojima, Trans.). Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle.
- Anderson, G. L. (1990). Toward a critical constructivist approach to school administration: Invisibility, legitimation, and the study of non-events. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26(1), 38-59.
- Angus, L. (1989). New leadership and the possibility of educational reform. In J. Smyth (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on educational leadership* (pp. 63-92). London, UK: Falmer.
- Apple, M. W. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum*. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Apple, M. W. (1982). *Education and power*. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Astin, H. S. (1989, November). *Women and power: Collective and empowering leadership*. Paper presented at the meeting of Research on Women and Education, a Special Interest Group of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- Astin, H. S., & Leland, C. (1991). *Women of influence, women of vision: A cross-generational study of leaders and social change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Avolio, B. J., Waldman, D. A., & Yammarino, F. J. (1991). Leading in the 1990s: The four i's of transformational leadership. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 15(4), 9-16.

- Bacharach, S. B., & Lawler, E. J. (1980). *Power and politics in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres & other late essays* (V. W. McGee, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Barth, R. S. (1988). School: A community of leaders. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), *Building a professional culture in schools* (pp. 129-147). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bascia, N. (1991, April). *The trust agreement projects: Establishing local professional cultures for teachers*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Bass, B. M. (1981). *Stodgill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31.
- Bates, R. (1989). Leadership and the rationalization of society. In J. Smyth (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on educational leadership* (pp. 131-156). London, UK: Falmer.
- Bauman, D. J. (1988). Characteristics and operational styles of transformational leaders (Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1988). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 49, 12A.
- Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bennis, W. (1984). Transformative power and leadership. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), *Leadership and organizational culture* (pp. 64-71). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Berg, D. N., & Smith, K. K. (1986). *The self in social inquiry: Researching methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Bergquist, W. H. (1992). *The four cultures of the academy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Blackmore, J. (1989). Educational leadership: A feminist critique and reconstruction. In J. Smyth (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on educational leadership* (pp. 93-129). London, UK: Falmer.
- Blanchard, K., Zigarmi, P., & Zigarmi, D. (1985). *Leadership and the one minute manager*. New York: Morrow.
- Bleich, D. (1978). *Subjective criticism*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Blount, J. M. (1994). One postmodern feminist perspective on educational leadership: And ain't I a leader? In S. J. Maxcy (Ed.), *Postmodern school leadership: Meeting the crisis in educational administration* (pp. 47-59). New York: Praeger.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brandt, R. (1992). A different kind of leader. *Educational Leadership*, 49(5), 7.
- Brenkman, J. (1987). *Culture and domination*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Broyles, I. L. (1991, April). *Transforming teacher leadership through action research*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the New England Educational Research Association, Portsmouth, NH.
- Bruffee, K. A. (1986). Social construction, language, and the authority of knowledge: A bibliographical essay. *College English*, 48, 773-790.
- Burlingame, M. (1987). Images of leadership in effective schools literature. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), *Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies* (pp. 3-16). Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- California Commission on Public School Administration and Leadership. (1988). *Return to greatness: Strategies for powerful improvements in our schools*. Sacramento, CA: Author.

- Carroll, S. J. (1984). Feminist scholarship on political leadership. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), *Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 139-156). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Chemers, M. M. (1984). The social, organizational, and cultural context of effective leadership. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), *Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 91-112). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Cherryholmes, C. H. (1988). *Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cialdini, R. B. (1988). *Influence: Science and practice* (2nd ed.). New York: Scott Foresman.
- Cinnamond, J. (1991, March). *Narrative: Its organization, intrapersonal, and interpersonal value*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Clifford, J. (1988). *The predicament of culture: Twentieth-century ethnography, literature, and art*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. E. (Eds.). (1986). *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Codd, J. (1989). Educational leadership as reflective action. In J. Smyth (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on educational leadership* (pp. 157-178). London, UK: Falmer Press.
- Cohen, A. R., & Bradford, D. L. (1990). *Influence without authority*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cohn, M. M., & Kottkamp, R. B. (1993). *Teachers: The missing voice in education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Conley, D. T. (1991). *Restructuring schools: Educators adapt to a changing world*. (Trends & Issues Series, Number 6). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 328 954)
- Conrad, J. (1973). *Heart of darkness*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Crawford, L. (1987, May). *Intercultural communication study: A description of an interpretive/ethnographic approach*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Syracuse, NY.

- Dahl, R. A. (1968). Power. *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, 12, 405-414.
- Darling, S. K. (1990). A study to identify and analyze the relationship between (1) transformational leadership and collaboration, and (2) transactional leadership and collaboration in selected Minnesota elementary schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1990). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52, 02A.
- Davies, J. (1989, March). *Transformational leadership: Promises and problems for a new school of leadership*. Paper presented at Leadership: Ten Years After conference at the University of San Diego.
- Davies, J., & Foster, W. (1994). A postmodernist analysis of educational administration. In S. J. Maxcy (Ed.), *Postmodern school leadership: Meeting the crisis in educational administration* (pp. 61-68). New York: Praeger.
- Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). *Corporate cultures*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Dressel, P. L. (1981). *Administrative leadership: Effective and responsive decision making in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Eisner, E. (1988). The primacy of experience and the politics of method. *Educational Researcher*, 17(5), 15-20.
- Ekholm, M. (1992). Evaluating the impact of comprehensive school leadership development in Sweden. *Education and Urban Society*, 24, 365-385.
- Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering: Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 59, 297-324.
- Estrada, K., & McLaren, P. (1993). A dialogue on multiculturalism and democratic culture. *Educational Researcher*, 22(3), 27-33.
- Ferguson, M. (1980). *The aquarian conspiracy: Personal and social transformation in our time*. Los Angeles: J. P. Tarcher.
- Fink, R. (1988). *Vision: An essential component of leadership*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation proposal, University of San Diego.
- Fisher, W. F. (1987). *Human communication as narration: Toward a philosophy of reason, value, and action*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

- Foster, W. (1986a). *Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus.
- Foster, W. (1986b). *The reconstruction of leadership*. Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Foster, W. (1989). Toward a critical practice of leadership. In J. Smyth (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on educational leadership* (pp. 39-62). London, UK: Falmer.
- Foster, W. (in press). School leaders as transformative intellectuals: Toward a critical pragmatism. In P. Thurston & N. Prestine (Eds.), *Vol. III, Advances in Educational Administration*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Fram, E. H., & Pearse, R. F. (1991). The effective executive director takes over. *Nonprofit World*, 9(3), 29-32.
- Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation*. Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.
- Fullan, M. G. (1992). Visions that blind. *Educational Leadership*, 49(5), 19-20.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Geertz, C. (1988). *Works and lives: The anthropologist as author*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Giddens, A. (1981). *A contemporary critique of historical materialism*. London, UK: Macmillan.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory and resistance in education: A pedagogy for the opposition*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A place called school: Prospects for the future*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Goodman, P. S., & Kurke, L. B. (1982). Studies of change in organizations: A status report. In P. S. Goodman & Associates (Eds.), *Change in organizations: New perspectives on theory, research, and practice* (pp. 1-46). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Goodson, I. F. (1988). *The making of curriculum: Collected essays*. Philadelphia: Falmer.
- Graumann, C. F., & Moscovici, S. (Eds.). (1986). *Changing conceptions of leadership*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Green, M. F. (Ed.). (1988). *Leaders for a new era: Strategies for higher education*. New York: American Council on Education and Macmillan.
- Greenfield, W. (Ed.). (1987). *Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies*. Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Grundy, S. (1987). *Curriculum: Product or praxis*. Philadelphia: Falmer.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1985). *Effective evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Haddock, C. C. (1989). Transformational leadership and the employee discipline process. *Hospital & Health Services Administration*, 34, 185-194.
- Hallinger, P. (1992). School leadership development: An introduction. *Education and Urban Society*, 24, 300-316.
- Hallinger, P., & Anast, L. (1992). The Indiana principal leadership academy: Assessing school reform for principals. *Education and Urban Society*, 24, 410-430.
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1983). *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. London, UK: Tavistock.
- Harman, W. (1988). *Global mind change: The promise of the last years of the twentieth century*. Indianapolis, IN: Knowledge Systems.
- Harstock, N. (1981). Political change: Two perspectives on power. *Building feminist theory: Essays from quest: A feminist quarterly* (3-19). New York: Longman.
- Hastrup, K. (1990). The ethnographic present: A reinvention. *Cultural Anthropology*, 5(1), 45-61.

- Heck, R. H., Larsen, T. J., & Marcoulides, G. A. (1990). Instructional leadership and school achievement: Validation of a causal model. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26, 94-125.
- Henrickson, R. L. (1989). *Leadership and culture*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego, San Diego.
- Hodgkinson, C. (1991). *Educational leadership: The moral art*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Hollander, E. P. (1978a). *Leadership dynamics*. New York: The Free Press.
- Hollander, E. P. (1978b). What is the crisis of leadership? *Humanitas*, 14, 285-96.
- Howey, K. R. (1988). Why teacher leadership? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(1), 28-31.
- Hoy, W. K., & Forsyth, P. B. (1986). *Effective supervision: Theory into practice*. New York: Random House.
- Hughes, G. D. (1990). Managing high-tech product cycles. *Academy of Management Executive*, 4(2), 44-55.
- Hunt, J. G. (1984a). *Leadership and managerial behavior*. Chicago: Science Research Associates.
- Hunt, J. G. (1984b). Organizational leadership: The contingency paradigm and its challenges. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), *Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 113-138). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hunt, S. M. (1984). The role of leadership in the construction of reality. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), *Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 157-178). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hynes, J. L., & Summers, P. F. (1990, November). *The southeastern teacher leadership center: A program for the development of teacher leaders*. Paper presented at the Annual National Conference of the National Council of States on Inservice Education, Orlando, FL.
- Iacocca, L. (1984). *Iacocca: An autobiography*. New York: Bantam.
- Jacob, E. (1988). Clarifying qualitative research: A focus on traditions. *Educational Researcher*, 17(2), 16-23.

- Jacobs, T. O. (1970). *Leadership and exchange in formal organization*. Alexandria, VA: Human Resources Research Organization.
- Jacobson, S. L., & Conway, J. A. (Eds.). (1990). *Educational leadership in an age of reform*. New York: Longman.
- Judson, G. (1992, July 19). Seeking an old-time pastor, finding uncertainty: Filling the pulpit. *New York Times*, pp. 1, 33.
- Karmel, B. (1978). Leadership: A challenge to traditional research methods and assumptions. *Academy of Management Review*, 3, 475-482.
- Keedy, J. L. (1991, March). *A strategy to develop teacher leadership for school restructuring: Teacher collegial groups*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, New Orleans. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 331 130)
- Kellerman, B. (Ed.). (1984). *Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- King, M. I. (1989). Extraordinary leadership in education: Transformational and transactional leadership as predictors of effectiveness, satisfaction, and organizational climate in K-12 and higher education (Doctoral dissertation, University of New Orleans, 1989). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50, 08A.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Krall, F. R. (1988). From the inside out: Personal history as educational research. *Educational Theory*, 38, 467-479.
- Kreisberg, S. (1992). *Transforming power: Domination, empowerment, and education*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Kuhn, O. W. (1991). A new brand of leadership. *Best's Review (Life/Health)*, 92(8), 25-27, 98-99.
- Lane, J. J., & Walberg, H. J. (Eds.). (1987). *Effective school leadership: Policy and process*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- LeCompte, M., Preissle, J., & Tesch, R. (1993). *Ethnographic and qualitative design in educational research* (2nd ed.). San Diego: Academic Press.

- Lehman, E. W. (1969). Toward a macrosociology of power. *American Sociological Review*, 34, 453-465.
- Leithwood, K. A. (1992). The move toward transformational leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 49(5), 8-12.
- Lieberman, A., Saxl, E. R., & Miles, M. B. (1988). Teacher leadership: Ideology and practice. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), *Building a professional culture in schools* (pp. 148-166). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Little, J. W., & Bird, T. (1987). Instructional leadership *close to the classroom* in secondary schools. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), *Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies* (pp. 118-138). Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Lofland, J. (1971). *Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After virtue: A study in moral theory* (2nd ed.). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Marsh, D. D. (1992). Enhancing instructional leadership: Lessons from the California School Leadership Academy. *Education and Urban Society*, 24, 386-409.
- Marshall, C. (1985). Field studies and educational administration and policy: The fit, the challenge, the benefits, and costs. *Urban Education*, 20(1), 61-81.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1989). *Designing qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Matey, D. B. (1991). Significance of transactional and transformational leadership theory on the hospital manager. *Hospital & Health Services Administration*, 36, 600-606.
- McClelland, D. C. (1975). *Power: The inner experience*. New York: Irvington.
- McKinney, J. R., & Garrison, J. W. (1994). Postmodernism and educational leadership: The new and improved panopticon. In S. J. Maxcy (Ed.), *Postmodern school leadership: Meeting the crisis in educational administration* (pp. 71-83). New York: Praeger.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Mertens, S., & Yarger, S. J. (1988). Teaching as a profession: Leadership, empowerment, and involvement. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(1), 32-37.
- Meyer, J. W. (1984). Organizations as ideological systems. In T. J. Sergiovanni and J. B. Corbally (Ed.), *Leadership and organizational culture* (pp. 186-205). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Miller, B. W., Hotes, R. W., & Terry, J. D., Jr. (Eds). (1983). *Leadership in higher education: A handbook for practicing administrators*. London, UK: Greenwood.
- Miller, J. L. (1990). *Creating spaces and finding voices: Teachers collaborating for empowerment*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Miron, L. F., & Elliott, R. J. (1994). Moral leadership in a poststructural era. In S. J. Maxcy (Ed.), *Postmodern school leadership: Meeting the crisis in educational administration* (pp. 133-140). New York: Praeger.
- Mink, L. O. (1987). *Historical understanding*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Mitchell, D. E., & Tucker, S. (1992). Leadership as a way of thinking. *Educational Leadership*, 49(5), 30-35.
- Mumby, D. K. (1988). *Communication and power in organizations: Discourse, ideology, and domination*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Nader, L. (1988). Post-interpretive anthropology. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 61, 149-159.
- Neustadt, R. E. (1960). *Presidential power*. New York: John Wiley.
- Nicoll, D. (1986). Leadership and fellowship: Fresh views on an old subject. In J. A. Adams (Ed.), *Transforming leadership* (pp. 29-38). Alexandria, VA: Miles River Press.
- Nieoff, B. P., Enz, C. A., & Grover, R. A. (1990). The impact of top-management actions on employee attitudes and perceptions. *Group & Organizational Studies*, 15, 337-352.
- North, S. M. (1987). *The making of knowledge in composition: Portrait of an emerging field*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.
- Nyberg, D. (1981). *Power over power*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

- Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best run companies*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Pettigrew, A. (1979). On studying organizational cultures. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 570-81.
- Pfeffer, J. (1992). *Managing with power: Politics and influence in organizations*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1988). *Narrative knowing and the human sciences*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Popkewitz, T. S. (1991). *A political sociology of educational reform: Power/knowledge in teaching, teacher education, and research*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Popper, M., Landau, O., & Gluskinos, U. M. (1992). The Israeli defence forces: An example of transformational leadership. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 13(1), 3-8.
- Raywid, M. A. (1990). Rethinking school governance. In R. F. Elmore & Associates (Eds.), *Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform* (pp. 152-205). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Reitzug, U. C., & Reeves, J. E. (1992). *Miss Lincoln doesn't teach here: A descriptive narrative and conceptual analysis of a principal's symbolic leadership behavior*. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28, 185-219.
- Rizvi, F. (1989). In defence of organizational democracy. In J. Smyth (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on educational leadership* (pp. 205-234). London, UK: Falmer.
- Roberts, W. (1989). *The leadership secrets of Attila the Hun*. New York: Warner.
- Romerdaahl, N. S. (1991, April). *Shared leadership in a professional development center*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Rosenthal, A. M. (1992, July 21). So long suckers. *New York Times*, p. 19.
- Rossner, J. B. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review*, 68(6), 119-125.
- Rost, J. C. (1985, October). *Distinguishing leadership and management: A new consensus*. Paper presented at the Organizational Development National Conference. San Francisco.

- Rost, J. C. (1989). *The nature of leadership in the postindustrial era*. Unpublished manuscript, University of San Diego.
- Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York: Praeger.
- Rost, J. C. (1994, March). *Moving from individual to relationship: A postindustrial paradigm of leadership*. Paper presented at the 1993-94 Distinguished Lecture Series at the University of Nebraska at Omaha.
- Roueche, J. E., Baker, G. G., & Rose, R. R. (1989). *Shared vision*. Washington, DC: The Community College Press.
- Russell, B. (1938). *Power: A new social analysis*. New York: Norton.
- Ryle, G. (1971). *Collected Papers* (Vols. 1-2). New York: Barnes & Noble.
- Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership: A dynamic view*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Seltzer, J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Transformational leadership: Beyond initiation and consideration. *Journal of Management*, 16, 693-703.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1987). Foreword. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), *Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies* (pp. vii-x). Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). Adding value to leadership gets extraordinary results. *Educational Leadership*, 47(8), 23-27.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). Why we should seek substitutes for leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 49(5), 41-45.
- Shannon, P. (Ed.). (1992). *Becoming political: Readings and writings in the politics of literacy education*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Sheive, L. T., & Schoenbelt, M. B. (Eds.). (1987). *Leadership: Examining the elusive*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.
- Shor, I., & Freire, P. (1987). *A pedagogy for liberation: Dialogues on transforming education*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.
- Shore, B. (1988). Interpretation under fire. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 61, 161-176.
- Smircich, L. (1985). Is the concept of culture a paradigm for understanding organizations and ourselves? In P.J. Frost, L.F. Moore, M.R. Louis, C.C.

- Lundberg and J. Martin (Eds.), *Organizational culture* (pp. 55-72). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Smircich, L., & Morgan, G. (1982). Leadership: The management of meaning. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 18(3), 257-273.
- Smith, J. K. (1983). Quantitative versus qualitative research: An attempt to clarify the issue. *Educational Researcher*, 12(3), 6-13.
- Smith, J. R. (1989). Implementing the California English-language arts framework: A strategic plan. *California Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Journal*, 2(2), 5-13.
- Smith, K. K. (1982). Philosophical problems in thinking about change. In P. S. Goodman & Associates (Eds.), *Change in organizations: New perspectives on theory, research, and practice* (pp. 316-374). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smith, P. B., & Peterson, M. F. (1988). *Leadership, organizations, and culture: An event management model*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Smylie, M. A., & Brownlee-Conyers, J. (1992). Teacher leaders and their principals: Exploring the development of new working relationships. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28, 150-184.
- Smylie, M. A., & Denny, J. W. (1990). Teacher leadership: Tensions and ambiguities in organizational perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26, 235-259.
- Smyth, J. (1989). A pedagogical and educative view of leadership. In J. Smyth (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on educational leadership* (pp. 179-204). London, UK: Falmer.
- Spring, J. (1988). *Conflict of interests: The politics of American education*. New York: Longman.
- Starratt, R. (1986). *Excellence in education and quality leadership* (Occasional Paper No. 11). Geelong, Australia: Institute of Educational Administration.
- Stodgill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: The Free Press.
- Sullivan, W. M. (1986). *Reconstructing public policy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Tichy, N., & Devanna, M. A. (1986). *The transformational leader*. New York: Wiley.
- Van Maanen, J. (1988). *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Van Maanen, J., & Barley, R. (1985). Cultural organization: Fragments of a theory. In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.). *Organizational culture* (pp. 31-55). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Vonder, T. S. (1989, July). *Three leadership models: Transactional, transformational, and community-based*. Paper presented at the World Future Society, Sixth General Assembly, Washington, DC.
- Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and decision making*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Waldman, D. A. (1987). Management by example: Developing transformational leaders. *Business*, 37(3), 23-28.
- Watkins, P. (1989). Leadership, power and symbols in educational administration. In J. Smyth (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on educational leadership* (pp. 9-37). London, UK: Falmer.
- Webb, L. D., Greer, J. T., Montello, P. A., & Norton, M. S. (1987). *Personnel administration in education: New issues and new needs in human resource management*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Weiler, K. (1988). *Women teaching for change: Gender, class and power*. Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.
- Whitney, C. R. (1992, July 5). The new era still demands bold strokes of leadership. *New York Times*, p. 3.
- Wrigley, J. (Ed.). (1992). *Education and gender equality*. London, UK: Falmer.
- Young, R. (1990). *A critical theory of education: Habermas and our children's future*. New York: Teachers College Press.

APPENDIX A

Jon Davies
7965 Calle Posada
Carlsbad CA 92009
619/633-1551

Dear Research Participant:

Enclosed is a transcript of the interview we had as part of my doctoral dissertation at the University of San Diego entitled *Stories of Leadership: Intending Real Changes in California's English/Language Arts Curriculum*. As you may recall, I am studying how leadership relationships develop and implement changes. As we discussed prior to our interview, I promised to give you an opportunity to review the transcript and make comments, add, or delete as you saw fit. Please do not feel obligated to comment, if you do not want to. Sign the form and return it and the transcript to me in the self-addressed stamped envelope.

Thanks again for your help!

Sincerely,

Jon Davies

Transcript Response Form

Please respond to the following questions:

1) Is the transcript an accurate depiction of what you recollect we said?

Yes_____ No_____

Comments:

2) Is the transcript an accurate reflection of what you intended to say?

Yes_____ No_____

Comments:

3) Are there statements in the transcript that you do not want included in the dissertation?

Yes_____ No_____

If so, please specify on the transcript itself by bracketing in the margin. Is there another way you would be willing to have those ideas expressed publicly? If so, please express them here:

4) Is there anything else you would like to add?

Please sign and date below in the appropriate category:

I give my permission to use my name in the dissertation:

Signature Date

I prefer that a pseudonym be used in the dissertation:

Signature Date

APPENDIX C

The California Literature Project

Supporting teacher leadership in English language arts
curriculum reform, K-12

Director: Mary A. Barr
Farnum Annex
4275 Cass Street, Room 9
San Diego, CA 92109
(619) 270-8418

CALIFORNIA LITERATURE PROJECT SUMMER INSTITUTES, 1990

Goal of the Institutes: By July 20, 420 teachers of English language arts, K-12, will design for use in their own classrooms and schools a variety of the kinds of instructional and curriculum development strategies and materials necessary to implement a literature-based language arts program which will improve the achievement of the particular students they teach.

Below are listed the instructional themes of each of the four weeks of the Institute together with descriptions of the activities planned for each participant.

WEEK #1: Literature as Experience

1. Defining a problem in implementing a meaning-centered, literature-based curriculum for his or her own students and proposing solution
2. Experiencing meaning-centered, literature-based instruction, using adult collections of prose and poetry
3. Experiencing the impact of visualization, writing and enactment on comprehension

WEEK #2: Using Language to Learn

1. Refining the implementation problem and solution
2. Participating in a core, extended and recreational reading program of instruction to focus on organizational strategies for encouraging wide, sustained reading
3. Using written and oral language to deepen engagement in learning
4. Collaborating with other learners to strengthen the understanding that differences in background experience are not learning deficits but can contribute to the achievement of all students

WEEK #3: Affirming What Is Known

1. Assessing classroom needs for learning in the language arts.
2. Examining a variety of materials and strategies appropriate to the needs of particular students
3. Using technology from literature anthologies and state adopted instructional materials to videos to optical disks to help provide access to the core curriculum by particular students
4. Reviewing assessment techniques--state, district, school and classroom

The California Literature Project is administered by the University of California in concurrence with the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Chancellor of the California State University.

WEEK #4: Exploring Solutions to Implementation Problems

1. Reviewing and revising the problem/solution statement about the implementation of a literature-centered curriculum with the participant's own students
2. Identifying and responding to issues of current concerns
3. Developing an instructional plan to fieldtest in September and October, 1990

CORETEXTS**Literature**

An anthology of poetry
"Cinderella"

Institute leaders, eds.
Versions from many
cultures

Gilgamesh
Their Eyes Were Watching God
The Tempest

Sumerian epic
Zora Neale Hurston
William Shakespeare

Pedagogy

*Basic Principles for the Education
of Language-Minority Students*

SDE*

*Effective Language Arts Programs
for Chapter 1 and Migrant
Education Students*

SDE

*Framework for English-language
Arts, K-12*

SDE

Literature as Exploration
Primary Language Record

Louise Rosenblatt
Inner London Education
Authority

Extended literature texts include *Atariba & Niguayona: A Story of the Taino People of Puerto Rico* by Harriet Rohmer, Jesus Guerrero Rea and Rosalma Zubizarreta; *Blood Wedding* by Garcia Lorca; *Ceremony* by Leslie Silko; *Y No Se Lo Trago La Tierra* by Tomas Rivera (bilingual edition); *Multicultural Literacy* edited by Rick Simonson and Scott Walker; *Thousand Pieces of Gold* by Ruthann McCune; *Recommended Readings in Literature, K-8 and 9-12* by SDE; and *Yonnondido* by Tillie Olsen.

Addendum to K-8 list

SDE

*The Changing Language-Arts Curriculum:
a Booklet for Parents*

SDE

***California State Department of Education**

Institute Directors and phone numbers: at San Diego State: Janis Gabay, 619-270-8414; at Dominguez Hills: Mel Grubb, 213-922-6811; at Northridge: Lloyd Thomas, 213-922-6811; at Hayward: Yette Bradley, 415-881-3042; at Sonoma State: Jayne DeLawter, 707-664-2257; at Sacramento: Richard Adams, 916-278-5876; at Fresno: Carol Hendsch, 209-441-3270

APPENDIX D

The California Literature Project

Supporting teacher leadership in English language arts
curriculum reform, K-12

Director: Mary A. Barr
Farnum Annex
4275 Cass Street, Room 9
San Diego, CA 92109
(619) 270-8418

Position Descriptions, 1990, CLP Institutes**Institute Directors**

1. Contribute to draft of core curriculum for Institute and follow-up
2. Select group leaders
3. Administer program details, e.g. facilities arrangements, materials ordering and distribution, scheduling of speakers, their travel and lodging as necessary
4. Coordinate the Institute activities at each campus
5. Conduct regional leader meetings and co-conduct central seminars
6. Serve as a curriculum resource for group leaders
7. Evaluate the recommendations of the group leaders as to the effectiveness of Institute program
8. Prepare, implement and evaluate individual Institute budgets, consistent with overall project budget

Institute Leaders

1. Contribute to the on going drafts of the regional Institute and follow-up curriculum
2. Provide particular expertise to overall program, e.g., grade level, language development, instructional strategies
3. Support a group of 20-25 teachers in 1990-91 and 1991-92 as they develop literature centered curriculum in their own classrooms and schools
4. Evaluate the developing expertise of the Institute and follow-up participants in reports to the Institute Director
5. Co-plan, co-conduct, and co-evaluate the Institute and follow-up program with the Institute Director and the other Institute leaders

The California Literature Project is administered by the University of California in concurrence with the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Chancellor of the California State University.

APPENDIX E

CLP Academy 1990

Second Annual Academy, The California Literature Project: Supporting teacher leadership in English language arts curriculum reform, K-12

The CLP is administered by the UC in concurrence with the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Chancellor of the Calif. State U.

Los Angeles Airport Hilton Hotel and Towers, February 2-4, 1990

Agenda

Friday, February 2, 1990

4-6:30 Registration	International Ballroom Foyer
5:30-6:30 No Host Social Hour	International Ballroom Foyer
6:30-9:00 Dinner and Program	International Ballroom
Presiding	
Lloyd Thomas, CLP Regional Director, Los Angeles	
<i>Fires on the Water: A Dramatic Anthology of Tlingit Legend</i>	
Naa Kahidi Theater Group, Juneau, Alaska	

Saturday, February 3, 1990

7:00-8:15 Breakfast	International Ballroom
8:30-11:30 General Session 1	International Ballroom
Welcome and Overview of the Academy	
Mary Barr, CLP Director	
Introduction of the Speaker	
Jayne DeLawter, CLP Regional Director, North Coastal Area	
<i>The Pragmatics of a Meaning-based Curriculum</i>	
Patrick Dias, McGill University, Montreal, Canada	
11:35-12:25 Response Group Meeting I	15 response groups
12:30-1:30 Luncheon	International Ballroom
1:40-2:45 General Session II	International Ballroom
Response Panel	
Arlene Mulligan, Moderator, CLP '85, San Diego City USD	
Janet Kenny, CLP '85, Los Alamitos USD	
John Powers, CLP '87, Anaheim UHSD	

Chiyomi Masuda, CLP '86, Albany USD
 Luis G. Martinez, CLP '87, Montebello USD
 Donald J. Bott, CLP '87, Stockton USD

Concluding Remarks: Patrick Dias

2:45-3:00 Break

3:05-5:00 Issues of Concern I

6:00-6:30 No Host Social Hour International Ballroom Foyer

6:30-9:30 Awards Dinner and Speaker International Ballroom
 Mary Barr, Presiding
 Introduction of Speaker
 Mel Grubb, CLP Regional Director, Los Angeles Area
The Year(s) Ahead for Teachers and the Role of the CLP
 Jan Gabay, CLP '85, California 1990 Teacher of the Year,
 San Diego USD

Sunday, February 4, 1990

7:00-8:00 Breakfast International Ballroom

8:10-10:10 Issues of Concern II

10:15-10:30 Break

10:30-11:30 General Session III International Ballroom

Presiding and Introduction of Speaker
 Richard Adams, CLP Regional Director, North Inland Area
As I See the CLP, Susan O'Hanion, writer and teacher-at-large

11:30-12:15 Break and check-out

12:15-1:00 Luncheon International Ballroom

1:10-2:00 Response Group Meeting II 15 Response Groups

2:00-3:00 Issues of Concern: Evaluation International Ballroom
 and Recommendations

Adjourns

Budget for Academy:
 \$209,000 grant from the California Department of Education

Naa Kahidi Theater was established in 1986 by Sealaska Heritage Foundation with support from Sealaska Corporation. With the participation of clan groups, the theatre produces dramatic presentations of traditional Native legends. Naa Kahidi serves the Native community by revitalizing the traditional performing arts while providing rare cultural training and employment for youth and elders alike.

Fires on the Water presents an anthology of three classics of Tlingit legend: *Gunakadeit--The Sea Monster*, *Keet Shagoon--Origins of the Killer Whale*, and *Yeil, Raven Stories*. Each story is told by a single speaker, while the other members of the company enact the story. The performers use masks and robes to portray the characters of the play, changing masks to assume the different roles. The plays incorporate Tlingit song, dance, and language. All of the performers are Alaska native.

Keet Shagoon tells the story of Naatsilanei, who carves a killer whale to seek revenge against his brothers-in-law who had left him to die on a rock at sea. *The Sea Monster* is the story of a young man being blackmailed by his mother-in-law, a shaman. It is a story of love, honor, and treachery. The final story of the evening is *Yeil*, Tlingit for Raven, the wise and witty trickster. *Yeil* tells of several of Raven's misadventures--stories that delight and enlighten.

APPENDIX F

The California Literature Project

Supporting teacher leadership in English language arts
curriculum reform, K-12

Sixth Annual *California Literature Project* Institutes —1990—

***The California Literature Project (CLP) announces its 1990 Institutes
for English language arts teachers, K-12.***

1990 Institutes—Dates and Sites

June 25 - July 20, 1990

- CSU Dominguez Hills
- CSU Northridge
- San Diego State University

June 18 - July 13, 1990

- CSU Fresno
- CSU Hayward
- CSU Sacramento
- Sonoma State University

About the Institutes

The 1990 *California Literature Project* Institutes will continue to stress ways to improve the quality of student achievement in reading, writing and oral language. The Institutes will focus on the use of "language to learn" as both teachers and their students read poetry, drama, novels, and essays. An intensive study of a broad range of cross-cultural literature will enable teachers to first experience and then design a literature-based language arts curriculum for all students they teach in their classrooms.

During four weeks of intensive study at one of seven California State University Institute sites, participants will:

- Experience successful teaching strategies recommended in the *English Language Arts Framework* and its support documents;
- Read and discuss literary works as well as professional articles and books important to the teacher as an adult and as a professional language arts teacher;
- Design curriculum plans for field testing—beginning in the fall of 1990;
- Correlate classroom assessment with new state and district testing procedures;
- Learn how to stimulate ongoing intellectual growth of teachers through a variety of leadership activities.

The regional follow-up Institute support activities—held for six days during each of the subsequent two academic years—will give participants the opportunity to field test their instructional plans supported by teacher leaders and to refine, adapt, and integrate their Institute experiences as they join a network of other teachers striving to improve teaching and learning in the language arts curricula.

California Literature Project 1990 Institutes—Information and Registration Packet

California Literature Project 1990 Institutes—Information and Registration Packet

All students should experience a literature-based language arts curriculum. *Thus teachers representing the full spectrum of language arts programs and age-grade levels—whether regular or special education, Advanced Placement, ESL, primary language teachers, compensatory education, or other types of programs—are encouraged to attend the 1990 Institutes.* Participants will receive intensive professional preparation necessary for introducing the powerful curricular content of a literature-based language arts curriculum directly into their classrooms while also learning how to share this knowledge with others.

District Benefits and Commitments

By sponsoring teachers to participate in the CLP Institutes and the two year regional follow-up support activities, districts will gain a cadre of teachers of language arts who can provide strong curriculum leadership. These teachers will be able to:

- Provide classroom demonstrations of a literature-based curriculum that will ensure academic success for all students, including those with special needs;
- Provide on-site or district level workshops and coaching for other teachers;
- Keep their expertise current by joining a statewide network of teachers who share information and materials.

Approximately one-half of the costs of Institute tuition and participation in subsequent regional follow-up activities will be borne by the CLP. The remaining one-half is borne by the participant's school or district. Funds should be allocated for each teacher selected by a school or district to attend a CLP Institute and to take part in the regional follow-up activities.

Participant costs include the following:

- Institute tuition and regional follow-up fee @ \$ 650 for 19 days in June-July, 1990; six days in 1990-91 school year; and six days in 1991-92 school year;
- Transportation and residence fee for non-commuter(s). Residence arrangements are available on or near each CSU site. *Notification regarding housing accommodation costs will be sent to applicants who request housing information on their "registration form"—page 4;*
- Twelve days of released time—plus transportation and lodging costs, if needed—for participation in regional follow-up activities cited above: six days during the 1990-91 school year, and six days during the 1991-92 school year.

Signatures on the "signature form"—page 5—by the district superintendent or the school principal—whichever is appropriate—provide formal endorsement of the participation of the attendee and acknowledge a district obligation for the stipulated commitments, as described above.

Participant Selection Criteria

The *California Literature Project* Institutes are for teachers, resource teachers, librarians, and administrators who work in the development of language arts instructional services—at school, district, and county levels—and who are identified as leaders committed to a literature-based curriculum for all students, K-12. *Participants representing the full spectrum of language arts programs and age-grade levels are encouraged to attend.* Teachers in categorical programs for students with special needs are especially invited.

California Literature Project 1990 Institutes—Information and Registration Packet

Participant Commitments

California Literature Project Institute participants should anticipate an intensive four-week experience in the study of literature and the development of instructional methods for translating their experiences into a meaningful literature-based English language arts curriculum for the students they teach now and in the future. Specific participant commitments are:

- Attendance at a four-week Institute at one of seven designated CSU campuses, 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. daily, Monday through Friday—excluding July 4th. (Campuses are CSU, Dominguez Hills; CSU, Fresno; CSU, Hayward; CSU, Northridge; CSU, Sacramento; San Diego State University; and Sonoma State University;
- Participation in regional follow-up activities: six days during the 1990-91 school year, and six days during the 1991-92 school year.

University Credit

Optional: Up to six units of university extension credit will be available to participants at their own tuition expense.

Registration Information

All California schools, K-12, have received 1990 CLP Institute information/registration materials. Each school/district/county office is encouraged to select participants to attend an Institute according to the needs of the student population to be served. See eligibility criteria above.

Registration Deadline and Payment of Fees:

The deadline for 1990 Institute registration is March 31, 1990. Checks or purchase orders should be made out in the amount of \$650—payable to the *California Literature Project*—and forwarded directly to the appropriate regional director together with the completed “*registration form*” and “*signature form*” which appear on pages four and five of this packet.

Campus Housing

Information regarding deadlines for the completion of campus housing arrangements—including payment of fees—will be sent directly from each campus to registrants requesting housing information on their “*registration form*”—page four of this packet.

Additional Information

The California Literature Project is administered by the University of California in concurrence with the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Chancellor of the California State University. Requests for additional information about the California Literature Project and/or its Institutes should be directed to the regional director whose name appears at the bottom of page four or to:

Mary Barr, Executive Director
California Literature Project
 (619) 270-8418

Questions regarding eligibility and funding should be directed to school, district, or State Department of Education administrators of funding sources—e.g., School Improvement Program, Migrant Education, EIA-LEP and other kinds of compensatory or categorical programs.

The California Literature Project Summer Institute, 1990

Week 1: June 25-29

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
<u>Materials:</u> 3-ring notebook	<u>Materials:</u> <u>Gilgamesh</u> Props, etc. for poetry groups	<u>Materials:</u> <u>Gilgamesh</u> & homework	<u>Materials:</u> <u>Their Eyes Were Watching God</u>	<u>Materials:</u> <u>Their Eyes...</u> Book info. for 1-min. review
Morning: HEPNER HALL ROOM 221	Morning: HOME GROUPS	Morning: HOME GROUPS	Morning: Elem: HH 221 Sec: HH210	Morning: HOME GROUPS
8:30 Coffee 9:00-10:15 Intros, Background on CLP, Into Lit. 10:15-10:45 SDSU Business Dr. Paul Strand 10:45: Break 11:00-12:00 Home Groups: Interviews	9:00 Metacog- nitive reflection 9:15 Poetry presentations 10:15 Break 10:30 Large Group: Poetry presentations 11:30 Problem- Solution	9:00-12:00 <u>Gilgamesh</u> activities TBA: Break	9:00-12:00 Solveig Fischer Jon Smidt, Guest speakers from Norway TBA: Break	9:00-11:30 <u>Their Eyes Were Watching God</u> - Activities 11:30-12:00 Oral lang. in the class TBA: Break
12:00 Lunch	12:00 Lunch	12:00 Lunch	12:00 Lunch	12:00 Lunch
AFTERNOON SESSION				
HOME GROUPS	HOME GROUPS	HOME GROUPS	1:00-2:00 Elem: HH 221 Sec: HH 210 2:00-3:00 HOME GROUPS	HOME GROUPS
1:00-2:30 <u>Gilgamesh</u> 2:30-3:00 Poetry Anth.	1:00-3:00 <u>Gilgamesh</u>	1:00-2:30 <u>Gilgamesh</u> 2:30-3:00 <u>Their Eyes Were Watching God</u>	1:00-2:00 Fischer & Smidt 2:00-3:00 <u>Their Eyes...</u>	1:00-1:30 Weekly Synthesis 1:30-3:00 Extended Readings
<u>HOMEWORK:</u> Read to p. 50 in <u>Gilgamesh</u> ; prepare for poetry presen- tation	<u>HOMEWORK:</u> "Report Card" on <u>Gilgamesh</u>	<u>HOMEWORK:</u> Read Ch. 1-5, <u>Their Eyes Were Watching God</u> Find quote to share. Read Walker article.	<u>HOMEWORK:</u> Finish <u>Their Eyes Were Watching God</u> Think about 1-min. book rpt.	<u>HOMEWORK:</u> Read extended fiction text.
EXTENDED DAY 3:00-5:30				

San Diego State University

The California Literature Project Summer Institute, 1990

Week 2, July 2-July 6

HOLIDAY: WED., JULY 4th: Have a safe, fun holiday!!

MONDAY	TUESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
<u>Materials:</u> Notebooks	<u>Materials:</u> <i>The Tempest</i> Dialectical journal	<u>Materials:</u> <i>The Tempest</i>	<u>Materials:</u> Pedagogical articles Extended literature texts <u>Lang. Arts Framework</u>
Morning: HOME GROUPS	Morning: HOME GROUPS	Morning: HOME GROUPS	Morning: ELEM: HH 210 SEC: HH 221
9:00-11:00 <i>The Tempest</i> activities & writing 11:00—Move to large group, HH 221 <i>The Tempest</i> , Act I, Scene i. Different interpretations 11:30 Reflections	9:00-10:00 <i>The Tempest</i> 10:00 Expert Groups meet as follows: Act I—HH 222 Act II—HH 221 Act III—HH 212 Act IV—HH 210 Act V—LS 246 Options in working with Shakespeare's text	9:00 Prospero & pedagogy & you 10:30: "American Tongues"	9:00 Assessing my own practice in my own school <u>Framework</u>
12:00 LUNCH	12:00 LUNCH	12:00 LUNCH	12:00 LUNCH
AFTERNOON SESSION			
HOME GROUPS	LARGE GROUP, HH 221	GRADE-ALIKE GROUPS K-2—LS 246 3-5—LS 281 6-8—HH 210 9-12—HH 222	BOOK-ALIKE GROUPS (Locations TBA)
1:00 <i>The Tempest</i> , I - V 3:00 Video Part I (49 min.) "The Tempest"	1:00 Expert groups present 2:30 Metacognition	1:00 Recreational Reading: sharing what works; sharing books of personal enrichment or pleasure 2:00 Research Articles (pedagogy)	1:00 Professional Book Clubs (PBC's) Extended reading 2:30 Relating core to extended works 2:45 Weekly synthesis
<u>HOMEWORK:</u> Dialectical journal; Bumper sticker	<u>HOMEWORK:</u> Thinking: "Prospero as pedagogue."	<u>HOMEWORK:</u> Read add'l articles Prep: Book-alike talks	<u>HOMEWORK:</u> Rosenblatt, Ch. 2

San Diego State University

The California Literature Project Summer Institute '90

WEEK 3: JULY 9 - 13

MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
<u>Materials:</u> <i>Literature as Exploration</i>	<u>Materials:</u> Articles packets	<u>EXTENDED DAY</u> <u>Materials:</u> Notebook, etc.	<u>Materials:</u> <i>Primary Language Record</i>	<u>Materials:</u> Article packets
Morning: HEPNER HALL ROOM 221	Morning: HEPNER HALL ROOM 221	Morning: ELEM: HH 210 SEC: HH 221	Morning: HEPNER HALL ROOM 221	Morning: HOME GROUPS
8:30 Coffee 9:00-10:30 <i>The Stonecutter</i> 10:30 Move to HOME GROUPS after BREAK 10:45 Rosenblatt <i>Lit as Exploration</i>	9:00 GUEST: LYDIA BARTALOME "Strategies to enhance multicul- tural education" TBA: BREAK 11:30 Tying ideas of Bartalome to Rosenblatt	9:00 "Thinking About My Own Classroom..." 10:00 BREAK 10:15 <i>Framework</i>	9:00-12:00 MYRA BARRS from Great Britain: <i>"The Primary Lang. Record"</i> TBA: Break	9:00 Self- assessment 10:00 BREAK 10:30- CDE Documents 11:30 Problem- Solution #4
12:00 LUNCH	12:00 LUNCH	12:00 LUNCH	12:00 LUNCH	12:00 LUNCH
AFTERNOON SESSION				
HOME GROUPS 1:00 Problem- Solution 1:15 Packets: pedagogical articles	HOME GROUPS 1:00 "Selecting texts" 2:00 Share extended reading w/Home Group 2:45 Synthesis	HOME GROUPS 1:00 <i>Primary Language Record & Video</i> 2:00 Prob-Sol # 3 3:00 Reception: Outside Little <i>Theatre</i> 4:00-5:30 Debbie Salzer, Young Playwrights Project	WHOLE GROUP HH 221 1:00 Myra Barrs, con't. 2:00 Move to HOME GROUPS Discussion & Metacog.	GRADE-ALIKE GROUPS 1:00 Prof Reading 2:00 Parents' Role in Literacy
<u>HOMEWORK:</u> Read "Group Work, Inter- language Talk, & Second Lang. Acquisition	<u>HOMEWORK:</u> Winograd & Paris article--read	<u>HOMEWORK:</u> Review <i>PLR & Framework</i> 3x5 cards: Questions	<u>HOMEWORK:</u> Prepare brief presentation on professional readings of personal value	<u>HOMEWORK:</u> Look for core works- "Books I'd like to teach"

San Diego State University

The California Literature Project Summer Institute, 1990

Week 4: July 16 - 20**EXPLORING SOLUTIONS (subject to adjustment)**

MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
Materials: Core texts	Materials: Draft: Problem-Solution Paper	Extended Day Materials: Notebook, etc.	Materials: Notebook, etc.	Materials: Materials for skits
MORNING: Whole Group, HH221	MORNING: Grade-alike Groups	MORNING: Whole Group, HH 221	MORNING: Grade-alike Groups	MORNING: West Commons
8:30 Coffee	9:00 Conversion Lessons; Curr. Action Plans; Institute Follow-up	9:00 Censorship TBA: Guest Dr. Armin Schulz	9:00- Currlic. Action Plans "Speculation..."	8:00 Break-fast
9:00 CAP				9:00 Evaluation
10:00 Portfolios				9:30 Skits by Home Group
11:00 Grade-alike Groups Problem-solution				11:30 Awards Ceremony
12:00 LUNCH	12:00 Lunch	12:00 Lunch	12:00 Lunch	
AFTERNOON SESSION				
Grade-alike Groups	Workshop Room	Home Groups	Grade-alike Groups	
1:00 "The Thought Fox"	1:00 Workshops Choices	1:00 Resources Displays: Books Software "Speculation About Effects" Issue Groups	1:00 Sharing Action Plans	
2:00 Sharing & Idea Exchange: "Books I'd Like To Teach"	Planning sessions		1:30 Whole Group, HH 221 Guest: Helen Mugambi, "Female African-American Writers"	
HOMEWORK: Draft Problem-Solution Paper	HOMEWORK: Curriculum Plans	HOMEWORK: Curriculum Plans 3:00 Reception 4:00-5:30 Cliff Trafzer, "American Indian Stories & the Social Studies Framework"	HOMEWORK: Prep for Friday presentations	

San Diego State University

The California Literature Project

Supporting teacher leadership in English language arts
curriculum reform, K-12

Director: Mary A. Barr
Farnum Annex
4275 Cass Street, Room 9
San Diego, CA 92109
(619) 270-8418

CALIFORNIA LITERATURE PROJECT SPEAKERS, SDSU 1990

Wednesday, June 27 4:00 - 5:30. Hepner Hall 221.

MARTHA JOHNSON, SDSU Professor, Academic Skills Center
"Assignment Ideas that Wed Thought to Feeling and Encourage
Creativity." (Reception beforehand from 3:00 - 4:00 in Hepner
Quad).

Thursday, June 28 9:00 - 12:00, 1:00 - 2:00. Hepner Hall 221,
Hepner Hall 210.

JON SMIDT "Dramatic Approaches to Understanding Literature,
or Creating Significance!" (secondary)
SOLVEIG FISCHER "Early Literacy Development." (elementary)
(Both Smidt and Fischer are visiting speakers from Norway)

Tuesday, July 10 9:00 - 11:00. Hepner Hall 221.

LYDIA BARATLOME, SDSU Professor, School of Education
BARBARA FLORES (tentative), CSU San Bernadino Professor
Both speakers will address "Strategies to enhance
multicultural education, K-12."

Wednesday, July 11 4:00 - 5:30. Hepner Hall 221.

Guest speaker TBD. (Reception beforehand from 3:00 - 4:00 in
Hepner Quad)

Thursday, July 12 9:00 - 12:00, 1:00 - 2:00.

MYRA BARRS - Great Britain, ILEA/Center for Language
"Using the Primary Language Record."

Wednesday, July 18 4:00 - 5:30. Hepner Hall 221.

CLIFF TRAFZER, SDSU Director, American Indian Studies
"Indian Literature for Integration with the Social Studies
Framework." (Reception beforehand from 3:00 - 4:00 in Hepner
Quad)

Thursday, July 19 1:30 - 3:00. Hepner Hall 221

DR. HELEN MUGAMBI, University of California Professor
"Afro-American and African Female Writers and the African Oral
Tradition."

The California Literature Project is administered by the University of California in concurrence with the
Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Chancellor of the California State University.

The California Literature Project

Supporting teacher leadership in English language arts
curriculum reform, K-12

Director: Mary A. Barr
Farnum Annex
4275 Cass Street, Room 9
San Diego, CA 92109
(619) 270-8418

July 24, 1990

TO: 1990 Participants, CLP Summer Institute
San Diego State University

FROM: Jan Gabay, CLP Institute/Regional Director

SUBJECT: Follow-up meetings; change in Regional Director

Warm summer greetings to each of you as vacation finally becomes a reality for most of you! Thank you for your contribution to the success of the CLP Summer Institute, San Diego State University.

I want to confirm some of the information you received at the Institute about follow-up meetings. Six follow-up days per year, 1990-91 and 1991-92, for a period of two years is the commitment you and your districts made when you decided to participate in the Institute. Your Teacher Leaders have set the following dates:

- #1 - Wednesday, October 10, 1990
- #2 - Wednesday, December 5, 1990
- #3 - Wednesday, January 30, 1991
- #4 - Saturday, March 9, 1991
- #5 - Wednesday, April 10, 1991
- #6 - Saturday, May 18, 1991

Two of the follow-up dates are on Saturdays as a courtesy to the many districts that have a shortage of substitutes. Your Teacher Leader will make adjustments to the above schedule as necessary--this is something you will need to contact your Teacher Leader about if you have concerns. We are working to have some uniformity in the meetings to allow participants more options in terms of where they might want to attend their follow-up meetings, but adjustments may be made as necessary. Below are the addresses for the SDSU Teacher Leaders; school information is based on data as of this date, 7/24/90:

Kathy Guilfoyle
H: 5274 Belardo Drive
San Diego, CA 92124
(619) 292-0954

W: Castle Park H.S.
13905 Hilltop Dr.
Chula Vista, CA 92011
(619) 691-5600

Judy Inskip
H: 2375 White Wing Dr.
Jamul, CA 92035
(619) 589-0636

Oak Grove Middle School
14545 Lyons Valley
Jamul, CA 92035
(619) 669-0591

Clarisa Rojas
H: 1389 Caliente Loop
Chula Vista, CA 92010
(619) 421-6828

Lincoln Acres
2200 Lanoitan Ave.
National City, CA 92050
(619) 267-3040

The California Literature Project is administered by the University of California in concurrence with the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Chancellor of the California State University.

James Saunders

H: 12421 Birch
Yucaipa, CA 92399
(714) 797-8721

Pinacay Middle School
1990 South 'A' Street
Perris, CA 92399
(714) 943-6441

James Sieg

H: 454 Palmer Place
Laguna Beach, CA 92651
(714) 494-5332

In transition....

Penny Turk

1760 Key Lane
El Cajon, CA 92021
(619) 440-0707

Greenfield JHS
1495 Greenfield Dr.
El Cajon, CA 92021
(619) 588-3103

If you wish to attend follow-up meetings closer to your home, please contact one of the following directors:

**Dr. Richard Adams
Sacramento State Univ.**

Dept. of English
6000 'J' Street
Sacramento, Ca 95819
(916) 287-5876

Secretary:

Carol Williams
(916) 278-6524

**Dr. Yelive Bradley Dr.
CSU Hayward**

School of Education
Art and Education Bldg.
Hayward, CA 94952
(415) 881-3042

Secretary:

Sheryl Terrell
(415) 881-3678

**Jayne DeLawter
Sonoma State Univ.**

School of Education
Rohnert Park, CA 94928
(707) 664-2257

Secretary:

Abbe Barker
(707) 664-2257

**Dr. Mel Grubb
CSU Dominguez Hills**

c/o Los Angeles County
Office of Education
9300 E. Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242
(213) 922-6811

Secretary:

(213) 922-6811

**Carol Hendsch
CSU Fresno**

c/o Roosevelt High School
Fresno, CA 93702
(209) 443-4818

Secretary:

Gloria Mitchell
(209) 443-4818

**Dr. Lloyd Thomas
CSU Northridge**

c/o Los Angeles County
Office of Education
9300 E. Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242
(213) 922-6811

Secretary:

(213) 922-6811

As I have mentioned to you already, I will be leaving my position for a year as Regional Director for this southernmost area--Imperial, Orange, and San Diego counties--effective July 31, 1990. Mrs. Janet "Jan" Kenny is taking over as Interim Director; her office will open August 15th (after she returns from vacation). You may contact her at:

Jan Kenny, Interim Regional Director

Los Alamitos High
3591 Cerritos Avenue
Los Alamitos, Ca 90720
Work: (213) 430-3511
Home: (213) 374-3366

As I prepare to leave my "official" responsibilities with the CLP, it is with much gratitude that I depart. Thank you for your enthusiasm, cooperation, energy, input (of all types!), and professionalism as we worked our way through the four weeks of the Institute. Be assured that your comments on the evaluations are taken very seriously and as appropriate, suggestions for changes or adaptations will be made in next year's program to benefit future CLP Institute participants throughout California. Again, I thank you for the opportunity to work with you. I will carry the inspiration I got from all of you as I journey about proclaiming that we teachers must be heard for we do indeed make a difference!!