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Abstract

This study attempts to identify and describe Minnesotan superintendent’s perceptions of barriers to district level reform as well as compare superintendent’s perceptions of district reform related characteristics. Despite a wealth of literature about the process of educational change (Elmore, 2000; Fullan, 2010; Hall, 1987; Heifetz, 2005; Hord, 1987; Leithwood, 1999; Linsky, 2005; Seashore, 1996; Senge, 1997) reforming education to resolve serious achievement issues continues to appear challenging. Our research strives to identify factors preventing one state’s district level leadership from implementing national reform efforts. A foundational lens for our framework comes from the Public Educational Leadership Project (PELP) Coherence Framework (Childress, Elmore, Grossman, & Johnson, 2007). We utilized a quantitative descriptive approach to survey all acting superintendents in the state of Minnesota. Using a quantitative self-perception survey superintendent’s overall perceptions of the barriers to district level educational reforms were compiled. We also surveyed superintendents’ overall perceptions of their district’s characteristics relating to school level reform. The study revealed two major findings: superintendents in the state of Minnesota that claimed that their districts had leadership skills to enact school change and knowledge of successful strategies regarding school reform were unrelated to the identification of barriers to district level reform; and superintendents who claimed that their districts had passive resistance to change and ingrained patterns of behavior to resist change were related to the identification of barriers to district level reform.
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Introduction

Currently reform efforts across the nation are focused on improving teaching methods in learning with the ultimate goal of increasing student achievement (Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson & Wahlstrom, 2004). For example, at the national level reform is being driven by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) striving to impact student achievement through policy, focused on accountability and identification of low performing schools. At the state and local levels reform efforts can be found in such areas as professional learning communities, curricula focus on science, technology engineering and mathematics (STEM) and extending learning opportunities. Yet, as a nation we have an increasing number of schools labeled as “failing” and in the state of Minnesota the state’s achievement gap remains exceptionally large compared to other states, particularly in racial and income subgroups (Minncan, 2011). Our study seeks to explore the barriers in Minnesota that are impacting successful school reform and also to explore relationships between district characteristics related to reform.

Despite a wealth of literature about the process of educational change (Elmore, 2000; Fullan, 2010; Hall, 1987; Heifetz, 2005; Hord, 1987; Leithwood, 1999; Linsky, 2005; Seashore, 1996; Senge, 1997) reforming education to resolve serious achievement issues continues to appear challenging. Our research strives to identify factors preventing one state’s district level leadership from implementing national reform efforts.

Two federal reform initiatives, A Nation at Risk: The Imperative For Educational Reform of 1983, and the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2002, have played a significant role in school reform and accountability efforts (Sherman, 2007). NCLB is seen as groundbreaking due to its unequalled attention to the nation’s achievement gap and its focus on accountability (Sherman, 2007). Recently, the negative effects of NCLB have been revealed bringing a realization of the nation’s inability to promote educational equity and excellence (Manna, 2011). Paul Manna in his book Collision Course (2011) states,
Although some exceptions exist, by and large NCLB’s implementation tended to produce practices and decreased academic quality and expectation in the nation’s schools. Further, it expanded bureaucratic rules that often led policy implementers to focus their effort on meeting technical rules. As a result, substantively important outcomes for schools and students suffered (p.17).

Through our research we are striving to understand what barriers are preventing superintendents in the state of Minnesota from enacting these legislative reforms that are intended to ensure increased student achievement for all students. We are focusing on what superintendents in Minnesota identified as barriers and challenges to educational change and reform efforts. Our research also seeks to identify barriers to district reform and the relationships between district characteristics related to reform.

The research questions that guided the study are as follows:

1. What barriers do superintendents in the state of Minnesota identify as the most significant to implementing reform efforts at a district/system level?
2. What district reform characteristics, such as skills, knowledge, behaviors, and structures regarding school reform, do superintendents perceive as present in their districts?
3. Is there a relationship between district reform related characteristics and superintendent’s perceived barriers to reform?

Theoretical Framework

In situating our work, we draw from research and literature focusing on educational change federal leadership in relationship to policies and the impact policies and leadership have on student achievement. A foundational lens of our framework comes from the Public Educational Leadership Project (PELP) Coherence Framework (Childress, Elmore, Grossman, and Johnson, 2007). The PELP framework emerged out of Harvard University as a collaborative effort among faculty members at Harvard’s graduate schools of business and education in partnerships with a network of urban school districts. According to Childress and his colleagues (2007), the PELP framework has roots in business organizational alignment but incorporates a content knowledge of successful reforms in education. This blend of focus on business, organizational alignment and reform of education provided an established framework from which we could view our study. Utilizing the PELP framework in this study provided us with an additional context in which to review potential reform efforts related to the elements of: instructional core, strategy, culture, structure, system resources, stakeholders and the educational environment.

A major focus of this study is to understand how the larger systemic educational reform efforts that are intended to bring about district level system change impact the perceived barriers by superintendents. Superintendents were selected based on their potential to meaningfully enact policy and therefore student achievement.

Since the enactment of NCLB, the expectations regarding the work of superintendents have shifted (Sherman, 2007). Most notably, superintendents must be dedicated to continuous improvement of all schools and diverse populations of students in their districts (Grogan & Sherman, 2003). Since NCLB, superintendents no longer have the choice of whether or not to name discrepancies in test scores among students (Sherman, 2007).

Review of Literature

Historically, federal influence over education has been limited, with local and state government maintaining primary impact on K-12 education. Since the 1983 release of *A Nation at Risk* to recent years with the No Child Left Behind (NCLB), federal influence on K-12 education and policy has increased. But this increase has been slow moving. Manna (2011) stated:

It took more than a decade after *A Nation at Risk* appeared for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to demand states hold all students, advantaged and disadvantaged alike to challenging academic standards. Further, it would take nearly another decade before the ESEA would incorporate specific consequences for schools that failed to make regular academic progress. (p. 6)

Increased federal influence is most noteworthy around issues of a school district’s environment. Childress and his colleagues (2007) describe environment in relation to the PELP framework as the external factors that have impact on the strategy, operations, and performance of a district; such factors as regulations, statues, contracts, funding and politics. This review of literature will explore federal leadership in relationship to policies and the impact policies and leadership have on student achievement. It will further examine how these external factors influence states,
state education agencies and the implementation of district reform resulting in increased student achievement.

**Federal Leadership and Education**

*A nation at risk.* In the late 1970s and early 1980s, there was general concern and public perception that something was significantly wrong with the United States education system (A Nation at Risk, 1983). This perception and concern led to the federal government initiating steps to examine the quality of education in the United States. Secretary of Education T. H. Bell created the National Commission on Excellence in Education to review the U.S. education system. A report entitled *A Nation at Risk* was the result of this commission. Findings identified four important aspects of the educational process that needed improvement: content, expectations, time and teaching (A Nation at Risk, 1983). Although *A Nation at Risk* report identified findings and recommendations, sweeping reform efforts and influence at the federal level remained lacking; state and local control remained. “*A Nation at Risk* was a report, not a legal mandate; if leaders in states and school districts wanted to implement its recommendations, they could; but they were also free to ignore the report and its recommendations” (Ravitch, 2011, p. 29). It was the reforming of ESEA that ultimately resulted in a shift and increase in federal influence over K-12 education in the U.S.

**Elementary and secondary education act.** ESEA was enacted in 1965 and prior to the reauthorization that resulted in NCLB it maintained minimal federal influence over K-12 education. ESEA throughout the decades remained focused on four goals. Manna noted:

> While details have varied from reauthorization to reauthorization, in general four main goals have stood out. They have included: first, to direct federal dollars to impoverished local school districts to better serve disadvantaged students; second, to meet these students specific academic needs while simultaneously helping them catch up academically with their more advantaged peers; third, to accelerate the development of state standards, testing, and accountability systems; and fourth, to judge and then hold school district accountable for academic performance. (p. 7)

The intentions of ESEA were focused on improving education for disadvantaged students. Although these were good intentions ESEA lacked the ability to hold schools and districts accountable for increased student achievement. According to Peters (2010) “…in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 the states were to receive their grants merely for participating in the program, without having to do anything in particular to improve education.” (p. 136). Peters goes on to note that even if local governments wanted to do what the federal government would have them do they often lacked the resources to meet the standard (2010). The increased federal influence in K-12 education in the U.S. escalated in 2001. “Three days after his inauguration in 2001, President George W. Bush convened some five hundred educators in the East Room of the White House to reveal his plan to reform American education” (Ravitch, 2010, p. 93). His plan was No Child Left Behind (NCLB).

**No child left behind.** NCLB was a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The focus of the plan was to ensure that “no child was left behind” and eliminate the inequities in U.S. education. “NCLB legislation set in place requirements that reached into virtually every public school in America. It expanded the federal role in education and took particular aim at improving the educational lot of disadvantaged students (Education Weekly, 2011, para. 2)

The role of the federal government grew significantly with the NCLB legislation. The NCLB law enacted measures designed to increase student achievement by holding states and schools more accountable for students’ progress (Department of Education, 2001). Broadly these changes included: annual testing, bringing all students to a “proficient” level on state generated tests by 2013-2014; adequately yearly progress; report cards outlining student progress by subgroups; teacher quality; expansion of school choice; highly qualified teachers in core content areas; grants for reading first, a researched based reading program (Department of Education, 2001; Manna, 2011).

Now over a decade after the implementation of NCLB school districts are feeling the results of increased federal influence through mandated national testing, with schools that did not improve their test scores on an annual basis termed as “failing schools”. Although NCLB was bipartisan supported legislation that appeared to have the best interest of all students a number of significant inherent problems have emerged. Ravitch, (2010) stated:

> The most toxic flaw in NCLB was it legislative command that all students in every school must be proficient in reading and mathematics by 2014. By that magical date, every single student must achieve proficiency, includes students with special needs, students whose native language is not English, students who are homeless and lacking in any societal advantage, and students who have every societal advantage
but are not interested in their school work (p. 102).

The consequence of mandating an unattainable goal has brought congress to the understanding that there is a need to rewrite the law. But this will be slow in coming and agreement on how the law is shaped will be difficult.

State Leadership and Education

Karen Seashore Louis, Kenneth Leithwood, Kyla Wahlstrom, and Stephen Anderson (2010) completed a six year study funded by the Wallace Foundation: Learning from leadership: Investigating the links to improved student learning. The broad focus of this study (Seashore Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010) was “to identify the nature of successful educational leadership and to better understand how such leadership can improve educational practices and student learning”(p. 7). This body of research provides the most significant foundation of knowledge recently completed with relevance to our study in the area of state leadership and the impact of federal initiatives on state agencies.

State leadership. States and state leadership have historically played an increasingly active role in creating and implementing policies and mandates intended to promote change in the U.S. educational system. States charged with implementing the requirements of NCLB created significant changes in policy and mandates at the state level. Seashore-Louis and associates (2010) identified five key findings in their study of state political culture and policy leadership:

1. All states are exercising policy leadership intended to improve teaching and learning.
2. State policy leadership for improved teaching and learning often predates, by a decade or more, the enactment of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act.
3. Across the states, there is strong demand for increased leadership activity at the state level. The common pattern of demand, however, does not translate into similar policies among the states.
4. Policy instruments used to improve teaching and learning vary from state to state.
5. Because few states have adopted comprehensive approaches to reform, state policy provides agencies and school districts with general directions for improving teaching and learning, but guidance for more specific means of achieving the goals in question is limited (p. 220).

The key findings of the Seashore-Louis and associates study (2010) described how states are exercising policy leadership with the intention of improving teaching and learning which aligns with the research on federal focus for school reform efforts (Mann, 2011; Peters, 2010 & Ravitch, 2010). This alignment of federal and state focus on reform for improved teaching and learning further impacted State Education Agencies (SEAs).

NCLB impact on state education agencies. Starting in 2001 SEAs were charged with interpreting and implementing NCLB federal education policy. Hamann and Lane (2004) noted “different SEAs interpret the same federal education policy (NCLB) differently.” Seashore-Louis and associates (2010) also provided context into the fundamental issues surrounding SEAs ability to implement federal policy consistently, “The standards and accountability movement has brought about an increase in state monitoring of education. It also has caused SEAs to shift their focus, relatively speaking, away from finances and facilities to factors more directly related to the improvement of teaching and learning” (p. 243).

A second finding from Seashore-Louis and associates (2010) study reported that SEAs were found to be the primary agency responsible for translating state and federal policy into workable requirements for districts and schools. Leading to a key conclusion that the movement from a focus on funding and facilities to curricular and instructional improvements created more tension in states, most notably where there was less experience with state accountability. Seashore-Louis and others (2010) further noted, “NCLB appeared to have a limited effect on educational legislative activity… In contrast, it has had a significant direct effect on SEAs” (p. 243).

Paul Manna (2010) refers to NCLB as a “Collision Course” in his new book, Collision course: Federal education policy meets state and local realities. As we move through the literature it is evident that this “Collision Course” is where federal policy is enacted at the state level by state agencies not prepared or equipped to implement the policies which collides with local schools districts as they struggle to improve student achievement (Manna, 2010; Seashore-Louis et al., 2010).

District Leadership and Student Achievement

Principal leadership and student achievement. Research suggests that schools succeeding against all odds share certain traits and
beliefs. Most notably, the schools are led by strong principals who hold students and teachers to the highest standards. These principals believe children of all races and income levels can meet high academic standards (Carter, 2000; McGee, 2004; Seashore-Louis et al., 2010).

In addition to creating a culture of high standards, the successful principal created a “can do/will do” culture built on a mission, communication, and collaboration (McGee, 2004). Eilers and Camacho (2007) found that if a principal is proactive in developing a culture of change and focused on student learning, the level of learning across the organization also increased. Heck (1992) reaffirmed the importance of the instructional leadership role of the principal in determining student achievement. From observing the characteristics of principals who improved student reading scores, Mackey and associates (2006) established that those who understood their role as instructional leaders had a greater impact on student achievement in reading. Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) stated, “The research of the last 35 years provides strong guidance on specific leadership behaviors for school administrators and that those behaviors have well-documented effects on student achievement” (p. 7). The research and literature on school leadership is well established and clearly points to effective recommendations for educational policies that support principal development.

District leadership and student achievement. According to Bjork and Gurley (2005) superintendents cannot achieve school reform and increase achievement for all students alone, they must provide vision of change for stakeholders and serve as political activists. In their working paper, School District Leadership that Works, Walters and Marzano (2006) reported that Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) conducted a meta-analysis of research on the influence on school district leaders on student performance. The meta-analysis included 27 studies “…resulting in what McREL research believe to be the largest-ever quantitative examination of research on superintendent” (p.3). Four major findings emerged from the study: (1) district level leadership matters; (2) effective superintendent focus their efforts on creating goal-oriented districts; (3) superintendent tenure is positively correlated with student achievement; and (4) they set clear, non-negotiable goals for learning and instruction, yet provide school leadership teams with the responsibility and authority for determining how to meet those goals (Walters & Marazzano, 2006, p. 4). Establishing a clear understanding that district leadership when focused on the right work matters and enhances student achievement.

Consequences of NCLB and School Reform

Ravich (2010) described how her fundamental view of NCLB has changed. She notes, “When I realized that the remedies were not working, I started to doubt the entire approach to school reform that NCLB represented” (p.102.) This doubt turned to reality when President Obama on February 9, 2012 granted 10 stated waivers to NCLB. A statement released by President Obama announced, “today, we’re giving 10 states the green light to continue making reforms that are best for them. Because if we’re serious about helping our children reach their potential, the best ideas aren’t going to come from Washington alone. Our job is to harness those ideas, and to hold states and schools accountable for making them work” (Muskal, 2012).

In our study we strived to identify the barriers superintendents in the state of Minnesota identify as the most significant to implementing reform efforts at a district/system level. Our review of the literature show that leadership does matter and as Seashore-Louis (2010) and associates noted,

Reform in the U.S educational system is both lively and messy but, as educators grapple with emerging demands, we found that leadership matters at all levels. Leaders in education provide direction for, and exercise influence over, policy and practice. Their contributions are crucial, our evidence shows, to initiatives aimed at improving student learning, and of course ultimately to the future in which we all share (p. 283).

Methodology

A quantitative descriptive approach was used to survey all acting superintendents in the State of Minnesota. The State of Minnesota, located in the Northern Midwest United States, was selected as the focus for this study based on homogeneity of demographics, convenience, and its large number of districts. Using a quantitative self-perception survey superintendent’s overall perceptions of the barriers to district level educational reforms were compiled. We also surveyed superintendent’s overall perceptions of their district’s characteristics relating to school level reform.

Data Sources
Quantitative and qualitative data were collected from 212 of the 350 (60.5%) acting superintendents in the state of Minnesota. The respondents were located in rural (78%), suburban (20%), and urban (2%) school districts throughout the state; were predominantly male (86%) and white (98%); and had varying levels of educational attainment.

The survey instrument consisted of 20 questions: 17 Likert scaled, one “yes” or “no”, and two open ended. The first eight Likert scaled questions asked superintendents to express their level of agreement with statements regarding district characteristics related to reform. The remaining nine Likert scaled questions asked superintendents to express their level of agreement with potential barriers (See Appendix A) to district reform, such as tenure and lack of funds. The “yes” or “no” survey question asked superintendents if their districts have a strategic long range plan to be used as a road map for school reform. The remaining two open ended questions asked respondents to provide a list of additional barriers to school reform within their district and provide a list of the top three reform efforts their district is currently using in an attempt to bring about reform.

Survey Analysis

The data were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 19. Data were imported to SPSS from Microsoft Excel by a single individual.

Descriptive statistics on sample characteristics and questionnaire items were computed, including means, medians, standard deviations and percentage frequency distributions. Spearman Rho nonparametric correlation analyses were used to compare respondent perceptions of district capacity for reform due to the nature of the ordinal Likert data. An alpha level of 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Preliminary Results

The data collected from the survey provided preliminary results that helped to address the focus of the research. This section attempts to explain the results of the study within the three research questions:

1. What barriers do superintendents in the state of Minnesota identify as the most significant to implementing reform efforts at a district/system level?
2. What district reform characteristics, such as skills, knowledge, behaviors, and structures regarding school reform, do superintendents perceive as present in their districts?
3. Is there a relationship between district reform related characteristics and superintendent’s perceived barriers to reform?

Identified Barriers

Superintendents, when posed with nine different barriers (See Appendix A) to district level reform had the greatest percentage of agreement (strongly agreed and somewhat agreed were combined for all reported results) with: mandates (92.9%), federal requirements (89.0%), lack of funding (87.2%), and tenure (86.2%). The remaining five barriers also had at least 51% or greater agreement. Just over half of the superintendents (51.2%) also stated that they did not have a strategic long range plan to use as a road map for school reform.

Thematic coding of the first open-ended response survey item presented the following nine additional barriers not addressed in the survey questions: resistance from teachers/internal employees, state politics, school culture, lack of time, teachers unions, teacher/leader preparedness, lack of funding, insufficient compensation, a focus on areas other than reform, and the lack of family stability.

District Reform Characteristics

Of the superintendents surveyed, 81.0% agreed that their district had leadership with the skills to enact change. Additionally, 78.7% of superintendents surveyed agreed that their districts had knowledge of successful strategies regarding school reform. However, 80.1% of superintendents surveyed agreed that their district had ingrained patterns of behavior that were resistant to school reform. Similarly, 78.2% of superintendents surveyed agreed that their district had a passive resistance to change.

Responses to the second open ended question relating to additionally implemented reform efforts were categorized as follows: technology integration (43, 20% of respondents), professional learning communities (PLC) (40, 19% of respondents), and response to intervention (RTI) (36, 17% of respondents). Other reforms such as flexible scheduling (27, 13% of respondents) and curriculum changes (23, 11% of respondents) were also listed.
Relationships Between Barriers And District Characteristics

Significant correlations (see Table 1) were observed between superintendent’s level of agreement for knowledge of successful strategies regarding school reform efforts and level of agreement as to whether their districts had leadership with the skills to enact change (sig. < 0.01). Additionally, significant correlations (sig. < 0.01) were observed between superintendent’s level of agreement for knowledge of school reform efforts and the following four district characteristics relating to reform: systematic plan for enacting school reform; sense of urgency regarding school reform; articulated vision that embraces change; and structure to implement strategies regarding school reform.
Table 1: Spearman Rho Correlations for District Reform Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership with Skills</strong></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ingrained Patterns of Behavior</strong></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.043*</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passive Resistance</strong></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates significance at the .05 level. ** indicates significance at the .01 level.
### Spearman Rho Correlations for District Reform Characteristics and Barriers to District Reform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vledge of Strategies</th>
<th>Mandates</th>
<th>School Boards</th>
<th>Federal Requirements</th>
<th>Community Expectations</th>
<th>Budget Control</th>
<th>Control Over Personnel</th>
<th>Lack of Funding</th>
<th>School Calendar</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Strategies</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>-.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership with Skills</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrained Patterns of Behavior</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.006**</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.049**</td>
<td>.021*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Resistance</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.005**</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.003**</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.006**</td>
<td>.017*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates significance at the .05 level. ** indicates significance at the .01 level.
Conversely, superintendent’s levels of agreement relating to their district’s passive resistance to change were correlated with levels of agreement concerning ingrained patterns of behavior that resist school reform (sig. < 0.01). Superintendent’s level of agreement relating to their districts ingrained patterns of behavior that resist school reform and/or passive resistance to change were correlated (sig. <0.05) with levels of agreement concerning the following as barriers to district level reform: community expectations, insufficient control over school personnel, school calendar, and tenure (see Table 2).

Findings

A number of findings emerged from interpretation and analysis of the results. The most revealing findings provided perspectives of how superintendents’ not only viewed their district characteristics in addressing reform, but what was actually perceived as a barrier to school reform.

Superintendents identified the greatest barriers as mandates, federal requirements, lack of funding, and tenure. Although other barriers were evaluated by the superintendents and additional barriers were provided in the open-ended questions, the four most prominent barriers reveal a perspective that the most pressing barriers appear to be outside of the school district’s scope of control.

The analysis of relationships among the barriers and district characteristics revealed several interesting trends. First, superintendents who characterized their districts as possessing knowledge of school reform also characterized their districts as having leadership skills to enact change. The analysis of results also revealed the opposite; superintendents who claimed that their district did not possess knowledge of school reform also claimed that their district did not have the leadership skills to enact change.

Of the superintendents surveyed a majority agreed that their district possessed knowledge of successful strategies regarding school reform as well as leadership with the skills to enact change. Superintendents who claimed that their district had both knowledge of successful strategies regarding school reform and the leadership skills to enact change also claimed that their districts had: structures to implement strategies regarding school reform; a systematic plan for change; a sense of urgency to change; and an articulate vision that embraces change. However, a majority also agreed that their districts possessed ingrained patterns of behavior that were resistant to school reform as well as passive resistance to school reform.

Although the relationship between district characteristics relating to knowledge, leadership, passive resistance, and behaviors appear superficially intuitive, when compared with superintendent’s perception of barriers, a much richer description emerged.

Superintendents who claimed that their district had knowledge of school reform strategies and the leadership skills to enact change did not relate to superintendents who identified any single barrier to reform. These superintendents did not perceive barriers as greatly when they agreed that their district had both the skills and knowledge regarding reform. Barriers such as mandates and federal regulations may not appear as challenging when the district has knowledge of successful school reform strategies and leadership skills to enact change.

An alternative trend was evident for superintendents who claimed that their districts had passive resistance to change and ingrained patterns of behavior that resist school reform. This group showed no statistically significant relationship with any systematic measure intended to promote school reform. Further, superintendents who claimed that their districts had passive resistance to change and ingrained patterns of behavior to resist change also claimed all of the following as barriers to school reform: community expectations, insufficient control over personnel, the school calendar, and tenure.

These additional relationships reveal a deeper possible explanation as to why district superintendents perceive barriers when faced with the pressure to reform their schools. From the results it can be inferred that those districts with knowledge and skills of reform do not perceive barriers in the same manner as those districts that have ingrained patterns and passive resistance to change.

Conclusions

In our research we endeavored to identify the barriers superintendents in the state of Minnesota identified as the most significant to implementing reform efforts at a district/system level. We also compared these perceptions of barriers with the view that the superintendents had of their district reform characteristics in hope of revealing what may be impeding change throughout the state’s school systems. Leadership does matter, and specifically at the district level superintendents can have influence over policy and practice (Seashore-Louis, 2010). Although this
study is preliminary in that it described and compared the current view of superintendents in mid-western state regarding barriers to reform, it also revealed a number of interesting conclusions.

Although over half of the superintendents viewed all the barriers presented to them in the survey as influential in bringing about change regarding student achievement in their schools, the four greatest barriers were mandates, federal requirements, lack of funding, and tenure. This reveals that the greatest perceived barriers are mainly external in nature and come from outside of the district’s control. The irony in this result is that those national requirements that were introduced to bring about reform are really perceived by the superintendents as the barriers to bringing about the reform needed for student achievement.

We also found that when superintendents viewed their districts as having knowledge of successful reform strategies with the leadership skills to enact change there was no significant relationship with the superintendent’s agreement with barriers to district reform. School districts that emphasize knowledge of successful reform strategies, such as professional learning communities or response to interventions, while simultaneously emphasizing leadership skills to bring about change, may not perceive barriers as threatening.

Another possible conclusion from this study revealed that superintendents who saw their districts as possessing ingrained behaviors that are resistant to reform while having passive resistance to change also had a relationship to agreement with barriers. This is meaningful for districts as they attempt to implement reform initiatives to resolve and address the current behaviors and cultures that exist in schools that may be detrimental to successful school change.

As a result of these findings the following recommendations have been made for district level leadership interested in improving response to barriers to school level reform:

1. District leadership can increase their ability to respond to reform efforts through professional development sessions aimed at increasing knowledge of successful strategies regarding school reform efforts.

2. District leadership can increase their ability to respond to reform efforts through professional development sessions aimed at advocating for leadership with the skills to enact change.

As with many research efforts, it is the aim of the researchers to reduce the number of possible limitations. Despite such efforts, within this study a number of limitations remained. The greatest limitation to this study is that data collected are based on self-perception, and the view that the superintendents have of their districts. These views may be skewed based on the ability to interact and truly gauge the reality of how their schools are enacting and viewing school change. These perceptions are also limited in the assumption that each superintendent closely knows their leaders and district characteristics related to reform first hand. It is also limited in the assumption that these superintendents have knowledge of what strategies and reform efforts are successful and how to implement them. A final limitation in measuring the perceptions of organizational leaders is the risk of bias by those surveyed in presenting a more favorable reality of their district than what actually occurs.

There is a need for more research in this area, especially in understanding what superintendents and building level leaders see as oppositional to bringing about reform in schools. Another influential group in impacting change in our school systems is the role of the school board. Research is needed to gauge what level of influence the board has in bringing about school reform.
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Appendix A

Barriers to school reform survey:

How many years have you been a superintendent?

Would you consider your district to be:

- Rural
- Suburban
- Urban

What is your student enrollment?

Gender

- Male
- Female

Age: In what year were you born?

Highest degree completed

- 6th year certificate
- Specialists
- Doctorate

Ethnicity
My district has…

1. the knowledge of successful strategies regarding school reform.
   - strongly agree
   - somewhat agree
   - partly disagree
   - strongly disagree
   - Does not apply

2. the structure to implement strategies regarding school reform.
   - strongly agree
   - somewhat agree
   - partly disagree
   - strongly disagree
   - Does not apply

3. ingrained patterns of behavior that are resistant to school reform. (i.e. traditional beliefs, norms, expectations)
   - strongly agree
   - somewhat agree
   - partly disagree
   - strongly disagree
   - Does not apply

4. passive resistance to change.
   - strongly agree
   - somewhat agree
   - partly disagree
   - strongly disagree
   - Does not apply

5. a systematic plan for change.
   - strongly agree
   - somewhat agree
   - partly disagree
   - strongly disagree
   - Does not apply

6. a sense of urgency to change.
   - strongly agree
   - somewhat agree
   - partly disagree
   - strongly disagree
   - Does not apply

7. an articulated vision that embraces change.
   - strongly agree
   - somewhat agree
   - partly disagree
   - strongly disagree
   - Does not apply

8. leadership with the skills to enact change.
   - strongly agree
   - somewhat agree
   - partly disagree
   - strongly disagree
   - Does not apply

Please rate the following statements regarding barriers to change in your district. As the superintendent of schools I view the following as barriers to change regarding improving student achievement in my district…

9. mandates
   - strongly agree
   - somewhat agree
   - partly disagree
   - strongly disagree
   - Does not apply

10. school boards
    - strongly agree
    - somewhat agree
    - partly disagree
    - strongly disagree
    - Does not apply

11. federal requirements
    - strongly agree
    - somewhat agree
    - partly disagree
    - strongly disagree
    - Does not apply

12. community expectations
    - strongly agree
    - somewhat agree
    - partly disagree
    - strongly disagree
    - Does not apply
13. lack of control over budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- strongly agree</td>
<td>- somewhat agree</td>
<td>- partly disagree</td>
<td>- strongly disagree</td>
<td>- Does not apply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. insufficient control over personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- strongly agree</td>
<td>- somewhat agree</td>
<td>- partly disagree</td>
<td>- strongly disagree</td>
<td>- Does not apply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. lack of funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- strongly agree</td>
<td>- somewhat agree</td>
<td>- partly disagree</td>
<td>- strongly disagree</td>
<td>- Does not apply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. school calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- strongly agree</td>
<td>- somewhat agree</td>
<td>- partly disagree</td>
<td>- strongly disagree</td>
<td>- Does not apply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- strongly agree</td>
<td>- somewhat agree</td>
<td>- partly disagree</td>
<td>- strongly disagree</td>
<td>- Does not apply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list any additional internal or external barrier to change evident in your organizations.

Does your district have a strategic long-range plan that is used as a road map for school reform?

Yes
No

Please list your top three school reform efforts in your district.