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Abstract

Professional development school partnerships can improve teaching and learning in our schools. To support these partnerships, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) developed standards for professional development schools. In this article, we address the questions, “What NCATE standards work from the point of view of school principals and university faculty members when sustaining PDS partnerships?” and “How can universities improve PDS implementations so that all partners see the benefit of each NCATE standard?” Although, there is wide agreement between school leaders and university faculty on the importance of the standards, there are also some notable differences in their functionality.

There is no doubt that a “fully functioning” professional development school (PDS) partnership can improve teaching and learning in our schools (Darling-Hammond, 2005; The Holmes Partnership, 2006; Levine, 2006; Tetiel, 2004; Van Scoy & Eldridge, 2012). These improvements manifest themselves in a variety of ways including, improved student achievement, powerful professional development opportunities for classroom teachers, and unique opportunities for undergraduate teacher candidates to learn their craft in a nurturing environment (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005; NCATE, 2006). School principals, district leaders, and university professors have opportunities to create meaningful partnerships that enhance both the school district and the university. However, building and sustaining quality professional development schools can be a challenge. Turnover in district and school-based leadership, changing areas of focus by universities or state policymakers, and limited financial and human resources can all place stress on a partnership. Having clear partnership expectations and lines of communication between the professional development school and the collaborating university are key to sustaining a meaningful partnership (Doolittle, Sudeck & Rattigan, 2008).

The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has developed standards for professional development schools (Table 1) that have been broadly accepted in the educational community (NCATE, 2001a). These standards are important in several ways. First and foremost, the standards address the essential characteristics (critical attributes) of a PDS (Brindley, Field, & Lessen, 2008). Second, the standards have been instrumental in bringing about a general consensus within the profession regarding the definition of a professional development school. Third, the standards are designed to accommodate the developmental nature of PDS partnerships and include guidelines meant to support PDS development and implementation across various levels. Finally, the standards provide a common framework across partnerships for investigating PDS outcomes, assessing PDS quality, and promoting continued partnership development through self-study (NCATE, 2001b).
Table 1
NCATE PDS Standards and Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1: Learning Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Support Multiple Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work and Practice are Inquiry-Based and Focused on Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop a Common Shared Vision of Teaching and Learning Grounded in Research and Practitioner Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Serve as Instrument of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Extended Learning Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 2: Accountability and Quality Assurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop Professional Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assure Public Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Set PDS Participation Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop Assessments, Collect Information, and Use Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Engage with the PDS Context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 3: Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Engage in Joint Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Design Role and Structures to Enhance Collaboration and Develop Parity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Systematically Recognize and Celebrate Joint Work and Contribution of Each Partner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 4: Diversity and Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ensure Equitable Opportunities to Learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evaluate Policies and Practices to Support Equitable Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recruit and Support Diverse Participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 5: Structures, Resources, and Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Establish Governance and Support Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ensure Progress towards Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Create PDS Roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Use Effective Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research on professional development schools has grown steadily since the mid-1990s (Neapolitan & Berkeley, 2006). Studies involving the NCATE PDS standards have been a part of this research. Teitel’s (2004) review of PDS research included studies that conducted interviews of principals, teachers, and other key participants in relation to the PDS standards. Specifically, Teitel’s work was a review of research documenting and assessing the impact of PDSs on students and educators. Some of the research cited examined PDS participants (preservice teachers, cooperating teachers, principals) views of self-efficacy, empowerment, beliefs, and perceptions of the PDS impacts on their school and students. Other studies used the PDS standards as a way to determine the extent to which a PDS partnership meets the definition of a PDS.

More recently, Field (2008) interviewed PDS principals to determine how they utilize research-based leadership practices that align with PDS Standard. Her findings illustrate how PDS principals actualize leadership practices (aligned with the PDS standards) and what the school district and
university could do to strengthen the partnership. Recommendations include a need for well-defined systems to support the PDS and the need to provide professional development for PDS principals as they facilitate the partnership.

Previous studies have either focused on PDS participant perceptions of their role in relation to the PDS standards, or they have been used for program assessment. It appears, however, that there has been little investigation into the perspectives of PDS principals and university faculty as to the functionality (or importance) of the PDS standards for sustaining a PDS. In this article, we describe a study that examines PDS principals and university faculty perspectives on the functionality of the PDS standards and provide recommendations for further study in this area. Specifically, the following research questions guided the study:

1. How are the NCATE standards perceived by school principals working in professional development schools?
2. Which standards are valued by school principals?
3. Which standards, if any, are viewed as superfluous or burdensome by principals?
4. What do principals believe contribute to successful PDS partnerships?
5. Do university partners agree with school principals on the value of the standards? If not, how do their perspectives differ?

Method

A qualitative research methodology with open coding procedures was used to identify a common set of themes that describe perspectives toward the NCATE PDS standards (Corbin & Strauss, 2007). This study targeted seven school principals, all of whom were veteran leaders in their schools. While the principals all came from one large school district (64,000 students), their partnerships were with five different colleges and universities. These partnerships included two large state universities, two small private liberal arts universities, and one large state college. Six of the seven participants in the study were elementary school principals, and one was a middle school principal. While the schools represented various geographic regions of the county, they were all Title I schools.

Data collection from school principals consisted of a series of structured phone interviews conducted individually with each of the seven respondents. The NCATE PDS Standards and Elements (see Table 1) were provided to each participant in advance, along with a generic description of the purpose of the interview. The interview questions were not provided in advance in an effort to facilitate an open-ended discussion with the participants (see Table 2). Notes from the interviews were analyzed, and emergent themes and patterns were identified.

The study also included four university faculty participants who have worked in professional development schools for more than 18 years. The four participants have more than 80 years of combined experience in PDS environments. Although all participants teach at the same small private liberal arts university, they have worked at multiple PDS sites (several schools in the same district as the principal respondents). The university perspective was gathered through focus group discussions where participants responded to the importance of the standards in their PDS work. University participants also shared how their experiences related to each standard. As with the principal
responses, university faculty responses were analyzed, and themes were noted (emerging themes identified from the principal interviews were available to the university focus group).

The following four themes emerged over the course of the interviews and focus group discussions (discussed further in the findings sections): 1) Relevance and immediacy of PDS activities, 2) collaboration and partnership between school and university, 3) planned data-driven PDS activities, and 4) aligned professional development opportunities for teachers.

Table 2
Interview Questions for PDS Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS FOR PRINCIPALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 1:</strong> Why did you apply to become a PDS school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Describe school population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How long have you been a PDS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 2:</strong> Describe the strengths and weaknesses of your PDS partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. From your perspective as a principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. From your perception of how your faculty feels about the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. From your perception of how your university partners feel about the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3:</strong> How helpful is your university partner in meeting your school goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What additional assistance do you need from your university?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is there anything they should focus less on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 4:</strong> What are the biggest faculty challenges you face with your PDS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Buy-in?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collaboration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 5:</strong> What are the PDS components and activities that ultimately make a successful partnership?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. With teachers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. With university partners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 6:</strong> NCATE PDS standard 1 is Learning Community. How important is that standard to the success of your PDS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 7:</strong> NCATE PDS standard 2 is Accountability and Quality Assurance. How important is that standard to the success of your PDS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 8:</strong> NCATE PDS standard 3 is Collaboration. How important is that standard to the success of your PDS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 9:</strong> NCATE PDS standard 4 is Diversity and Equity. How important is that standard to the success of your PDS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 10:</strong> NCATE PDS standard 5 is Structures, Resources, and Roles. How important is that standard to the success of your PDS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 11:</strong> Looking at all 5 PDS standards, how would you rank them in order of importance from most important to least important?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Would your faculty feel the same way?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings

Findings from Principal Interviews

While all five NCATE standards are important and understood by principals in this study, not all standards are deemed to have equal significance in the eyes of the school leaders. Based on the interviews, principals repeatedly and consistently identified “collaboration” and “data driven” activities as the most important contributors to a successful PDS experience.

Standard 1, the formation of a learning community, Standard 2, the development of accountability and quality assurance (particularly in the areas of collecting data and using that data in a meaningful way), and Standard 3, collaboration, were clearly evident in the interview responses as the “must have” components for a PDS to last. Principals want to see their PDS focus directly on where their student achievement data needs improvement. Further, principals reported that they want to see their PDS assist in the development of professional development activities that align with what their data are showing. As one principal commented, “If teachers don’t feel that the professional development they are receiving from the PDS experience is relevant to their academic situation and is helping them help their students do better, they will quickly disengage from the process.” When asked why his PDS failed, another principal reported that “a lack of focus on meaningful academic goals that made sense to the teachers’ current conditions killed our partnership.”

Principal participants consistently reported that teachers need to see why PDS partnerships are important to them and their students. Responses indicated that principals felt their teachers were overwhelmed with state and district mandates and needed to see an immediate connection between the time they spend on PDS activities and the relationship of those activities to their daily work as teachers. Responses also showed that principals need to know that the time teachers are spending in PDS meetings and activities are aligned with the demands of the district and their particular academic areas of focus. This need for relevance and immediacy was clearly evident in all responses.

PDS principals identified collaboration, communication, and true “two-way” partnerships as critical to the success of their PDS. One principal who just moved from a PDS environment with one university to a new school with a new PDS partner reported that her last partnership was stagnant due to a lack of collaboration. “My teachers were turned off and felt disrespected by what they perceived as a top down approach from the college partners. I could never get faculty buy-in once that attitude took hold.”

Of equal importance to PDS sustainability from the perspective of school principals is the alignment of professional development with student academic achievement and the teaching framework in use by the district. Principals identified their role in helping teachers understand the pedagogy behind the teacher evaluation system as a powerful component of any successful PDS. Moreover, principals felt their PDS experiences were positive and important when the university created opportunities for developing instructional strategies that both support the instructional framework of the district and build upon the data driven strengths and weaknesses of the students.

Findings from University Discussions

Based on the university focus group discussions, a basic framework for what constitutes a healthy and successful PDS environment emerged. While there was a great deal of overlap and agreement between the university respondents and the principals, there were also significant differences regarding the value of the NCATE standards and what it takes to form an effective PDS partnership.
The focus group discussions revealed an immediate agreement that a natural alignment should exist between the standards that principals find as powerful and necessary for the success of a PDS and the standards that university partners typically identify as their main areas of focus. Focus group participants agreed that the standards identified by principal respondents are essential for PDS sustainability. University partners recognized that the NCATE standards are important because they represent the essential attributes of a PDS and are designed to support PDS development and implementation and assess PDS quality. This same level of recognition was not as evident in the responses from the PDS principals.

University focus group participants identified Standard 1, learning community, as the heart of a PDS. This standard requires a commitment among all participants to support multiple learners through practice grounded in a shared vision of teaching and learning guided by inquiry focused on learning (Teitel, 2003). University partners agreed that the time invested in nurturing a learning-centered community pays off in educational dividends through initiatives that target identified student learning needs, provide meaningful faculty development, and support quality teacher candidate preparation. The structured phone interviews with PDS principals revealed this same commitment to Standard 1 (learning community) as a key requisite for PDS sustainability. While Standard 2 (particularly the element of “develop professional accountability”) was seen as key for PDS success by principals, the principals were silent on the other elements of this particular standard. For example, none of the 7 principals focused on public accountability. The university focus group, however, took a broader view of Standard 2 and its importance in PDS overall quality.

The focus group respondents agreed with the focus on student academic outcomes but felt that this was just one, albeit important, dimension of the standard. In addition to ensuring that the learning-centered outcomes established in Standard 1 are achieved, Standard 2 also provides for public accountability at the local, state, and national level. University focus group members were more interested in Standard 2’s capacity for PDSs to leverage change in policies and practices at all levels.

Focus group members agreed with principals that Standard 3, collaboration, helps participants engage in joint work to improve outcomes for students, preservice teachers, faculty, and other stakeholders. Focus group members felt the standard of collaboration also ensures that there is parity in the decision-making process of a PDS. This standard is strongly connected to the other NCATE standards and is considered foundational to Standard 1, learning community (Teitel, 2003). Again, school principals agreed that collaboration is an essential component to effective partnerships.

A brief overview of the focus group participants’ experiences informs their views on the relative importance of the NCATE PDS standards. Their experience with professional development schools began in 1993. Supported by a grant, the university faculty worked with a local elementary school as their first PDS pilot. Since preservice teachers were placed in the elementary school for field experiences and the school itself was in close proximity to the university, administrators from the university decided that this school would be selected. Although the partnership, as described in the grant proposal was approved by the district and school principal, the PDS partnership experienced challenges from the beginning. These challenges were primarily due to a lack of quality implementation of Standards 1 (learning community), 3 (collaboration), and 5 (structures, resources, and roles). It is interesting to note that the focused interviews with school principals identified Standards 1 and 3 as priority standards. School leaders, however, did not view Standard 5 as a high-priority standard. In fact, principals routinely placed Standard 5 at the bottom of their list of standards.
that have a significant impact on the overall success of their PDS. Yet, it was the opinion of the university focus group that failure to implement Standard 5 with fidelity doomed their first PDS pilot.

According to focus group participants, the issue that sparked the biggest challenge for the newly established PDS began when the school’s principal identified a select group of teachers to participate in the planning and act as the “PDS Team.” It was the university’s goal that this planning team would be representative of the entire school, however, not all teachers were directly involved in the planning of the PDS. Consequently, animosity developed among the rest of the school’s faculty. The team in charge of the PDS became known as the principal’s “dream team.” Further, efforts by the university faculty to become involved in the school as a whole were received with resistance. University focus group members later realized that the faculty on the “dream team” did not share with their grade-level teams the ideas discussed at the planning meetings, nor did they ask for their input. Consequently, the other teachers at the PDS site did not have a stake or ownership in the PDS partnership. In the discussions, university faculty highlighted that although this was not a successful first PDS attempt, they learned an important lesson regarding teacher buy-in, open communication, and establishing a governance structure. Standard 5 mattered. Without the structures, resources, and roles for the PDS firmly established as a foundation for success, the ability to form a true collaborative partnership failed.

As a result of lessons learned, the university participants described a second PDS partnership that began with a deliberate and systematic focus on Standard 5 as a prerequisite for success. An inclusive and open selection process between the university and school district was step one for the partnership, something that did not happen the first time. A school’s expressed interest in becoming a PDS partner initiated an application process. At that time, university faculty made a presentation to school faculty that outlined the roles and responsibilities of all parties, including the district, school-based personnel, and university personnel. Focus group members repeatedly emphasized that having all responsibilities explicitly discussed and understood was important to the success of any PDS. They mentioned that outlining the individual responsibilities makes it easier for stakeholders to commit to the partnership agreement and be personally responsible for their individual and collective roles. University faculty learned from the second PDS experience the importance of a governing structure to the overall effectiveness of a partnership (Standard 5). While none of the 7 practicing PDS principals recognized Standard 5 as particularly necessary, the university partners saw this standard as the structure from which the work of the PDS is identified and monitored, roles and responsibilities delineated, resources secured, and outcomes assessed (Heins, Tichenor & MacIsaac, 2002).

As school principals highlighted in their interview responses, they are concerned with Standard 2, accountability and quality assurance, particularly as it relates to collecting and using data in meaningful ways. Standard 2’s focus on using data is an area that university faculty and school principals have in common. This is evident by one of the PDS projects initiated by a school principal who (based on various assessment data) saw the need to address the learning gap of African American boys in her school. The discussion group participants described how the PDS partnership fully supported the school’s goal to better reach this student population by beginning a single-gender program, the first in the district. Both groups of respondents felt the PDS must be data-driven and must use data as a rationale to plan, support, and measure the success of any PDS initiative. Both groups were in agreement that the planning of study groups, workshops, and other professional development activities should emphasize how to enhance K–12 student learning.
While the principal perspectives for Standard 2 focus exclusively on accountability and quality assurance, the university focus group also saw the importance of other elements described in Standard 2, such as assuring public accountability and engaging with the PDS context. The university participants agreed that annual school board presentations highlighting major initiatives (as well as data from the projects) should be a joint undertaking between university faculty and school-leaders. Moreover, school-based personnel should participate in conference presentations with university faculty, thus sharing the work of the PDS with a wider audience. Although not a must for school-based faculty, the university focus group felt participating at professional conferences and publishing scholarly work was a must for university partners. Highlighting PDS initiatives through these types of activities is highly beneficial to university faculty for promotion and tenure decisions. Principals did not emphasize these elements in Standard 2 and did not see them as important parts of a successful PDS.

Another NCATE standard that showed a discrepancy in perceived value between school principals and university faculty was Standard 4, diversity and equity. In the structured phone interviews with principals, this standard was never rated as a “top three” standard. When questioned about the apparent lack of significance with this standard, principals routinely focused on the issue of diversity within their faculty population, as opposed to their student population. There was an underlying assumption that all students benefit from quality PDS experiences, but the need for diversity or even equity among PDS faculty participants was not seen as important to the principals. One principal respondent replied that she was more interested in making sure the “right” faculty were involved in PDS activities and training than having a diverse or democratically arrived-at group of teacher participants. When questioned as to whom the “right” faculty were, the response was the faculty who she felt would benefit the most from quality PDS professional development.

The university focus group felt that, like Standard 5, Standard 4, diversity and equity, directly connected to Standard 2, accountability and quality assurance, by ensuring equitable opportunities to learn. University faculty agreed that PDS initiatives should naturally focus on diverse populations that typically have not fared well in our schools. They believe that through PDS partnerships, many diverse issues can be addressed, including gender equity, poverty, second language learners, and exceptional student education.

Another interesting point made by university faculty was that they felt the PDS standards serve as practical guidelines when working with individual school partnerships or multiple school partnerships. They pointed out that for a network of professional development schools to be effective, the partnership must work to increase collaboration and support among area schools and the university. University faculty discussed how school personnel in a PDS network of multiple schools must have opportunities to interact with other school-based educators, while continually focusing on measureable outcomes. They agreed that the network governance structure, major PDS initiatives, and ongoing projects should address the unique interests and needs of the individual schools, school district, and university. However, PDS activities should also be developed and implemented within the framework of all five standards.

**Implications for Future Study**

An examination of the findings of the structured interviews and focus group discussions points to several areas of alignment and of concern regarding the functionality and understanding of the PDS...
NCATE standards. Potential areas for further study include how to build into the PDS framework and governance structure guidelines that support communication, participant involvement, systematic planning, and flexibility among all stakeholders. Other research questions may include the following:

How can partnerships assure that professional development schools create a collaborative relationship with the aim of achieving the educational goals of both the school and the university? Is the quality implementation of all five standards an important prerequisite for district administrators, school-based personnel, and university faculty to feel that they are a valued part of the partnership? Finally, since the goals, needs, and resources continually change for both the school site and the university, do the standards provide the flexibility to meet the needs of principals reporting significant stress and lack of time to achieve their goals?

Conclusion: Do the Standards Matter?

Yes, the NCATE standards do matter when sustaining professional development school partnerships. While the structures, resources, and roles for effective PDSs (Standard 5) and the responsibility for PDSs to address equity and diversity (Standard 4) are clearly important prerequisites for overall PDS quality, school leaders do not view them as the variables that make or break a PDS relationship. We see this disconnect between school and university partners regarding the need for a focus on Standard 5 in both the feedback from principals of PDS schools and in the actions of the pilot school administration in the initial design of the roles and structures for their PDS (as described in the university focus group findings). However, the findings do not indicate that principals see no need for establishing the governance structure of the PDS (they did recognize the necessity for establishing roles and structures for the work). What the principals did not recognize, however, was the foundational importance of how those roles and structures were established and maintained. School principals assumed that once there was a focus on Standard 1 (learning community), Standard 2 (accountability and quality assurance), and Standard 3 (collaboration), it did not matter how Standards 4 and 5 were built or maintained.

All partners must be willing to recognize the purpose and necessity of each of the standards for long-term program viability, while demonstrating flexibility to meet the needs of the school. To ensure sustainability, it is important to build partnerships that are part of both university and school cultures. When partnerships are built on a foundation of collaboration and professional development activities aligned with the needs of the schools, a meaningful and sustainable professional development school partnership will certainly occur. We can confidently say that school principals and university faculty would agree.
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Abstract
Within the realm of K–12 education, instability is an inherent feature that school leaders must successfully manage. Turbulence, in the form of micro-level issues (day-to-day, in-house happenings) and macro-level concerns (externally imposed organizational disturbances/changes), develops indiscriminately and may escalate quickly without adequate warning. Therefore, it is necessary to understand the means by which a school leader can moderate the school atmosphere. This paper reveals the decisions, devices, and behaviors of one school principal who worked to minimize the effects of turbulent conditions in the senior high school setting. The findings illuminate particular leadership tools and actions that may be of assistance to school leaders who seek to better stabilize their schools.

Introduction
Turbulence is an inherent feature of the public school and is something that school leaders must successfully manage. As Gross (1998) explained, there are many sources of turbulence that may arise, including a disjointed community, isolation, issue overload, tension-filled conditions, loss of support, communication problems, rapid changes, value-conflicts, and external pressures.

According to Gross’s (2006) turbulence theory, the concept of positionality is important, since where a person stands in relation to the turbulence will determine how he or she experiences it. This is because turbulence “is not usually spread around the school and community in a uniform way” (Gross, 2006, p. 56), and the school principal’s position lends to a preoccupation with many of the conflicts that develop within the organization. Unfortunately, such conflicts may cluster at any given time, and these combined forces or events may become formidable, as they create a cascading effect that escalates the level of turbulence that the school faces (Gross, 2006; Shapiro & Gross, 2013). For the school leader, the cascading effect is something that is often very real and may require a high capacity for management, decision-making, and action. Furthermore, the school leader must consider when to deliberately heighten the level of turbulence within the organization, for the purpose of gaining positive results in pursuing particular goals (Shapiro & Gross, 2013).

Along with the school principal’s role and expertise in handling turbulence, the school’s stability will determine whether it can withstand heightened levels of turbulence. The school’s stability level depends on past and present circumstances, members’ confidence in the inherent worthiness of the organization, and the school’s ability to be flexible while turning turbulent experiences into opportunities (Gross & Shapiro, 2013).

Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this study was to examine the workings of a school principal who sought to manage turbulence within the senior high school environment. The study explores the lived experiences of the...
leader, subordinates, and stakeholders who were involved with the school organization. The focus is on gaining an understanding of the school principal’s intentions, and then examining his actual leadership decisions and behaviors, as experienced by school stakeholders.

Specifically, this study seeks to reveal whether the school principal was able to successfully lead the school organization during times of heightened turbulence, and to determine what allowed or disallowed him to do so. The perceptions of administrators, teachers, staff, parents, community members, and recent graduates were utilized to gather an understanding of the principal’s leadership behavior. This process was set to generate an understanding of how leader competencies and organizational behavior relate to the management of turbulence within the school environment.

A Primer on Turbulence within the School Organization

Putnam (1991) revealed that, “within any environment, there are areas of calm, agitation, opportunity, and danger – as well as areas of unknown risks. Because of these coexisting but conflicting elements, all environments are turbulent” (pp. 1–2). As an aggregate of uninhibited forces arise, the degree of instability increases (Putnam, 1991). However, with the right decisions, skills, and actions, a school can appropriately harness turbulence within the organizational environment (Gross, 2006; Putnam, 1991; Shapiro & Gross, 2013).

Intertwined with turbulence is the concept of change, which is fundamental to school leadership in the 21st century. According to Fullan (2009), school principals have the difficult task of managing two different worlds:

The old world is still around, with expectations that the principal will run a smooth school and to be responsive to all; simultaneously, the new world rains down on schools with disconnected demands, expecting that at the end of the day the school constantly should be showing better test results and ideally becoming a learning organization. (p. 57)

With this “double world” comes the paradox effect, which, as Jaffee (2001) discusses, “stems from the multiple consequences of a single action which seem to contradict or work at cross-purposes with another” (p. 34). Even with the best of intentions, the actions of a school principal within such a world create a natural tension, as both positive and negative organizational effects occur (Jaffee, 2001).

More than two decades ago, Morgan (1988) accurately predicted the 21st century management world, which consists of tension, ambiguity, and paradox, and proposed that managers must cope with chaotic, ambiguous situations through creative actions and solutions. Morgan also explained the necessity for managers to understand that complexity is innate to the leadership game:

Many managers may want simplicity, but the reality is that they have to deal with complexity. The complexity of organizational life is increasing rather than decreasing, as manifested in the conflicting demands posed by multiple stakeholders, the need for managers to deal with many things at once, and the almost continuous state of transition in which organizations exist. (p. 12)

Quite possibly, the school organization stands as the most appropriate venue for Morgan’s thinking. This is due to the multiplicity of issues and concerns that need to be addressed within the educational domain (Beck, 1994; Blankstein, 2004; Gross, 1998; Sernak, 1998; Shapiro & Gross, 2013).
Fullan (2009) outlines various forces of turbulence, fragmentation, and change that mark today’s typical educational institution, including a lack of coherence in mission; disconnections within the school curriculum; incomplete and/or insufficient teaching modalities; student alienation and strained relationships; an anti-intellectual peer culture; and a lack of student support and attention due to large, overcrowded schools (p. 42).

While high levels of turbulence are very real within today’s K–12 school system, Sergiovanni (2005) argues that, with the right mix of values, systems, structures, and actions, school leaders hold the capacity to successfully defend against the obstacles they face as they work to improve their respective schools. From this perspective, various authors have offered their views on how to best manage the forces of turbulence, change, and paradox within school organizations (Fullan, 2010; Kochanek, 2005; MacGilchrist, Myers, & Reed, 2004; O’Donoghue & Clarke, 2010; Schlechty, 2005). In fact, various conceptual ingredients have been offered for managing, leading, and improving school organizations in turbulent times. Included in the mix are such terms as networked organizations, distributed leadership, professional learning communities, ethical decision-making practices, operational intelligence, collective capacities, teacher leadership, and systemic vision (Fullan, 2009; Gabriel, 2005; Kochanek, 2005; Lambert, 2003; Lunenburg & Irby, 2006; MacGilchrist, Myers, & Reed, 2004; O’Donoghue & Clarke, 2010; Strike, 2007). While some of these focus on the decisions and actions of the school leader, others center on more global organizational behavior.

In light of the modalities school leaders currently have available to them during turbulent times, there is an urgent call to microscopically study the actualities of school leadership practice in today’s schools. This is due to the sociopolitical conditions that have made turbulence and change very real to the educational arena in the 21st century. To better understand the attributes, proficiencies, and limitations of school leadership practice, it is necessary to analyze the activity that plays out in K–12 public school settings. By doing so, scholars and practitioners can better understand what is being done to combat the turbulent forces currently disrupting the educational process. In turn, school leaders, scholars, and practitioners can learn lessons in educational leadership through real-world scenarios.

Methodology

This study focuses on the phenomenon of school leadership during turbulent times, as experienced by school stakeholders. For this purpose, qualitative case study methodology was employed. The intent was to collect rich, meaningful descriptions of leadership behavior and to determine how such behavior impacted the school environment. To meet this end, the perceptions of various stakeholder groups were gathered, including those of school administrators, teachers, parents, community members, and recent graduates. This effort resulted in a clear description of the turbulent forces and associated decisions and actions of the school principal, which illuminated particular leadership tendencies during times of instability.

Sample

This study employed single site case study methodology to allow for in-depth analysis of the problem area. The site selection process involved critical assessment procedures that ensured a suitable location in terms of the voluntary involvement of the school principal and each school stakeholder group. The chosen site was a southeastern Pennsylvania senior high school that consisted of
approximately 2,000 students. The site was semirural, with multiple areas of land preservation, storefronts, and neighborhood developments (City-Data, 2012; ePodunk, 2007).

Data Collection
Data collection procedures for this study occurred over a 5-month period. Data collection began with an in-depth initial interview with the school principal to acquire a description of his leadership intentions. From there, the leader’s actual behaviors were examined through researcher observation, document analysis, a series of follow-up interviews that investigated specific decisions and behaviors, and an exit interview. Additionally, school stakeholder perceptions of the principal and the school organization were gathered through a semistructured interview format. For this purpose, a total of 30 administrators, faculty members, parents, community members, and recent high school graduates were selected for participation. The researcher utilized interview protocols to focus on gathering rich descriptions about the school leader’s tendencies and behaviors and asked each respondent to provide details and clarification about past happenings and current events.

Triangulation of data occurred through onsite researcher observations and document analysis efforts centered on gathering an understanding of the school principal’s communicative and behavioral tendencies during episodes of instability. A discovery-oriented approach remained constant throughout the data collection process as the researcher conducted participant interviews, onsite observations, and document analyses.

Data Analysis
Throughout the 5-month data collection phase of the study, the initial stage of data analysis occurred as the researcher, transcribed interviews, listened to the audio versions of each interview, wrote notes that revealed apparent connections, read and reflected upon the field notes, analyzed thoughts and observations, engaged in preliminary thematic construction, and compared the data and apparent themes to related research literature.

At the conclusion of the 20-week onsite investigation, and after verifying the interview data with each participant, the researcher advanced the process by developing categories and themes. Both aspects of the cross-case analysis approach were employed: 1) grouping different people’s answers to common questions, and 2) analyzing different perspectives on key issues (Patton, 1990). Additionally, Auerbach and Silverstein’s (2003) method was utilized through the following steps: 1) reading through the raw text and extracting the relevant passages of each interview, 2) grouping repeating ideas and organizing preliminary themes, 3) revamping and finalizing the thematic construction process, by making sure each relevant data element could be properly filtered into a theme, and 4) creating a theoretical narrative by retelling the participants’ stories.

Methods of Verification
Several measures were implemented that supported and bolstered the internal validity of the study. These included: 1) the solicitation of feedback, 2) triangulation, 3) the collection of rich data, 4) prolonged engagement and persistent observation, 5) member checks, 6) the maintenance of a case study database, 7) a search for discrepant evidence and negative cases, and 8) comparison. Each of these strategies has been mentioned as a specific tactic to allow the qualitative researcher to increase the credibility of conclusions (Creswell, 1998; Maxwell, 1996; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 1990; Yin, 2003).
The extended timeframe reserved for data collection strengthened the verification process, by allowing for considerations of what might be pertinent to the study and offering a variety of activities and events to explore. Additionally, this period allowed for a proper review of participant responses and a clarification process that involved the study’s interviewees. Also, considerable dialogue with the school principal took place, which led to a deep exploration of organizational expressions, activities, procedures, and events.

**Results**

This study’s findings suggest the school principal under investigation was, in many ways, able to manage and lead successfully during times of heightened organizational instability. Furthermore, due to the magnitude and systemic nature of the school principal’s behavior, the results of this study offer a particular framework of school leadership during turbulent times. In the following sections, the school principal’s leadership intentions and actions will be revealed and tied to pertinent literary findings that relate to effective leadership behavior.

**Discussion of Findings**

With more than a decade of school leadership experience, this study’s school principal possessed a historical record of successfully handling difficult situations. Severe turbulence, in the form of a deadly meningitis case, a teacher’s strike, a bomb threat, and a small bomb explosion in the school served as a record of disturbing activity that he had to manage. Admittedly, the school principal’s ability to handle more current episodes of turbulence stemmed from his prior experiences, which he was able to overcome not only due to his personal aptitudes but also because of the aptitudes of those around him at the time. Within this context, the findings reveal specific features of the school principal’s crisis management abilities. In particular, the findings exposed three distinct strategies and a number of aptitudes, concepts and principles that allowed him to establish a reputation for being able to handle turbulent conditions appropriately. Figure 1 presents each of the intentions, behaviors, concepts, and principles that were associated with this study’s school leader.

In relating emotion to the school principal’s behavior in times of organizational turbulence, it may be most fitting to begin with the reframing process that occurred, as he was confronted with unstable circumstances. In his own words, the school principal framed turbulence as “an opportunity to gain credibility and to gain leadership potential.” Furthermore, he believed:

...if you don’t take risks, if you don’t create turbulence, you aren’t doing anything, you aren’t moving forward...So, I feel comfortable that if there isn’t some angst, then we wouldn’t be getting at the core in making things better for kids, and if we aren’t taking risks, we’ll never get better...And, I’m able to coach people through that, also. So, that makes me feel somewhat comfortable.

The school principal’s line of thinking was aligned closely with Morgan’s (1988) and Gross’ (1998, 2006) assertions that flux is not only inherent to organizational life, but also provides an opportunity for the leader to propel the organization forward. Since the school principal positively framed turbulent school happenings, considered what could be gleaned from specific situations, and aptly intervened when necessary, he was able to systematically stabilize the school. Gross and Shapiro (2013) discussed such
activities and explained that when organizations operate from the standpoint of “learning systems,” they can turn a “turbulent experience into an opportunity to reflect and actually profit, thereby further enhancing their resilience and stability” (p. 48). The installment of an appraisal process, which is natural to the formation of emotion (Damasio, 2003), was highly significant for the school principal. The mere understanding that turbulence was essential to his leadership prepared him to respond appropriately and confidently. As he stated,

Every time that there is something negative going on, there is an opportunity to gain more traction and more leverage by showing that you work through it, and perhaps reversing an original decision. So, from my perspective, as far as my ability to lead, it’s all going to be a win.

The rational and emotional judgments he made about various circumstances, such as opening a new school building, dealing with a teacher strike, controlling a deadly meningitis case, changing the honors class system, recovering from a small bomb explosion, handling bomb threats, changing the
school mascot, and providing corrective feedback to teachers allowed him to set the stage for response. For the school principal, these were not problems, but rather, opportunities to establish or re-establish a leadership standard within the school. Lazarus (1991) framed this pattern of thinking as a cognitive-coping mechanism, and this stream of consciousness kept the school leader’s stress levels in-check, which allowed him to respond with maximum cognitive capacity. Additionally, in this realm, the principal brought forth the tenets of affect control theory since he felt comfort with his ability to handle difficulties and was acting in a way that reflected his own identity as school leader at a time of instability (Heise, 1988; Kemper, 2000). Furthermore, in framing situations in this manner, the premise behind social cognitive theory was at work, as the school principal became an agent for proactive engagement, self-reflection, self-regulation, and self-organization—and in this way, began to intentionally make things happen through his actions (Bandura, 2001; Cassady & Boseck, 2008). As he explained,

I think I can see the big picture and see how things will play out down the road. I’m close to right on with those kinds of things. I get what makes people tick. I get the politics…I get where my position is, where my boundaries are, and I know where I am pressing them, and choose carefully when to do so. I think I understand that positive energy makes positive things happen. Negative energy is just wasted energy. So, what’s the point? That’s why I do those things behind closed doors.

As explained by the school principal, the reframing process was bolstered through strategic emotional management activities that allowed him to direct and express emotion in ways that did not interfere with or harm the level of functioning within the school. Here, he entered Epstein’s (1998) realm of constructive thinking as he was able to focus on the job at hand, carry out plans, and appropriately deal with negative feelings. The fact that he had a responsible, trustworthy administrative team was critical in his ability to communicate emotion while discussing issues poignantly and developing plans of action. As he discussed, “I’m just confident in myself in those situations. I’m confident in myself because of the people who are around me. I know I can’t do it myself…I rely upon my administrative team incredibly.” The closed-door forum served as a venue for venting and discussion, which enacted a team approach and made use of available talents. In this setting, his intrapersonal and interpersonal skill sets gained relevance, as he utilized his emotional and social competence abilities. The school’s faculty understood these skills, as one teacher explained:

Each one of them [assistant principals] has been a real good helper for [him] and have brought different strengths to the table and they’ve learned from each other, so it’s been interesting to watch them, to watch him to share the power with them…and not think that he knows everything.

Another teacher commented on the school principal’s abilities in moments of crisis:

He’s able to leverage his assistant principals in a variety of different ways that are effective at dealing with all kinds of issues. But, his initial reaction is usually one of thinking quickly and engaging the right people to deal with the issue. He’s not reactionary… He’s usually pretty quick to think about what the issue is, what has risen, how serious it is and who can best respond to those
issues... So, he’s very good at recognizing who he has available to him that could respond well to things and engaging them in the process.

One of the assistant principals explained the process of team leadership that the school principal invoked:

There are a lot of really smart people on our administrative team that all have special strengths and what [the principal] does, instead of taking ownership, for one thing he delegates and taps the strengths of each of his administrators. I think that [he] is able to delegate and look at what he has and tap those resources, empower those people, make those people powerful and ultimately that funnels right back to him. And, it’s really a great way to lead and it makes people feel a part of the team. That’s ultimately what this is, it’s a big team and he’s the head of the team, he’s the captain of the team, and I think he is able to disburse power or disburse power ultimately to get us to where we need to be.

As Weare (2004) revealed, human beings possess the ability to organize, modulate, moderate, shape, and think about their feelings through reflection and learning. The findings suggest that the school principal was masterful in both organizing and moderating his emotions in a way that allowed him to communicate clearly when necessary and also engage in a type of emotional theater that allowed him to put forth an unflappable social demeanor. When communicating during times of crisis, he was able to contain his emotions while offering distinct messages through assertive speech and mannerisms. In this way, he displayed a commanding demeanor that provided clear direction for the school’s stakeholders. One former student commented on his high school principal’s ability:

He definitely gives you a sense of confidence that he knows what he’s doing. He’s very composed... I think he’s just very good at answering questions and being in the spotlight, taking the heat. He doesn’t seem nervous. He doesn’t really allow for the opportunity for someone to come in and shake him up and get him off balance and then throw more attacks or more questions at him. He’s very focused.

One of the assistant principals described the principal’s leadership style under turbulent conditions:

Its steady, its calm...when there’s a crisis situation that comes up or a situation that needs to be brainstormed and all those resources are brought to bear, lets come together, lets clear our minds and understand what’s our responsibility and what’s not our responsibility...he is able to narrow the focus very quickly on that. [He] is very strategic when he uses anger and emotion in a situation, and he will. I can’t remember when I’ve seen him actually use it when I would say he is out of control in a situation, or losing his ability to see the big picture on something. [He] will only use emotion or use anger for effect.

A teacher commented on the “professional presence” the principal exuded during difficult times:
I just think that he’s the ultimate professional...even in spite of something terrible that might have happened, that might be upsetting to him, he doesn’t let that come through. I mean, he may let that come through in a private setting but the face that he shows to the staff is one that says I’m calm about this. I’m in control and everything will be fine. I’m going to take care of it.

One teacher discussed the principal’s ability to listen, and then communicate his decisions in a very clear, straightforward manner:

He does value our opinion, our perspective as classroom teachers. And then, he makes a decision. He doesn’t waffle much. When people go to him, it’s a no-win position [for him]. No matter what decision he makes, there’s always going to be some stakeholder that’s upset... But, he’s firm and he’ll make a decision and he collects all the information, listens to everyone’s point of view, makes a well-reasoned decision and then lives with it and feels comfortable with it and doesn’t kind of waiver back and forth and try to kowtow to people that are being negative.

The conduct of the school principal coincides with Topping, Bremner, and Holmes’s (2000) idea that “socially competent people are able to select and control which behaviors to emit and which to suppress in any given context, to achieve any given objective set by themselves or prescribed by others” (p. 33). Overall, in a multitude of ways, the school principal demonstrated a certain acuity in his emotional and social engagements under the lens of organizational volatility. Thus, his behavior reflected many of the tenets of the social and emotional intelligences offered in recent literature, including stress tolerance, reflective self-regulation, flexibility, problem-solving, mood management, self-awareness, concern, conflict management, social cognition, and interpersonal expertise (Albrecht, 2006; Bar-On, 2007; Bradberry & Greaves, 2009; Ciarrochi & Godsell, 2005; Cooper & Sawaf, 1997; Goleman, 2006; Higgs & Dulewicz, 1999; Hughes, Patterson, & Terrell, 2005; Kang, Day, & Meara, 2005; Ortony, Revelle, & Zinbarg, 2007; Weisinger, 1998; Zirkel, 2000).

The school principal’s acuity went beyond the social and emotional realms, as his planning, knowledge, and decision-making abilities surfaced both before and during turbulent events. Such aptitudes emerged in the form of the systems processes and crisis principles that he worked to install, which allowed him to advance his influence during unstable times. One administrator commented on the established organizational norms, which stemmed from the principles and systems in place:

What [the principal] does very well in meetings is that he establishes norms of belief. Here’s what we believe in the organization, and here’s what we do not believe, and how do we act off of that, even though there might be multiple ways of approaching it. So, it’s modeling and reinforcing... So, if we wouldn’t continue to hear those types of things and bounce those ideas around, then we would go back to a vacuum of decision-making...that’s where I think those kinds of meetings and discussions are so important.

Another administrator explained how proactive engagement reduced the level of turbulence and tension felt in the school:
I continue to appreciate how he uses his calendar as an organizational method, in terms of setting meetings ahead, setting agendas for those meetings, allowing open agendas for administrators to contribute to this calendar, and then with weekly meetings and in daily meetings there is both the understanding and culture of this. And, there is just not reacting to the issue of the moment, but we are going to think well enough ahead, we are going to discuss what we are reading and we’re going to be able to map out where we want to go with elements. He’s smart, he anticipates, he self admits that’s through experience, having done this for nine years, but it’s also just anticipating what the next issue might be and creating and setting up people to be successful no matter what’s coming around the corner.

One administrator discussed how the principal’s “cerebral acuity” and “charismatic authority” flashed during tension-filled meetings:

Anytime he conducts a meeting he is always prepared and engaging, always. We’ve dealt with a lot of legal issues in this office with hot topic items. Suspensions, expulsions. He has been in several situations that are so heated with attorneys, big time attorneys, and he is able to take those people and turn them upside down. And, he does it with a smile on his face because he’s prepared and he is well thought out and as smart as all those attorneys are, he comes ready for a fight without ever lifting his hands. And, when he speaks, it’s of knowledge, of fact, consistently. He knows the handbook. He knows school law and he’s been in a number of those situations where people are coming in screaming and yelling at him. He never raises his voice. He states his position, states where it’s going and is able to get them to leave understanding where he’s coming from. He is sympathetic but not apologetic. But, it’s amazing how those hot meetings just get diffused like that. He never gets upset about them. He just listens and when you have a leader that that’s the way he handles it, you’re just sitting right behind him and giddy-up.

In relating this school scenario to systems thinking, Gharajedaghi’s (1999) five essential dimensions of a system become apparent: 1) the generation and distribution of services, 2) the generation and dissemination of information, knowledge, and understanding, 3) the creation and dissemination of beauty, or the emotional aspect of being, including the meaningfulness and excitement of what is done in and of itself, 4) the formation and institutionalization of values for the purpose of regulating and maintaining interpersonal relationships through cooperation, coalition, competition, and conflict, and 5) the development and duplication of power, which involves legitimacy, authority, and responsibility (p. 56). The findings suggest that the school principal allocated a significant amount of time in holding administrative team meetings focused on these five dimensions, wherein each team member became accustomed to the values and language that eventually became inherent to the school’s culture. As the team grew closer, due to shared organizational understandings, team members were left to handle lower level turbulent issues on their own. Furthermore, the team worked to communicate performance or production concerns to faculty; share information and understandings with others in the organization; generate positive emotion by recognizing people and celebrating organizational achievements; and institutionalize the established, communicated values of the organization. It was this team-centered approach that led to common causes and understandings, which allowed effective action to take place during instances of organizational turbulence. In short, high production,
transparency, emotional stimulation, shared values, and duplications of power marked the school, due to the principal’s willingness to work diligently in installing systems operations in all phases of the administrative team’s work. The expansion of this effort could be seen in the principal’s willingness to gradually grant control to other members of the workforce once he believed a satisfactory understanding of how he wanted the school to operate had taken hold. One administrator explained how the transformation in leadership and school culture took place under the principal’s direction:

[His leadership] has changed from stability to direction...And I think that’s where and why we have seen such phenomenal growth across the board. He’s allowed people to see and share in the vision, to [get the staff] into thinking that our ideas are their ideas and they buy into those ideas. They support us in those things...The only way you do that is by relinquishing control, which I have seen him do on a regular basis, sharing the vision and the leadership and then supporting from all angles.

Another administrator discussed the organizational norms established and explained how this allowed a proactive atmosphere to take hold:

...any secondary or high school administrator is so often on their heels, in a reactive mode. To be proactive, you got to get out, you got to establish those norms, you got to have the language consistent from faculty meeting to cabinet meeting to staff development session, and then you got to echo that kind of language through formal and informal walk through observations, and otherwise. And then when individuals or teams of teachers are doing it well, then you hit it big with full-scale emails or faculty meeting celebrations of here is what we’re doing and you come back to that same language. But, that’s proactive, that’s knowing your language, it’s knowing where you want to go with an organization. And, [the principal] does that very, very well.

Finally, the school principal utilized particular crisis principles, when necessary, to handle turbulent conditions. These included being hands on, following school policy, focusing on the facts of the situation at hand, considering the school’s values and the best interests of the students, providing clear direction, being transparent, and being tactful with those involved. One former student commented on his observations of the principal during a bomb explosion in the school:

That afternoon, I saw him with the security officers, like they were in the television studio putting footage together trying to figure out ways to get everything together into one package, not like he was freaked out about this, like he didn’t know how to handle it, but he seemed that in a situation like this when some kid makes something explode in the cafeteria in the school, he knows how to handle it and he doesn’t lose control of what he knows has to happen. I could see that. Everything was very calm and collected. Everything was like, there’s this step, this step, this step. “This is what I need done. This is what I need on this. We need to take care of it this way.” And, he’s just very in control and never displays weakness in those kinds of times.

A teacher revealed his take on why the principal has a track record of success in such situations:
I think what he does is, he plans what he’s going to do and he gets a game plan by talking to the other principals. He’s very methodical in the way he plans things. He always has a protocol...he’s very proactive in figuring out what needs to be done. I think that reduces someone’s anxiety. So, he’s a planner...and he brings people in on the decision-making process.

Another teacher thought back to her original encounter with the principal as she explained his leadership capabilities:

He met with every one of the faculty members when he came in, for fifteen minutes, every single one of us. Talked to us, put a name to a face, got blown up, whatever. He took it all in stride and just said, “Okay, this is where I’m at. Here’s what I need to do.” And, he’s never made a comment about it negatively. He’s just said, “Thank you. I hope we can always talk this way. Moving forward, let’s do this.” That’s big.

Overall, the school leader’s principle-centered characteristics suggest a blend of cerebral acuity, systems operations, and a particular ethical awareness. As Shapiro and Stefkovich (2011) discuss, the ethics of justice, critique, and care, when combined with the ethic of the profession, serve as complementary forces that assist the school leader’s ability to make appropriate decisions. In this process, serving the “best interests of the student” becomes the “moral imperative” (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2011, p. 25). According to one assistant principal, these ethical underpinnings were a big part of the school principal’s identity:

It’s amazing to sit through a meeting with him...he’s consistent, he’s fair, he follows what he believes to be the right thing for the school and for students. And, he never takes shortcuts and doesn’t bend in those situations. And, that’s important, that consistency and that integrity keeps him where he is.

From the perspective of the principal, his application of ethical school leadership went one step beyond:

I think that probably the thing that I’ve done the most is, I never hang them [faculty and staff] out to dry. I always have their back. If someone were to make a mistake, I would take responsibility for it and people would really believe that it was me. I’m able to cover that. I would take the hit for that and they know that. I think they know I’ll make the difficult call and I’ll sit with them in the difficult meeting and that’s happened over the years.

As the generated outcomes and stakeholder accounts suggest, the principal demonstrated a certain moral acuity, in which he was able to use key operational and ethical principles that aided the school during episodes of turbulence.

In linking this study’s data to leadership theory, the school principal’s behavior was closely aligned with various formulations of virtuous leadership conduct. Sergiovanni (1999) explains authentic leadership in terms of leaders who “anchor their practice in ideas, values, and commitments, exhibit distinctive qualities of style and substance, and can be trusted to be morally diligent in advancing the
enterprises they lead” (p. 17). Brown and Trevino (2006) discuss how transformational leaders apply ethical behavior in terms of 1) caring for others; 2) acting with integrity by aligning their behavior with moral principles; 3) considering the ethical consequences of their decisions; and 4) being ethical role models for others. Higgs and Dulewicz (1999) highlight the commonalities between transformational leadership and emotional intelligence, stressing that interpersonal sensitivity, self-awareness, influence, conscientiousness, intuitiveness, and motivation are inherent features of both emotional intelligence and successful leadership practice. Choi (2006) proposes that “charismatic leaders” are those who apply three components: 1) envisioning, which allows a picture of a desired future state to develop and causes excitement and organizational identification; 2) empathy, which allows the leader to understand others’ motives, values, emotions and perspectives; and 3) empowerment, which is a process that leads to enhanced perceptions of self-efficacy among followers, as negative conditions are removed through both formal organizational practices and informal techniques. As evidenced by this study’s stakeholder accounts and researcher observations, adept application of such leadership behavior holds the potential to bolster a school organization, when threatened by turbulent conditions.

Conclusion

Across the various leadership domains, including the emotional, social, cognitive, and moral, the school principal investigated for this study demonstrated a particular acuity for leadership practice, especially during times of heightened organizational instability. His aptitudes in such areas as communication, teamwork, emotional competence, strategy formulation, ethical reasoning, and rational decision-making not only allowed him to handle turbulence but also led to high levels of stakeholder trust for the school leader.

Taken together, the aptitudes and conduct of the school principal promote the idea that a particular leadership acuity that transverses the rational, emotional, social, technical, and moral domains is necessary to constrain turbulence while creating a resonant, trustful, and highly functioning organizational state. Therefore, the results of this study call for additional inquiry across the various realms of leadership conduct and promote the idea that school leadership preparation must invoke considerations from the ethical, emotional, social, spiritual, and technical perspectives. By gleaning knowledge and developing proficiencies across this spectrum, a rich tapestry can arise that illuminates the best practice of leadership while accounting for the upper potentials of human functioning and organizational conduct.
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