




How Clan Culture Impairs Functions of Instructional Leadership: The Case of Israel

Haim Shaked 

ABSTRACT

Clan culture is a family-like work environment with strong bonds of loyalty and close relationships. The current study seeks to understand how this organizational culture, prevalent in the Israeli education system, influences instructional leadership implementation. Participants of this qualitative study were 36 Israeli school principals. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews. Findings identified three functions of instructional leadership that were weakened when Israeli principals were influenced by clan culture: *supervising and evaluating instruction*, *protecting instructional time*, and *providing teachers incentives*. This study fills a gap by exploring educational leadership's application in different societies through the prism of the national context.

The national context influences school leadership in many ways (Hallinger, 2018a; Miller, 2018). Not only does the institutional aspect of the national context shape the official job definition and responsibilities of principals through laws, policies, and qualification requirements (e.g., Grinshtain & Gibton, 2018; Hallinger & Walker, 2015), but also the socio-cultural aspect of the national context shapes principals' behavior through a complex network of values and perceptions internalized through training and socialization processes (Benoliel & Barth, 2017; Crow, 2007). Both superiors and subordinates unconsciously judge a principal's leadership's effectiveness by the degree to which observable practices conform to national expectations and norms of desirable role behavior (Benoliel & Berkovich, 2018; Hallinger & Truong, 2014).

Because school leadership is context-dependent (Hallinger, 2018a; Miller, 2018), its conceptual frameworks are interpreted and applied in various modes in different countries. For example, an examination of instructional and transformational leadership in a sample of Norwegian principals showed that the taxonomy of these two conceptual models of school leadership roles, which were developed in the United States, could not be replicated, implying that school leadership was different in Nordic countries in comparison to the United States (Aas & Brandmo, 2016). In a second example, a recent study that analyzed an international survey found that while worldwide there are three types of schools in the context of the leadership for learning framework, the United States has only two of these three types, which casts doubt on the effectiveness of using US-based research on leadership for learning for policy, training, and practice around the globe (Bowers, 2020).

Although these two studies, as well as other studies, show that the national context molds educational leadership, the research literature on educational leadership often ignores or minimizes contextual influences, exploring 'what works' rather than 'what works in a specific context' (Clarke & O'Donoghue, 2017). The national context's effects were insufficiently explored regarding school leadership in general and instructional leadership in particular (Hallinger, 2018a). Although instructional leadership as a critical feature in the role of school principals is currently being investigated and

implemented in many countries worldwide (Bush, 2013; Hallinger, 2018b), we still do not know enough about how the application of instructional leadership is altered and shaped by the values, beliefs, and norms that comprise different national contexts (Miller, 2018).

By exploring the implementation of instructional leadership in the Israeli context, this study joins other important recent attempts to reveal what happens when generic frameworks of instructional leadership encounter diverse national contexts' needs and constraints (e.g., Ng et al., 2015; Qian et al., 2017). Particularly, Israeli schools are characterized by the type of organizational culture known by Cameron and Quinn (2011) as *a clan culture*, which views the organization as an extended family, held together by loyalty, commitment, and lasting interpersonal relationships (Shaked, 2019; Katriel, 1991; Shapira-Lishchinsky, 2009). This study explores how the clan culture, which is a national norm in the Israeli school system, influences the application of instructional leadership. To establish the basis for this, the following background section conceptualizes instructional leadership as task-oriented leadership and presents clan culture and its potential inhibiting influence on the application of instructional leadership. Because this study was conducted in a specific context, the research context is then presented. Next, the method section describes this study's sample, how information was gathered, and analytical strategies. The subsequent findings section identifies the functions of instructional leadership that were weakened when Israeli principals were influenced by clan culture. Finally, the discussion section delves into the meaning and relevance of the findings.

Theoretical background

Instructional leadership as task-oriented leadership

Instructional leadership is the extensive and direct involvement of principals in curricular and instructional issues so that students achieve academic success (Glanz, 2005; Neumerski et al., 2018). The conceptual framework of instructional leadership presented by Hallinger and Murphy (1985), which is the most common in research (Hallinger & Wang, 2015), consists of three dimensions that include ten instructional leadership functions: *A. Defining the school mission* – refers to the responsibility for ensuring a clear mission, focusing on the academic progress of all students, and for sharing this mission with the school community. This dimension is made up of two functions: (1) framing the school's goals and (2) communicating the school's goals. *B. Managing the instructional program* – refers to the responsibility for regulating and controlling the academic program in the school. This dimension comprises three functions: (3) coordinating curriculum, (4) supervising and evaluating instruction, and (5) monitoring student progress. *C. Developing a positive school learning climate* – refers to the responsibility for creating a culture of ongoing improvement and high standards and expectations for both students and teachers. This dimension is broken down into five functions: (6) protecting instructional time, (7) providing incentives for teachers, (8) providing incentives for learning, (9) promoting professional development, and (10) maintaining high visibility.

This widely utilized framework portrays instructional leadership as task-oriented, rather than relationship-oriented, leadership. Task-oriented leadership focuses on the work that needs to be carried out to meet specific goals, while relationship-oriented leadership focuses on supporting team members and ensuring their job satisfaction (Ayman & Lauritsen, 2018; Miner, 2015). Hallinger and Murphy (1985) conceptual framework of instructional leadership does not give a central place to building strong, close relationships. Instead, it emphasizes aspects of authority and control, such as supervision, evaluation, and monitoring, and therefore it is “a directive and top-down approach to school leadership” (Hallinger, 2003, p. 337). Indeed, in a broad literature review, Stronge and his colleagues (2008) listed among the core areas of instructional leadership some functions that may be seen as relationship-oriented, such as sharing leadership and leading a learning community. However, instructional leadership's main components are still setting direction, making data-based decisions, and monitoring instruction, which reflect task-oriented leadership.

The task-oriented nature of instructional leadership is probably why it leads to positive school outcomes, including higher teaching quality and improved student achievements, as many studies have shown (e.g., Glickman et al., 2017; Goddard et al., 2010; Jacobson, 2011; Quinn, 2002). For this reason, researchers and practitioners alike have long asserted that principals should demonstrate instructional leadership in their schools (Bush, 2013; Hallinger, 2018b). At the same time, the task-oriented nature of instructional leadership may also play a role in understanding how national norms serve as an inhibitor of instructional leadership.

The research literature identified several inhibitors of instructional leadership (Goldring et al., 2015, 2008; Prytula et al., 2013), which can be classified into three types. The first type involves constraints and inabilities of school principals. For example, lack of time for principals to engage directly in improving teaching and learning (Camburn et al., 2010; Goldring et al., 2015; Murphy et al., 2016). The second type involves disagreements with the conceptual framework that underpins instructional leadership. For example, principals' perception that schools' primary task is not to ensure students' learning and academic success (instructional leadership's basic assumption), but rather to meet students' emotional needs, impart moral values, and support their social integration (Shaked, 2018). The third type involves norms that push principals away from instructional leadership. For example, norms that see instruction as a domain of teachers alone, deterring principals from encroaching on teachers' territory (Cuban 1988; Goldring et al., 2015).

Norms that inhibit instructional leadership often depend on the national context (Shaked et al., 2021). The current study seeks to explore such a national norm, which serves as an inhibiting factor of instructional leadership because of the task-oriented nature of this leadership approach. Specifically, this study investigates the inhibiting influence of the prevailing clan culture in Israeli schools. As a culture that emphasizes employees' autonomy and well-being, this culture may inhibit a task-oriented leadership such as instructional leadership. The characteristics of clan culture are presented in the next section.

Characteristics of clan culture

Cameron and Quinn (2011) presented an organizational culture typology based on a dual-axis model. The vertical axis examines whether an organization is more focused on stability or flexibility. The horizontal axis examines whether the organization looks more outward or inward. The way organizations prioritize these competing values determines the types of cultures that emerge within them. Thus, the model is called a *competing values framework*. The two axes of the model create four types of cultures: market (stability/outward), hierarchy (stability/inward), adhocracy (flexibility/outward), and clan (flexibility/inward) (Helfrich et al., 2007; Yu & Wu, 2009).

Under the market culture, organizations are very aware of their market position and are determined to improve it. Such competitive organizations are results-based workplaces that are built upon the dynamics of competition. Under the hierarchy culture, organizations prefer control, formal rules, and a structured working environment, in which procedures determine what the people do. Maintaining a smooth-running organization is of utmost importance. Under the adhocracy culture, organizations prefer innovation and risk-taking to meet external expectations as fast as possible. These organizations are dynamic and entrepreneurial, continually creating new products (Gulosino et al., 2017; Hartnell et al., 2011).

Under the clan culture, which is the focal area of this study, the organization is a very personal place. Organization members share commonalities and see themselves as part of one big, cohesive family. A sense of "we-ness" is the "glue" that holds clan-type organizations together, and the theory of effectiveness is based on human empowerment and participation (Brewer & Venaik, 2010; Heritage et al., 2014). In clan cultures, leaders are seen as mentors and team builders, and perhaps even parent figures. All employees are equal, taking part in decision-making processes. Teamwork, collaboration, and consensus are of paramount importance.

The clan culture is focused on flexibility rather than stability (the vertical axis of Cameron & Quinn's model). Therefore, rules and regulations are of secondary importance. Leaving room for discretion is more important than adherence to procedures, and a favorable climate and concern for people are more important than control and supervision. At the same time, the clan culture looks inward more than outward (the horizontal axis of Cameron & Quinn's model). Therefore, the work atmosphere is pleasant for employees, but there is not always a commitment to providing optimal service to customers.

Critics of clan cultures claim that it can reduce effectiveness if employees use tolerance to relax rather than contribute to shared goals. Similarly, freedom and autonomy may be used to do nothing useful or even deal with private matters at the expense of working time (Hartnell et al., 2011). It may also be problematic when team members disagree on an important issue. Finally, without a strong authority figure, useful ideas that can advance the organization may be abandoned simply because they do not get a majority vote (Büschgens et al., 2013).

Although the competing values framework of Cameron and Quinn (2011) is situated within the business context, which may differ from the educational context, several pieces of research applied it in schools as well. For example, Shapira-Lishchinsky (2009) sought to identify the relationships between the types of culture included in the competing values framework and mentoring styles and the effect of these relationships on mentoring effectiveness. Contrary to the expected outcome, the "match" between the type of culture and the mentoring style had no impact on mentoring effectiveness. More recently, Gulosino et al. (2017) found a significant positive relationship between a balanced profile of the competing values and teacher satisfaction. Since leaders of clan organizations are viewed as part of the clan, the clan culture seems to contradict instructional leadership. Clan culture leaders focus on nurturing and facilitating, pay a lot of attention to team members' satisfaction and general well-being, and encourage participation and involvement of all employees (Gulosino et al., 2017; Heritage et al., 2014). On the other hand, instructional leaders engage mainly in coordinating and controlling teachers' work, concentrate on getting things done and bottom-line results, and may "reduce opportunities for exercising voice among others" (Hallinger, 2003, p. 340).

Insofar as research suggests that the school's organizational culture influences the principal's instructional leadership (Liu et al., 2020; Sahin, 2011), the clan culture may keep principals away from instructional leadership. Under the clan culture, principals may resist taking actions that may place them at odds with their clan, unwilling to push teachers to improve. Accordingly, the current study seeks to answer the following research question: How does the clan culture, which is a national norm in the Israeli school system (Shaked, 2019; Katriel, 1991; Shapira-Lishchinsky, 2009), influence the application of instructional leadership?

Research contexts

The current study explored the Israeli national school system, which serves about 1.8 million students attending about 5,000 schools (Israeli Ministry of Education, 2020). The student population in Israel has grown by about 44% in the last two decades (an increase of about 2% per year), which is unusual compared to other developed countries (Blass, 2018). The achievement scores of Israeli students in the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) tests are lower than the OECD average in all areas examined. However, Israel is among the countries whose results have improved significantly throughout the PISA cycles. The vast achievement gaps in the Israeli school system have hardly diminished over the years (OECD, 2016). These gaps are closely linked to socioeconomic inequalities (BenDavid-Hadar, 2016), and therefore may be seen as a social justice issue. While many countries have implemented test-based accountability policies in recent decades, Israel has not adopted such an approach. Although there is a wide range of large-scale examinations, surveys, and polls that assess students' success rates across Israel in critical subjects, the assessments are not used to decide about principal or teacher employment or rewards and resource allocation. Results are only partially communicated to parents and the general public (Grinshtain & Gibton, 2018).

Capstones, the institute responsible for training school principals in Israel, stated that Israeli school principals' fundamental role is to serve as instructional leaders to improve all students' education and learning. Four educational areas comprise the Israeli framework for instructional leadership: designing the school's future image – developing a vision and bringing about change; leading the staff and ensuring its professional development; focusing on the individual; and managing the relationship between the school and the surrounding community (Capstones – The Israeli Institute for School Leadership, 2008). The perception of the principal's role in Israel still reflects the “principal-centered” instructional leadership model and not the distributed instructional leadership approach.

While instructional leadership emerged in the United States over half a century ago (Bridges, 1967) and has since received much attention there from scholars and practitioners alike, it has only spread to other parts of the globe since the beginning of the 21st century (Hallinger, 2018b). Therefore, the import of the instructional leadership concept into the Israeli education system may be seen as policy borrowing, which refers to a deliberate attempt to improve an educational system by introducing a policy that originated in a different national context (Nir et al., 2018; Steiner-Khamsi, 2016). Policy borrowing reduces the need to start from the beginning when facing similar challenges, reduces application-related uncertainty, and reduces resistance to change (Ng et al., 2015). However, policy borrowing can also introduce unforeseen problems resulting from differences in socio-cultural values and institutional policy frameworks between the originating and receiving societies (Pan et al., 2017; Qian et al., 2017).

Policy-driven efforts to reorientate Israeli principals around a new framework of instructional leadership have yielded mixed results. Recent studies have suggested that school principals in Israel demonstrate only limited instructional leadership involvement (Glanzet et al., 2017; Shaked et al., 2021). They do not consider themselves fully committed to the borrowed instructional leadership policy. Instead, they continue to interpret their leadership role in more diverse ways (Shaked, 2018, 2019). Although in other countries there are principals who also refrain from taking on the mantle of instructional leadership in schools, the reasons for this probably vary from country to country depending on the context (Goldring et al., 2015, 2008; Murphy et al., 2016). A recent study (Shaked et al., 2021) suggested that three socio-cultural forces had an impact on the implementation of instructional leadership in the Israeli school system: low power distance, which refers to the extent to which the least influential members of institutions and organizations in the country accept that power is unevenly distributed; incomplete identification with the academic goal of schooling; and clan culture. The current study seeks to understand how clan culture influences the implementation of instructional leadership by Israeli principals.

Method

Qualitative methods are necessary when a phenomenon is not well defined and the available knowledge about it is limited (Taylor et al., 2016). Therefore, the present study was qualitative to provide a detailed description of clan culture influences on instructional leadership practices. Specifically, this study was interview research. Interviews are widely held to be a fundamentally useful way to understand informants' beliefs, experiences, and worlds because they provide unique access to the lived world of study participants, who in their own words describe their activities and opinions (Mann, 2016; Rossman & Rallis, 2017).

Participants

The purpose of sampling in this study was that the sample would be similar to the principals' population in Israel. Among Israeli principals, 67% are women and 33% are men. They have an average of 11 years of school principalship, and their average age is 50. As for their education, 65% hold a master's degree or higher, 35% hold a bachelor's degree, and 8% of principals do not have a college degree. Regarding the school level, 39% work in middle and high schools, while 61% of principals work in elementary schools (Capstones – The Israeli Institute for School Leadership, 2012).

To build the study sample, the author's colleagues and students were asked to recommend possible participants. Four participants recommended other participants from among their acquaintances. However, the principals recommended for participation in the study were included only if their participation matched the larger population characteristics in terms of gender, age, years of principalship experience, education, and school level. Accordingly, the current study involved 36 principals, 24 females and 12 males. Participants had 2 to 24 years of principalship experience ($M = 10.64$). They were between 31 and 62 years old ($M = 48.92$). One principal had no academic degree, ten principals held a bachelor's degree, 23 principals held a master's degree, and two principals held a Ph.D. They worked in elementary schools ($n = 21$), middle schools ($n = 5$), and high schools ($n = 10$), in all six Israeli school districts (each comprising about 850 schools). [Table 1](#) presents the information of the study participants.

Data collection

The author collected the data from April to July 2020 through semi-structured interviews. Although the interviews were conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, it seemed at the time that the pandemic was over within about two months. Thus the interviewees rarely mentioned the pandemic, which later turned out to be more prolonged and comprehensive. While an interview protocol was prepared in advance, the interviews also included questions that arose from previous responses. As principals, most interviewees spoke freely and fluently, so the interviews flowed like conversations, or

Table 1. Study participants' demographic information.

	Pseudonym	Sex	Principalship Experience	Age	School Level	Education
1	Albert	Male	11	41	Elementary	MA
2	Anne	Female	12	49	Elementary	BA
3	Barbara	Female	7	44	Elementary	MA
4	Bruce	Male	13	46	High	MA
5	Carl	Male	14	52	High	MA
6	Cynthia	Female	4	50	High	MA
7	Dale	Male	12	46	Elementary	BA
8	Danny	Male	3	56	Elementary	MA
9	David	Male	13	49	High	MA
10	Donna	Female	16	50	Elementary	BA
11	Doris	Female	19	62	High	BA
12	Dorothy	Female	11	46	Elementary	MA
13	Douglas	Male	9	51	Elementary	BA
14	Elizabeth	Female	24	60	Elementary	BA
15	Esther	Female	19	57	Elementary	BA
16	Gary	Male	12	55	Middle	BA
17	George	Male	5	46	Middle	MA
18	Gloria	Female	16	51	Elementary	MA
19	Jacob	Male	2	31	High	PhD
20	Karen	Female	8	41	Elementary	MA
21	Kathleen	Female	8	43	High	MA
22	Kathryn	Female	21	51	Elementary	-
23	Kelly	Female	11	46	High	MA
24	Lisa	Female	10	48	Elementary	MA
25	Marilyn	Female	9	46	Middle	MA
26	Margaret	Female	6	52	High	PhD
27	Mary	Female	6	53	Elementary	MA
28	Pamela	Female	4	51	Middle	MA
29	Paul	Male	6	42	Elementary	MA
30	Phyllis	Female	5	46	Elementary	MA
31	Rachel	Female	9	53	Elementary	MA
32	Sarah	Female	14	48	High	BA
33	Sharon	Female	9	47	Middle	MA
34	Susan	Female	18	54	Elementary	BA
35	Tammy	Female	8	52	Elementary	MA
36	William	Male	9	46	Elementary	MA

even monologues, rather than a sequence of questions and answers. For ethical reasons, all participants were informed at the beginning of the interview that they could leave the study at any point (no one chose to leave). They were promised confidentiality and were asked to provide written consent based on an understanding of the study's purpose.

Although the interviews were intended to explore the influence of the clan culture on the application of instructional leadership, the author deliberately refrained from mentioning the terms “clan culture” and “instructional leadership” so as not to direct participants to frame their answers using this framework. In writing the interview protocol, open-ended questions were used to get descriptive answers, using language that participants can easily understand and keeping questions positive and as short as possible. The interview protocol, which was based on protocols used in the author's previous studies (Shaked, 2018, 2019; Shaked et al., 2021), is provided in Appendix A.

Most of the interviewees easily made themselves available to meet with the author, mainly when they heard that he also was a school principal rather than a “disconnected researcher,” as one of them said. The author tried to come to interviews with deliberate naiveté, which means to “exhibit openness to new and unexpected phenomena, rather than having readymade categories and schemes of interpretation” (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 28). The interviews, which usually lasted an hour, were recorded on audio for later transcription. To clarify questions that arose during the review of the interview transcripts, four follow-up interviews were conducted.

Data analysis

Data analysis, conducted by the author, was a three-stage process – sorting, coding, and categorizing. Not all the data collected could serve the purpose of the study, so the first stage – sorting – was designed to look for the relevant statements, which might represent influences of clan culture on instructional leadership implementation. In the second stage – coding –, each data segment (statement) was coded according to its meaning. Codes representing ideas or concepts were developed as the transcripts were read and connected to each statement. After capturing the essence of the statements in the second stage, in the third stage – categorizing – similar utterances were assembled into clusters to generalize their meanings. This stage was theory-driven as the ten functions of instructional leadership, presented by Hallinger and Murphy (1985), were optional categories. The member check method (Koelsch, 2013) was used. The findings were sent to all interviewees, who were asked to check both accuracy and interpretation. Six interviewees submitted their comments.

Findings

Clan culture is a very friendly working environment, in which people have a lot in common with each other and which to no small extent resembles a big family. The current study explored how this organizational culture, prevalent in the Israeli school system, impacted principals' instructional leadership implementation. Qualitative data analysis identified three functions of instructional leadership that were weakened when Israeli principals were influenced by clan culture: *supervising and evaluating instruction*, *protecting instructional time*, and *providing teachers incentives*. The other seven functions of instructional leadership were not significantly weakened. The findings are presented below, supported by quotations taken from interviews with study participants.

Supervising and evaluating instruction

The first function of instructional leadership hindered by clan culture was supervising and evaluating instruction. This function entails supporting teachers in putting the school's instructional goals into practice, developing their thinking about their instructional decisions, directing them to weak areas in their teaching and helping them to improve, monitoring the extent of curricula implementation, etc. The influence of clan culture on this function was found in 14 interviews.

While classroom observations are a valuable means of supervising the quality of teaching, Israeli principals who were influenced by clan culture rarely observed classes so that they would not have to criticize the teachers' practice. When they were required to use impressions from classroom observations to evaluate teachers who were candidates for tenure or promotion to higher ranks, they did not utilize this process to improve teaching quality, but instead they gave higher ratings than what they thought these teachers deserved. Lisa, an elementary school principal with ten years of principalship experience, explicitly compared her school to a warm family: "Our school is like one big family." From her perspective, the family-like ambiance did not allow for tough teacher evaluation: "If I were to make teacher evaluation like I was asked to do, it might heavily change our family-like atmosphere."

Low performance in national achievement tests was not a sufficient reason to criticize teachers. Albert, an elementary school principal with 11 years of principalship experience, asserted: "Failure of an entire class indicates a problem but does not always mean that the teacher is not good enough. Some students have difficulty passing exams, while others do not have enough motivation." He concluded: "Criticism of teachers for student failure is not the right way to improve their work." Pamela, a middle school principal with four years of principalship experience, claimed that the perception of teachers as responsible for students' outcomes has negative consequences: "Blaming teachers for students' poor performance does not lead to a further effort by teachers or to improving their teaching methods. It leads to cheating, narrowing the curriculum to emphasize test content, and teaching directly for the test."

Even when it came to consistently ineffective teachers, principals saw them as part of the family, and therefore took an inclusive approach and did not push for dismissal. Margaret, a high school principal with six years of principalship experience, did not want to hurt teachers' livelihood: "No school wants unprofessional teachers, but a teacher is also a breadwinner. So I will try to improve the weak teacher's methods, but I will not fire them." By retaining poorly performing teachers because of the economic harm it would cause them, principals agreed to lower the school's quality of teaching. Elizabeth, an elementary school principal with 24 years of principalship experience, emphasized the costs of the lengthy process required to fire a tenured teacher on the organizational climate: "The process of firing a tenured teacher requires years of quarreling, during which the atmosphere in the staff room becomes unpleasant. I have only a few bad teachers. I would rather leave them than cloud the atmosphere for years."

Protecting instructional time

The second function of instructional leadership impaired by clan culture was protecting instructional time. This function focuses on the principal's actions to ensure that the precious resource of instructional time is not lost. To this end, instructional leaders make sure that teachers are punctual, employ classroom management strategies that allow maximum utilization of teaching time, do not suffer from distractions from the school office, and alike. The influence of clan culture on this function was found in nine interviews.

Under clan culture, principals often saw teacher absenteeism as an acceptable phenomenon and an inherent part of school life and made only limited efforts to reduce its scope. They claimed that teachers made every possible attempt to attend: "When a teacher takes sick days, I have no reason to put pressure on her because I'm sure she has a good reason for it" (George, a middle school principal with five years of principalship experience). They did not make any difficulties for teachers who wanted to be absent: "If a teacher informs us that she is ill, we wish her a speedy recovery, and that's all. Teachers have a right to take care of themselves" (Anne, an elementary school principal with 12 years of principalship experience). They sometimes even encouraged teachers to go home: "I saw that one of my teachers was not feeling well, so I made her go home, knowing that I'd have to find a last-minute substitute" (Kathleen, a high school principal with eight years of principalship experience).

Influenced by clan culture, principals also showed leniency when teachers were late for school or late for class after the break. For them, arriving on time is just one of the many qualities of a good teacher: “One of my teachers is consistently late. It is not uncommon for him to appear 15, 20 and even 30 minutes late. But he also has many merits. So why should I just look at his lateness?” (David, a high school principal with 13 years of principalship experience). Similarly, they did not protect the time set aside for teachers’ professional development, turning a blind eye to late arrival and even the absence of teachers from professional development meetings.

To not burden the teachers, principals who acted in accordance with clan culture allowed teachers to attend meetings with parents or teacher meetings at the expense of lessons they had to teach. When a solution had to be found for the class, they only wanted to keep the students quiet and safe and did not consider the loss of teaching and learning. Moreover, principals influenced by clan culture did not make sure that the teachers used instructional time properly. They did not require them to plan their lessons so that the students would learn more during the instructional time or ensure the teaching and learning processes would help the students be actively involved during instructional time. In the final weeks of the school year, they allowed teachers to screen films instead of teaching.

Providing incentives for teachers

The third function of instructional leadership impeded by clan culture was *providing incentives for teachers*. This function pertains to the quality and consistency of the recognition and appreciation a principal gives teachers for their teaching quality and student success. The more significant the praise is given, the more motivated teachers are to improve teaching and learning. The influence of clan culture on this function was found in seven interviews.

When clan culture influenced principals, they believed that giving teachers incentives might arouse envy among teachers and undermine the family atmosphere. Barbara, an elementary school principal with seven years of principalship experience, considered awarding prizes to teachers who were least absent during the school year. However, the senior management team recommended her not to do so, as “placing one teacher at the top may make other people resentful, so while making one teacher happy, you make others miserable.” Similarly, Jacob, a high school principal with two years of principalship experience, said: “The educational network to which our school belongs gives a free vacation each year to one of the teachers, in appreciation of their educational work. I am against this initiative because it only provokes controversy among the teaching staff.”

The principals who were influenced by clan culture not only failed to give incentives for teachers whose practices were above the standard expected, but they were also forgiving or merciful, rather than strict or tough, when teachers’ practices were below or contrary to the standards expected. For example, they did not respond harshly to noncompliance with deadlines. Although delays diminish the effectiveness of teaching work, these principals forgave teachers who did not submit annual planning, achievement mapping, or period marks by the set date. They accepted late submission as normative behavior: “I take into account in advance that teachers will not submit grades on time, so I set an early deadline” (Esther, an elementary school principal with 19 years of principalship experience). “Some teachers meet deadlines, but others do not. There’s nothing to do” (Dorothy, an elementary school principal with 11 years of principalship experience). “I remind them over and over again to submit the mappings, but there are some who will not submit at all” (Rachel, an elementary school principal with nine years of principalship experience).

Providing incentives for teachers expresses prioritization for quality teaching that directly affects student learning and results. In contrast, under clan culture, principals gave primary importance to maintaining positive relationships among the teaching staff. Thus, they did not celebrate academic achievements but rather arranged events designed to strengthen their team’s cohesion. Birthdays and other social gatherings were prominent features in their schools. Teachers internalized this message, and therefore saw interpersonal relationships, rather than educational work, as their primary purpose when they came to school. They came mainly to meet their close friends on the teaching staff, and not

necessarily their students. The most enjoyable time at school was the time they spent with their colleagues, and getting out of the teachers' room into the classroom was a moment worth postponing for as long as possible.

Discussion

This study aimed to inquire into the effects of Israeli schools' prevailing clan culture on how Israeli principals' practiced instructional leadership. While the qualitative methods utilized in this study offer insights on this topic, this study has several limitations. First, the limited number of study participants is insufficient to generalize the findings to all Israeli principals. Second, the data were collected at a particular point in time. As is well known from the United States, the assimilation of instructional leadership may take many years (Hallinger & Wang, 2015). Therefore, repeated data collection over time could reveal trends of change in understanding Israeli principals' instructional leadership role. Third, as with any self-reporting method, the interview offered little control over whether participants might provide socially desirable responses. Further research using techniques such as direct observation may supplement principals' self-reports with more objective data on their instructional leadership behaviors. Interviews with middle leaders and teachers about the principal's instructional leadership may also supplement principals' self-report. Fourth, data analysis did not look for the interactions between clan culture influences on principals' instructional leadership and principals' variables (such as gender, seniority, and academic degree) and schools (such as school level and socioeconomic status). Further research with a larger number of participants is required to examine these correlations.

The principles of clan culture and instructional leadership are incompatible: the clan culture emphasizes support, autonomy, and employees' well-being (Gulosino et al., 2017; Heritage et al., 2014), while instructional leadership emphasizes clear goals, control, and results (Glickman et al., 2017; Neumerski et al., 2018). According to the findings of this study, some of the barriers to the application of instructional leadership in Israel are rooted in the clan culture, which Israeli principals have no interest in changing. It could be argued that principals should try to change the culture; however, the study participants do not see the clan culture as a problem to be solved but as a way of life in the education system. Analysis of qualitative interview data identified three instructional leadership functions disrupted when Israeli principals were subject to clan culture.

The first function of instructional leadership identified as being affected by clan culture was *supervising and evaluating instruction*. Through adequate teaching supervision and evaluation, principals can strengthen and enhance teaching methods that have the potential to raise students' level of learning (Tuytens & Devos, 2017). In fact, teaching supervision and evaluation serve as a critical component in many countries' current educational policies that aim to improve their education systems (Marzano & Toth, 2013). This study found that principals who acted according to clan culture did little to fulfill supervision and evaluation roles to avoid criticizing teachers' work. They did not want to indicate the faults and flaws of teaching quality, academic performance, or test scores so as not to spoil the perceived pleasant atmosphere at school. They therefore often refrained from taking on their instructional leadership responsibilities of supervision and evaluation.

The second function of instructional leadership that was found to be impaired by clan culture was *protecting instructional time*. There is broad consensus that academic time expenditures are extremely important (Leonard, 2008). The correlation between the principal's function of *protecting instructional time* and school performance is statistically significant, which indicates that this function directly influences student achievement (Fancera & Bliss, 2011). This study's findings indicated that Israeli schools' clan culture led principals to give primary importance to maintaining positive relationships and a friendly atmosphere. Therefore, they showed leniency in cases of unjustified and unprofessional absences and tardiness. They have not made multiple efforts to improve teachers' attendance and their arrival on time, as well as maximum utilization of instructional time.

The third function of instructional leadership that this study found to be weakened by clan culture was *providing incentives for teachers*. In a broad sense, this function, through which the principal reinforces teachers' exceptional efforts for the success of their students (Gaziel, 2007), expresses the premise of instructional leadership that improving the quality of their teaching and promoting students' learning and achievements is the teachers' most important task (Neumerski et al., 2018). However, this study revealed that insofar as clan culture supports all employees' equal treatment, Israeli principals found it challenging to apply this function without prioritizing one over the other. Viewing the school as a large family, principals shied away from providing incentives for teachers because they wanted poor-performing teachers to feel good as well.

Overall, this study illustrates the need for a more nuanced exploration of instructional leadership, tailored to specific national contexts. Instructional leadership became a major role of school principals in American education system culture (Hallinger & Wang, 2015). Over the years, this leadership approach's prominence has gradually spread worldwide (Bush, 2013). However, until recently, the literature often overlooked the influences of the national context on instructional leadership. Researchers have offered very few insights into how instructional leadership is applied in and influenced by different societies' context (Clarke & O'Donoghue, 2017; Hallinger, 2018a). The findings of the current study show how a characteristic (clan culture) of a particular national context (the Israeli education system) disrupts functions of instructional leadership (*supervising and evaluating instruction, protecting instructional time, and providing incentives for teachers*).

Researchers identified deep-seated norms as barriers to instructional leadership (Goldring et al., 2015). For example, Cuban (1988) emphasized the prominent influence of organizational norms that shaped the American principalship's DNA, which gave priority to the principal's managerial/administrative role: "Embedded in the DNA of the principalship is a managerial imperative. Efforts taken by principals to act in ways that depart from this managerial or conservative orientation are likely to face overt and covert resistance from above and below, as well as inside and outside the school" (p. 37). Our findings substantiate previous claims about the power of norms, providing specific evidence for the impact of national norms that led Israeli principals into practices that went against formal expectations of their role as instructional leaders, enacting their role of instructional leadership in a way that was not consistent with prescriptions embedded in policy frameworks and training curricula.

Israel's education policy, which is based, among other things, on borrowed policies that do not always correspond to the values characterizing the national context, leads to conflicts and contradictions. Differences in school systems culture between the United States, the "birthplace" of instructional leadership, and Israel may account for differences in how principals accept instructional leadership as a vital responsibility of school leaders. Therefore, this study illustrates how borrowed policies, which do not take into account the complex characteristics of each national context, may lead to resistance, unintended outcomes, and partial implementation (Nir et al., 2018).

Highlighting the importance of the national context for understanding effective school leadership, this study joins other research initiatives conducted by consortia such as International Successful School Principalship Project (ISSPP) and International School Leadership Development Network (ISLDN), which shed light on contextual differences and advocate culturally responsive leadership (Angelle et al., 2016; Merchant et al., 2013; Tubin & Pinian-Wias, 2015). So far, however, I have not identified specific studies from these consortia that relate to and illustrate the Israeli context.

Concerning practice, this study suggests that policymakers worldwide need to consider how to mediate between instructional leadership frameworks and the values, norms, and perceptions of local national contexts. Making necessary policy adjustments may facilitate acceptance and increase the impact of instructional leadership in different contexts. For example, the Israeli school system may benefit from a version of instructional leadership with principals keeping deep involvement in improving teaching and learning but serving as coaches rather than rulers. Such instructional leadership will be based on trust and closeness, giving up the authoritative aspect of instructional leadership (Hallinger, 2003). Importantly, research is needed to determine whether instructional leadership, which maintains the priority of improving teaching and learning but does not involve monitoring and

controlling, has the desired effect. Importantly, such adjustments should be made through dialogue with a wide range of stakeholders, and in particular school principals. Furthermore, these adjustments may be discussed at various stages of school leaders' careers, such as preparation programs, mentoring programs provided to beginning principals, and professional development as principals.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

ORCID

Haim Shaked  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3998-7696>

References

- Aas, M., & Brandmo, C. (2016). Revisiting instructional and transformational leadership: The contemporary Norwegian context of school leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 54(1), 92–110. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-08-2014-0105>
- Angelle, P. S., Arlestig, H., & Norberg, K. (2016). Identifying social justice leaders: Contextual differences in US and Swedish principals. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 43(2), 19–35.
- Ayman, R., & Lauritsen, M. (2018). Contingencies, context, situation, and leadership. In J. Antonakis & D. V. Day (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 138–166). Sage.
- BenDavid-Hadar, I. (2016). School finance policy and social justice. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 46, 166–174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2015.10.003>
- Benoliel, P., & Barth, A. (2017). The implications of the school's cultural attributes in the relationships between participative leadership and teacher job satisfaction and burnout. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(6), 640–656. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-10-2016-0116>
- Benoliel, P., & Berkovich, I. (2018). A cross-national examination of the effect of the Schwartz cultural dimensions on PISA performance assessments. *Social Indicators Research*, 139(2), 825–845. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-017-1732-z>
- Blass, N. (2018). *The Israeli education system: An overview*. Taub center.
- Bowers, A. J. (2020). *Examining a congruency-typology model of leadership for learning using two-level latent class analysis with TALIS 2018*. OECD.
- Brewer, P., & Venaik, S. (2010). GLOBE practices and values: A case of diminishing marginal utility? *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41(8), 1316–1324. <https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2010.23>
- Bridges, E. M. (1967). Instructional leadership: A concept re-examined. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 5(2), 136–147. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb009614>
- Büschgens, T., Bausch, A., & Balkin, D. B. (2013). Organizational culture and innovation: A meta-analytic review. *The Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 30(4), 763–781. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12021>
- Bush, T. (2013). Instructional leadership and leadership for learning: Global and South African perspectives. *Education as Change*, 17(sup1), S5–S20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16823206.2014.865986>
- Camburn, E., Spillane, J., & Sebastian, J. (2010). Assessing the utility of a daily log for measuring principal leadership practice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(5), 707–737. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X10377345>
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2011). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Capstones – The Israeli Institute for School Leadership. (2008). *Perception of the principal's role in the state of Israel: Report by the professional committee to formulate policy recommendations for the Ministry of Education*. Avney Rosha.
- Capstones – The Israeli Institute for School Leadership. (2012). *School principals as seen in the data*. Avney Rosha.
- Clarke, S., & O'Donoghue, T. (2017). Educational leadership and context: A rendering of an inseparable relationship. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 65(2), 167–182. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2016.1199772>
- Crow, G. M. (2007). The professional and organizational socialization of new English headteachers in school reform contexts. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 35(1), 51–71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143207071385>
- Cuban, L. (1988). *Managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools*. SUNY.
- Fancera, S. F., & Bliss, J. R. (2011). Instructional leadership influence on collective teacher efficacy to improve school achievement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 10(3), 349–370. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2011.585537>
- Gaziel, H. H. (2007). Re-examining the relationship between principal's instructional/educational leadership and student achievement. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 15(1), 17–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09718923.2007.11892557>

- Glanz, J. (2005). *What every principal should know about instructional leadership*. Corwin.
- Glanz, J., Shaked, H., Rabinowitz, C., Shenhav, S., & Zaretsky, R. (2017). Instructional leadership practices among principals in Israeli and USA Jewish schools. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 26(2), 132–153.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2017). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (10th ed.). Pearson.
- Goddard, Y. L., Neumerski, C. M., Goddard, R. D., Salloum, S. J., & Berebitsky, D. (2010). A multilevel exploratory study of the relationship between teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional support and group norms for instruction in elementary schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 111(2), 336–357. <https://doi.org/10.1086/656303>
- Goldring, E., Grissom, J. A., Neumerski, C. M., Murphy, J., Blissett, R., & Porter, A. (2015). *Making time for instructional leadership*. Wallace Foundation. <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/Pages/Making-Time-for-Instructional-Leadership.aspx>
- Goldring, E., Huff, J., May, H., & Camburn, E. (2008). School context and individual characteristics: What influences principal practice? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(3), 332–352. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230810869275>
- Grinshtain, Y., & Gibton, D. (2018). Responsibility, authority, and accountability in school-based and non-school-based management: Principals' coping strategies. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 56(1), 2–17. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-01-2017-0005>
- Gulosino, C. A., Jones, L., & Franceschini, L. (2017). Using the competing values framework (CVF) to examine teacher satisfaction in Tennessee schools. *Planning and Changing*, 47(3/4), 141.
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), 329–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764032000122005>
- Hallinger, P. (2018a). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(1), 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143216670652>
- Hallinger, P. (2018b). Principal instructional leadership: From prescription to theory to practice. In G. E. Hall, L. F. Quinn, & D. M. Gollnick (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook of teaching and learning* (pp. 505–528). Wiley Blackwell.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–247. <https://doi.org/10.1086/461445>
- Hallinger, P., & Truong, D. T. (2014). Exploring the contours of context and leadership effectiveness in Vietnam. *Leading and Managing*, 20(2), 43–59. <https://search.informit.org/doi/abs/10.3316/aeipt.206324>
- Hallinger, P., & Walker, A. (2015). A synthesis of reviews of research on principal leadership in East Asia. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 53(4), 554–570. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-05-2015-0039>
- Hallinger, P., & Wang, W. C. (2015). *Assessing instructional leadership with the principal instructional management rating scale*. Springer.
- Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A. Y., & Kinicki, A. (2011). Organizational culture and organizational effectiveness: A meta-analytic investigation of the competing values framework's theoretical suppositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(4), 677. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021987>
- Helfrich, C. D., Li, Y. F., Mohr, D. C., Meterko, M., & Sales, A. E. (2007). Assessing an organizational culture instrument based on the competing values framework: Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses. *Implementation Science*, 2(1), 13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-2-13>
- Heritage, B., Pollock, C., & Roberts, L. (2014). Validation of the organizational culture assessment instrument. *PLoS ONE*, 9(3), e92879. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0092879>
- Israeli Ministry of Education. (2020). *Transparency in education* (Hebrew). <https://shkifut.education.gov.il/>
- Jacobson, S. (2011). Leadership effects on student achievement and sustained school success. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 25(1), 33–44. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513541111100107>
- Katriel, T. (1991). *Communal webs: Communication and culture in contemporary Israel*. The State University of New York.
- Koelsch, L. E. (2013). Reconceptualizing the member check interview. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 12(1), 168–179. <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940691301200105>
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Leonard, L. (2008). Preserving the learning environment: Leadership for time. *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning*, 12(16), n16. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ940604>
- Liu, Y., Bellibaş, M. Ş., & Gümüş, S. (2020). The effect of instructional leadership and distributed leadership on teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Mediating roles of supportive school culture and teacher collaboration. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(3), 430–453. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220910438>
- Mann, S. (2016). *The research interview: Reflective practice and reflexivity in research processes*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marzano, R. J., & Toth, M. D. (2013). *Teacher evaluation that makes a difference: A new model for teacher growth and student achievement*. ASCD.
- Merchant, B., Garza, E., & Murakami Ramalho, E. (2013). Culturally responsive leadership: Laura Martinez' journey as a principal. In D. Gurr & C. Day (Eds.), *Leading schools* (pp. 174–183). Routledge.
- Miller, P. W. (2018). *The nature of school leadership: Global practice perspectives*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Miner, J. B. (2015). *Organizational Behavior I*. Routledge.

- Murphy, J., Neumerski, C. M., Goldring, E., Grissom, J., & Porter, A. (2016). Bottling fog? The quest for instructional management. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 46(4), 455–471. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2015.1064096>
- Neumerski, C. M., Grissom, J. A., Goldring, E., Rubin, M., Cannata, M., Schuermann, P., & Drake, T. A. (2018). Restructuring instructional leadership: How multiple-measure teacher evaluation systems are redefining the role of the school principal. *The Elementary School Journal*, 119(2), 270–297. <https://doi.org/10.1086/700597>
- Ng, F. S. D., Nguyen, T. D., Wong, K. S. B., & Choy, K. W. W. (2015). Instructional leadership practices in Singapore. *School Leadership & Management*, 35(4), 388–407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2015.1010501>
- Nir, A. E., Kondakci, Y., & Emil, S. (2018). Traveling policies and contextual considerations: On threshold criteria. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 48(1), 21–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2017.1281102>
- OECD. (2016). *PISA 2015 results (Volume 1): Excellence and equity in education*.
- Pan, H. L. W., Nyeu, F. Y., & Cheng, S. H. (2017). Leading school for learning: Principal practices in Taiwan. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(2), 168–185. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-06-2016-0069>
- Prytula, M., Noonan, B., & Hellsten, L. (2013). Toward instructional leadership: Principals perceptions of large-scale assessment in schools. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 140, 1–30. <https://cjc-rcc.ualgary.ca/index.php/cjeap/article/view/42840>
- Qian, H., Walker, A., & Li, X. (2017). The west wind vs. the east wind: Instructional leadership model in China. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(2), 186–206. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-08-2016-0083>
- Quinn, D. M. (2002). The impact of principal leadership behaviors on instructional practice and student engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40(5), 447–467. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230210440294>
- Rossmann, G. B., & Rallis, S. F. (2017). *An introduction to qualitative research: Learning in the field* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Sahin, S. (2011). The relationship between instructional leadership style and school culture (İzmir case). *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 11(4), 1920–1927. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ962681>
- Shaked, H. (2018). Why principals sidestep instructional leadership: The disregarded question of schools' primary objective. *Journal of School Leadership*, 28(4), 517–538. <https://doi.org/10.1080/136603124.2018.1481533>
- Shaked, H. (2019). Perceptual inhibitors of instructional leadership in Israeli principals. *School Leadership & Management*, 39(5), 519–536. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1574734>
- Shaked, H., Benoliel, P., & Hallinger, P. (2021). How national context indirectly influences instructional leadership implementation: The case of Israel. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 57(3), 437–469. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X20944217>
- Shapira-Lishchinsky, O. (2009). Israeli teachers' perceptions of mentoring effectiveness. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 23(5), 390–403. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540910970485>
- Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2016). New directions in policy borrowing research. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 17(3), 381–390. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-016-9442-9>
- Stronge, J. H., Richard, H. B., & Catano, N. (2008). *Qualities of effective principals*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Taylor, S. L., Bogdan, R., & DeVault, M. L. (2016). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: A guidebook and resource* (4th ed.). Wiley.
- Tubin, D., & Pinian-Wias, M. (2015). Distributing positive leadership: The case of team counseling. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 43(4), 507–525. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143214523012>
- Tuytens, M., & Devos, G. (2017). The role of feedback from the school leader during teacher evaluation for teacher and school improvement. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 23(1), 6–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2016.1203770>
- Yu, T., & Wu, N. (2009). A review of study on the competing values framework. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(7), 37–42. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v4n7p37>

Appendix A: The interview protocol

Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed. The information you provide in this interview will contribute to my study, which aims to better understand school leadership.

Your participation is voluntary. Please read this form and sign to confirm your consent to participate. You may stop at any time you wish.

I will keep the information you give me confidential. Your name will not appear in my articles. To facilitate my note-taking, it would be helpful to me if I taped our interview. Is that okay with you?

The interview takes about one hour, depending on you. If you need to take a break at any time, let me know.

1. Please tell me about your work as a principal. What does it mean to be a principal?
2. If you could, what would you omit from your work as a principal?
- 3–4. As a principal, what are your priorities in your work? How were they determined?
5. What is the success of the school for you?
- 6–7. Are there goals for school improvement that this school is working toward? If so, what are they?
What guarantees quality instruction in your school?
- 9–10. Who is responsible for improving teaching quality in your school, and how?
- 11–12. As a principal, how do you rate instruction among the various areas requiring your attention, and why?