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ABSTRACT

This thesis describes and analyses the principals' perception of leadership in the process of transforming the school culture as reflected by their experience in introducing a new government initiative “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” in Israel's secondary schools.

Since the study's aim was to investigate the principals' perception of their leadership the interpretive research paradigm and inductive analysis were chosen as the study's methods. The data were collected primarily from semi-structured in-depth interviews. Furthermore, the research findings were enriched by the findings obtained from a self-completion questionnaire, used in the initial phase, which preceded the qualitative research as well as by documents collected at school.

The sample population of the present study consists of fifteen secondary school principals who participated in the new initiative and agreed to participate in the present study.

Analysis of the findings shows that the principals perceived three factors as enabling them to transform the school culture. Those factors were the principals' impact, school processes and external support. However, the finding shows that the principals perceived their impact as the most meaningful factor enabling them to lead the transformation in their school culture. Their impact was composed of four main components: mindscape, values, modeling as well as personal involvement. Those components reflected their worldview and guided them in the transformation process.

The findings indicate that the Israeli secondary school principals who participated in this study, perceived their leadership as being a transformational-strategic leadership having social mission. Two central aspects of this perceived leadership were prominent in the present study: a moral aspect and a pedagogical aspect. These aspects differentiated between the principals as expressed in their different approaches, which affected their transformation of the school culture. Whereas the principals who stressed moral aspects of their leadership viewed the school role extended beyond the school context, based its moral purpose on ethical values and led the transformation collaboratively with their staff and parents, the principals who shared pedagogical aspects based their leadership on intra-organizational practical values and led the transformation by means of various mechanisms ranging from collegiality up to authoritative style both with their staff and parents.
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Chapter 1- Introduction

“A 13-year old boy wrote a will: My friends abuse me, I will kill myself. I am writing this will, admitting that I was used, my things were stolen, I was blackmailed... I am miserable, under threat... and the principal and my home-class teacher do nothing” (Maariv, 28 November 1999).

Setting the scene

“All schools owe a duty of care to their children as part of their responsibility for child protection and to enable pupils to gain full benefit from their education” (Whitney, 1997, p.3).

Violence among students is neither new nor unique. However, according to Astor et al. (1999, p. 144), public awareness increases especially when extreme acts of violence occur. In Israel as in many countries around the world, there is great concern regarding this issue. Studies in the United States show that violence preoccupies citizens in general and parents in particular (Elam and Rose, 1995). This concern is comprehensible in light of the fact that violence at school threatens the safety of students and teachers and compromises educational practice (Astor et al., 1999; Furlong and Morrison, 1994; Sharan, 2000).

In Israel, public awareness of violence has increased in recent years, following the rising number of violent incidents among youth in general and in schools in particular. This awareness has been intensified as a result of public responses published in the media. At the same time, two studies, large in scale and scope, were published in Israel (Benbenishti et al., 1999; Harel et al., 1999), showing that a high percentage of Israeli students perceive schools as unsafe places. Moreover, a study conducted by Admati
(1998) showed that principals do not perceive themselves as responsible for initiating the creation of a safe school culture; therefore, they do not have adequate tools for carrying it out.

In view of this reality, the Ministry of Education decided to develop a new model to help principals create a safe school culture. This model was named “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”. This new initiative was developed in the spirit of “self-management”, according to which principals are responsible for creating a safe school culture as part of their entire educational responsibility. In that spirit, one of the model’s keys principles was that the principals’ use of this new initiative was based on voluntary choice rather than external dictate. This is the contextual background for the present study. The conceptual framework of this study is based on the literature, which underscores the centrality of principals in the process of transforming a school culture.

This thesis investigates (according to the interpretive paradigm) the secondary school principals’ perception of their leadership in the process of transforming school culture. This gave rise to the over-arching question which examines the principals perceptions of the factors they perceive to be of the greatest importance in enabling them to lead the transformation in their schools. These perceptions are based on the analysis of interviewing the principals on their experience in introducing the new government initiative “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”.

The Introduction chapter focuses on four central topics. The first describes the conceptual framework. The second explains the contextual framework, focusing on the concept of violence in the context of the Israeli society. It also reviews the nature and scope of violence in Israeli schools as well as in schools worldwide. The third is a description of the Israeli education system and its structure. The fourth enhances the
understanding of the rationale and the principles of the new “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” initiative.

**Conceptual framework**

**Introduction**

School constitutes a meaningful social and psychological environment for students and teachers. Within its framework social processes are created, affected by factors associated with the school culture – norms, values, attitudes, behavioural patterns – and they in return affect social and academic outcomes (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Friedman, 1995; Sharan, 1986). A healthy school culture is manifested by school values and norms as well as by supportive teacher-student relations (Astor et al., 1999; Benbenishti et al., 2000; Glover et al., 1998; Olweus, 1991). Lightfoot (1983) conducted a study of the common features of “good schools”. She found that the five schools defined as good schools, were characterized by the students’ strong sense of safety, high expectations for academic achievements and positive teacher-student relations. This was corroborated by Rutter et al. (1979), who investigated twelve schools in London. Their findings showed that a well-disciplined school environment and teachers’ positive attitude towards the students characterized schools, which demonstrated a high level of academic achievements.

Furlong et al. (1997) and Morrison et al. (1997) argue that violence undermines the basic human need for safety and impinges upon the students’ basic rights to learn. Kaplan (1995) points out that

"... if students and teachers do not feel safe from physical danger and free from disruption, intimidation, harassment, or negligence, in school
or travelling to and from school, successful teaching and learning cannot occur. Distracted or fearful people cannot attend to classroom instruction; they are too busy trying to protect themselves from physical or emotional harm” (p. 265).

Hence, it is necessary to consider violence as an educational issue; “A safe and orderly school environment... is an administrative priority” (Kaplan, 1995, p. 265). Morrison et al. (1997) focus on this priority and argue that school must provide “...environments that maximize their [students] chances for learning and positive development” (p. 250). Moreover, Chen and Addi (1995), Day et al. (2000) and Solomon (2000) claim that school is an institution, which contributes to societal development and democracy, in general, and transforms the world of values of students as citizens, in particular. Hence, it is perceived as a moral social agent (Fullan, 2001a; Inbar, 2000). These points of view underscore the perception that a healthy school is a place that provides students with the conditions required for moral development and optimal learning (Erhard, 2001; Furlong et al., 1997; Morrison et al., 1997).

Consequently, in order to create a healthy school environment, the school has to transform its culture, to prevent violent behaviour on the one hand and to empower its moral role for shaping students’ value infrastructure on the other hand (Sharan, 2000). In this context, Sharan (2000) states, that violence can be perceived both as an overt and a covert characteristic of the school culture.

“Violence is a symptom of a disease underlying the structure of school as a social system and its pattern of functioning.... Consequently, only a change in the school culture, may bring about a physically and emotionally safe school and a healthy psychological and physical environment for the people in it” (p. 2).

According to Zilberman and Levi (1996, p. 228), violence can be perceived either as a limited problem or as an overt or covert characteristic of the school culture. These
perspectives affect the way a school copes with violence. Whereas the first is manifested by limited treatment of violence, the second requires a holistic-systemic change in the school culture. One of the factors, affecting the way of coping with violence, is the principals’ perception of its nature. As Leithwood et al. (1999, p. 99) state “...what leaders do depends on what they think”. Referring to this statement, Steyn and Squelch (1994) note, “... the meaning that persons attribute to change that constitutes the reality. It is this, rather than change as an objective fact... ” (p. 184).

Similarly, Sergiovanni (1995) specifies that the way principals lead school depends on their mindscape, which directs them in their practice. Moreover, Goldring and Pasternak (1991) and Inbar (2000) indicate that principals’ perceptions are the crucial factors in their commitment to lead a change in school culture.

“...the principals’ perception of their leadership directs their activity style and their commitment to lead processes of change in the social aspect of the school culture” (Inbar, 2000, p. 215).

Specifically, based on her findings, Admati (1998) adds:

“...only a principal with power and awareness of the issue was found to be able to provide the overall organizational framework, suitable for the implementation of programmes, designed to prevent and cope with violence effectively and successfully” (p. 14).

Taking a wider view, Kramer-Hayoun (1995) argues that, in an era of social and cultural changes and in an era of loose ideologies and values, the principal is the ideologue of the educational system, who influences the shaping of the school culture and its educational values and academic outcomes. Consequently, Fullan (2001a) claims that leading a change in the school culture should be guided by moral purposes. Based on that, Chen et al. (1992) add that, due to the political situation in Israel, educational leadership is perceived as a social change agent.
These perceptions emphasize the importance of the school leadership in transforming a healthy school culture.

"Principals are important! Indeed no other school position has greater potential for maintaining and improving quality schools" (Sergiovanni, 1995, p. 83)

**Conceptual framework**

The conceptual framework is grounded on three theoretical concepts: leadership as a primary concept, culture and change. These three concepts create the basis for the development of the topic of this thesis as well as the basis for the research questions.

Since the study aims to examine the principals' perception of leadership, leadership was considered as the primary concept. The research literature stresses leadership as a central factor in transforming school culture and in introducing change most noted by Leithwood *et al.* (1999), Sergiovanni (1995) and Yukl (1989).

Hence, an emphasis was placed on transformational leadership as minted by Burns (1978). This form of leadership is associated with improvement and transformation, creating a vision based on values and moral purpose, setting goals and establishing relationships (Leithwood *et al.*, 1999; Bryamn, 1992; Bass and Avolio, 1994; Gronn, 1996). This form of leadership is also known for its application of informal power (such as cultural power, symbolic and human power) as identified by Sergiovanni (1984), as well as psychological influence manifested by the 4 I's as conceived by Bass and Avolio (1994). This influence and power is employed in order to rally the school members around values and the school's purposes.

Many researches have investigated this form of leadership, attesting to its contribution to altering the cultural context in which people work (Bass and Avolio, 1994; Burns,

Leithwood et al. (1999) specify what is expected from this form of leadership in the process of culture building “...culture building by transformational leaders includes behaviours aimed at developing school norms, beliefs, values...” (p. 83). To this Hopkins et al. (1994) add

“...leadership through the development of organization's culture means building behavioral norms that exemplify the best that a school standards for. It means building as institution in which people believe strongly, with which they identify personally, and to which they gladly render their loyalty. All this gives meaning to the work they do, gives it significance, and this—as we know—is highly motivating’” (p. 155).

Leithwood and Jantzi (2000) further claim that the transformation of the school culture is based on the school's capacity, commitment and motivation to carry it out.

“Most school reform initiatives assume significant capacity development on the part of individuals, as well as whole organizations...they also depend on high levels of motivation and commitment ... and evidence suggests that transformational practices do contribute to the development of capacity and commitment” (p. 112).

Hence, leading a transformation requires managerial strategies, appropriate to the school culture, as well as the involvement of the school staff (Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Caldwell and Spinks, 1998; Day et al., 2000; Fullan, 2001b; Leithwood et al., 1999; Sergiovanni, 1995). Yet, transforming a school culture requires an understanding of the overt and covert aspects of the existing culture. Schein (1985) identifies three levels of
culture. He argues that change in the overt school culture (namely behavioural norms) requires a transformation in deeper levels - the level of values and basic assumptions. As the study deals with transforming the school culture, the literature review expands on the understanding of culture as a mechanism for shaping behavioural norms and as a mechanism, which enables the transformation process, as indicated by Samuel (1996), Sarason (1982), Schein (1985) and Deal and Kennedy (1982).

Moreover, as transforming the school culture is a change process (Morrison 1998) and as the new initiative was developed as a managerial tool for creating a change, the concept of change completes the conceptual framework. That is, the concept of change makes a significant contribution to the understanding of the nature of change, its course and the factors enabling principals to lead a change process (Fullan, 1991; Hopkins et al., 1994; Fuchs, 1995; Blenkin et al., 1997; Dalin, 1998).

Hence, the concepts leadership, school culture and change, provide the conceptual background underlying the present study. They serve to clarify the principals’ perception of leadership while leading a change in school culture. Moreover, those concepts constitute the basis for the development of the research questions, for choosing the topic of the semi-structured interview as well as for comparing my findings with those of other studies.

These three concepts will be extensively reviewed in the Literature Review Chapter.

**Contextual framework**

**The concept of violence**
The concept of violence relates to a wide variety of harmful actions, perpetrated by one or more persons, injuring an individual or society at large. Horowitz (2000, p. 7) distinguishes three aspects of violence: violence by individuals, violence in the family and at school and violence in society. Amir (1982) describes two central approaches, which explain this phenomenon. The first is the psychological approach, which mainly relates to the individual’s personality and behavioural factors. The second is the sociological approach, which examines the socio-demographic characteristics of those involved in violence, as well as the social factors leading to violent tendencies. The latter approach distinguishes three stages in the development of violence: prior conditions, such as a sense of alienation or deprivation; accelerating factors, which exacerbate the problem; and an escalation process, resulting from an inappropriate response of the authorities.

Horowitz (1995, p. 7) reviews theories, which explain the underlying reasons for violence. The bio-psychological theory, rooted in the Freudian theory, views aggressiveness and violence as an essential part of human existence; the drive theory, which maintains that the source of violence can be found in frustration; social learning theories, which examine the development of violent patterns from responses of reinforcement and generalization; and the behavioural-social theory, which views violent behaviour as the result of interactions between people and the interaction between people and the environment.

From a historical point of view, violence at school was regarded as part of juvenile delinquency and in the context of low socio-economic status and underprivileged areas (Cohen, 1955). This perspective stemmed from the fact that violence at school was frequently manifested, as Miller (1958) found, in underprivileged and delinquent areas. This seemingly unequivocal connection was shattered, following incidents of violence
in middle class schools. Baker and Rubel (1980) stated further that violence at school is a unique phenomenon. Starting in the 1970s, with conceptualization of the notion "school climate", anti-social concepts, lack of values and the way students felt at school were found to be related to violent acts at school (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Recently studies (Astor et al., 1999; Furlong and Morrison, 1994; Furlong et al., 1998) subscribe to the ecological approach, which links the individual, the school, the community and the physical structures to the incidence of violence.

The definition of violence has also changed over the years. In the past, violence at school was perceived only from its physical aspect; it was commonly perceived as "bullying" (Olweus, 1993). Benbenishti et al. (2000) maintain that the definition of the term bullying in its current form does not reflect all the characteristics of violence at school. At present, this definition has been expanded and, as Glover et al. (2000) and Astor et al. (1999) indicate, it now includes both physical and emotional injury. Recent studies (Furlong et al., 1998; Harel et al., 1999; Olweus, 1993) incorporate this expansion of the term, as Olweus (1993) comments

"A pupil is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed repeatedly and over time, to negative actions ... Negative actions can be carried out by words (verbally), for instance, by threatening, taunting, teasing, and calling names. It is a negative action when somebody hits, pushes, kicks or restrains another – by physical contact" (p. 9).

Horowitz (1995, p. 33) suggests explanation for violent behaviours at school. Violence as an outcome of students’ frustration, violence as a result of processes taking place in school - meaning the school culture- and violence as a reflection of society. The next section describes the Israeli society in which schools are situated.
**The Israeli Society**

"Man is eternally embedded in his culture and from it he emerges" (Shkolnik-Cohen, 1994, p. 77).

Behavioural-social theory views violence as the product of the interaction between individuals and society. Based on this approach, violence at school is a reflection of society. That is, a violent society, projects its norms onto adolescents at school (Bromberger, 1994; Dgani and Dgani, 1990; Horowitz and Amir, 1982). Hence, the characteristics of the Israel society should be examined, in order to shed light on the phenomenon of violence as it appears in its schools.

The Israeli society is highly segmented and pluralistic, its almost six million citizens consisting of a variety of groups, which differ from one another in values, culture, language and religion. This differentiation has engendered a complex socio-cultural reality that provides fertile soil for the multidimensional and powerful social conflicts that threaten to fragment Israeli society from within, at the same time that it intensifies the ongoing violent struggle with the Arabs. Shoham *et al.* (1994) and Hareven (1999) consider that these conflicts breed violent behaviour. The conflicts themselves originate from six major issues:

**Security issues:** In 1967, Israel introduced martial law in the occupied territories, for the purpose of ruling the Palestinian population recently occupied. Only after the Oslo Accords, signed in 1993, did the army begin evacuating some of the territories. The occupation has led to persistent conflict with the surrounding Arab countries, characterized by wars, terrorism and uncertainty regarding the political future of the region. This situation has given rise to unrelenting tension and fear, on the one hand, and to the legitimization for solving conflicts by means of violence, on the other.
Archer and Gartner (1976) and Hickson (1992) maintain, that violence increases during and after war. Moreover, they emphasize that due to socialization, children living under the shadow of conflict, view violence as an accepted form of behaviour. Hence, the concern is that they will come to regard human life as expendable. This was corroborated by Bilu (1989), who investigated the effects of the Israeli-Arab conflict upon the lives of Palestinian and Israeli children.

**Political ideology** - There is a continuous dispute between the Israeli left and right wings regarding the permanent borders of the State of Israel and how to achieve peace with the Arabs. It was against this background that Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin was assassinated.

**"Jews" versus "Israeli Arab"** - Since the establishment of the State in 1948, the number of Arab citizens of the State of Israel has increased from 100,000 to 1,000,000. Only in 1966, was the martial law, governing Israeli Arabs lifted. Even after its abolition, the Israeli governments have continued to discriminate against these citizens in many areas, giving birth to an on-going sense of deprivation. This was dramatically expressed by the events of October 2000, when a surge of violence led to the death of thirteen Israeli Arab citizens.

**Extreme demographic change** - During the first decade of its existence, the population of Israel doubled as a result of immigration. About 50% of the immigrants came from Islamic countries in the Middle East and North Africa ("Sephardim"). As a result, the demographic balance shifted away from the West European ("Ashkenazim") population. The social and economic gaps between the two sectors created, in effect, two unequal "societies", with the attendant feelings of deprivation, discrimination and frustration. These feelings became stronger as a result of the long recession of the 1960s, which particularly harmed the weakest sectors, in which the percentage of
“Sephardim” was high. Violent protests erupted against the background of this inequality.

During the 1990s, another major demographic change took place, following extensive immigration from the former Soviet Union and Ethiopia. About 12% of the current population of Israel consists of new immigrants. The fact that these immigrants tend to cluster in specific cities has intensified their geographic and social isolation, leading to the formation of sub-groups and impeding their integration into Israeli society as a whole.

**Economic gaps**—During its early years, Israel was a country of austerity with a rather modest standard of living for most of its citizens. Today, Israel is among the world’s 22 leading countries in terms of standard of living. With growing prosperity and a shift toward a free market economy, economic gaps have widened. About one-fifth of the country’s citizens live in poverty, most of them of Asian or African origin or Israeli Arab citizens. This situation has intensified feelings of alienation and social injustice.

**Religious ideology**—The founders of the state defined Israel as a “Jewish democratic state”. This definition reflects the unresolved tension between the religious sector in Israel, which is striving to impose national norms according to a theocratic definition of a “Jewish state” and the secular sector, which supports universal democratic values. This tension originated from the various sources of moral authority, on which the state was grounded. In the name of religious values, some religious people (particularly the ultra-Orthodox) have committed acts of murder and violence against Arabs as well as against Jews. The definition of Israel as a democratic-Jewish state also created a problem for the Arab population, being “non-Jews” in a state defining itself as “Jewish”. Non-Jewish citizens are viewed as inferior to Jewish citizens in spite of the Proclamation of Independence, which guaranteed “full equality to all citizens”.
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Additional factors that promote violence are the weakening of the family support system, demonstrated by the persistent rise in divorce rates and the parallel increase in single parent families (Landau, 1992). Moreover, there has been a substantial increase in the number of weapons held by the Israeli public (above and beyond the number of weapons in the possession of soldiers, the security forces, the civil guard, etc.), due to security problems in Israel. In effect, the need for a personal weapon also expresses a general lack of confidence in the government’s ability to protect its citizens.

According to Landau (1992, p. 42), sociological studies in Israel corroborate the hypothesis that the ratio of violent incidents in society is in direct proportion to the intensity of stress factors and in indirect proportion to the intensity of the support system or social solidarity. Thus, against the background of social and political stress described, Horowitz and Frankel (1990, p. 16) argue that Israeli youth is growing up, with the view that violence is a legitimate instrument of power.

The following sections describe the nature and the scope of violence at school.

**The nature of violence at school**

Current studies (Astor *et al.*, 1999; Furlong and Morrison, 1994; Horowitz, 1995; Olweus, 1993; Snyder *et al.*, 1996; Whitney and Smith, 1993) indicate that violence at school is a social phenomenon that is not necessarily related to demographic, social or economic background; rather it is an outcome of multiple factors. Based on this point of view and on the belief that behaviour is an interaction between individuals and their environment, Zilberman and Levi (1996) and Baker (1998) argue for identification of those organizational and social factors within the school context, which reinforce
positive or negative behaviour. Various researchers investigated these factors. As early as 1978, a study of “the safe school”, carried out at the request of US Department of Health, Education and Welfare (1978), showed that violence is directly related to factors such as: school size, class size, relevance of the lessons to the students, consistency in enforcing school rules, fair rules, school organizational climate and culture and principal-teacher relations.

Many studies have investigated these and many other factors. Friedman et al. (1988) and Harel et al. (1997) found that a climate of well being is characterized by a high level of safety and order, on the one hand, and respect for teachers, on the other. In their study of seventeen English junior high schools, Whitney and Smith (1993) found that only one-third of the students felt that their teachers lent them an attentive ear. Moreover, in those schools, where the level of violence was high, the students were unhappy and lonely. This finding is associated with another factor associated with violence that is the students' sense of alienation. One explanation for the students' sense of alienation and their unhappiness is the teachers' behaviour and attitudes. An example of this relationship is given by Elbedour et al. (1997) in a study of Bedouin schools (a sub-group of the Arab sector in Israel). The authors emphasize that the mediating variable was teachers' acceptance of verbal and physical violence as a legitimate educational method. Another study, conducted in Israel by Horowitz and Amir (1981), found a positive correlation between teaching methods directed at only some of the students and a sense of frustration and violence manifested by the others. Similarly, a positive relationship between teachers’ superficial acquaintance with their students and violent behaviour at school was found by Kikkawa (1987). Referring to these points, Baker (1998) argues that violence is a consequence of the failure of the
school as a community, meaning a failure to provide support, a sense of belonging and identity.

Another factor, explored in studies of violence, is school policy (Amir, 1982; Furlong et al., 1998; Glover et al., 1998; Olweus, 1993). These studies show that a clear anti-violence policy and its implementation lead to a reduction in violent incidents at school. Nevertheless, Glover et al. (1998) found that this policy should be established within a positive and supportive framework.

The physical-topographical factors that encourage violence were examined by Astor et al. (1997), Olweus (1991), and Whitney and Smith (1993). Their findings indicate that students considered dangerous those areas where the adults' presence was not felt, such as the playground during recess, the school's main entrance and the bathrooms. An interesting finding, cited by several studies (Astor et al. 1999; Benbenishti et al., 1999), indicated that assessments made by principals regarding violence problems, are considerably more moderate than those made by students. Moreover, Benbenishti et al. (1999) and Morrison et al. (1997) show that only 4-6% of the principals in their sample estimate that they have a problem of violence at their school, while estimating that the level of violence is severe in other schools.

To sum up, violence at school is a complex social phenomenon, encompassing the mutual influence of factors related to the individual and to the school. Since the creation of a safe, healthy school begins with the school's recognition of violence and its scope within its walls (Benbenishti et al., 1999; Olweus, 1991), the incidence of violence at school in Israel and around the world will be reviewed.
The scope of school violence

The Israeli context

Until the 1980s, no studies of violence at school had been conducted in Israel. The reasons were various. First, as Horowitz (2000, p. 43) notes, the scope of the phenomenon was limited and, second, the tools for its diagnosis were inadequate. In the early 1980s, Horowitz and Amir (1981) published a study, which showed that 25% of Israeli students were involved in violent incidents. A later study, conducted by Horowitz and Frankel (1990) reported that 60% of the boys and 40% of the girls had experienced some level of verbal violence.

A comprehensive survey of Tel-Aviv schools conducted by Dgani and Dgani (1990) showed that close to 60% of the city’s students reported some form of violence in their school. Verbal violence was identified as most prevalent. About 80% of elementary school students and about 60% of secondary school students were involved in swearing and offensive remarks. As to extremely severe violence occurrences, 31% of the students reported that they had been victims of intimidation and threats; 19% were actual victims of bullying and humiliation and about 8% were seriously injured. The survey also showed that only 20% of the students reported the violent incidents to the school staff.

During the 1997-1999 school years, two extensive studies were published, providing a systematic database on the scope of violence within Israel’s educational system (Benbenishti et al., 1999; Harel et al., 1999). These two studies clearly indicate that the
number of students perceiving school as an unsafe place was very high. Benbenishti reported that approximately one-third of primary school and junior high school students and approximately one-fourth of secondary school students perceived the problem of violence at their schools as severe to very severe. The findings of Harel et al. (1999), reinforce these data, showing that 40%-45% of students in the 6th to the 10th grades perceived their school as an unsafe place, following numerous cases of bullying.

Verbal violence is very common among school children: approximately half (45.1%) of primary school students, almost three-fourth (74%) of junior high school students and more than half (60.1%) of secondary school students reported having being sworn at and about half of the students indicated that they were subject to mockery or humiliation on the part of other students (Benbenishti et al., 1999).

The rates of non-severe physical violence among Israeli students are similar to those of verbal violence; 57.2% of primary school students, 47% of junior high students and 74% of secondary school students reported that they were intentionally shoved during the month prior to the study. Moreover, 43.9% of primary school students, 28% of junior high students and 14% of secondary school students pointed out that they were kicked or punched at least once during the previous month (Benbenishti et al., 1999). Harel et al. (1999) specify that 60% of the boys and 40% of the girls were victims of bullying at least once during the school year. These findings indicate that violent fights are commonplace phenomena and that approximately two-thirds of the boys and about one-fourth of the girls surveyed said they were involved in a fight at least once during the past year. Moreover, 6.5% of junior high students and 3.6% of secondary school students reported they had been stabbed.
In addition, Benbenishti et al. (1999) point out that about half of primary school students, a third of junior high students and a fifth of secondary school students reported having been threatened. However, students’ perceptions of their school as an unsafe place result not only from the violence expressed between students but also from the violent behaviour exhibited by the school faculty. Approximately 22% of primary school students, 15% of junior high students and 10% of secondary school students reported being mocked, insulted or humiliated by teachers (Benbenishti et al., 1999).

After being subjected to a high level of violence on a daily basis, it is not surprising that students feel threatened and attempt to defend themselves in various ways, such as bringing weapons to school. Benbenishti et al. (1999) indicate that 5.5% of junior high students and approximately 7% of secondary school students reported bringing weapons to school during the month prior to being asked. The findings of Harel et al. (1999) are even more severe, showing that approximately 22% of boys and 7% of girls in the 4th to 10th grades reported having carried weapons generally knives and sticks. It is not surprising, then, that 5 to 15% of the students reported that they were absent from school for fear of being hurt (Benbenishti et al., 1999).

Data collected by the Israeli police corroborate these findings. They show a constant rise in the level of violence among youth during the years 1988-2000, as illustrated in Figure 1.A.
Astor et al. (1999, p. 144) argue that ever since studies began to measure the extent of violence in schools, it has been difficult to estimate its scope. That is due to the gap between empirical studies, which support public impressions regarding the high level of violence in schools, and the incidence of violence reported by the principals themselves.

The Center for Disease Control and Prevention (1998) reports that, in 1997, 36.6% of United States secondary school students were involved in a physical fight during the previous twelve-month period. Approximately 14.8% of these fights occurred on school premises. Moreover, findings of the National Household Education Survey (Brick et al., 1994) show that 8% of 6th to 12th grade students are chronic victims of bullying at school. In 1996 students, aged 12-18 experienced an estimated 1.3 million acts of nonfatal violence, ranging from serious acts of violence to mild assault (or 49
incidents per 1,000 students). About 2.1 million secondary school students reported being victims of theft at school (Kaufman et al., 1998).

The potential for lethal violence in secondary schools is considerable, due to the availability of weapons. As reported by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (1998), in 1997, 18.3% of secondary school students carried weapons - a gun, knife or club - during the thirty days preceding its survey. However, the data illustrate that many students avoid actually bringing their weapons to school. For example, only 8.5% of secondary school students reported bringing weapons to school during the previous twelve months. Approximately 7.4% of secondary school students reported they had been threatened or injured with a weapon on school grounds. The prevalence of weapons carried during, or after school hours contains the potential to influence the rate of severe and lethal forms of school violence.

In 1990, a survey was conducted in Sheffield encompassing 24 schools, 2623 primary school students and 4135 secondary school students, indicated that about 12% of secondary school students said they had been bullied on occasion and 6% admitted to having bullied others (Whitney, 1997). Although the frequency of bullying declines with age, the incidents tend to become more serious especially in secondary schools.

A later study, conducted in another region of the U.K, by the Department of Education at Keele University, among 4700 students between the ages of eleven to sixteen in 25 schools. 70 out of every 1000 students had experienced physical and verbal intimidation, social exclusion and damage to property (Glover et al., 2000).

Based on data from bullying and victim studies conducted in Norway (with the samples ranged from 25,000-50,000 students), Olweus (1991) established that about 15% of students were regularly either bullied or victimized. Similar rates were found in
England (Boulton and Underwood, 1992; Smith and Sharp, 1994; Whitney and Smith, 1993). In Scotland, however, the rates were somewhat lower: 6% for bullied students and 4% for bullying students (Mellor, 1990).

Additional data of violent behaviours were gathered by Harel et al. (1999) in a comparative study of adolescents (HBSC), conducted in twenty-seven countries.

The results for twenty-three of the countries were published and are shown in Table 1.1.

Table No. 1.1: **Percentage of school children who were victims of bullying, harassment or pestering at school at least three times (during the past month)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Age 11</th>
<th></th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Age 13</th>
<th></th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Age 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenland</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>French Belgium</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>Greenland</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Belgium</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>French Belgium</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td><strong>Israel</strong></td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flemish Belgium</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Israel</strong></td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td><strong>Israel</strong></td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>Greenland</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>Flemish Belgium</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>Flemish Belgium</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Israeli education system

Schooling in Israel is, for the most part, controlled by central government (the Ministry of Education) and publicly funded. As in many other newly established countries, Israeli political authorities tightly controlled educational affairs, especially the allocation of educational resources. According to Gaziel (1999), there were three main reasons underlying the tight administrative structure. The first was to ensure a high degree of equality at school; The second was to increase, especially through a uniform national curriculum, the state’s influence over the socialization of its youth; and the third was to facilitate the absorption of new immigrants into Israeli society.

In the 1970s, people started to criticize the centralized education system. The centralized system did not satisfy the varied needs of a pluralistic society and the directives received from the Ministry of Education ignored the special needs of the school and the community it served.

Israel is a multi-cultural society. Its educational institutions have some common fundamental characteristics, yet, they acknowledge the society’s cultural diversity. A basic factor, which creates diversity, is the system division into cultural sub-systems, based on national background and religion. The public education system is officially divided into four such divisions: Jewish secular, Jewish religious, Arab and Druze. Central government authorities formulate separate official curricula for each sector. Yet, a considerable number of subjects, mainly those dealing with social issues, remain common to the various sectors.
During the 1980s and 1990s, the Ministry of Education began to expand the pedagogical autonomy of schools, so that they could undertake educational initiatives according to local needs. These efforts had limited success, since centralized forces continued operating as before. Only in 1993, with the convening of a steering committee for school self-management and the subsequent publication of its recommendations, did this issue receive momentum and the Israeli model of self-management started to develop. Since the process of decentralization and extension of the school autonomy are now in progress, Volansky (1999) writes

"We can find today in Israel various models of organizational structures on the centralization – decentralization – self-management sequence" (p. 25).

In the last two decades, the education system in Israel has been characterized, by the search for a way, which will enable schools to adjust themselves to the changing needs of society. Among the models developed are the democratic, communal, experimental and autonomous school. The emergence of the concept of an autonomous school has provided the education system with a basis for coping with change on two major levels, the organizational and educational. On the organizational level, the system has to respond to the changes transpiring in the different social sectors, while on the educational level the system has to prepare students for citizenship in a changing society. These changes have affected all the educational frameworks – primary, junior high and secondary schools. But,

"...whereas in primary school the manifestation of the change is derived from the overall policy, in secondary school the change stems from the need to respond to the problems which require immediate solutions and which are a result of the needs in the field" (Yogevo, 1999, p. 157).
Structure

The education system in Israel is free and compulsory until the 10th-grade. Primary schools encompass the 1st-6th grades and secondary schools the 7th-12th grades.

Secondary schools can adopt one of three different organizational structures: a 4-year school, prevalent mostly in the religious sector, where students learn in the 9th-12th grades; an independent 3-years junior high school, where students learn in the 7th-9th grades; and a 6-year school, where students learn in the 7th-12th grades (the junior division forming an integral part of school).

The 6-year schools also display different organizational structures. Some 6-year schools are divided into two organizational units – junior and senior divisions. Other schools are divided into three age-group units. In both cases, each unit has its own principal, who is accountable to the principal of the school. This is the first distinction between these educational frameworks.

A second major distinction concerns the student body and the administrative structure. Primary school students (1st-6th grades) are assigned to schools according to their place of residence, thus creating a homogeneous school. Conversely, secondary school students are assigned from various districts, resulting in a heterogeneous school.

Another distinction between primary and secondary schools is their size, which affects the position of the principal. Whereas primary schools are small, secondary schools are complex and large. In primary schools, the principal manages the school single-handedly. However, due to the complex organizational structure of secondary
schools, their principals are assisted by a senior management team, which consists of the unit principals.

This differentiation in the school structure led to the decision to conduct the present study only in secondary schools, in order to avoid any bias, rooted in school structure. (The reasons for this decision are elaborated in the Research Methodology Chapter).

The “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”

Background

Data relating to the state of violence at school (Benbenishti et al., 1999; Harel et al., 1999), which indicate a disturbing rise in the scope of violence in Israelis schools, have compelled the Ministry of Education to give the issue top priority, and to adopt a clear stance so as to ensure that schools in Israel will be a safe and protected environment for all their members.

On 1 November 1998, the Minister of Education appointed a public commission to examine the issue of violence among children and youth. General (Reserves) Matan Vilnai, the Minister of Culture and Science, was appointed to head the commission. Its members were researchers, psychologists, and social workers. Additional members of the commission were principals, teachers, parents, pupils, and police as well as public figures. The commission submitted a series of recommendations to the Ministry of Education, for the purpose of creating safe schools and reducing violence.

The commission’s recommendations were published in a special Managing Director’s Circular (Ministry of Education, 2000), opening with the following words
“Our obligation as a civilized society is to break the code of silence so that the younger generation will be able to grow up in safety and to ensure a healthy society in the future...school must be a safe place for all those present there. Pupils’ sense of safety and confidence that they are in a protected environment is the prime condition for the development of learning” (p. 3).

Following the Vilnai Commission Report and the findings of Benbenishti et al. (1999) and Harel et al. (1999), the Ministry of Education placed these social problems on the school’s educational agenda. After many years of denial, schools began to admit that violence did exist and that it undermined learning and educational practice.

In view of this reality, the Ministry of Education policy makers decided to treat the phenomenon of violence with consistent and preventive measures as well as high-gear activity. Furthermore, based on the commission’s recommendations, it was decided to strive not only to reduce school violence, but also to ensure

“...the safe school: a place not only devoid of violence, but also an educational institution that promotes optimal learning and development” (Ministry of Education, 1999, p. 3).

An examination of the intervention programmes carried out since then, has shown that these programmes were neither systematic nor systemic and orderly information about the level and types of violence was missing. These programmes were also “pre-packaged” and focused only on treating violent incidents in isolation from their context and the school culture. Moreover, those programmes were led solely by the Ministry of Education’s Psychological-Counselling Services (SHEFI), without the involvement of the principals. Hence, the principals were not provided with the tools required for leading such a process (Admati, 1998).

This situation provided an opportunity for the Psychological-Counselling Services (SHFI) to recommend the development of an intervention process for coping with
violence in Israeli schools. The outcome was the new “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” initiative.

Rationale

Psychosocial intervention processes are designed to influence the students’ emotional-cognitive and behavioural world.

“Psychosocial intervention deals with the reduction of risk factors and the reinforcement of protective factors relating to the individual and the system, for the development of a school climate that provides emotional and physical security and promotes the growth of all the partners functioning in it” (Psychological-Counselling Services, 1998, p. 4).

Astor et al. (1999) indicate that successful school intervention programmes have these core characteristics

“They raise the awareness and responsibility of students, teachers and parents regarding the types of violence in their schools.... They get school staff, students and parent involved. The interventions fit easily into the normal flow and mission of the school” (p. 154).

The literature (Glover et al., 1998; Olweus, 1993) shows that intervention programmes, which considerably reduce violent behaviour, enhance the students’ well being. Furthermore, Astor et al. (1999), Stephens (1994) and Zilberman and Levi (1996), argue that only a programme, which is directed at the entire school, will increase the effectiveness of the intervention programme.

“...the intervention programme, as part of educational practice, involves the entire educational staff and it therefore has an impact on the entire school environment” (Zilberman and Levi, 1996, p. 227).
Intervention programmes, in general, and programmes for creating a safe school climate in particular are grounded on four fundamental concepts. The first concept identifies the principal as a change agent (Erhard, 2000; Fullan, 2001b); the second combines primary and secondary levels of prevention into a comprehensive approach. Primary prevention is a systematic educational intervention process with two aims: reducing risk factors and reinforcing the school’s coping capability. Secondary prevention relates to the focused treatment of violent incidents (Klingman and Aizen, 1990).

“The most effective violence prevention programmes are those that combine a number of strategies and approach the task in a comprehensive manner...Primary and secondary interventions both play a role in adding to a comprehensive plan” (Morrison et al., 1997, p. 243).

The third concept is a "tailored" intervention programme. This means that the programme will be effective only if it matches the school culture.

“Whilst there is a strong relationship between a positive culture and effective anti-bullying policies, the existence of a anti-bullying policy without contextual support is likely to be less effective in establishing a positive social environment” (Glover et al., 1998, p. 103).

Erhard (2000, p. 11) notes that there is not one single mode of intervention, which is appropriate for all educational institutions. The difference in the character, incidence and scope of violence in each school on the one hand and the social-organizational characteristics of the school (size, sector, norms, values and working methods) on the other, require that a unique plan be “tailored” for each school. This gives rise to the fourth concept, namely, that an integrative systemic and systematic process is needed for the creation of a safe school climate (Erhard, 2000; Stephens, 1994).

These concepts constituted the conceptual infrastructure for the new “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”.
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**Principles**

The new “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” initiative, as presented by its author, Dr. Rachel Erhard (2000, pp. 31-32), is based on the understanding that a safe climate is one of the essential conditions for creating an educational environment, which promotes academic and social outcomes. Moreover, the process is grounded on the perception that a safe climate is one manifestation of a healthy school culture. Hence, the methodology of the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” incorporated three additional principles. The first and central principle views school principals as responsible for educational practice in general and for the creation of a safe climate in particular. The second assumes the principals’ willingness to cope with social problems as a result of their awareness of these problems and their commitment to solve them. The third postulates that a school culture is transformed by the school members.

Three principles of action are derived from this framework. The first requires that principals volunteer to lead the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate” Intervention Process” in their school, rather than a centralized directive from the Ministry of Education. The second involves the provision of questionnaires to help principals diagnose the scope of violence as perceived by the students. The third entails provision of professional assistance to the schools in building their own intervention programme adjusted to the data collected and in accordance with the organizational culture of the school.

The combination of the principal’s voluntary participation in the process and the school’s construction of its own programme, represents the innovative character of the new intervention process.
The new "Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process", like any other intervention process, rests on planned, systemic and systematic steps. It may be described as a cyclical activity consisting of four basic stages (See Figure 1.B)

**Figure No. 1.B – The intervention process for the creation of a safe school climate**

![Diagram showing the intervention process]

The aim of the diagnosis is to obtain information about the existing state of violence, its scope, level of severity and characteristics. This information is used to assess the extent to which the school needs to make a change, which is in itself, an important tool for recruiting the entire staff involvement and cooperation (Morrison et al., 1997; Stephens, 1994). Diagnosis is, moreover, the basis for examining attitudes towards violence and creating a shared meaning for the educational practice (Zilberman and Levi, 1996). In the new "Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process", the
diagnosis of the state of violence at school was based on the students' perceptions and was performed by means of a students' questionnaire (Appendix No. 2).

Planning, the next stage - precedes the programme building. West-Burnham (1994, p. 82) sees this stage as building a bridge between the current situation and the desired situation. Implementation - the third stage - represents the collaborative building of the intervention programme by each school, done in accordance with the diagnostic data and the programme's practical integration in the school activities. The last stage - Evaluation - refers to the evaluation of the process.

The nature of the intervention process points to its structured-open-ended nature. The structured aspect refers to the four-stages systematic process. The open-ended aspect refers to the construction of the programme by each school. Fullan (1999) considers this dual nature of the process to be suitable for coping with complex problems (p. 24).

**The purpose of the study**

The purpose of this study is to examine principals' perceptions of leadership in the process of transforming the school culture. These perceptions are examined on the basis of Israeli secondary school principals' experience in introducing a new “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”. This gave rise to the overarching research question, aiming to comprehend the principals' experience in the process they have undergone. This question investigates the factors that principals perceive to be of greatest importance in enabling them to lead a transformation of the school culture.
Summary

The Introduction reviewed the contextual and the conceptual framework of the study. The contextual framework focused on the explanation and description of violence at school. To better understand the phenomenon, a description of violence in the Israeli social context was provided. Moreover, a broad review of incidents of violence in Israeli schools, as well as in comparison with other countries, was included. This background facilitated the understanding of the development and the nature of the new “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” a government initiative, which was developed for school principals as a strategic tool for leading transformation of the school culture. This initiative was based on the acknowledgement that school principals are responsible for leading the transformation process as a result of their commitment. Hence, introducing the new initiative was based on the principals’ voluntary choice rather than a centralized directive from the Ministry of Education. Moreover, the initiative’s rationale was grounded on the perception that a safe climate is one manifestation of a healthy school culture, which every school has to transform by its own. Following the Vilnai Commission’s recommendations “...strong emphasis should be placed on systemic improvement of the school’s culture and climate ...” (Ministry of Education, 1999, p. 5). The new initiative was thus offered to the school principals as a strategic tool for leading a transformation of their own unique school culture.

Since creating a healthy safe school is an administrative priority (Kaplan, 1995) and because principals are in the best position to create such environment in their schools (Sergiovanni, 1995), the conceptual framework stressed the importance of principals in
the process of transforming a school culture. The related literature indicates, that leading a transformation of a healthy school culture encompasses three key concepts: leadership, culture and change.

Moreover, as the study’s aim was to examine the principals’ perception of leadership, in addition to the fact that the new initiative was developed for school principals, leadership was considered as the primary concept.

The research literature stresses leadership as a primary factor in transforming school culture and in introducing change most noted by Leithwood et al. (1999), Sergiovanni (1995) and Yukl (1989). Hence, an emphasis was placed on transformational leadership as minted by Burns (1978). This form of leadership is associated with improvement and transformation; it entails creating a vision based on values and moral purpose, setting goals and establishing relationships in the school (Leithwood et al., 1999; Bryman, 1992; Bass and Avolio, 1994). Furthermore, as the study deals with transforming a safe school culture, it was deemed important to provide an understanding of culture as a mechanism for shaping the behavioural norms and a mechanism which enables the transformation process as discussed by Samuel (1996), Sarason (1982) and Schein (1985). The third concept—change—was included because transformation is essentially a change process (Morrison, 1998, p. 13).

The principals’ perceptions of leadership—the topic of the study—were examined on the basis of their experience in introducing a new initiative aiming at changing school culture. The over-arching research question therefore examined the factors that the principals perceived as enabling them to lead transformation in their schools. The sub-questions attempted to expand the understanding of leadership by examining various aspects of the same process. These aspects refer to the principals’ values, the ways
those values are shared within the school and the leadership styles the principals identified as enabling them to promote change. The present study evolved stage by stage while reading the literature on leadership in the process of transforming the school culture, thus the research questions were not determined a-priori. Rather, they were formulated and revised in the process of constructing the conceptual framework, which was based on the literature. To retain the developmental nature of the study, it was decided to place the sub-questions only after reviewing how researchers of educational leadership refer to leadership in the process of transforming the school culture. Moreover, placing these questions following the literature review was meant to enhance comprehension of how those questions stemmed from the literature, as required in qualitative research. Hence, the sub-questions and their rationale will be reviewed at the end of the Literature Review Chapter (pages 142-144).

The next chapter reviews the three main concepts- leadership, culture and change- which were found to be pertinent to the study's topic and which provide a conceptual framework for understanding the development of the research questions.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

"The only thing of real importance that leaders do is to create and manage culture" (Schein, 1985, p. 2).

The topic of the present study is principals' perception of their leadership in the process of transforming school culture. The over-arching research question, focusing on the
factors they perceived to be of greatest importance in enabling them to lead the transformation within their schools stemmed from it. Sub-questions attempted to examine various aspects of leadership associated with the same process. These aspects were the principals' values, how they shared their values within the school and the leadership styles they identified as enabling them to promote the change process. In addition, as transformation was based on a new intervention initiative, the last sub-question examined the contribution of this initiative to the transformation process.

Hence, the literature review, which constitutes the theoretical foundation for the research questions, seeks to expand knowledge of these subjects and will therefore, focus on the key theoretical elements of school leadership during the transformation of a school culture and climate.

This chapter contains three parts, which review three main key concepts related to the research topic. The first part examines leadership as a primary topic; the other two parts expand on the understanding of school culture and change as secondary topics. These three concepts, in aggregate, aim at reaching a better understanding of the principals' perceptions in leading a transformation of the school culture.

The literature review opens with a description of leadership. The description focuses on various theories, which attempt to explain the different aspects of school leadership. Hence, the distinction among these aspects is underscored. The best-known type of leadership for cultivating school culture is transformational leadership. (Burns, 1978; Bass and Avolio, 1994; Leithwood et al., 1999; Popper, 1994). For this reason it will be extensively discussed in this chapter.

The second part of the literature review elaborates the concept of school culture. School culture is the ideological basis, around which educational practice revolves, uniting all the members of the organization and a basic condition for the motivation to change.
Hence, successful changes are associated with the notion of culture (Friedman, 1995; Fullan, 2001b; Glover et al., 1998; Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991; Hopkins et al., 1994; Sergiovanni, 1995; Schein 1992). The third part of the literature review discusses change and the conditions, which facilitate or curb its introduction in schools. The literature thus, links the success of principals in leading a transformation of school culture with these three key concepts: leadership – culture and change. These concepts, together with studies illustrating their use in change of school culture, concludes the literature review. The chapter ends with the development of the research questions.

Part 1 - Leadership

Setting the Scene

"Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their shared purposes" (Rost, 1993, p. 102).

Leadership is the most observed, yet the least clear phenomenon in the world (Burns, 1978, p. 2). Some contend that more than 350 definitions of leadership have been formulated. Stogdill (1974) goes even further, arguing that

"...there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept" (p. 9).

The definitions of leadership express cultural and political values (Grace, 1995, p. 192), and reflect fads, political tides and academic trends (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 5). Hence, theoretical models have been developed over the years, describing leadership types as democratic and authoritative, formal and informal, instrumental and
expressive, task-oriented and people-oriented, transactional and transformational. Moreover, Yukl (1989, p. 252) states that definitions of leadership fall into a range of categories, which refer to individual traits, leader behaviour, interaction patterns, role relationships, follower perceptions, influence on task goals, and influence of organizational culture. Yet, some view leadership as nothing but a romantic myth, based on false expectations that “someone will come and solve the problem” (Popper, 1994, p. 39). He states that this conception grounded in the attribution theory, which treats leadership as a process, in which the leader is perceived as such by the followers. There is no doubt that the definition of the term is complex because the phenomenon itself is complex. As Ronen (1992) illustrates “…leadership is ... a complex relationship among variables” (p. 182). The key variables, which he identifies as involved in leadership, are leader’s traits and behaviours, organizational dimensions and the social environment. Bossert et al. (1982) depict the key variables in the following figure (1982, quoted in Hallinger and Leithwood, 1996, p. 102).

Figure 2.A : Key variables involved in leadership- (according to Bossert et al.)
The above elements provide the conceptual framework for describing leadership, based on extensive studies of this issue, in recent years.

The literature review begins with a historical review of leadership theories, starting with approaches, which emphasize leaders' traits, and continuing with behaviourist and contingency approaches, which examine the organizational context in which the leader operates. The main part of this chapter reviews pedagogical, moral, cultural and strategic aspects of educational leadership. Since the focus of the present study is principals' perception of leadership in transformation of school culture, stress is placed on the description and explanation of transformational leadership.

**Theories of Leadership**

**Trait approach**

For generations, the prevalent approach stated that leadership traits are innate and only a few exceptional individuals possess them. Thus, until the 1940s research of leadership was primarily included in socio-psychological studies, which examined the leader’s personality traits. Theories such as the “Great Man” theory, based on political and religious leaders, emphasized charisma. Charisma was considered as an exceptional personality trait, from which leaders, draw their power and by means of which they evoke beliefs and confidence as well as enthusiasm in followers (House, 1977). As Etzioni (1975) defines it, charisma is “…the ability of an actor to exercise diffuse and intense influence over the normative orientations of other actors” (quoted in Bryman, 1992, p. 92).
In hundreds of studies, conducted during the 1930s and 1940s, researchers attempted to identify the traits, which distinguish leaders from non-leaders. Most focused on physical factors, capabilities and personality traits (Mann, 1959; Stogdill, 1974). However, Jennings (1961) stated, that these studies failed to produce one personality trait or set of traits that could be used to distinguish between leaders and non-leaders (p. 2). Stogdill (1974) reviewed the extensive literature dealing with the subject. He concluded that certain personality traits - intelligence, self-confidence, sensitivity and determination, as well as the ability to influence and cope with stressful situations - were indeed associated with leadership. However, Drucker (1989, p. 156) maintained that a person did not become a leader due to these traits. Moreover, focusing on the leader’s traits narrowed the attempts to create leaders, because leadership so defined cannot be created, taught or learned. Popper (1994) concluded that the few traits, which characterize leaders, are general and manifested only in specific situations. Yukl (1989), added an empirical element to this criticism, saying that

"The trait research has shown little concern for direct measurement of leadership behaviour or influence, even though it is evident that the effects of leader traits are mediated by leadership behaviour and influence" (p. 254).

Nevertheless, the trait approach continues to exist in the margins of research, in exploration of the factors associated with leader’s motivation especially in studies of transformational leadership and the “new leadership” (Bryman, 1992).

**Power-Influence approach**

“Leadership requires using power to influence the thoughts and actions of other people” (Zaleznik, 1992, p. 126).
Such a statement raises questions about the way power is used, its intensity, sources and educational implications. Studies of effective principals and principals who have succeeded in introducing change, often underscore the “strong”, “energetic” and “dynamic” personality of the principal as leader (Persell, 1982, quoted in Hopkins et al., 1994, p. 153). However, one cannot ignore the fact that, beyond the draw of personality, principals derive their power from other sources, such as official position, expertise, as well as control of resources and rewards.

White and Lippit (1939) constructed a typology, relating to the activity patterns of leaders, based on the way authority is formed and applied, in guiding the relations and outcomes of behaviour. This typology gave rise to three main leadership types. The first type is an authoritative leadership, characterized by the exercise of control over people. Smith (1995, p. 29) noted that this style may achieve outputs, but it is likely to undermine the professional confidence of subordinates, release them from personal responsibility and evoke resistance. The second type is laissez-faire leadership, which is viewed by some as a lack of leadership, due to its policy of non-intervention in group activities, an approach that does not lead to results. The third type is a democratic-collegial leadership, characterized by work “with, or through, other people”, by involvement in decision-making, decentralized responsibility, delegation of authority, consideration for subordinates’ expectations and the granting of autonomy to subordinates. The salient advantage of this style is the ability to recruit people to action and commitment. Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1973) revised this dichotomy as a leadership continuum and explained that the level of power, exercised by leaders, is influenced by their system of values, leadership inclinations, degree of confidence in their subordinates and situations of uncertainty.
According to Burns (1978), how power is used distinguishes between powerful-tyrannical and democratic-moral leadership. Burns maintained that the leader’s power draws on two major elements – motives and resources. Each of these elements is possessed not only by the leader but also by followers, for the purpose of accomplishing the shared goals of all the organization’s members. Thus, Burns (1978) viewed this kind of leadership as a structure of action that engages others, whether they are fellow leaders or followers, in social processes of change (p. 3).

One of the basic elements, on which leader-followers relationships are grounded, is acknowledgement of the followers’ psychological needs. Consequently, these relationships affect leadership style.

"...psychological needs can be especially relevant to political leadership when they are seen as relative deprivation" (Burns, 1978, p. 66).

According to Burns (1978), the introduction of followers’ needs as an aspect of the leader’s power underscores, the democratic and moral dimension of leadership.

"...by this term [moral] I mean, first that leaders and led have a relationship not only of power but of mutual needs, aspiration and values" (p. 4).

Some researchers, however, disagree that recognition of the followers’ needs, as stressed by Burns, is democratic. They argue that the factor involved is actually a process of persuasion and influence; initiated in order to cause the subordinates to accept the leader’s values and adapt the needs to those of the leader’s (Allix, 2000, p. 15).

From another perspective, Leithwood et al. (1999, p. 13) defined three elements of power in an organization: administration control, professional control and community
control. Sergiovanni (1984) expanded this definition and viewed power as energy required for changing the situation within an educational context. Based on these sources he presented five aspects of the power of leadership: technical-organizational power, which helps to maintain the school’s ability to function – the “management engineer”; human power, which views the leader as a “human engineer”; educational power, which includes the educational aspects of management - the “clinical practitioner”; symbolic power, which involves the staff’s expectations, motivation, sense of commitment, as well as their beliefs and enables development of a vision- the leader as “chief”; and finally, there is cultural power, which intertwines the shared values, beliefs and meanings of the principal, teachers, pupils and parents- the leader as a “High Priest”. Sergiovanni (1998) points out that

“...the source of authority for leadership is found neither in bureaucratic rules and procedures nor in personality and styles of leaders but in shared values, ideas and commitments” (p. 43).

This classification points to an additional source of power, namely the leader’s informal authority, attributed to leaders by their followers. According to Williams (1999) and Popper (1994), this distinction differentiates between leaders and managers. Popper (1994) explains that informal leadership stems from the leader’s professionalism and mastery of the information required and is reinforced by social relationships and a common system of values, by virtue of which the leader acts. Leithwood et al. (1999) sum up this notion of power

“...authority and influence are not necessarily allocated to those occupying formal administrative positions, although much of the literature adopts their perspective. Rather...power is attributed by organization members to whomever is able to inspire their commitments to collective aspirations and the desire for personal and collective mastery of the capacities needed to accomplish such aspirations” (p. 9).
"By introducing the concepts of a whole-staff and individual needs, the issue of leadership becomes one of what leaders actually do, rather than who they are" (Smith, 1995, p. 48).

Leader behaviour, which affects the effectiveness of subordinates' performance and satisfaction, was studied from the 1940s until the late 1960s. Two main schools of thought related to the behaviour approach developed during the 1950s, one at the University of Ohio and the other at the University of Michigan. While examining the behaviour of leaders, researchers had found that it ranged between the organizational dimension, involving an instrumental orientation to the accomplishment of results, and the human dimension, reflecting an orientation to relationships. Those belonging to the first school (Hamphill, 1950) classified nine major categories of leader behaviour. Out of these categories, Halpin and Winer (1957) chose three key elements, which constituted the basis for the two indices that according to this approach characterize leaders' behaviour. The first, the initiating structure, referred to goal accomplishment, and the second, the consideration structure referred to followers' needs. Numerous studies attempted to investigate the relationship between these two indices. Some viewed these dimensions as polarities, whereas others stressed their independence. Halpin and Winer (1957) stressed their independence; That is, the same leader may be both considerate and task-oriented. Consequently, successful leaders display high levels in both dimensions. On the other hand, Lowin et al. (1969) argued that there is an inverse relationship between the indices, namely, that the more considerate a principal is, the less task-oriented he or she is, and vice versa. Kavanagh (1972) added factors, which affect the relationship between consideration and initiating: subordinates'
expectations as to the leader's behaviour, the complexity of the task and the subordinates' competence. Although Kavanagh failed to corroborate his hypotheses, his findings indicated that there was some dependence between consideration and initiating, the most salient finding being the positive correlation between the consideration style and satisfaction and productivity. The inconsistency of these and other findings led to criticism of this approach, particularly regarding its theoretical framework, conceptual ambiguity and lack of allowance for situational variables (Yukl, 1989, p. 259).

In parallel, similar theories were developed elsewhere. The Research Centre of the University of Michigan distinguished between two leader types: people-oriented, which emphasizes relationships within the organization, and task-oriented directed at output and outcomes. The criticism of this two-factor behaviour approach was rooted in the argument that rarely were the leader's traits and power included in studies conducted by this school of thought. Moreover, it was argued that the dichotomous classification of leadership styles was arbitrary and did not capture the principals' need to use various styles in the complex reality, which they faced (Bass and Valenzi, 1974; Hill, 1973).

On the whole, the behaviour approach was subject to criticism along several major parameters: inconsistency of findings, absence of situational analysis, issues of causality, focus on formal leadership and not on informal leadership and measurement problems (Bryman, 1992). Yet, one cannot ignore the advantage of the approach, which provides an expansive perspective on leadership. Generally speaking, one can say that studies conducted both at the University of Ohio and the University of Michigan support the view that
...there is no single behavioural category of leadership which is superior. There are many types of leadership behaviour and their effectiveness depends upon the variables in any given situation (Mullins, 1999, p. 266).

Contingency approach

The failure of the behaviour approach to identify an effective leadership style led, at the end of the 1960s, to the development of the situational or contingency approach, which argues that there is no single effective leadership style but that leadership is contingent on the situation.

"A variety of people with differing personalities and from different backgrounds have emerged as effective leaders in different situations. The person who becomes the leader of the work group is thought to be the person who knows best what to do and is seen by the group as the most suitable leader in the particular situation" (Mullins, 1999, p. 272).

That is, the effectiveness of leadership style depends on the match between the elements of the organizational situation, the subordinates’ traits and the leadership style (Daft, 1999, p. 94). Based on these variables, different theories were developed, which strove to identify the characteristics of the situations, followers and leadership styles considered effective.

Fiedler (1967), to whom the development of the contingent theory is attributed, distinguished between two types of leader: task-oriented and social-oriented. He defined three characteristics, which describe the reality under which the leader is functioning: leader-member relations, task structure and leadership position power, as well as the extent to which the situation favours the leader. This theory presupposes that effective leadership will occur when organizations exhibit good relations, define clear tasks and display authority. However, Fiedler (1967) also referred to situations that are
more complex and maintained that a task-oriented leader would be more successful in extreme situations (very convenient or very difficult situations), where guidance was required. On the other hand, a social-oriented leader would be more successful in intermediate situations, where the situation is vague, and it is necessary to emphasize individual development.

The advantage of Fiedler's approach rests on his identification of the connection between the range of the factors, which affect leadership style, and the prediction of leadership effectiveness, a goal, which guided research throughout the 1960s and 1970s. Consequently, his approach represents a paradigm, which serves for the development of numerous theories, such as the Situational Theory of Hersey and Blanchard (1982). This theory adds followers' behaviour as a central factor in adapting leadership style to the situation, while positing the maturity of the staff as a key variable. Hersey and Blanchard (1982) match each leadership style with an organizational context. For organizations, characterized by high levels of experience and commitment, the most suitable leadership style will be delegation, assuming that experienced people do not need guidance and people with a high level of commitment do not need support. For an inexperienced but enthusiastic staff, a directional style will improve performance; however, due to the staff's enthusiasm, no massive support will be required. A competent but uncommitted staff will benefit from a coaching style, which combines high levels of guidance and support, whereas a staff with an average amount of experience and varying levels of motivation will benefit from a style of support and guidance (Bollington, 1999, p. 169). Ronen (1992) argues that the Hersey and Blanchard model does not recommend a preferred leadership style but associates leadership with group development, wherein resides its advantage. This dynamic view of leadership style follows the changing reality and organizational culture. Another
classification, based on the range between people and task-oriented leadership, was constructed by Blake and Mouton (1964). They analyzed the different dimensions of leadership, with each dimension emphasizing the prominence of the task-oriented versus people-oriented. In their “Managerial Grid” model, five major leadership styles were identified. The first is the task-oriented style, characteristic of leadership, which aspires to accomplish goals without considering the people in the organization. Hence, leaders who demonstrate this style demand obedience in order to attain maximum efficiency in reaching objectives. The opposite of the task-oriented style is the country club style, which focuses on people’s satisfaction with a low emphasis on outcomes. Unlike these two, the impoverished style displayed passive leadership and is characterized by a low result rate and low relationship rate. The fourth style is the middle-of-the-road style, characteristic of a leadership whereby “... solutions are found through equilibrium or compromise” (Blake and Mouton, 1964, p. 110).

The fifth style, favoured by Blake and Mouton, is the team style, correlated with collaboration, involvement, trust and mutual support. This leadership style is characterized by the leader’s investment in accomplishing the goal, while considering people’s needs and nurturing teamwork. Its main disadvantage is the constant effort invested in every situation and the lack of assurance that the desired results will be achieved under all circumstances (Popper, 1994).

A similar, yet more complex model is Reddin’s (1970) three-dimensional model. Reddin identifies four main leadership styles: the related style characterizes high people-oriented and a low task-oriented leadership; the separate style characterizes low leadership in both dimensions; the dedicated style characterizes leaders who are more task-oriented and less people-oriented; and the integrated style combines a high task-oriented with high people-oriented leadership style. In addition, Reddin (1970)
integrated into the model situational dimensions, such as organizational tasks, organizational climate and colleagues, which he saw as dynamic variables having mutual influences. According to Popper (1994), the advantage of this model resides in the fact that it emphasizes leadership flexibility and responsiveness to the circumstances.

Another contingency theory, the path-goal theory, is associated with the work of House (1971). This theory depicts the leader as a mediator between followers’ needs and goal characteristics. The theory maintains that effective leaders create subordinates on a “smooth path” for accomplishing both their own goals and those of the organization. Focus is placed on the question of how the leader’s behaviour stimulates subordinates’ motivation, satisfaction and high level of performance.

"Leadership behaviour will be motivational to the extent that it provides necessary direction, guidance and support, helps clarify path-goal relationships and removes any obstacles which hinder attainment of goals” (Mullins, 1999, p. 278).

Hence, different styles can characterize the same person and at different times, in different situations. Moreover, the leadership style chosen is influenced by the nature of the people as well as of the goal. Yukl (1989) criticized this theory, saying that it focuses on subordinate motivation as the explanatory process for the effects of leadership, and ignores other explanatory processes, such as a leader’s influence on task organization, resource levels, and skill levels” (p. 264).

Another criticism of the path-goal theory is that the studies, conducted on the basis of this theory, are repetitive and tend to focus on narrow dimensions of leadership and not on an aggregate of leadership styles.
"...similarly, in spite of House's insistence that a range of moderating variables might be examined, there was an overwhelming emphasis upon the role of task structure in this respect" (Bryman, 1992, p. 19).

To sum up, the contingency approach emphasizes that there is no single "proper" leadership style and, that the success of any leadership style, is contingent on the context. As Fidler (1997b) stated

"What is appropriate leadership at a particular point in time depends on: the context and its pre-history; the nature of followers; the particular issues involved; in addition to the predispositions of the leader. Thus, although a leader may have a preferred leadership style, this may need to be varied according to circumstances" (p. 25).

Hence, leaders must understand their own style, properly diagnose the organizational context and be prepared to adapt the situation or alter their leadership style. This process demands flexibility in order to match leadership style to the requirements of the environment.

Since the 1980s, researchers have been stressing the role of leaders in shaping the organization in their image, according to their vision while interacting with their followers (Ronen, 1992, p.35). This model of leadership is extensively reviewed in the following.

**Transformational leadership**

One way to examine leadership is through interrelations with the followers. Two approaches follow from this point of view. The first is the instrumental approach, which emphasizes transactions between performance and needs. That is, leaders satisfy the followers' needs and obtain performance in return. This type of leadership is termed-
transactional leadership. The second is the affective approach, whereby the leader generates the transformation of followers’ expectations and ambitions, evokes an intellectual stimulus and shapes new organizational norms. Popper (1994) indicated that this is accomplished through the power of the leader’s personality, his or her inner beliefs and his or her ability to respond to the followers’ latent ideas. This type of leadership is termed transformational leadership, and described in terms similar to charismatic leadership, inspirational leadership, visionary leadership and new leadership. This distinction raises the question of how leaders affect situations and followers rather than how they adapt themselves to various situations. According to Ronen (1992, p. 37), this does not negate the contingency approach but does re-formulate the concept of leadership.

The notion of transformational leadership looms large in contemporary administrative theory and research (Bennis, 1984; Caldwell, 1992; Gronn, 1996; Hallinger, 1992; Leithwood et al., 1999). Burns (1978) minted the term transformational leadership and placed it opposite to transactional leadership. He analyzed leadership in situational terms and the interrelationships between the leader and his or her followers. These relationships are dynamic with the leader’s personality driving them.

Burns (1978) argued that

"...the most powerful influences consist of deeply human relationships in which two or more persons engage with one another" (p. 11).

To Burns, the nature of relationships resides in the interconnections between motives, resources, leaders, and followers (p. 9). Similarly, Sergiovanni (1990) claimed that
"leadership is exercised when persons with certain purposes mobilize resources so as to arouse and satisfy the motives of followers" (p. 31).

Bryman (1992) added that this purpose is one in which the aims and aspirations of leaders and followers meld (p. 95). Moreover, Leithwood et al. (1999) noted that

"transformational leadership entails not only a change in the purpose and resources of those involved in the leader-follower relationships, but an elevation of both – a change "for the better" (p. 28).

Consequently, transformational leadership is associated with the notion of group betterment. In this sense, a transformational leader

"stimulates interest among colleagues and followers to view their work from new perspectives, generate awareness of the mission or vision of the team and organization, develop colleagues and followers to higher level of ability and potential, and motivate colleagues and followers to look beyond their interests toward those that will benefit the group" (Bass and Avolio, 1994, p. 2).

Unlike transformational leadership, transactional leadership relies on the elements in the situation and is based on an exchange between leaders and followers, whereby the leader creates a link between effort and reward. Hence, a transactional leader focuses on stimulating effective performance, based on the followers’ readiness. The advantage of this type of leadership relates to the organization’s effective functioning and the preservation of its stability (Bass and Avolio, 1994). Alternatively, Daft (1999) claims that its disadvantage lies in its inability to generate change (p. 427).

This distinction illustrates the unique characteristics of each style. Transactional leadership emphasizes contingent rewards, management–by-exception and laissez-faire or “hands off” forms of leadership, whereas transformational leadership emphasizes the
Idealized influence, Inspirational motivation, Intellectual stimulation and Individualized consideration (Bass and Avolio, 1994).

These characteristics have practical implications, manifested in several areas. The first area relates to professionalism, whereby transformational leaders grant their subordinates more freedom support their initiatives, and encourage them to take part in decision-making and problem solving. The second area is connected to self-actualization, whereby transformational leaders succeed in making people rise above the basic needs and reach the higher needs of actualization and personal development, by providing a personal example and response to challenges. The third area relates to the ability of transformational leaders to mobilize people to act for the sake of the organization (Allix, 2000; Bass, 1985; Bass and Avolio, 1994; Bryman, 1992; Burns, 1978).

Caldwell (1992, p. 17) suggested a broader view of transformational leadership by using four dimensions - cultural leadership, strategic leadership, educational leadership and responsive leadership. Based on these dimensions, Tucker-Ladd and Thurston (1992, p. 204) argued that transformational leadership is characterized by its ability to initiate major changes and innovations. Hence according to Yukl (1989)

"Transformational leadership is viewed as both a micro-level influence process between individuals and as a macro-level process of mobilizing power to change social system and reform institutions" (p. 271).

Using Burns as a starting point, Bass (1985) conducted numerous studies and wrote about transformational leadership. Like Burns, Bass distinguished between transformational and transactional leadership. However, while Burns perceived these two leadership styles as the two extremes of one continuum, Bass viewed them as separate but complementary dimensions. Bass and Avolio (1994), who formulated the
two-factor theory, whereby transformational leadership may exist parallel to transactional leadership, underscored the fact that leaders require both these leadership styles in order to manage an organization, each applied according to the situation and the organization in which they function. According to their perception, leaders can be both transformational and transactional at the same time. Hence, according to Bass and Avolio, 1994 p. 5) individuals found to have an optimal leadership profile were transformational leaders who backed-up their leadership with transactional qualities, accompanied by positive reinforcements and rewards. Southworth (1993) supports this perspective stating that

"...transactions are particles of the transformations the leader seeks. Thus, transformational leadership is dependent upon transactional leadership. And one is not better than the other, rather the two are mutually dependent and complementary. Although some writers presently portray transformational leadership as a superior option ... I believe we need to see transformational leadership as mediated by transactional leadership" (p. 79).

Empirical evidence linking these two dimensions of leadership is found in studies conducted by Leithwood (1994). In a study of transformational leadership in the context of school restructuring, he pointed out that "...we no longer distinguish leadership dimensions as transformational or transactional" (p. 508). Yet, in another study Leithwood et al. (1996), specified that

"...transactional practices to be necessary and associated them with routine management, whereas transformational practices were associated with their change effort" (p. 828).

In applying the Bass (1985) theory, in an educational context, Leithwood, et al. (1999, p.9) identified seven factors that characterizes transformational leadership: building a school vision, establishing school goals, providing intellectual stimulation, offering individualized support, modeling organizational values, demonstrating high
performance expectations, creating a productive school culture and developing structures to foster participation in school decisions-making. These aspects were positively related to transformational leadership as a whole, but especially to charisma/vision/inspiration, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration and contingent rewards (Bass, 1985; Kirby et al., 1992).

In the wake of empirical research of these factors, Leithwood et al. (1999, p.39) proposed re-organization of the transformational leadership dimensions into four central dimensions: (a) setting directions -includes vision building, goal consensus and the development of high-performance expectations; (b) developing people -includes the provision of individualized support, intellectual stimulation and modelling of values and practices important to the schools’ mission; (c) constructing a school culture in which colleagues are motivated by moral imperatives. The fostering of shared decision-making and problem-solving capacities; and (d) building relationships with the school’s community. These dimensions of transformational leadership underscore the importance of its influence on the school’s organizational culture. Moreover, Bollington (1999) argues that transformational leadership has the potential to change school culture and create conditions for improvement (p. 172).

Studies of educational institutions have indicated that transformational leaders help staff members to develop and maintain a collaborative, professional school culture, foster teacher development; and promote effective shared problem solving (Leithwood et al., 1992). Moreover, they contribute to organizational learning, develop a productive school climate and improve student outcomes (Leithwood et al., 1999; Silins, 1994). These findings are supported by studies in the business sector, such as that of Peters and Waterman (1982), who investigated the characteristics of highly successful companies.
Their study shows that the central characteristic of these companies is a strong coherent culture, based on a system of values and beliefs, which creates meaning and direction for the organization. These researchers attribute these organizational characteristics to transformational leadership style (p. 82).

One of the major factors of leader-follower actions is motivation. Whereas transactional leadership is based on external motivation, transformational leadership is grounded in stimulation of internal motivation (Silins, 1994). Burns (1978) maintained that increasing followers' internal (psychological) motivation becomes possible only if their wishes are recognized and their needs satisfied, notably at higher levels of the need and value hierarchies.

"...the transforming leader looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower..." (Burns, 1978, p. 4).

To that Bass (1985) added the creation of a shared organizational purpose as a motivational factor to transcend the individual self-interests. This approach to leadership fundamentally attempts to foster capacity development and higher levels of personal commitment to organizational goals and outcomes (Leithwood and Jantzi, 1999, p. 451). Bryman (1992) expands on this point thusly.

"...transformational leaders enhance followers' confidence and hence their expectation that they can attain greater performance. These effects on followers operate in conjunction with the tendency of transformational leaders to seek to change the organizational culture, which alters the ways in which followers think about themselves and the organization, and their position within it (p. 98).

Bryman (1992, p. 91) refers to this transformational leadership as "new leadership". However, despite its presentation as a new type of leadership, some researchers
wonder whether it is actually “the same old thing in a new form” (Gronn, 1996; Meindle, 1990, p. 181).

Although the terms transformational and transactional help to classify leadership styles, Southworth (1993) contends these terms do not capture the character and nature of school leadership in action.

“...they are too abstract and omit the vigorous quality of headteachers at work. Rather, researchers should seek more grounded interpretations of school leadership, so that they do not leave behind the very essences they are trying to portray” (p. 78).

To the above Gronn (1996) adds, that the concept of transformational leadership is complex and open to interpretation. He further maintains that even Leithwood himself seems ambivalent about transformational leadership; sometimes he embraces it, at other times he bypasses, ignores or rejects its attributes (p. 20). Bryman (1992, quoted in Gronn, 1996, p. 16) attributes this problem to the fact that research of transformational leadership suffers from a dearth of detailed ethnographic case studies of leaders in action. Gronn (1996) further argues that a great part of the transformational leader research focuses on conventional surveys of superiors or on structured interviews using diverse informant samples (p. 16).

**Charisma**

“Followers become important in the sense that their needs are met and motives aroused and mobilized as a function of the leader’s characteristics. Some have argued quiet explicitly that charismatic leadership is best thought about in terms of the personal attributes possessed by the leader” (Meindl, 1990, p.186).
The study of transformational leadership relates to a series of parallel concepts, one of which is charisma. Burns (1978) related to charisma as heroic leadership, whereby the leader can stimulate emotions, enthuse and inspire followers. He or she can encourage loyalty to the organization and be perceived as a person of vision. Bass (1981) viewed charisma as one of the essential elements of transformational leadership, though insufficient in itself. Avolio and Gibbon (1988) implied that these concepts are barely distinguishable while Gronn (1996) noted the close relationship between perceptions of transformational and charismatic leadership, as well as the explicit omission of charisma from some current conceptualisations of transformational leadership. He added that, even if a distinction is made between the two concepts, charisma is always an element of transformational leadership rather than vice versa (p. 14). In contrast, Trice and Beyer (1990) maintained these two types of leader can be differentiated, mainly in reference to change of the organizational culture. Whereas the transformational leader replaces the existing organization with a new one, a charismatic leader creates both a new organization and a new culture.

The theory of charismatic leadership alludes to additional aspects of its traditional definition. Whereas in traditional perception, charisma is attributed to the personality traits of the “great man”, Bass (1985) viewed it as a cluster of personality traits and transferable skills. Furthermore, traditional approaches stress the innate character of charisma whereas contemporary researchers underscore its learnt aspects (Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Conger and Kanungo, 1987).

Conger and Kanungo (1987) viewed charismatic leadership as essentially the product of a process of attribution. Meindl (1990) further argued that in order to understand the influence of the charismatic leader on followers, one has to understand the dynamic, social and psychological interactions maintained between leaders and followers,
including the characteristics attributed to the leader by the followers. As he continues "...charismatic leadership is made possible because charismatic effects in followers are created and transmitted within the group" (p. 189). Related to this point of view, Popper (1994, p. 34) stated that a leader will be perceived as charismatic if his or her behaviours closely comply with the organization's goals and are perceived as such by the followers.

Charisma engendered synonymous terms such as "magic leadership", "symbolic leadership" and "visionary leadership"). "Magic leadership" minted by Nadler and Tushman (1989) emphasizes three behaviours considered typical of charismatic leaders: Envisioning – the ability to shape a vision and assimilate it within the organization; Energizing – the enhancement of motivation; and Enabling – assisting people to perform tasks. The "symbolic leadership" of Bolman and Deal (1991) assigns meaning to an organization's activities by means of symbols, thereby, affecting the beliefs, values, attitudes and behaviours of the organization's members. Meaning provides the basis for identification with the leader's vision and the inspiration of commitment to the organization's goals (Bennis and Nanus; 1985; Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Deal and Peterson 1990; Lightfoot, 1983). There is also "visionary leadership" suggested by Sashkin (1986), which refers to the leader's cognitive capabilities, required for the transformation of organizational culture in accordance with the vision articulated by the leaders of where the organization should be heading. Visionary principals are strongly committed to their personal convictions and are typically eager to express their own beliefs about educational purposes (Blumberg and Greenfield, 1980; Lightfoot, 1983).

Despite all the advantages of charismatic leadership, some researchers still view it as a quality, which belongs only to cults and as the negation of effective role leadership.
This is exemplified by harsh criticism of charismatic leadership, such as Fullan's (2001a)

"...charismatic leaders inadvertently often do more harm than good because, at best, they provide episodic improvement followed by frustrated or despondent dependency. Superhuman leaders also do us another disservice: they are models who can never be emulated by large numbers. Deep and sustained reform depends on many of us, not just on the very few who are destined to be extraordinary" (p.1).

**Vision**

Among the behaviours of transformational leaders, vision and their ability to articulate it in school have been mentioned.

"Successful transformational leaders are usually identified in terms of providing a strong vision and sense of mission, arousing strong emotions in followers and a sense of identification with the leader" (Mullins, 1999, p. 281).

Studies conducted in recent years indicate that vision is the heart of leadership and the core of school culture (Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Leithwood et al., 1999; Sergiovanni, 1994). In a study of ninety leaders, who succeeded in generating a transformation of people's expectations, Bennis and Nanus (1985) found that the common denominator of all of them was their vision, which they defined as

"... a mental image of a possible and desirable future state of the organization... as vague as a dream or as precise as a goal or mission statement... attractive future for the organization, a condition that is better in some important ways than what now exists" (p. 89).

Hence, researchers concur that vision involves setting a direction for the organization (Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Goldring and Pasternak, 1994; Louis and Miles, 1992; Rosenholtz, 1989).
"The development of a vision... should viewed... as a compass that points the direction to be taken, that inspires enthusiasm and that allows people to buy into and take part in the shaping of the way that will constitute the school mission" (Sergiovanni, 1990, p. 57).

Moreover, vision serves as a tool for organizational cohesion and commitment (Beare et al., 1989, 1993; Leithwood et al., 1999; Hopkins et al., 1994) as Sergiovanni (1990) states“... the building of a consensus about purposes and beliefs creates a powerful force that bonds people together around common themes... (p. 57). Beare et al. (1989) maintain further that

"Outstanding leaders have a vision for their schools... which is shared with all in the school community and which shapes the program for learning and teaching as well as policies, priorities, plans and procedures pervading the day-to-day school life” (p. 99).

Additionally, Sergiovanni (1994) perceives vision as an “educational platform” that incorporates the school’s beliefs about the preferred aims, methods and climate, thereby creating a “community of minds” that establishes behavioural norms. This position is supported by MacBeath (1998) and Leithwood et al. (1994), who investigated teachers’ perceptions of leadership. They have found that teachers perceive leadership as effective when the leader has a clear personal vision of what he or she wants to accomplish and has the ability to connect both the teachers and the pupils to this vision. In this sense

“...vision provides a shared meaning: people talk about it, use the same language to describe it, and believe that they are engaged in a common task” (Louis and Miles, 1992, p. 237).

Roueche and Baker (1986), who obtained “profiles of excellence“ of 154 schools in the U.S.A., found that principals with a vision, not only preferred outcomes but also the processes of change and approaches to the management of change. In this sense, vision
is less a one-time event than an evolutionary process that requires continuous reflection, action and re-evaluation. On that, Louis and Miles (1992) add saying

"...visions are not a simple, unified view of 'what this school can be and do', but are a complex braid of the evolving themes of the change program. 'Visioning' is a dynamic process. Developed and reinforced from the action...."

Bennis and Nanus (1985) further argued that leaders should provide the organization not only with a vision but also with the ability to turn that vision into reality. In order to do this, a leader must have a mental image of the organization’s desirable future state. Thus, they noted that the vision must be a realistic, credible, attractive future for the organization, "...a condition that is better in some important ways than what now exists" (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 89). Beare et al. (1989) and Fullan (2001b) added that, vision must be significant and clear to all and attuned to the school culture. In an elaboration of that thought, Bollington (1999) states

"...such a vision is seen as crucial to gaining commitment and enthusiasm and to empowering people to act in the knowledge of the direction they need to go in. It will reflect, often contains an ethical stance" (p. 171).

**Vision building**

Whereas there is no dispute that vision plays a crucial role in building the future direction of a school, questions have been raised about the way vision is interpreted and implemented at school, which managerial strategies should be used, as well as the ethical issues to be confronted. One of the situations discussed by Beare et al. (1993) is the possibility that a school and its staff may have several visions, some of which may
be contradictory (p. 157). This gives rise to moral as well as practical questions as to which vision to adopt and whether the principal’s vision has precedence.

“Today, vision is a familiar concept in corporate leadership. But when you look carefully, you find that most visions are one person (or one group’s) vision imposed on an organization. Such vision, at best, commands compliance - not commitment…” (Senge, 1995, p. 206).

Hence, Hargreaves and Fullan (1999) warn against the damage of blindly “adopting the principal’s vision”. Inbar (2000) questions the ethics of mobilization and wonders whether

“...a leadership which succeeds in uniting all its members around one vision is not, at worst, totalitarian, simplistic-populist in the current case, and ‘valued bureaucratic’ at best” (p. 107).

Senge (1995) and Sergiovanni (1992) tried to “mellow” this point by introducing the dimension of the “personal vision” of the followers and claming that “... a shared vision is a vision that many people are truly committed to, because it reflects their own personal vision” (Senge, 1995, p. 206). Sergiovanni (1992) adds “...these values create the community’s vision and enable everyone to follow the vision rather than a person” (p.42)

Yet, the creation of a shared vision raises the question of power used by the principal. One style is authoritative top-down leadership, which ensures agreement in the shortest time. Southworth (1993), who related to this question in a study of primary school principals in England, argued that this leadership style can indeed be quick and effective, but it raises ethical questions, since it overrides teachers’ professionalism (p. 83). Another style is the democratic bottom-up style, which assumes that
"...real commitment is only achieved when people are helped to develop the competence and commitment to become involved in the development of the vision" (Bollington, 1999, p. 172).

This leadership style focuses on the assimilation of the shared vision by building communication networks, empowering the people, granting as much autonomy as possible, extensively decentralizing authority and cultivating employees and their capabilities. This view raises the issue of collaboration as the most certain way to ensure the implementation of a shared vision and turn it into reality (Beare et al., 1989; Bryk et al., 1998; Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991; Sergiovanni, 1994). Moreover, empirical studies underscore that teachers’ collaboration is an effective way to implement change and empower the entire organization in the process (Fullan, 1992; Nanus, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1994; Southworth, 1993). Yet, Hargreaves and Fullan (1999) warned, “…building collaborative culture involves a long developmental journey” (p. 110). They took the concept one step further, viewing the process of building the vision as bi-directional, whereby the principal learns from others, as they learn from him or her (p. 98). Therefore, the vision presented by the principal is “tentative” and subject to change, as part of the construction of a common culture.

Consequently, Inbar (2000) and Sergiovanni (1992) note that a leader has to create conditions and mechanisms for empowerment and to strive for many people in the organization to become “leaders”. In Southworth’s words “...all staff need to become leaders and visionaries. This will mean an end to deference towards and dependence upon the head” (1993, p. 85).
Educational leadership

The central axis, around which school is organized, represents educational and learning processes. These processes occur within a complex reality, requiring a type of management, which revolves around demands, issuing from sometimes-contradictory goals, values, participants, processes, contents and outcomes. Recent decades have witnessed the strengthening of this approach by underscoring the importance of the principal’s leadership for the improvement of the quality of life at school. Goodlad (1984) went even further, arguing that the principal is entirely responsible for the quality of life at school.

When seen from a historical perspective, research of educational leadership has undergone three main complementary phases. The first phase related to the description of leadership and dealt with the question “What is leadership”. The second asked “How does it work”, in trying to understand the process of leadership, whereas the third attempted to determine “Who can be considered as the ideal leader”. These questions encompass the attempt to adapt the “desirable” to the unique conditions of education and the adjustment of the principal’s educational perceptions to the educational process. Over the years, conceptions of educational leadership have variously focused on the first among equals, the super-educator, the administrative leader, the social leader, the professional organizer, the system operator and the instructional leader. Today, the emphasis is on the notion of a moral-communal and professional leader (Friedman, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1995). Furthermore, Goldring and Bacharach (1991) state that educational leadership has been influenced by the changes in school dynamics. From hierarchical organizations to professional schools with a collegial culture, from centralized systems to pluralistic establishments, and from static to dynamic schools
which emphasize expertise and personal authority. However, to a large extent, the way principals perceive leadership dictates, their management style, communication with the environment and educational-pedagogical-ideological rationale, which guides their actions in the field and their interpretation of the educational policy. Inbar (2000) further claims

"...any attempt to separate management style, perception of their leadership and educational policy is erroneous and blurs the essence of the principal's role" (p. 17).

This claim reflects two fundamental leadership concepts, associated with the principal’s functioning - educational leadership and educational management. Many researchers have investigated the link between these two concepts. Some view them as synonymous and equally important for the functioning of school (Bolman and Deal, 1991; Fullan, 2001a; Glatter, 1997). Bollington (1999) states "... leadership and management are best seen as closely linked and as two sides of the same coin" (p.157). Fullan (2001a) expresses this position thusly: "...I have never been fond of distinguishing between leadership and management: they overlap and you need both qualities" (p. 2)

As Terrell (1999) concludes,

"Most leadership needs to be conducted through the management of the school. There is the case for showing leadership through management rather than distinguishing between the two" (p. 105).

Others view leadership and management as distinct terms (Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Caldwell and Spinks, 1988; Williams, 1999), with the building of vision and shaping of the school culture is attributed to leadership, while day-to-day functioning of school is attributed to management. West-Burnham (1997) describes this dichotomy in more detail, namely, that leading is concerned with vision, strategic issues, transformation,
ends and people “doing the right thing”, while managing is concerned with implementation, operational issues, transactions, means and systems “doing things right” (p.117). Additional distinctions have been made by Kotter (1990) who argues that effective leadership produces useful change while good management controls complexity. This view is supported by Kouzes and Posner (1987) who state that leaders

“...are associated with change and innovation and managers with stability and control. Each is associated with different times: managers with periods of constancy; leaders with period of turbulence” (quoted in Bryman, 1992, p. 138).

Mullins (1999) stresses another aspect

“Leadership is not only an essential part of the process of management, it is also an integral part of the social structure of the organization. If the manager is to be successful in dealing with people and influencing their behaviour and action this requires a leadership style, which helps to foster a supportive organizational culture” (p. 284).

These issues continue to divide researchers both theoretically and operationally, when they examine principals’ functioning in practice.

A number of studies of educational leadership have indicated that the principal’s activity is characterized by four major areas: creation of a vision (Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991; Sergiovanni, 1995); promotion of a learning environment (Caldwell and Spinks, 1998; Dimmock, 1995); initiative to introduce changes (Fullan, 2001b; Hoy and Miskel, 1991); and the construction of the school’s relationship with its external environment (Chen and Addi, 1995; Goldring and Rallis, 1993; Inbar, 2000).

The analysis of these elements emphasizes four central aspects of educational leadership: the pedagogical, the cultural, the moral and the strategic.
**Pedagogical leadership**

The American National Education Policy Committee defined the “principal-leader” as the “… crucial force that determines the schools’ climate and the teachers’ and the students’ attitudes towards the learning process…” (Drake and Roe, 1986, p. 11). Since one of the main goals of school is learning, pedagogical leadership has to create organizational conditions, in which learning is made possible and teachers can fulfill their educational tasks (Fidler, 1997a; Schmuck and Schmuck, 1978). Dimmock (2000) specifies these conditions

"...these conditions include the physical and emotional state of the students, the physical classroom environment, the characteristics of the teachers and teaching and the students' own motivation. Students best learn when they are free of undue worry and stress, and when they feel safe, secure and comfortable at school “ (p. 109).

Fidler (1997a) further points out that “…by affecting the school-level climate and culture the expectation is that the classroom climate and culture may also be influenced” (p. 32). Caldwell (1992) describes this climate and culture as “nurturing of a learning community”, with an emphasis on the development of learning processes, the structuring of a working environment for teachers and the development of human capital in the sense of strong mutually supportive relationships among the different constituencies in the school community. Specifically, he mentions

“...the processes of learning and teaching and the support of learning and teaching... the restructuring of the workplace for teachers, the development of social capital...” (Caldwell, 1992, p. 17).

Pedagogical leadership as described by Sergiovanni (1998), invests in capacity building by developing social and academic capital for students and professional capital for
teachers "... pedagogical leadership adds value by developing various forms of human capital "(p.38). He further emphasizes that development of social capital is accomplished by encouraging collegiality and collaboration. Inbar (2000) indicates that pedagogical leadership relies on the development and implementation of professional ethics and Kramer-Hayoun, (1995, p. 221) add that this type of leadership is manifested by the principal's human relations and personal example. Dimmock (2000, p. 252) concludes that pedagogical leadership is goal-oriented with respect to improving students learning outcomes. Hence, principals adopt collegial and professional rather than hierarchical structures and above all hold students' welfare uppermost in their minds, while maintaining that teachers are in school primarily to serve the interests of all students.

Cultural leadership

"Cultural leadership is concerned with changing in a fundamental sense the way things are done around here... to help change a culture to one that focuses all energies on improving the quality of learning and teaching" (Caldwell and Spinks, 1998, p. 28).

Principals' success in shaping school culture was investigated by Leithwood and Jantzi (1990), who found that principals manifesting cultural leadership applied six essential strategies: reinforcing the school culture, using bureaucratic mechanisms to encourage and enhance change, developing staff, modelling values, using symbols for the purpose of expressing values, and sharing responsibility and authority with others. At the same time, Dimmock (2000) claims that such principals

"... serve to bolster a sense of belonging, attachment and commitment to the school mission and above all in the success in the mission" (p. 258).
He continues

"...new configurations of teaching and learning are dependent on school leaders taking responsibility for building a culture which supports learning for all and a positive climate..." (Dimmock, 2000, p. 258).

Hence, building such culture needs strategies that

"... range from more explicit forms of verbal communication with all groups in the school community to include modelling and demonstrating through their own behaviours... " (Dimmock, 2000, p. 258).

Caldwell (1992) concludes that cultural leadership is the

"...capacity to work with others in the school community to create and sustain a culture which reflects not only the core values which should underpin the provision of an excellent education, however defined, but also reflect 'the new way we do things around here'" (p.17).

Such cultural transformations are performed "with" people and based on collegiality, empowerment, involvement and commitment on the part of the principal (Bennis, 1989; Bryman, 1992; Hargreaves and Fullan, 1999; Rosenholtz, 1989; Sharan and Shachar, 1990; Wallace and Hall, 1994; Williams, 1999).

Moreover, cultural leadership is characterized by creating organizational learning (McLaughlin and Talbert, 2001; Newmann et al., 2000; Sergiovanni, 1995) and breeds internal leadership (Caldwell and Spinks, 1988; Goldring and Rallis, 1993; Sharan and Shachar, 1990). As Hall (1998) notes "...where the team together achieves more than the aggregate of what its individual members would do as individuals " (p.139).
Consequently, such principals succeed when they create collaborative leadership. This type of leadership is based on a shared system of values, whereby the principals no longer represent the main source of professional knowledge but encourage development of teachers' expertise, empowerment of school officials and a high level of commitment among all school members. Hence, according to Leithwood et al. (1999) cultural leadership has the potential to enhance teachers' motivation and their competence in the process of change (p. 83).

**Moral leadership**

"Schools are likely to have either an implicit or an explicit requirement to contribute to the moral education of the young. Thus, school leaders should be moral leaders" (Fidler, 1997b, p.31).

Fidler's argument, which stresses the role of school leaders as moral leaders, raises the question as to the essence of moral leadership. However, it is difficult to discuss this issue without relating to the moral aspects of education in the post-modern age in which we live.

The post-modern age is characterized by a crisis in society's dominant ideology, which has failed to acknowledge a single objective truth on the basis of the rational view of the world that epitomized modernism. Thus, the perception of morality in the post-modern age is marked by the transition from an objective-monolithic approach, originating in Greek philosophy and relating to values such as truth and good as absolute, towards a relativist-pluralistic perception, characterized by the belief that there is not one single absolute and objective value.

Aviram (2000) and Solomon (2000) argue that post-modern ideas have undermined those educational assumptions formerly considered as conventions. Hence, life in a
pluralistic society, without an absolutist system of values, gives rise to questions regarding the values that guide educational practice at school. To further illustrate this, Aviram (2000) poses the question: “What is the good in education?” which leads to the question of implementation – “How will the good be interpreted at school and who decides what is “good”? These issues give rise to ethical dilemmas associated with the determination of the desired order of priorities, the way by which valued choices are made and how choices between contradictory values are made as well as the relationship between values and goals and their implementation.

Yogev (1999) maintains that in the post-modern age, with the undermining of ideological models that the education system was meant to reflect and preserve, the need to acknowledge the principle of valued pluralism has grown and with it, society’s need to cope with its implications. Nevertheless, pluralism in a democratic society, which enables all citizens to openly express their opinions, raises the question of how values will be determined in the education system. Inbar (2000) argues that determination and maintenance of values underlines educational leadership and constitutes its moral aspect.

In order to understand what is required of educational leadership, the central issues facing the educational system in a pluralistic society should be understood.

Chen (1999), Yogev (1999), Solomon (2000) and Sergiovanni (1995) present several issues, which require value-oriented decisions. The first relates to pluralism in values: Should pluralism be allowed in education and can a variety of values co-exist side by side. Yogev (1999, p. 157) brings examples such as the values of equality and diversity. He questions whether these two values can co-exist in an education system. Can equality, the value directing the creation of an equalitarian society and providing
equal education for all, exist together with diversity, a value stressing differential education. This issue has implications for educational decision-making regarding the criteria for accepting students at school, the organizational structure of school and the determination of its academic regime.

The same can be said with reference to the issue of cultural pluralism, which grants legitimacy to divergent ethnic and social ideologies and enables the acknowledgment of differences. Conversely equality, inherently aspires to create a broad-based, equalitarian society, attuned to the values of the wider culture.

Yogev (1999, p. 159) underscores the notion that educational leadership at school cannot ignore these issues. He argues that educational leadership should implement a balanced policy with respect to the main issues, rooted in society’s values, such as social justice, fairness and tolerance. At the same time, each unique group should be allowed to express itself according to its own values.

This predicament is related to yet another issue, the perception of educational leadership’s role in a pluralistic society. Is educational leadership intended to preserve and reflect the values of society or to shape society? In practice, should principals respond to the demands of a centralized establishment, which strives to preserve society’s main values or should they choose the school’s values autonomously. This issue has become more salient since the introduction of school-based management and is associated with the relationship between school and society in a pluralistic society.

Solomon (2000) emphasizes the social role of school, particularly during changes in society and the family. He maintains that schools should not isolate themselves within the educational sphere. This stance reflects the perception prevalent among educators, of school as a “social agent” that transforms students into citizens (Aviram, 2000;
Day et al. (2000) note that "...we must see our society and its schools as interconnected systems" (p. 11). This view reflects the perception of school as an institution mediating between the individual and society (Chen and Addi, 1995; Goldring and Rallis, 1993; Inbar, 2000). From this perspective, educational leadership is responsible for creating a culture, which embraces all aspects of educational practice within the wider contexts of the community and society. With reference to school leadership in the Israeli education system, which is highly politicized and socially oriented, Chen et al. (1992) define the principal as a social agent fulfilling a social mission. These approaches, which view educational leadership as a bridge between school and society (Goldring and Rallis, 1993), emphasize that the purpose of educational leadership is to establish a link between school and society (Chen, 1999; Day et al., 2000; Leithwood et al., 1999; Sergiovanni, 1995). Consequently, these researchers stress the dialogue to be created between school and its external environment. Viewed from this perspective, educational leaders must create a framework that enables school to reflect society's values and at the same time influence them. Regarding Israel, Chen (1999) formulates the role of educational leaders as: "...leaving their mark in practice not only on the school which they lead but also on the community and the Israeli society" (p. 323).

Researchers concur that the leadership of educational institutions bears the responsibility for determining the values of their institutions (Day et al. 2000; Hodgkinson, 1991; Inbar, 2000; Sergiovanni, 1995). Rokeach (1973) defines "value" as an enduring belief that a specific end-state or mode of conduct is preferable. He differentiates between "instrumental" and "terminal" values. The latter refer to
desirable end-state, such as wisdom, peace or freedom. Instrumental values correspond to the means by which these goals are to be achieved. Bush (1998) adds

"These values underpin the behaviour and attitudes of individuals within schools and colleges..." (p. 33).

Moreover, Hodgkinson (1991), Inbar (2000) and Sergiovanni (1995) claim that values constitute the cultural infrastructure of school and indicate its goals. Based on that Sergiovanni (1995) argues that, school, to be considered an educational institution, should be committed to a shared valued infrastructure. Hence, he indicates that the role of the educational leader is to see to it that all the organization’s members not only understand the school’s values and moral purposes, but are committed to them too.

"...the school must move beyond concerns for goals and roles to the task of building purposes into its structure and embodying these purposes in everything that it does with the effect of transforming school members from neutral participants to committed followers. The embodiment of purpose and the development of followership are inescapably moral" (Sergiovanni, 1995, p. 309).

The question, thus, shifts to how the educational leader will determine the school’s system of values in a pluralistic society characterized by multiple social and personal goals legitimate, yet sometimes polar values and circumstances that "...create a mosaic of organizational realities rather than a uniform corporate culture" (Morgan, 1986, p. 127).

Hodgkinson’s (1991, p. 11) argument that "...if there are no value conflicts then there is no need for leadership" raises the question of how educational leaders deal with conflicts between values and subsequent decisions. Making decisions about values is in fact, the essence of moral leadership. Hodgkinson (1991) claims that
moral leaders choose higher-level over lower-level values. Moreover, he states that leaders, in applying a range of values, justify their choice by either the consensus prevailing among those affected, or by appealing to some future consensus they consider desirable. Another option he mentions is valued decisions based on ethical codes.


"...ethics here refers to a more comprehensive construct than just individual behaviour, rather it implicates us how we as a moral community live our communal lives" (p.55).

The origin of the term “ethics” is the Greek word “ethos”, meaning custom or habit. The term eventually acquired the sense of guidelines for appropriate decisions. These guidelines are helpful in placing on record a consensus on many of the ethical dilemmas principals face. Ethics, then, is a sort of “morality science” that determines the criteria for proper human behaviour. Professional ethics derived from general ethics, relates to the code of behaviour applicable at a certain time and in a certain place (Cohen-Javar, 1998, p. 76). Inbar (2000) adds that ethical codes serve a useful function in guiding principals in making moral choices, resolve complex ethical dilemmas and demonstrate to the out-side world that the principal can be relied upon to give a professional service.

According to Inbar (2000), the question of ethics is more acute in pluralistic societies, where recognition of difference and autonomy has spread. The utility of ethics rests on the fact that they help maneuver between different commitments and pressures, as well as contrasting values. Professional ethics within specific sectors of activity makes it possible to determine the order of priorities. Inbar (2000) argues that the
adoption of ethical codes does not, however, provide a correct response to all conflicts and ethical dilemmas arising in the course of educational practice. He maintains that ethical codes provide only a framework, enabling principals to examine the valued issues they have to cope with, to understand their implications and to make moral choices. Hence, Cohen-Javar (1998) defines moral behaviour of educational leadership as the

"... constant effort to act according to ethical principles, derived from the human morality theory... these principles are the basis for the determination of the ethical code which guides its behaviour..." (p. 78).

Inbar (2000) supports this construction, adding, "moral behaviour meets the criteria of personal responsibility and is based on ethical and professional codes" (p. 213).

Sergiovanni (1995, p. 213) elucidates one key to understanding the moral dimension of leadership in the context of value-related decisions. He argues that moral behaviour is the ability to choose between what he calls normative rationality (based on what is considered as good) and technical rationality (based on effectiveness). Principals no doubt want to achieve both. The question is then, what happens when these two elements conflict. According to Sergiovanni (1995), a choice of normative rationality provides the basis for moral leadership. Normative rationality, he argues, is affected by the principals' philosophical resources and their worldview, as well as by personal theories, aspirations and perceptions. Those constitute the sources of normative rationality and affect the valued decisions made (Sergiovanni, 1995, p. 313).

Empirical support for Sergiovanni's position is found in a study conducted by Day et al. (2000), who found that educational leadership

"...is defined and driven by individual value system..." (p. 60). "They [leaders] place a high premium upon personal values..." (p. 176). "... the choices they make relate directly to their own beliefs, values..." (p. 170).
Since the choices made by leaders stem from their personal values, Day et al. (2000) argue that moral principals have to examine their own values and understand their implications for the choices they are making. This understanding attributes the meaning to their practices and moral validity to their choices.

Nevertheless, Sergiovanni (1995) contends that leaders cannot settle for this understanding alone. They need to impart the reason for their choices to the organization members rather than relying on bureaucratic power. Hence, he believes, the reason for valued choices should be open to discussion and assessment by all the school members.

The structure of this argument is related to the arguments of Solomon (2000), Dallin (1998) and Hodgkinson (1991), who suggest that in an age of complexity and the attendant moral dilemmas, school must provide an arena for the discussion of these dilemmas but not necessarily offer solutions. The very act of asking questions and clarifying values and moral purposes, they argue, provides all the school members with an opportunity for personal and school development. It is an occasion to elevate themselves to new levels of morality and to construct the school’s capacity to deal with complex demanding questions. Clarification of values is a moral process, which should pass the test of normative rationality (Sergiovanni, 1995). Hence, the role of moral leadership is to create an environment, which allows all the school members to openly and critically examine the school values and their personal understanding of the moral purposes of school.

According to Fullan (2001a) and Segiovanni (1995), moral purposes determine a valued context while they provide and provide a framework for action. Moral purposes signal what people should aspire to and to create a mutual commitment to its implementation.
Fullan (1999, p. 1) views moral purposes as a central element of school leadership in the post-modern age. He stresses two main aspects of these purposes. The first relates to the macro level. At this level, moral purposes represent education’s contribution to societal development and democracy, which are grounded in humanitarian-democratic values. The second aspect relates to the micro level, where moral purposes are connected to the expansion of the conditions, which help students to succeed.

Hence, Day et al. (2000) stress that leaders should offer "...clear sets of personal and educational values, which represent their moral purposes for the school" (p. 165).

Dimmock (2000) adds

"...public declaration of values and purposes are part of the expected responsibility of leaders. The same set of values should permeate individual relationships and the formal and hidden curriculum" (p. 256).

Nevertheless, Fullan (2001a, p. 25) does not ignore the difficulty of setting a moral purpose for school in the post-modern age. He attributes this difficulty to the multiplicity of good purposes, which cannot always be achieved concurrently if at all. Dallin’s (1998) solution is that “Any school depends on certain core common values... while it can live with different views in a number of fields...” (p. 74).

Hence, one function of educational leadership is to acknowledge this complex reality, appreciate differences in viewpoints and include all groups in the development of common values and norms. Development of common values leads to coherence in the organization. The creation of coherence is based on valued moral purposes, oriented toward goals, which the school aspires to accomplish; the process attributes meaning and moral validity to common educational practices (Fullan, 1999; Morgan, 1986).

Consequently, Bollington (1999), Louis and Miles (1992) and Sergiovanni (1995) consider moral leadership to be responsible for the development of an agreed-upon system of values, which constitutes the foundations for the school vision. This
development has to be conducted in a collegial-democratic way in order to evoke a sense of "ownership" of the organization's values and objectives among the educational staff. Such a process enables appropriate choices to be made on a broad basis of social interests while it inspires commitment to their implementation.

Nevertheless, Day et al. (2000, p. 150) indicate a dilemma, which can emerge when the educational staff does not feel committed to this process of shaping common school values. This dilemma touches upon one of the central ethical issues of moral leadership, namely, the ethical use of power. Use of power is, according to Burns (1978), one of the main factors distinguishing between moral-democratic and dictatorial leadership (discussed on pages 42-43). By their very nature, power relations between principals and subordinates are unequal. The principals' power is a legitimate part of their position. Consequently, the relevant test of moral leadership resides in the way this power is used. According to Sergiovanni (1990, p. 28), leaders' moral power is linked to their responsibility to promote and develop the organization members as well as to respect and fulfill their needs.

This view of moral leadership matches Burns' (1978) perspective reflected in this statement

"Moral leadership emerges from and always returns to the fundamental wants and needs, aspirations and values of followers. I mean the kind of leadership that can produce social changes that will satisfy followers' authentic needs" (p.4).

Sergiovanni (1984) also, argues that moral leadership should employ power. He notes that this power should be based on a symbolic, cultural and humane power (see page 43). The use of power in this way contributes to the democratic dimension of moral leadership.

"...leaders realize the importance of democratic values, such as tolerance and respect for the rights and values of others, participations, concern for
equality and ability and opportunity to make judgments and choices in one's own and others' interests (Dimmock, 2000, p. 257).

Leithwood et al. (1999, p. 11) claim that democratic leaders can well be placed in moral category of leadership since the central argument for participation is justified by democratic theory. They further explain

"Values central to this form of leadership are derived from democratic theory and give credit to wide participation of organizational stakeholders as a reflection of the society in which we live...the nature of the relationships among those within the organization and the distribution of power between stakeholders both inside and outside the organization" (p.11).

Dimmock (2000) elaborates this aspect of moral leadership

"It involves motivating teachers and students by appealing to emotion and social bonds within a context of informed professional ideals and practices" (p.256).

Consequently, principals who encourage a democratic-collegial culture, enable school members to be involved in decision-making, create a shared organizational vision and critically examine its objectives. They likewise encourage social responsibility, empowerment, delegation of moral responsibility for the organization's well-being and objectives. Put simply, they educate for good citizenship. This behaviour demonstrates the principal's awareness of the importance of democratic values.

To sum up, in the post-modern age of cultural and valued pluralism, educational leadership plays a central role in establishing the relationship between education and values. Principals should, therefore, shape a value-oriented learning-educational environment to provide a solid moral anchor in a changing society.

Along this line, Sergiovanni (1995) and Girioux (1992) stress the need for educational leadership rooted in values, in addition to a political approach to social justice.
Sergiovanni refers to this type of leadership as "moral art". Consequently, a moral-educational leadership cannot be neutral, as Leithwood et al. (1999) state

"... moral leadership assumes that the critical focus of leadership ought to be on the values and ethics of leaders themselves..." (p. 10).

Such leadership maintains professional loyalty rooted in an ethical code, which guides its behaviour as well as the values of a democratic society: diversity, freedom of speech, justice and equality.

"Leadership in general must maintain the ethical focus which is oriented toward democratic values within a community. This has to do with the meaning of ethics historically – as a search for the good life of a community" (Grace, 1995, p. 55).

Moreover, moral leadership is evaluated by its use of the power granted to it by its position and by the way it determines the common system of values at school. Its role is to clarify fundamental democratic-moral values, as the anchor of the educational practice, to meticulously review the dilemmas emerging in the current age of complexity, to encourage democratic choice of the school values and to understand the human needs of school members. At the same time, such leadership must shape an educational environment, which facilitates personal development and growth on the one hand, and an educational environment, which is attuned to the values of the boarder society on the other.

**Strategic leadership**

"Strategic leadership calls for a capacity to see ‘the big picture’, to discern the megatrends, to see the implications for the school, to build a capacity for others in the school to do the same in their areas of interest, and to establish structures and process to deal with the implications in the school setting” (Caldwell and Spinks, 1998, p. 27).
School, as an open system, is required to constantly review its goals and re-shape them in light of changing reality (Chen, 1999; Fullan, 2001a; Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991; West-Burnham, 1997). Hence, Fullan (2001a) states “The more complex society get, the more sophisticated leadership must become...” (p. ix). Consequently, Fullan (2001a) and Inbar (2000) stress that in the post-modern reality, principals are required to cope with multidimensional issues and dilemmas.

“The big problems of the day are complex, rife with paradoxes and dilemmas. For these problems there are no once-and-for-all answers” (Fullan, 2001a, p .2).

One dilemma is posed by often contradictory pressures exerted by society, parents and pupils, which may give rise to conflicts over the management of collaboration and competition between schools (Grace, 1995). Another dilemma refers to autonomy, which increases the power of school on the one hand, but exposes it to the need to struggle for educational legitimacy on the other. With respect to the latter, Inbar (2000, p. 206) notes that the transition from managing compulsory programmes in a centralized system to directing elective programmes in an autonomous system, requires a transition from management relying on bureaucratic authority to management relying on professional authority and power of the principal and staff. In this complex framework, strategic leadership is required. Otherwise, leaders or principals find themselves exclusively involved in crisis management. Hall (1998) points out that

“...effective strategic leadership is about making choices about how to lead in the context of ever-changing demands and constraints. Paying attention to what leaders need to be to implement strategy successfully shifts the focus from their skills and actions to their beliefs and qualities” (p. 137).
Strategic leadership in this sense is the ability to set an ideological direction for the organization and to see that it is indeed carried out in practice (Daft, 1999, p. 139). This definition contains two key elements. The first is strategic thinking, a mental aptitude, which refers to the ability to predict the future direction of the organization in compliance with transformation in the environment, or, to quote Garrett (1995, cited in Caldwell and Spinks (1998)

"...‘Strategic thinking’ is the process by which an organization’s direction-givers can rise above the daily managerial process and crises to gain different perspectives of the internal and external dynamics causing change in their environment and thereby giving more effective direction to their organization. Such perspectives should be both future-oriented and historically understood. Strategic thinkers must have the skill of looking forward and backwards while knowing where their organization is now, so that wise risks can be taken by the direction-givers to achieve their organization’s purpose...” (p. 198)

The second element is strategic management, which aims to construct the organization’s direction “...strategic management as its name implies involves managing in a strategic way...” (Fidler, 1997a, p. 90). In fact, strategic management is the practical manifestation of strategic thinking and prepares for its implementation. According to Fidler and Bowels (1989, p. 21), strategic management is comprised of four processes - analysis, decision-making, implementation and evaluation. The first process, strategic analysis, has three elements. The first is the environment, which includes physical, political, social and technological components; the second element is composed of financial and human resources, required for change; the third is the school culture and values. Disregard of this last element - the organization’s values and culture- accounts for most failures to introduce change (Fidler and Bowels, 1989; Fullan, 2001b). On a more positive note, Middlewood (1998) states “...only in
recognising this central link between strategy and its implementation process can the strategic manager become effective” (p. 9). As Fidler (1997a) concludes “Strategic thinking and strategic management are complementary. Both are needed” (p. 88)

Sergovanni’s (1995, p. 29) term "mindscape" expresses this combination of strategic thinking and strategic management. Hence, the way principals act depends on their mindscape. “...mindscapes influence what we see, believe, and do” (p 29). Sergovanni (1995) further explains that these mindscapes provide the principles that guide leaders in their management of schools (p.30).

Caldwell and Spinks (1992) specify what is required of strategic leadership in operational terms

"...keeping abreast of trends and issues, threats and opportunities in the school environment and society at large, nationally and internationally; discerning the "mega trends" and anticipating their impact on education generally and on the school in particular; sharing their knowledge with others in the school’s community and encouraging other school leaders to do the same in their areas of interest; establishing structures and processes which enable the school to set priorities and formulate strategies which take account of likely and/or preferred futures; being a key source of expertise as these occurs; ensuring that the attention of the school community is focused on matters of strategic importance; and monitoring the implementation of strategies as well as emerging strategic issues in the wider environment; facilitating an ongoing process of review” (p. 92)

Setting the direction for the organization based on a long-term “view of tomorrow”, commits the strategic principal to organizational development and growth on the one hand and to organizational stability in order to ensure continuity to support students' development on the other hand (Middlewood, 1998, p. 4). These two features underscore the dialectic framework, characterizing the principals’ work. Hence, Fullan (2001a) argues that in this complex age, principals should be more flexible and more sophisticated and Hall (1998) specifies that principals need to “...combine strategic thinking with its implementation in practice” (p. 135).
Summary

The above section explored the phenomenon of leadership, which can be described thusly,

"...leadership is considered to be a concept which describes actions which yield social change and improvement with the development of community involvement and participation in decision-making... the management of educational change and the development of processes which promote quality educational outcomes" (Berry, 1997, p. 53).

Various leadership theories were reviewed, starting from approaches, which emphasize leaders' traits and concluding in theories, which relate to the organizational context in which the leadership operates. The main part of the section was devoted to the various dimensions of educational leadership – pedagogical, cultural, moral and strategic. These dimensions demonstrated what is demanded of leaders,

"...leaders need to combine a moral purpose with a willingness to be collaborative and promote collaboration among colleagues, whether through teamwork or extending the boundaries of participation in decision-making. They need skills in communicating (both of vision and with people); in matching people to strategic objectives and reorganizing structures and roles appropriately; in supporting colleagues" (Hall, 1998, p. 145).

Given the main purpose of the present study - to examine principals' perception of their leadership in the process of transforming the school culture- emphasis was placed on examining transformational leadership. The prominent features of this kind of leadership according to Leithwood et al. (1999) are

"...building school vision; establishing school goals; providing intellectual stimulation; offering individualized support; modeling best practices and important organizational values; demonstrating high performance expectations; creating a productive school culture; and developing structures to foster participation in school decisions" (p. 9).
It follows that the transformation of a school culture is one of the major challenges faced by school leadership, so we turn to this concept next.

**Part 2 - School Culture**

**Setting the scene**

"Many innovations designed to create more humane relations in school do not survive because the organizational culture in which they transpire has not been changed with the view of absorbing and adjusting to these innovations" (Schmuck and Schmuck, 1978, p. 121).

School, the place where pedagogical and social processes transpire, is an organization with a structure, tasks and processes designed to accomplish shared and agreed upon goals. Some elements of school such as structure, technology, goals, resources and plans, are formal and overt. Other elements, such as values, attitudes, beliefs, culture, norms, conflicts, politics and sub-groups are informal and latent:

"Every organization has a formally instituted pattern of authority and an official body of rules and procedures which are intended to aid the achievement of those goals. However, alongside this formal aspect of the organization are networks of informal relationships and unofficial norms which arise from the interaction of individuals and groups working within the formal structure" (Bush, 1998, p. 20).

Viewed holistically, organizational culture influences all areas of an organization’s life. Organizational culture as a historical phenomenon, makes it possible to understand the "why" of organizational processes. Moreover, organizational culture has
anthropological and social features associated with the wider culture to which the organization belongs.

"The subtle and subjective quality of personal and interpersonal values, attitudes and actions, together with other contextual elements, contribute to the gestalt of a particular organization, including a school" (Beare et al., 1989, p.172).

The importance of understanding school culture lies in its contribution to the identification of the undocumented, unofficial and intangible elements, which influence the way the organization functions and its effect on educational outcomes. These have direct consequences for school management. Sarasson (1982), Wilson (1980) and Rutter (1980) maintained that studies of the impact of school have failed because they did not consider the cultural variables, which describe the internal life of school as a social organization. These variables shape people's behaviour, as well as the academic outcomes of school. Sharan and Shachar (1990) indicated those variables that encompass the school culture

"...school norms, values and attitudes, which create the school culture, manifested by the working patterns... the relations and the communication between people (p. 36).

Consequently, Huberman and Miles (1984), Sarasson (1990) and Schein (1985) state that without considering the school culture, no change will occur, or else it will be short-lived and will not have any influence on the educational outcomes. In this section the concepts of climate and culture are compared. Moreover, the characteristics and the types of school culture are reviewed.
School climate

Organizational quality of life has been discussed in the literature since the 1960s, relying heavily on the concepts “organizational climate” and “organizational culture”. Friedman (1995) defines this quality as

“... based on the texture of the relations prevalent in it, and affected by the nature of professional and social relations as well as the communication patterns between its members and feelings of order and safety (p. 10).

School “climate” has been identified with psycho-organizational approaches, whereas “culture” has been identified with anthropological approaches (Reichers and Schneider, 1990). These concepts, extensively explored during the 1960s and 1970s, were based on a numerous dimensions, constructed from variables ranging from atmosphere to organizational dynamics. Halpin and Croft (1963) and Maxwell and Thomas (1991) argued that this complexity made it difficult to distinguish between variables and to identify the unique contribution of each.

Empirically, Drexler (1977) noted that the concept “organizational climate” has two meanings. The first pertains to an overall, objective evaluation of the organization’s features whereas the second, mainly psychological, relates to the way in which individuals perceive the organizational environment and the impact of this perception on their behaviour. Theoretically, Halpin and Croft (1963), Moos and Trickett (1974) and Tagiuri (1968) claimed that climate studies originate in social psychology and relate to variables, regarding needs and the quality of relationships based on feelings.

“School climate is an effective dimension that describes how the people in a given environment feel about being there (Kaplan, 1995, p. 265).
Moreover, Friedman (1995) distinguishes between climate among teachers and climate among students. Climate, as teachers perceive it, relates to feelings, beliefs about their educational work, attitudes towards school goals, their perception of the principal’s professional leadership, patterns of cooperation among the staff and satisfaction. Climate, as students perceive it, relates to their social relations, their involvement in school life and their feelings towards school. The combination of these two levels completes the picture of school atmosphere.

During the 1970s and 1980s, several studies were conducted in Israel, dealing with teachers’ perception of school climate. These studies showed that a positive school climate was associated with a sense of belonging, satisfaction and involvement in school life (Anavi, 1989; Darom et al., 1980). Studies of students’ perception of school conducted by Horowitz and Amir (1981) corroborated these findings and found a correlation between students’ sense of alienation and manifestations of violence at school. This aspect of climate does not encompass all the processes, which take place in the organization. Hence, in recent years the broader concept “school culture” has been used to describe the nature of the organization.

Culture versus climate

In early school effectiveness studies, “climate” "ethos" and "saga" were applied to describe school learning climate, organizational climate, and social climate (Bossert et al., 1982; Deal, 1993; Weil et al., 1984).

In recent years, the concepts of culture – borrowed from anthropology – and organization – borrowed from management – have been linked in a core concept of
modern organization theory, namely organizational culture. From the anthropological point of view, culture represents historically transmitted patterns of meaning which are expressed both (explicitly) through symbols and (implicitly) in taken-for-granted beliefs (Geertz, 1973). Management theory, however, emphasizes the importance of creating symbols in the present to suit the organization's functioning and outcomes. Thus, Smircich (1983) and Friedman et al. (1988) claimed that researchers sometimes relate to culture as the essence of the organization "what it is" and sometimes to what the organization "has". This perspective reflects the different theoretical bases, from which the concept "organizational culture" has evolved. The first approach, for the most part exploratory and descriptive in nature, yields extensive descriptions of the structure of organizations. The second promotes an examination of organizational cultures as systems of shared meanings, assumptions, beliefs and underlying values. This approach encourages the search for causes (e.g., founders, societal context) and effects (e.g., organizational performance) of organizational culture (Reichers and Schneider, 1990, p. 22). As Torrington and Weightman (1989) described it

"Organizational culture is the characteristic spirit and belief of an organization, demonstrated, for example, in the norms and values that are generally held about how people should treat other, the nature of working relationships that should be developed and attitudes to change" (p.18).

Sergiovanni (1994) formulates this approach thusly

"Culture serves as a compass setting to steer people in a common direction; it provides a set of norms defining what people should accomplish and how, and it is a source of meaning and significance for teachers, students, administrators, and others as they work" (p. 95).

No wonder, it has been argued that "...organizational culture and climate are related concepts" (Fidler and Bowels, 1989, p. 28). Some definitions are similar and perhaps
even overlapping. The common basis of both concepts is their attempt to identify the factors in the environment, which influence the behaviour of people in the organization. Reichers and Schneider (1990) saw the similarity in two main features. The first is their reference to shared perceptions, creating the shared significance and interpretation, which the organization's members give to various events.

"...climate is a shared perception of organizational policies, practices and procedures, both formal and informal. Climate is a molar concept that is indicative of the organization's goal and appropriate mean to goal attainment" (Reichers and Schneider, 1990, p. 22).

The second common feature of these two concepts is their reciprocity "...the one causing the other in an endless cycle over time" (Reichers and Schneider, 1990, p. 24).

In spite of the similarity between the two concepts, Anderson (1982) and Friedman (1995) see the school climate as a limited local construct and only one component of school culture. Friedman (1995) argues, for example, that climate focuses on the input for learning- curricula and the infrastructure- whereas the school culture includes both the input and output - academic and educational outcomes-. In addition, he distinguishes between the two concepts from two other aspects. The first is subjectivity-objectivity. While organizational climate is largely based on experiences and feelings and is, therefore, perceived as a subjective concept, organizational culture since it consists of symbols, norms and procedures, which can be examined by external observation, is a more objective concept. The second distinction relates to the conceptual level. In operational terms, climate focuses on the interactions between people in the organization, whereas organizational culture relates to broad concepts, some of which are abstract - and include symbols, rituals, beliefs and patterns of thinking.
In light of such thinking as the above, Friedman (1995, p. 15) believes that school culture, with its overt and covert characteristics is more difficult to describe, measure and change than is school climate. Hallinger and Heck (1998) formulate these implications in the following way

"...climate, therefore, would be expected to change more readily – depending, for example, on the actions of administrators – than the entire system of variables comprising the school’s culture namely, its structure, value system, managerial processes” (p. 178).

Another distinction between these two concepts stems from their different research methodologies. While studies of climate tend to use quantitative measuring tools (Halpin and Croft, 1963; Steinhoff, 1965; Stern, 1970), studies of culture have relied on interviews, observations and case studies (Reichers and Schneider, 1990, p. 25). According to Reichers and Schneider (1990), quantitative and qualitative tools are complementary and should be integrated in studies of school culture.

The distinctions between these two concepts stress the need to thoroughly explore the uniqueness of school culture and its contribution to the successful introduction of change at school.

**School culture**

Culture is dynamic; it is shaped slowly by its members and influenced by a combination of three central factors: the organization’s leadership, manifested by the choice of vision and direction for accomplishing goals; the organization’s members, manifested by culturally defined behavioural norms; and the external environment.
School culture, like organizational culture in general, can be examined from two major perspectives, the functional and the interpretative. Schein (1985) claimed that from the functional perspective, culture assists an organization in adjusting to its environment. Viewed from the interpretative perspective, Sarason (1982) and Smircich (1983) argued that the organization itself creates its own unique culture.

*Every organization*...*has a particular culture, determined by individual values and experiences which each person brings to it, the ways in which its people act and interact and the footprints they leave behind them*” (Beare et al., 1989, p. 174).

A associated studies have yielded various theoretical and empirical approaches to the nature and role of organizational culture. One approach views it as a tool for the analysis and understanding of organizations (Schein, 1992); another relates to culture as a tool for shaping behavioural patterns that are desired of the organization’s members (Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Peters and Waterman, 1982). A third approach views culture as a mechanism for change, which motivates and directs development within the organization (Samuel, 1996). Still another approach interprets culture as a system, which attributes a meaning to the practice of the organization’s members, as explained by Morgan (1986).

“*Shared meaning, shared understanding, and shared sense making are all different ways of describing culture. In talking about culture, we are really talking about a process of reality construction that allows people to see and understand particular events, actions, objects, utterances, or situations in distinctive ways. These patterns of understanding also provide a basis for making one’s own behaviour sensible and meaningful*” (p. 128).

Morgan (1986) maintains that by sharing meanings, members of the organisation actually create the organisation. This implies that organizations are socially constructed...
realities, rather than being defined by their structures, they are constructed in the minds of their members. Sergiovanni (1994) adds that

"...the more understood, accepted, and cohesive the culture of a school, the better able it is to move in concert toward ideals it hold and objectives it wishes to pursue" (p. 89).

Schein (1985) views organizational culture as the entirety of the behaviours of the organization’s members, the norms and values determined by the organization, the philosophy and worldview dictating the organization’s policy, management and operational tools, as well as the ambience created by the organization’s physical set-up. As he defines it, organizational culture is

"...a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, 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" (Schein, 1992, p. 12).

According to Schein (1985), organizational culture consists of three levels. The first one is the level of artifacts, which refers to visible structures and processes, such as language, rituals, ceremonies symbols and myths that are unique to the organization. These shape the organization’s vision and reinforce the relations between the sub-units, as Day et al. (2000) found in their study

"...the heads in this study communicated their personal vision and belief system by direction, words and deed. Through a variety of symbols, gestures and actions, they were successful in realigning both staff and pupils to their particular vision of the school" (p. 171).

The second level consists of espoused values – the values and expectations shared by all the organization’s members. Values define the norms, shape individual and group
behaviour and determine the goals and means to accomplish them. As noted by Weindling (1997)

"Values are reflected in the structure and the way the organization approaches its work, and lies at the heart of almost all key organizational decisions" (p. 225).

Friedman (2001) enlarges on this notion

"...some values are overt, while others are covert. All the organization's members share these values and they determine, to a great extent, the organizational culture and image and direct the behavioural patterns in it. Moreover, based on the contents of these values, it is possible to predict the extent of the organization's success or failure to accomplish its goals" (p. 7).

The third is the level of basic assumptions. It is the most fundamental level, namely, the unconscious, taken-for-granted beliefs, perceptions, thoughts and feelings, which are the ultimate source of values and actions. This level represents the organization's philosophical and ideological infrastructure.

"The deeper level of basic assumptions and beliefs that are shared by members of an organisation, that operate unconsciously and define in a basic 'taken-for-granted' fashion an organisation's view of itself and its environment" (Schein, 1992, p. 6).

In this line of thought, Maxwell and Thomas (1991, p. 77) claim that a change in overt behavioural norms necessitates changes in the interior levels, in values.

Friedman (1995) claims that at present it is customary to use five key dimensions for describing and measuring a school culture. The first is educational ideology – the systems of beliefs and values in which the educational practice is grounded. The second is educational and social policy. The third dimension is organizational structure. The fourth is organizational atmosphere – inter-personal relations at school. The fifth
dimension is curriculum: the overt curriculum determined by external authorities, and
the covert curriculum, expressed by communication channels, internal authority,
democratic values, behavioural norms and expectations. Inbar (2000, p. 25) stresses that
educational ideology determines all the other key dimensions of school culture. He
further underscores three prevalent models of school culture, which associated with
these key dimensions of school culture. Hence, a question arises as to which model of
school culture is most conducive to accomplishing the desirable educational goals. The
predominant models are reviewed here.

Models of the school culture

The Bureaucratic Model

The bureaucratic model is normative; it assumes that the hierarchical distribution of
authority and tasks is, from a rational point of view, the most appropriate for achieving
organizational effectiveness (Inbar, 2000, p. 28). The bureaucratic structure can be
viewed as a system of rules, distributed in a hierarchical structure, which has three
central functions; to serve as a basis for activities designed to realize the organization’s
objectives, to ensure conformity to the organization’s demands and to exercise control
based on this distribution of power and authority.

The bureaucratic model follows several fundamental principles. The first is rationality,
that is, objectives are clear and can be obtained through rational planning. Although this
approach does not ignore problems and complexities, it assumes that they can be
overcome exercising control. The second principle is specialization. In schools
organized according to the bureaucratic model, teachers feel responsible for their area
of specialization only and not for the organization as a whole. The third principle is the
clear definition of authority. Management determines the nature and boundaries of activities, resulting in a vertical, one-directional pattern of communication, manifested in the instructions dictated by the principal. This pattern increases control over processes and encourages conformity among people. McNeil (1988) found that this pattern leads to a low level of collaboration between the ranks at school and lowers the principal's expectations of teachers. Rosenholtz (1989) and Sharan and Shachar (1990) added that a low level of collaboration encourages individual work, which increases teachers' sense of professional isolation, a feeling, which curbs the ability to promote change and improvement.

A study of Israeli secondary school principals found that 80% of their time is dedicated to individual one-on-one conversations and only a small part is dedicated to working together with groups of teachers, professional committees and parents (Sharan et al., 1998, p. 44). According to Bush (1994, p. 37), this model in which authority and control is concentrated in the principal’s hands, is primarily suitable for stable rather than dynamic situations. Hargreaves (1995), however, had reservations about this sweeping determination and maintained that when the principal’s status is secure, the bureaucratic style can be effective when introducing imposed change. As he stated

"... if the principal's authority is accepted and seen as a legitimate source of innovation, there can be a positive and effective response to externally imposed change (Hargreaves, 1995, p. 40).

The bureaucratic model has been criticized on other levels as well. One criticism contests the assumption of the clarity of objectives and ways to achieve them. The literature points out that, in reality, school has several objectives, some overt, some covert and some contradictory (Fullan, 2001a; Inbar, 2000; Solomon, 2000). A second criticism argues that the rational basis of the bureaucratic model cannot stand the test of
reality, in which most human behaviour is non-rational and influence decision-making accordingly (Bush, 1994, p. 37). Another criticism relates to the effectiveness of specialization. Inbar (2000) argues that "...in complex systems the amount of knowledge accumulated by one person is limited and allows partial solutions rather than systemic ones" (p. 90). Williams (1999) sums up the findings of his study of perceptions of leadership in England by arguing that bureaucratic leadership is unsuitable "...in the context of the increasing complexities of school systems" (p. 19).

Notwithstanding criticism of the bureaucratic model, the advantages of bureaucratic methods cannot be dismissed. Like the force of official policy, systematic organization and planning, institutionalized structures, decision-making and work patterns can be harnessed to collaborative culture. This is especially necessary in secondary schools, the size of which may lead to educational Balkanization (Hargreaves and Fullan, 1999; Leithwood and Jantzi, 1990).

The Political Model

The rational approach, which analyzes the existing reality in terms of means and goals, underlies the political model. This approach assumes that a bureaucratic-professional organizational structure, which encompasses multiple objectives and sub-objectives, interacts with the environment. These elements create a community that lacks cohesion due to its inherent contradictory interests. Inbar (2000, p. 91) argues that the often conflicting interests of the organization's members, the multitude of the organization's objectives and a lack of resources constitute fertile soil for the development of conflicts, which, according to the political approach are to be expected and should be dealt with. One salient example in school life is the introduction of change. During this process,
which threatens short-term stability, teachers tend to struggle against the process in order to preserve the existing situation (Van den Berg et al., 1999, p. 342). Conflicts may then arise, between the principal’s interests in change and teachers’ interests in preserving the status quo.

Criticism of political models is directed at their focus on power and conflict rather than on other results, such as collaboration and agreement, which negotiation may (Bush, 1994, p. 42). Nevertheless, the advantage of this model resides in the fact that it prompts the analysis of the latent organizational processes and allows the staff to make decisions on the basis of understanding rather than blind obedience. A political culture has been found to be particularly characteristic of secondary schools that, due to their structure, often display conflicting interests.

**The Collegial Model**

"In a school, wide agreement about important aspects of its culture seem to be best obtained, paradoxically, through a recognition and toleration of a legitimate plurality of views and styles on less central matters. In such a school, differences will not be resolved by the Great Person's exercising "the right to manage", but through "the collegiate approach" – discussion among all parties concerned" (Torrington and Weightman, 1989, p. 28).

Inbar (2000, p. 90) indicates that the collegial model, which places the collaborating group at the centre of the decision-making process, is derived from four fundamental complementary concepts. The first concept originates in the democratic approach and relates to the legitimate right of the organization’s members to be partners to processes whose results would affect them. As such, it rests on a system of ethics. The second concept emphasizes the authority of expertise and maintains that some individuals have
the knowledge necessary for decision-making and therefore, no need to display control (Holliday, 1995, cited in Brundrett, 1998 p. 307). The third concept links involvement, commitment and effectiveness. To quote Bush (1994), collegiality “...encourages the participation of teachers in decision-making, leading to a sense of ownership and an enhanced prospect of successful innovation” (p. 39). The fourth concept uses personal growth as a motive for adoption of the collegial approach; it emphasizes the importance of collaborative decision-making as a means for personal and professional development (Routh, 1993, cited in Brundrett, 1998 p. 307). Following that line of thought, Hargreaves (1995) concludes that a collegial culture is ripe for the introduction of change

“The collegial school type, with its stronger developmental structure and collaborative relationships that sustain teachers under stress, may be better placed to handle rapid change” (p. 34).

In spite of the advantages of the collegial model and the humanistic and democratic principles on which it rests, Rosenholtz (1989) maintained that the number of collegial schools is insignificant. Hargreaves (1995) did not find this fact astonishing and claimed that by definition, school could not have a pure collegial culture because

“...in pure collegial systems, members elect their heads, power is shared subject to the status and ordinances, and responsibility for the college is a collective one” (p. 40).

In addition, collegial culture has come under criticism because it mixes normative (what should be) with descriptive concepts (explaining what actually takes place)

“...more than once there is a mixture of collegiality as a function of involvement and commitment under the guise of democracy, although in fact this is a manipulative process (Inbar, 2000, p. 18).
Creating collegiality is a long, exhausting and time-consuming process, and may slow down organizational processes. As a result, innovation and change may be delayed (Bush, 1995; Hargreaves and Fullan, 1999). Furthermore, school size and organizational complexity, demands for accountability and a need for quick response to change, discourage principals from adopting this model (Brundrett, 1998; Lumby, 1998; Sharan et al., 1998). These difficulties, according to Lumby (1998), lead to the perception of collegiality as impractical and “... often impossible to achieve” (p. 199) in a school’s day-to-day reality. These obstacles are particularly prominent as principals often find themselves between contradictory demands. Lumby (1998) concludes, “...if collegiality and ownership were indeed Drucker’s (1992) ‘only way’, it would condemn many educational organizations to paralysis” (p. 199).

Yet, Hargreaves and Fullan (1999) argue that when collegiality is managed in an administrative coerced and involuntary way, it becomes “contrived collegiality” (p. 8).

Consequently, the key to the success of establishing a collegial culture resides in the principals’ and the teachers’ attitude towards it. If the principal is positive and the teachers support it, this model will succeed (Bush, 1995). Hopkins et al. (1994) set collegiality as a challenge to principals

“...the building of a school culture, in which individuals at all levels enjoy a degree of autonomy in relation to their own work, and the possibility of bringing their own knowledge skills and creativity to bear in resolving problems and pursuing opportunities, is the challenge facing school leaders” (p. 157).

**Types of school cultures**

Owen and Steinhoff (1989) identified four types of school culture. They characterized them metaphorically; school as a family, where the concern for children is most
important and creates commitment; school as a machine where the principal coordinates between all the parts of the machine so that it functions effectively; school as a cabaret, where the uniqueness and creativity of every group member are emphasized and the principal is the maestro; and school as a small shop of anxieties, where nothing can be predicted and tension reigns. However, school can also operate like a clan, where tight cohesion between the organization’s members and its goals provides a framework of expectations for its members.

Hopkins et al. (1994) describe four types of school culture (based on the Rosenholtz, (1989) typology: the moving school, the stuck school, the promenading school and the wandering school. The moving school adjusts well to changes and is characterized by a suitable degree of stability and change that produces much higher outcomes. The stuck school lacks the energy to make changes because it is based on individual learning and low expectations of pupils; thus Hopkins et al. (1994) argue, “...stuck schools are often failing schools” (p. 90). The promenading school is the traditional school, which rests on its laurels and is based on a staff, which is not open to change. The fourth type, the wandering school, is characterized by many changes but lacks a clear direction; therefore, its staff is tired and exhausted. Hargreaves (1995) offers another typology of school culture: the formal school – a traditional school with an emphasis on discipline; the welfarist school – a happy, child-centered school, where students are not driven; the hothouse school – where expectations are very high; and the survivalist school – where emphasis is simply on maintaining control.

Yet, schools as organizations do not display internal unity; several sub-cultures may co-exist simultaneously within their frameworks.
Sub-cultures

Woods (1983) and Kula and Globman, (1994), argue that sub-cultures are not merely intra-organizational frameworks; each has values, norms and procedures to which they are connected to other parts of the system. Fuchs (1995) adds that sub-cultures may be the source of differences in behaviour and, sometimes, give rise to tensions in the organization. Hence, the way these sub-cultures are shaped affects the school effectiveness Therefore, the principal must identify and link them by inculcating shared organizational culture (Deal and Peterson, 1990; Fuchs, 1995; Hopkins et al., 1994).

Hargreaves and Fullan (1999) describe the main sub-cultures:

**Balkanization** - is a form, in which teachers work in separate groups, which sometimes competes with each other and are sometimes indifferent to each other. However, in any case, their level of communication is low. This sub-culture is mainly predominant in secondary schools as a result of the structure – divisions, blocs and large age groups that sometimes have independent principals. Nias et al. (1989, p. 53) found that teachers who share opinions frequently gather in sub-groups, which inhibit consensus about shared vision in the school as a whole.

**Isolation and individualism** – are a powerful combination, which nurtures educational conservatism. They prevent accessibility to opportunities and create pressures, mainly during change processes, when new demands are dictated to the teachers. In such situations, teachers feel isolated and helpless in the face of decisions, which they do not always understand and in which they are not involved. Moreover, Hopkins et al. (1994) state, "...it reinforces uncertainty and insulates the teacher from positive feedback and support" (p.92). Therefore, Fuchs (1995) stresses that this undermines teachers' confidence and their ability to change. In her study Rosenholtz (1989) found that ‘stuck
schools' are characterized by isolation and alienation, hierarchical relationships and authoritative management style. In such schools there are less chances of introducing a change.

Hargreaves and Fullan (1999) outlined how a collaborative culture could avoid Balkanization, isolation and individualism.

Collaborative culture – means that teachers' display teamwork, which revolves around central organizational processes in school and contributes to the improvement of school culture (Beare et al., 1989; Day, 2000; Hargreaves and Fullan, 1999; Rosenholtz, 1989; Sergiovanni, 1995). Collaborative sub-cultures assume that decisions will be made on the basis of consensus and not through conflict, as us done in a political culture, due to the shared values and objectives of the organization (Brundrett, 1998, p. 308). Yet, collaborative cultures display tolerance towards non-agreement, which grants teachers the confidence to respond to change and autonomously choose the change. Thus, paradoxically, schools where collaboration prevails, allow non-agreement, based on extensive agreements about fundamental values and higher-goals, which the staff aspires to. Lofthouse (1994, p. 133) enumerated several features of collaboration as a basic for this sub-culture; some of them are manifested by non-formal inter-personal relations and social cohesion, while others are structured and are manifested by strong professional relations, a common social and moral foundation, based on shared beliefs, agreement on educational policy and ability to share failures and successes. Rosenholtz (1989) found that collaboration is the main characteristic of 'moving schools'. Such schools are characterized by continuous collaborative organizational learning for constant improvement based on trust and mutual help “...the striking characteristic of the 'moving' school is that it has a culture that sustains quality teaching. (Hopkins et al., 1994, p. 92). Rosenholtz (1989) added that collaboration fosters appreciation and
trust among the teachers and the legitimization of shared expertise (p.80). Similarly, Nias et al. (1989) investigated five schools in England, in which collaboration was prominent, she found that staff behaviour was based on mutual support and trust. Furthermore Elmore and Burney (1999) and Sharan et al. (1998) found that involving teachers in decision-making enhances their development, involvement, satisfaction and commitment to the organizational objectives.

Nevertheless, Fullan (2001a) notes that

"Collaborative cultures, which by definition have close relationships, are indeed powerful, but unless they are focusing on the right things they may end up being powerfully wrong" (p. 67).

Several levels of collaboration dominate school sub-cultures. Cardno (1998, p. 114) identified five levels: information, consultation, discussion, involvement and participation, while Little (1990) identified four different types of collaborative relations between the teachers. The first three -telling stories, assistance and collaboration -may manifest artificial collegiality that by representing "loose connections" have no influence on the school culture. The fourth type teamwork is the strongest form of collaboration. It attributes meaning, shared responsibility, commitment to group improvement and greater willingness to take part in tasks primarily when introducing change. As described by Hopkins et al. (1994)

"...the staff feels more enthusiasm and commitment to their jobs because they are actively involved in decisions about them, creating a strong sense of personal identification with organizational jobs"

(p. 163).

Yet, Hargreaves and Fullan (1999) argue that collaboration has never been perceived as necessary at school (p. 56). However, since this term "seems appropriate" schools can
boast of their collaborative culture when, in fact, they display types of local collaboration and not an overall collaborative school culture. They further mention some forms of collaboration.

**Comfortably collaborative** – is a limited collaboration, which does not penetrate the system of moral principles and values. It usually stops at the convenient stage of giving advice, focusing on the immediate and practical in order to avoid long-term planning. Hargreaves and Fullan (1999) view this as a sort of “befriending” rather than collegiality (p. 61).

**Contrived collegiality** – occurs when administrators rather than teachers determine the forms of collaboration as in bureaucratic organizations. As a result “…they are usually ...compulsory, implementation oriented...and predictable…” (Hopkins *et al*., 1994, p. 93). Hence, according to Hargreaves and Fullan (1999), this form of collaboration discourages true collegiality.

So far, cultures found among of teachers have been described. However, it should be remembered that there is another sub-culture, that of the pupils. The culture displayed by teachers and pupils, which, creates tension that, affects their relationships (Deal and Peterson, 1990).

**Summary**

This section explained the concept of climate and the concept of culture as well as explaining similarities and differences existing between them. Moreover, the models of school culture, types of school culture and sub-cultures were reviewed.
This review underscored the importance of culture as a factor for understanding the latent processes in schools and the dynamics of change. Furthermore, the review illustrated that school culture affects all the areas of practice at school. These areas include ideological aspects – creating a shared vision and collective identity, from which policy and contents are derived; and organizational aspects – relating to management, processes and inter-relationships. Creating a school culture is attributed to the organization’s members, the external environment and above all the principals, who transform culture on the basis of their beliefs, perceptions and goals. Hallinger and Leithwood (1996) sum up the main ideas reviewed in this section.

“...culture is the source of values that people share in a society. As such culture can be viewed as having an effect on multiple features of the school and its environment... it influences the predilections of individuals leaders as well as the nature of interactions with others in the school and its community” (p. 109).

As transforming a culture is a process of change, the concept of change will be discussed in the next section.

**Part 3 - Change**

**Conceptual framework**

“Change can be regarded as a dynamic and continuous process of development and growth that involves a reorganization in response to “felt needs”. It is a process of transformation, a flow from one state to another... involving individuals, groups or institutions, leading to a realignment of existing values, practices and outcomes” (Morrison, 1998, p. 13).
Change is a pervasive influence and inescapable part of both social and organizational life (Mullins, 1999, p. 821). As Lumby (1998, p. 191) indicates, "...change is an ever-present reality for all those working in education".

Introduction of change attests to progress and development (Fuchs and Hertz-Lazarovich, 1991), whereas absence of change may mean the impending demise of an organization (Globerson and Carmi, 1987). While organizational survival depends on the ability to foster with routine, through the re-examination of basic values and beliefs. Sergiovanni (1995, p. 86), nevertheless, maintains that this re-examination endangers the stability, which values and routine provide to the organization’s members.

The prevalent definition of change is grounded on the work of Sarasson (1982) and Adijas (1991) who pointed out that change means replacing fixed behavioural patterns with new ones and aiming to do something today so that tomorrow will be different from yesterday. As change is neither a one-time event nor does it have uniform meaning, but a multi-dimensional process affecting individuals and groups, it involves cognitive and emotional modifications of knowledge, behaviour and values (Hopkins et al., 1994, p. 25). This complexity

"...creates different patterns of coping with changes, ranging from rigidity and closure, through the implementation of a change in a specific area, and up to a holistic change in the institution" (Fuchs, 1995, p. 57).

Motivation for change originates in an organization’s external and internal sources. External sources are embodied in social, ideological, technological, economic and political events as well as demands from officials. Mullins (1999) maintains that most planned organizational change is triggered by the need to respond to new challenges or opportunities that are presented by the external environment. As such, demands for change are sometimes perceived as coercive and may give rise to anxieties and
objections. The second source for generating change is the organization’s internal needs, which generally revolve around a crisis, which threatens the organization (Samuel, 1996, p. 321). Such a crisis may stimulate improvement in school climate and the pupils’ achievements (Kula and Globman, 1994, p. 47). Another internal source is the stage reached in the organization’s development (Fuchs, 1995, p. 46). This may be represented by an event that can facilitate the introduction of innovations (Fullan, 1991). Still another feature distinguishing change is its level. According to Fuchs (1995), it is customary to distinguish between two levels of change. “First-order change” relates to improvements in the current system, mainly on the level of “doing”, “Second-order change”, which is more penetrating, focuses on the level of “being”. At this level, change is generated in four dimensions: values, organizational vision and goals, organizational culture and operational practices, which include procedures and methods appropriate to the organization’s culture. On this topic Fullan (1991) states

"The challenge of the 1990s will be to deal with more second-order changes that affect the culture and structure of school, re-structuring roles and recognizing responsibilities, including those of pupils and parents” (p. 29).

**Perspectives of change in education**

According to Hopkins et al. (1994) and Blenkin et al. (1997), six perspectives can be applied to the analysis of organizational change in general and educational change in particular; technological, political, cultural, biographical, structural and socio-historical. The technological perspective is concerned with the organization’s product; thus, the main objective of change is to improve efficiency. Change focuses on new working methods and procedures. Hence, intervention process is often viewed mechanistically. Consequently Dalin (1998) notes that: “The important thing here, then, becomes a
search for the most effective means of reaching a specific goal” (p. 106). The technological perspective is reflected in centralized strategies such as the adaptive approach and the top-down model. This perspective assumes that change is a logical and rational process, as Hopkins et al. (1994) indicate

“...the approach...is logical, it makes sense: our approach to school improvement would be unrealistic unless it also embraced this perspective” (p. 32).

In contrast the political perspective stresses conflicts as an inherent part of the change process, because change, by its very nature, upsets the organization’s status quo, and thus, creates conflictual situations. This perspective focuses on the power-oriented aspects of an organization and the leader’s role in obtaining teachers’ collaboration, based on obedience. Dlain (1998) points out the consequences of applying this perspective

“...attention is no longer focused exclusively on such issues as the ‘quality’ of particular innovation, but is broadened to include the interaction between an idea and the organizations and environments that are taken up with it” (p. 107).

Turning to the cultural perspective, the focus shifts to the social setting in which an innovation is introduced. This means observing

“...the complexities of school life, including the way in which the culture of an organization impacts upon individual teachers and the way they go about their tasks” (Hopkins et al., 1994, p. 34).

According to this point of view, the cultural perspective focuses on how the organization is affected by ideas as Dallin (1998) notes “... the extent to which the norms and values represented by’ the development’ are in harmony with the
organization's basic values" (p. 108). From this perspective, Hargreaves (1994, p. 190) argues that leadership is perceived "... as a matter of management and legitimacy", in which collaboration and collegiality emerge from a process of consensus building.

As for the biographical perspective it focuses on the way in which change impinges upon the life and career of individuals. As, Blenkin et al. (1997) claim

"...it is centrally concerned with examining change in relation to the biographical experiences of individual practitioners, in terms of their hopes, aspirations, fears, commitments, beliefs and values" (p. 223).

Consequently, they conclude that the success of the change process depends upon the support that the people and school provide when constructing a new set of meanings (p. 225).

The fifth perspective is the structural. According to this perspective "... the process of schooling is embedded in, and a reflection of, wider economic, social and political structures." (Blenkin et al., 1997, p. 225). They argue that the structures that impinge on the work of teachers operate at a number of levels and in different ways. At the macro level there are social, economic and political structures; at the micro level -in the classroom- there are sets of structures that include the implementation of policies, resources, pupils and parents' expectations (p. 226).

The last perspective, the socio-historical, attempts to understand the historical essence of different events. This perspective offers a useful framework for analyzing processes such as curriculum change.

According to Hopkins et al. (1994, p. 35), each of these perspectives makes its own contribution and provides a valuable lens for viewing the process of change. In discussing the application of this multi-dimensional approach, Fuchs (1995) claims that
a change, which focuses only on one perspective, is a “tactical change” rather than a “strategic change”.

**Characteristics of change**

Fuchs (1995) and Fullan (2001b) state that change is a dynamic process involving interacting variables over time. Hence, in order for change to be meaningful and not merely ritualistic in nature, all the variables have to be integrated at all change levels. Acknowledgment of these variables and their implications as an imminent part of the process may make it easier for the change’s leaders and participants to accept the difficulties entailed. Fullan (1999) summaries these variables in eight basic “lessons” that illustrate his view.

The first lesson is moral purpose, which refers to ends and means

"...Moral purpose and change strategies combined to promote greater attachment to the school and greater academic achievement..." (Fullan, 1999, p. 20).

To this he connects the second lesson, which links theories of change to theories of education. He argues, “...any good ideas or programmes that hope to spread must include in their theories of action, a focus on context” (Fullan, 1999, p. 20).

The next lesson refers to conflict and resistance to change as essential ingredients of the change process. He explains the consequences of avoiding conflicts

“...if you avoid differences you may enjoy early smoothness, but you pay the price because you do not get at the real difficult issues until it is too late” (Fullan, 1999, p. 23).

The fourth lesson deals with understanding the meaning of operating on the edge of chaos. This involves operating simultaneously on structure and open-endedness, with
few guidelines but mainly dependence on organizational learning communities (p. 24). This lesson leads to three other lessons, which deal with the individual’s anxiety and the need for a collaborative culture to provide support. Consequently, Fullan states that a collaborative culture enables knowledge creation.

"The conversion of tacit knowledge to explicit Knowledge is a meaning-making proposition because it brings knowledge out into the open to be shared" (Fullan, 1999, p. 27).

In his last lesson, Fullan (1999) states that in complex times and complex problems, there is no single solution. Hence, each school has to create its own solution. Fullan sums up his lessons, by saying "...the eight lessons only have power in combination" (p. 29).

Change can also be viewed in terms of its three main characteristics. The first is associated with the nature of change; the second is associated with the evolution of change; and the third is associated with the individual carriers of change.

The nature of change

"Educational change is technically simple and socially complex" (Fullan, 1991, p. 65).

Fuchs (1995) notes that change takes place in four areas: formal, cognitive, emotional and behavioural. A formal change involves change of organizational structure and includes modification of the role descriptions, procedures, time allocation and working methods. A cognitive change relates to the level of knowing and understanding the organization’s goals, which attribute meaning to the change. An emotional change targets the school staff’s motivation to acknowledge and implement change. A behavioural change requires skills, implementation capability and inculcation of new
behaviours. Kula and Globman (1994) make a similar classification, arguing that change has three dimensions - professional, human and physical. The professional dimension includes professional knowledge of the nature of change. More specifically, for the field of education, it includes educational ideology and teaching practice. The human dimension extends across the human system, in which the principal, teachers, pupils, parents and the community are integrated. The physical dimension refers to financial and technical resources. All those dimensions are inseparable parts of the change implementation process; if lacking, they have to be provided for organizations to undergoing change.

Fullan (2001b) identifies the four main factors, which he view as characteristics of change: need, clarity, complexity and quality.

The need for change – Mullins (1999) states that change is triggered by either the need to respond to new challenges presented by the external environment or in anticipation of the need to cope with problems (p. 822). Samuel (1996) adds that this need emerges from a “performance gap”, that is, when the

"...organization's functioning level is not in compliance with the expectations, worldviews, ideological platform of the organization's members or of outside elements, influencing school” (p. 310).

Referring to the need to cope with problems, Fuchs (1995, p. 103) emphasizes that the need for change should be triggered mainly in stable institutions, which are unaware of covert problems, or following imposition of change. Furthermore, she states that to trigger a need for change, requires recruit people to support this position after reviewing their attitudes and feelings toward the change to be implemented, specifically:
"...preparing the ground-checking attitudes, consolidating a worldview, building an ideological common denominator for the group and formulating the school credo" (Fuchs, 1995, p. 107).

Clarity – clarity relates to two levels, the emotional and the cognitive. On the emotional level, it is necessary to understand what is expected from the change process, its benefit and cost of implementation. On the cognitive level, it is necessary to understand the essence of the change, its underlying theory, policy, goals and methods of implementation. Moreover, while lack of clarity of the process is an essential characteristic, of the initiation phase, at the implementation phase "...it may constitute an obstacle to its development“ (Fuchs, 1995, p. 136). Hence, clarity should be developed in a constant dialogue between the participants throughout the phase of implementation in the process of change, to avoid what Fullan (1991, p. 70) calls false clarity. That is that teachers’ perception of the change as grounded in contents alone, regardless of beliefs and values.

Complexity – complexity is examined from the perspective of the required change and the school’s ability to execute it. Milstein (1994, p. 53) argues that a larger number of changes have been achieved by smaller projects, due to their manageability. Alternatively, Fuchs (1995) points out that although complex projects generate larger change, they have the greatest probability of failure. On that point Fullan (2001b) concludes that

"...simple changes may be easier to carry out, but they may not make much of a difference. Complex changes promise to accomplish more...but they also demand more effort and failure takes a greater toll..." (p. 78).

However, Fullan (1991) argues that the obstacles, associated with complex projects, can be overcome by dividing the project into numerous separate parts and by supporting all the parts throughout the process.
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Quality and practicality of programmes - this characteristic is associated with the three previous characteristics and is manifested in the way they are handled. Kula and Globman (1994) state that changes, resulting from the adoption of an external policy, without clarification of their necessity for the institution, or allocation of time for elucidating people's beliefs about and commitment to change, reduce the quality of the programme. The dimension of practicality pertains to the operative conditions and means - such as physical resources, human resources and the coherence of the programme - available to the institution and the individuals undergoing the change, (Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991).

Characteristics associated with the course of change

According to Samuel (1996), every organizational change encompasses three key variables: the current situation, the future situation and the transitional situation. Defining these variables helps to define the entire process and identify its sub-processes. Fuchs (1995) points out that the course of change "...develops according to the starting points of the change, type of population, management patterns, resources and school culture" (p.27).

Different patterns of change can be found. However, despite their variation, four basic phases underlie each change process: Initiation, Implementation, Institutionalization and Outcome.

"...Phase 1 - variously labeled initiation, mobilization or adoption...Phase 2 - implementation or initial use...to put an idea or reform into practice. Phase 3-called continuation, incorporation, reutilization, or institutionalization...[Phase 4] the concept of outcome is to provide a more complete overview of the change process" (Fullan, 1991, pp. 47-48).
The transition from one phase to another is not automatic but depends on the quality of the implementation in the preceding phase. This quality has short-term implications for the transition between the stages and long-term implications for the skills, which school has developed for itself with regard to the process.

Initiation

At this phase the school decides to initiate a change. Since various combinations of sources can initiate change, how the decision is reached and its timing, determine this phase’s characteristics. Fullan (1991) argues that this phase may create meaning or confusion, commitment or alienation, cooperation or resistance (p.35). Hence, at this phase, the emphasis is on clarifying the need for change, understanding its nature and exploring the ways of adopting it.

According to Fullan (1991) and Fuchs (1995), three main factors can be distinguished at this phase. The first factor is a diagnosis of the organization’s current situation, which is the starting point of any planned change and the basis for evaluating its outcomes. Diagnosis focuses on the need for change and how the change complies with the school objectives; identification of the sources of power and resistance at school and the areas on which the change should focus as well as determining whether it is “implementable” (Cardno 1998; Fullan, 1991). The second factor is choice and decision-making, which are associated with adoption of a change, a definition of goals, attitudes towards change and clarification of personal and organizational benefits and costs. The third factor is preliminary planning for long-term goals and short-term objectives, in order to create motivation for promoting the process.

Fullan (1991, p. 63) emphasizes three elements, to be considered at this phase: relevance, readiness and resources. Relevance, includes the need for change; clarity of
the change; and utility, namely, what the change offers teachers and pupils. Readiness, involves the school's practical and conceptual capacity to initiate, develop or adopt an innovation. Resources concern the accumulation and provision of support as a part of the change process.

Consequently, at the initiation phase, the principal is expected to create the meaning and provide the relevance of the change for school life as well as to build confidence in the success of the change. Otherwise, resistance to the change will inhibit transition to the implementation phase. Mullins (1999) sums up this point by stating

"...people tend to be resistant to change. It is therefore, for management to adopt a clearly defined strategy for the initiation of change. The successful management of change is an increasingly important managerial responsibility" (p. 825).

Implementation

Implementation is the phase representing adjustment to change by the individuals and the organization.

"...implementation, consists of early experiences of putting reform into practice. Successful implementation is influenced by many similar factors, including characteristics of the change, school and external factors" (Stoll and Fink, 1996, p. 44).

During this phase, individuals develop and enhance their understanding of the meaning of the change and adapt themselves to the new situation. At the same time, the school system develops mechanisms and work patterns in order to assimilate the change and turn it into an integral part of school life. Hopkins et al. (1994) note that
"...it is during that phase that skills and understanding are being acquired, some success is being achieved, and responsibility is delegated to working groups of teachers" (p. 37).

Moreover, Fullan (2001b) indicates that the implementation phase takes two or three years, during which the individuals and the organization gain experience with the different programmes and ideas. This experience contributes to the understanding and adaptation of the change. "... only then can we consider that the change has really had a chance to become implemented..." (Fullan, 2001b, p. 52).

Institutionalization

Institutionalization is a process that routinizes the change and makes it part of the ordinary life of school, as Hopkins et al. (1994) indicate

"Institutionalization is the phase when innovation and change stop being regarded as something new and become part of the school’s usual way of doing things" (p. 38).

Introducing innovation into regular procedures (e.g., embedding the change in classroom practice) requires recruitment of broad support, the principal’s commitment and peer support. Institutionalization likewise means shifting responsibility for the change from external agents to the school (Kula and Globman, 1994) by empowering the staff (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992). Empowerment encourages the staff to contribute ideas and proposals, based on their experience and increases their involvement in the process and its implementation. This requires collaborative strategies such as collaborative decision-making as well as identifying people’s needs, creating an open climate and legitimizing emotional expression (Cardno, 1998; Kula and Globman, 1994). In educational as well as other organizations, change is grounded in altered
attitudes, knowledge acquisition and new skills. Consequently, during this phase, principals are expected to stimulate collaborative organizational learning, which is undoubtedly the most crucial element of any change process (Fullan, 1991, p. 86).

Some researchers argue that the line between implementation and institutionalization is vague and that, sometimes the institutionalization phase is incorporated into the implementation phase (Fuchs, 1995).

Outcomes

Outcome at schools can refer to several types of results. Results can include improved student learning and attitudes, attitudes on the part of teachers, learning new skills or improved problem-solving capacity of the school (Fullan, 1991, p.48).

Hopkins et al. (1994) state that

"...the impact and outcomes of the innovation are dependent on the nature of the initiation decisions... the factors affecting implementation strategy and the degree to which institutionalization is achieved..." (pp. 38-39).

At this phase, monitoring and evaluation are used to examine the change with reference to the goals set at the beginning of the process and their achievements at its conclusion. Hardie (1998) distinguishes between these two processes

"Monitoring is about making adjustment to the plan during the implementation process, and involves checking without making value judgments. It offers an answer to the question "How are we getting on?" Whereas, evaluation is seen as an activity, which involves thought, reflection and analysis and it offers an answer to the question: 'How did we get on?'" (p. 164).
Monitoring constitutes a basis for making decisions about the continued activity, to continue or terminate it or to make additional improvements and modifications. Evaluation according to Milstein (1994, p. 58) sets standards to encourage positive feedback, as well as to help school remain focused on the process. Fuchs (1995) emphasizes that monitoring and evaluation should be performed throughout all the change process phases, as change is continual process. It is important to mention that, although the change process was described as a series of phases, its development is not linear. A phase can occur more than once and sometimes, interactively as “… events at one phase can feed back to alter decisions made at previous stages, which then proceed to work their way through in a continuous interactive way” (Fullan, 2001b, p. 50).

**Individual Characteristics**

“…change concerns people more than content. This is a critical factor, particularly in human services like education” (Morrison, 1998, p. 15).

According to Morrison *et al.* (1997, p. 250), change is arduous and, sometimes, painful process, due to its vagueness, which induces uncertainty about the future and a separation from “familiar” situations. Moreover, since “…change is a process whereby individuals alter their ways of thinking and doing…” (Hopkins *et al.*, 1994, p. 41), reactions to change can differ from person to person. Some may see it as a challenge and become enthusiastic, whereas others perceive it as a threat and become resistant (Sergiovanni, 1995, p. 282). Hopkins *et al.* (1994, p. 41) note that it is necessary to check the perceptions held by those involved in the change, identify potential conflicts
and thereby arrive at the most extensive consensus possible regarding the change. Fuchs (1995) adds that

"Turning the objective reality of the change into the individual's subjective reality contributes to the confidence and mobilization necessary for the implementation of the change" (p. 26).

Fullan (1991) continues this argument thusly

"Real change... represents a serious personal and collective experience characterized by ambivalence and uncertainty: and if change works out it can result in a sense of mastery, accomplishment, and professional growth" (p. 32).

Fullan's statement shows that despite potential positive outcomes, change can be resisted at the individual and organizational levels, and thus, it is potentially open to failure. Indeed, quite a few changes fail. Some disappear after the initiation phase and others fail to be assimilated in school life. Cascio (1995) reports a survey conducted among principals, according to which 70%-80% of change initiatives have failed. The reasons for failure rest on several factors, the most crucial being resistance to change (Fox, 1998, p. 70).

Resistance to change

Resistance to change is manifested by disagreement, dissatisfaction and unwillingness to accept change; whether on the emotional, cognitive or behavioural level. Emotional resistance stems from apprehensions about the change and is mainly directed towards its initiators and agents. Cognitive resistance is manifested by presentation of the change's faults and negative effects, or by invoking arguments in favour of preserving the current situation, as well as disregarding indications of the need for change.
Behavioural resistance concerns actions directed at undermining the change programme.

Resistance is incited by three main factors associated with change. The first is the nature of the change, the second is the school culture and the third is individuals’ responses. Concerning the first factor, Fullan (1991, p.106) maintains that "... Since every group of people possess multiple realities any collective change attempt will necessarily involve conflict...". Fuchs (1995) claims that “...lack of information and understanding of the essence of change may result in resistance to its necessity” (p.135). Yet, Samuel (1996) argues that

“...resistance is an inseparable part of the change process, due to the conservative nature of organizations, including schools, which strive to maintain an internal balance, in order to protect their stability” (p. 324).

Regarding the second factor, Morrison et al. (1997, p. 247) stress that a change will be meaningful, only if presented in a wider context, as part of the school organizational culture and objectives. More precisely, a change, perceived as contradictory to the school culture, undermines the staff’s belief system and deprives the organization of meaning (Hargreaves, 1995; Inbar, 2000).

The third source of resistance resides in people. Milstein (1994) and Sharan and Shachar (1990) contend that resistance in individuals may stem from the fear of being harmed: change may undermine the familiar, jeopardizing one’s professional status and exposing incompetence. Moreover, Morrison et al. (1997, p. 247) and Fox (1998, p. 227) point out that resistance to change by the school staff may stem from practical sources: the time invested in learning the change and the difficulty in adjusting to new frameworks. It may also result from fatigue, caused by “adds on”, meaning the accumulated changes introduced at school. Above all, Fuchs and Hertz-Lazarovich
(1992) indicate the lack of internal support and training during the change process. Hence, Morrison (1998) states "...reducing resistance is a key factor, therefore, in the successful management of change" (p. 123). To overcome resistance to change, Mullins (1999) specifies the following

"...If staff are kept fully informed of the proposal, are encouraged to adopt a positive attitude and have personal involvement... there is a greater likelihood of their acceptance of the change" (p. 826).

**Factors facilitating the introduction of change in school**

According to Gali (1979), no single factor is capable of generating a change by itself; interaction between factors is required in order to carry out change. As Fullan (1991) argues "...the more factors supporting implementation, the more change in practice will be accomplished" (p. 67).

Fuchs (1995) and Fullan (1991) divide the factors facilitating the introduction of change in school into two main categories, internal and external.

**Internal factors**

A study conducted by the Rand Change Agency (quoted in Avi-Itzhak and Ravid, 1985) showed that factors facilitating change include the principal’s support throughout the change process, compliance with the school needs and staff training. Sergiovanni (1994) and Kula and Globman (1994) in turn emphasize that efforts at change will be successful only if the entire school staff is involved in the process, acknowledges its need and importance, experiences ownership of the process and makes an effort to implement it. Fullan (2001b) arrives at the following conclusion
"...change will always fail until we find some way of developing infrastructures and processes that engage teachers in developing new understandings” (p. 37).

**Principals**

The literature dealing with change processes, dedicates considerable attention to the principal as the leader and manager of change, as stated by Bush and Coleman (2000) “...change is at the heart of management and leadership” (p. 77). Consequently, the principal has to be at the

"...head of the change leaders, as a pedagogical leader, as an organizational figure, influencing the relationships at school and contributing to the school staff development “ (Popper, 1994, p. 77).

As the major link between the surrounding environment and the school, between the needs of the school as an organization and those of the people, the principal plays a central role in adopting, introducing and implementing change (Goldring, 1987). Fuchs (1995) notes that principals

"...even if they have not initiated the change, are the ones to decide which change will be introduced into the system and they can promote or curb it (p. 99).

From this point of view, Fullan (2001b) concludes “...the principal is the gatekeeper of change” (p. 59). The main aspect of this role relates to the principal as a transformational leader, who cultivates a vision, sets goals, delegates authority, supports individual staff members and develops a collaborative decision-making style (Leithwood et al., 1999). Morrison (1998) phrases the connection between principal and change thusly“...successful change is about successful management; successful management is about managing successful change.”(p. 15)
Teachers

Change affects and is affected by all the populations associated with it. Consequently, they have to be involved in its various phases, starting from the collection of information to active participation throughout the process. According to Sharan and Hertz-Lazarovich (1981) and Gali (1979), since change undermines assumptions, which direct the professional life of the teachers, the willingness and readiness of the teachers to adopt the change is crucial. Hence, they should be involved throughout the entire change process. Fullan (2001b) concludes by saying, "...educational change depends on what teachers do and think-it's as simple and as complex as that" (p. 115). Hence, he maintains that the quality of support given teachers, as well as attention to their needs and providing them of the meaning of change, are prerequisite for the success of the change process. Rudduck (1991) echoes this position

"Teachers have to feel some control over the situation and, in order to feel a sense of control, they have to recognize what it is they want to change. They have to understand...what they are trying to achieve, why they are trying to achieve it, and how any new possibilities might match the logic of their analysis of the need for change" (p. 31).

Rudduck's words emphasize arguments made by Hargreaves (1995) and Sergiovanni (1995) that in order to achieve commitment to change, the school staff should achieve sense of ownership of change process through shared understanding. Moreover, Leithwood et al. (1999) state that leaders have to empower teachers' capacity to take part in the change process (p.142). Hence, the principal has to develop a "professional learning community" in the school (Hargreaves and Fullan 1999). Hargreaves (1994, p.10) sums up his perception of the importance of teachers in the change process as follows "...teachers, more than any others, are the key to educational change".
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Pupils

Organizational changes are rooted in the assumption that, in order to generate changes, authority should be delegated to all the partners. Hence, pupils should be considered as active partners in the change process (Morrison et al., 1997). Fullan (2001b) maintains that

"...unless they[the pupils] have some meaningful (to them) role in the enterprise, most education change, indeed most education, will fail" (p. 151).

Milstein (1984) adds that pupils’ participation increases their level of involvement and expands implementation possibilities. On the other hand,

"...when pupils are less involved...then, when innovations are introduced, they may well become barriers to change" (Hopkins et al., 1994, p. 126).

Thus, schools undergoing a change should consider pupils active partners rather than mere customers. As partners, they will contribute a unique aspect to the process and increase its relevance to the school.

External Factors

"An organization can only perform effectively through interactions with the broader external environment of which it is part. The structure and functioning of an organization must reflect, therefore, the nature of the environment in which it is operating" (Mullins, 1999, p. 822).

Fuchs (1995) identifies four systems in the school’s external environment, which are meaningful for the change process: the government, the school district authorities, the
parents, and external change agents. She furthers argues that an organization cannot withstand the burden of a change without support from these systems.

The government

The government determines priorities regarding the continued operation of currently successful educational programmes and impels introduction of new programmes (Kula and Globman 1994, p. 146). Moreover, government support can encourage principals and can be an important source for the allocation of money (Milstein, 1994). Fullan (1991) sums up the role of the government

"The role of the government is... to provide the kind of pressure and support that force and reinforce local districts to peruse continuous improvements" (p. 288).

School district authorities

School district authorities affect the quality of change (Fullan, 2001b). The main role of the school district authorities is to facilitate the change process, by providing support and knowledge, rather than by being as Bryk et al. (1998, p. 279) state "patrons" Moreover, it can grant status and allocate money (Kula and Globman, 1994, p. 27).

Fuchs (1995 p. 146) states that even when a school is involved in a change and even if a school is capable of coping without external help, the effect of the change will only be for a short time. Fullan (1991) corroborates this by saying

"Individual schools can become highly innovative for short periods of time without the district, but they cannot stay innovative without district action to establish the conditions for continuous and long term improvement" (p. 209).
The parents

Opinions about parents’ influence on school are varied. They range from reservations about the parents’ ability to influence, through the assumption that the principal should consider parents’ wishes, and up to positive acceptance of parents’ involvement (Clark et al., 1984; Milstein, 1994). In fact, parents’ involvement is, still debated, yet Fullan (1991, p.250) argues "...parents and teachers should recognize the critical complementary importance of each other in the life of the pupil “

External change agents

Fuchs (1995) and (Fullan 2001b) indicate that the external change agents are perceived as mediators between the school and the change process. As such they play an important role in initiating change processes at school. Their role is to help the school adjust to the change by training and supporting the people who are undergoing the change process. Moreover, Fullan (2001b, p. 194) describes their goal as being to "... help organization develop greater internal commitment... “.

In Israel, the supervisors of the counselors are perceived as the major external change agents at school. Their role is

"...shaping the educational environment ... being an active partner to the process of making decisions relating to topics of policy and teachers’ training“ (Psychological-Counselling Service, 1998, p. 5).

Summary

In his third lesson, Fullan (1999) points out that
"...there never will be a definitive theory of change. It is a theoretical and empirical impossibility to generate a theory that applies to all situations..." (p. 21).

Indeed, to date, researchers have not reached a consensus as to which elements have the greatest impact on the success of an educational change process. Is it the nature of the change process, its characteristics, the models used, or whether its phases. All those issues were reviewed in this section. However, all the researchers concur that change is a complex process that relates to people "...real change can only come as a result of commitment of both the minds and the hearts of the total school community" (Sergiovanni, 1994, p. 1).

Moreover, most researchers agree on the salience of the principals as leaders of the change process and as central to its success. Nevertheless, they all also underscore the importance of the internal bodies, namely the teachers and the pupils, as well as the external bodies, namely the government, school district authorities and external change agents.

**Leading a change in school culture**

**Conceptual framework**

"Since organization ultimately resides in the heads of the people involved, effective change implies cultural change " (Morgan, 1986, p. 138)

Sergiovanni (1995) states that the way principals lead schools is dependent on their way of thinking or their mindscape. This mindscape provides the rules and principles, which guide the principals in their practice. Furthermore, Fullan (2001a) claims that a change in school culture should be guided by moral purposes. However, moral purposes are
insufficient; leading a change effectively involves all members of school and requires their involvement and commitment. Hence principals are expected to

"... develop a collective identity, increase their commitment, identify acceptable and unacceptable behaviours, communicate and find ways for effectively working together" (Friedman, 1995, p. 184).

Moreover, Hargreaves and Fullan (1999) argue that developing a common organizational identity is perceived as the most important aspect of principals’ leadership, because it ties together the sub-cultures at school, and unites them around shared values, which provide a meaning to the organization in which they work. Expressing this cultural force, Sergiovanni (1994) considers the principal as a “high priest”, seeking to strengthen, and articulate those enduring values, beliefs, and culture strands that give the school its unique identity over time. Consequently, leadership activities associated with the transformation of a school culture include articulation of the school purpose; determination of mission; socialization of new members; explanation of “the way things operate around here” as well as development of a system of symbols. Nias et al. (1989, p. 103) therefore, consider principals to be the “founders” of the culture in their school.

**Empirical perspective**

"Transforming the culture-changing the way we do things around here- is the main point. I call this reculturing “ (Fullan 2001a, p. 44).

Empirical research on the principal as the key leader in school change has confirmed in the main theories of organizational change, leadership and the management of change in school. Schein (1992) distinguishes between two mechanisms for transforming the
school culture; principals’ beliefs and their affect on teachers’ perception of their personal involvement and the ways change process is structured. As for the effect of principals’ beliefs on teachers, Leithwood (1994) in his research of Houston schools in the process of restructuring, found that leadership affects three critical psychological dispositions of staff. The first is their perceptions, the second is their commitment and the third refers to the organizational learning.

The importance that principals attribute to change, stems from their personal perception of its nature and the need for it. Fuchs (1995) claims that principals who perceive the change as imposed and contradictory to their educational worldview, or as not given to implementation, will not feel any obligation to introduce the programme. A study of female principals in processes of introducing change, conducted in Israel by Fuchs and Hertz-Lazarovich (1992), indicated that when the subjects perceived the change as emanating from institutional needs, they committed themselves to leading the change. This attitude was manifested by their personal involvement and the way they recruited teachers to the project.

Glover et al. (1998) studied twenty-five schools in England, which had introduced an intervention programme for the reduction of violence. They found that in fifteen schools, the principals encouraged the introduction of the programme, based on their realization of the necessity to change the school culture. They attribute this finding to “the importance of a leader as a driving force in maintaining change... (p. 92). They further state

“... If anti-bullying [the objective of the change programme] is not high on the agenda of the leader and opportunities are not offered for active staff participation in managing change... (Glover et al., 1998, p. 92).
Hence, recognition of the necessity for the change creates the organization’s commitment to its introduction. One of the sources of its necessity is “the knowledge of what is happening” (Garrett, 1997, p. 104). Morrison et al. (1997) and Astor et al. (1999), who studied the processes of introducing programmes for the creation of a safe climate and of violence reduction in the United States, and Benbenishti et al. (1999) who studied the same processes in Israel, found that awareness of the problem is a central factor, which explains the principal’s commitment to cope with it. Thus, principals, who perceived the problem of violence at their school as serious, demonstrated a higher level of willingness to cope with it. Benbenishti et al. (1999, p. 104) studied Israeli principals’ evaluation of the severity of violence at their school. They found that none of the principals considered the problem as very serious at his/her school. About 25% of the respondents believed that violence constituted no problem at all or that it was only a minor one; 40% evaluated the severity as low and about 25% indicated the severity of the problem as only intermediate. Only 6.7% of the principals evaluated the problem of violence in their schools as serious. Benbenishti et al. (1999) concludes that this can account for the minority of principal who were actively involved in the creation of a safe school culture.

The second mechanism for transforming a school culture, relates to the process of change through the creation of a shared vision and the formation of organizational constructs. Based on their study of secondary schools in Ontario, Liethwood et al. (1999) found that the success of the change programmes can explained by the content of their vision and both the formal and informal processes used in their development. One formal process is policy based on the school vision and its objectives. A clear policy enables the reation of a code of desirable behaviour. A study of sixty-four primary schools and forty-six secondary conducted simultaneously in The Netherlands
and Belgium by Van den Berg et al. (1999), showed that schools, which succeeded in introducing a change, had a clear policy for the introduction of change. Similarly, Glover et al. (1998) found that

"...schools which have developed clear anti-bullying policies, fully owned by the staff and consistently applied, are more likely to have a positive general culture" (p. 103).

In other studies Morrison et al. (1997), Furlong et al. (1997) and Stephens (1994) found that the success of implementing an anti-violence intervention programmes firstly depends on the context of introducing a change. As pointed out by Morrison et al. (1997),

"... if change are introduced in the context of a wider, fuller effort toward school reform, where the goals of safe schools are part of the goals of the school in general" (pp. 247-248).

Second, support from leaders is necessary, as Furlong et al. (1997) conclude

"For school safety plan to be most effective, it must have support from school and community leaders. Strong commitment to the plan must come from the district and from the principal at the school site" (p. 253).

Furthermore, principals, who lead cultural change, are described as leaders who reinforce the school culture, by using symbols in order to express the cultural values.

"... this process of cultural management appears to have been achieved through the skilful use of artifacts, stories, myths and symbolic actions to reinforce desired patterns of thought and behavior" (Brown, 1992, p. 6).

In other words as Senge (1995, p. 346) formulates it, "leaders 'teach' people in any organization to act like them". Day et al. (2000) in their study of twelve principals in England found that principals communicated their personal vision and belief systems by
direction, words and deeds. Based on their research they note that "...the heads in the study did 'walk to talk'...they modelled behaviour that they considered desirable to achieve the school goals" (p. 171).

Another method for achieving mutual ownership of the school goals is by collaborative organizational learning. Fullan (1999; 2001b), Leithwood et al. (1994) and Sergiovanni (1984) suggest that collaborative organizational learning constructs should be set up in school, whereby the principal encourages collective responsibility. This learning leads to a sense of ownership and commitment to the shared values system and ensures consistency in policy application. Rosenholtz (1989), in her study of seventy-eight schools in Tennessee, and Goodlad (1984) in his study of 1350 teachers in the United States, showed that teachers, who are not partners to the general objectives of school and who do not get support as an organization and a learning community, manifest a low sense of belonging towards their work and their school. Furthermore, Rosenholtz (1989, p. 137) found that "shared goals served to focus efforts and mobilize resources in agreed-upon directions", which is the way to translate the meaning and vision into the teachers' daily practice.

Principals' contribution to the creation of a climate of collaborative organizational learning has been investigated in studies conducted recently (Bryk et al., 1998; Day et al., 2000; Elmore, 2000; Leithwood et al., 1999; McLaughlin and Talbert, 2001; Newmann et al., 2000; Sergiovanni, 1995). Elmore (2000) found that contrary to expectations, only a minority of principals is actively responsible for creating a common culture of expectations around the organization's collective goals. Leithwood et al. (1999) likewise found in their study of six Canadian schools, that were quite promising sites of organizational learning, leadership practices associated with the transformational leadership, made positive contributions to organizational learning.
Moreover, a study of sixteen high schools in California, conducted by McLaughlin and Talbert (2001) revealed that teachers’ collaborative organizational learning is necessary for perseverance of change process while Newmann et al. (2000) on the basis of their research emphasized that this learning should be well organized. However, McLaughlin and Talbert (2001) found that only three out of the sixteen secondary schools they investigated demonstrated such a school-wide professional community.

Leithwood and Jantzi (1990) based on their study of twelve schools in Ontario, concluded that principals have to use broad strategies to lead a transformation in a school culture. They identified six strategies: shared goals, collaborative decision-making, bureaucratic mechanism, staff development, sharing responsibilities and the use of symbols.

**Management styles for introducing change**

In their studies in twenty schools conducted during the 1980s, Hall et al. (1984) identified three management styles connected with the introduction of change; the responder, the manager and the initiator. Principals who demonstrate a “responder” leadership style, are characterized by the establishment of good relations with the staff. Moreover, they focus on traditional administrative tasks and lack a vision and long-range goals. In term of the classic categorization of the task versus a people-oriented manarer, this leadership style is more people-oriented. Unlike them, principals who are characterized by a “manager” style view themselves as the main decision-makers at school. Nevertheless, their key characteristic is their response to external demands, mainly those of the Ministry of Education; hence, this style is more task-oriented.
Principals displaying the characteristics of an “initiator” are those who lead change processes and motivate teachers. According to Hall et al. (1984) initiators hold strong beliefs about what constitutes good schools and good teaching; they demonstrate inspiration and set high standards of performance. The “initiator” style closely resembles transformational leadership, as described by Leithwood et al. (1999); such principals were found to be effective in the introduction of cultural changes. In recent decades, several field studies both in Israel and around the world have made use of this classification and demonstrated that the most successful introduction of change was typical to principals adopting the initiator style (Bryk et al., 1998; Friedman, 1992; Kula and Globman, 1994; Sergiovanni, 1995; Sheinman and Ben-Peretz, 1993).

Goleman (2000), who investigated the relationship between management styles, organizational culture and outcomes, among 3871 principals, identified six leadership styles. Four have a positive effect on the organizational climate: Authoritative – driving people towards the vision; Affiliative – creating harmony and building an emotional relationship; Democratic – achieving consensus through collaboration; and Coaching – developing people. Two styles had a negative effect on the organizational culture: Coercive – demanding obedience; and Pace-setting – in the sense of “act like me”.

While examining the effect of transformational leadership on the implementation of large-scale innovation programmes in The Netherlands, Geijel et al. (1999), found that three salient dimensions of transformational leadership – vision, individual consideration and intellectual stimulation that positively affect teachers’ involvement in the introduction of a change.

The benefits of supportive management styles, were corroborated by many researchers (Bryk et al., 1998; Day et al., 2000; Elmore, 2000; Hargreaves and Fullan, 1999; Midthassel et al., 2000; Sharan and Shachar, 1990; Stoll and Fink, 1996). In Israel,
Sharan and Shachar (1990) studied schools which had undergone a systematic change and found that the principals' main contribution was their supportive and cultivation of the educational staff's involvement in the change. Similarly, a study conducted by Midthassel et al. (2000), which examined the principals' contribution in promoting social activities in eighty-one Norwegian schools, showed that the principal's active involvement was the critical factor promoting creation of the school culture. Furthermore, they found that

"...through a supportive leadership style the principals can achieve a better position for influencing teachers' norms concerning innovation and thereby enhance school development activity" (Midthassel et al., 2000, p. 257).

Yet, in our age of rapid and complex changes, which affects the complexity of educational leadership, researches tend to suggest a flexible managerial style and contingency-based approach as the most effective strategy for leading change (Bass and Avolio, 1994; Bush and Coleman, 2000; Day et al., 2000; Friedman, 1995). To use Goleman's (2000) words "...most effective leaders switch flexibly among the leadership styles as needed" (p. 87).

Summary of the literature review

"...leadership, vision and culture are essential in schools if significant and permanent change is going to be institutionalized" (Gore, 1993, quoted in Berry, 1997, p. 52).

As the topic of this research is the perceptions of leadership in the process of transforming school culture, the literature review was based on three main concepts related to this topic; culture, leadership and change. According to the literature, the
relationship found between these concepts, makes it possible to understand leadership in transforming school culture. Glover et al. (1998) point out that change is one of the elements of culture. According to Bush (1998, p. 43) culture and the strategy of managing change are interrelated in two ways. First, both are underpinned by values, lead to a clear vision of the school's future and its norms, which gradually coalesce to form the school culture. Second, culture is an important dimension of the context in which the strategy is applied. Moreover, Schein (1992, p. 15) and Gaziel (1990, p.78) view leadership and culture as two sides of the same coin. Hence those concepts were extensively reviewed. Referring to culture the review underscored the importance of culture for understanding covert organizational processes and change dynamics as well as its affect on all areas of practice at school.

"The usefulness of the concepts of culture, then, consists its assumed ability to help leaders understand 'seemingly incomprehensible and irrational aspects of groups and organizations' by the taken-for-granted basic assumptions held by the members of the group or organization" (Schein, 1992, p. 15).

These include ideological aspects – creating a shared vision in addition to the organization’s collective identity and organizational aspects – that relate to styles of managing processes and relationships. In addition, following Schein (1992), the importance of culture as a managerial mechanism for introducing a change by creating a shared meaning to the practice has been underscored. It follows that principals who intend to change their school culture should try to understand the relationships in the existing culture, which are at the very core of institutional stability.

The responsibility for transforming school culture is located among the organization’s members, the external environment but above all to the principals. The research literature stresses leadership as a central factor in introducing change in the school
culture (Fullan, 2001a; 2001b; Leithwood and Jantzi, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1995) as Fullan (2000b, p.13) notes “…the principal is absolutely a key when it comes to developing the ‘school capacity’ to manage a change”.

Bass and Avolio (1990), Sergiovanni (1994) and many other researches describe the type of leadership that cultivates school culture as transformational leadership. Such leadership focuses on constructing a shared vision, which attributes a meaning to the educational practice, and establishing the identification of the organization’s members, on the basis of shared norms. Other aspects found to be significant in leading a change of school culture focus on moral and strategic leadership, based on the principals’ values, the importance they attribute to the change as well as their managerial strategy for implementing change (Inbar, 2000; Sergiovanni, 1995). Furthermore, it has been shown that leadership, based on a democratic, collaborative and collegial leadership style, which involves the people in the organization through collaborative organizational learning, affects the motivation, commitment and successful implementation of change (Bolman and Deal, 1991; Day et al., 2000; Fullan, 2001b; Leithwood et al., 1999; Morgan, 1986; Rosenholtz, 1989; Schein, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1995).

The literature review examined the complexity of educational leadership as operating within a dialectic framework that demands major change and stability. In addition, it illustrated the emotional processes on the one hand and elements of rational strategy on the other, which together shed light on an organizational culture’s overt and covert process. Hence, according to Day et al. (2000) principals, who operate in such a complex, uncertain and dynamic environment, are required to possess a proactive
value-led and contingency-based approach towards the creation of a clear vision for the organization's future direction.

**The development of the research questions**

As mentioned, the research literature relates to three main concepts of leading a process of transforming a school culture. The first one is leadership, the second is school culture and the third is change (Day *et al.*, 2000; Fullan, 2001b; Inbar, 2000; Leithwood *et al.*, 1999; Schein, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1995; Sharan, 2000). Fullan (2001b) and Leithwood *et al.* (1999) claim that the principal is the figure in the best position to shape the organizational conditions necessary for the successful transformation of school culture. This claim is the basis for the over-arching research question: *What are the factors the principals perceive to be of greatest importance in enabling them to lead the transformation of a school culture?*

An alternative claim is presented by Caldwell and Spinks (1998) and Hall (1998), who contend that two main mechanisms are required in order to transform a school culture. The first one is strategic thinking and the second is strategic management. Strategic thinking is manifested by the principals' mindscape, their worldview, their values and moral purposes. These form the basis of the school vision, which can be oriented towards the desirable change (Day *et al.*, 2000; Fullan, 2001a; Inbar, 2000; Sergiovanni, 1995). This distinction led to the first additional research question; *What impact do the principals personally have on the school's shared values?*

Strategic management is directed at the way in which, values and moral purposes are translated into collaborative practice at school (Fullan, 2001a; Leithwood *et al.*, 1999; Sergiovanni, 1992; Sharan, *et al.*, 1998). This concept provides the basis for the next
additional research questions: How do principals share their values within the school? Which leadership styles do principals perceive to be of greatest influence in transforming a school culture?

The fourth additional research question relates to the contribution of strategic tools, by means of which the principals lead the transformation of a school culture. In the present study, the strategic tool, used by all the principals in leading the transformation of the school culture, was the new “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”. This strategy relies on the relationship between the creation of a safe climate and prevention of violence and the transformation of school culture.

Since violence represents both an overt and a covert manifestation of school culture (Astor et al., 1999; Furlong and Morrison, 1994; Glover et al., 1998; Olweus, 1993; Sharan, 2000; Stephens, 1994), it was assumed that in order to generate change in a school’s overt behavioural norms, a change must first be generated in the core of the school culture, that is, its values. Otherwise, no change will occur and if it does occur it will be short-lived (Glover et al., 1998; Schein, 1992; Inbar, 2000). This observation led to the development of the last research question: What do the principals believe to be the contribution of the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” to the transformation of school culture?

To examine the principals’ perceptions of their own leadership in the process of transforming their school culture the qualitative methodology was considered the most suitable. The methodology chosen will be reviewed in the next chapter.
Chapter 3 - Research Methodology

Introduction

The present study’s aim is to explore the Israeli secondary principals’ perceptions of leadership in the process of transforming the school culture. These perceptions were examined on the basis of their experience in introducing a new “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”. The research questions were developed on the basis of the study’s purpose and the literature review.

In this context the study aims to comprehend the principal’s experience in the process they have undergone. The development of the over-arching research question was driven from this objective. The key question investigates the factors principals perceive to be of greatest importance in enabling them to lead a transformation of school culture.

It was developed and refined during the period that preceded the data-collection phase of the study. Moreover, in order to acquire a more holistic picture of the principal’s perceptions, the following additional questions were developed.

- What impact do the principals personally have on the school’s shared values?
- How do principals share their values within the school?
- Which leadership styles do the principals perceive to be of greatest influence in transforming the school culture?
- What do the principals believe to be the contribution of the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” to the transformation of school culture?
Since the aim of the present study is to understand the principals’ perceptions, the qualitative approach, which focuses on understanding the subjective reality of the individuals involved, was chosen. Within this approach the methodology of the interpretive paradigm, which aims to understand phenomena through the eyes of the subject, and inductive analysis were chosen for their fit to the research objectives.

The main body of research involved semi-structured interviews with fifteen principals, as well as review of documents attended from the principals’ schools. In addition, the research itself entailed initial data-collection phase conducted first with a self-completion questionnaire to locate the research sample and followed by open interviews with three principals to locate the boundaries of the investigated topic. It is important to note that the information, gained with these additional tools, served only as background, designed to enrich the information obtained from the semi-structured in-depth interviews.

The in-depth interviews were analyzed by constructing categories and core categories to yield a comprehensive picture of the principals’ perception of their leadership in the process of transforming the school culture.

This chapter presents the rationale underlying the choice of research design and methodological tools, employed. It also describes the stages of the field research, following completion of the literature review. In addition, the study’s weakness as well as ethical issues associated with qualitative research will be discussed.

**The research design**

Choosing a research design is not merely a technical decision, which reflects the advantages and disadvantages of the optional approaches. Choosing the design is linked
to the paradigmatic rationale of the researcher’s understanding of the problem and the theoretical basis of the study.

As indicated earlier, the methodological approach chosen for conducting the research is the qualitative approach, which focuses on understanding the subjective reality of the individuals involved in it. Since the study’s aim is to examine and thus comprehend the principals’ perception of their leadership in the process of transforming the school culture and the conditions required for leading such a change, this approach was found to be most suitable.

Within this framework, the interpretive paradigm and inductive analysis were adopted. The interpretive paradigm is based on a conventional wisdom-domain theory, which requires review of the findings and a creation of a theory that captures the comprehensive reality as perceived by the subjects. This paradigm is also known in the literature as grounded theory, which transcends deterministic theories in its search for new understanding of social processes in the subject’s natural environment. As pointed out by Hutchinson (1988) in the context of education.

"Grounded theory offers a systematic method by which to study the richness and diversity of human experience and to generate relevant plausible theory which can be used to understand the contextual reality of social behaviour. With such understanding, educators can assess what is happening in the groups studied and plan interventions to improve the quality of education" (p. 127).

The decision to conduct qualitative research is rooted in the following considerations. First, my wish was to obtain comprehensive understanding of a phenomenon originating in peoples’ perceptions interpretations and experiences. Since the holistic approach inherent in qualitative research views subjective reality in its broadest sense, it enables to grasp the complex meanings attached to human experience. This capacity is based on the characteristics of qualitative data.
“Qualitative data, with their emphasis on people’s ‘live experience’, are fundamentally well suited for locating the meanings people place on the events, processes, and structures of their lives; their ‘perceptions, assumptions, prejudgments, presuppositions... and for connecting these meanings to the social world around them’” (Miles and Huberman, 1994, p. 10).

Moreover, qualitative research gives equal weight to the subject voice; the subject’s interpretation is accepted as reflecting reality by the researcher. This perspective accords with my personal worldview and professional experience as a counsellor. Grounded in the respect for others, qualitative methodologies recognize the salient of the subjects’ point of view and to the meaning, which they attribute to their life and work. For these reasons, the qualitative paradigm is suitable for investigating the perceptual aspects of educational leadership and the implications for leading a change in the school (Day et al., 2000; Hoy and Miskel, 1991).

**Qualitative research characteristics**

The starting point of qualitative research is the assumption that

“...people do, in fact, have patterns of experience. They order and make sense of their environment, although their world may appear disordered or nonsensical to the observer. The order or pattern derives from their shared social and symbolic interactions” (Hutchinson, 1988, p. 125).

This approach assumes that it is possible to identify, a central theme, among these patterns and to describe that theme in a way, which provides a comprehensive explanation of the investigated phenomenon. This explanation, according to theory must be acceptable to the subjects themselves, acknowledged by the scientific community and, under certain conditions, capable of generalization. Peshkin (1993)
notes that a qualitative research deals with four areas: description, interpretation, verification and evaluation. Accordingly, every qualitative research is, to a great extent, interpretive in the sense of identifying new problems, reformulating, refocusing and clarifying existing theory and initiating a new theory, which enable the understanding and clarification of phenomenon’s complexities (Peshkin, 1993, p. 24).

Qualitative research displays several characteristics as indicated in the literature (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982; Denzin and Lincoln, 1998; Gibton, 2001; Hutchinson, 1988; Mason, 1996; Miles and Huberman, 1994; Sabar Ben-Yehoshua, 1995; Sherman and Webb, 1988; Strauss, 1987).

- Qualitative research attributes salience to the meanings attached to events by the people on whom the research is focused. By exposing the subject’s perceptions, the researcher can comprehend underlying processes.

  "...consequently, researchers often ask how their subjects view, understand and explain the phenomenon and try to ensure that indeed they have managed to absorb their right perception" (Sabar Ben-Yehoshua, 1995, p. 25).

- Since the qualitative research emphasizes understanding of the subjects’ world, qualitative researchers tend to derive their data from the natural surroundings and strive to intervene as little as possible in the investigated reality.

  "The contexts of inquiry are not to be contrived or constructed or modified; they are natural and must be taken as they are found. The aim of qualitative research is not verification of a predetermined idea, but discovery that leads to new insights. Thus qualitative researches focus on natural setting..." (Sherman and Webb, 1988, p. 5).

- Qualitative research views the researcher as the main instrument for study of the phenomenon. He/she is assisted by tools such as interviews, observations, and
document content analysis, which enable as much as possible a precise and true representation of the subjects' views and of the investigated reality.

"The researcher's personal impressions are by themselves an important finding, although an attempt is made to separate it from the subjects' views and the reality displayed before his eyes. This gives rise to the descriptive nature of qualitative research and it, sometimes, has a narrative-descriptive nature, according to the researcher's talent' (Sabar Ben-Yehoshua, 1995, p. 22).

• Qualitative research is grounded in field study and it is a descriptive in nature as it seeks to uncover the patterns inherent in social events. The “thickness” of its descriptions results from the effort to portray the multidimensionality of life.

"...another feature of qualitative data is their richness and holism, with strong potential for revealing complexity: such data provide 'thick' descriptions: that are vivid, nested in a real context, and have a ring of truth that has strong impact on the reader'" (Miles and Huberman, 1994, p. 10).

• The major impetus for use of “research focus” lies in a problem or difficulty, which stymies the researcher in his/her attempts to interpret reality. In the field of education, problems frequently arise that require practical solutions involving the introduction of change. The qualitative researcher, in such circumstances, is more interested in the processes behind the problems origin, than in the results or outcomes of its situation.

"Emphasizing the processes contributes greatly to the understanding of occurrences in the field of education and to learning behavioural patterns and action ways of those involved" (Sabar Ben-Yehoshua, 1995, p. 23).

• Qualitative research design is usually not pre-planned but evolves within the research site. It develops through the data’s collection, by moving from subject to subject, observation to observation, interview to interview. The process continues
until saturation of the database and identification of stable patterns, which withstand the rigid tests of internal validity.

- Qualitative research question is, by nature, open-ended and does not imply possible directions of the answer. "How" and "What" are typical question in a qualitative research.

- Qualitative data analysis is ongoing, performed throughout the research.

> "The researchers do not wish to confirm or reject hypotheses that were set at the beginning of the research. The researchers' perception is formed as the data is gathered, and the theories are formed layer upon layer, based on the findings and information gathered, as part of a dynamic process of forming grounded theories" (Sabar Ben-Yehoshua, 1995, p. 23).

Hence, the theory's outlines undergo a constant process of shaping and consolidation, called "cyclic process", as opposed to the "linear path" of quantitative research.

- Qualitative research designs allows for small sample. "…qualitative researchers usually work with small samples of people…unlike quantitative researchers, who aim for large number..." (Miles and Huberman, 1994, p. 27).

- Generalization – a special place in the methodological literature is dedicated to the nature of generalization in qualitative research. Qualitative studies usually lead to a naturalistic generalization (Stake, 1988), as distinguished from scientific generalization based on probabilities of recurrence. Sabar Ben-Yehoshua (1995) argues that "…qualitative researchers do not preoccupy themselves with the issue of the findings' generalization but with identifying systems..." (p. 28).

Thus, generalization in qualitative research is limited to creating a new body of knowledge and constructing a grounded theory. This point will be elaborated later on.
Alternative research approaches

Research approach as a concept, is very comprehensive, which determines the research methods. Research approach is chosen according to the characteristics of the phenomenon and the research goals. In the social sciences, two main research paradigms are applied: the Positivist, and the Relativist.

"Quantitative (or positivist) research followed the scientific mode, aiming at objectivity, standard procedures and replicability. Qualitative (or relativist) research, on the other hand, took the view that all human life is experienced and indeed constructed from a subjective point of view of the participant" (Johnson, 1994, p. 7).

The conceptual bases of these two approaches are different and rest on different perceptions of reality and the methods for comprehending this reality. The approaches are differentiated along three main dimensions: research objectives, data collection methods and outcomes. The positivist-objective approach, underlying the quantitative methodology, assumes that regularity can be found in social behaviour, by means of empirical research tools. Hence, quantitative research is hypothetical-deductive, whereby the researcher formulates hypotheses a priori, which the study corroborates or refutes. The data are collected mainly by means of structured tools and presented in numerical formats.

Alternatively, the interpretive-subjective approach, which constitutes the basis for qualitative research, perceives human reality as social and subjective structures. Consequently, the qualitative approach strives to capture people’s complex world from an individual point of view, close to that of those experiencing the focal event. The starting point of qualitative approach is then, collection of data by open-ended means: in-depth interviews, observations and document analysis, which are presented in verbal
formats. According to Denzin and Lincoln (1998, p. 26), four paradigm structures originated from the interpretive approach: Positivist and post-positivist, constructivist-interpretive, critical (Marxist) and feminist-post structural. I dwell on the constructivist-interpretive because it is the most pertinent to my research. The constructivist-interpretive approach adds the researcher's own subjectivity to the interpretive framework "...we can never know whether we know the phenomenon as it really is ...we know it only as we perceive it" (Shlasky and Arielli, 2001, p. 53).

The question nonetheless has arisen as to whether these two approaches can be combined. Miles and Huberman (1994) have stated the issue thusly

"...why link qualitative and quantitative data? Rossman and Wilson (1984, 1991) suggest three broad reasons: (a) to enable confirmation or corroboration of each other via triangulation; (b) to elaborate or develop analysis, providing richer detail; and (c) to initiate new lines of thinking through attention to surprises or paradoxes, 'turning ideas around' providing fresh insight... looked at the other way, qualitative data can help the quantitative side of a study during design by aiding with conceptual development and instrumentation. They can help during data collection by making access and data collection easier. During analysis they can help by validating, interpreting, clarifying, and illustrating quantitative findings, as well as through strengthening and revising theory" (p. 41).

Gibton (2001) summarizes the issue in this way

"It seems to me that one of the qualitative research principles and advantages is that the methodological eclecticism allows the research to adapt the research method, sampling process, the tools chosen and the way of using them, as well as the data collection and analysis to the issue and the investigated field. As long as the research complies with the rules of validity and reliability, explains in an adequate and detailed way the method and design which he has chosen, and is capable of persuading the readers that he passes the test of intellectual integrity and that his findings are true and accurate - it is sufficient" (p. 216).

With respect to education, Hutchinson (1988) adds that

"A combination of qualitative and quantitative methods can broaden a study's perspective. The method can also be used in the evaluation of
educational programs and/or policies...Education and educators can only benefit from such a approach” (p. 139).

Those views justify the combination of several data collection tools used in this study. Sabar Ben-Yehoshua (1995) specifies this point:

“...self-completion questionnaires, customary in quantitative research, accompanied by open-ended interviews, characteristic of the qualitative approach, provide a deeper understanding of an investigated phenomenon” (p. 26).

The main research tool chosen for in the present study was a semi-structured in-depth interview, conducted with the principals (Appendix No. 4). Two additional tools were used in the initial phase of the study: an open-ended interview that provided the construction of the semi-structured interview schedule and a self-completion questionnaire (Appendix No. 3), used to refine the qualitative research framework and choose the research population. Moreover, documents were collected, to illustrate the principals’ perceptions.

To conclude, the qualitative approach was considered appropriate to this study as it examines the perceptions and the meanings the subjects- secondary school principals- attributed to their leadership. The paradigm adopted for the present study is interpretive because it focuses on the principals’ interpretations of their experience in the process of the transformation process they led at their schools. Moreover, the data were presented in the principals’ own words and analysed inductively. The methodology enabled construction of a comprehensive picture of the principals’ perception of their leadership.
Initial phase of the study

The initial phase provided the foundations for the final research design. This phase consisted of two stages. The first stage was conducted among all the 162 Israeli principals, who had chosen to introduce the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”. These principals received a self-completion questionnaire, in which they were asked to describe the intervention process at their school (Appendix No. 3). Of the original 162, 86 principals returned the questionnaires (Appendix No. 1, Table No. 1). The purpose of this stage was to locate the research population as well as to learn how the principals had introduced the new initiative into their school. The second stage entailed an open-ended interview with three principals - a male secondary school principal, a female primary school principal and a male principal from the religious sector. These principals were chosen out of convenience and for their assumed representativeness of each school level and sector. The purpose of those interviews was to collect preliminary information, free of theoretical restrictions, in order to trace the boundaries of the phenomenon and as a basis for the construction of the in-depth interview used in the main body of the study. The principals were asked to share any information, which might help illuminate the experience they had undergone in the process of introducing the new intervention.

The research population

Primary and secondary schools display different organizational structures and relationships with outside bodies (the district education authority, the local authority’s supervisors as well as parents). Primary schools are small and homogeneous by nature, whereas secondary schools are large integrative complex organizations. Hence, in order
to reduce any bias, which might resulted from this differentiation, I chose to focus on one population only, that is the secondary principals, who introduced the new “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” and agreed to take part in this research. The decision to focus on secondary school principals was due to my interest in the secondary school leadership as a complex phenomenon and to my professional specialization in working with secondary schools. Hence, the research population is purposive sample, which is acceptable in a qualitative research (Miles and Huberman, 1994, p. 27).

“Purposive sampling allows us to choose a case because it illustrates some feature or process in which we are interested” (Silverman, 2000, p. 104).

However, it should be mentioned that the research sample represents all the organizational structures of secondary schools (6-year schools, independent junior high schools and 4-year schools), geographical districts, sectors (excluding the Arab sector due to the current political tension) and gender (Appendix No. 5, Figures Nos. 4.A – 4.F).

Consequently, fifteen secondary school principals participated in the present study. These principals were chosen out of the 34 secondary principals who returned the self-completion questionnaires (Appendix No. 1, Table No. 1). The 34 principals were personally contacted and asked to participate in the study. Only 22 of them agreed to do so. However, political tension in Israel prevented access to principals in the occupied territories and the Arab sector. Hence, the sample population size of fifteen. This small sample size did not pose a problem because, as argued by Miles and Huberman (1994) “... sampling means just that: taking a smaller chunk of a larger universe” (p. 31). Mason (1996) adds
"If you are using a theoretical or purposive sampling strategy, then whether or not the sample is big enough to be statistically representative of a total population is not your major concern. However, you will wish to include particular units...from which you can generate data which will help you to develop your theory...” (p. 96).

In addition, Mason (1996) argues that the sample size should match the researcher’s ability to control and analyze the data as well as the ability to examine additional information obtained after every interview.

"...doing 20 qualitative interviews at two hours apiece may not seem to take very long... but if you are going to transcribe them, and search the transcripts for themes and categories...you will begin to realize that the commitment of resources is quite large” (Mason, 1996, p. 105).

Miles and Huberman (1994, p.30) conclude, “...with high complexity, a study with more than 15 cases or so can become unwieldy. There are too many permutations to account for”

**The research tools**

As noted, several data collection tools can be used in a qualitative research. Sabar Ben Yehoshua (1995), Johnson (1994) and Robson (1993) list the major types: documents, observations, questionnaires and interviews.

In the main body of the present study, the main research tool was a semi-structured in-depth interview (Appendix No. 4). In addition, documents were collected to demonstrate the principals’ perceptions. Moreover, two additional tools were used in the initial phases of the study; an open-ended interview and a self-completion questionnaire.

It should be noted that observations were ruled out from the start. Observation can take a variety of forms. It is commonly used in exploratory phases identify “what is
going on here". The main problems related to observations stem from the position of the observer. Sometimes it is impossible to describe the entire phenomenon in detail; at other times, the researcher has to decide whether a certain event is connected to the research topic. Alternatively, the researcher’s ability to simultaneously participate in several events regarding observation (e.g., when working in groups); as well as from the researcher’s level of involvement in observation – passive or active-can vary. Since the process of introducing the new “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” transpired over a period of two years in each school, it was clear that thorough observations of every case would be impossible. Moreover, because the present study does not focus on “actions” but on the principals’ perceptions on their leadership, an observation per se was of secondary value.

Hence, in the present study’s instruments consisted of documents, questionnaire and interviews. As to documents, Sabar Ben-Yehoshua (2001) states, that they can be internal in origin – memoranda, circulars, “credo” papers as well as external – publications, newspaper articles, circulars to teachers or to parents. All these provide detailed information that helps to reveal institutional mechanisms such as organizational culture, collaborative organizational learning, time management, personal involvement, communication patterns and implementation difficulties (p. 107). This information can identify gaps between perceptions and actions and between covert and overt processes. Johnson (1994, pp. 58-59) states some reservations regarding documents, He explains that documents should be viewed as available content, not as research tools. Following his position, the documents obtained from the schools (primarily expositions of the school’s “credo” and circulars), were served only to enrich the information obtained from the in-depth interviews.
As to the questionnaire, a self-completion questionnaire was used in the initial phase. As stated, the findings of the self-completion questionnaire served to identify the research population, to construct the in-depth interview as well as to enhance understanding of the finding obtained from the semi-structure interviews.

A decision was then required regarding use of questionnaires and interviews to collect the main body of data. Although the purpose, of both interviews and the questionnaire is to obtain information from subjects, differences exist in their application as well as the type of data collected. Questionnaires, applied mainly in quantitative research, are designed to obtain information from a large number of subjects. The questionnaire empowers the respondent and gives him/her the option to decide whether to provide the relevant data, as Johnson, (1994) points out

"The essence of a questionnaire, as a research tool, is that it is in the hands of the respondent, and is completed by him or her" (p. 37).

On the other hand, interviews are social encounters, “a talk with a purpose”, which empowers to the interviewer.

"...interviews have a particular focus and purpose. They are initiated by the interviewer, with a view to gathering certain information from the person interviewed" (Johnson, 1994, p. 43).

Hence, according to Robson (1993), the interview is a research tool common to the qualitative research because “...the interview appears to be a quite straightforward and non-problematic way of finding things out” (p. 228).

Importantly, the direct interaction between the interviewer and interviewee, enables the researcher to discover the interviewee’s world in his/her natural environment and to hear his/her language, is the main strength of this tool. This aspect is a major justification for its use it in the present study. Nevertheless, some researchers point out
that herein reside its weaknesses, too. The first weakness relates to the researcher’s lack of anonymity, which may introduce bias in both directions – the interviewer’s influence on the interviewee and vice versa. The second weakness relates to the interpretation of the interviewee’s words, influenced by the interviewer’s impressions, values and attitudes; the third weakness relates to the absence of standardization associated with the interview. All these affect the validity and reliability of the findings study (Aspinwall et al., 1992; Gibton, 2001; Robson, 1993; Sabar Ben-Yehoshua, 1995). An operative impediment should also be recalled: interviews are time-consuming to plan, administer, write up and analyze.

According to Johnson (1994), there are four main types of interviews. The first type is the fully structured interview. It is held usually according to written guidelines, which specify the topics and relate to the goals of a specific study. The primary aim of the structured interview is

"...to get equivalent information from a number of interviewees, information which is uncontaminated by subtle differences in the way in which it is asked for..." (Johnson, 1994, p. 45).

The advantage of this type of interview over the questionnaire is that response are ensured, with the added of working with large samples. The second type of interview is specialized interview, which is tailored to particular people. The third type is an open-ended unstructured interview, where "...the interviewer has a general area of interest and concern, but lets the conversation develop within this area" (Robson, 1993, p. 231).

In this study, an open-ended unstructured interview was employed in the second stage of the initial phases of the study. The three principals interviewed were asked to share any information, which would help to understand the experience they underwent while
introducing the new initiative. The information obtained from those interviews served as a basis for formulation the semi-structured interviews. The fourth type a semi-structured interview, is a flexible style, in which the questions, are preset in advance, but can modified according to the circumstances during the interview (meaning the order of questions can be changed but the interviewer does not add anything).

"The semi structured interview has a similar aim of collecting equivalent information from a number of people, but places less emphasis on a standardized approach. A more flexible style is used, adapted to the personality and circumstances of the person being interviewed..." (Johnson, 1994, p. 45).

According to Sabar Ben-Yehoshua (1995), the advantages of the semi-structured interview over the open-ended unstructured interview (more common in naturalistic and ethnographic studies) relate to the way time is exploited and the relative focus on the relevant points. The main disadvantage of the open-ended interview lies in the difficulty processing it, due to the variety of interviewee responses.

A semi-structured in-depth interview was chosen as the main research tool because it most efficiently complied with the research paradigm and the research purposes. That it allows to the researcher to enter the interviewees’ inter-of opinions, beliefs, and worldviews, mindscapes and perceptions.

"...to verify, clarify or alter what they thought happened, to achieve a full understanding of an incident, and to take into account the 'lived' experience of the participants" (Hutchinson, 1988, p. 125).

Hence, the justification for using this research tool follows from the research objective, which examines the principals’ perception of their leadership in the process of transforming the school culture. Moreover, this type contained the potential to learn
about the hierarchy of factors perceived by the principals as enabling them to lead the transformation process within their schools.

In the present study, the interviews were held only with principals. The decision to interview only principals and not the other school members was based on the fact that principals were the subjects of the study. More precisely, this decision followed from the purpose of the study, namely, the examination of principals’ perceptions of leadership in the process of transforming the school culture. This decision was also based on the assumption that

"...all people who share common circumstances and also share social psychological “problems” that are not necessarily articulated or conscious but grow out of their shared life...” (Hutchinson, 1988, p.133).

The “shared common circumstance” other than their principalship, is the experience they all underwent in introducing the new “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” initiative. As this initiative was developed especially for principals, in order to support them in leading the transformation process at their school, the research population consisted only of principals.

Moreover, as no research has yet been conducted on principal’s perceptions when leading a transformation in a safe school culture, while using this new initiative as a managerial tool for leading the creation of a safe school culture, I deemed it as of greatest importance to focus on principals only.

The content of the semi-structured interviews

As mentioned, the literature defines three main concepts of leading a process of transforming a school culture. The first one is leadership, the second school culture and
the third change. The topics of the interviews were derived from these concepts as well as other topics identified during the initial phase of the study.

The interview was divided into two parts. The first related to general information about the schools and the principals; and the second to the subject of the research. Thus the first questions were more open-ended in order to obtain general information about the school, its unique history and characteristics, as well as some background about the principals themselves—their educational worldviews, and educational history. The second part began with question focused on topics associated with the investigated area such as the principals’ reasons for introducing the new initiative. This question aimed to explore the basic assumptions underlying the principals’ priorities, regarding leading their school activities.

Moreover, in order to understand their values and purposes which were underscored in the literature as essential in the process of transformation of school culture, the principals were asked to describe the messages they considered important to transmit to the school staff and students. This led to a question trying to understand the process of constructing the important messages. Afterwards, the interviewees were asked about the conditions that facilitated or impeded the introduction the initiative. These questions addressed to the principal’s perspective regarding their leadership in the process of transformation.

The principals were likewise, asked to indicate the contribution of the new initiative to the transformation of school culture. At the end of each interview, the principals were asked if they wanted to add something or make some comments.
The Procedure of the semi-structured interview

The semi-structured interview was conducted according to written guidelines, which specified the topics to be discussed during the encounter (Appendix No. 4).

Sabar Ben-Yehoshua (1995) argues that the content of a semi-structured interview consists of topics prepared in advance, which are subject to change during the course of the encounter. Robson (1994) concurs

"...the interviewer has worked out a set of questions in advance, but is free to modify their order based upon the perception of what seems most appropriate in the context of the 'conversation'..." (p. 231).

In the present study, the interview topics were sent to the principals in advance, so that they knew the topics of the interview beforehand. Yet, the order of the questions was not dictated a priori but determined by the points raised by the interviewee during the encounter. It should be pointed out that, during the interview, I responded to new aspects raised by the interviewee but did not initiate discussion of new points independently, in order to avoid directing the interviewee. This policy is supported by Robson (1993).

"...through semi-structured interviews, where the interviewer has worked out a set of questions in advance, but is free to modify their order based upon the perception of what seems most appropriate in the context of the 'conversation', can change the orders, give explanations..." (p. 231).

The interviews were conducted face-to-face in the principals' office and lasted between two to five hours (more than one interview was held with two principals). It is important to mention that the principals cooperated willingly, spoke in length and
viewed the encounter as an opportunity to share their experiences. It appears that they viewed the conduct of the interview as a reflection of their principalship, while introducing the new initiative. As one female-principal said: "Only now, when I think about it, I understand the meaning... in day-by-day life I have no opportunity to examine myself..."

Following Robson (1993), the sequence of the interview was as follows:

"...Introduction - interviewer introduces herself, explains purpose of the interview, assures of confidentiality, asks permission to tape/or make notes...Warm-up - easy, non-threatening questions at the beginning to settle down both...Main body of interview - covering the main purpose of the interview in what the interviewer considers to be a logical progression. In semi-structured interviewing, this order can be varied...Cool off - usually a few straightforward questions at the end to defuse any tension that might have built up... Closure - thank you and goodbye..." (p. 234).

In general, the interviews were recorded in full, with the consent of the interviewees. Two were not: one because of the principal’s refusal and the other due to technical problems. The thirteen interviews were transcribed for the data processing. In addition, I wrote down remarks throughout the interview to pertain impressions I had received. Moreover, immediately after each interview, I recorded my personal impression of the intensity of the points raised, body language and interactions, in order to preserve the quality of authenticity attached to the interview.

**Data analysis**

Data analysis assigns meaning to findings and enables linking new research to published studies. In the present study, the data were analysed inductively. The analysis comprised three stages: (1) coding the principals’ interviews, (2) formulating categories as suggested by the data, and (3) constructing core categories that emerged from the
original set of categories, as described in the Conclusion Chapter (pages 288-291). These core categories used to construct a comprehensive picture of the principals' perception of leadership in the process of transforming the school culture.

Miles and Huberman (1994), describe coding, the first stage of the analysis, thusly

"Coding is analysis. To review a set of field notes, transcribed or synthesized, and to dissect them meaningfully, while keeping the relations between the parts intact, is the stuff of analysis. This part of analysis involves how you differentiate and combine the data you will have retrieved and the reflections you make about this information" (p. 56).

The data in the present study were coded according to the procedure proposed by Hutchinson (1988) and Strauss (1987). The first stage, called “open coding” by Strauss (1987) or coding “level 1” by Hutchinson (1988), involves selecting a phrases as units of analysis. A phrase was defined as “the interviewee’s words on a single matter” (one or more sentences dealing with the same topic). At recurring topic, or theme, were characterized and named. These themes were labelled the “initial categories”. In the next stage, a more accurate definition of the categories was determined, by indicating the unique contents that arose within a single theme [“axial coding” Strauss (1987); or “coding level 2” Hutchinson (1998)]. This stage followed by “selective coding” (Strauss, 1987) “coding level 3” (Hutchinson, 1998), which entailed final revision of the categories and review of the classification criteria in order to increase the internal categories validity. Guba and Lincoln (1994) and Miles and Huberman (1994) refer to the categories, identified by the within the data transmitted during the research, as “emic” categories. The “emic” categories identified by me, during the analysis of the in-depth interviews, were compared to concepts associated with the world of theory or
“etic” categories (Miles and Huberman, 1994 p. 61) categories derived from the literature. Gibton (2001) describes this process

"...the process of creating categories enables also the use of external categories. These are the “etic” categories, originating in other studies or in central concepts of the area, the existence of which the researcher is trying to prove in his or her data... " (p. 210).

The main “etic” categories were taken from the literature on transformation of a school culture, particularly: leadership, change and school culture.

The core categories yielded a comprehensive picture of the phenomenon studied, that is, principals’ perception of their leadership in the process of transforming the school culture. As Gibton (2001) states: “…core categories are shaped until a new theoretical conceptualization is created” (p. 212). This picture represents the new theoretical conceptualisation referred to by Gibton.

**Validity, Reliability and Generalization**

The strength of scientific study lies in its validity, reliability and generalization. Within the context of empirical research, validity (content validity) refers the extent to which findings represent the phenomenon, which they are supposed to represent. Alternatively external validity refers to the extent to which the abstract structures and research assumptions are applicable to the same phenomenon but in under other circumstances. External validity is usually can be assessed by the consistency with the theoretical literature, which support future theorizing. Reliability refers to the extent to which results can be replicated in repeated studies.
The ability of the qualitative research to validate its findings is being criticized. Opponents of the approach question how a study, based on personal interpretation, can “pass the test of validity”. Due to the open and descriptive nature of qualitative research and to the researcher's knowledge in the research process, the possibility exists that the researcher will report from within his/her own world and not the world of the subjects. The researcher's subjectivity, views may indeed influence data collection and, therefore, the researcher must be aware of this limitation and focus on adding knowledge rather than stating opinion. Moreover, standard of reliability as defined by quantitative research, are inapplicable because every researcher and every subject are unique, a fact that impedes similarity of findings. Hutchinson (1998) adds by saying

“The question of replicability is not especially relevant, since the point of theory generation is to offer a new perspective on a given situation that can then be tested by other research methods” (p. 132).

In any case, Sabar Ben-Yehoshua (1995) argues that “…there is no reason to doubt the data collection methods of qualitative researchers more than those of quantitative researchers” (p. 29).

**Trustworthiness**

Lincoln and Guba (1985) make a strong case for the position that the concepts of internal validity, external validity, reliability and objectivity used in quantitative research are inappropriate for qualitative research. Hence, they propose alternative criteria for judging a qualitative study, under the heading of trustworthiness. Trustworthiness is embodied in four criteria: credibility, dependability, transferability,
and confirmability. They argue that these terms replace the accepted positivist criteria while they capture internal and external validity as well as generalizability.

Credibility is a construct parallel to internal validity or true value. It refers to the accuracy of the findings. As the main paradigm of the present study is the interpretive one, aims at examining perceptions, the semi-structured interview was used as the main tool. As part of the procedure, every interview was taped and transcribed in full. Using the semi-structured interview, which brings forth the principals’ point of view in their own words, made it possible to attain credibility. Moreover, many of the principals’ statements, presented in their own words, were used in the presentation of the findings and served the purpose of this criterion. It should be noted that the principals’ responses to the in-depth semi-structured interview’s topics indeed provided a clear picture of their perceptions regarding leadership in the process of transforming the school culture.

The second parameter to test trustworthiness is dependability. Dependability is analogous to reliability. Lincoln and Guba (1985) state that a study that is shown to be credible is also dependable. Dependability thus follows credibility in logical order. So, the underlying issue here is whether the process of the study is consistent. That is, are the research questions relating to the topic of inquiry, are they clear and is the study design congruent with those questions. Hence, the researcher has to justify the methodological rationale, to explain the study’s methods and the ways the data were collected and analyzed. All those issues were discussed extensively and justified in this chapter. Moreover, to meet this standard Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest comparing the findings with those obtained with other research tools. In the present study comparing the findings with the finding of the self-completion questionnaire and
documents fulfilled the requirements of this criterion. Furthermore, Lincoln and Guba (1985) note that to meet the standard of dependability the methodology should provide safeguards against bias. To avoid the bias that might result from differences between primary and secondary school organizational structures, the study focused on secondary school principals only.

Transferability is the construct corresponding to external validity or generalizability in qualitative research. It refers to the likelihood that findings will pertain to other groups in other situations. Lincoln and Guba (1985) claim that in qualitative research

"It is ... not the [researcher's] task to provide an index of transferability; it is his or her responsibility to provide the data base that makes transferability judgments possible on the part of potential appliers" (p. 316).

Because potential users determine external validity, no techniques are provided by Lincoln and Guba to meet this standard (1985, p. 316). Rather, they contend that the researcher is obligated to provide sufficient data and adequate descriptions of the data so that the user can make all the judgments about application necessary. In the present study, many quotations from the transcripts, the school documents and the data obtained from the self-completion questionnaire, provided sufficient evidence to meet this standard. Moreover, transferability requires provision of sufficient information to compare one study to other studies. This is usually the result of the compliance between the study's results and the theoretical literature. Such compliance enables conceptualization through analysis of the findings and generalization of the results. In the present study, this standard was met by comparing the study's findings with the findings from other studies as well as with the theoretical literature. However, questions remain about the conclusions' generalizability. It should be stated that the conclusions could be
generalized only to other samples of secondary principals, the research population. Yet, the small size of the sample reduces their generalizability even the research sample included all types of the secondary schools organizations, as well as genders, geographical areas and sectors - excluding the Arab sector.

The last criterion Guba and Lincoln (1985) refer to is confirmability, which corresponds to objectivity. This, they state, refers to the question of whether the conclusions result from the subject and the conditions of inquiry rather than the researcher. Confirmability was achieved in the present study by relying only and directly on the principals’ worldviews and interoperations as expressed in their own words and not on any interpretations made by me as the researcher. This was demonstrated throughout the analysis, which showed a clear connection between the findings and the data provided by the principals (their own statements). This standard was also achieved by showing how the conclusions were derived from the findings and not from any interventions by me, as the researcher.

**Ethics**

The subjects of the research are people, thus, special care should be taken to protect them. The following ethics, consisting of a set of rules, are helpful in achieving this. Following ethical standards and rules for their application were strictly followed. Most researchers (Johnson, 1994; Miles and Huberman, 1994; Robson, 1993; Sabar Ben-Yehoshua, 1995) concur with following rules:

1. Anonymity – all the participants were promised full anonymity, which will prevent their identification. Hence, to prevent any possible identification, the principals were given fictitious names in the study – names of “trees” to the male principals, and names of “flowers” to the female principals.
2. Confidentiality – all personal details and other information will remain only in the researcher's hands.

3. Informed consent – relevant information about the research objective, scope, research method, research tools, form and place of publication were clarified in advance to all the participants. Furthermore, the study allowed a voluntary choice to participate research. Hence, the principals' consent to the interview was obtained prior to the interview. Twelve principals of the original research population did not agree to take part in the research.

4. Privacy – consent was obtained with regard to the contents of the interview. The interview questions were sent to the principals in advance and only after receiving their consent regarding the questions and their contents, was the personal interview scheduled. Recording of the interviews was done only with the principals' authorization; recording could be stopped at any stage if requested.

5. Negotiating access to the schools- the access to the principals was according to the binding rules of conducting a research within the education system in Israel. Only after obtaining the formal authorization by the Bureau of the Chief Scientist of the Ministry of Education, the study conducted.

**The weakness of the research**

The present study has two basic weaknesses. The first relates to the population and the second to the researcher. The research population was unique in two aspects, both resulting from the principals' willingness to participate. The first aspect of this willingness relates to the principals' choice to introduce the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”. As mentioned, only 56 out of a total of
937 secondary school principals (about 6%) chose to introduce this initiative. The second aspect relates to the principals’ willingness to participate in the present study. As indicated earlier, only 22 out of 34 secondary school principals (who responded to the self-completion questionnaire – Appendix No. 3) agreed to participate in the study. In addition, the political tension in Israel, made the participation of the Arab principals impossible, thus, they are not represented in the study. This fact reduced the sample to fifteen. Hence, the uniqueness of the population and the small sample size restrict the generalization of the findings. Nevertheless, the conclusions can still enhance the understanding of the factors needed for principals to lead the process of the transformation in the school culture.

The second weakness of the study is associated with my acquaintance with the new “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” initiative. This acquaintance might have affected the extent of my objectivity as a researcher. Yet, my acute awareness of possible bias was a warning sign throughout the interviews. As recommended by Hutchinson (1988): “…the researcher must … become aware of his own preconceptions, values and beliefs…” (p. 130). Nevertheless, I am confident that my professional competence as a counsellor and interviewer enabled me to “mellow” this effect and to conduct the study with sensitivity and caution. Moreover, because the study’s objective was to understand the principals’ perceptions of their leadership and not to assess the new initiative, my acquaintance with the new initiative, should not affect the implications of the findings. Use the interpretive paradigm and my expertise in the field of education may even be considered to have contribution to the research findings. Finally, and quite importantly, I was not previously acquainted with the principals.
Summary

This chapter reviewed the rationale for choosing the research methodology, framework and the tools. As the aim of the present study is to understand the principals’ perceptions and to learn about their experiences during the process they underwent, the qualitative approach, which focuses on understanding the subjective reality of individuals, was chosen. The interpretive paradigm, and inductive analysis were found best fit the study’s objectives. The data were collected from fifteen secondary school principals, among the principals who had chosen to introduce the new “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”. The data were collected by means of semi-structured interviews of the principals, shedding light on their experience. This research tool enabled the principals to share their feelings, beliefs and perception as well as to focus on the issues relevant to the study. Additional data was collected from school documents associated with the topic, as submitted by them.

The data obtained also from a self-completed questionnaire, which included in order to enrich and to back up the findings.

The data analysis method, chosen for the present study, was based on open, axial and selective coding techniques, designed to reduce raw data into concepts, which were, in turn, developed into categories and related core-categories as the basis of the theory.

In the next chapter, the data obtained from the field will be presented and will be analyzed.
Chapter 4 – Findings: presentation and analysis

Introduction

The topic of the present study is principals’ perception of their leadership in the process of transforming school culture, as reflected by their experience in introducing a new “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” initiative. This initiative, used to examine the perception of leadership, is grounded on the view that a safe climate is one manifestation of a school healthy culture and a basic condition for creating an educational environment promoting academic and social outcome. Moreover, the new initiative is rests on the assumption that the creation of school culture is the principals’ responsibility (Erhard, 2000). (The rationale of the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” was extensively described in the Introduction, pages 28-29).

Based on the initiative’s rationale, the professional literature and the research objective, the research questions were formulated.

The over-arching research question relates to the factors principals perceive to be of greatest importance in enabling them to lead transformation of the school culture.

The additional questions, related to this question, refer to three main themes: the principals’ values and the ways they share their values within the school; the contribution of the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” to the transformation of the school culture; and the leadership styles, which the principals perceived to have the greatest impact on the transformation process.

The chapter presents an analysis of the research findings as well as a discussion of the central themes revealed by the analysis. Based on the result of the analysis, an
examination will be made of the principals' perception of their leadership as reflected by the way they lead a process of transforming the school culture.

The findings rely on the principals’ own words spoken during the in-depth interviews (the main research tool). “Emic” categories were formulated on the basis of these responses, then they were compared with the literature, all the while, underscoring three main topics: leadership, change and school culture (extensively reviewed in the Literature Review Chapter). Furthermore, these findings were compared to the self-completion questionnaire’s findings, which preceded the present study.

The process of presenting and analyzing the data was incremental and consisted of an analysis of the main themes, which were revealed during the coding phase. The analysis of the main themes assigned meaning of each theme. The way those themes were connected by categories and core categories created the basis for constructing a holistic picture of the way the principals in the sample viewed the leadership they exercised when transforming the school culture.

Nevertheless, in order to transmit an authentic research and enable the reader to comprehend the process of analysis in its context, the chapter opened by presenting the principals’ educational perceptions, illustrated through an analysis of the responses to the first question asked in the semi-structured interview. This question related to their considerations for entering the transformation process. Their responses revealed their educational worldviews. Based on the analysis of these worldviews, two central aspects of the principals’ perception of their leadership in transforming the school culture emerged. These two aspects differentiated between the principals in the sample and enabled identification of their unique worldviews.
A content analysis was performed as a natural extension of the attempt to understand the principals' worldviews, values and moral purposes as the base of the school vision. The analysis enhanced comprehension of the compliance between the worldviews, values and moral purposes as well as the direction of the change that the principals wanted to lead.

This approach to piecing together the details, one by one, eventually led to the analysis of the over-arching research question. This question was directed at identifying the main factors that the principals' perceived as enabling them lead the change. Analysis of the main themes, against the background of the educational worldviews and their underlying values contributed to helping the reader grasp the contextual context of the findings. Moreover, it enables the reader to arrive at the understanding of the relationship between the findings and principals' statements, free of any interpretation on the part of the researcher.

This chapter consists of five parts. The first part presents background data of the research population. The second part describes the principals' considerations for entering the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” and the construction of the two clusters of principals. The third part specifies the factors, which the principals perceive as enabling them to introduce the change in the school culture, based on their experience with the introduction of the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”. The fourth part investigates the contribution of the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” as a strategy for the transformation of the school culture. The fifth and final part describes the leadership styles the principals perceived to be of greatest influence in leading the transformation of the school culture.
The research population- background data

Fifteen secondary principals participated in the present study. As described in the Methodology Chapter, the principals were chosen in two phases, which preceded the main study (Appendix No. 1). The first was conducted among all the principals in Israel, who had chosen to introduce the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”. A total 162 principals chose to adopt this initiative, out of whom 56 were secondary school principals. These principals received a self-completed questionnaire, in which they were asked to describe the introduction of the new initiative at their school (Appendix No. 3). Of the 162, 86 returned the questionnaires, 34 of whom were secondary school principals (Appendix No. 1., Table 1). These principals were personally contacted and asked to participate in the present study; 22 of them agreed. However, the political situation in Israel prevented access to principals in the occupied territories and the Arab sector. Hence, the research population of the present study consists of 15 secondary school principals. The rationale for choosing only secondary school principals was reviewed in the Research Methodology Chapter (pages 154-155).

It should be mentioned that in Israel, all non-primary schools are considered as secondary schools. The secondary school consists of several different structures: a six-year school, where the students learn in the 7th-12th grades; a four-year school, where the students learn in the 9th-12th grades (most prevalent in the religious sector) and autonomous three-years junior high schools, where students learn in the 7th-9th grades. The junior high schools and the six-year schools are characterized by a high level of
social and ethnic integration whereas the four-year schools are more homogeneous by nature.

It is very important to note that in order to maintain maximum confidentiality, as guaranteed to the principals, male principals are referred to by the names of trees and female principals by the names of “flowers”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal’s name</th>
<th>School’s Geographical District</th>
<th>School structure</th>
<th>No. of students</th>
<th>No. of teachers</th>
<th>Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iris</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>Junior high school</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Secular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysanthemum</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>6-year</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Secular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daffodil</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>Junior high school</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Secular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>Junior high school</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>Junior high school</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Secular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulip</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>Junior high school</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Secular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>Junior high school</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Secular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>6-year</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Secular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fir</td>
<td>Tel-Aviv</td>
<td>6-year</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Secular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm-tree</td>
<td>Tel-Aviv</td>
<td>4-year</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahlia</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>6-year</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchid</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>Junior high school</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>Junior high school</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Secular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camellia</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>6-year</td>
<td>2390</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>Secular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violet</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Junior high school</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Secular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 shows that more than 50% of the schools are independent secular junior high schools located in the centre district. The distribution of the schools according to
geographical districts, sector, and number of pupils are presented in Appendix No. 5 (Figures 4.A-4.D)

Table No. 4.2 - Profile of the principals in the qualitative research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals' name</th>
<th>Seniority in the education system</th>
<th>Seniority in principalship</th>
<th>Seniority in managing the current school</th>
<th>Principal's Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Management course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iris</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysanthemum</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daffodil</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulip</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fir</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm-tree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahlia</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camellia</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violet</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen from Table 4.2, 40% of the principals in the sample are in their first five years of management. Most of them have an MA degree and all but one ("Daffodil") participated in a management course. Moreover, the data show that, like trend in the education system, most of the participating principals are female. The distribution of
the principals’ seniority in principalship and in managing their current school is presented in Appendix No. 6 (Figures 4.E, figure 4.F)

Research findings

As mentioned earlier, the study comprised two stages. The first stage was an initial phase, during which the principals, choosing to introduce the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”, were identified by means of a self-completed questionnaire sent to them by mail. In this questionnaire, the principals were asked to describe the introduction of the new imitative and their involvement in it (Appendix No. 3). The second stage was the qualitative research, in which the population identified in the initial phase, was asked to be interviewed. For those principals who agreed to participate in the study a semi-structured questionnaire, the main research tool of the present study, was constructed. The topic of this questionnaire constituted the basis for the in-depth interviews (Appendix No. 4).

In this chapter, the findings are presented according to the research questions and are supported by the findings of the self-completion questionnaire. I repeat that the findings of the self-completion questionnaire serve only as a background for understanding the findings of the qualitative study. Moreover, documents collected at school, helped to further understand the perception of the principals’ leadership.

The following part of this chapter describes the principals’ considerations for introducing the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” initiative.
The principals’ considerations for introducing the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”

The main reason for introducing the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”, as described by all the principals, was their perception of safety as a basic value in the creation of a healthy school culture, which promotes academic and social outcomes. As expressed by two principals

“we all share the same feeling that we have to preserve the basic right of being safe in order to learn and teach” (“Rose”).

“...a school wishing to cultivate a school climate which promotes the ‘well being’ should start by creating a safe climate at school; this is the basis for a healthy society and for the entire educational practice” (“Violet”).

Hence, all the principals perceived the introduction of the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” as an opportunity for improving the school culture. This attitude relies on their understanding of violence as an element of the school culture. Two representative responses are given here

“Violence reflects a wider problem which is embedded in the norms and values of school and, therefore, I saw it as a lever for improving and promoting a safe society in general and of the school culture in particular” (“Lily”).

“...this was an opportunity to build working patterns and culture around a subject [safe climate], which is so important...” (“Chrysanthemum”).

Nevertheless, the reasons presented by the principals indicate that these shared perceptions are embedded in two different sets of considerations. This distinction
between the sets of considerations, resulted in the differentiation between two clusters of principals, and became the starting point for the analysis.

One group of eight principals presented considerations related to the perception of the school's role in its wider social context. This perception links the effect of social processes on school and the alternative effect of school as a social agent that influences society. These principals emphasized throughout the entire interview that school should act as a moral change agent, which advocates honour and tolerance in general and transforms the students' values with respect to their role as citizens in particular. This attitude gave rise to their perception that the moral purpose of school should focus on the school's "being", that is, on creating a valued-moral infrastructure. Consequently, transforming the school culture according to this perspective is the means to create this system of values. Nevertheless, the subjects indicated that the right for safety is one value from among a range of ethical - democratic and humanitarian- values, that constitute the societal infrastructure in which education should be rooted. The principals who shared this perception were refereed to in the present study as "The Moral Cluster".

The second group of seven principals offered a set of pedagogical considerations, associated with the school context. This set of consideration links improvement of the educational outcomes to the improvement of the school culture. The position, that the moral purpose of school is to expand the conditions required for the success of all the students by improving the school educational practice, is the origin of their considerations. Hence, the process of transforming the school culture was perceived by these principals, as the means for accomplishing this purpose. The principals, in this
group, were referred to as "The Pedagogical Cluster". However, it should be mentioned that, although all the principals in this cluster emphasized their striving to improve educational practice as their moral purpose, there emphasized different aspects of the meaning of “improving the educational practice”. One sub group of principals in “The Pedagogical Cluster” placed greater emphasis on the improvement of academic outcomes and related more to the improvement of the “working culture”, whereas the other sub group of principals placed greater emphasis on the improvement of the “social climate”, which they related to the violence prevalent in their school. These differences, observed throughout the analysis led to the identification of two sub groups within “The Pedagogical Cluster”. The first sub group of principals, which related to the improvement of the academic outcomes was referred to as “Group 1”, whereas the second group of principals, which emphasized more the improvement of the social outcomes, was referred to as “Group 2”. Hence, the principals’ considerations for electing to introduce the "Preventing violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” will be presented according to these distinctions.

“The Moral Cluster”

Eight principals (“Fir”, “Oak”, “Violet”, “Dahlia”, “Iris”, “Lily”, “Jasmine” and “Camellia”), related their considerations to introduce the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”, to macro level, meaning the wider social environment beyond the school context. This perspective links the school culture to its external social context and reflects the perception of school as an institution, which mediates between the individual and society (Chen and Addi, 1995; Day et al., 2000;
Goldring and Rallis, 1993; Inbar, 2000). This view was manifested by the words of one principal, representing the view of others in this cluster

"...the need to deal with school climate is not merely a social need of school, but a social national need. We are living in Israel; we see what is happening every day, every moment... we are committed to the children... It was obvious to us that the most significant change had to come from the creation of another climate at school" ("Violet").

More precisely, against Israel’s socio-political environment and the results of two major studies conducted in Israel (Benbenishti et al., 1999; Harel et al., 1999), which indicated violence among youth in Israel, these principals specified the role of school in the creation of a safe climate.

"...as an educating institution, school cannot remain indifferent in the face of violence in Israeli society... In order for Israeli society to be tolerant, it should begin at school... School has to create a system grounded in tolerance and mutual respect" ("Jasmine").

"Oak" indicated the moral values, on which the educational practice should rest

"The moral and social basis of school is creating a society which advocates tolerance, equality and respect for human rights in general and pupils’ rights in particular".

His school’s “credo” echoed this position

"...at the centre of the school being lie inter-personal relations which are grounded on the determination of a system of rights and duties ... derived from the individual’s freedom and social rights”.

Another principal emphasized her view of the role of education in a wider contexts extending beyond the school’s boundaries toward the future. As she explained it

"...if I am an institution which educates children...it is concerned not only with what they are doing now at school, but wants to provide them
with tools for the future and their life in future, ... this is part of my educational concept as a principal” ("Dahlia").

“Iris”, as a new principal in a new school within a new community, saw the opportunity to transform the school environment and the community in terms of her belief that

“...the common denominator of all of us was the search for identity, to start something new for transforming the place – not only the school but the entire neighbourhood ... therefore, the motto of the school is re-transforming – a window of opportunities for everybody... (“Iris”).

Unlike her, “Lily”, a veteran principal, she “exploited” the work of improving the school climate in order to re-clarify values for the purpose of creating shared meaning within her organization.

“...the relations, clarification of values and renewal of the norms in order to create a shared meaning for people”.

The humanitarian worldview of “Fir” finds its expression in the focus of educational practice on inter-personal relations at school.

“I am an educator first of all and only then all the other things... I manage an educational institution with values, upon which education is grounded. I think that the message you transmit with regard to education is respect and understanding... a real equality between the student and you, between the teacher and you, there is no difference. Once you transmit it to the children, you tell them ... that you want them to have a cultural infrastructure as citizens “.

And this principal adds

“...what you show every day is the person within you, not your credentials ... therefore the most important thing at school is the way the teachers behave and not what they teach...”

Consequently, in his opinion

“...It is important to attend to inter-personal relations also between the teachers and the pupils...what the students will remember later in life is
These comments, made by the principals in “The Moral Cluster”, reflect an attitude prevalent among educators, according to which school is a “social agent” that contributes to societal development and democracy in general and transforms students into citizens in particular (Aviram, 2000; Fidler, 1997b; Solomon, 2000). Hence, those principals stressed that violence in the school undermines this role. Their perspective reflects the view of Morrison et al. (1997), who argue that violence deprives school of the moral and valued justification for its existence. Consider this comment, made by “Fir”

“... academic achievements can always be completed but scars in the heart, which teachers cause the children, are never erased. Therefore we must achieve a situation of zero percent violence”.

“The Pedagogical Cluster”

The principals in this cluster connected the reasons for their introduction of the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe climate Intervention Process” to pedagogical considerations associated with the school context.

“Every student has the ability to learn but only under proper conditions. Hence, our duty is to provide safety and then, we will undoubtedly see an improvement in the students’ achievements” (“Palm-tree”).

Seven principals shared this perspective (“Palm-tree”, “Orchid”, “Chrysanthemum”, “Cypress”, “Rose”, “Tulip” and “Daffodil”). These principals appeared to have adopted the ecological approach, which views violence as overt as well as covert
manifestations of the school culture (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Sharan, 2000). This is expressed in the words of two principals

"... Violence is a symptom of something else; it is not the phenomenon itself..." ("Tulip").

"A safe school is not a goal by itself...this is rather ... a part of the complex of the school culture ... violence does not characterize a class, a single student or a group of uneducated students but it is influenced by the school culture and by the example and behavioural norms of the management and the school staff" ("Palm-tree").

The prevalence of this attitude has been corroborated in many studies of violence (Astor et al., 1999; Furlong and Morrison, 1994; Morrison et al., 1997; Olweus, 1993).

As mentioned, although all the principals in this cluster emphasize the relation between school culture and academic-social outcomes, two sub groups were identified within this cluster. One sub group of principals stressed the relationship between the "working culture" at school and the improvement of academic achievements ("Group 1"), whereas the second sub group of principals linked the school's "social climate" to learning, while stressing the violence prevalent in their school ("Group 2").

"Group 1" – this group consisted of three principals ("Orchid", "Palm-tree" and "Chrysanthemum"). They presented a point of view, which underscored their wish to improve the organizational culture at their school as a means for improving the students’ academic achievements. "Palm-tree" analyzed the components of culture, associated with these improvements

"... the school culture, staff working culture, teachers' expectations from the students, assuming responsibility and involvement guarantee improvement of the students' academic achievements and their motivation to learn".
“Orchid” adds

“...my goal was to improve the students' achievements... it is the duty of school to make students succeed in their studies”.

“Chrysanthemum”, as a new principal in her school, saw this as an opportunity to construct a revised organizational culture, as she explained

“...I wanted to use it to put some order into the system... teamwork and raising motivation... raising teachers' motivation will influence the students' motivation, leading to improved achievements”.

“Group 2” – whereas the principals in “Group 1” emphasized “working culture” as a prerequisite for improving students’ learning, the other four principals in “The Pedagogical Cluster” (“Cypress”, “Rose”, “Tulip” and “Daffodil”) emphasized more the relationship between safe climate and pedagogical practice

“...it was clear to me that these are two things, that I am walking on two parallel and tangent pathways, namely the pedagogical and the safe climate areas together” (“Tulip”).

Many researchers (Astor et al., 1999; Furlong and Morrison, 1994; Kaplan, 1995; Morrison et al., 1997) concur with this perspective, that is, that students, who do not feel safe at school, are not “free” to learn. Consider ” Rose’s” remark

“When a student feels bad at school and he is exposed to risks and violence from others, he will not want to be here. You cannot feel well when you come to school and you know that others want to hit or harass you or tease you... If the students are constantly under pressure and tension they cannot learn...only when a pupil is calm he is open to learn...”.

The educational conclusion reached was that “... it was impossible to start creating a pedagogical climate unless we had a clear infrastructure of safety (“Daffodil”).
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It is important to note that, although all the principals in the present study did not deny the incidence of violence at their school, they did not perceive the violence as severe and did not attach great importance to it among their considerations regarding the introduction of the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”. The principals in “group 2” were the only ones to admit that the incidence of violence at their school influenced their decision. Two principals in this sub group indicated that the violence in their school was mild and two mentioned that it was severe. (This finding agrees with those of Benbenishti et al. (1999), who found that only 6.7% of the principals in Israel perceive violence at their school as a severe problem). The principals’ expressed the state of violence at their school thusly

“When you entered school you heard shouts all the time, shouts by the students, the teachers or the principal and his deputies. It was as if you had entered, if you’ll pardon me, a large auto repair shop, shouts all the time... everywhere you went you found scribbling, whether in the toilets, on the desks, in an exaggerated way. And the content of the graffiti was against the principal, the deputy principal and the teachers. The contents transmitted hate…” (“Cypress”).

“Rose” elaborated, on her own experience

“...I see many cases of beatings, cursing, ear pulling and pulling down students’ pants as well as violent expressions like ‘I am going to kill you’ and ‘I am going to cut you’...”

In addition, these principals admitted that their methods of handling violence had failed

“All the time both my deputy and I took care of problems... we simply were over-burdened ... we have indeed coped with them in various ways, some were disciplinary; others were educational, but to no avail...” (“Cypress”).
Hence, it was not surprising to find coping with violence at the beginning of their school “credo

“We attribute the highest importance to the inclusion of the issue of violence in the daily educational processes. Prevent it in any way possible...” (“Daffodil”).

To sum up, the principals’ considerations for introducing the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” indicate that they shared the same educational perception. That is, safety as a basic value in the creation of a healthy school culture, which promotes academic and social outcomes. Nevertheless, the principals’ considerations encompassing two different points of view, based on which a distinction between the two clusters of principals was made. The first – “The Moral Cluster” – aspired to a healthy culture as part of the promotion of society’s “well-being”. This perspective based on the perception of education’s contribution to the valued-moral-social society development in general and of adolescents in particular. Hence, these principals underscored creation of a valued infrastructure as the moral purpose of educational practice at school. On the other hand, the principals in the second cluster – “The Pedagogical Cluster” – ground their set of considerations in improving the overall functioning of school. This improvement relates to the expansion of those conditions, which link the “social climate” with the “working climate” and affect both the academic and social outcomes.

Throughout this chapter, the findings will be described in relation to the two main clusters, which represent the two basic categories into the principal’ perceptions of their leadership can be classified.
As the principals’ considerations illustrated the importance they placed on values and moral purposes as the heart of their leadership, the next section examines the system of values and moral purposes raised by the principals.

**Moral purpose and values**

"You cannot set rules and then set the principles. If values and purposes are consolidated, clear, significant to all of us, the operational steps will follow... in my opinion many schools are preoccupied with the opposite. They deal with events and do not understand why they are doing it and then you are susceptible to every trend, every whim" ("Lily").

This statement reflects Fullan’s (1999) and Sergiovanni’s (1995) view of values and moral purpose in education. Fullan (1999) views moral purpose as a central element of educational leadership in the postmodern age “…in complex times, leaders must be guided by moral purpose” (p. 5). He attributes to enhancement of social cohesion, the psychological power to cope with problems during turbulent times to moral purpose. Sergiovanni (1995, p.5) refers to the power of moral purpose “…once common purpose and shared value are in place, they become compass point and milepost for guiding what is to be done and how”

Fullan (1999, p. 1) further distinguishes between two aspects of moral purpose. The first aspect relates to the macro level. At this level, moral purpose represents education’s contribution to societal development and democracy, rooted in humanitarian-democratic values. The second aspect relates to the micro level, at which moral purpose relates to the expansion of the conditions, which support students’ academic achievements.

These two aspects were salient in the considerations mentioned by the principals, in this study, when describing their reasons in introducing the “Preventing Violence
and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”. Each cluster displayed moral purposes yet, these purposes were based on different values. “The Moral Cluster” focused on ethical values, whereas “The Pedagogical Cluster” focused on practical values. Hence, these aspects will be examined according to the identified clusters.

“The Moral cluster”

The principals in this cluster emphasized moral purposes, rooted in basic humanitarian-democratic values of human rights, equality, tolerance, good citizenship, safety and concern for the future of their students. The following statement, taken from “Dahlia’s credo” reflects this position

“School places the person at the centre of its interests. This is a person with humanitarian values, who advocates tolerance, accepts the different and believes in equality...” (“Dahlia”).

The core values, indicated by the principals in “The Moral Cluster”, as expressed in their comments and in their school credo, are presented in the following table.

Table No. 4.3 – Core values of the principals in “The Moral Cluster”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Oak</th>
<th>Fir</th>
<th>Iris</th>
<th>Violet</th>
<th>Camellia</th>
<th>Jasmine</th>
<th>Dahlia</th>
<th>Lily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for human rights</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality between people</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening a window of opportunity to the future</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for good citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communality</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The right of every student to learn in a safe environment</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As Table 4.3 shows three values—"respect for human rights", "tolerance" and "safety"—were mentioned by all the principals in this cluster. These values dominated the in-depth interviews as well as the school "credo". All the schools dedicated a special chapter to the students' rights, emphasizing that "students are entitled to be respected by both their teachers and their friends", an attitude based on "tolerance among people". This finding is not surprising as these are basic rights at the foundation of human relations. Nevertheless, they do not pass the test of reality as perceived by the Israeli students, who claim that teachers do not respect them (Harel et al., 1997, p. 68).

"The right of every student to learn in a safe environment" was the third central moral value emphasized by the principals in this cluster. Since this value was mentioned by all the principals in both clusters and constituted the basis for introducing the "Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process", it will be analyzed in depth later in the chapter.

Six principals in "The Moral Cluster", emphasized the value of "good citizenship" as a basis for creating a healthy society "...a good citizen is a person who is more at peace with himself, healthier in mind and contributes more to society" ("Oak"). Five of those six principals, connected good citizenship, to the value of communality

"...inculcate skills in the students, enabling them to develop as citizens who respect the law and their fellowmen... and to contribute to society in general and to the school community in particular" ("Dahlia"'s credo).

"Good citizenship" and "communality" thus, express according to Caldwell and Spinks (1992, p. 156), the relationship between school as a microcosm of society and the perception of school as an organization designed to serve the interests of society and the community. Moreover, the principals in this cluster, associated these values with their
perception of school as preparing the students to be future citizens. As "Camellia" phrases it "...to open a window of opportunities to the future of the children through education for good citizenship and formal schooling".

A more thorough perusal of these findings shows that most of the principals in "The Moral Cluster" mentioned at least five humanitarian values. That is, they related to a system of values rather than one single value. This system constituted the basis for the moral purposes, which guide their educational practice. These findings conform to the definition of moral leadership found in the literature (Dimmock, 2000; Grace, 1995; Girioux, 1992; Hodgkinson, 1991).

One principal ("Lily") was the exception in this group. She mentioned only three values, yet referred extensively to the meaning of those values as the basis of her approach

"The principal navigates the school on the basis of the values which he brings with him. And school navigates itself on the basis of these values. If you have a true inner belief, rather than recite recent fads, you reflect it in every move you make every day".

For this reason, she indicated the process of clarifying values at school as the most meaningful process related to the moral purpose of education

"...the clarification of the perceptions is more significant. The philosophy, belief, values...re-examination, re-defined...these are significant".

Moreover, she added that although basic values themselves do not change, they have to be examined and re-clarified constantly

"...it constantly needs to be re-clarified and renewed...however, the central axis of the values does not change, only our understandings... I and the staff have to review them..."
The re-examination of the basic values of school is considered by Fullan (2001b, p. 45) as crucial for the achievement of long-term change and as the foundation for building a holistic educational programme. Inbar (2000, p. 27) even mentions re-examination as one of the key features of moral leadership.

The emphasis on moral purposes, as expressed by the principals in this cluster, can characterize their principalship as “moral art” (Sergiovanni, 1995). These findings comply with those of Day et al. (2000), who showed that the vision and practice of the twelve principals investigated in their study were organized around their core values. These values entailed respect, fairness, equality as well as caring for the well-being and future development of the students and staff (p. 39).

“The Pedagogical Cluster”

Seven principals presented moral purposes associated with the school context, as a reason for introducing the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”. These principals focused more on practically oriented values and linked the creation of a safe school climate to the commitment of school to the academic success of the students. This perception links the academic outcomes to school processes. Prevalent during the 1970s in studies of effective schools (Beare et al., 1989) and continues to have an impact also today (Fullan, 1999, p. 11). The following table demonstrates the moral purposes mentioned by the principals in this cluster.
Table No. 4.4 – The moral purposes of the principals in “The Pedagogical Cluster”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moral purposes</th>
<th>Palm-tree</th>
<th>Chrysanthemum</th>
<th>Orchid</th>
<th>Cypress</th>
<th>Rose</th>
<th>Tulip</th>
<th>Daffodil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School is committed to the success of every student</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school culture affects achievements</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate affects achievements</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every teacher is also an educator</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The right of every student to learn in a Safe environment</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 shows that all the principals share the moral purpose that “school is committed to the success of every student”. Accordingly, the students’ success is associated with two main processes. The first process, mentioned by six out of the seven principals, links the school culture to academic success. As indicated by “Palm-tree” “...the school culture is directly related to the improvement of academic achievements...” This perspective is corroborated in the literature (Leithwood and Jantzi, 1990; Rutter et al., 1979; Sarasson, 1990; Sharan and Shachar, 1990).

The second process, linked by the principals to academic outcomes, is school climate, a relationship also found in Lightfoot (1983), Grosin (1991) and Rutter et al. (1979). This moral purpose was shared by four principals from “Group 2” (“Cypress”, “Rose”, “Tulip” and “Daffodil”), as one of them notes

"The mental health and climate is the skeleton, on which the pedagogical practice can be built... this is a real infrastructure, something very primary and fundamental“ ("Tulip").
These two aspects - "culture" and "climate" - are interrelated and, sometimes, it is difficult to distinguish between them and their unique contribution to academic outcomes (Maxwell and Thomas, 1991). Today, the tendency is to see "climate" as a unique feature of "culture" (Fidler and Bowels, 1989; Kaplan, 1995; Reichers and Schneider, 1990). Indeed, as demonstrated in Table 4.4, the four principals from Group 2 in "The Pedagogical Cluster" ("Rose", "Cypress", Daffodil" and "Tulip") mentioned climate and culture as linked to academic achievements. As one of them stated:

"...the working norms, teacher-student relations, school climate and the inter-personal relations of the teachers among themselves and with the students affect the students' achievements" ("Daffodil").

Importantly, because the term "climate" in spoken Hebrew language clearly relates to the social-psychological aspects of school and the term "culture" refers to the organizational dimension (e.g., "working culture") and because the principals used both terms during the in-depth interviews, I deemed it necessary to explore the meaning of the selective use of these concepts. This examination indicated that the principals from "Group 1" in this cluster ("Palm-tree", "Orchid" and "Chrysanthemum) did not raise the relationship between "climate" and achievements nor the role of the teacher as an educator. As mentioned, the principals in this group gave their reasons for introducing the "Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process" as improvement of academic achievements by improving the school culture. As the context analyses of their responses showed, "Group 1" principals linked the "school culture" to the working patterns in their organization.
Conversely, the principals of “Group 2”, in addition to the “working culture”, stressed “social culture” as promoting achievements. They also emphasized the role of the teacher as an educator: “Every teacher is also an educator” (Table 4.4). This relationship reflects the argument made by Fullan (1999, p. 19), that in order to enhance students’ motivations and achievements they need a greater attachment to school.

To sum up, values and moral purposes represent the espoused level of the school culture (Shein, 1985; Torrington and Weightman, 1989). Therefore, change in overt behaviour necessitates a change in the covert level of values. The findings show that indeed, each cluster displayed values and moral purposes. Yet, the findings show that the moral purposes were based on different values. While the principals in “The Moral Cluster” focused on ethical values, such as equality, tolerance and respect for human rights, the principals in “The Pedagogical Cluster” focused on practical values, such as the school’s commitment to the success of every student. However, the findings show that the moral purposes mentioned by all the principals, in both clusters, contained the value of safety (Table 4.3 and 4.4). Furthermore, during the interviews, the principals were preoccupied by this subject and repeatedly mentioned it in their responses. Yet, the principals in “The Moral Cluster” stressed safety as only value one out of a system of humanitarian-democratic values, which should guide educational practice. On the other hand, the principals in “The Pedagogical Cluster” stressed this value in connection with its pedagogical-academic aspects, associated with the improvement of educational practice.

Stressing the value of safety is shared by many researchers, who have shown that the awareness of the moral role of school is increased by appealing to humanitarianism
values and freedom from fear (Glover et al., 1998; Morrison et al., 1997; Snyder et al., 1996).

Since all the principals underscored the role of values and moral purposes as the basis for the school vision, the next section will examine their reflections on the school vision and the way the vision is created as described by the principals.

**A shared vision**

"...It was clear to us that we had to create a positive educational horizon ... that we needed a motto, which would lead us and guide us in our practice at school" ("Violet").

This statement, represents all the other principals in this study. Indeed, all the principals stressed the salient role of school vision.

"...our starting point was the question which society we wish to see here, what are the basic values which should be inculcated in the future citizens... we consolidated basic values on which we would work..." ("Fir").

This words reflect a conventional wisdom that school acts according to values and meta-laws, reflected in its vision, which directs the common educational practice (Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Louis and Miles, 1982; Senge 1995; Sergiovanni 1995). Inbar (2000, p. 159) and Bennis and Nanus (1985, p. 89) state that vision serves, as an organizational’s guidelines, facilitating global thinking through local practice. Moreover, they and others (Bollingtion, 1999; Southworth 1993) argue that vision engenders commitment to organizational goals. Hence, Yukl (1989) sees transformational leadership as responsible for the development of a vision that is both clear and highly appealing to followers.
The previous section described the differences in the principals’ moral purposes and values systems (Table 4.3, Table 4.4). Now, these differences will be examined with respect to the content of the school vision and the ways of creating that vision, by the clusters identified.

“The Moral Cluster”

As mentioned, the considerations, of the principals in this cluster, to introduce the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” related to school in its wider social context and its role in cultivating a moral society. This position was manifested in the school vision and credo of most of the principals in this cluster.

“... school has to develop a model of a safe and moral society, based on respect and freedom” (“Oak”).

Moreover, this school vision reflects the personal vision of the principals

“My vision as a principal demands seeing school as a community, a school which educates for values and for a tolerant and contributing society. This is the ‘backbone’, which upholds my school,” (“Oak”).

This relationship between the principal’s vision and the school vision as manifested by “Oak” and the other principals, invites reference to two observations made by Sergiovanni (1995). The first praises the principal’s personal vision, required by every “good principal” (p. 32). The second expresses the apprehension that this personal vision may be owned only by the principal or, alternately, that the organization’s members will follow the man rather than the vision. As a solution to this dilemma, Sergiovanni proposes creating “collective ownership of the vision” (p. 51). “Lily”
reflects this proposal in her statement "...my job is to see to it that the teachers understand my perception and turn it into our shared goal at school..."

According to Sergiovanni (1995) and Hargreaves and Fullan (1999), this “collective ownership”, to which the entire organization is committed, can be created only if all the teachers are involved. Indeed, the principals in “The Moral Cluster” indicated that they built the vision jointly with the staff, as expressed by one of them

"...we constructed the school vision together. Since we did it together, everybody was committed to it. As reminded them repeatedly, these are things we decided together" (“Dahlia”).

Moreover, the principals saw it as their responsibility to create “collective ownership”, on the basis of a broad consensus rooted in shared values. “Iris” elucidated this point “…making everybody connected to the shared values is my duty”.

The system of shared values, presented by the principals in this cluster, included humanitarian-moral values, including the value of safety (Table 4.3) as one of the basic values, on which the shared vision is founded “...it is the right of every student to be protected... the value of safety is most important and our duty is to preserve it... (“Jasmine”’s credo)

The principals treated the value of safety, the heart of the new initiative, as the starting point for creating shared meaning and a coherent practice. According to Morgan (1986), creating such a shared meaning enables people, to understand events in their broader context. Moreover, Fullan (2001b) indicates this understanding as one of the preliminary factors required to introduce change but first and foremost, to construct a school vision. “Lily” describes this in her own words
"... the whole idea was to intensify the perception of 'school as educator'. After having analyzed the meaning of this and what was required, we decided to start on our way... we understood at the very beginning that we would need something very significant as far as the process was concerned. The problem was to create a meaning and a relationship between the data and people's beliefs and commitments. People have to understand what they are doing and how their actions are related to the school climate".

"Dahlia" supported this point with a description of the way she and her staff collaboratively created their school vision

"... until we reached this formulation we had discussions and debates, there was quite a tumult. We underwent a very considerable change at school and, eventually, we decided what we wanted our school to be. We set ourselves some goals for the coming years, in light of the vision which we had built".

"Camellia" was the exception in this cluster. She reported that the vision was collaboratively formulated by the senior management team only and not by the entire staff. She added that the school size did not allow collaboration of its members, a factor, which dictated how she recruited teachers to participate the process (Table No. 4.9).

"The Pedagogical Cluster"

"My vision is that children will come to school out of right and not of duty, teachers will come to teach out of right and not of duty... we have to make it happen" ("Tulip").

Beare et al. (1989) and Fullan (2000a) argue that vision must be meaningful and clear to the entire organization. The principals in "The Pedagogical Cluster" constructed the
meaning of their vision around the school commitment to the students’ academic accomplishments.

"...as educators we see our educational goal in cultivating personal excellence, acquisition of learning skills, orientation to creative thinking and education for initiatives" ("Chrysanthemum").

With these words, "Chrysanthemum" links vision to the meaning of the proposed change “...in order to accomplish our goal, we have to arrange for conditions at school which will enable it...”.

The principals in "The Pedagogical Cluster" included aspects of school culture as prior conditions for the promotion of learning

"...my vision – effective learning of the students – will not transpire if the students’ needs are not satisfied and if there are no open teachers-students communication channels" ("Daffodil").

They also specifically emphasized, in their credo, safety as one of those basic conditions

"...our goal is to provide tools for coping with manifestations of violence in order to cultivate the quality of life at school" ("Daffodil”’s credo).

According to Fullan (2001b, p. 75), one of the ways for creation the meaning of change and its implementation is by explaining the need for and relevance of the change to school life. The relevance of the change was raised by the principals in this cluster by connecting learning and the sense of safety.
"...we all [the principals and the teachers] thought that this was a goal which should really be achieved... it is impossible to learn when children feel threatened" ("Rose").

Since teachers perceived the connection between safety and learning as necessary and relevant, the principals indicated that they encountered no difficulty in recruiting them to the process.

"...everybody can relate to the need for the safety of the students and the teachers. Therefore there were no differences of opinion and it was easy to take the subject and work on it" ("Tulip").

Snyder et al. (1996) indicate that awareness and understanding of a problem constitute catalysts for the readiness to make a change. Indeed, five principals in this cluster ("Palm-tree", "Chrysanthemum", "Cypress", "Orchid" and "Tulip") indicated readiness to introduce the new initiative as a higher level of urgency. They included a sense of "covert threat" in their messages, "...unless there is an improvement in the students' achievements... good students will not register to school" ("Cypress")

The connection made by the principals between the need for change and the potential crisis situation helped them to recruit people. According to Fox (1998), a crisis situation reduces resistance to the introduction of change. To use his words "When the status and the very existence of school are threatened, school functionaries' commitment to change increases" (p. 201).

To sum up, the common feature of all the principals in the study was their perception that the transformation of school culture is connected to the creation of a shared meaningful and relevant vision. This is perception seen by Leithwood et al.
(1999, p. 2) as a key feature of transformational leadership. Nevertheless, there was a difference in the value contents of the school vision and the moral purposes, which were influenced by the principals’ personal vision. The principals in “The Moral Cluster”, who emphasized the social-valued context, encouraged creation of a shared vision on the basis of ethical values. This approach, according to Inbar (2000) and Sergiovanni (1995) characterizes leadership in the 21st-century. On the other hand, the vision elaborated by the principals in “The Pedagogical Cluster” was related to practical values for the improvement of the educational culture in general and the promotion of learning in particular. These principals linked safety to the school’s immediate need to further learning outcomes. According to Bennis and Nanus (1985) and Fox (1995) this attitude manifests a leadership, which connects vision to current problem solving for the purpose of creating a better future.

Since the principals’ objective was to transform the school culture, the question arises as to what factors they perceived to be of greatest importance in enabling them achieve this objective. The next section is dedicated to the examination of this question.

**The factors principals perceive to be of greatest importance in enabling them to lead a transformation of school culture**

The over-arching research question of the present study investigates the factors principals perceive as enabling them to lead the transformation of school culture. The following model presents the factors that facilitate transformation of school culture, indicated by the principals following their experience with the introduction of the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”.
Figure 4.G presents three key factors, which the principals identified as enabling them to lead a transformation in the school culture. The first factor relates to their own decision-making style and staff involvement and commitment. The second factor is collaborative organizational learning and professional counseling. The third factor is external support from parents, District authority, and professional intervention processes.
impact in leading the transformation of the school culture. Analysis of this factor indicated three components: the principals' mindscape, which provides direction for transforming the culture; modeling, by means of which principals influence teachers; and the principals' involvement in the initiative itself.

The second factor, indicated by the principals as promoting the transformation of the school culture, is school processes composed of three components: decisions making; staff involvement and commitment; and a creation of a collaborative organizational learning community.

The third factor, required to transform the school culture, as stressed by the principals, was the external support system. This system had two main sources: the first, human resources, included the district authority, parents and professional counselling bodies; the second material resources, related to the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” itself.

Analysis of the findings was performed for each factor separately in order to clarify the unique contribution of each. This analytic separation is artificial because, in reality, the factors operate simultaneously and are interdependent (Sharan, 2000). It is important to note that, although transformation of the school culture is a change process, change was not analysed as a distinct variable. Instead, it was analysed with reference to the research questions. This was done in order to elucidate on educational leadership during the process of transformation.

The first factor, which emerged in the present study, was the principals' impact on the transformation of a school culture. This is analyzed extensively in the following section.
The principal’s impact

All the principals in the present study, with no exception, clearly perceived themselves as having a strong influence on school practice in its entirety. They clarified it well in their words, as represented by “Violet”

“I think that the school leadership, and I use this term on purpose, has a crucial influence on the entire school practice. The leadership guides the processes and arranges the agenda, both pedagogical and social”

“Iris” was unequivocal “...if I believe in something, it will be carried out”. “Cypress” supported this approach “...it depends only on me... if the principal does not want to hear and is unwilling to act, then nothing will happen at school”.

These principals’ perceptions of their impact is corroborated by the literature, which underscored that the educational leadership has been found to be a key feature of schools and is acknowledged as a central element of a school’s success (Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991; Fullan, 2000b; Inbar, 2000; Sergiovanni, 1995).

Moreover, “Violet” adds, “...I lead at school, I would not want to be in the position of just a manager”. With respect to her statement, it should be mentioned that ten of the principals emphasized their impact, while distinguishing between leadership and management. “Violet” further clarified this distinction

“Leadership is manifested by moving an entire school from point X to point Y. This is the ability to create within the school the motivation and belief, the sense of belonging. These are things, which a manager does not do but a leader is capable of doing”.

Yet, five principals (“Oak”, “fir”, “Rose”, “Daffodil”, “Palm-tree”) did not make such a distinction. These findings reflect the split in the research on the issue of management versus leadership. While some researches (West Burnham, 1997; Caldwell and Spinks,
1998; Kotter, 1990), view the transformation of culture and the creation of vision as features of leadership, whereas management concerned with implementation, operational issues and means. Others (Fullan, 2001a; Bollington, 1999; Terrell, 1999), view management and leadership as overlapping, as two sides of the same coin. Or, to use Terrell (1999) terms “leadership is showing through management” (p.105).

All the principals in this study underscored the message, which they transmit at school, as the central characteristic of their impact.

“The message transmitted by the principal is the basis for the shared values and the vision of school, for the school language, the norms and working patterns. This is the school's identity card” (“Palm-Tree“).

This finding agrees with Sergiovanni’s approach (1995, p. 174). The principals’ comments elucidate this point “…the principal determines the policy and delivers the educational-valued message” (“Orchid”). “Chrysanthemum” agreed, adding, “The message at school is determined by the principal. He determines the values …”.

Similarly, Sergiovanni (1995, p. 96), views the principal as the central figure in the transformation of school culture, focusing his or her impact on moral purposes and values while turning the school into a community of minds. However, the task of articulating these purposes into a community of minds is undoubtedly not easy. The explanation of “Lily” demonstrates this clearly

“The greatest problem in managing such a complex process...resides in the fact that the inputs are human, the processes are human and the outputs are human...”

Indeed, many researchers (Gaziel, 1990; Sharan et al., 1998; Schein, 1992; Yukl, 1989) view the transformation of school culture as a complex and integrated process, whereby the quality of the educational leadership and the school culture factors, which are
interrelated, should be considered simultaneously. Only comprehension of their interdependence will facilitate understanding of the processes of school system.

Consequently, in order to transform school culture, the educational leader has first to create all the requisite conditions. The conditions as specified by Schein (1985) and Sharan et al. (1998), are: clarification of the values, beliefs and relationships in the organization, which are the covert elements of culture and behavioural norms, which characterize the overt elements of the organizational culture. Creation of these conditions is incumbent on the principals and it is one of the features of transformational leadership (Leithwood et al., 1999).

Since all the principals in the present study indicated their impact as the main factor enabling them to introduce change, and given the present study’s aim of understanding the principals’ perception of leadership in leading the transformation of the school culture, the elements of the “impact” were further analysed. Two central elements were revealed: the first is, the principals’ mindscape, according to which they determine the order of priorities of the educational practice; the second is the way in which they transmit these priorities to the organization.

**The principals’ mindscape**

The principals’ worldview, which determines their priorities when leading the school, termed ‘mindscape’ by Sergiovanni (1995). Mindscapes are maps, which “provide rules, images and principles that define what the principalship is and how its practice should unfold” (Sergiovanni, 1995, p. 30). “Fir” reiterated this concept in his own language
"The picture of school is lying in my head... this is my direction in the way I want to lead the school... this is the way of transmitting my message at school... this is my way to inculcate values..."

This definition of mindscape resembles that of vision, which many researchers relate to as the main feature of transformational leadership, visionary leadership and charismatic leadership (Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Bolman and Deal, 1999; Conger and Kanungo, 1987). Yet, the term mindscape explicitly alludes to a practical direction. In this sense, this term is closer to the concept strategic thinking as used by Caldwell and Spinks (1998) and Hall (1998). Since the present study deals with the principals’ perception of their leadership in the process of transforming the school culture, mindscape will serve to identify the principals’ perceptions of leadership and to examine their influence on the decision-making and the transformation of the school culture.

According to Sergiovanni (1995, pp. 109-110), a mindscape can be identified by talking to principals about how they cope. Their explanations can reveal the basic assumptions underlying their leadership. In the present study, the in-depth interviews were the main tools used to glimpse into the principals’ inner world and to understand their mindscape.

The analysis of the values and the moral purposes indicated that the mindscape, which characterized all the principals in the present study, was their perception that educational leadership cannot avoid coping with violence a problem, which undermines the moral infrastructure of educational practice and undermines its outcomes. This finding is important in light of the studies which indicate that the principals’ awareness of the need to deal with violence is a central factor which influences their commitment to coping with it (Admati, 1998; Astor et al., 1999; Benbenishti et al., 1999; Morrison et al., 1997; Snyder et al., 1996).
Inclusion of this goal in the principals' 'social mission' manifests, according to Chen et al. (1992), a leadership having a social orientation. Indeed, the findings showed that the principals perceived that the educational leadership couldn't avoid coping with violence. This finding is not surprising based on the fact that the choice to deal with the issue of violence was voluntary and presumably, the principals would not have chosen to deal with it, had they not attributed importance to the problem. Nevertheless, this finding is highly important since, out of about 3000 principals in Israel, only 162 principals (5.4%) chose (at the time the study was conducted) to deal with this issue by means of the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” (Appendix 1., Table A.1). Also, since the research population consists secondary principals exclusively, it should be emphasized that only 56 secondary principals (about 6%), a total of out of 937 secondary principals in Israel, chose to enter this new initiative (Appendix No. 1, Table A.1). This figure undoubtedly underscores the social perception of the principals who participated in the present study and identifies them as unique among the population of principals in Israel.

Thus, it can be said that the mindscape, which characterizes the leadership of the principals in the present study, encompasses a perception of leadership having a social mission, a leadership that cannot ignore the social phenomena, which affect school. Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that all the principals in the present study expressed such a social mission, two different aspects of its materialization emerged, among their considerations to introduce the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”. Thus, the principals in “The Moral Cluster” linked dealing with violence to the wider social context.

"School does not operate in a vacuum. This is a school in the State of Israel. The State of Israel has goals; we must get connected to these"
goals. Everything connects us to the place where we are living, the communal, the limited and also the wider..." ("Violet").

Alternatively, the principals in “The Pedagogical Cluster” related to their social mission to deal with violence in the narrower school context.

“Two things occupy the central place at school – pedagogy and climate... school is committed to both of them at the same time... school has to see to it that every student feels safe at school so that he or she can exhaust his/her potential...” ("Tulip").

However, the principals see the school’s commitment to deal with violence in the same light. As indicated by one of them

“The role of school is to set norms of behaviour, not only to enforce the law but to shape an educational process... therefore no school can ignore it and say that there is no violence in the school” ("Camellia").

Hence, they all derive their personal commitment as principals to deal with the problem of violence from the same source

“It is my [the principal’s] duty to care for the physical and mental well being of the teachers and students... These days school must deal with the issue of violence all the time...” ("Camellia").

The level and direction of the change

Analysis of the principals’ mindscape shows a further distinction between the two clusters of principals. This distinction relates to the level of change (First or second-order, see p. 97), which the principals wished to introduce. They all strove to transform the school culture while relating to the school values and moral purposes in addition to the commitment to deal with violence. However, the principals in “The
Moral Cluster emphasized the creation of the shared vision through clarification of the values in the organization, its beliefs and basic assumptions what Schein (1985) calls the covert level of culture, which constitutes the ideological infrastructure of the organization, meaning the school ‘being’. Building the school vision by the principals in this cluster was indeed grounded in clarification of values and their examination among the teachers. References to this level of change also indicated in which direction the principals wished to lead the school, a direction legitimized by the way they related to their social mission. This mission reflects their perception of school as a moral-social agent in the wider society within which it is situated. Thus, they saw their own mission as construction of the moral-social role of the school, as indicated by “Iris” “...my mission is to create a generation of youth with values because they are the generation of the future”. This perception indicates a pro-active view that of “leading from the future” towards the present, as “Fir” stated: “…first the dream and then the way... then we will see what is possible and what is not”.

Conversely, the principals in “The Pedagogical Cluster” link their moral purposes to educational function of school, which stresses the school’s commitment to students’ success. On the basis of this perception, the principals in this cluster directed their change efforts to at the overt level of the school culture that is behavioural norms and working patterns.

“...we have to create a better culture at school which is based on better behavioural norms... better relationships with the students...staff working norms... (“Tulip”).

Thus, the direction of change guiding these principals was characterized by “leading towards the future from the present”. As “Orchid” stated
"...as a principal I have to look for the tools, the ways, to promote and draw us nearer to that model of school in which all of us would like to learn".

To summarize, the principals in this study can be characterized as transformational leaders, grounding their leadership on moral purposes and personal values, expressed the school vision. The shared purpose of the principals was creating a 'good' culture revolving on the value of safety as a basic value of a moral society; hence, their commitment to deal with violence. Consequently, it can be said that leadership of the principals in the present study entailed a social mission. Nevertheless, their mindscapes demonstrated unique aspects, which reflected their different perspective of their leadership. Leadership for the principals in “The Moral Cluster” reflects the view of school as a microcosm of the society within which it is embedded. As such, principals are required to assume responsibility for coping with social problems, which concern society. This approach accords with the postmodern view of school as a source of cultural legitimacy; hence, change of school follows from a change in its values (Day et al., 2000; Inbar, 2000; Solomon, 2000).

Unlike them, the principals in “The Pedagogical Cluster” were characterized by the perception that their commitment to cope with violence is part of their commitment to the pedagogical and social aspects of school. This perception follows from the modernistic perspective of the school, based on the relationship between educational outcomes and school processes (Beare et al., 1989; Inbar, 2000).

Examination of the additional research question, which refers to the ways by which the principals share their personal values with the entire organization, is discussed in the next section.
Modeling

"Leadership is first of all a personal example. Teachers lead the class in the same way that you [the principal] lead the school" (Iris).

This comment was agreed to by all the principals in this study. It demonstrates that the principal is a role model in and outside school, as argued by Hargreaves and Fullan (1999, p. 100). Moreover, Popper (1994) has indicated that the principals’ modelling behaviour is intended to stimulate the followers’ motivation and their internal commitment to the school purposes. The principals’ modeling in this study was manifested along two dimensions, first being the principal’s emotional influence on the organization’s members, the second being their overt behaviour. These two dimensions will be analysed here.

The first dimension relates to the psychological influence, which is created by employing one or more of the four I’s: Idealized influence, Inspirational motivation, Individual consideration and the Intellectual stimulation (Bass and Avolio, 1994, p. 3). Leadership as a “psychological process, which transpired between the leader and the followers,” (Popper, 1994, p. 96) is also known as transformational leadership in the literature. Bass and Avolio (1994) maintain that this type of leadership generates awareness of the school’s mission or the vision, which the four I’s serve to articulate throughout school.

Most of the principals in the sample (eleven out of fifteen) related to their psychological modeling behaviour as a mean for transmitting the values. Hence, I deemed it important to investigate this dimension. However, it should be mentioned that the analysis of the modeling gave rise to two majors dilemmas, which affected this process. Consequently, I judged it appropriate to present them:
1. The first dilemma concerns the issue of whether a person self-perception represents sufficient evidence of his/her being a model for others. Self-perception represents only one dimension, the other is the influence a felt by the followers. Yet, since the present study does not investigate the followers’ perception, this analysis remains limited to the principals’ perceptions of their own modelling behaviour, while acknowledging that this is not the entire picture.

2. The second dilemma involves the issue of self-awareness. Not every person is aware of his or her influence on others. Indeed, some principals did not depict themselves as serving as a modelling at all. However, the interviews and their analysis brought forth many instances where they do serve as role models for others. Hence, I decided to adopt the interpretive-subjective approach (Sabar Ben-Yehoshua, 2001, p. 323) and dared to use my personal interpretation. I grounded myself in my professional experience and used also inferences and non-verbal indicators, which came up throughout the interviews. Hence, I included all the principals in the analysis and not merely those eleven who referred to themselves as role models.

Consequently, these findings should be related to with the required caution. Yet, in spite of these dilemmas, the modeling analysis enlightened the way the principals made an influence on their staff and therefore was analyzed.

The principals’ perceptions of their modelling was analysed by applying the model of Bass and Avolio (1994).
Table No. 4.5 - The principals’ perception of their modeling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal’s name</th>
<th>The Four I’s</th>
<th>Concept’s meaning</th>
<th>Representative Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Violet”, “Fir”, “Oak”, “Iris”, “Camellia”, “Lily”, “Orchid”, “Rose”, “Cypress”, “Dahlia”, “Jasmine”</td>
<td>Idealized influence</td>
<td>Ability to image of the organization’s future, stimulate motivation and commitment to the vision, by demonstrating moral values</td>
<td>“Together we sat for many nights and traced the dream... this swept us...” (“Dahlia”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“My belief... that we can create a school which will look different...” (“Cypress”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Iris”, “Fir”, “Lily”, “Violet”, “Cypress”, “Dahlia”, “Jasmine”</td>
<td>Inspirational motivation</td>
<td>The ability to translate the vision into symbols which inspire, attribute meaning to the vision, motivate, challenge and stimulate commitment</td>
<td>“I painted the vision in the shape of stars. They illuminated our ways... this connected the people” (“Dahlia”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“... my ability to create identification, motivation and ‘local patriotism’ around our future gave rise to enthusiasm...” (“Violet”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Violet”, “Oak”, “Fir”, “Iris”, “Dahlia”, “Lily”, “Cypress”, “Tulip”, “Jasmine”, “Rose”, “Camellia”, “Palm-tree”, “Daffodil”, “Chrysanthemum”</td>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>Requiring high professional standards, encouraging creativity and critical reflection and evoking awareness of problem solutions</td>
<td>“I see to it that I don’t come with solutions and ask the staff to approve them. We present the issue, the problem, the difficulty, the challenge” (“Fir”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“...I want the teachers to be of high quality and I invest in them. I show them that I don’t compromise on quality...” (“Palm-tree”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Dahlia”, “Fir”, “Oak”, “Iris”, “Jasmine”, “Rose”, “Cypress”, “Tulip”, “Daffodil”, “Lily”, “Camellia”, “Violet”</td>
<td>Individual consideration and</td>
<td>Providing a supportive climate through encouragement, listening, empowerment and consideration of other people’s needs</td>
<td>“It is important to me what teachers think, what they feel. I listen to them, support them...” (“Daffodil”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5 indicates that at least one of the four I’s was demonstrated by each of the principals, according to their perception or mine. Thus, following the definition offered by Bass and Avolio (1994), all the principals, who participated in the present study, can be viewed as transformational leaders, at least according to their self-perceptions. Yet, a difference between the two clusters of principals was found with regard to these dimensions.

“The Moral Cluster”

The eight principals in “The Moral Cluster”, who demonstrated universal values and moral purposes were characterized by at least three of the four I’s (see Table 4.5). Moreover, five principals were characterized by all four I’s (“Fir”, “Iris”, “Violet”, “Lily” and “Dahlia”).

The two dimensions, common to all the principals in this cluster, were Individual consideration and Intellectual stimulation, which are two of the key characteristics of transformational leadership (Leithwood et al., 1999, p. 39). Regarding Individual consideration, Sergiovanni (1995) argues that only a leadership, which acts out of respect for others and considers their opinion and their needs, can develop a culture with similar values. Moreover, Burns (1978) views this as the central feature of moral leadership.

The two other dimensions prominent among the principals in this cluster were Idealized influence and Inspirational motivation. However, whereas all the principals in the cluster demonstrated Idealized influence, only six demonstrated Inspirational motivation.
According to Popper (1994, p. 102) these two dimensions are directly associated with a leader’s ability to rally people around a shared vision and goals. Moreover, he adds these two dimensions approach the essence of ‘charisma’.

Yet, special caution should be applied with regard to the analysis of these dimensions, whose influence must be felt through the followers’ eyes rather than through the leaders’ words.

“The Pedagogical Cluster”

Six principals in “The Pedagogical Cluster”, whose goals focused on the improvement of school practice, were characterized by one to three of the 4 I’s (Table 4.5). Only one principal (“Cypress”) demonstrated all four dimensions.

Two dimensions, common to most of the principals in this cluster, were Individual consideration and Intellectual stimulation. However, a further examination reveals that these dimensions were found in the principals belonging to ”Group 2” in this cluster.

On the other hand, one principal (“Orchid”) belonging to “Group 1” in this cluster did not demonstrate the dimensions of Individual consideration and Intellectual stimulation while the two other principals in this group (“Palm-tree” and “Chrysanthemum”) did not demonstrate the dimension of Individual consideration.

Nevertheless, it is interesting that these very three principals (“Chrysanthemum”, “Palm-tree” and “Orchid”), belonging in “Group 1”, underscored their modeling as a means for transmitting their messages at school although they referred mainly to modeling of investment and diligence. As “Chrysanthemum”, who represents these three principals, said: “I am here from 07.00 until 22.00... I expect others to follow suit”.
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Conversely, all the other principals in the present study mentioned their enthusiasm, energy and belief as key features of their modeling. These latter features are specified by Fullan (2001a, p. 7) as invoking moral purposes in the principals themselves and influencing followers’ commitment to the school purposes.

Idealized influence together with Inspirational motivation, were demonstrated by only one principal (“Cypress”) in “Group 2”. Three principals (“Rose”, “Orchid” and “Chrysanthemum”) demonstrated one characteristic, the Idealized influence.

To sum up, the principals in the present study strove to stimulate their followers’ awareness of and commitment to basic values and moral purpose by means of psychological interpersonal processes. The analysis of these dimensions, based on the 4 I’s model (Bass and Avolio, 1994), clearly shows that the principals in “The Moral Cluster” were characterized by a greater number of these dimensions than were the principals in “The Pedagogical Cluster”. The three dimensions, common to all the principals in “The Moral Cluster”, were Individual consideration, Intellectual stimulation and Idealized influence. Six of these principals demonstrated also Inspirational motivation. On the other hand, the principals in “The Pedagogical Cluster” were characterized by one to three dimensions and only one of them demonstrated all of the 4 I’s.

Principals’ involvement

One of the overt aspects of modeling is behaviour. According to Deal and Peterson (1990), this form of modeling signals to the entire staff about the principals’
commitment. Hence, Yukl (1989) argues that transformational leaders are expected to set an example by exemplary behaviour. Major aspect of the principals’ overt modelling was manifested by their involvement in the change process. This is illustrated by "Daffodil", whose words representative of all the principals

"I think that a principal who sees it as important ... puts it at the top of his order of priorities and expresses it by action in practice, not only on the level of intentions and statements. I think that it drives other people too... Since I saw the importance, I was involved in all the processes which took place".

Indeed, all the principals mentioned their involvement in the transformation process. This finding agrees with studies conducted in Israel by Sharan and Shachar (1990) and by Midthassel (2000) conducted in Norwegian schools’. These findings indicated that principals’ involvement promote the construction of school culture. However, this finding is not surprising in light of the principals’ perception of their centrality in the introduction of the intervention process, as discussed in the first part of this chapter. Moreover, this finding is not surprising in light of the fact that one of the main principles, on which the new initiative is grounded, resides in the principal’s leadership of the change process.

Yet, the principals’ extent of involvement varied and it was located on the continuum between the simple introduction of the intervention process and full involvement in the process, as shown in the following table.
Table No. 4.6 – The principals’ perception of their involvement in the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The principals’ Names</th>
<th>The principals’ extent of involvement in the process</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Representative Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All the principals</td>
<td>Involvement at the first stage of the intervention’s introduction – presenting it to faculty members</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>“I presented it in the teachers’ lounge because I think it is important that they understand that this is important to school” (“Jasmine”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Chrysanthemum”, “Rose”, “Camellia”, “Orchid”</td>
<td>Involvement only at crucial points of the process</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>“Presenting the issue... before the diagnosis in class I gathered the staff... during the stage of receiving the findings I sat with the senior management team” (“Rose”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Cypress”, “Oak”, “Palm-tree”, “Tulip”</td>
<td>Active involvement throughout the intervention process</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>“I was involved in the process, I sat with teachers, parents... because it was important for me to transmit the message...” (“Palm-tree”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Fir”, “Dahlia”, “Jasmine”, “Iris”, “Daffodil”, “Lily”, “Violet”</td>
<td>Full involvement with the entire staff as an equal partner</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>“... I am a partner to all the staff meetings, this is an opportunity to learn the issue and also to be together with them...” (“Daffodil”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 shows that all the principals were involved in the first stage of the transformation process, namely presentation of the intervention initiative at school. This involvement indicated the importance that they attributed to transmission of their commitment (this was also prominent with their reference to their impact on the process). Comparison with the self-completion questionnaire’s findings indicated a gap at this point. Whereas in the present study all the principals took part in presenting the intervention initiative at their school, only about 70% of the principals...
in the initial phase were so involved, whether exclusively or in collaboration with other staff members (Appendix No. 1, Table 7). Yet, as Fullan (2001b, p. 77) argues, in spite of the importance of such a message during the first stage of a change process and its clarification to the organization, implementation of the process is nonetheless determined by the way it is led. Consequently, the extent of the principal’s involvement throughout the process is highly important. Table 4.6 shows that about 73% of the principals were either actively involved or involved as an equal partner throughout the entire process, as compared to about 95% of the secondary principals in the self-completion questionnaire’s findings who indicated a high to very high involvement during the implementation stage (Appendix No. 1, Table 11.2) and 100% of the principals in the self-completion questionnaire’s findings, who indicated their high and very high involvement in constructing the intervention programme at school (Appendix 1, Table 23.2).

This gap is apparently related to the different research paradigms. The self-completion questionnaire was directed at the general perception of the term “involvement”, whereas the qualitative study, based on a semi-structured questionnaire, enabled ranking of “the extent of involvement”. An example can be seen in the case of “Rose” who, according to her perception, led the entire process.

“...my commitment to the entire change process, from beginning to end, that is my involvement in the process – full involvement and my personal leading ...”

On the other hand, the description of “Rose’s” interpretation of “full involvement” indicated that she was involved only at crucial points of the process (Table 4.6).

The analysis of the extent of the principals’ involvement by clusters does not distinguish between the clusters, although the principals in “The Moral Cluster”
demonstrated higher involvement. Consequently, it can be said that all the principals were involved in the intervention process but that the extent of their involvement ranged between involvement at crucial points and full involvement in the process.

Summary

The analysis of the "Principals' impact" as the primary factor principals indicated as enabling introduction of change showed that all the principals perceived themselves as figure who exercise strong influence on the entire school practice.

The principals' impact is linked to their "mindscape", which reflects the value system in which their leadership is rooted. It is also related to the moral purposes, which they set for the school, as well as to their ability to translate their values into the school vision and shared educational practice. The findings show that the "mindscape", shared by all the principals, had a social orientation, whereby they perceived their leadership as a social mission, from which they derived their commitment to lead creation of a safe school climate. Their leadership’s influence was manifested by symbolic and behavioural modeling. Most of the principals demonstrated the Individual consideration and Intellectual stimulation, which according to Leithwood et al. (1999) are characteristic of transformational leadership. However, the findings show that the principals in "The Moral Cluster" also demonstrated Inspirational motivation and Idealized influence. Moreover, this psychological influence was integrated also in the overt modeling of all the principals namely their involvement in transmitting the importance of the message to the organization. Most of them (eleven out of fifteen) were also actively involved in leading the entire process.
Since the principals in the present study indicated school processes as another factor enabling them to introduce a change, the next section analysing these processes.

**School processes**

"The difference in leading the school is the difference between obligated people and committed people, between a staff which feels impelled to act and a staff which feels committed to the school practice...as a principal I must see to it that the people at my school will also feel a commitment to the goals“ ("Iris").

Fullan (2001b), Leithwood et al. (1999) and many other researchers concur that the educational leadership is responsible for the way of creating a value system, which is shared by the entire school. Moreover, Inbar (2000, p. 215) argues that there is a tight connection between the way school operates and its educational approach, which is reflected at the overt as well as the covert strata of the school culture. The covert culture is manifested by the norms, values and the basic assumptions and the overt culture is reflected by the inter-personal relations and the working patterns in the organization.

The majority of researchers agree that culture constitutes the shared meaning of the organization and serves as a compass to steer people in a common direction (Morgan, 1986; Schein, 1985, Sergiovanni, 1994; Torrington and Weightman, 1989). Furthermore, Fullan (1999) maintains that a shared school culture, based on teamwork and involvement in decision-making, evokes enthusiasm for joint commitment by the organization’s members and, at the same time, provides emotional support during the process of change. Specifically relating to the creation of a safe climate, Morrison et al. (1997) argue that, a “climate of action” should first be created at school. This climate is based on creating commitment to the change process.
The principals underscored that the ways of creating the commitment among the organization members when introducing a change were related to three factors: decision-making with regard to entering an intervention process, the way principals harness the school staff to the process and collaborative learning.

**Decision-making**

Kula and Globman (1994) have indicated that an organization’s decision-making processes express the management’s attitude and, at the same time, are means for creating a shared school vision. Since the basic principle of the intervention initiative relied on the principals’ voluntary choice to introduce the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”, it is not surprising that all the principals in the present study emphasized their centrality in making this decision. Nevertheless, given the assumption that the school culture is created by all the school members, it is important to identify how the decision-making at school operated as a means for transforming the culture.

The findings, relating to the way of making a decision to enter the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”, which is the first stage of the change process, indicate that the decision-making process ranged between decision-making exclusively by the principal and joint decision-making by the entire educational team, as shown in the following table.
Table No. 4.7 – Decision-making at the stage of introducing the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The principals’ Names</th>
<th>Decision-making Style</th>
<th>Decision-making Description</th>
<th>Representative Statements</th>
<th>Behavioural Anticipated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Iris”, “Dahlia”, “Fir”, “Violet”, “Oak”</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Full collaboration in making decisions with the entire school staff</td>
<td>“All the teachers experienced the process from its beginning, starting from making the decision to enter the process. This turned them into full partners to the Process” (&quot;Iris&quot;)</td>
<td>Encourages initiative, mobilizes internal commitment, develops a strong culture around the shared values and objectives (Bush, 1995; Sergiovanni, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Camellia”, “Jasmine”, “Cypress”, “Daffodil”</td>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td>Joint decision-making (with the senior management team)</td>
<td>“After hearing the concept, I sat with my senior management team and we decided that there is a need for such a programme in our school” (&quot;Jasmine&quot;)</td>
<td>Expands the repertory of problem solutions, increases commitment (Fullan, 2001a; Kula and Globman, 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Rose”, “Tulip”</td>
<td>Contrived Collegiality</td>
<td>The decision is made by the principals but they make the staff feel that the decision is joint</td>
<td>“I made a decision beforehand but I did not make them feel that I was making the decision” (&quot;Rose&quot;)</td>
<td>External obedience similar to the authoritative style (Fullan and Hargreaves, 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Chrysanthemum”, “Orchid”, “Palm-tree”, “Lily”</td>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>An exclusive decision-making by the principal</td>
<td>“I made the decision alone... I am the principal” (&quot;Palm-tree&quot;)</td>
<td>Agreement reached out of obedience to formal authority, creates external commitment (Bush, 1995; Sergiovanni, 1995)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.7 shows that five principals in this study demonstrated a collaborative
decision-making styles and four demonstrated a collegial decision-making style, both
styles are considered as “bottom-up” decision-making. Sergiovanni (1995, p. 135)
views these styles as a manifestation of a participatory, decentralized democratic
worldview characterized by mutual respect, openness, shared work values and
cooperation.

“The Moral Cluster”

As previously noted, the principals in this cluster indicated moral and democratic
value system, which advocates equality, tolerance and respect. Seven principals in this
cluster fully demonstrated a style, expressing their democratic perceptions. Of these,
five principals demonstrated a collaborative style and two demonstrated a collegial
decision-making style. Only one principal demonstrated an authoritative style.

Collaborative style, is viewed by Sergiovanni (1995) as an important factor for coping
with change and responding to external demands. Moreover, Leithwood et al. (1999)
related to this style a moral aspect of transformational leadership. “Violet” specified
the practical manifestation of collaboration in her school.

“...when I talk about partnership I refer to complete partnership. This
means that...the decision is made by the educational staff at school and
we all stand behind the decision for better or worse... even when the
decisions contradict my opinion...once a decision is made, this is the
decision and we go forward with it”.

As she further states “...I think that it gives the teachers' strength and confidence...”.

All the principals in this cluster saw the advantages of collaborative decision-making
as put forward by Torrington and Weightman (1989, p. 28). “Oak” phrases these
advantages
"...the advantages of collaborative decision-making reside in the effectiveness, validity and quality of the decision because I truly believe that not all wisdom and knowledge are in my hands" ("Oak").

Another advantage mentioned by the principals related to the contribution of collaboration to the introduction of a meaningful change. "Fir" explains it in his words:

"In order to implement the entire change which I had introduced to school, we had to do it together with the participation of all people; otherwise it would have been impossible to do it. If people had not contributed and were unwilling to invest and accompany this entire matter, we would have made some little changes but not a meaningful change".

This perception follows the research literature (Fullan, 2001b; Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991; Leithwood et al., 1999; Rosenholtz, 1994). However, four principals in this cluster ("Oak", "Fir", "Iris" and "Dahlia") criticised the collaborative style as being a time-consuming process:

"...I would not have given it up although the process is long and time-consuming. It is easier to dictate instructions, but in the long run it would have taken a great deal of time to deal with all those who did not get connected because it did not speak to them" ("Iris").

This aspect also expressed in the professional literature (Bush, 1995; Hargreaves and Fullan, 1999).

Two principals in this cluster demonstrated a collegial decision-making style. "Jasmine" viewed the senior management team as the educational leadership working at her side: "That is how I build a larger team of initiating and responsible people". Unlike her, "Camellia", who believes in collaboration, explained that the size of her school made it impossible to implement this style. Therefore, she chose collegiality:

"...the size of the school which I manage does not enable joint decision-making, although I think that this is the correct way..."
The exception in this cluster is “Lily”, who demonstrated an authoritative decision-making style. She explained her rationale

“I made a decision that I, as a principal, would enter the process... I am first of all their principal, the teachers need to have someone to manage them, tell them what to do and how to do it. Someone has to tell them what is right or wrong. They need it ...”

However, she presented her dilemma with regard to her authoritative style, which contradicts her basic values

“I find myself preoccupied with the dilemma of authority and free choice. I believe in a person’s freedom to choose. A person should live according to his approach and his choices. This is the moral foundation of my entire life. A person determines the course of his own life... who am I to tell him what to do”.

The contradiction between “Lily’s” basic value and her managerial style may reflect Bush’s (1995) observation that, although a collegial style creates commitment, in periods of decision-making a hierarchical authority leadership style is required. However, “Lily” provided a different argument to explain this paradox “...I understand that not everybody has the same attitude. Some employees need someone to come and tell him ‘do it’...”. The explanation given by “Lily” illustrates that, although managerial style does reflect a worldview, its applications are also contingent on the situation at school.

Indeed, in her words, “Lily” supports Hersey and Blanchard (1982), who argue that leadership style is contingent on organizational maturity. Hence, it can be assumed that “Lily” perceived the maturity of her organization as low and, as a result, an authoritative decision-making style was required: “...I do so because I see they need it”. This gap between “Lily’s” humanitarian worldview and her authoritative style
raises the issue of how authority is exercised. Burns (1978) maintains that the way authority and power are used distinguishes between moral-democratic and tyrannical leadership. As “Lily” presented it, the authoritative style she exercised indeed combined professional and formal authority, resting on a democratic worldview. “Once the perception was assimilated... I showed the direction, I allowed people to lead the process”. That is, she apparently used professional authority together with formal authority. (Support for this explanation was found in other instances associated with her leadership, which will be analyzed later).

“The Pedagogical Cluster”

In this cluster, varied decision-making styles were found on the continuum between collegiality and authoritative style.

“Group 1” – the three principals of this group (“Orchid”, “Palm-tree” and “Chrysanthemum”) demonstrated an authoritative, “top-down” decision-making style (Table 4.5). This style was based on the exercise of control and power, stemming from their formal authority, as illustrated by “Palm-tree”: “...I am a principal and this cannot be ignored...”. Similarly, “Orchid” raised the following argument

“I determine the policy. When I am convinced, there is no room for objection and doubt. School is a pyramid with the principal at its head as a professional authority having formal status”.

“Chrysanthemum” indicated the consequence of such style at her school “…[the teachers] did not want to assume responsibility...they were divided ...It is difficult to introduce a change ...”. Hence, it is not surprising that she wrote the credo by herself “…I wrote the school credo alone... I want this message to serve all the teachers”.

These comments demonstrate the argument made by Hargreaves (1995) and Fuchs
that a centralized management, based on formal authority and power, cannot create a collaborative culture and cannot facilitate change.

"Group 2" – two principals in this group ("Daffodil" and "Cypress") demonstrated collegial decision-making, manifested by making decisions together with the senior management team (I will return to this issue in the context of organizational structure).

The two other principals in this group ("Rose" and "Tulip") demonstrated another version of collegiality – contrived collegiality (Table 4.5). Hargreaves and Fullan (1999, p. 64) view this style as an authoritative style "disguised" as collegiality.

"Rose" maintained that the severe violence at her school obliged her to find an immediate solution, which she believed justified her approach. According to Fullan (2001a, p. 47), a coercive leadership style may be suitable in crisis situations. Nevertheless, since this style does not agree with "Rose’s" basic collegial approach, we can assume that the "compromise" she made between her authoritative style and collegiality was manifested by contrived collegiality. Unlike her, "Tulip" stated that, although she is aware of the need to involve people in the organization

"...depending on people, their pace, their motivation is difficult for me. I don't like to be dependent. Management, which depends on so many people, is difficult and frustrating".

This statement expressed the rationale behind her contrived collegiality.

Although decision-making styles manifest the principals' managerial approaches (Inbar, 2000, p. 45), Bush (1995) and Fuchs (1995) present two additional dimensions associated with decision-making: school organizational structure and school size.

**The organizational structure of the secondary school**

The organizational structure characteristic of secondary schools in Israel (as opposed to that of elementary schools), is a pyramid, headed by the principal who is assisted
by the senior management team. This team consists of key people in the organization and ranges in size between three people in a small school and ten people in a large school. The key people in the organization are chosen by the principal and usually include the school counsellor, age-group coordinators, the social coordinator and the deputy-principal. The senior management team holds regular meetings, which are part of the secondary school managerial culture. According to Fullan (2001a), internal commitment cannot be induced from the top. Consequently, he claims that in order to create commitment, leaders should develop "many leaders around themselves" (p. 133). In fact, this structure of the senior management team, which is a middle-level management, enables team members to act as a leadership group alongside the principal and to play an important role in creating a middle-up-down management style. Thus, it is only natural that all the principals indicated the involvement of the senior management team in the decision-making. This was also supported by the self-completion questionnaire findings (Appendix No. 1, Table 11.2).

Nevertheless, the extent of the senior management team's involvement in the decision-making differed from school to school, ranging between joint management at one extreme to passive involvement at the other.

Three principals ("Violet", "Iris" and "Fir") were found at one end of the continuum. They mentioned that they manage the school together with their senior management team. This leadership is viewed by Hargreaves and Fullan (1999) as a means for developing teachers' leadership. As "Violet" expressed it, she involved the senior management team "... in order to form the leadership infrastructure among the teachers, which will continue taking the school to different and good places".

At the centre of the continuum were nine principals who actively involved the senior management team, manifested by collegial decision-making. As "Daffodil" attested,
"I do not make decisions alone. The senior management team is a partner to decision-making at almost any level".

At the other end of the continuum were three principals ("Orchid", "Palm-tree" and "Chrysanthemum"), who involved the senior management team in a passive way. That is, the principals only informed the senior management team of their decisions after the fact

"...after being convinced of the need and deciding that this is my chance to make a change in the school culture, I passed it in the senior management team" ("Palm-tree").

School size

Bush (1995, p. 148) argues that an organization's size affects management style. In order to investigate the applications of this argument, the management styles adopted by the principals in the present study are presented according to school size (Table 4.8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>Management Style</th>
<th>No. of Principals</th>
<th>Principals' names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 550</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Iris”, “Oak”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Cypress”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Orchid”, “Palm-tree”, “Lily”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550-750</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Fir”, “Dahlia”, “Violet”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Daffodil”, “Jasmine”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contrived collegiality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Tulip”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1000</td>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Camellia”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contrived collegiality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Rose”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Chrysanthemum”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 4.8 indicates Bush's (1995) argument regarding the relation between the school size and management style was not corroborated. Bush (1995) and Hargreaves and Fullan (1999) maintain that in large schools, an authoritative decision-making style is sometimes required to avoid balkanization. In the present study, the two large schools were indeed characterized by an authoritative style and contrived collegiality (which is considered to be a variant of authoritative style). However, three principals of small schools also demonstrated this style. Thus, the findings show that the authoritative style is not necessarily characteristic of large schools. Nevertheless, Table 4.8 also shows that none of the large schools displayed a collaborative style. It can be argued, then, that large schools may encounter difficulties in making-decisions collaboratively but that does not necessarily mean that the authoritative style is always characteristic of large schools. This conclusion is supported by “Camellia”, who managed the largest school in the present study (and one of the largest schools in Israel) yet adopted collegiality. It is important to indicate, that although this principal does support Bush (1995) regard school size, she indicated in many instances that her school’s size obliged her to adopt a collegial style although her basic management approach is collaborative.

Bush (1995) argues further that collegiality can be exercised only in small schools or in large schools, which comprise sub-units. According to Table 4.8, the principals of the medium-size schools and one large school also demonstrated collegiality. Yet, it should be mentioned that the organization of high schools is structured class levels, with each level autonomously managed by its own. Hence, it is safe to assume that this sub-unit structure may account for the fact that nine principals demonstrated collegiality in spite of their school size.
Summary

Principals' decision-making styles reflected their educational perceptions. At one end of the continuum was found the collaborative style, characteristic of the principals in "The Moral Cluster", whose educational perceptions were democratic. At the other end of the continuum was the authoritative leadership style, mainly characteristic of the principals in "Group 1" of "The Pedagogical Cluster", who adopted a pragmatic orientation towards effective school functioning. These perceptions were also reflected by the way these principals involved the senior management team in decision-making. The principals in "The Moral Cluster" and the principals in "Group 2" of "the Pedagogical cluster" actively involved the senior management team, whereas the principals in "Group 1" of "The Pedagogical Cluster" passively involved the senior team members. Moreover, the analysis of the management styles showed that these styles were sometimes contingent on the school's characteristics. Nevertheless, no clear relation was found between school size and decision-making style. Thus, it can be said that the principals' decision-making style reflected their educational perception, which was also affected by some organizational and situational factors.

Staff involvement and commitment

"Without people it is impossible to make a change... my role as a principal is to motivate people to create a change" ("Iris"). "Dahlia" concurs, saying "...the purpose is that every teacher feels that, without him, this will not happen". According to Sergiovanni (1995), people's commitment is one of the conditions, which motivate
an organization to accomplish its goals. Methods used by the principals to recruit their teachers to the change effort are presented in Table 4.9

Table No. 4.9 – Methods of Recruiting Teachers to the change effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal's name</th>
<th>Recruitment Methods</th>
<th>Representative Statement</th>
<th>Anticipated Behavioural Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Chrysanthemum”, “Camellia”</td>
<td>Informing</td>
<td>“I described what is going to happen in general terms” (“Chrysanthemum”)</td>
<td>Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Palm-tree”, “Orchid”</td>
<td>Cognitive recruitment</td>
<td>“I explained the purpose of the initiative....my purpose was to get their consent to the process, so that they will go with me...” (“Palm-tree”)</td>
<td>Consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Rose”, “Jasmine”, “Tulip”, “Cypress”, “Daffodil”</td>
<td>Emotional recruitment</td>
<td>“I came to the teachers and said, ‘... let’s try together, you and I, to build something...’” (“Rose”)</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Dahlia”, “Fir”, “Oak”, “Violet”, “Iris”, “Lily”</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>“… it came from the inner process which we underwent here...” (“Iris”)</td>
<td>Internal commitment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 shows that recruitment of the teachers involved psychological and cognitive aspects. According to Fullan (2001b, p. 30) and Inbar (2000, p. 184), these aspects should not be ignored while recruiting people to a change process. Moreover, Fullan (1999) indicates that the desired behavioural result- commitment- is linked to recruitment methods. Indeed, the findings presented in Table 4.9 shows that the recruitment methods are located on a continuum. At one end is informing, which Fullan (1999) and Fuchs (1995) argue is indeed necessary for the creation of motivation but
insufficient for the creation of commitment. Moreover, Hargreaves and Fullan (1999, p. 16) maintain that involvement in itself does not suffice for change to be implemented. “Fir” relates to this, while criticizing the attempt to attain teachers’ commitment through consent.

“In order to implement a meaningful change you need to create a wide circle of partners who will be willing to run with you over a long period of time, not in short runs but in marathons. ...you cannot achieve involvement or commitment if you work in a style of ‘you have to align yourself with me’.”

At the other end of the continuum is collaboration, which has been shown to create internal commitment. Internal commitment determines whether the change will be meaningful. It is manifested by the teachers’ sense of “ownership” of the change process. “Iris” describes it well: “...If you do things because it comes out of you and it suits you and then you ...feel it is yours”.

Fullan (1999, p. 36) further states that collaboration expands the repertoire of solutions to complex problems, which people require each people’s knowledge “Rose” explains this aspect in her own words

“... one cannot work alone, as a soloist. A soloist work is wrong because a person is not enriched, does not learn or develop if he does not consult and support and shows what he has within a group of people”.

“The Moral Cluster”

Table 4.9 shows that six out of the eight principals in “The Moral Cluster” recruited the teachers by collaborative means. This method combines both cognitive and emotional recruitment what Sergiovanni (1995) refers to as “both the mind and the heart”. Yet, the principals in this cluster did not ignore the difficulty embodied in creating the shared meaning and the investment required.
"...I had a lot of work to do, so many workshops and meetings with everyone...we underwent a process, which involved all the teachers, the pupils, parents, community and together we worked on the process for almost a whole year ...it is a big investment" ("Dahlia").

The intensity of this investment must be considered in the face of the “temptation” to use easier methods to obtain consent. “... for the short term this [the easier methods] makes things terribly convenient and you feel good because you see performance” ("Fir").

“The Pedagogical Cluster”

“Group 1” – according to Table 4.9, the principals of “Group 1” recruited the teachers by informing them (to raise their awareness) and cognitively recruiting them (to obtain their consent). This finding accords with their decision-making style. Kula and Globman (1994) state that informing involves uni-directional communication, from the leadership to the organization members and entails a cognitive explanation. As “Orchid” demonstrates, “I explain the intervention process to the teachers... it is important that the teachers know what is going to happen”. This kind of communication way according to Fullan (1999) creates consent and involvement but it does not attain the commitment required for change. Indeed, this finding explains difficulties principals who used this method encountered attested by “Orchid”

“...the main difficulty is changing teachers’ perception, making them see that pedagogy, and coping with violence are inter-connected and inseparable... The great difficulty is to “convert” the teachers, just like that. Converting the teacher is a process that takes time, and much energy...”

“Group 2” – Unlike the principals in “Group 1”, the principals in “Group 2” recruited the teachers by appealing to their emotions “...this [violence] is a problem for all of us. Only together will we be able to cope with it” (“Rose”). Popper (1994) points out that
this method of recruitment is typical of leadership during crisis. Furthermore, “Cypress”, who confronted a severe state of violence at his school, exerted “emotional blackmail” on the teachers, when trying to recruit them. “...if we do not go for it, we will suffer terribly” (“Cypress”).

To sum up, the findings show that the method the principals used to arouse involvement and commitment to the change process reflected their decision-making style. As mentioned in previous sections, the principals in “The Moral Cluster” applied collegiality to create a shared system of values as the basis for the educational practice. Accordingly, teachers were recruited to the change in response to emotional and cognitive recruitment. Conversely, a distinction was found between the groups of “The Pedagogical Cluster”. The principals in “Group 1”, whose decision-making style was authoritative, recruited the teachers in line with this style, by informing so as to obtaining their consent. However, the principals in “Group 2”, who demonstrated democratic collegiality and contrived collegiality, recruited the teachers by appealing to their emotions.

The next section examines the organizational learning process, which the principals mentioned as an avenue for introducing the new initiative.

**Collaborative organizational learning**

"From my point of view, the teacher is also a learner" (“Iris”).

One approach to creating commitment and collaborative culture involves creating a collaborative learning community (McLaughlin and Talbert, 2001; Newmann *et al.*, 2000; Fullan 2001b). Collaborative learning provides the learners with an opportunity
to express their opinions and be partners in problem solving based on equality. Moreover, such learning also enables the devising solutions adapted to the age of complexity, characterized by non-linear and unexpected events. Thus, according to Fullan (2001b), collaborative learning is perceived as a substitute for traditional rational planning (p. 103).

One of the principles of the new initiative is that each school constructs its own programme on the basis of a school diagnosis. Hence, learning is important as a platform from which to construct the programme. The principals indeed mentioned that, collaborative learning created new knowledge by turning tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge, shared throughout. Inbar (2000, p. 212) calls this process the transition from a “knowing” system to a “learning” system. The tacit knowledge, to which the principals referred, entailed the values, beliefs and feelings of safety of the pupils (i.e., the covert culture). It became explicit knowledge through learning.

“Daffodil” expresses this process in her own words

“...we met in workshops in order to elucidate the beliefs, opinions and the values... we learnt together the results of the diagnosis. We saw what we did not know... we heard also the teachers and the pupils... this gave us a clear direction about what should be the focus of the in-service training courses... it was easier to build the intervention programme this way”.

Moreover, the principals pointed out that the collaborative learning process helped them create shared meaning, which contributes what Sergiovanni (1995) calls ‘a community of minds’. “Lily’s” statement manifest this perception

“...through learning together... we created a language which everybody at school understands... we understand what we do here. This gave the meaning to your work...”.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that, in those schools, where there was no
The schools managed by “Dahlia”, “Rose”, “Tulip”, “Cypress” and “Orchid”), the new initiative triggered its creation. As “Dahlia” stated “... the collaborative learning is a change which we work on... it is one step after another”. She adds that, at the same time, the process contributed to the school’s rallying around the vision “...we together created our practice vis-à-vis the vision; a practice that created collaboration at school”.

According to Leithwood et al. (1999) and Caldwell and Spinks (1998), transformational leadership contributes to the creation of a collaborative learning culture at school. Elmore (2000) and McLaughlin and Talbert (2001) found that principals, who supported collaborative organizational learning, directed it and were actively involved, empowered the teachers and were even perceived as better principals.

The findings of the present study illustrate that most of the principals were partners to the learning process, which they explained stating “…it was new to us too and we wanted to learn...” (“Oak”).

Yet, the findings show that a variety of mechanisms were used to initiate collaborative learning. These ranged from encouraging and supporting the creation of collaborative learning, led by professionals, and up to personal leading the learning process by the principals.

At one end of this continuum were five principals (“Chrysanthemum”, “Rose”, “Orchid”, “Jasmine” and “Camellia”) who encouraged and supported construction of the collaborative learning mechanism under the guidance of external as well as internal professionals. Three of them (“Chrysanthemum”, “Rose” and “Camellia”) utilized external professionals, whereas “Orchid” and “Jasmine” utilized external and
internal professionals. It should be mentioned that only “Jasmine” mentioned her participation in this learning process.

Seven principals (“Daffodil”, “Palm-tree”, “Dahlia”, “Tulip”, “Cypress”, “Fir” and “Oak”) established a collaborative learning process, which was led internal staff (mainly educational counsellors). These principals indicated that they were equal partners to the learning process.

“We learnt together the process... created it together... I don’t see myself different from the teachers... therefore I cannot exclude myself” (“Dahlia”).

Three principals (“Violet”, “Lily” and “Iris”) created the learning process in a manner similar to the previous. However, they also led the learning process at the beginning as modelling. Later, they allowed the teachers to lead it. As “Iris” describes it

“...during the first year I conducted part of the in-service training courses... today the coordinators lead it at school and I am part of the learning staff”.

Summary

The findings show that the principals’ perception of their leadership in transforming the school culture follows from a collaborative perception, which characterized most of them. This perception was manifested in the principals’ decision-making style, methods for recruiting the teachers and the creation of a collaborative learning culture. The leadership styles ranged between collaborative, characteristics of the principals in “The Moral Cluster” to the authoritative style, characterized mainly by the three principals in “Group 1” of “The Pedagogical Cluster”.

As mentioned, the principals in “The Moral Cluster” demonstrated a creation of collaborative system of values as the basis for the educational practice. Along the
same lines, they recruited the teachers by emotional and cognitive methods in order to create internal commitment. On the other hand, the principals in "Group 1" of "The Pedagogical Cluster", whose decision-making style was authoritative, recruited the teachers by informing them so as obtaining their consent. In "Group 2", whose decision-making styles were mixed, combining democratic collegiality with contrived collegiality, they recruited the teachers by appealing to their emotions. However, the characteristic common among all the principals was their perception of collaborative organizational learning as the main mechanism for creating a collaborative culture. In each of the fifteen schools, the principals created a culture of collaborative learning; in eleven of those schools, the principals themselves were full partners to the learning process. Such collaborative learning, manifested by the fact that the principals participated as equal partners in the learning processes, attests to an equalitarian democratic perception.

Until now, we have focused on intra-organizational aspects. However, the principals mention also external factors which enabled them to lead the transformation at their school. These factors are examined next.

**External support**

This section of the analysis presents the principals' perception of the external support system, which they indicated as one of the factors contributing to the transformation of the school culture. Bryk et al. (1998) have indicated that one factor characterizing restructuring schools is the continuation of interrelations with their external environment. Moreover, Snyder et al., (1996) as well as Goldring and Rallis (1993) found that in schools, where reform projects had been successfully completed, all the
educators, partners and committee members were considered to be important participants. As components in the external support system of school, the principals in this study included the parent community, the district supervisory authority and external professionals. Nevertheless, it should be mentioned that the principals linked the support of the external professionals directly to the new intervention initiative (to which a separate chapter is dedicated).

**District authority**

In Israel, every district authority has two supervisory frameworks - the Ministry of Education and the municipality. As a result, the two bodies compete with one another. The outcome of this competition is that the supervisors' influence on the school depends more on the supervisors themselves and the district manager than on the specific framework to which they belong. For this reason, I relate to supervisors in general.

The central finding of the study indicates that the supervisors- not the school- initiated relations regarding the initiative's introduction. As shown in figure 4.A (Appendix 5), the central district had very large representation in the present study, as it had in the self-completion questionnaire's findings (Appendix 1, Table 3). This participation can be attributed to the district manager, who encouraged the supervisors to establish contacts with the schools. As expressed by one principal in this district "The district manager encouraged us, organized meetings... demonstrated involvement..." ("Iris"). This finding corroborates many researchers, who have stressed the importance of the district authority on the introduction of change in the school (Berman and McLaughlin 1977; Hargreaves and Fullan, 1999; Huberman and Miles 1984). More precisely,
according to Fullan (2001b), when the district authority opposes the change its effect is negative, alternately, when the district authority supports the change, its effect is positive.

It should be mentioned that not all the supervisors were involved in the process, undergone by the schools in their district. Three principals ("Camellia", "Dahlia" and "Violet") indicated that the district authority was not involved at all in their school. As one of them stated "...we underwent the process by ourselves, the supervisor knew nothing about the programme..." ("Camellia"). However, all the principals, who maintained close ties with their supervisors, reported that the latter had a positive effect on the process of creating a safe climate. "Iris" specifies this positive effect as follows

"The supervisors were partner to the entire process...coached the entire city on the subject, supported, showed interest... shared our deliberations and also appreciated what we had done ".

The principals underscored that the supervisors' contribution related to two main aspects. First, the mandate to engage in the project, second the support, encouragement and sense of partnership.

One manifestation of the mandate was the message delivered by the supervisors to enter the process "... it manifested by the fact that the entire city entered the process and this was transmitted as a message to us..." ("Jasmine").

According to Fullan (1999, p. 19), although official mandate itself does not create commitment, it does provide legitimation and encouragement. Similarly, Furlong et al. (1997), found that that the implementation of safety programmes at school was linked to district support. The principals in the present study exemplified this support as indicates by one of them
"They [the supervisors] helped us to inculcate the culture of “saying no to violence” and to apply rules and norms, which help me to set a clear policy at school... (“Jasmine”).

Another form of the supervisors’ support was their encouragement to a creation “learning groups” among the principals themselves, which served also as a support group. “Fir” described the benefit of this initiative thusly

"The principals’ team supported one another and learnt from each other... If someone needed something, I immediately lent my support... I knew that each of them would provide support and materials... I made progress in the process and all the time shared the expected difficulties with them, gave them materials “

Another aspect of the district authority’s input mentioned by the principals was the contribution to their empowerment, manifested by emotional support and positive reinforcements, given to the principals during their work on this subject.

“...they gave us, as principals, the motivation and strength to continue” (Fir”).

“... In addition to having an attentive ear... a sense of partnership. I didn’t feel alone in this process, that is I didn’t feel this is only my problem” (“Daffodil”).

“... In every forum I was asked to present what had been done at school and that gave me a sense of satisfaction and pride” (“Iris”).

These findings corroborate those of Bryk et al. (1998), who showed that for a major reform to succeed, the district is required to be “an advocate for school rather than super patrons” (p. 279). It seems that in our case, there was a combination of support and positive pressure – in the form of the mandate – which Fullan (2001b, p. 98) believes is necessary during introduction of a change in school.
As was mentioned, the supervisors and not the school initiated the relations with the schools. This may indicate a change in the traditional role of district supervision in Israel from control to support. Moreover, it is interesting to point out that, although one of the main principles of the intervention initiative was the school’s autonomy, allowing them neither to involve the district authority and the local authority nor to advise them of the diagnostic data, then, paradoxically, the principals did involve the supervisors.

To sum up, the findings show that where the district authority initiated the initiative, their involvement, was perceived by the principals as positive, mainly regarding empowerment of schools to cope with the change process. Since no distinction was found between the clusters of principals in this respect, it can be assumed that the principals’ perceptions of the relations with the district authority are positive when the latter empowers them to promote school processes. However, the fact the principals did not initiate these relations, may indicate that they have not yet assimilated the change in the role of the district authority.

**Parents**

The findings indicate that all the principals participating in the study initiated the relations with the parents regarding the initiative’s introduction in their schools. This may indicates perception of community to which school belongs as a source of power whose involvement is legitimate (Hargreaves, 1995). Based on studies conducted in the past thirty years, Fullan (2001b, p. 198) argues that “the closer the parent is to the education of the child, the greater the impact on child development and educational
Consequently, he believes that reforms in education require a joint effort of the parents and school. Sergiovanni (1998) concurs, adding that schools reflect the values of the community in which they are situated. Thus, the process of creating a unique school culture requires that parents be involved.

Table 4.10 shows the extent of the parents’ involvement and the way in which they were involved.

### Table No. 4.10 – Ways of involving the parents in the school process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal’s Name</th>
<th>Extent of Involvement</th>
<th>Way involved</th>
<th>Representative Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Oak”, “Fir”, “Dahlia”</td>
<td>Full partnership</td>
<td>Full involvement in decision to introduce the new initiative and throughout the process by means of joint meetings, joint steering committees, representation in the debates</td>
<td>The parents’ community is part of school. The parents are partners to every move, which takes place at school... I convened the broader forum of the parents’ committee and told them, ‘let’s see it together and see what we can do in order to create here a safe school’. The forum participated in our professional planning teams...” (“Oak”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Jasmine”, “Violet”, “Iris”, “Cypress”</td>
<td>Involvement in planning and practice</td>
<td>Involvement after making the decision to introduce the initiative (by the school’s staff), by means of general meetings, class meetings and joint steering committees</td>
<td>“After deciding to enter the process, we invited the parents to discussions and active parents’ meetings. We worked with the parents in an intensive way” (“Jasmine”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Lily”, “Tulip”, “Daffodil”, “Rose”</td>
<td>Involvement in implementation</td>
<td>Involving parents’ committees after receiving the data about the state of violence at school, by means of parents committee meetings and age-group meetings</td>
<td>“I informed the parents, who were members of the education committee, of all the data (relevant to the state of violence) and told them, ‘Let’s draw conclusions about what we see’. They were asked to join the steering committee for building the intervention programme” (“Rose”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Palm-tree”, “Orchid”, “Camellia” “Chrysanthemum”</td>
<td>Informing</td>
<td>Delivering information to the parents about the process which school is undergoing by means of letters and through the parents committees</td>
<td>“We sent letters to the parents and informed them about the move we were taking” (“Orchid”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.10 shows that all the principals involved the parents in the intervention process. Yet, differences in the level of the parent involvement was found.

"The Moral Cluster"

Table 4.10 shows that three principals in this cluster ("Dahlia", "Fir" and "Oak") involved the parents throughout the process. As mentioned, communality was one of these principals' basic values (Table 4.3) and they demonstrated collaborative collegiality (Table Nos. 4.7 and 4.8). Hence, it appears that they perceived the parents and the teachers as equal partners in the children's education. All three indicated that this collaborative model was not unique to the current process, but part of their school culture.

"We have a forum of teachers and parents which meets during the year. In this forum we raise together topics in which the parents want to be involved at school, how do they want to contribute and what do they want to receive" ("Dahlia")

Two other principals in this cluster ("Iris" and "Violet") who, like the three principals just mentioned, had a communal worldview and management style, involved the parents but after the decision had been maid at school. This finding indicates that they may have perceived the parents as partners but, at the same time, they retained a view of the autonomous management of the school. Unlike them, "Jasmine", who did not include communality among her basic values (Table 4.3), demonstrated collegiality (Table 4.7) and recruited the teachers only after making the decisions with the senior management team (Table 4.9). This pattern was repeated with the parents, whom she involved only after making the decisions at school. The two other principals in this cluster ("lily" and "Camellia") involved the parents only after receiving the diagnostic data and after determining the school programme. Interestingly the way that "Lily"
involved the parents reflected her authoritative style, manifested in her style of making decisions at school (Table 4.7). As to “Camellia”, a similarity was found between her recruitment of the teachers and of the parents – in both cases, this was done by informing them (Table 4.9).

To sum up, the parents were perceived by most of the principals in this cluster as partners in the education of the children. This finding conforms to the image of Israeli’s schools of the future in its wider communal context (Chen, 1999; Inbar, 2000) as well as the principals’ mindscape as demonstrated throughout the present study. Moreover, several principals in “The Moral Cluster” (“Oak”, “Fir”, “Iris”, “Violet” and “Jasmine”) saw themselves as leading the drive to establish relations with the other schools in the community and with other important bodies in it.

“...I led a move for building a municipal code of behaviour, I started to take additional schools and other bodies with me” (“Oak”).

This perception of school as part of the communal landscape appears to express the communal vision, which underlies the principals’ perception of their leadership and of themselves as agents in the transformation of norms in society.

“The Pedagogical Cluster”

“Group 1” – Table 4.10 shows that none of the principals in this group involved the parents in the decision-making at school. This finding conforms to their authoritative management style (Table 4.7) and the way they recruited the teachers by informing them as a means obtaining their consent (Table 4.9). Informing the parents indicates awareness of what Caldwell and Spinks (1992, p. 156) refer to, as the parents’ right to know how school is promoting the good of the pupils.
“Group 2” – In this group of four principals, two displayed democratic collegiality (“Cypress” and “Daffodil”) and two (“Tulip” and “Rose”) a contrived-collegial style (Table 4.7). “Cypress” involved the parents after making decisions at school whereas all the others involved the parents after the diagnostic findings were received. However, all the principals in this group involved the teachers through emotional recruitment in order to increase their commitment to the process (Table 4.9). It can be assumed that involving the parents after receiving the diagnostic findings was also meant to recruit them in order to increase their involvement to help with the performance required by the intervention process.

To sum up, all the principals in the present study saw the parents as partners not to be ignored during the introduction of change. This finding indicates the principals’ perception of parents as important factors in the solution of social problems. Yet, the findings also show that principals in “The Moral Cluster” perceived the parents as legitimate partners in their children’s education. Unlike them, the principals in “The Pedagogical Cluster” demonstrate a perception which considers the parents as important but indirect clients, to be informed about the school processes (“Group 1”) and recruited to support the intervention’s implementation (“Group 2”).

**Professional support**

Sharan (1986) points out that in order to generate a change at school both external and internal knowledge is required. External professionals constitute a source of knowledge about the essence of the change and its processes, whereas internal
professionals contribute knowledge about the organization and its needs (p. 71). Fullan (2001b, p. 60) adds that change agents play an important part in the initiation of change, mainly by supporting the change process.

In Israeli schools, educational counsellors are perceived as internal professionals while the senior counsellors and the psychologists are perceived as external professionals. Yet, these three professionals – the counsellors, senior counsellors and the psychologists – work within a single entity in the Ministry of Education, the Psychological-Counselling Service (SHEFI), which provides mental health services to schools. Within the framework of its services, SHEFI is responsible for the development of socio-emotional programmes like the “Preventing Violence and Creating Save Climate Intervention Process”, about which the present study revolves. SHEFI’S staff (senior counsellors, psychologists, instructors and school counsellors) were trained to support schools during this process and were, therefore, perceived by the principals as the professional body accompanying the process.

The self-completion questionnaire’s findings illustrate that SHEFI’S involvement (primarily by the senior counsellors) was greater at the initiative’s preliminary stage, when the initiative was presented to the principals (Appendix 1, Table 6.2). In general, more than 70% of the principals perceived the involvement of the senior counsellors as high to very high. Similarly, 11 out of 15 principals in the study indicated the great involvement of these external professionals. The principals underscored the considerable contribution of the senior counsellor in directing the process and in helping to overcome difficulties encountered. An example of this contribution is found in the following two comments.

"...the senior counsellor, who accompanied the process at school, gave us a direction and helped us in all the difficult situations we encountered" ("Jasmine")
"I must admit that we were lucky to have external support which helped us a lot to see school in a systemic view. That is, I had a counsellor with whom I often met personally and we had many psycho-pedagogical instructors" ("Cypress")

Here, (as in the case of the district authority’s involvement), no distinction was found between the clusters of the principals due to the fact that SHEFI initiated contacts with the principals regarding the new initiative.

Summary

The involvement of external bodies – supervisors, parents and external professional – demonstrates that the support a school receives from these bodies encompasses an important message. When school is leading a change perceived by these bodies as essential to the pupils’ development, it earns support and encouragement. In fact, as shown by the statements of the principals in the present study, as well as by the self-completion questionnaire’s findings (Appendix 1, Table 9), the process itself won positive responses from all bodies, inside as well as outside the school. This may indicate that the protection of the pupils’ physical and mental safety is undoubtedly an uncontroversial value and constitutes a moral purpose, widely accepted and supported. This support empowers principals, who derive encouragement its delivery. Moreover, it makes principals want to cooperate with those external bodies.

However, while relations between the school, the district authority and external professionals were initiated by the latter, relations with the parents were initiated by the principals. The principals’ educational perception was found to affect the form of
these relations. The principals in "The Moral Cluster" perceived the parents as legitimate partners in the pupils' education, whereas some of the principals in "The Pedagogical Cluster" informed them of the processes which school was undergoing ("Group 1") while others recruited them to actively help during the implementation ("Group 2").

Among the main factors enabling the principals to introduce the change in their school, they underscored the "Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process" as a salient factor. This is also one of the study's additional questions, presented next.

**The contribution of the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” to the transformation of the school culture**

Hargreaves and Hopkins (1991) Fullan (1999) and Caldwell (1992) argue that the nature of the change signals a “new way” to the entire school and determines its implementation to great extent. The research findings show that the new way, signaled by the principals, offered “every student the right to learn in a safe environment” (Tables 4.3 and 4.4). Indeed, all the principals indicated the contribution of this value as expressed in the new initiative, to the improvement of the climate and behavioural norms at their school. The words of two principals represent the feeling of all the others

"Today there is a huge improvement at school...the atmosphere is more pleasant. There are clear norms of behaviour" ("Jasmine").
"The school has undergone a transformation since we started working on the issue of violence. We now have order, clear procedures and a code of behaviour. Teachers report that it is more pleasant to teach and the students report that it is more pleasant to learn" ("Daffodil").

Nevertheless, the principals in the present study share the perception, prevalent among researchers in the field of violence, that the creation of a safe climate is not as a limited treatment but part of a wider change to be implemented in compliance with the overall purpose of the school (Furlong et al., 1997; Morrison et al., 1997). The following statements represent this view.

"...we did not present a programme but presented a worldview, which was manifested in all the areas of practice and we examined how it was connected to our basic perception" ("Violet").

"This is the first time that we built a programme which was not labelled 'school climate'. Its is that of a holistic work plan in which the climate is intertwined. From my point of view, this is not a programme, this is a recursive process which is never ending" ("Iris").

These comments conform to Fullan’s statement (1999) that any technical tool (such as an intervention programme) is only a resource in the service of a broader goal (p. 80). Indeed, although the stated goal of the new initiative was to prevent violence and create a safe climate, all the principals, irrespective of the cluster in which they were categorized, underscored that the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” was perceived as a holistic process for transforming the school culture. “Jasmine” represents the principals’ approach “...not only to deal with violence but also with the culture, which is the basis for the entire school’s practice”.

This goal likewise manifested in the creation of a collaborative culture.
"...It greatly helped us to consolidate ... and create a situation, whereby no teacher worked alone, today they all work as one team and collaborate in curricula, projects carried out at school.... It resulted in strong collegiality and mutual guaranteed and shared involvement" ("Rose").

This collaborative pattern was implemented in many areas. Thus, it became to penetrate the school’s organizational culture.

"In fact, working patterns were also set for other areas and other issues with which we had tried to cope, for example, drugs... This creates a halo effect “ ("Rose").

Moreover, the principals pointed out that the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” enabled them to arose motivation around a shared mission. “Fir” elucidates this point

"The process enabled the creation of the staff and the students motivation to assume responsibility and be partners to the building of a better school climate”.

As “Rose” further stated “...everything which happens ... comes under the responsibility of the teacher”. Finally, several principals ("Cypress", “Fir”, “Oak”, “Daffodil” and “Violet”) specified the contribution of the new initiative to the creation of students’ involvement. This involvement, according to Inbar (2000), manifests democratic perception

"The biggest innovation of the process was involving the students as partners ... they participated in the learning groups which we set up” ("Cypress").

The principals cited three key aspects of the new initiative as contributing the school’s transformation: The nature of the initiative, voluntary participation and the diagnosis.
Structure - open-endedness

Israel's Ministry of Education has become accustomed to developing "off-the-shelf" (structured) programmes, which schools were required to implement. This same approach had been applied to violence prevention programmes:

"...What we had in previous years were all kinds of programmes, for the prevention of violence, which surfaced like mushrooms after the rain... if I had brought an instant programme it would have resulted in alienation in the teachers' involvement. They would have done it because they had to... this is simply not the way it works" ("Iris").

The uniqueness of the new "Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process" was that it is both structured and open-ended, based on minimal guidelines but, primarily, on collaborative school learning processes. The structured aspect of the new initiative relates to its cyclic process, entailing four stages of action. The first diagnosis, requires the school to map the students' feeling of safety (Appendix 2). The second stage is the school's collaborative planning of the intervention, based on the diagnosis. The third stage is the school's collaborative construction of the intervention programme in compliance with its own culture. The last stage involves re-valuation in order to continue the process by reactivating the cycle.

"...The safe school programme's effectiveness is not measured as a function of a one-time focused activity. This is rather the outcome of a planned, structured, systematic and continuous working process...." ("Palm-tree").
Israel's Ministry of Education has become accustomed to developing "off-the-shelf" (structured) programmes, which schools were required to implement. This same approach had been applied to violence prevention programmes.

"...What we had in previous years were all kinds of programmes, for the prevention of violence, which surfaced like mushrooms after the rain... if I had brought an instant programme it would have resulted in alienation in the teachers' involvement. They would have done it because they had to... this is simply not the way it works" ("Iris").

The uniqueness of the new "Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process" was that it is both structured and open-ended, based on minimal guidelines but, primarily, on collaborative school learning processes. The structured aspect of the new initiative relates to its cyclic process, entailing four stages of action. The first diagnosis, requires the school to map the students' feeling of safety (Appendix 2). The second stage is the school's collaborative planning of the intervention, based on the diagnosis. The third stage is the school's collaborative construction of the intervention programme in compliance with its own culture. The last stage involves re-valuation in order to continue the process by reactivating the cycle.

"...The safe school programme's effectiveness is not measured as a function of a one-time focused activity. This is rather the outcome of a planned, structured, systematic and continuous working process..." ("Palm-tree").
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The open-ended aspect of the new initiative was manifested, first, by the fact that each principal could lead the process according to his or her view and his or her school's culture.

"The process is indeed structured and has many stages but every principal can lead it according to his or her perception" ("Jasmine").

Second, each school constructs its own intervention programme. This is carried out by the school staff through a collaborative learning process, the product of the overt knowledge accumulated from the diagnostic data and in accord with the school culture.

"... what appealed to me was the fact that for once we were entering something in a serious and thorough manner. Not an instant ready-made programme dictated to the school but by mapping the difficult points within the school and, based on this, the school built its programme. What can be more appropriate than that?" (Iris).

According to Fullan (1999), management practices for navigating on the edge of chaos requires of both structure and open-endedness practices (p. 24). This initiative indeed provided both types of techniques.

To sum up, the principals' comments illustrate, they in fact, viewed the advantage of this combination of structure and open-endedness as a strategy, which enabled them to better lead the change process, as opposed to the structured programmes prevalent until now in the social area. This observation held irrespective to the specific cluster in which the principals had been categorized.

Voluntary choice
The crucial principle guiding the new “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” was that the principals’ use of this new initiative was based on voluntary choice rather than external dictate. Voluntary choice is one manifestation of the self-management concept, which emphasizes the school autonomy (Caldwell and Spinks, 1998). Indeed all the principals stated that the voluntary choice to enter the intervention process challenged them. This view can clarify the term, which Fullan (2001b) uses, “the principal as a gate keeper”. This implies that a principal who has voluntary chosen to introduce a change will support it and see that it succeeds, in contrast a principal, who has been coerced into introducing a change, which will prevent its effective implementation. To use “Iris” word s“...a coerced person is a person to whom a decision was dictated – a committed person is a person who has made a choice”. It was found that all the principals, without exception, expressed that voluntary choice was perceived as a motivational factor.

“...It was an option. If you want it, take it, if you do not want it, don’t take it...this won my respect as a principal... I have been in the education system for the past twenty years and do not remember a similar request...this is what appealed to me...this was challenging...” ("Iris").

This aspect complies with the argument made by Morrison et al. (1997), who maintain that voluntary choice empowers principal capability to create a safe school.

**Information-based**

“The clear goal, the methods of operation, the data according to which the work is planned that is what appealed to me – the respect for the professionalism of the principal in contents which, until today, he avoided because any action was based on hunches” (“Palm-tree”).
As mentioned, the new "Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process" was based on a four-staged cyclical process. The first stage was the diagnosis, during which the school mapped the students' feeling of safety (Appendix 2). According to Fullan (1999, p. 29), an organization's tacit knowledge when it becomes explicit, gives the organization a direction for generating change and constitutes a basis for building a coherent programme. Indeed, all the principals in the present study pointed to the contribution of the diagnostic data (i.e., the now explicit organizational knowledge) to the building of their programme.

"The findings focused us and gave us the intervention's directions... according to which together all the teachers we built the programme."

("Fir").

This finding is corroborated also by findings from the self-completion questionnaire's findings, where more than 80% of the principals indicated that the up-to-date database on the state of violence served as an infrastructure and as a lever for planning and constructing the intervention programme (Appendix 1., Tables 20 and 21).

Sergiovanni (1995) argues that knowledge should be derived from the school's clients and stakeholders. As mentioned, in our case, the information about the state of violence at school was obtained through a diagnostic questionnaire, in which the students were asked to describe their feeling of safety (Appendix 2). Furthermore, Fullan (1999, p. 4) claims that information should be aimed at understanding the problem and putting some order into the chaos. Comprehension of this aspect of information is made in the following comments

"...I deemed it important to check, by means of an up-to-date database, the situation at school and not base myself only on hunches...the diagnosis helped me as a principal to focus issues" ("Camellia").
"... I wanted to know what was going on in my school and wanted to identify the foci and roots of the problem" ("Cypress").

In fact, this was the first time that the principals had received up-to-date information about a social phenomenon at school, from the students' point of view. The principals, who were familiar with measurement in the curricular subjects, treated this data as a management tool for a non-academic area. This enabled them to make decisions and manage in a systematic way the intervention initiative at school.

"...the data indicated how to plan the intervention programme...we found that we have to focus first on the creation of good relationships between staff themselves and between the staff and the students" ("Chrysanthemum").

Hence, it is not surprising that all the principals stressed the contribution of the new initiative to their sense of professionalism as leaders. "Dahlia" elucidates it in her own words

"I felt it was professional. You approach the problem with organized input, facts which the students have pointed out, national studies, organized data, analyzed on a class and school levels in a professional way...".

The principals' sense of professionalism in leading the transformation was most meaningful for their self-confidence. The words of "Lily" illustrate this result

"On the personal level this freed me of a fear I had and which, I think, all principals experience, of dealing with issues which cannot be measured and assessed and come under public criticism, mainly those about which there is a national consensus, like violence. This liberated me of the fear of not relating to the issue of whether there is violence at school or not. I could relate to the data, learn them, look at them and not view the issue as a private problem".
Hence, it can be assumed that the principals' perception of their professional competence and the empowerment of their leadership are related to the nature of the initiative. A major added value of the new initiative was the application of its management strategy to other areas at school.

"...This made another contribution to school since it simply taught us that there is a model here... that it is possible to design a model for constructing educational principles in all the areas...We can 'pull it out' for any subject at school" ("Lily").

It is important to note that no distinction was found between the two clusters of the principals regarding their perception of the contribution of the new “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” to their leadership.

Summary

The new “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” provided an opportunity to transform the various strata of the school culture. The findings show that the principals perceived the new initiative as a tool for the strategic management of the school culture. They translated their strategic understanding of violence as an overt manifestation of the school culture into an impetus for the use of the new initiative as a lever for the transformation of the school culture. Moreover, the principals recognized the contribution of the new initiative to the school’s capacity to rally around the school purpose and to increase the shared sense of responsibility for creation of a safe school. The principals stressed three main elements of that contribution: the structured yet open-ended nature of the intervention process, the information-based as a foundation for decisions-making and the principals’
voluntary choice to participate in process. The principals perceived all these components as empowering their capability to lead the transformation of culture at their school "... it became a very useful tool of management for me..." ("Rose").

**The principals’ leadership styles**

The final additional research question refers to which leadership styles the principals’ perceived to be of the greatest influence in the process of transforming the school culture. Three styles dominated: the empowering style, the transactional style and the task oriented-people oriented styles.

**Empowerment**

Empowerment is generally conceived in terms of granting teachers freedom, autonomy and responsibility for decision-making (Mullins 1999). Most researchers (Bryk et al., 1998; Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991) link the promotion of teachers’ professional capability and their sense of competence to their willingness to assimilate the organization’s values, to promote a coherent professional community and to introduce change. This sense of competence according to Fuchs (1995, p. 125) is an outcome of the perception of human capital as professional and competent. Sergiovanni (1995) points out that the principal is responsible for the creation of this sense of competence by empowering the teachers in educational practice (p. 57). Empowering leadership thus considered to be one characteristic of transformational leadership (Bass and Avolio, 1994; Leithwood et al., 1999).
"The Moral Cluster"

Yukl (1989) maintains that transformational leaders are expected to express their belief in the ability of teachers to carry out a strategy for accomplishing the school's vision. Indeed, the principals in this cluster expressed their belief in the professional competence of their teachers. The words of “Oak” attest to this attitude

"The human capital is the main resource of my school – and I am lucky to have people who initiate, who are involved.”

The principals’ belief in their staff was also demonstrated in their modelling of the four I’s (Table 4.5) characterized by Intellectual stimulation and Individual consideration. In consequence, the principals consider that they have a responsibility to empower the teachers.

“"I think that my role as a principal is to facilitate and encourage people to grow” (“Camellia”).

“I think that I know how to motivate other people... know how to drive them, based on my appreciation of their ability” (“Lily”).

“Violet” details the method of empowering her teachers

"I think that my job was to give them [the teachers] the criteria, upon which they can rely in the fulfilment of expectations... My approach is to give them strength, power... I gave them guidance, counselling, direction, accessibility to me... This provided them foundations on which they could count. All this leads to empowerment”.

The outcome of this empowerment is described by “Jasmine”
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"...when I gave people the power, I gave them both the responsibility and the authority. I gave my people the opportunity to act according to their views." ("Jasmine").

Teachers' empowerment was also manifested by the way in which the principals involved them in organizational decision-making (Table 4.7) and leading the collaborative learning (pp. 241-244).

Although this management style expressed the principals' worldview, contingency demands consideration of the relationship between situational factors and management style. In this context, Hersey and Blanchard (1982) argue that the leadership style should match the organization's level of maturity. Indeed, three principals in this cluster ("Iris", "Violet" and "Lily") emphasized this relationship regarding empowerment.

"At the beginning, I was involved in everything which went on at school. I myself organized in-service training courses. Today, as the teachers are more experienced, I only participate as a partner in the courses and the teachers deliver, create and initiate, this is a leap forward towards their professional independence." ("Iris").

"The Pedagogical Cluster"

The principals in "Group 1" of "The Pedagogical Cluster" related to empowerment in an implicit manner. One principal "Orchid", referred to empowerment in the context of her leadership and not as an exclusive topic.

"At the beginning I was very authoritative in order to introduce new working norms. Today I allow people to show their professional strength." ("Orchid").

On the other hand, the two other principals of this group, "Palm-tree" and "Chrysanthemum", expressed their belief in empowerment in an indirect way. This
attitude was reflected in the words of “Palm-tree” who argued, “I let the teachers to guide the in-service training course at school because they know how to do it”.

Empowerment of teachers was raised by the principals in “Group 2” in reference to the appreciation, which they show the teachers “...I compliment them ...I express my appreciation for them and their ability” (“Rose”). This relationship is supported by the analysis of the four I’s (Table 4.5), which showed that these principals demonstrated Individual consideration and Intellectual stimulation, as well as by the fact that they entrusted the teachers with the collaborative learning processes (pp. 241-244). However, two principals “Rose” and “Tulip” demonstrated a contrived collegiality when making decisions, we should question the validity of this finding with regard to these two principals.

**Transactional leadership**

According to Bass (1985), Burns (1978) and others, transactional leadership assumes transactions between leaders and followers. In the present study, the principals emphasized rewards as one mechanism for empowerment and support. The types of reward, mentioned by the principals, were either material or emotional. On the emotional level, the principals specified: “...a good word, encouragement, appreciation... illuminating a person’s strong points, collegiality” (“Iris”). This type of reward provides the support and empowerment, required during change (Fuchs, 1995). “Violet” explained how she distributed emotional rewards

“... I told them that this is not a one-person job. The success will not be mine, it will be ours, I kept repeating this like a mantra... I expressed my appreciation for them. I constantly said how good and successful they
were... and I believe it... I complimented them on their actions at every opportunity".

The principals also mentioned emotional rewards as creating a sense of belonging, expressed by activities such as parties, trips: "...school is like a family, we go on trips together, organize parties for the staff" ("Jasmine", "Rose", "Tulip"). Yet, some principals mentioned material rewards as important to the teachers

"Acknowledgement is very important... The spiritual, human reward is important but it is not enough. One needs also the reward in terms of money... People do want material rewards" ("Camellia").

Some principals ("Cypress", "Palm-tree", "Orchid" and "Chrysanthemum") assigned extra working hours (which means extra money) but yet, asked for something in exchange "...you get three weekly hours as a home-class teacher, out of which you sit one hour and talk to only one child" ("Cypress").

As this method of rewarding is limited in the education system, some of the principals related to workshops and seminars as both a material and emotional reward.

"We gave the staff special bonuses... we went to seminars. This creates togetherness, a sense that we are a team" ("Dahlia").

Unlike the majority of the principals in the study "Palm-tree" used reward in another way: "...people know that if they do not comply with me they will be fired or not receive any good jobs at school".

To sum up, the principals in both clusters integrated rewards, both the material and emotional, as factors for enhancing people's motivation. The combination of transactional leadership complements the principals' transformational leadership, which
is manifested by their empowerment of the teachers in order to improve educational practice. This finding complies with the view of Bass and Avolio (1994), Fullan (2001a), Leithwood et al. (1994) and Southworth (1993).

However, on the whole, the principals in “The Moral Cluster” and “Group 2” of “The Pedagogical Cluster” tended to focused on higher-order needs that is intrinsic and moral needs. According to Sergiovanni (1995, p. 118) and Burns (1978), this characterizes transformational leadership. Unlike them, the principals in “Group 1” of “The Pedagogical Cluster” related more to basic needs – material reward and extrinsic motives- which Sergiovanni (1995, p. 199) classifies leadership by bartering.

**Task oriented / people oriented**

Two major dimensions were prominent in the principals’ perceptions of their leadership styles; first related to the task they had to perform and the second to the people with whom they had to implement the change. The task-oriented leadership style was demonstrated by the way the principals set the goals, made decisions led the change process and expressed their involvement, factors investigated throughout the present study. The fact that the principals were people-oriented leaders was demonstrated by the way in which they recruited teachers to the change process, modelling behaviours when influencing followers and their attitude toward human capital and its needs. Such dimensions can be placed on one pole of a continuum. Distinctions between the two clusters of principals will be discussed within the framework of two contingency theories: the “Managerial Grid” developed by Blake and Mouton (1964) and Reddin’s model (1970).
"The Moral Cluster"

The principals in this cluster perceived the transformation of school culture as a responsibility shared by themselves with their teachers. This attitude is illustrated by "Oak".

"... the process belonged to the entire staff. We raised the subject in various forums at school – management, age group coordinators, subject coordinators, parents, students... this is an integrated dynamic... and it grows when you, as a principal, checks yourself and what is being done at school... I analyzed the important points raised by the teachers and these points served as the basis for our decisions ".

Generally speaking, the principals in this cluster were prominent in the integration of the task and the people. This represents a style, whereby the leadership creates conditions, which combine high productivity and high morale through concerted team action. "Oak" describes this integrated perception.

"I would not have succeeded in accomplishing the goal without the collaboration between me and the people... you have to hear the teachers' needs... yet, at the same time, I persevere my goal and never let it go... ".

The integration of a task-oriented with a people-oriented style, was prominent in the decision-making style of the principals in this cluster. All the principals (with the exclusion of "Lily"), demonstrated collegiality in their decision-making with five applying collaborative decision-making (Table 4.7). These principals were role models as they assumed responsibility for leading the process and were involved in all its stages (Table 4.6). Another manifestation of this style was their active participation in the collaborative learning (pp. 241-244). They likewise perceived the creation of school climate and culture as outcome of collaborative practice, manifested by their
collaborative recruitment of the teachers (Table 4.9) and how they stimulated motivation by means of the four I’s (Table 4.5). This belief in collaboration was also supported by their perception of the school’s human capital as a professional resource, manifested by their empowerment of the staff.

Hence, it can be said with certainty that the leadership style of the principals in “The Moral Cluster” is high in both the task-oriented and people-oriented dimensions. This style is characteristic of leadership, which exerts efforts in order to accomplish goals while it develops dedication to performance of tasks. Yet, this is accomplished while taking the needs of the people into consideration and nurturing teamwork. This leadership style is described by Blake and Mouton (1964) as the “team style” (9/9) in the “Managerial Grid” or, according to Reddin’s model (1970), the “integrated style”.

“The Pedagogical Cluster”

The two groups of principals in this cluster exhibited distinctive behaviours.

“Group 1” – the three principals in this group (“Palm-tree”, “Chrysanthemum” and “Orchid”) were identified as achievement-oriented, authoritative, demanding obedience and inconsiderate of the people’s needs. “I set a goal and said: Follow this example... I transmitted a very clear message” (“Palm-tree”). All three, demonstrated an authoritative decision-making style and made decisions alone (Table 4.7). They recruited the teachers by informing and obtaining their formal consent without involving them (Table 4.9). Their modeling indicated investment in time and money but not by means of Individual consideration (Table 4.5).
In light of these findings, it cannot be determined that their leadership style was task-oriented (9/1) in the “Managerial Grid” Blake and Mouton’s (1964) or “dedicated-style” according to Reddin (1970). This leadership is characterized as “results rated high” and “relationship rated low”, a style characterizing leaders who make decisions alone, demand obedience and supervise heavily in order to achieve maximum effectiveness in the performance of the tasks, without consideration people.

“Group 2” – Three out of the four principals of this group (“Cypress”, “Tulip” and “Daffodil”) led the change process while actively participating throughout the entire change process (Table 4.6). Moreover, they participated together with the teachers in the collaborative learning in their school (pp. 241-244). Throughout the interviews, they stressed people and their needs, as illustrated by “Tulip”

“... being attentive to people’s needs. This means being alert all the time, not ignoring them... always trying to see what needs people bring with them and what they find difficult to do”.

Indeed, they all emphasized Individual consideration (Table 4.5) and involved the teachers by means of emotional recruitment (Table 4.9).

It should be mentioned that another dimension of the four I’s, Intellectual stimulation, was demonstrated by the four principals in this cluster, behaviour witnessed in their empowerment of the teachers. However, their decision-making style was different. All four demonstrated collegiality, but two (“Tulip” and “Rose”) demonstrated contrived collegiality (Table 4.7), indicating a wish to avoid conflicts and achieve “peace organizational”. This leadership style, characterized by compromise intended to maintain good relations in the organization, is what Blake and Mouton (1964) called “center leadership” (5/5). Considering the differences mentioned, it could be relate to as nuances in emphases. Thus, generally speaking, the style of the principals of this
group was characterized by a high level of the two task-oriented and people-oriented dimensions.

To sum up, excluding the three principals, who were distinctly task-oriented, most of the principals (12 out of 15) can be characterized as demonstrating a leadership style, which is both people-oriented and task-oriented. Moreover, the leadership style of the principals in the present study displayed integration of the four leadership styles that according to Goleman (2000) have been found to be effective for the creation of an organizational climate: “Authoritative - in which the leader mobilizes people towards a vision; Affiliative - in which the leader creates harmony and builds emotional bonds; Democratic- in which the leader forges consensus through participation; and Coaching – the leader develops people for the future” (p. 40). “Iris” expressed this approach as follows

“I believe that a principal should lead people and serve as a personal example... he should set a mission for the organization and persevere it. He should enable the teachers to connect to the mission, acknowledge needs and let them build the process by themselves”

The exceptions to this description were three principals (“Orchid”, “Palm-tree” and “Chrysanthemum”), whose leadership style can be described as coercive and pacesetting. According to Goleman (2000), this style is negatively connected with the atmosphere and the relations in the organization. The outcome of this style of leadership is illustrated by “Chrysanthemum”, who admitted her failure to transform the school culture.

“I failed to motivate people to act, they were unwilling to contribute to school. I did not succeed in building a senior management team, committed to school like me“.
However, in spite of the differences between the principals’ styles, the characteristics shared by all the principals in the present study was, undoubtedly, the initiator style, evidenced by the voluntary choice to introduce the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”. The initiator leadership style has been found as the most successful style for creating a healthy organizational culture and introducing change (Fuchs, 1995; Hall *et al*., 1984; Leithwood *et al*., 1999; Kula and Globman, 1994; Sheinman and Ben-Peretz, 1993).

**Summary**

Following the main research question, the findings of the present study show that the principals perceived three factors as enabling them to transform the school culture. Those factors were the principal impact, the school process and external support. However, the finding shows that the principals’ impact is the most meaningful factor in enhancing transformation of the school culture. This impact is associated with their mindscape, which guides their educational practice, beginning with setting morale purposes for school and continuing in its translation into practice at school. Moreover, the findings show that the principals’ mindscape for leading transformation of a school culture is embedded in two different aspects: a moral perspective and a pedagogical perspective. Based the different stress placed on each aspect, a distinction was made between the principals, which served as the basis for analysis of their perceptions of their leadership in the process of transforming the school culture.

The research findings are presented graphically in the following figure, based on which they will be summarized.
The findings illustrate that all the principals shared three main perceptions. The first is that the transformation of the school culture is related to the shaping of a school vision and purposes based on a system of values. The basic value, shared by all the principals in the present study, was the value of safety of the school community. The second perception is that leadership is identified with a social mission reflected by awareness of the moral role of school in granting every pupil the right to learn in a safe
environment. This perception indicates that the mindscape, characteristic of all the principals in the present study, recognized the social role of leadership as manifested by the readiness to cope with an issue plaguing Israeli society – violence – and to assume responsibility for leading transforming of the school culture.

The third perception acknowledges that leadership, striving to transform a safe school culture, requires a strategy. The strategy they adopted is based on a combination of strategic thinking and strategic management. Strategic thinking involves setting a clear moral purpose whereas strategic management involves translating the moral purpose into collaborative practice. The principals in the present study used the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” as a tool for leading the transformation of the school culture. This tool incorporates a strategy that is both structured and open-ended, a systematic process resting on information. Data provides the infrastructure, upon which each school can build its own intervention programme. Furthermore, the principals viewed the process of creating a shared purpose as a collaborative practice to be undertaken in the school itself. Hence, according to their perception, it is the principal’s responsibility to rally the entire organization around its creation.

Based on the shared perceptions of their leadership, the principals who participated in this study can be described as exercising transformational-strategic leadership with a social mission. Yet, this form of leadership is a conceptually very broad, which embodies many aspects. Two of its aspects were prominent in the present study, the moral aspect and the pedagogical aspect. Based on these aspects the principals could be allocated to two clusters according to the dominance of one of the two aspects.
Eight principals stressed moral aspects of their leadership, which represented the formation of their mindscape for the transformation of a healthy culture that expanded beyond the school context. They perceived educational leadership as responsible for the future social-moral development of the youth. This perception of their leadership emphasizes inculcation of ethical values such as equality, tolerance and mutual respect. These principals were referred to in the present study as “The Moral Cluster”.

The other seven principals in the present study stressed pedagogical aspects of their leadership. Their mindscape for transforming the school culture was manifested an ‘intra-organizational’ perception of leadership, based on practical values for the overall functioning of school. Within this perception, the social and learning climate is a major prerequisite for the improvement of social and academic outcomes. These principals were referred to in the present study as “The Pedagogical Cluster”.

“The Moral Cluster”

As mentioned above, the eight principals referred to as “The Moral Cluster”, stressed the moral aspect of transformational leadership. The mindscape of these principals was rooted in the view that school, simultaneously influences and is influenced by the wider social context. This assumption engendered their perception of the school and themselves, as principals, as responsible for the creation of a safe school.

Following that, the transformation of the school culture was perceived by them, to be the process through which the valued system would penetrate the school culture. That is, by creating a moral-valued infrastructure, school will be become a moral change agent, and thereby further creation of a moral society.
Eight principals stressed moral aspects of their leadership, which represented the formation of their mindscape for the transformation of a healthy culture that expanded beyond the school context. They perceived educational leadership as responsible for the future social-moral development of the youth. This perception of their leadership emphasizes inculcation of ethical values such as equality, tolerance and mutual respect. These principals were referred to in the present study as “The Moral Cluster”.

The other seven principals in the present study stressed pedagogical aspects of their leadership. Their mindscape for transforming the school culture was manifested an ‘intra-organizational’ perception of leadership, based on practical values for the overall functioning of school. Within this perception, the social and learning climate is a major prerequisite for the improvement of social and academic outcomes. These principals were referred to in the present study as “The Pedagogical Cluster”.

“The Moral Cluster”

As mentioned above, the eight principals referred to as “The Moral Cluster”, stressed the moral aspect of transformational leadership. The mindscape of these principals was rooted in the view that school, simultaneously influences and is influenced by the wider social context. This assumption engendered their perception of the school and themselves, as principals, as responsible for the creation of a safe school.

Following that, the transformation of the school culture was perceived by them, to be the process through which the valued system would penetrate the school culture. That is, by creating a moral-valued infrastructure, school will be become a moral change agent, and thereby further creation of a moral society.
The moral foundations of the school vision promoted by the principals, relied on a conception of moral community based on the ethical values of respect, equality, tolerance, good citizenship and the opening of a window of opportunity for all (Table 4.3). This valued system, considers the needs of school and of the wider social environment while focusing on higher-order needs and to attain a purposeful meaning to what one does. The principals’ moral perspective constituted the starting point for the change in the school culture, which they wanted to generate, a change related to the deep covert level of culture – the level of values and its fundamental assumptions. The time frame of this pro-active perception of leading the organization is “from the future to the present” and dwells on affecting the future of civil society.

The principals in this cluster transmitted their values through the four I’s (Table 4.5). However, they did not settle simply for demonstration of these values only through the four I’s. They also practiced behavioural modeling, manifested in their personal involvement throughout the transformation process. Six principals transmitted their messages by fully and actively participating in the entire process including participating in the learning processes (Table 4.6). Only one principal in this cluster was involved only at crucial points of the process, attributing it to the size of the school and not to her perception of leadership.

Furthermore, the principals in this cluster saw determination of the shared purpose of school as a collaborative creation involving the entire educational school staff. Hence, they recruited the teachers by activating intrinsic moral motives and needs, both emotions and cognition, for the purpose of creating commitment to change (Table 4.9). This collaborative perception of the principals in this cluster conformed to heir ethical democratic values. The main means for translating this shared moral purpose was collaborative organizational learning (pp. 241-244), in which all school staff
members were partners. The fact that the principals used the collaborative learning indicates that they perceived their leadership as providing a support system for promotion of people's professional confidence. Moreover, the principals perceived the use of collaborative learning as a tool for empowering the teachers' to implement the change. This was manifested by devising solutions, building a school intervention programme, shared by the entire educational staff and granting the teachers the professional autonomy to lead the collaborative learning process. These actions demonstrated the principals' appreciation of the human capital and their belief in the teacher's professional prowess. Another avenue for manifestation of the principals' collaborative perception was the structure of decision-making (Table 4.7). The findings show that five principals, in this cluster, made the decision to introduce the new initiative, in collaboration with all the teachers in their school. Two others, made the decisions in collaboration with their senior management team and one principal made the decisions alone, rationalizing this action, by the lack of her staff's organizational maturity.

The senior management team working with the principals in this cluster was treated as an active partner to all the processes. However, three principals of them even perceived their leadership as a collaborative leadership with their senior management team.

Thus, this cluster of principals can be characterized by collaborative style of leadership with a people-centered orientation. Moreover, these principals rarely used formal authority but rather used their professional authority in order to accomplish their goals. Their professional authority derived its power from their solid system of values and perseverance in their social mission. The principals' perseverance was also manifested by attempts to create internal commitment to the accomplishment of the
mission, a factor they added the task-oriented dimension to their leadership. Thus, the principals in this cluster can be characterized by being both task-oriented and people-oriented with a team leadership style, as formulated by Blake and Mouton (1964).

The process by which relations were established with the school external environment also manifested the principals’ perception of collaboration. The principals in this cluster perceived the external support system – supervisors, professionals and parents – as contributing to the transformation of the school culture and empowering the school to cope with change. Moreover, they considered the parents as legitimate partners to the education of their children, and a perception that sustained full collaboration (Table 4.10).

“The Pedagogical Cluster”

Seven principals, referred to in the presented study as “The Pedagogical Cluster”, presented pedagogical-social considerations, associated with the intra-school context. This considerations linked improvement of educational outcomes to the improvement of the school intra-school processes based on practical values. From this aspect, their perception that the moral purpose of school is expanding the conditions required for the pupils’ success was generated (Table 4.4). Thus, they viewed transforming the school culture as a means of achieving this moral purpose. More precisely the principals in this cluster perceived the meaning, relevance and necessity of the change at school in terms of creation of a healthy culture supportive of both academic and social success. Accordingly, they inspired motivation for change through awareness and emotional acceptance of the need for the change.
Yet, the principals in this cluster viewed improving the school intra-school processes differently in some aspects. One sub group of principals placed greater emphasis on academic outcomes, was referred in the study as “Group 1”, whereas the others placed greater emphasis on social climate, referred as “Group 2”.

The finding shows that this motivation was created by a variety of means, ranging from informing, through the use of cognitive explanatory means and including emotional recruitment (Table 4.9). Most of the principals in this cluster created commitment to the change by activating two of the four I’s, Individual consideration and Intellectual stimulation. This finding underscores the distinction between the two clusters of principals. While the principals in “The Moral Cluster” consistently demonstrated almost all four I’s, only one principal in this cluster demonstrated all the four dimensions whereas the others demonstrated only one to three dimensions (Table 4.5).

However, all the principals in this cluster, like the principals in “The Moral Cluster”, were involved in the intervention process. As a group they presented the new initiative rationale at school and clarified its messages at the very beginning of the process. Yet, here too, they differed in their level of involvement. Three principals were involved only in crucial points of the process while the others were actively involved throughout. Only one principal was a full partner, together with the entire school staff, at all stages of the process (Table 4.6).

As for their perception of collaboration, the findings show that the perceptions of the principals in “The Pedagogical Cluster”, ranged along a continuum, from collegiality to authoritative style (Table 4.7). As to making the decision to introduce the new initiative, the findings indicate that two principals in this cluster demonstrated collegiality, two demonstrated contrived collegiality and three demonstrated an
authoritative style (principals comprising “Group 1”). None of the principals in this cluster demonstrated collaboration, unlike the principals in “The Moral Cluster”. Nevertheless, all the principals in this cluster involved the senior management team in decision-making, albeit to different degrees. Three principals passively involved the senior management team (“Group 1”), whereas four actively involved them (“Group 2”). Moreover, the findings show that the principals in “The Pedagogical Cluster”, like the principals in “The Moral Cluster”, considered the collaborative organizational learning as the appropriate mechanism for creating a collaborative culture and solving problems (pp. 241-244). Four principals allowed the teachers to lead the learning process, while three led it together with external professionals.

Analysis of the leadership style of the principals in this cluster distinguished the two groups in this cluster. Whereas the three principals, in “Group 1”, demonstrated a task-oriented leadership style, the four principals in “Group 2” demonstrated a combined task-oriented and people-oriented, a leadership style, characteristic of the principals in “The Moral Cluster”. As for the principals’ perception of the external support system, the findings illustrate that the principals in this cluster, like the principals in “The Moral Cluster”, considered the external bodies as supportive of change. However, their perception of parents’ involvement differed. Whereas the principals in “The Moral Cluster” saw parents as full partners, the principals in “The Pedagogical Cluster saw them as partial partners, meaning clients who have to be informed and assists the implementation (Table 4.10).

Yet, three additional points should be mentioned. The first is that all the principals in both clusters integrated aspects of transactional leadership as an additional dimension of their transformational leadership. The second is that the profile of the principals in “The
Moral Cluster” was homogeneous in both their moral perceptions and the way they led the transformation in the school. Unlike them, the profile of the principals in “The Pedagogical Cluster” was heterogeneous in both their moral perceptions and their methods of generating the transformation. Nevertheless, the background data of the principals (Appendix 6) was not related to the distinction between these two clusters of principals. The last point is that the principals perceived the contribution of the new “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” as a strategic tool for transformation of the school culture. The findings show that all the participants in this study perceived this strategy as empowering their professional capacity to lead the creation a safe school culture and, thus, applicable for the transformation process.

Chapter 5 — Conclusions

Setting the scene

This thesis deals with the Israeli secondary principals’ perception of leadership in the process of transforming their school culture, as reflected by their experience in introducing the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate” intervention initiative. This unique group of principals has chosen to engage in an issue, which is a threat to the Israeli society in general, and to schools in particular. They all perceived safety as a basic value in the promotion of society in general and as one of the basic conditions required for promotion of educational practice at school in particular. Moreover, the
principals viewed the creation of a safe climate as an opportunity to transform the school culture.

The over-arching research question, by means of which the principals' perceptions of leadership in transforming the school culture were examined, focused on the key factors, which the principals perceived as enabling them to lead this transformation. The additional research questions were developed in order to investigate the principals’ impact on the values shared within the school and the way they shared their values with the teachers. Another question aimed at examining the principals’ leadership style in leading a transformational change. The final question explored the principals’ perception of the contribution of the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate” intervention process as a strategic tool for motivating transformation of the school culture.

These research questions were grounded in the conceptual framework found in the professional literature dealing with the transformation of school culture, which links three key concepts: leadership, change and school culture (Leithwood et al., 1999; Schein, 1985; Sergiovanni, 1995; Fullan, 2001a; Fullan 2001b; Inbar, 2000).

The findings illustrated that the principals in the present study perceived their leadership as transformational-strategic with a social mission. However, two aspects of their perception of their leadership were prominent; a moral aspect and a pedagogical aspect. These two aspects classified the principals into two main clusters, manifested by the way they transformed the school culture. Hence, the two clusters were referred to in this study as “The Moral Cluster” and “The Pedagogical Cluster”, according to which the analysis was formulated.
The principals' overall perception of their leadership was elucidated through the analysis of core values formulated on the basis of the data obtained directly from the principals statements – the "emic categories" – and comparison with the literature - most notably, the work of Day et al. (2000), Leithwood et al. (1999), Sergiovanni (1995), Caldwell and Spinks (1998), Fullan (1999, 2001a, 2001b) and Inbar (2000).

Research framework

Since the present study's aim was to understand the principals' perception of their leadership in the process of transforming the school culture, the qualitative approach, which focuses on understanding the subjective reality of the participants, was chosen for the research framework of this study. The interpretive research paradigm and the inductive analysis method therefore applied. Hence, the data were coded and categorized to form a comprehensive picture of the principals' perception of their leadership. Following the study's purpose and the research approach, a semi-structured in-depth interview was chosen as the primary research tool (Appendix No. 4). Findings of the in-depth interviews led to the formation of categories and core categories, yielding an overall picture of the principals' perception of their leadership. Yet, two additional tools were used in this study. The first, a self-completion questionnaire, was used in the initial phases of the study (Appendix No. 3); the second was the documents collected in the schools. These tools provided only as background to expand and enrich the information obtained from the in-depth interviews of the principals during the main part of the study.
The research population consisted of fifteen secondary school principals who had chosen to introduce the "Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process" and who had agreed to participate in the present study. These fifteen principals were chosen by a two-stage process. The first stage included identification of the principals, on the basis of a self-completion questionnaire, sent to all 162 Israeli principals, who had chosen to introduce the new initiative. Out of the original 162 principals, 86 elementary and secondary principals responded to the questionnaire. Since these two educational frameworks are structurally different and in order to reduce any bias, which might stem from this differentiation, it was decided to focus on one population only. Such a purposive choice, is acceptable in qualitative research (Miles and Huberman, 1994, p. 27). The decision to focus on secondary school principals resulted from my interest in secondary school leadership as a complex phenomenon and to my professional specialization of working with secondary schools.

Out of the 34 secondary school principals, who responded to the self-completion questionnaire, 22 consented to participate in the present study. However, the political situation in Israel prevented access to the entire group. Thus, the research population was limited to 15 secondary school principals.

In light of the above, the research population is, undoubtedly, unique and purposive. However, it should be mentioned that the participants represent all the organizational structures form among Israel’s secondary schools (6-year schools, independent junior high schools and 4-year schools), geographical districts, sectors (excluding the Arab sector due to the political situation) as well as both gender (Appendix No. 5, Figures 4.A – 4.D).
The research findings

Analysis of the arching-question shows that the principals perceived three factors enabling them to transform the school culture: their impact, school processes and external support. However, the finding shows that the principals perceived their impact to be the most meaningful of the three factors. Analysis of the principals’ impact as the primary factor principals indicated as enabling the introduction of change showed that all the principals perceived themselves as figures who exercise strong influence on the entire school practice. This finding is corroborated by Beare et al. (1993), Leithwood et al. (1999), Sergiovanni (1995), Fullan, (2001a) and many others. Four central themes or “core categories” (Strauss, 1987) were found to explain the principals’ perceptions of their impact and to link these perceptions to all the other elements identified in the present study.

The first core category relates to the principals’ mindscape, which, according to Sergiovanni (1995), dictates the direction of the change. The principals’ mindscape was found in the present study as central to the transformation of the school culture. The findings show that the mindscape shared by all the principals in this study, was their perception that educational leadership cannot avoid coping with violence as a problem, which undermines the moral infrastructure of educational practice and undermines and its outcomes. Hence, this mindscape accounted for their willingness to cope with social issues and for the starting point for future direction, in which they wished to lead the school. According to Chen et al. (1992), inclusion of social issues in the principals’ practice, manifests a leadership having a social orientation. From this shared mindscape, they derived their commitment to lead the transformation of their school culture. Nevertheless, their mindscapes demonstrated unique aspects. The principals in
"The Moral Cluster" viewed school as a microcosm of the society within which it is embedded. As such, they perceived themselves as moral-social agents in the wider society beyond the school. Unlike them, the principals in "The Pedagogical Cluster" perceived their commitment to create a safe school as part of their entire commitment to school's practice.

The second core category relates to the values and moral purposes of the educational leadership, the "beacon" to the educational practice reflected in the school vision. (Beare et al., 1989; Louis and Miles, 1992; Shein, 1985; Torrington and Weightman, 1989). Values and moral purposes signalled the code of behaviour desirable as the basis of the shared school culture. The finding shows that all the principals grounded their leadership on moral purposes and personal values, seen by Leithwood et al. (1999, p. 2) as a key feature of transformational leadership. The moral purposes mentioned by all the principals, in both clusters, contained the value of safety. Stressing the value of safety as an administrative priority is shared by many researchers (Glover et al., 1998; Kaplan, 1995; Morrison et al., 1997; Snyder et al., 1996). Yet, the principals in "The Moral Cluster" stressed safety as only one value out of a system of ethical values, which should guide educational practice. According to Inbar (2000) and Sergiovanni (1995), this characterizes leadership in the 21st-century. Thus, their leadership can be described as "leading from the future towards the present". On the other hand, the principals in "The Pedagogical Cluster" focused on practical values, and linked safety to the improvement of educational practice, which, according to Bennis and Nanus (1985) and Fox (1995), manifests a leadership, aiming to create a better future. Thus, their leadership can be described as "leading towards the future from the present".
The third core category relates to the ways used by the principals to share their values and induce the teachers’ commitment to the transformation. This was manifested by modelling and the principals’ involvement in the process of the transformation.

The finding shows that all the principals transmitted their values by employing one or more of the dimensions of the four I’s (Bass and Avolio, 1994). Most of them demonstrated the Individual consideration and Intellectual stimulation, which, according to Leithwood et al. (1999) are characteristic of transformational leadership. However, the findings show that the principals in “The Moral Cluster” were characterized by a greater number of these dimensions than were the principals in “The Pedagogical Cluster”. The analysis of the four I’s, clearly showed that the three dimensions, common to all the principals in “The Moral Cluster”, were Individual consideration, Intellectual stimulation and Idealized influence. Six of these principals demonstrated also Inspirational motivation. On the other hand, the principals in “The Pedagogical Cluster” were characterized by one to three dimensions and only one of them demonstrated all of the 4 I’s.

Moreover, this psychological influence was integrated also in the overt modelling of all the principals, namely their involvement in transmitting the importance of the messages to the organization. Most of them (eleven out of fifteen) were actively involved in leading the entire process. Yet, the principals’ extent of involvement varied and was located on the continuum between simple introduction of the initiative and full involvement in the entire process.

The fourth core category refers to the strategic means employed to transform the school culture. The findings show that the principals perceived the transformation of the school culture as a collaborative act involving all the organization’s members. Hence, they perceived their responsibility as having to facilitate the creation of collaborative
learning mechanisms, which ensure that their vision is realized. This finding is inline with the work of Bryk et al. (1998), Elmore (2000) and McLaughlin and Talbert (2001). Yet, the research findings show that the principals’ perceptions of collaboration did not uniformly reflect their decision-making. At one end of the continuum, was the collaborative style, characteristic of the principals in “The Moral Cluster”, stressing a moral collaborative-empowering leadership. This style of leadership characterizes a moral aspect of transformational leadership (Dimmock, 2000; Hodgkinson, 1991; Leithwood et al., 1999). At the other end of the continuum was the authoritative leadership style, characteristic mainly of the principals of “Group 1” in “The Pedagogical Cluster”, who adopted a pragmatic orientation towards an effective school functioning.

Another mean employed to transform the school culture was the use of the new “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”. This mean provided the principals with the opportunity to transform the strata of the school culture. The findings show that the principals perceived the new initiative as a tool for the strategic management of the school culture. Moreover, all the principals acknowledged the contribution of the new initiative to the school’s capacity to rally around the school purpose and to increase the shared sense of responsibility for the creation of a safe school. The principals stressed three main elements of that contribution: the structured yet open-ended nature of the intervention process, the information-based as a foundation for decisions-making and the principals’ voluntary choice to participate in the process. All the principals perceived all these components as empowering their capability to lead the transformation of culture at their school.
The principals' perception of leadership

All the principals shared the four themes, identified as the "core categories" in the present study. The analysis of the categories showed that all the principals perceived their leadership as striving to transform a school culture in light of a moral purpose and shared vision. A vision, which is based on a shared valued system and relies on the power of the school staff to shape it. This form of leadership is described in the literature as transformational leadership (Bass and Avolio, 1994; Caldwell and Spinks, 1998; Day et al., 2000; Hargreaves, 1994; Leithwood et al., 1999; Yukl, 1989). More specifically, all the four dimensions of transformational leadership, according to Caldwell and Spinks (1998), were manifested by the principals' perceptions of their leadership in the present study, as well as the use of the five leadership powers, presented by Sergiovanni (1984) (extensively reviewed on p. 40).

The first dimension of transformational leadership is the cultural-moral. This aspect is related to the principals' aspiration to change not only the academic outcomes but also to develop a coherent school culture, rooted in a shared moral value system, which creates a meaning and purpose for the organization. Indeed, all the principals in the present study used the "cultural power" by articulated moral purposes in order to develop what Sergiovanni (1995) calls a "moral community". The moral purposes, determined by the principals as the basis for the school vision, were grounded in ethical values, which manifested their worldview (evidenced mostly by the principals in "The Moral Cluster"). The platform, on which all the principals consolidated their leadership, was oriented towards a healthy school culture that was based on the value of safety, which reflected a humanitarian perception that related to people's basic needs. This in
turn reflected the principals’ worldview of their leadership as having a social mission, characteristic of educational leadership in an age of complexity in general and the turbulent era in which the Israeli society find itself in particular. This finding complies with those findings of Chen and Addi (1995), who argue that Israeli principals have a social mission; they are leaders, who do not take social reality for granted and who strive to improve it. This was manifested by the principals’ willingness to introduce the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate” initiative.

The pedagogical dimension of transformational leadership was manifested by the principals’ perception that creating a safe environment is one of the conditions required for improvement of both social and academic outcomes. This gave rise to their leadership styles, which emphasized empowerment of the school’s capability to engage in both aspects as combined practice. Empowerment of the school capacity was manifested by the principals’ use of educational power on two levels. One level refer to the intra-school level, by means of which the principals considered the pupils’ and the teachers’ needs and chose how to create a shared commitment. This commitment was created by developing a shared meaning, involving the teachers in the decision-making process and constructing a collaborative school learning community in order to solve problems. The second level, related to the school’s external support system. This was manifested in the present study by the principals’ responses to the support provided by supervisors and the external professionals in addition to the relations, which the principals established with the parents.

The third dimension, especially prominent in the present study, was the perception of leadership accountability for all the processes, which take place at school. This
accountability was demonstrated from the stage, at which the principals became aware of the problem of violence, up to their personal leading the intervention process from beginning to end. Their accountability was manifested at the stage of making the initial decision to enter the intervention process, recruiting the staff and the involvement in the learning processes leading to the construction of the intervention programme in collaboration with the educational staff at school. This behavioural modeling of personal accountability signaled the importance, which they attributed to the transformation of the school culture to the teachers. Moreover, the principals’ accountability was manifested in their recruiting teachers by activation of symbolic powers – the four I’s (Bass and Avolio, 1994)- and by collegiality, a process that expands the circle of leadership with the school. These perceptions embodied a message of managerial autonomy and constituted a model of personal accountability for each staff members to the transformation of the school culture.

The fourth dimension of transformational leadership, which was prominent in the present study, was the principals’ strategic perception, which upheld that a management strategy is required in order to transform a school culture. This perception is associated with the principals’ perception of their accountability for the implementation of the process. The principals specifically derived their strategy of achieving a safe school from the perception that violence is an overt and covert characteristic of the school culture. Hence, the strategy, which they used, was directed at the transformation of the school culture rather than at a focused treatment of violence only. The strategic perspective was exhibited by long-term planning, based on strategic thinking, manifested in creating moral purposes on the one hand and the use of technical powers to ensure optimum implementation on the other. One of these technical powers
involved diagnosis's of the current state of violence among the pupils (Appendix No. 2). This database than served as the infrastructure for the construction of a unique intervention programme by each school. Hence, the principals’ perception of the strategy required to transform the school culture is characterized by combined strategic thinking and strategic management. According to Caldwell and Spinks (1992) and Hall (1998), this combination determines the educational priorities of school, helps to analyze environmental trends and their effect on school, as well as constitutes a basis for choosing suitable procedures and strategies for managing the change process. Furthermore, this combination reflected by the principals’ mindscape, as a way for determined the future vision of school and the means for turning it into the school reality. As perceived by Sergiovanni (1995).

Thus, it can be concluded that the principals’ perceptions of their leadership can be described as transformational-strategic leadership with a social mission. However, whereas all the principals perceived their leadership as transformational, they could be differentiated by the emphasis placed in their perceptions of this leadership. These emphases were exhibited by what I called the moral aspect and the pedagogical aspect. This was manifested by the determination of the content of the value system, which the principals set as the basis of their moral purposes and the school vision, the mindscape, which directed the way they transformed the school culture and how they transmitted the values and purposes within the school.

The moral aspect characterized eight principals, who were referred to as “The Moral Cluster” in the present study. The moral aspect reflected a worldview, which underscored the role of school in its wider social context. All eight principals in this cluster viewed school as an institution, which mediates between individuals and the society. School, it follows, contributes to the development of a democratic society in
general and to the transformation of the values of the pupils as citizens in particular. This perception linked, simultaneously, the influence of social phenomena on school and the influence of school as a moral-social agent on society for the improvement of the entire society, not only the school. This approach accords with the postmodern view of school as a source of cultural legitimacy; hence, change of school follows from a change in its values (Day et al., 2000; Solomon, 2000). Validity of this perception is corroborated by many researchers (Aviram, 2000; Chen and Addi, 1995; Fidler, 1997b; Fullan, 2001a; Goldring and Rallis, 1993; Inbar, 2000).

Moreover, the principals belong to this cluster perceived their leadership as grounded in humanitarian-democratic values such as respect for the individual's rights, tolerance and equality. According to Grace (1995), Girioux (1992) and Hodgkinson (1991), grounding on such higher-level, demonstrates a moral leadership. These moral accents gave rise to the way, in which the principals determined their moral purpose and transformed the school culture, behaviour that agrees with Hargreaves (1994), who maintains that, in the postmodern age, the concept "restructuring" should be replaced by "reculturing". Reculturing emphasizes that the starting point for the transformation of culture are values, which guide the growth of a new school structures. Moreover, principals, who stressed the moral aspect in their leadership, considered themselves as leading this transformation at their school and beyond the school. The practice of this leadership type is what Sergiovanni (1995) calls "moral art". In addition, Inbar (2000), Fullan (2000a) and Day et al. (2000) consider such leadership as most appropriate to the 21st century, which reflects the postmodern perception of school as responsible for the creation of moral-humanitarian "anchors".
The pedagogical aspect characterized the other seven principals, who were referred to as “The Pedagogical Cluster” in the present study. The perception of those principals stressed the relationship between educational and academic outcomes and the school processes and demonstrates a “holistic intra-organizational” leadership. This type of leadership assumes responsibility for the transformation of a school culture so as to improve learning and behaviour (Beare, et al., 1989; Dimmock, 2000; Fuchs, 1995; Fullan, 1999; Hargreaves, 1995). In terms of this focus, the educational practice in creating a safe environment was perceived as one of the school processes, required for the social and academic outcomes. This perception, which views safe climate as a condition for promoting academic outcomes, has been identified by many studies (Astor et al., 1999; Furlong and Morrison, 1994; Glover et al., 1998; Kaplan, 1995; Morrison et al., 1997; Sharan, 2000).

The differentiation made between the two clusters of principals, does not however, attest to two distinctive perceptions of educational leadership. Rather, each cluster demonstrates an extension of the transformational leadership concept. As Dimmock (2000, p. 35) claims, each aspect is important for a leadership aspiring to re-design the school culture. That is, attention to the wider environment and a pro-active response to what transpires outside the school, and at the same time, a readiness to engineer the within-school variables. Both are requisite for the initiation and implementation of change.

Moreover, these perceptions are likewise expressed in the collaborative perspective applied within the school and in the establishment of partnerships with elements outside the school.
The principals’ perception of collaboration

Hargreaves (1994) states that a key characteristic of the postmodern school is collaboration. According to Sergiovanni (1995) and Fullan (1999), in order to reinforce educational tasks in the postmodern age, an age rooted in value-oriented worldviews, suitable organizational perspectives should be adopted. These perspectives are based on collaboration, manifested by the expansion of the leadership infrastructure at school, involvement in making decisions and the creation of a learning community (Bennis, 1989; Hall, 1998; McLaughlin and Talbert 2001; Rosenholtz, 1989). Indeed, the basic perception shared by the principals was that transforming the school culture was a collaborative act involving all the organization members. Hence, they perceived their responsibility as having to develop a collaborative culture, which encourages professional development, problem solving and collaborative commitment by the organization’s members to take part in its creation. Following the principals’ collaborative perceptions, the principals in this study perceived their leadership as “learning-facilitating”, manifested in the creation of collaborative learning mechanisms, which ensure that their vision is realized. Various researchers have argued that this collaborative culture empowers the school to cope with problems through the introduction of change (Day, 2000; Fullan, 2000a; Hargreaves and Fullan, 1999; Leithwood et al., 1999; Peter and Waterman, 1982).

Yet, the research findings show that the principals’ perceptions of collaboration did not uniformly reflected their leadership styles in practice. At one end of the continuum they displayed collaborative style, characteristic of the principals in “The Moral
Cluster”, whose educational perceptions were democratic in nature. This perception underscores a moral collaborative-empowering leadership, stressing trust and appreciation of human capital. This style of leadership can be characterized the moral aspect of transformational leadership (Dimmock, 2000; Hodgkinson, 1991; Leithwood et al., 1999). This finding contradicts earlier findings obtained in Israel by Sharan et al. (1998), who found that principals dedicate only a small part of their time to collaborative activities. At the other end of the continuum was the authoritative leadership style, characteristic mainly of the principals of “Group 1” in “The Pedagogical Cluster”, who adopted a pragmatic orientation towards an effective school functioning.

The principals’ perception of partnership with the community

The research findings indicate that the principals identified the external bodies- the district authorities, parents and external professionals - as a support system for the educational practice at school. Consequently, they strove to increase the involvement and assistance of these bodies when coping with social issues like violence. This finding attests the principals’ perception of the community as a legitimate source of power (Hargreaves, 1995). However, the findings show that, whereas the relations of the principals with the district authority’s supervisors and external professionals were initiated by the latter, the relations with the parents were initiated by the principals themselves. The nature of the relations with the supervisors might point to the decentralization, which the Israeli education system has been undergoing in recent years, resulting in a change of the supervision system, from supervisory to support system (Volansky, 1999). We may conclude that the principals have not yet assimilated
this change, because they did not "invite" the supervisors to participate in the change process implemented at their school.

Alternatively, the principals perceived the parents- the third external body- as a legitimate and important element, resulting in their initiative to establish relations with them. This contradicts the findings of a previous study conducted in Israel by Goldring (1987), which described the principals’ contradictory feelings towards the involvement of parents at school. However, a later study of Israeli schools conducted by Goldring and Pasternak (1991) specified that the principals sought ways to involve the parents at school. This development in the school-community relations, found expression in the present study as well. Perceptions of relations with the parents were located on a continuum. At one end were principals who perceived the parents’ right to know how school promoted its goals for the good of their children; hence, those principals involved the parents only by informing them at one or other stage of the process. This perception characterized the principals in “The Pedagogical Cluster”. At the other end of the continuum were the principals, who perceived the parents as legitimate partners in the education of their children and as partners in the solution of social problems, affecting their children in particular. This perception characterized the principals in “The Moral Cluster” and was manifested by the principals’ full involvement of the parents. This perception complies with the perception of school’s place in the postmodern society (Giroux, 1992; Inbar, 2000; Sergiovanni, 1995). Moreover, five out of the eight principals in “The Moral Cluster” viewed themselves as leading the establishment of relations with other schools in their community and with wider systems in the community, demonstrating their perception of communality. According to Sergiovanni (1995), this perception of communality points to a leadership style,
which deals with major social problems, emphasizes these goals at school and aspires to transform those broader social norms, which have an impact beyond the school context.

**The main conclusions**

1. Analysis of the over-arching question shows that all the principals perceived their personal impact as the most meaningful factor enabling them to transform the school culture. They attributed this impact to their mindscape, their values, as well as their modeling behaviour and personal involvement. This leads to the conclusion that the school principals consider themselves as the central factor in transforming the school culture as argued by Sergiovanni (1995) and that they perceive themselves as the ideologues of the school just as Kramer-Hayoun (1995) noted.

2. All the principals stated that school principals couldn’t avoid coping with violence. Hence, they perceived creating a safe school culture as their main mission. Based on that it can be concluded that Israeli principals consider themselves as social agents whose social mission is an important aspect of their leadership following Chen et al. (1992).

3. The principals perceived the new "Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process" initiative as an opportunity for transforming their school culture into a healthy school culture. A culture, which contributes to the students’ moral development and expands optimal learning conditions. This leads to conclude that the principals view
transformation of a safe school culture as a moral purpose on both the macro and micro level, as Fullan (1999, p. 1) noted.

4. The principals perceived that transforming a safe school culture is not merely reducing violent incidents; rather it requires a holistic change in the deeper strata of school culture. This finding attests that the principals understood Schein’s (1985) argument that transforming the overt level of school culture - the level of behavioral norms - requires a change in the deeper level of the school culture - the level of values. Moreover, the principals stated that such a holistic transformation requires a systemic as well as systematic strategy. Based on these findings the conclusion here is that the principals in the sample perceive leadership in the process of transforming the school culture as transformational-strategic leadership, requiring strategic thinking and strategic management, as suggested by Caldwell and Spinks (1998) and Hall (1998).

5. The analysis of the principals’ perceptions revealed two aspects of their perceived leadership - a moral aspect and a pedagogical aspect. These two aspects affected the way the principals led the transformation process. The findings indicate that principals, who stressed moral aspects of leadership, viewed the school's role as extending beyond the school context, based the moral purpose on ethical values and led the transformation collaboratively with their staff and parents. Conversely, the principals, who shared pedagogical aspects, based their leadership on intra-organizational practical values and led the transformation by means of mechanisms,
ranging from collegiality to authoritative style with both their staff and parents. Based on this finding, it can be concluded that the way principals lead transformation is contingent on their perceptions. This means that the way leaders lead school depends on the way they think, or in Sergiovanni’s (1995) terms, their mindscape.

6. The principals, who stressed democratic values such as equality, respect for human rights and tolerance as the moral purposes, collaboratively involved all the school members in the transformation process. This observation follows Leithwood’s (1999, p. 11) claim that democratic leader can well be placed in the category of moral leadership, because participation is justified by democratic theory.

7. The research findings indicate that when the decision to generate the change was collaboratively made by the principals and the educational staff, the level of involvement and collaboration of both the principal and the educational staff throughout the process was higher than when the decision was made only by the principals. That is, when principals perceive the transformation of the school culture as a joint venture, the high collaboration continues throughout the transformation process. The conclusion to be drawn is that creating a culture of collaboration at school depends considerably on the principals’ perceptions and actions; as Fullan and Hargreaves (1999, p. 100) state: "The principal is a role model of collaboration".
8. The findings showed that when organizational learning was practiced at school, the principals applied it in the transformation process; when this mechanism was absent, the principals developed it for this purpose. This finding, which is supported by numerous studies (Rosenholtz, 1989; McLaughlin and Talbert, 2001; Elmore, 2000), points to the conclusion that organizational learning is an effective targeted mechanism for rallying school members around educational practice in general and transforming the school culture in particular.

9. The principals stated that the voluntary choice to introduce the new initiative motivated and challenged them to take part in the process. This indicates that when principals can exercise choice they will support change and see that it succeeds. Moreover, with reference to creation of a safe school culture, this supports the claim of Morrison et al. (1997) that voluntary choice empowers the principal's to create a safe school.

10. The principals underscored the contribution of the new imitative as an empowering tool, which enabled them to lead the transformation. The analysis revealed that they referred to the intervention's structured systematic four-stage nature as well as to its open-ended character, which enabled the principal to choose what they considered to be the most appropriate way to lead the transformation. This finding support Fullan's (1999, p. 24) argument that structured-open-ended intervention programmes are suitable for coping with complex problems.
11. The finding show that the principals perceived external bodies - parents, professionals and district authority supervisors - as helpful and supportive. This leads to the conclusion that in the process of transforming the school culture the principals need a large support system outside school.

12. The findings show that the principals’ relations with the district authority supervisors were initiated by the latter. This may reflect the transition the Israeli education system is currently undergoing: from a centralized to a decentralization system (Vollansky, 1999). Moreover, the principals, we may conclude, not yet have assimilated the new role of the district authority supervisors as a support system as opposed to inspectors, their traditional role.

**Implications - Educational leadership in Israel at the dawn of the third millennium**

The research findings and conclusions indicate that the Israeli secondary school principals participating in this study, perceived their leadership as transformation-strategic leadership with a social mission. However, two central aspects of this leadership were prominent, its moral aspect and its pedagogical aspect. This wider perception may point to developments in the perceptions of educational leadership among Israeli secondary school principals, reflective of new trends appearing at the dawn of the 3rd millennium.

The principals’ perceptions of their leadership revealed in the present study, attest that they have begun assimilating a perception associated with the postmodern era and the
age of uncertainty, in which western society in general and Israeli society in particular are living. These perceptions emphasize the need for a solid moral-value infrastructure to serve as the educational “anchor”, which school must provide to the students as future citizens. This anchor is particularly necessary for Israel in light of the confusion evolving from the socio-political situation, demanding caution coupled with humanitarian behaviour. This anchor therefore is crucial for any attempt to transform the culture that provides the moral infrastructure of school. This infrastructure contributes the well being of the school citizens as well as a model for the creation of a moral and just society.

Hence, the educational leadership is a cornerstone for the creation of such infrastructure. Leading this process requires collaboration of all the organization’s members. School leadership should create this collaborative infrastructure through acknowledgment of people’s basic needs and by propelling them towards the higher needs of the organization. Moreover, leading transformation process necessitates the combination of strategic thinking with strategic management. Strategic thinking frames the effort by providing a shared moral purpose whereas strategic management, when using updated information about the organization, supports making operational decisions about how to approach the educational horizon. This combination is seem to be an appropriate strategy suitable to the age of complexity and the turbulent environment, whereby the future cannot be predicted but should be created and reality should be managed in line with fundamental values. Hence, a transformational-strategic educational leadership with a social mission that was identified as the characteristic of the principals in this study, leads us to conclude that they perceived the situation’s complexity and that they were ready to try to adopting appropriate methods though with different emphases.
The contribution of the study

The contribution of the present study resides in the input it offers to Israel’s educational policy makers, who are concerned with the phenomenon of violence in Israeli schools and who aspire to introduce a healthy culture at school. The study acknowledges the importance of the educational leadership in the creation of such culture. Moreover, the present study underscores the importance of values and moral purposes in the transformation of a school culture as a basis for academic and social outcomes at school and for the development of a moral community. Most important, the study contributes to the understanding of the conditions, which principals need in order to lead this transformation in their school. With this information, nationwide implementation of programmes dealing with the transformation of school culture may be achieved more effectively. The approach adopted by the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” initiative, since it complies with the needs and perceptions of transformational leadership, may be used as a model for future initiatives.

Recommendations

Since educational research does not aspire only to describe reality but also to improve it, therefore, on the basis of the research, the following recommendations are proposed.

1. In light of the state of violence in the Israeli society, which threatens its moral-value infrastructure, educational leaders should be encouraged to increase awareness of this problem. Moreover, principals should be expected to take
responsibility for coping with this urgent problem, whose impact on school
cannot be ignored.

2. School leadership should develop a "moral orientation" in its educational
practice. It appears that the consolidation of a leadership, grounded in moral
purpose and ethical values, can be a source of power for schools in this age of
uncertainty and fragmented values and behavioural norms manifested in the
Israeli's school reality. Hence, school leadership must introduce a solid moral-
value school culture, to which the entire school population must be partners, in
order to cope with this difficult situation. Modelling of mutual commitment is
essential for such a transformation to be successful.

3. It is recommended that training of principals should be based on the development
of a "moral orientation" in the education of the future generations with
humanitarian-democratic values serve as its guiding principle.

4. School principals should be empowered by acknowledging their professionalism.
Granting them the option to make voluntary choices, stemming from their internal
commitment and real goals rather than dictating programs top-down,
acknowledges their professional power and capacity to lead. Moreover, they
should be trained to adopt monitoring tools as part of the professional
preparedness for the strategic management perception of strategic leadership. At
the same time, they should be encouraged to exploit the support granted by the
external support system of school.
5. Principals should be encouraged to create a collaborative learning culture not only at their school but also among themselves in order to empower their management. Such form for a "principals' leadership", whether informal or formal, would exert a strong impact on the education system.

**Methodological remarks**

1. The major methodological remark refers to the current research topic: the principals' perceptions of their leadership. These perceptions and their associated worldviews are highly important in themselves, but the question remains as to how much events transpiring within the school and relationships between principals and their partners comply with these perceptions. In this sense, the study's findings should be approached with caution. Having stated that, the documents collected in the schools, the findings from the self-completion questionnaire and the comparisons of the research findings with those obtained from other studies conducted in Israel and abroad do increase the likelihood that the principals' perceptions indeed reflect reality.

2. Qualitative approaches are most suitable for the study of phenomena displaying greater differences than similarities. However, generalizations consistent with quantitative sampling designs and standards of empirical validity should be obtained if the researcher is interested in convincing policy makers dealing with large bureaucratic systems, to accept his or her research-based recommendations. Hence, the current research should be extended to larger samples on the one hand, while
retaining the qualitative research paradigm appropriate to its subject and research population on the other.

These two methodological remarks open directions for future research.

**Research in the future**

1. The present study dealt only with the perceptions held by the principals. Although this factor is salient for the determination of the school reality, the match between school reality, as it is perceived by the principals, and reality as it is perceived by the teachers and pupils should still be explored.

2. Since the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” is an experimental and innovative programme in Israel, a long-term comparative study to investigate the knowledge accumulated by additional schools, joining the initiative should be conducted. This should include principals of elementary schools and schools in the Arab sector, which were not included in the present study.
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Appendix No.1

The principals’ questionnaire findings

162 principals participated in the new “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”. This process involved a diagnosis state of Violence at schools (Appendix No. 2). The principals were requested to modify the ways they introduced the process at their school. A self-completion questionnaire was sent to all the 162 principals who took part in this process (Appendix No. 3). The data of this questionnaire are presented here.

86 principals responded to the feedback questionnaires. Below is the distribution of the returned questionnaires according to three indices: the school type, the Ministry of Education supervision and the local authority supervision.

Extent of representation

Table 1: Distribution of the returned feedback questionnaires, according to the school type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary school</th>
<th>Junior high school</th>
<th>High school</th>
<th>6-grade school</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the sample</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the population</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary school</th>
<th>Junior high school</th>
<th>High school</th>
<th>6-grade school</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the population</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2: Distribution of the returned feedback questionnaires, according to the supervision districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State</th>
<th>State-religious</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Arab</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the sample</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State</th>
<th>State-religious</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Arab</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the sample</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Distribution of the returned feedback questionnaires, according to districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Haifa</th>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Tel-Aviv</th>
<th>Jerusalem</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the sample</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the population</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of schools, in which the new “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” has been performed, represents to a great extent their distribution in the school population in Israel. Thus, out of those performing the diagnosis, 20% belong to the state-religious supervision, 6% to the rural sector, 6% to the Arab sector and 65% are primary schools.
A distribution, which is entirely not representative, was demonstrated with regard to the supervision districts. Whereas schools in the central district constitute about 21% of the schools in Israel, they constitute 64% of the entirety of schools, which have entered the process (103 schools). In the other districts, the rate of participation ranged between 4% in the southern district and up to about 12% in the Haifa district.

**Table 4: Distribution of responding principals according to their years of seniority in management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable – years</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures show that most respondents (79.2%) have held the role of principal for 12 years or less. One fifth of the principals are veteran in the management role, between 13 and 34 years.

**Table 5: Distribution of responding principals according to their years of seniority in managing the present school**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable – years</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures show that half of the principals who responded to this question are at the beginning of their way in managing the present school (49.3%) and have served in this role at school between 1 and 5 years.
The report data are presented according to the order of the systematic activity of the intervention process and in compliance with the principals' questionnaire.

**Part I – Questions relevant to the way of presenting the “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”**

The new “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” was presented to the principals in various ways by elements outside the school. The following table shows the people “harnessed” to the task.

**Table 6: Distribution of the bodies presenting the “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” to the principals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable presenting body</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education supervision</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority supervision</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior counsellor</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint presentation (of the above bodies)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows that in 2/3 of the schools the initiative for presenting the “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” to the principals was taken by one central functionary in the system, the most common being the senior counsellor (28.9%).

In 1/3 of the schools, the initiative was presented to the principals jointly by several elements. In about half of those schools, the Psychological-Counselling Service
employees were involved and in the other half – supervisors from the Ministry of Education and the local authority, as presented in Table 6-A.

Table 6A: Presentation of the “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” was done jointly by the following

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological-Counselling Service</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education supervision</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority supervision</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of the various bodies presenting the initiative to primary school principals and secondary principals was also checked. The following tables illustrate the data.

Table 6-1: Distribution of the bodies presenting the “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” to primary school principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education supervision</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority supervision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior counselor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Manager</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior regional psychologist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society and Youth Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6-2: Distribution of the bodies presenting the “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” to secondary principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education supervision</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority supervision</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior counsellor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Manager</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior regional psychologist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society and Youth Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint presentation (of the above bodies)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data show that with regard to primary school principals, in about half of the cases the presentation of the intervention process was done jointly whereas in secondary schools, in most of the cases, one central element presented the process to the principals. In more than half of the cases it was the senior counsellor who presented the process to the principals. The significant differentiation in the presentation of the initiative at primary and secondary schools stemmed from the different relation patterns between the schools and the supervisory bodies.
Presentation of the “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” at school

After having presented the new “Preventing Violence an creating Safe Climate” Intervention Process” to the principals, they were requested to present it in their schools, in order to recruit the school staff to take part in the process. The principals were asked who presented the intervention process at their school and to which forums it was presented. The following tables show their answers:

Table 7: Distribution of the bodies presenting the process at school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counsellor/ counselling team</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School psychologist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological-Counselling Service instructor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint presentation (of the above bodies)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution shows that in over 50% of the schools the process was jointly presented by several elements at school. The principal, counsellors, psychologists and members of the staff did this joint presentation. This finding represented the distribution in both primary and secondary schools.
Table 8: Distribution of the forums in which the “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” was presented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The senior management team</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-class teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The entire faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parents’ committee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management + all the teachers + parents’ committee</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and parents committee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows that in most schools (88.3%) principals claimed that the intervention process was widely discussed by management teachers, and parent representatives.

Responses to the “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”

The principals were asked about the responses in school and among the parents to the very fact of the intervention process. Their answers are shown in the following table.
Table 9: Distribution of the principals’ perceptions of the responses to the intervention process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Principals’ perceptions of staff responses</th>
<th>principals’ perceptions of students’ responses</th>
<th>Principals’ perceptions of parents’ responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A very negative response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A negative response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An indifferent response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A positive response</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A very positive response</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the whole the principals have reported that there was a prominent positive response in the system for the very process both among the educational staff, the parents and the students. In no case have the principals reported any negative responses to the diagnosis process.

Considerations for the implementation the “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”

Parallel to the positive responses to the intervention process, it was important to investigate the apprehensions and reservations raised at school with regard to this process. Consequently, the principals were asked what were the arguments presented at school during the discussions about the implementation of the intervention process.

* This was an open question
Considerations in favour of the intervention process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Self-investigation with the purpose of improving the school climate.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Increasing the awareness to this issue at school, both among the students and among the school staff.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* A basis for building an intervention programmes.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Recruiting the involvement of the school staff to involved in the process</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Obtaining information about the state of violence.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* &quot;A sense of doing&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Identifying risk factors at school.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considerations against the intervention process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* An apprehension that the data are going to be published.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* A fear from the exposure of the data at school and the difficulty to cope with them.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Unclear questions (complex and difficult questions, unsuited to the lower grades).</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The circulation of the questionnaire is time-consuming, a long and tiresome process).</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Involvement in the “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”

In this part of the questionnaire the principals were asked to rate the level of involvement of various external bodies (Ministry of Education supervisors, senior counsellors, district psychologists, instructors, local authority supervision) in the
course of the intervention process at their school. The following table illustrates the principals’ perception.

**External elements**

**Table 10: Distribution of the perceived level of involvement of each of the external bodies in the intervention process at their school**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable External bodies</th>
<th>Very high N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>High N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Intermediate N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Limited N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Not at all N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education supervision</td>
<td>6 7.4</td>
<td>26 32.1</td>
<td>13 16.0</td>
<td>13 16.0</td>
<td>23 28.5</td>
<td>81 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior counsellor</td>
<td>31 40.3</td>
<td>19 24.7</td>
<td>8 10.4</td>
<td>5 6.5</td>
<td>14 18.1</td>
<td>77 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District psychologist</td>
<td>4 5.7</td>
<td>5 7.1</td>
<td>9 12.9</td>
<td>13 18.6</td>
<td>39 55.7</td>
<td>70 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological-Counselling Service instructor</td>
<td>11 18.2</td>
<td>17 25.8</td>
<td>3 4.5</td>
<td>8 12.1</td>
<td>26 39.4</td>
<td>65 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ committee</td>
<td>5 6.4</td>
<td>14 17.9</td>
<td>13 16.7</td>
<td>25 32.1</td>
<td>21 26.9</td>
<td>78 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority supervision</td>
<td>3 4.0</td>
<td>8 10.7</td>
<td>13 17.3</td>
<td>14 18.7</td>
<td>37 49.3</td>
<td>75 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14 66.7</td>
<td>4 19.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 4.8</td>
<td>2 9.5</td>
<td>21 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The principals’ answers to the question of the involvement of external bodies at school show that the involvement of the senior counsellor in the intervention process at school was the highest. 65% of the principals indicated the senior counsellor’s high and very high level of involvement in the process at school. 32% of the principals indicated supervisors’ high level of involvement and 44% of them mentioned the involvement of the Psychological-Counselling Service instructors.

A distinction between the involvement of external bodies at primary schools and at secondary schools was made, as illustrated by the following tables.
Table 10.1: Distribution of the perceived level of involvement of each of the external bodies in the intervention process at elementary schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education supervision</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior counsellor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District psychologist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological-Counselling Service instructor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ committee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority supervision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.2: Distribution of the perceived level of involvement of each of the external bodies in the intervention process at secondary schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education supervision</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior counsellor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District psychologist</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological-Counselling Service instructor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority supervision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

343
The data demonstrate that in primary schools the perceived involvement of the Ministry of Education supervision was higher than in the secondary school. In secondary school the perceived involvement of the local authority supervision was more prominent than the primary school. This finding reflects the different ownership of school. In elementary schools the Ministry of Education does the supervision, whereas in secondary schools, both the Ministry of Education and the local authority do the supervision.

**Internal elements at school**

The following questions aimed to check which of the functionaries at school was “harnessed” to the intervention programme process and what was the extent of involvement of each of them.

**Table 11: Distribution of the perceived level of involvement of each of the internal functionaries in the intervention process at school**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th></th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th></th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management team</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School counsellor</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School psychologist</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age-group coordinators</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social education...</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A distinction between the involvement of internal elements at school was made with regard to the type of school, as shown by the following tables.
Table 11.1: Distribution of the perceived level of involvement of each of the internal functionaries in the intervention process at primary schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Very high N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>High N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Intermediate N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Limited N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Not at all N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management team</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School counsellor</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School psychologist</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age-group coordinators</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social education coordinators</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.2: Distribution of the perceived level of involvement of each of the internal functionaries in the intervention process at secondary schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Very high N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>High N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Intermediate N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Limited N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Not at all N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management team</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School counsellor</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School psychologist</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age-group coordinators</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social education coordinators</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data show that more than 95% of the principals perceive their involvement in the process as high to extremely high. Moreover, the principals indicate the high level of involvement of the other school senior team members. The lowest involvement, according to the principals’ perception, has been that of the school psychologist.

Whereas the principals indicated a high level of differentiation in the involvement of external elements in the diagnosis process, they mentioned the high level of involvement of all the school senior team, headed by them in the intervention process.
The school preparation towards the “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”

The preparation processes towards the initiation stage, consisted of a series of actions, which required some time. The following questions were designed to check the principals’ comments as to whether there were any preparations in their schools, by whom these preparations were made and the length of time it took.

The data are shown in the following tables:

**Table 12: Distribution of the periods of time dedicated by the school in the initiation stage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Periods of time dedicated for the preparation</th>
<th>Periods of time dedicated for the preparation – primary school</th>
<th>Periods of time dedicated for the preparation – secondary school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 2 weeks</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A month</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 months and longer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data show that over 80% of the schools took 2 months or less in this stage. This finding represents both the primary and the secondary schools.

**Preparation of the students**

Principals were asked to comment upon the level of preparation the students were given prior the process. The following tables illustrate their comments:
Table 13: Was there any preparation of the students prior to the circulation of the diagnosis questionnaire?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Distribution of the bodies who prepared the students prior to the circulation of the diagnosis questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home-class teacher</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School counsellor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-class teacher + counsellor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-class teacher + counsellor + other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In most schools (over 80%) the students were prepared prior to the circulation of the diagnosis questionnaire. This preparation was mostly done by the home-class teacher and in about 25% of the schools, jointly with the school counsellor.

On the whole, most schools organized preparatory activities. The preparation processes lasted less than two months.
Part II — Questions relevant to the way the diagnosis data were received at school

This part relates to questions about the way the diagnosis results were received. The questions were designed to find out who was informed by the principal of the diagnosis results, the way the results were received at school and the principals' response to the diagnosis data. The following tables illustrate the principals' answers.

The first table relates to the question as to whom the principal has chosen to inform the first of the diagnosis results.

Table 15: Distribution of the bodies the principal has chosen to inform first of the diagnosis results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal elements (senior management team)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External elements (supervisors, senior counsellor, psychologist, Psychological-Counselling)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both internal and external elements</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 shows that 66.3% of the principals have chosen to involve first in the diagnosis results, mostly elements inside the school.

Table 16: Distribution of the period of time, which passed from receiving the data and disseminating them to the various elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One day after receiving the data</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to a week</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than a week</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A month</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 shows that, in most cases, the principals have chosen to share the diagnosis data immediately after receiving them. About 25% of them preferred to wait a week and then present them to the various elements. Very few principals waited more than a week, before informing the various people of the data.

**The way the diagnosis data were received at school**

The following table presents the principals' answers to the way in which the data were sent to them.

**Table 17: Distribution of the principals' perceptions of the clarity of the data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very unclear</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very clear</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 shows that most principals (about 80%) report that the way in which the data are sent to school is clear to very clear.
Table 18: Distribution of the principals’ answers to the question as to whether they should have been prepared for the stage of receiving the data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60% of the principals believe that there should be preparation and instruction towards the data reception stage. When asked who would be the best person to give the instruction, the principals gave varied answers, among them professionals (statisticians, counsellors, instructors, senior counsellors and psychologists).

This part of the questionnaire, relating to the finding reception, indicates that principals were satisfied with the clear way in which the data were sent to school. However, the principals indicated the need for prior preparation towards the finding reception stage.

**The picture of the state of violence**

The following question attempted to find out whether the data from the diagnosis questionnaire corroborated the principals’ prior knowledge about the stage of violence or whether they were surprised.
Table 19: The picture of the principals' perception of the state of violence as demonstrated by the data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very surprising (for the worse)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprising (for the worse)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was not surprising at all</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprising (for the better)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very surprised (for the better)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 shows that more than 50% of the principals were not surprised by the diagnosis results; about 30% of them were surprised for the better.

The distribution according to the type of school as shown above is that the surprise for the better of primary school principals is 40.8% as opposed to 16.7% of secondary school principals. 70% of secondary schools were not surprised at all from the data, whereas 44.9% of the primary principals were not surprised by the data.

**Part III – planning stage**

The objective of the diagnosis questionnaire was to assist the school to build its own intervention programme, in compliance with its needs. Consequently, the principals were asked whether the diagnosis results provided, in fact, a sufficient information infrastructure for building an intervention programme. The following tables illustrate the data:
Table 20: The extent to which principals felt that the data provide a sufficient information infrastructure for building an intervention programme

- 65%
- 12%
- 5%
- 18%

Table 21: The extent to which the data serve as offered “leverage” for building an intervention programme

- 49.4%
- 20.3%
- 6.3%
- 1.3%
- 22.8%
Tables No. 20 and No. 21 show that the data served as an information infrastructure as well as "leverage" for building an intervention programme. Over 80% of the principals reported that the data served as a sufficient information infrastructure to a great-up-to-a-very-great extent. For over 70% of the principals the data even served as leverage for building an intervention programme.

**Table 22: The principals’ perception of the current stage of development at school**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data reception</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data processing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building an intervention programme</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing the intervention programme</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 shows that most schools in the sample are at the stage of building their intervention programme.

**The involvement of functionaries in the planning stage**

This question asked which of the functionaries at school and outside it took part in planning the intervention and to what extent. The data are shown in the following table:
Table 23: Distribution of the principals’ view of the participants levels of participation in planning the intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To an intermediate extent</th>
<th>To a little extent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management team</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counsellor</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School psychologist</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group coordinators</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority supervision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education supervision</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social education</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological-Counselling Service instructor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 indicates that the principals feel that a large number of elements in school are very highly involved in planning the intervention. The very prominent participants in planning the intervention are the principals themselves (about 90%), the counselling team (75%), the senior management team (about 73%), age-group coordinators (about 63%) and social education coordinators (about 65%). Furthermore, joining the stage of planning the intervention programme by the external elements (school supervisors, local authority people, Psychological-Counselling Service instructors and parents) is also prominent.
The distribution of this question regarding the involvement in planning the intervention at school according to the type of school is illustrated in the following tables.

**Table 23.1: Distribution of the principals' view of the participants in planning the intervention programme at elementary schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To an intermediate extent</th>
<th>To a little extent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>46 92.0</td>
<td>4 8.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management team</td>
<td>27 77.1</td>
<td>8 22.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counsellor</td>
<td>33 75.0</td>
<td>9 20.5</td>
<td>1 2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 2.3</td>
<td>44 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School psychologist</td>
<td>18 46.2</td>
<td>12 30.8</td>
<td>7 17.9</td>
<td>1 2.6</td>
<td>1 2.6</td>
<td>39 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group coordinators</td>
<td>31 73.8</td>
<td>8 19.0</td>
<td>3 7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority supervision</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 15.0</td>
<td>2 10.0</td>
<td>3 15.0</td>
<td>12 60.0</td>
<td>20 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School supervisor</td>
<td>5 19.2</td>
<td>5 19.2</td>
<td>9 34.6</td>
<td>1 3.4</td>
<td>4 15.4</td>
<td>26 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social education</td>
<td>35 77.8</td>
<td>10 22.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological-Counselling Service instructor</td>
<td>11 44.0</td>
<td>4 16.0</td>
<td>4 16.0</td>
<td>2 8.0</td>
<td>4 16.0</td>
<td>25 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>7 19.4</td>
<td>13 36.1</td>
<td>13 36.1</td>
<td>2 5.6</td>
<td>1 2.8</td>
<td>36 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23.2: Distribution of the principals’ view of the participants in planning the intervention programme at secondary schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To an intermediate extent</th>
<th>To a little extent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management team</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counsellor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School psychologist</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group coordinators</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority supervision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education supervision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological-Counselling Service instructor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the whole, the principals report that the level of intervention of school functionaries is very high in both types of school. The differences are in the involvement of outside bodies, such as: supervisions and the local authority. The supervisors’ involvement is higher at primary schools (38.4%) versus 21.7% in secondary schools. On the other hand, local authority supervision are more involved in high schools (23.8%) as compared to primary schools (15%). The parents, too, are more involved in elementary schools (55.5%) than in secondary schools (30.4).
Principals’ satisfaction with the decision to carry out the “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”

The new “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” is long, requires that the entire school enlisted, displays the difficulties in a more acute way and exposes school to those issues, which need to be extensively treated. It was important to find out whether, in retrospect, the principals who underwent the diagnosis process were satisfied with their decision to introduce the process.

The following table shows the data:

**Table 24: The distribution of the principals’ satisfaction with the decision to carry out the intervention process at school**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To an intermediate extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a very great extent</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the whole it seems that most of the principals (93.7%) are satisfied to a great-up-to-a-very-great extent with their decision to carry out the intervention process in their school.
Appendix No. 2

Pupils’ Questionnaire

State of Israel
Ministry of Education and Culture
Psychological and Counseling Services
Research and Development Unit

Dear pupil,

This is a questionnaire concerning school violence. The aim of the questionnaire is to examine to what degree you feel safe at school, and what makes you feel this way. The information extracted from the questionnaire will help your school handle the problems raised and plan activities for improving the school and classroom climate.

The questionnaire is anonymous (no names are requested).

Thank you for your cooperation!

1. School: ___________

2. Grade: ___________

3. Sex: □ Male □ Female
Part A:

The following questions deal with various types of violence. The questions relate to acts of violence of all types that happened to you *personally*. Which of the following events happened to you at school *during the last month*?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Ne*er</th>
<th>Once or twice</th>
<th>Three times or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A pupil grabbed or shoved you on purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>You were kicked or punched by a pupil who wanted to hurt you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>You saw a pupil with a handgun at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A pupil used a stone or other object to hurt you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>You went to the nurse or doctor because a pupil hurt you in a fight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pupils stole your personal belongings or school equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>You saw a pupil with a knife (of any kind)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A pupil threatened to hurt you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Another pupil swore at you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Another pupil mocked, insulted or humiliated you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Another pupil threatened you with a knife (of any kind), and you saw the knife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A group of pupils at school threatened you or “ganged up on you”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A pupil extorted you (for money, food or valuables) by threatening you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Once or twice</td>
<td>Three times or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Someone from the school staff mocked, insulted or humiliated you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Someone from the school staff shoved or hit you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>A pupil touched or tried to touch you sexually against your will</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Someone from the school staff tried to “make advances towards you” (sexually)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>You carried a weapon (knife, handgun, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part B:**

The following questions relate to the location of violent incidents and the characteristics of violent pupils. Read the questions and check the answer most appropriate to you. More than one answer may be checked.

22. If you have ever been hurt (insulted, shoved, hit, etc.), where did this take place?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outside the school gates</th>
<th>At the candy store during a break or at the school canteen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Inside the school gate</td>
<td>□ In the staff room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ In the school yard or on the playground</td>
<td>□ In the toilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ In the corridor</td>
<td>□ In the gym or another school facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ In the classroom</td>
<td>□ Other, specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. If you have ever been hurt, during which part of the school day did this occur?

- □ Before school started
- □ During lessons
- □ During break
- □ After school
- □ Other – specify: ______

24. If another pupil hurt you (insulted, shoved, hit you, etc.) who was he or she?

- □ A pupil from your class
- □ A pupil from a higher class
- □ A pupil from another class in your grade
- □ A pupil not belonging to your school
- □ A pupil from a lower grade

25. If a group of pupils hurt you (insulted, shoved, hit you, etc.), who were they?

- □ A gang from your class
- □ A gang from a higher grade
- □ A gang from another class in your grade
- □ A gang from different classes
- □ A gang from a lower grade
- □ A gang not belonging to the school

26. Are there certain places at school where you feel unsafe?

- □ No
- □ Yes, specify: ______

27. What do you do when you’re hit, bullied or threatened with force?

- □ Turn to a staff member (teacher, principal, consultant, etc.)
- □ Seek help from another pupil
- □ Turn to a family member (parent, brothers, cousins, etc.)
- □ Nothing or wait till it ends
- □ Other, specify: ______
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Part C:

The following questions are concerned with your school's atmosphere. Please state to what degree you agree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A bit</th>
<th>Sometime</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>There's a problem with pupils swearing at teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Pupils break things at school (vandalism)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Pupils drink alcohol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Pupils use drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I usually feel safe and protected at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Teachers manage to handle violent troublemakers effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Teachers care about there being no violent behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Teachers do things to reduce violent behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Teachers manage to reduce violent behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix No. 3

Questionnaire for principals who participate in the new “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”

Part 1 – Questions regarding the way of presenting the new “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process”

1. The new “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” was presented to you by (circle the appropriate answers, you may circle more than one):

1.1 The Ministry of Education supervisor
1.2 The local authority supervisor
1.3 Senior counsellors
1.4 District manager
1.5 School psychologist
1.6 Society and Youth Administration
1.7 Other ________________
1.8 Jointly by ___________________

2. The intervention process was presented at your school by (circle the appropriate answers, you may circle more than one):

2.1 The school principal
2.2 Counsellors
2.3 School psychologist
2.4 Instructors
2.5 Other ________________
2.6 Jointly by ___________________

3. The “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” presented in your school in the following forums (circle the appropriate answers, you may circle more than one):
3.1 Senior management team How many meetings were held?__________
3.2 Class teachers How many meetings were held?__________
3.3 Entire teachers’ lounge How many meetings were held?__________
3.4 Parents’ committee How many meetings were held?__________

4. Rate the educational staff’s response to the use of the new “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” (Mark X according to the response).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very positive (5)</th>
<th>Positive (4)</th>
<th>Indifferent (3)</th>
<th>Negative (2)</th>
<th>Very negative (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. During the discussions about entering the intervention process, what were the arguments rose

In favour of the intervention process _____________________________________
____________________________________

Against the intervention process _____________________________________
____________________________________

6. Rate the students’ reactions to the use of the violence diagnosis questionnaire (Mark X according to the response).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very positive (5)</th>
<th>Positive (4)</th>
<th>Indifferent (3)</th>
<th>Negative (2)</th>
<th>Very negative (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. Rate the parents’ reactions towards the intervention process (Mark X according to the response).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very positive (5)</th>
<th>Positive (4)</th>
<th>Indifferent (3)</th>
<th>Negative (2)</th>
<th>Very negative (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. During the process, what was the level of involvement of each of the following parties? (Mark X in the appropriate square)
9. What was the level of involvement of each of the following parties in the "Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process" in the school? (Mark X in the appropriate square)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Very high (5)</th>
<th>High (4)</th>
<th>Medium (3)</th>
<th>Low (2)</th>
<th>Non existent (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior counsellor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School psychologist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. The time of preparing the school for the intervention process (Mark X in the appropriate square)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Less than 2 months</th>
<th>1 Month</th>
<th>2 Months</th>
<th>3 Months</th>
<th>More than 4 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Was any preparatory work performed with the students before the questionnaire was administered?
11.1 Yes
11.2 No

If yes, who was it conducted by?

I. School teacher
II. School counsellor
III. Other _____________

Part 2 – Questions concerning reception of the diagnosis data

12. Who did you chose to be the first to receive the diagnosis data? (circle)

12.1 Senior management team
12.2 Senior counsellor
12.3 School counsellor
12.4 Ministry of Education
12.5 Psychologist
12.6 Instructors
12.7 Local authority supervisors
12.8 Other

13. How long after receiving the data did you involved her/him?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 day after receiving</th>
<th>Up to one week</th>
<th>More than a week</th>
<th>A month</th>
<th>More than two months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. Who did you choose to present the diagnosis data to? (Circle the appropriate answer, or more than one answer)

14.1 Senior management team
14.2 Pedagogic council
14.3 Local authority supervisors
14.4 Students
14.5 All the parents
14.6 Senior counsellor
14.7 Parents’ committee
14.8 The Ministry of Education supervisor
14.9 Psychologist
14.10 Other ______________
15. The manner in which the data were given to the school (Mark an X according to level of clarity).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Clear</th>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Reasonable</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Very unclear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Do you think the principals should be prepared for the stage of receiving the data?

16.1 No
16.2 Yes
If so, by whom? _____________________________

17. The level of violence arising from the diagnosis questionnaire data (mark an X according to your level of surprise)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very pleasantly surprised</th>
<th>Pleasantly surprised</th>
<th>Not surprised at all</th>
<th>Sadly surprised</th>
<th>Very sadly surprised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 3 – Questions related to the level of planning an intervention based on the data

18. To what extent do the data constitute sufficient information for preparing the intervention programme at your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To a reasonable extent</th>
<th>To a minor extent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Reflect on the extent to which the data were used as a lever for building an intervention programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Use</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a very great extent</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a reasonable extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a minor extent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all extent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. At what stage of the process is your school these days?

20.1 Receiving the data.
20.2 Analyzing the data by school teams.
20.3 Building the intervention programme for the 2001 school year.
20.4 Implementing the intervention programme.

21. Indicate the partners involved in the planning of the intervention programme for 2001 (you may indicate more than 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To a reasonable extent</th>
<th>To a minor extent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counsellor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School psychologist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age-group coordinators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social education coordinators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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22. In retrospect, how satisfied are you with your decision to introduce the new “Preventing Violence and creating Safe Climate Intervention Process” (Mark X according to the response).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To a reasonable extent</th>
<th>To a minor extent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 4 – background details

24. Name of principal________________________
25. Name of school ____________________________
26. Number of years of seniority in principalship_________________
27. Number of years of seniority in the present school______________
28. Type of school
   28.1 Primary
   28.2 Junior high
   28.3 Secondary
   28.4 Six-year
29. Sector
   29.1 State
   29.2 State religious
   29.3 Rural
   29.4 Arab
30. District
   30.1 South
   30.2 North
   30.3 Haifa
   30.4 Centre
   30.5 Tel Aviv
   30.6 Jerusalem
   30.7 Other
31. School size:
   31.1 Number of classes_________
   31.2 Number of students_________
   31.3 Number of teachers_________
APPENDIX No. 4

The in-depth semi-structured interview topics

- General background of the school.
- General background of the principal.
- What are the reasons for joining the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate” process?
- Which messages did you deem important for transmitting by means of this process?
- How were these messages transmitted?
- Please describe the process of introducing the intervention process, from the stage of hearing about it.
- What are the factors, which helped you to lead the process of introducing the process to school?
- What were the difficulties you encountered?
- How did you overcome these difficulties?
- What was the contribution of the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate” process to the transformation of the school culture?
- What are the advantages, which you as a principal, think have been the result of this working process?
Appendix No. 5

The distribution of schools participating in the study

Figure 4.A - Distribution of schools according to geographical districts

Figure 4.A illustrates that, in the present study, the distribution of schools according to districts does not represent the distribution of schools in Israel. While schools in the centre district constitute only 21% of the overall number of schools in Israel, they constituted 60% of the schools in the present study. This finding was in compliance with the distribution of principals who had chosen to join the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate” intervention process, as shown by the self-completion questionnaire’s findings (Appendix No. 1, Table No. 3). This can be explained by the key principle of the programme, which is based on the principal’s voluntary choice rather than on an external directive of the establishment. However, this finding has
another meaning, which was analyzed in the External Support section. Moreover, it should be mentioned that the Haifa district is not represented in the present study because all the schools in this district, which participated in the programme, were primary schools.

Figure 4.B – Distribution of schools according to sectors

The distribution of schools according to sectors illustrates that 74% of the schools who participated in the study belong to the secular sector and 13% belong to the religious sector. This distribution represents the population in Israel and is in compliance with the self-completion questionnaire's findings (Appendix No. 1, No. 2). However, the rural schools had a larger representation in the present study, 13% as compared to 5.5% in the initial phase. Moreover, it should be indicated once more that the Arab sector was not represented in the present study due to the political situation in Israel.
Figure 4.C – Distribution of schools according to organizational structure

The distribution of schools according to organizational structure represents their distribution in the population, where about 2/3 of the high schools are independent junior high schools. However, this finding does not comply with the distribution of schools as compared to the self-completion questionnaire findings, since the latter was conducted among the entire school population, whereas the present study was conducted among high schools only.
Figure 4.D illustrates that about 50% of the schools participating in the study are average in size. This finding was in compliance with the distribution of schools according to structure, since the junior high schools, which constitute 60% of the research population, are of that size. Nevertheless, it should be mentioned that although the 6-year schools are the educational frameworks with the highest number of students, the number of their students is also related to the demographic situation in the district. Hence, two 6-year schools in the present study were average in size.

The above four figures show that most of the research population manages secular junior high schools from the central district.

The following table presents the profile of the principals who participated in the present study.
Appendix No. 6

The distribution of the principals participating in the study

participating in the study

Figure 4.E – Distribution of the principals’ seniority of principalship

The distribution of the principals’ seniority of principalship shows that most of the principals are new in their job. 80% of them have been in a principalship position for less than 12 years. 40% of them are in their first five years of management and only about 7% have been in this position for more than 21 years. This finding is in compliance with the distribution of all the principals who participated in the “Preventing Violence and Creating Safe Climate” intervention process as shown by the self-completion questionnaire findings (Appendix No. 1, Table No. 4).
The distribution of the principals' seniority in managing the current school shows that 93% of the principals have managed their school for less than 12 years, whereas in the self-completion questionnaire findings, about 80% of the principals have managed their school for less than 12 years. Out of them, 53% have managed the current school for only 5 years. Moreover, the findings show that, while in the present study only 7% of the principals have managed their school for up to 20 years, then in the self-completion questionnaire findings they constituted about 20% (Appendix No. 1, Table No. 5).