5-1-2003

The impact of high definition training on teacher perceptions of the principal’s leadership, parent support, and student improvement

Gwendolyn Miller
CLARK ATLANTA UNIVERSITY

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.auctr.edu/dissertations

Recommended Citation

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@Robert W. Woodruff Library, Atlanta University Center. It has been accepted for inclusion in ETD Collection for AUC Robert W. Woodruff Library by an authorized editor of DigitalCommons@Robert W. Woodruff Library, Atlanta University Center. For more information, please contact cwiseman@auctr.edu.
ABSTRACT

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

MILLER, GWENDOLYN

B.A. FORT VALLEY UNIVERSITY, 1975

Ed.S. GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY, 1975

THE IMPACT OF HIGH DEFINITION TRAINING ON TEACHER

PERCEPTIONS OF THE PRINCIPAL’S LEADERSHIP, PARENT

SUPPORT, AND STUDENT IMPROVEMENT

Advisor: Dr. Ganga Persaud

Dissertation dated May 2003

The study was designed to examine the impact of high definition training on teacher perceptions of the principal’s leadership, parent support, and student improvement. A review of the literature supports the critical role the principal plays in influencing learning and the total climate of a school. Effective schools research consistently identifies the principal’s leadership as being key to effective schooling.

The research design is a quasi-experimental design. The instrument used in the study was a teacher questionnaire. Questionnaires were administered to a total of 64 elementary school teachers. An item-to-scale correlation using the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient Method was used to validate the validity and reliability of the instrument. The reliability was .85 and above for each item. The following are the findings of this study.
1. High definition training does impact teachers’ perception of principal’s leadership team.

2. High definition training does impact teachers’ perception of instructional supervision.

3. High definition training does not impact teachers’ perceptions of grade level teaming.

4. High definition training does impact teachers’ perception of parent support.

5. High definition training does not impact teachers’ perceptions of workshops.

6. High definition training does impact teachers’ perceptions of school climate.

7. High definition training does impact teachers’ perception of student improvement.

8. High definition training does impact the teaching of critical thinking skills.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The principal's leadership has been shown to be a significant factor in many aspects of the school. The perception of the principal's leadership ultimately impacts staff morale, school climate, and student achievement. The consensus is that professional development is only effective when the school principal is an active participant and supporter of teacher's professional development. When teachers perceive the principal's leadership to be a nonfactor in professional development, the results are less than effective in producing achievement gains as well as promoting a healthy school climate.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of high definition training on teacher perceptions of the principal's leadership, parent support, and student improvement. Specifically, it was intended to determine if the perceived leadership of the principal influences teacher performance after high definition training and how this training impacts student achievement at an elementary school that is a part of the Atlanta Public School System located in the city of Atlanta, Georgia. The community is a low-income community where 98% of the students receive free and reduced lunch.
Background of the Problem

Improving student achievement in the areas of reading and math had been the major goal for the administration and teachers at the school. For the past 2 years student achievement as measured by standardized test results had not shown improvement. Reading and math scores had dropped for the last 2 years, and there were a number of programs that had been in place for several years that were designed to improve student achievement but had not yielded the kind of success needed. A description of these programs and how they were used is provided below.

Reading Recovery is a program designed to provide additional support to at-risk first grade students. Teachers received special training and used resources and materials specifically designed to implement the program.

Reading First is a program designed to provide specialized reading to students in grades k-3. All of the teachers in grade kindergarten through third grade were trained. Materials and resources recommended to implement the program were purchased and used by the teachers.

Lightspan is a technology-based parental involvement program that is designed to provide students not only an opportunity to work on deficient skills at school but also at home. Not only must teachers be trained but parents as well. Parents are able to check out play stations and software for students to use the entire school year.
Learnstar is a technology-based program that provides software in all subject areas. Learnstar was used to provide additional support to kindergarten through fifth grade students.

Sylvan Reading is a program that has been very successful in improving the reading levels of students. The program was used to improve reading of third grade students. After-School Tutorial was a program organized to provide additional instructional support to all students with test results that fell in the lowest quartile on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills.

The results from the Iowa Test of Basic Skills for the past 2 years had indicated that students were having the most difficulty in the area of reading comprehension and math problem solving. The programs that were in place provided some support for teachers as they planned for daily instruction; however, most of these programs mainly provided support in the area of remediation. The challenge continued to be how to get students to consistently perform at a level that would show yearly gains on standardized tests and state required criterion tests, and not have to use additional funds to purchase more programs that would also require additional resources to implement.

Many of the schools in the district had been involved in whole school reform initiatives for at least one year. At this school the decision was made not to attempt whole school reform due to the following reasons:

- It was difficult to select an initiative that would meet the needs all of the students.
• The amount of training required to implement a new program school-wide would take a great deal of time. This training would have teachers spend a large amount of their time during summer vacation or spend days away during the regular school year.

• In order for any initiative to work effectively, staff buy-in would be critical. Teachers had to believe that what they were doing was going to work.

• Most school-wide initiatives required at least 2 years before results were seen. This could mean that test results would get worse before showing improvement.

• The kinds of initiatives that were being implemented in other schools required administrators to spend a great deal of time with budgeting, finding funds to often-time match other funds, managing resources, organizing training session, finding consultants, and monitoring the effectiveness of these programs. These added responsibilities would place administrators in positions of not having enough time to effectively manage their schools cites.

Teachers at this elementary school had attended workshops on using critical thinking skills over the past several years. These workshops were usually given at the beginning of the school year and periodically during the school year teachers would be given additional handouts to read and use in class. It was known that the kinds of questions students were asked and the interactions that took place in the classroom daily from observing teachers were not fostering higher level thinking. In order for students to
acquire new skills and master new objectives in reading comprehension and math problem solving, teaching low level thinking skills primarily at the knowledge and comprehension level for literal explanation was not going to improve student achievement. Tests indicators required analysis, application, synthesis and evaluation of tests items. Additionally, teachers were having a very difficult time effectively incorporating these skills into their daily instruction. Often times they would appear in lesson plans but the delivery of the skills was ineffective. Teachers could not make the connection between how they were instructing students daily and gaining the desired outcomes. Thus, a process was needed more than another program to help get teachers to a level of competency so their instructional delivery would daily involve higher order critical thinking skills. It is widely believed that in order to teach well, one must be able to question well. It was discovered that too many of the teachers were spending most of their time asking low-level cognitive questions. Students were performing well on teacher-made assessments mainly because they were not being asked to go beyond the textbook learning literal meaning. It was felt that if teachers had a clear purpose for their questioning and explanation rather than just determining what knowledge was known, this would expand students’ knowledge and encourage them to think. There was a need to put a process in place that would not require extensive training, nor require teachers to spend days away from the classroom or require them to use weeks of their vacation time training and not be able to implement the training until weeks later when some of the skills may have been forgotten. For the purpose of this study, high definition referred to
a process which placed emphasis on (1) defining the problem as accurately as possible in terms of its causes; (2) selecting a solution that would likely be effective more than alternative in counteracting the causes; (3) managing the implementation process to ensure that resources are utilized for attaining the objectives; and (4) evaluating the process to determine the extent to which the solution is effective in counteracting the causes as well as achieving the stated objectives (Persaud, 1999). The steps to this process provided the framework for the training to begin. Through this process teachers and administrators were better equipped to look at the true causes of why students were not making the kinds of gains needed and select the best approach to achieve those gains. The approach selected was the teaching of critical thinking skills. This framework provided the administrative team a foundation for providing staff development (training) as well as guiding, supervising, and helping teachers to assess progress. Through high definition training, teachers were provided strategies that would allow them to use the experiences that children brought to the learning environment initially, along with exposure to the content from across the curriculum, to help them teach critical thinking skills to the students.

Contextual Framework

There has been a significant amount of research that indicates that the effective principal is also an instructional leader. In effect, the principal assumes a major role in how the instructional program is structured and how the teacher delivers the instructional program. There has also been some research conducted that suggests that many teachers
do not have sufficient training to deliver a sound instructional program, especially in the area of teaching critical thinking. In short, providing teachers with professional development in teaching critical thinking and using high definition principles should positively impact the achievement of students. When any one of the essential elements of an effective school program is missing, e.g., lack of strong administrative leadership and teachers not equipped to teach skills in critical thinking to students, the result is often low student achievement and poor school climate.

Significance of the Problem

The educational community is requiring all schools to demonstrate accountability relative to student achievement. The strength of the instructional program and the effectiveness of the school principal and his or her staff are essential to improving student achievement. In addition, the role of professional development has recently been identified as one of the most important factors toward improving student achievement. Local boards of education are demanding that the rate of student achievement be in proportion to the amount of time and money spent on staff in-service training.

Research Questions

The questions that guided this research were developed from eight key dimensions that directly impacted or influenced the total school program.
1. Is there a difference between the perception of teachers participating in high definition training and those not participating regarding the principal's leadership team?

2. Is there a difference between the perception of teachers participating in high definition training and those not participating regarding instructional supervision?

3. Is there a difference between the perception of teachers participating in high definition training and those not participating regarding grade level teaming?

4. Is there a difference between the perception of teachers participating in high definition training and those not participating regarding parent support?

5. Is there a difference between the perception of teachers participating in high definition training and those not participating regarding workshops?

6. Is there a difference between the perception of teachers participating in high definition training and those not participating regarding school climate?

7. Is there a difference between the perception of teachers participating in high definition training and those not participating regarding student achievement?

8. Is there a difference between the perception of teacher participating in high definition training and those not participating regarding higher order thinking skills?
Significance of the Study

The findings of this study could be beneficial to the field of education in the following ways:

1. This study could add to the existing body of knowledge in the area of high definition principles.
2. This study could add to the existing body of knowledge in the area of teacher perception and principal leadership.
3. This study could add to the existing body of knowledge as it relates to teacher perception of school climate.
4. This study could add to the existing body of knowledge as it relates to teacher perception of instructional supervision.
5. This study could add to the existing body of knowledge as it relates to teacher perception of parent involvement.
6. This study could add to the existing body of knowledge as it relates to teacher perception and student improvement.
7. This study could add to the existing body of knowledge as it relates to teacher perception of workshops.
8. This study could add to the existing body of knowledge as it relates to higher order thinking skills.
Summary

The principal is a major influence on learning and school climate. Teachers' perceptions of how effective a principal's leadership is can have a tremendous impact on the total school climate, having its greatest impact on student achievement. Providing teachers with effective professional development (training) not only equips them with the necessary skills needed to become better at what they do, but it additionally helps to create an overall healthy environment where trust, support, and teamwork are established.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The principal is a major influence on learning and school climate (Norton, 1984; Geogriades, 1984; Smith & Piele, 1989). The school’s climate appears to directly influence the success or failure of learning in the school (Knight, 1987; Purkey & Smith, 1993) and should be considered as an important factor in school effectiveness. Improving the quality of education at the school level is essential to the success of students. As a result, a great deal of attention has been placed on the quality, skills, and performance of the school principal. Most of the recent national educational reports highlight the role of the principal in promoting excellence (Dianda, 1984). Barth (1984) states that the principal has a critical effect on school climate and productivity by way of interaction with teachers. He considered the relationship of the principal and teachers as having the greatest effect on the quality of life in a school. Traditionally, leadership has been described from the perspective of the leader (Rhinehart, 1998). However as principals attempt to change the social and academic climate of their schools, it is important to understand how teachers perceive the principal. Recently, Kouzes and Posner (1993) suggested that leadership is a relationship between employers and employees. They considered this association as an alliance where the leader assumes a
supportive role and thinks of employees as constituents. These authors also argued that constituents choose to follow a leader based on "the leader's perceived capacity to serve a need."

The principal is challenged to facilitate administrative vision, demonstrate concern for students’ learning processes and relate to faculty, staff, and community in a cooperative environment (Silins, 1992; Moorthy, 1992; Lane, 1992). This is essential in creating a school climate that will get the desired results. When the atmosphere of the school is one that values learning and supports achievement, it is difficult not to learn.

Tests results nationally have indicated that students, especially those in urban school environments, have difficulty in applying critical thinking to problem solving situations. In addition, the research has also indicated that teacher training programs spend little time providing perspective teachers with training in the application of critical thinking instructional strategies. As a result teachers are, in general, ill prepared to employ critical thinking skills to students. Teachers who have received training in critical thinking have not been trained to utilize high definition principles to teaching critical thinking. Research has shown that the majority of teacher’s instructional time is spent asking students questions (Dillon, 1982; Feldhusen & Treffinger, 1980). Unfortunately, the questions asked by teachers are low-order and low definition types. As a result, students are seldom challenged to utilize their total thinking capabilities. The results of these two situations have had a deleterious impact upon student achievement in all subject areas. The impact has been especially pronounced in student reading and mathematics achievement.
Principal's Leadership and School Climate

There has been an extensive body of research pertaining to the relationship between principals and teachers (Blase, 1987; Johnson & Pajares, 1996; Keith & Girling, 1991). The greater majority of the research findings suggest that although principals have traditionally been accountable for the effectiveness of schools, teachers and other staff have become increasingly more active in management of the school site. Findings in these studies revealed significant improvement in the climate of the school when the principal shared decision-making and control with teachers and other staff (Hoy, 1994). The role of the principal has a major influence on learning and school climate. For schools to function effectively there must be effective leadership that creates a responsive school climate. Healthy school climates are associated with higher student achievement, better behavior, and better attitudes (Lindelow et al., 1989). A study done by Warner (1993) investigated the leadership styles of elementary school principals and the impact of situational leadership styles upon school climate and pupil achievement from two perspectives, the principals and the teachers. The sample consisted of 121 teachers and administrators in ten elementary schools randomly chosen from the Department of Defense Dependents Schools Directory, 1992-1993. The theoretical framework for the study was the W. J. Reddin’s 3-d Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. The instruments were the Educational Administrative Style Diagnosis Test-Modified (EASDT-M, W. J. and M. K. Reddin, 1979); the School-Level Environment Questionnaire (SLEQ) (Fisher & Frases, 1990); and the Spring, 1993, Administration of the Comprehensive Test of
Basic Skills, 4th edition (CTBS/4th). Findings indicated that four principals agreed with the perceptions of the teachers in their school as to the principal's leadership style and style synthesis; a significant difference existed in the way that teachers perceived leadership styles of principals in three of the schools; and no significant difference existed between leadership styles and effectiveness of the school. Teachers perceived that where a more or less appropriate style is used, there is a significant effect on 6 of the 8 climate scales. Only when principals are viewed as a collective group can a significance be seen between their perspective of leadership styles and the effect upon climate (Warner, 1993). In the literature on school effectiveness, the school principal has been identified as the main link connected to school climate and effectiveness.

According to the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP, 1996) the creation and preservation of a school climate are the principal's highest leadership priorities. In quality schools, staff and students care for, respect, and trust one another. Morale is high and social and academic growth is continuous.

Research done by Collmer (1989) to determine the relationship between elementary school principals' leadership styles(s) and teachers' job satisfactions in a public school setting indicated that how a teacher perceived the attitude of the principal directly affected how the teacher rated job satisfaction. Job dissatisfaction produced low morale, absenteeism, and inept or uncaring teachers. Teachers who were satisfied with their job had better job performance, were less likely to be absent, and usually remained with the system for a longer period of time. Two questionnaires, Job Descriptive Index and Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII, were distributed to selected
elementary teachers taking graduate classes through the Federation of North Texas
Universities. A demographic data sheet was distributed with each test package. Findings
were teacher job satisfaction was greater when the principal exhibited the integration and
consideration dimensions of leader behavior. Teachers also showed greater job
satisfaction when principals were warm, caring, and sensitive to their needs and ideas. It
was important for teacher to be involved in the decision making at their schools and to be
free to try new ideas. There seems to be a fine line between teachers being over-
supervised and under-supervised, as both extremes caused feelings of job dissatisfaction
(Collmer, 1989). A critical review of 25 years of research on morale concluded that
whether or not teachers were satisfied depended primarily on the quality of the
administrative relationships in which teachers were involved and the quality of the
leadership they received. Thus, a major key to high faculty morale and satisfaction seems
to be the leadership behavior of the school administrator. Zbikowski (1992) analyzed the
relationship between elementary principal leadership behavior characteristics, which
were frequently associated with better staff morale. In this study, 25% of the teachers in
17 Kent County, Michigan, elementary schools were asked to complete the Purdue
Teacher Opinionnaire and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Major
findings included significant relationships between elementary principal leadership
behavior and each of the ten dimensions of teacher morale. The dimensions are listed
below.

1. Satisfaction with teaching
2. Teacher workload
3. Community support
4. School climate
5. Principal support
6. School facilities and services
7. Teacher rapport with principal
8. Rapport among other teachers
9. Production
10. Principal

For this study, the school climate profile was condensed to 56 items. Analysis of teacher responses on a pre-test showed the modified instrument to be highly reliable (0.99). Factor analysis allowed construction of a two-factor model to represent the data: supportive principal leadership and considerate school climate. These accounted for 46% of the total variance. The study showed that of the 10 dimensions, all but production were significant on teacher morale.

The study further found that in each of the leadership behavior dimensions, the principals rated themselves significantly higher than did their respective teachers (Vernadine, 1997). In a study by Vicente Parades (1991) on school climate and student achievement, it was found that where there is a positive school climate there is also a higher rate of learning. Communication is an important aspect in establishing the climate of a school. A school with an open climate has a principal who respects teachers, values their opinions, and seeks their assistance in the decision making process.
Ames-Debraux (1999) did a study to determine whether key leadership characteristics identified in effective school research were at work in the case of one visionary leader who implemented educational change and other institutional reforms in a low-income community elementary school noted for its academic success and gain. This research also wanted to gain a greater understanding of a reputedly successful leader’s vision, how he communicated his vision, inspired trust, and expressed his passion for his low-income community. This study was undertaken at Bowling Park Elementary, whose population was drawn from low socio-economic families. The children had attended the same school for at least 4 years, as had the principal and teachers. The Comer Zigler model had been incorporated into the school’s programs. A case study approach was used that revealed that the principal promoted the following:

1. A collaborative school climate;
2. A strong parental involvement;
3. Involvement of teachers, parents, and community in problem-solving;
4. Opportunities for teachers, parents, and other constituents to share in decision-making;
5. A sense of family;
6. A climate of expectations that students would learn; and
7. A participatory style of school operation with the principal providing leadership as a transformational leader.

These 7 findings were consistent with the effective schools research. In this study, 6 additional key leadership characteristics were found that differed from what the effective
schools research might conclude regarding the success of a low-income community school. Examination of this school, its principal, his leadership style, and implementation of school reform, including the CoZi model, explains its success:

1. Seeking spiritual guidance;
2. Becoming a visionary leader;
3. Being a risk-taker;
4. Acting as a change agent;
5. Providing transformational leadership; and
6. Integrating of personality, theory, and services.

This study further suggested that the principal’s approach to school change and being a people-person while implementing school reform programs were also key components that added to the effectiveness of the school (Ames-Debraux, 1999). At the school level, most administrators recognize the importance of developing and maintaining high satisfaction and morale. The primary value of having high staff morale and satisfaction is in helping to achieve worthwhile goals. These goals include staff stability, cohesiveness, and increased effectiveness. It becomes therefore important for principals to understand better the factors that contribute to low or high staff satisfaction and morale. Research supports the thought that with more decision-making opportunities, teachers’ morale and productivity improve (Johnston & Germinario, 1985). The traditional opportunities for decision making afforded teachers have done little to advance the professionalism of teachers or to involve teachers in critical educational concern (Vernadine, 1997).
Schlechty (2001), in his book *Shaking Up the School House*, states that shared leadership recognizes the concepts of shared fate and shared accountability. Shared leadership requires a great deal of trust and confidence among the leaders and those they lead. It requires that leaders know each other and that all members of the leader follower team have reasonable assessment of the strengths, weaknesses, and tendencies of each of their peers. Most of all it requires fluidity and flexibility in determining who shall lead at any given time. As a group, the share decision-making team is less like an orchestra where the conductor is always in charge, but is more like a jazz band where leadership is passed around among the players, depending on what the music demands at the moment and who feels most moved by the spirit to express that music.

Principal’s Leadership and Instructional Support

According to Schmoker (1996), data help researchers to monitor and assess performance. Just as goals are an essential element of success, so data are an essential piece of working toward goals. Clifford (1995) cites, in her study on the Impact of State—Mandated Student Performance Assessment on Instructional Practices (Kentucky Education Reform Act), that educational policy makers have continually searched for means to make sure that what are believed to be the most effective and efficient instructional practices are being used so that all students are learning that which is expected and that the most significant trends in the history of educational policy making has been the increased use of tests as tools for holding schools and teachers accountable for students learning outcomes. Mehrens (1989) states that administrators know that the
public often favors accountability in education and believes that holding teachers responsible for students' achievement will result in better education.

A study done by Crocker (1993) designed to provide a description of the extent to which test preparation and curricular alignment activities took place over a 3-year period in a middle-sized metropolitan school district in north central Florida. The focal years of the study encompassed the first year of the implementation of a nationally normed, standardized achievement test through the third year of its use. The classes of teachers who taught the same grade level of the 3 years in question served as subjects. Data on both teacher behavior and student test performance were collected. Impact of teacher behavior on student performance at item, subskill area, and total test levels for mathematics computation and mathematics concepts were examined. Evidence was presented which indicated that teachers change test preparation activities based on beliefs about whether students would be tested and, to some degree, on the perceived emphasis placed on testing by the school board. Little relationship was found between test preparation activities in the classroom and average scores for the class.

Testing and teaching are not separate entities (Rudman, 1989). Rudman further states that teaching has always been a process of helping others to discover "new" ideas and "new" ways of organizing that which they learned. Whether this process took place through systematic teaching and testing, or whether it was through a discovery approach, testing was and remains an integral part of teaching. In this article Rudman (1989) cites ways in which testing can be linked to teaching. Four ways are given.

1. Testing is a useful tool at the beginning of the school year.
2. Testing can aid in decisions about grouping students in the class.

3. Testing can be used to diagnose what individual pupils know.

4. Testing can help the teacher determine the space of classroom instruction.

In Rudman’s discussion on how tests results can be used by teachers and administrators, one important point made was the use of test results for measuring the effectiveness of instruction and learning.

Grant Wiggins (1998) has used the term “educative assessment” to describe techniques and issues that educators should consider when they design and use assessments. His message is that the nature of assessment influences what is learned and the degree of meaningful engagement by students in the learning process.

McMillan (2000) states that just as assessment impacts student learning and motivation, it also influences the nature of instruction in the classroom. When assessment is integrated with instruction, it informs teachers about what activities and assignments will be most useful, what level of teaching is most appropriate, and how summative assessments provide diagnostic information.

According to Matter (1999), parents and teachers rarely learn how results are used to improve curriculum, instruction, or individual student learning plans. Assessment offices and school districts have a responsibility to provide them with that information and develop a yearlong communication plan for school staffs, parents, and the community. It is important for everyone affected by the assessment process to be continually informed. They should know what test are being administered, the purpose
of the tests, what the past results show, and how the current results are used to improve student performance.

Principal's Leadership and Grade Level

According to Whitaker (1997), historically teachers have held different types of leadership roles in schools. These roles included department chairs, professional association leaders, and master teachers. More recently, teachers have assumed leadership roles as grade level team leaders, staff development specialists, mentor teachers, and leaders on shared decision-making councils (Devaney, 1987; Wasley, 1991). The nature of the complex work of teaching “cannot be accomplished by even the most knowledgeable individuals working alone” (Little, 1990, p. 510). In the typical school, however, teacher practice is “limited to the boundaries of their own experience” (Schmoker, 1996, p. 10) without any outside scrutiny or objectives analysis. Little (1990) found a strong relationship between the right kind of collegiality and improvements for both teachers and students:

- Remarkable gains in achievement;
- Higher-quality solutions to problems;
- Increased confidence among all school community members;
- Teachers' ability to support one another's strengths and to accommodate weaknesses;
- The ability to examine and test new ideas, methods, and materials;
- More systematic assistance to beginning teachers; and
• An expanded pool of ideas, materials, and methods.
 Collaboration works (Fullan, 1991), and it also addresses an essential social dimension of improvement. Successfully implementing innovative procedures “is very much a social process” (p. 12). Little (1981) found that the prevalence of collegiality in a school was closely related to four specific behaviors of the principal:

• States expectations explicitly for cooperation among teachers. “I expect all of us to work together, help one another, and make our knowledge available” (p. 520).

• Models collegiality, that is enacts it by joining with teachers and other principals working collaboratively to improve conditions in the school.

• Rewards collegiality by granting release time, recognition, space, materials, or funds to teachers who work as colleagues.

• Protects teachers who initially engage in collegial behavior and thereby risk the retribution of their fellows.

According to Barth (1990), teachers working in any kind of team are provided with a built-in support system, someone to observe and by whom to be observed, an adult with whom to talk about teaching, learning, and students. In short, teachers who work together can enjoy continuous professional, collegial relationship.

Principal’s Leadership and Parental Involvement

According to Anderson (2000), parental involvement has been defined as any interaction between a parent and child that may contribute to the child’s development or
direct parent participation with a child’s school in the interest of the child. Decker and Decker (1988) state that it is frequently assumed that involvement efforts must focus outside the immediate school community, the implication being that parents already are involved. This is not always so, and schools should not overlook their primary resource—parents—as they work diligently toward generating partnerships with others in the community. The following is a list of fundamental principles that all schools that work well with parents should have in place.

- Every aspect of the school climate is open, helpful, and friendly.
- Communications with parents are frequent, clear, and two-way.
- Parents are treated as collaborators in the educational process, with a strong role to play in their children’s learning and behavior.
- Parents are encouraged to comment, both formally and informally, on school policies and to share in some decision-making.
- The school recognizes its responsibility to forge a partnership with all families in the school, not just those most easily available. This includes parents who work outside the home, divorced parents without custody, and families of minority race and language.
- The principal and other school administrators actively express and promote the philosophy of partnership with all families.
- The school encourages volunteer participation from parents and the community.
According to Giordano (1992), the more involved parents become with their children's school, the more effective the school will be in educating those children. While most schools do an adequate job of informing parents about what their children are learning, many fail to convey an understanding of how they learn, which would help parents to better assist their children's learning. Carr (1997) says that community participation has become an important aspect of most change efforts in public schools in recent years. The movement has waned through the decades since the common school, but is enjoying renewed interest with the emphasis placed on involving stakeholders in systemic change efforts. Typically, community participation has taken the form of seeking “buy-in” by parents and community members. The success of such efforts and more sweeping decision-making involvement depends largely on leadership styles among school principals.

The impact of principal leadership has also been examined in the context of the total school and community environment. In a study conducted in the Chicago Public School System, Sebring, Bender, and Bryk (2000) discovered that principals in productive elementary schools skillfully used a number of strategies to promote the efforts of both parents and teachers. The research suggested that this kind of arrangement resulted in significant improvement in students' achievement and school climate.

Principal’s Leadership and Staff Development (Workshops)

The principal clearly has a major role in the development of staff. For example, principals have always had some responsibility for the orientation of new teachers
In one research study, Ganser (2000) found that principals were more likely to support mentoring programs when the staff developers included them in the mentor training. Sparks (1992) believes that the greatest test of instructional leadership is to improve teaching. He additionally states that elementary school principals must have appropriate staff development knowledge and skills if they are to help move their schools forward to meet the complex educational challenges of the future. In a study done by Marshall, Pritchard, and Gunderson (2001), professional development—what works and what does not—found after 400 hours of interviews that high-quality professional development provides the foundation for school improvement when it is tied to a district purpose. It is most effective in strong districts that have established a constancy of purpose and are focused on the processes that lead to effective student learning. Ramos-Kelly (1999) completed a study that addressed the factors associated with the implementation of new instructional practices by examining the role that the school principal plays and organizational structures created for staff development to occur. These factors were considered with respect to their impact on changes in teachers' classroom practices. Literacy learning was the specific practice addressed in the study. Four schools were involved in the study and teachers at each school worked closely with consultants, staff developers, or teacher leaders in implementing new approaches. The instructional leadership and knowledge base of the principals in the study, combined with their skill in addressing individual and collective professional development needs, were viewed by teachers as important aspects of support for change. The leadership of building principals and their ability to craft staff development opportunities around new
initiatives were viewed by teachers and principals in the study as significant factors in moving changes forward. Wilken (1995) says that staff development programs involve more than just teachers’ evaluations of their practices and initiating changes based on what they presently do. Principals need to search for new ways in which staff can develop into more effective and responsible educators, something that usually does not happen by attending a one-day in-service session or enrolling in a university course. The principal (Wilken, 1995) and staff must identify the changes they want to make, gain the knowledge needed to do so, receive the training to implement such changes, plan for integration into the curriculum and the school day, and then evaluate the process after a sufficient period. Caine (1998) examined the perceived influence of the principal on the professional growth of teachers from the perspectives of selected teachers and principals. The study found that principals play a critical role in establishing the expectations for professional growth, developing and maintaining the organizational structures that can support it, and providing multiple opportunities for professional motivation and learning. The following are findings and conclusions from the study.

1. Principals have an influence on the professional development of the staff. The data revealed that principals who valued on-going professional development and adult learning shared that value with the teachers.

2. Principals have a direct influence on the collegiality of the staff. Through collegial relationships, teachers create their own insights about their teaching and potential growth areas.
3. Teachers need to be involved in the decision-making process. Meaningful professional development occurred in schools where teachers were actively involved in the planning, greater staff commitment to the collaborative school culture was present, and teachers were empowered.

4. Professional development models operate from a growth perspective or a deficit perspective.

5. Teachers need time to reflect with each other about their practice. Continuous professional development is achieved when teachers engage in frequent talk about learning (Caine, 1998).

Principal’s Leadership and Student Improvement

One of the key elements in a quality school is the principal’s leadership role in assuring an excellent instructional program and one of the most important questions in education is how to enhance the academic performance of children. According to Reck (1998), learning is the combined result of many variables; some are under the teacher’s control and have effects on students’ behavior, attitude, and achievement. Good teachers set the stage for learning (Shelley, Ashley, & Emerson, 2000) by choosing materials carefully, designing thought-provoking questions, modeling higher-level thinking, and promoting good discussion. According to Krug (1993), when the atmosphere of the school is one that values learning and supports achievements, it is difficult not to learn. This is especially true in the critical first years of school, when lifelong attitudes toward education are forming. Krug further states that the school leader plays a primary role in
defining reinforcement systems, creating excitement, and communicating a message to students that learning has value outside the classroom.

According to Slotnik (1999), many educators feel that their best efforts to improve instruction and inform decision-making on behalf of children would be significantly stronger if they had access to better data and analysis—if they had much better information on which children were succeeding, in which area, and why. What school districts need and what the public is clamoring for, in short, is a systematic approach to district management that is based on data and focused on student achievement.

Research done by Haycock (2001) that relates to closing the achievement gap that separates low-income and minority youngsters from other young Americans lists what she considers to be four important lessons:

- **Standards are key**: Clear and public standards for what students should learn at benchmark grade levels are a crucial part of solving the problem. Standards are a guide for teachers, administrators, parents, and students themselves to what knowledge and skills students must master.

- **All students must have a challenging curriculum**: Standards will not make much difference if they are not accompanied by rigorous curriculum that is aligned with those standards.

- **Students need extra help**: Ample evidence shows that almost all students can achieve at high levels if they are taught at high levels.
Teachers matter a lot: If students are going to be held to high standards, they need teachers who know the subjects and know how to teach the subjects.

Summary

The review of literature supports the critical role that principals' leadership plays in influencing learning and the total climate of a school. Effective schools research consistently identifies the principal's leadership as being key to effective schooling. This review attempted to provide research that relates principal’s leadership to school climate, which for the purpose of this study, encompasses teacher morale; teacher involvement in decision-making, planning, evaluation, staff development, student achievement; and parent and community involvement. This research provides the background for the main purpose of the study, which specifically looks at the impact of high definition training on teacher perceptions of the principal’s leadership, parent support, and student improvement. Historically, leadership has been seen through the eyes of the leader. If principals are to change the social and academic climate of their schools and empower teachers, it is important to understand how teachers perceive their principal.

The research did not examine the connection between teacher perception and principals’ leadership in high definition training and how this training impacts student achievement. However, research clearly indicates a relationship between teacher morale and student achievement. The review of the literature suggests that a need exists for a study to examine teachers’ perceptions of principals’ leadership in high definition training and how this training impacts student achievement.
CHAPTER III
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

This study was done to investigate whether teachers would increase their teaching of higher order thinking skills, and would rate improvement in school climate and student performance after being treated in in-school workshops on principles of high definition teaching strategies. The principal and the leadership team were trained in strategies for: principal teaming, instructional supervision, grade level teaming, parent supervision, and use of in-school workshops. Then teachers and grade level teams were trained to teach and supervise colleagues at grade level meetings on how to improve higher order thinking skills. Hence, it was expected that, in a pre-post analysis, teachers would rate the principal in the post-test as emphasizing the use of high definition techniques in principal teaming, instructional supervision, grade level teaming and workshop strategies. Further, teachers would show a higher rating of school climate, and student performance in the post-test as compared with the pre-test, and a control group.

Definition of Variables

1. **High Definition** is defined as a technique for administrators to define their problems into cause and effect. Hence, administrators need to enable teachers to
identify the causes for student failure, and based on those causes, select strategies for improving student academic achievement. This variable was infused into dimensions: (a) principal teaming, instructional supervision; grade level teaming, parent support, and (b) in-school workshops in the training process. Hence this variable was measured indirectly through teachers' rating of these dimensions. The following definitions are based on the instrument: “Teacher Opinions About School Transactions” as constructed by Persaud (2000).

2. **Principal leadership team** was defined as the extent to which the principal was perceived by teachers to ask for and use their opinions when discussing issues (items 1-5); promotes teamwork (items 6-12); uses cause-effect analysis when defining a problem for the purpose of selecting a solution (items 13-20).

3. **Instructional supervision** was defined as the extent to which the principal was perceived as requesting teachers to examine the reasons for students' failure (items 21-25); reviewing lesson plans for purposes of ensuring objectives are related to students' experiences, learning styles, related subject matter, and standardized tests items (26-32); providing support and techniques for teachers to develop lesson plans along these lines (items 33-40); and discussing the effective use of questioning for higher order thinking skills after the observation of teaching (items 41-45).
4. *Grade level teaming* was defined as the extent to which the grade level meetings examine teaching in terms of cause-effect technique in areas of need analysis of students, and linking teaching to such needs (items 46-53).

5. *Parent support* was defined as the extent to which teachers perceived parents as supportive in the critical area of supporting teachers in promoting learning at home, and utilizing teachers' suggestions for improving discipline (items 54-57).

6. *Workshops* were defined as the extent to which teachers perceived them to be conducted on cause-effect techniques for impacting higher order thinking skills by relating the causes for students' failure to choices in curriculum, teaching and evaluation strategies (items 58-67).

7. *School Climate* was defined as the extent to which teachers were satisfied that the school functioned as a cohesive unit (items 68-78).

8. *Student Improvement* was defined as the extent to which teachers perceived the students as making improvement on class work, higher order thinking skills, and discipline (items 79-86 and 87-92).

**Hypotheses**

1. There will be no significant difference between the perception of teachers participating in high definition training and those not participating regarding the principal's leadership team.
2. There will be no significant difference between the perception of teachers participating in the high definition training and those not participating regarding the teacher’s rating of instructional supervision.

3. There will be no significant difference between the perception of teachers participating in high definition training and those not participating regarding the teacher’s rating of grade level teaming.

4. There will be no significant difference between the perception of teachers participating in the high definition training and those not participating regarding parent support.

5. There will be no significant difference between the perception of teachers’ ratings of workshops in high definition training and those teachers not participating in high definition training.

6. There will be no significant difference between teachers participating in high definition training and those not participating regarding their perception of school climate.

7. There will be no significant difference between the perception of teachers participating in high definition training and those not participating regarding their perception of student improvement.

8. There will be no significant difference in the number of higher order teacher response prior to and following completion of their critical thinking training sessions.
Limitations of Study

The study was limited to one school district and two schools. This restricted the population to which the data could be generalized. This study was also limited due to completion of the training within one school year. Though training was designed to be on-going, one year did not provide teachers enough time to master the skills without continuous monitoring.

Summary

There has been a significant amount of research that indicates that the effective principal is also an instructional leader. In effect, the principal assumes a major role in how the instructional program is structured and how the teacher delivers the instructional program. There has also been some research conducted that suggests that many teachers do not have sufficient training to deliver a sound instructional program, especially in the area of teaching critical thinking. In short, providing teachers with professional development in teaching critical thinking, using high definitions principles, should positively impact the achievement of students. When any one of the essential elements of an effective school program is missing, e.g., lack of strong administrative leadership and teachers not equipped to teach skills in critical thinking to students, the result is often low student achievement and poor school climate.
CHAPTER IV
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

This study was designed to examine the impact of high definition training on teacher perceptions of the principal’s leadership, parent support and student improvement. Teachers were trained on how to teach higher order thinking skills that would improve both student achievement and school climate. The intent of the study was to investigate whether teachers would increase their teaching of higher order thinking skills and would rate improvement in school climate and student performance after being treated in in-school workshops on principles of high definition teaching strategies.

Research Design

The research design was a Quasi-Experimental Design. A teacher questionnaire was the instrument that was utilized in the study, which was developed for the purpose of collecting data to test the hypotheses as described in Chapter III. The results of the questionnaire were analyzed to explain relationships among different variables as hypothesized.

Description of the Sample

The study took place at an elementary school in the Atlanta Public School System, Atlanta, Georgia. The selection of this school was based on the existing
principal's desire to have a training process in place that would carry over from year to year and would strengthen teachers' implementation of instruction. The school not receiving the treatment was selected because it represented a very similar population of students and school location. The school, a part of the Atlanta Public School System, is located in a low-income community located approximately 2 miles away. The principal has been at the school for 19 years and 1 year prior to this study the school went to a year-round calendar. Improving reading and math had been the major goal of the school due to large numbers of students performing in the lowest quartile. The school had been involved with several partnerships that provided some academic support. Hands-on Atlanta had provided support for teachers in the classroom and an after-school program for 2 years. In the year of this study, the school developed and implemented an after-school program that targeted students that were considered critical needs students. These were students whose test results were in the lowest quartile on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills given the previous year. Additionally, the school had several partnerships that provided mentoring for students. At one time there was also a peer mediation program in place that helped to improve student discipline.

Description of the Instrument

The instrument used in the study is a teacher questionnaire developed by researcher, Dr. Ganga Persuad (1997). The questionnaire is designed to get teachers' opinions about school transactions that include principal leadership, instructional supervision, grade-level teaming, parent support, staff development (workshop), school
climate and student improvement. In addition, teachers were asked to provide
demographic data and comments. The comment section was optional. The principal
leadership portion included items 1 through 25. The instructional supervision portion
included items 26 through 45. The grade level teaming included items 46 through 52.
The parent support portion included items 53 through 57. The workshop portion included
items 58 through 67. The school climate portion included items 68 through 78. The
student improvement portion included items 79 through 92 and teachers' demographics
included items 93 through 98. The last section of the questionnaire was left for teachers
to provide comments if they desired. A High Definition Teacher Empowerment
Evaluation Model, developed and revised by Dr. Ganga Persaud (1999), was used to
record information from the video tapings of teachers during classroom instruction.

Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

An item to scale correlation using the Cronbach Alpha Co-efficient Method was
used to validate the validity and reliability. The reliability was .85 and above for each
scale item.

Questionnaire Reliability

Reliability Coefficient was performed on each set of questionnaire items. The
reliability coefficients ranged from .90 to .96 (Table 1). These suggest a high consistency
between the questionnaire items.
Table 1

Reliability Coefficients Analysis Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N Cases</th>
<th>N Items</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Leadership Team</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.9443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Supervision</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.9604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Level Teaming</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.9446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Support</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.9577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.9552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.8958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Improvement</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.9219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection Procedures

Permission and assistance from the district office was requested as the first phase of the data collection. During the month of September 2000 the principal of the school received training on the High Definition Planning Principle. During this training the problem was identified as it related to student achievement and school climate. It was necessary for the entire administrative team to receive the training before teachers were trained so that the concept and the process would be clearly understood to increase the likelihood of successful implementation.

The administrative team composed of the assistant principal, instructional liaison specialist, counselor, and principal, serving as facilitator, received training on the entire process. The expectations and roles the administrative team would have to play in
ensuring that teachers would be given the support and supervision during implementation were also given. In a group setting the certified teaching staff was administered the questionnaire, and the researcher collected the questionnaires. During this session teachers were told that each one would be videotaped teaching a lesson to their class.

Because it was important to look at instructional delivery before high definition training and after high definition training involving critical thinking skill, a total of 17 teachers were videotaped carrying out instruction. If the quality of instruction was going to be improved, there needed to be a way to measure how teachers were incorporating critical thinking skills in daily instruction before training occurred. In order to do this, the teachers were videotaped teaching one lesson for approximately 10 to 15 minutes. The lessons varied across the curriculum and all grades, kindergarten through fifth grade, were included. Teachers were told only that they were going to be videotaped teaching a lesson of their choice and that instruction should be carried out in the normal manner.

It is important to note here that the use of critical thinking skills refers to how teachers used the levels of Blooms Taxonomy to explain and question students. The instrument used to gather this data is the High Definition Teacher Empowerment Evaluation Model (TEEM: SHORT FORM) created by Dr. Ganga Persaud (1999). The instrument looks at the following teacher actions:

1. **Textbook: Literal Meaning-Literal** refers to answering questions found directly in the text or directly stated main ideas.
2. **Textbook: Inferential Concepts**—Inferential refers to having to deduct the answers from the text and answering questions that call for interpretation and predicting outcomes.

3. **Student Life Experiences** refer to questions or explanations that students can relate to from their own life experiences.

4. **Related Concepts in Same Subject** refers to questions and explanations that are drawn from the same context area.

5. **Related Concepts in Different Subject Areas (Integration)** refer to questions or explanations that come from across content areas.

6. **Test Concepts/Items** refer to questions or explanations that relate to test objectives.

7. **Using Students' Concepts, Praising, Recognizing** refers to use of praising and recognition doing questions and explaining.

The thinking skills are categorized as follows: Lower Order: Knowledge; Comprehension (Literal Explanation); and Higher Order: Analysis, Application, Synthesis, and Evaluation. After the completion of the first videotaping, the initial training for teachers began with the leadership team.

The leadership team was composed of one teacher from each grade level, grade kindergarten through fifth. The training began by helping teachers understand the problem through the High Definition Planning Principle. The High Definition Teaching Model was used to show teachers how to prepare lessons in order to teach for high order
thinking skills. During the workshop (training) teachers were given practical examples of how to use the model in their planning and instruction. Team leaders took this information back to their team meetings and shared this training with the teachers on their respective teams. During the month of October, the entire teaching staff received the first training sessions. This training followed the same steps that had been used to train the leadership team. In that the team leaders had done preliminary training with teachers, this training was successful in clearing up any confusion on how implementation was to occur as regular daily instruction was carried out. Teachers were encouraged to use the High Definition Lesson Planning Format so that they would be better able to monitor their own delivery of instruction each day. Classroom observations were made weekly, and teachers were provided feedback from the administrative team. Grade level team leaders met with their teams monthly to discuss progress and share ideas. During the month of February teachers were engaged in a hands on session in which groups were assigned different responsibilities to demonstrate and show how the activity related to specific knowledge and social experience. This provided teachers with strategies that could be used to expand the process that was being used in the classroom and to reach students that were still experiencing difficulty functioning on the higher levels of Blooms Taxonomy. Beginning the first week in May, teachers were videotaped for a second time. The tapes were scored using the High Definition Teaching for Higher Order Thinking Skills (Short Form). Teachers were also administered the Teacher Opinions
About School Transactions survey during the first week of June. Results will be discussed in chapter 5.

Summary

The focus of chapter 4 was to present the methods and procedures used in this study. The chapter discussed the research design, description of the sample, the instrument, validity and reliability of the instrument, and data collection procedures.
CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This chapter presents an analysis of the statistical data gathered from surveys administered to teachers at two different elementary schools and data gathered from a high definition teacher empowered evaluation form. The purpose of the study was to examine the impact of high definition training on teacher perceptions of the principal’s leadership, parent support, and student improvement. The high definition training was designed to train teachers better on how to teach higher order thinking skills. This study analyzed data from 25 teachers in the pre-test and 39 teachers in the post-test. The instrument used in the study was a teacher questionnaire. An item to scale correlation using the Cronback Alpha Co-efficient Method was used to validate the validity and reliability. For the high definition teacher empowered evaluation form a one-sample t-test were used.

Tables included in this chapter described the data and finding therein. Each null hypothesis was stated and data analyzed, accompanied by a table which illustrates the results.

The data will be analyzed in order of the hypotheses.
Hypotheses Testing

**HO 1**: There will be no significant difference between the perception of teachers participating in the high definition training and those not participating regarding the principal's leadership team.

A mean score and analysis of variance was used to test this hypothesis. Tables 2 and 3 present the description data for Principal Leadership Team using Mean Scores and a One Way ANOVA. The number for the Pre-test experimental was 25 with a mean of 4.3429 and a standard deviation of .7054. The number for the post-test control was 18 with a mean of 4.8639 and a standard deviation of .2650. The number for the post-test experimental was 21 with a mean of 4.7571 and a standard deviation of .2891. The post-test experimental mean was higher than the pre-test experimental mean which indicates the treatment did have an effect on the group. The post-test control was higher than the post-test experimental. The researcher can only speculate factors inherent to the school culture. The One way Analysis of Variance resulted in an F-ratio of 6.97, significant at the \( p < 0.002 \) level. These results clearly indicate that teachers participating in the high definition training had a better perception of the principal’s leadership team compared to the control group of teachers (Table 3). The hypothesis of no difference was therefore rejected.

**HO 2**: There will be no significant differences between the perception of teachers participating in the high definition training and those not participating regarding the teachers' rating of instructional supervision (Tables 4 and 5).
Table 2

Mean Score and Analysis of Variance: By Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Leadership Team</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test Experimental</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.3429</td>
<td>.7054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test Control</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.8639</td>
<td>.2650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test Experimental</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.7571</td>
<td>.2891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.6253</td>
<td>.5374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Oneway ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Leadership Team</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.384</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.692</td>
<td>6.970</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>14.809</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.193</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A mean score and analysis of variance was used to test this hypothesis. Tables 4 and 5 present the descriptive data from instructional supervision using mean scores and a Oneway ANOVA. The number for the pre-test experimental was 25 with a mean of 4.0990 and a standard deviation of .8851. The number for the post-control was 18 with a mean of 4.6111 and a standard deviation of .4056. The number for the post-test
Experimental was 21 with a mean of 4.5400 and a standard deviation of .5495. The Oneway Analysis of Variance resulted in a significant F-ratio of 3.82, < p.027. As a result, the hypothesis of no difference was rejected. In effect, high definition training did significantly impact how teachers felt about the level of instructional supervision following the training.

Table 4

Mean Score and Analysis of Variance: By Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Supervision</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test Experimental</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.0990</td>
<td>.8857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test Control</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.6111</td>
<td>.4056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test Experimental</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.5400</td>
<td>.5495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.3877</td>
<td>.7030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Oneway ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Supervision</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.469</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.734</td>
<td>3.825</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>27.663</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31.132</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HO 3: There will be no significant difference between the perception of teachers participating in the high definition training and those not participating regarding the teachers’ rating of grade level teaming (Tables 6 and 7).

Table 6

Means Score and Analysis of Variance: By Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level Teaming</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test Experimental</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.6850</td>
<td>1.1710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test Control</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.2639</td>
<td>1.0837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test Experimental</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.1349</td>
<td>1.1108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.9954</td>
<td>1.1386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

Oneway ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level Teaming</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.115</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.058</td>
<td>1.618</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>77.552</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81.667</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A mean score and analysis of variance was used to test this hypothesis. Tables 6 and 7 present the descriptive data from grade level teaming using mean scores and a One-way ANOVA. The number for the pre-test experimental was 25 with a mean score of 3.6850 and a standard deviation of 1.1710. The number for the post-test control was 18. The mean was 4.2639 and the standard deviation was 1.0837. The number for the post-test experimental was 21. The mean was 4.1349 and the standard deviation was 1.1108. The one-way analysis of variance resulted in a F-ratio of 1.618, > p.05. As a result, the hypothesis of no difference was accepted indicating that the treatment, high definition training did not significantly impact the teacher perception of grade level teaming as a result of the training.

HO 4: There will be no significant difference between the perception of teachers participating in the high definition training and those not participating regarding the teachers' perception of parent support (Tables 8 and 9).

A mean score and analysis of variance was used to test this hypothesis. Table 9 presents the descriptive data from parent support using mean scores and a One-way ANOVA. The number for the pre-test experimental was 25. The mean was 2.6833 and the standard deviation was 1.3372. The number for the post-test control was 18. The mean was 4.000 and the standard deviation was 1.2066. The number for the post-test experimental was 20. The mean was 3.0625 and the standard deviation was 1.2066. The analysis of variance indicated that the F-ratio of 5.266 was significant p.008, resulting in
the rejection of the hypothesis of no difference. Teachers did believe that the level of parent support did in fact change as a result of the high definition training.

Table 8

Mean Score and Analysis of Variance: By Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Support</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test Experimental</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.6833</td>
<td>1.3372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test Control</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.2066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test Experimental</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.0625</td>
<td>1.4139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.1799</td>
<td>1.4153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

Oneway ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Support</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>18.546</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.273</td>
<td>5.266</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>105.651</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124.197</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HO 5: There will be no significant difference between the ratings of workshop by teachers participating in the high definition training and those not participating in the high definition training (Tables 10 and 11).

Table 10
Mean Score and Analysis of Variance, By Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test Experimental</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.6920</td>
<td>1.1376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test Control</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.2000</td>
<td>.6435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test Experimental</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.0143</td>
<td>.8912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.9406</td>
<td>.9500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11
Oneway ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshops</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.870</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.435</td>
<td>1.622</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>53.984</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56.854</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A mean score and analysis of variance was used to test this hypothesis. Tables 10 and 11 present the descriptive data from workshops using mean scores and a One-way ANOVA. The number for the pre-test experimental was 25. The mean was 3.6920 and the standard deviation was 1.1376. The number for the post-test control was 18. The mean 4.2000 and the standard deviation was .6435. The number for the post-test experimental was 21. The mean was 4.0143 and the standard deviation was .8912. The analysis of variance resulted in an F-ratio of 1.66, P >.05. As a result, the hypothesis of no difference was accepted. In effect, teachers reported that the high definition training had no significant impact upon their perception of the workshops conducted at the treatment school.

**HO 6:** There will be no significant difference between teachers participating in high definition training and those not participating regarding their perception of school climate (Tables 12 and 13).

### Table 12

**Mean Score and Analysis of Variance: By Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Climate</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test Experimental</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.7019</td>
<td>.7076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Control</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.2525</td>
<td>.6515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test Experimental</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.2987</td>
<td>.6099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.0582</td>
<td>.7084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

Oneway ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Climate</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.941</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.470</td>
<td>5.663</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>26.172</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31.112</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A mean score and analysis of variance was used to test this hypothesis. Tables 12 and 13 present the descriptive data from student achievement using mean scores and a Oneway ANOVA. The number for the pre-test experimental was 25. The mean was 2.6259 and the standard deviation was .7569. The number for the post-test control was 18. The mean was 2.9402 and the standard deviation was .2836. The number for the post-test experimental was 21. The mean was 3.1023 and the standard deviation was .6833. The oneway analysis of variance resulted in an F-ratio of 3.381, (p < .05). The hypothesis of no difference was therefore rejected. A significant difference occurred in the level of student achievement as perceived by teachers.

HO 7: There will be no significant difference between teachers participating in high definition training and those not participating regarding their perception of student improvement (Tables 14 and 15).
Table 14

Mean Score and Analysis of Variance: By Groups

Student Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Improvement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test Experimental</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.6259</td>
<td>.7569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test Control</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.9402</td>
<td>.2836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test Experimental</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.1023</td>
<td>.6833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.8706</td>
<td>.6567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15

Oneway ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Improvement</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.711</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.355</td>
<td>3.381</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>24.455</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.166</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A mean score and analysis of variance was used to test this hypothesis. Tables 14 and 15 present the descriptive data from student improvement using mean scores and a oneway ANOVA. The number for the pre-test experimental was .25. The mean was
2.6259 and the standard deviation was .7569. The number for the post-test control was 18. The mean was 2.9402 and the standard deviation was .2836. The number for the post-test experimental was 21. The mean was 3.1023 and the standard deviation was .6833. The one way analysis of variance resulted in an F-ratio of 3.381, (p < .05). The hypothesis of no difference was therefore rejected. A significant difference occurred in the level of student achievement as perceived by teachers.

HO 8: There will be no significant difference in the number of higher order teacher responses prior to and following completion of their critical thinking training sessions.

This null hypothesis was tested using the one-sample t test. The null hypothesis is that the mean responses prior to the critical thinking training sessions and following the critical thinking training sessions are equal, or that no statistically significant difference exists between them. The p value, ascertained from the t distribution critical values, indicates the probability of obtaining data at least as extreme as that actually observed when the null hypothesis is assumed true. Therefore, if this probability is very small, then the null hypothesis is unlikely given the observed data, and it is rejected. The resulting t value was then checked against the t distribution critical values table to determine the corresponding p value, denoting level of significance of change. A value of p less than 0.05 indicates that the difference considered is significant, while a value of less than 0.01 corresponds to highly significant difference (see Table 16).

The findings were generated according to the following teacher actions: (a) textbook: literal meaning, (b) textbook: inferential concepts, (c) student life experiences,
(d) related concepts on the same subject, (e) related concepts in different subjects, (f) test concepts/items, and (g) using students’ concepts, praising, and recognizing.

The one-sample t tests revealed statistically significant differences between teachers’ TEEM before and after ratings in one teacher action—related concepts in the same subject—and highly significant differences in five teacher actions-textbooks: literal meaning, textbooks: inferential concepts, student life experiences, test concepts/items, using students’ concepts, praising, and recognizing. No statistically significant difference was found between pre and post-TEEM ratings for related concepts in different subject areas (integration).

Textbook: Literal Meaning. The Textbook: Literal Meaning average ratings prior to the critical thinking training sessions was 2.5714. The Textbook: Literal Meaning average ratings after completion of the critical thinking training sessions was 4.20, a mean difference of 1.6286. The one-sample t-test analysis yielded a highly significant t value, \( t(.05, 19) = 4.722, p = .0000 \). These findings are summarized in Table 17. Based on this finding, the null hypothesis of no significant difference was rejected with respect to the Textbook: Literal Meaning variable.

Textbook: Inferential Concept. The Textbook: Inferential Concepts mean rating prior to the critical thinking training session was 2.0000. The Textbook: Inferential Concepts mean rating after completion of the critical thinking training session was 3.2222, a mean difference of 1.2950. The one-sample t-test analysis yielded a highly significant difference, \( t(.05, 17) = 3.716, p = .002 \). These results are summarized in
Table 18. Based on this finding, the null hypothesis of no difference was rejected with respect to the Textbook: Inferential Concepts variable.

Table 16

Summary of Statistical Analysis of Mean Teacher Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test (Test Value)</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textbook: Literal Meaning</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.722</td>
<td>&lt;.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook: Inferential Concepts</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.716</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life Experiences</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.448</td>
<td>.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Concepts in Same Subject</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.782</td>
<td>.017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Concepts in Different Subject Areas</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.651</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test concepts/items</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>3.713</td>
<td>.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using students, concepts, praising, recognizing</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>5.939</td>
<td>&lt;.001***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.

Student Life Experiences. The Student Life Experiences mean rating prior to the critical thinking training session was 2.0000. The Student Life Experiences mean rating after completion of the critical thinking training session was 3.3529, a mean difference of 1.3529. The one-sample t-test analysis determined a statistically significant difference at the .05 level, t (.05, 16) = 3.448, p = .003, in the Student Life Experiences mean ratings.
prior to critical thinking training session and after completion of critical thinking training session. These results are summarized in Table 19. Based on this finding, the null hypothesis was rejected with respect to the Student Life Experiences variable.

Table 17
One-Sample t-Test Analysis: Textbook: Literal Meaning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Value = 2.5714</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook: Literal Meaning</td>
<td>4.722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18
One-Sample t-Test Analysis: Textbook: Inferential Concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Value = 2.0000</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook: Inferential Concepts</td>
<td>3.716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19

One-Sample t-Test Analysis: Student Life Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life Experiences</td>
<td>3.448</td>
<td>1.3529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Related Concepts in Same Subject. The Related Concepts in Same Subject mean rating prior to the critical thinking training session was 2.1667. The Related Concepts in Same Subject mean rating after completion of the critical thinking training session was 3.0000, a mean difference of .8333. The one-sample t-test analysis yielded a t value of 2.782 (p = .017), which was statistically significant at the .05 level. The results are summarized in Table 20. Based on this finding, the null hypothesis of no difference was rejected with respect to the Related Concepts in Same Subject variable.

Related Concepts in Different Subjects (Integration). The Related Concepts in Different Subjects mean rating prior to the critical thinking training session was 2.0000. The Related Concepts in Different Subjects mean rating after completion of the critical thinking training session was 2.5000, a mean difference of .5000. The one-sample t-test analysis indicated no statistically significant difference at the .05 level, t(.05, 15) =
1.651, \( p = .119 \), in the Related Concepts in Different Subjects mean ratings prior to the critical thinking training session and after completion of the critical thinking training session. These results are summarized in Table 21. Based on this finding, the null hypothesis of no difference was accepted with respect to the Related Concepts in Different Subjects variable.

Table 20
One-Sample t-Test Analysis: Related Concepts in Same Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related Concepts in Same Subject</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.782</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.8333</td>
<td>.1806, 1.4860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Concepts/Items. The Test Concepts/Items mean rating prior to the critical thinking training session was 0. The Test Concepts/items mean rating after completion of the critical thinking training session was 2.2000, a mean difference of 2.20000. The one-sample t-test analysis indicated a statistically significant difference at the .05 level, \( t(.05, 9) = 3.713, p = .005 \), in the mean Test Concepts/Items ratings from prior to critical
thinking training sessions to after completion of the critical thinking training sessions. These results are summarized in Table 22. Based on this finding, the null hypothesis of no difference was rejected with respect to the Test Concepts/items variables.

**Using Students' Concepts, Praising and Recognizing.** The Using Students' Concepts, Praising and Recognizing mean rating prior to the critical thinking training session was 2.5000. The Using Students' Concepts, Praising and Recognizing mean rating after completion of the critical thinking training session was 4.7059, a mean difference of 2.2059. The one-sample t-test analysis determined a statistically significant difference at the .05 level, \( t(.05, 17) = 5.939, p = .000 \), in the mean Using Students' Concepts, Praising and Recognizing ratings from prior to the critical thinking training session to completion of the critical thinking training session. These results are summarized in Table 23. Based on this finding, the null hypothesis of no difference was rejected with respect to the Using Students' Concepts, Praising and Recognizing variable.

Table 21

**One-Sample t-Test Analysis: Related Concepts in Different Subjects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Value = 2.0000</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Concepts in Different Subjects (Integration)</td>
<td>1.651</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22

One-Sample t-Test Analysis: Test Concepts/Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Concepts/Items</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23

One-Sample t-Test Analysis: Students' Concepts, Praising and Recognizing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students' Concepts, Praising and Recognizing</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' Concepts, Praising and Recognizing</td>
<td>5.939</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.2059</td>
<td>1.4184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

In summary, this research study used a Quasi-Experimental post-test only control group design to measure the main effects. A oneway analysis of variance resulted in significant F-ratios for the main effects for 5 of the 7 dependent variables. Reliability coefficients were applied to the questionnaire used to gather the participants' responses. The analysis of the data indicates that the High Definition Training Model does impact, in a significant manner, the perceptions of teachers regarding 5 of the 7 dependent variables. The two exceptions were the impact of high definition training upon the teacher's perception of grade level teaming and workshops. Variables, teaming, and workshops have a cause-effect component as a requirement. The data do not make clear the relationship, if any, between the emphases placed upon this component and the teachers' perception of the effectiveness of the training. The analysis of the data indicated a significant relationship between the high definition training and the impact upon the principal's leadership team, instructional supervision, school climate, parent support, and student improvement. The statistical results of each these variables were well within the predetermined confidence level of .05.

The data from High Definition Teacher Empowerment Evaluation Model, which was used to gather data from the videotaping of teachers, examined teacher actions in reference to the following:

1. Textbook: Literal Meaning;
2. Textbook: Inferential Concepts;
3. Student Life Experience;
4. Related Concepts in Same Subject;
5. Related Concepts in Different Subject;
6. Test Concepts/Items; and

Scoring was done for Higher Order Thinking Skills for Higher Order Pre- and Higher Order Post. The one-sample t tests revealed statistically significant differences between teachers' TEEM before and after ratings in one teacher's action—related concepts in the same subject—and highly significant differences in five teachers' actions textbooks: literal meaning, textbooks: inferential concepts, student life experiences, test concepts/items, using students' concepts, praising, and recognizing. No statistically significant difference was found between pre and post-TEEM ratings for related concepts in different subject areas.
CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS,
RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of high definition training on teacher perceptions of the principal's leadership, parent support, and student improvement. The study took place over a one-year period at an elementary school in the Atlanta Public School District in the City of Atlanta, Georgia. The community is a low-income community where 98% of the students are on free and reduced lunch. Improving student achievement in the areas of reading and math had been the major goal for the administration and teachers. It was felt that if teachers knew how to identify the real causes for students not making the desired achievement gains each year, then achievement results would change. Additionally, a process could then be put into place that would train teachers to use resources that were already available to get the desired results. Results from standardized tests indicated that students were not performing well in areas that related directly to higher order thinking.

The High Definition Training Model trained the principal and the administrative team to do the following:

1. Systematically define school-related problems as cause-effect paradigms;
2. Select a solution that was likely to be effective more than alternatives;
3. Manage the implementation process to make sure that resources were utilized to attain the objectives; and
4. Evaluate the process to determine the extent to which the solution was effective.

The training model prepared the administrative team to reinforce and monitor the high definition principles while teachers implemented higher order thinking skills in their classrooms daily. The high definition training provided teachers with strategies that allowed them to use the experiences children brought to the learning environment to teach higher order thinking skills across the curriculum. As teachers became more aware of their teachings to lower order skills they began to understand why students were not progressing at the rate desired. Through the training teachers were taught how to begin with what students already knew and use that to make a connection to what new skill had to be taught. This provided opportunities for students to apply, analyze, and use other higher order skills. As teachers confidence levels improved the quality of instruction improved.

Findings

The answer to research questions 1-8 are reflected and addressed through hypothesis 1-8. Findings are summarized by discussion of the variables:

1. Principal leadership team
2. Instructional Supervision
3. Grade level teaming
4. Parent support
5. Workshops
6. School Climate
7. Student Improvement

For hypothesis 1, results from the one way analysis of variance resulted in an F-ratio of 6.97, significant at the \( p < 0.002 \) level indicates that teachers participating in the high definition training had a better perception of the principal's leadership team compared to the control group of teachers. Mean score was higher for post-experimental then pre-experimental but not higher than post-control.

For hypothesis 2, results from the one way analysis of variance resulted in a significant F-ratio of 3.82, \( p < 0.027 \). High definition training did significantly impact how teachers felt about the level of instructional supervision following the training. Mean score was higher for post-test experimental than pre-test but not higher than post-test control.

For hypothesis 3, results from the one way analysis of variance resulted in an F-ratio of 1.618 > \( p > 0.05 \). The hypothesis of no difference was accepted indicating that high definition training did not significantly impact the teachers' perception of grade level teaming. Mean score was higher for post-test experimental than pre-test experimental but not higher than post-test control.

For hypothesis 4, results from the one way analysis of variance resulted in an F-ratio of 5.266 was significant at \( p = 0.008 \), resulting in the rejection of the hypothesis of no difference. Teachers did believe that the level of parent support did in fact change as a
result of high definition training. Mean score was higher for post-test experimental than pre-test experimental but not higher for post-test control.

For hypothesis 5, results from the oneway analysis of variance resulted in an F-ratio of 1.66, p >.05. As a result the hypothesis of no difference was accepted. High definition training had no significant impact upon their perception of workshops conducted at the school. Mean score was higher for post-test experimental than pre-test experimental but not higher for post-test control.

For hypothesis 6, results from the oneway analysis of variance resulted in a F-ratio of 5.663, p < .05 causing the hypothesis to be rejected. High definition training did impact school climate. Mean score was higher for post-test experimental than pre-test experimental but not for post-test control.

For hypothesis 7, results from the oneway analysis of variance resulted in a F-ratio of 3.381, p < .05. The hypothesis of no difference was rejected. A significant difference in the level of student achievement as perceived by teachers mean score was higher for post-test experimental than pre-test experimental but not for post-test control.

This study analyzed data collected from 25 teachers in the pre-test and 39 teachers in the post-test. The instrument used in the study was a teacher questionnaire developed by researcher, Dr. Ganga Persaud (1997). An item to scale correlation using the Cronbach Alpha Co-efficient Method was used to validate the validity and reliability. The reliability was .85 and above for each scale.

**HO 1:** There will be no significant difference between the perception of teachers participating in the high definition training and those not participating regarding the
principal’s leadership team. This hypothesis was rejected based upon analysis of the data which indicated that high definition training does impact teacher’s perceptions of principal’s leadership team.

**HO 2:** There will be no significant difference between the perception of teachers participating in the high definition training and those not participating regarding the teacher’s rating of instructional supervision. This hypothesis was rejected based upon analysis of the data which indicated that high definition training does impact teachers’ perceptions of instructional supervision.

**HO 3:** There will be no significant difference between the perception of teachers participating in the high definition training and those not participating regarding the teachers’ rating of grade level teaming. This hypothesis was accepted based upon analysis of the data which indicated that high definition training does not impact teachers’ perception of grade level teaming.

**HO 4:** There will be no significant difference between the perception of teachers participating in the high definition training and those not participating regarding the teachers’ perception of parent support. This hypothesis was rejected based upon analysis of the data which indicated that high definition training does impact teachers’ perceptions of parent support.

**HO 5:** There will be no significant difference between the ratings of workshop by teachers participating in the high definition training and those not participating in the high definition training. This hypothesis was accepted based upon analysis of the data
which indicated that high definition training does not impact teachers’ perception of workshops.

**HO 6:** There will be no significant difference between teachers participating in high definition training and those not participating regarding their perception of school climate. This hypothesis was rejected based upon analysis of the data which indicated that high definition training does impact teachers’ perception of school climate.

**HO 7:** There will be no significant difference between teachers participating in high definition training and those not participating regarding their perception of student improvement. This hypothesis was rejected based upon analysis of the data which indicated that high definition training does impact teachers’ perception of student improvement.

**HO 8:** There will be no significant difference in the number of High Order Thinking Skills teacher responses prior to and following completion of their critical thinking training sessions. This hypothesis was rejected based upon analysis of the data which indicated significant difference was found in one teacher’s action and highly significant difference was found in five teachers’ actions.

**Conclusions**

The survey “Teachers Opinions About School Transactions” was used to gather data for this study. The following components were identified as dependent variables:

- Principal’s team;
- instructional support;
- grade teaming;
• parent support;
• workshops;
• school climate; and
• student improvement.

The data indicated that high definition training does impact, in a significant manner, perceptions of teachers regarding 5 of the 7 dependent variables. The two exceptions were the impact of high definition training upon the teacher's perception of grade level teaming and workshops. This could possibly be due to the cause-effect component of teaming and workshops. The data did not indicate a clear relationship, if any, between the emphases placed upon these components and teacher's perception of the effectiveness of the training. This study revealed that high definition training did have an impact of teacher perceptions on the following:

- Principal's leadership team
- Instructional supervision
- Parent support
- School climate
- Student achievement

Recommendations

The following recommendations were drawn from the findings and conclusions of this study.
1. Follow-up study should be conducted to examine the impact that continued use of the principles of high definition would have on students' test results.

2. Teachers should be given more workshops that relate to the teaching of critical thinking skills using the high definition model.

3. Grade level teams should be involved more in the training and implementation of the high definition model.

4. Further research should be conducted to compare the effectiveness of the high definition model to other school-wide reform initiatives.

5. Leaders should spend more time in the supervision of teachers in training to ensure they apply the skills learned.

Summary

The chapter began by restating the main purpose of the study. A synopsis of the study was done to provide closure. The major findings were summarized based on the research questions. The conclusions generated 5 recommendations as result of the research.
APPENDIX A

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

TEACHER OPINIONS ABOUT SCHOOL TRANSACTIONS

Your Principal has requested that your school engage in an experimental design. The data on the experiment will be used in her Doctoral dissertation at Clark Atlanta University. Hence, there is need for honesty and accuracy in data collection.

In order to conduct an experimental design, we solicit teachers' opinions about the various activities in their respective schools. The purpose is to use teachers' opinions as baseline data for guiding planning for the next year. There is no right or wrong response and no one can be identified. So please be frank in providing your responses.

To ensure anonymity, a designated person will administer this instrument and deliver the completed questionnaires directly to the Researcher, Dr. Ganga Persaud, Clark Atlanta University.

Use the scale below and check or circle ( ) one response for each item.

A = Almost Always; B = Most Times; C = Sometimes; D = A Few Times; E = Almost Never (or don't know/not applicable)

A. The principal

1. Is friendly and approachable when you have a problem or concern to discuss.  
   A B C D E

2. Solicits the opinions about your needs and concerns in a timely manner.  
   A B C D E

3. Considers your opinion as equally important, even if different from his/her own.  
   A B C D E

4. Changes his/her opinion when presented with alternative reasoning.  
   A B C D E

5. Values your ideas and/or efforts in a timely manner  
   A B C D E
B. The principal and his/her administrative team

6. Promote teamwork at grade and/or departmental levels.

7. Facilitate each grade level or department team in setting objectives for improving each student's achievement.

8. Facilitate each grade level or department team in developing curriculum and instructional strategies for improving each student achievement.

9. Facilitate each grade level or departmental team in evaluating the effectiveness of decisions and plans.

10. Recognize my grade department team for work done.

11. Accept decisions made at grade or department levels.

12. Assign duties and responsibilities to all teachers and staff equitably.

C. The principal in the planning and decision making process at meetings

13. Facilitates the faculty in analyzing problems in terms of cause and effect relationships.

14. Helps the faculty to define a problem by identifying the failed objectives.

15. Helps the faculty to identify the causes for failed objectives.

16. Ensures that the faculty learns about the causes of a problem before selecting a solution.
17. Ensures that a solution is selected on the basis that could counteract the causes of the problem.

18. Ensures that the solution to a problem is cost effective as compared to alternatives.

19. Ensures that evaluations to determine the effectiveness of decisions are conducted.

20. Ensures that the results of evaluation are utilized in improving the activities designed for promoting objectives.

D. The principal and other administrators request teachers to organize students' data as follows:

21. Rank order the students according to their performance in math or reading (or in your subject area).

22. Identify low performers in reading or math or in your subject area.

23. Identify the concepts and skills that students failed in reading comprehension, math or your subject area.

24. Determine if academic problems might be a reason for students' low self-esteem and/or discipline problems.

25. Talk to low achievers and/or discipline problem students to find out if their home factors and learning styles could be reasons for their low performances.

E. The building administrators review lesson plans to ensure that each lesson demonstrates instances of

26. Objectives framed for improving the self-esteem of each student.

27. Objectives framed for improving each student's
basic skill as compared to his/her beginning performance.

28. Objectives framed for improving each student's higher order thinking skills as compared to when he/she began the school year.

29. Objectives aligned to standardized tests.

30. Objectives framed for integrating new concepts to previous lessons and related subject areas.

31. Objectives aligned to the social problems and everyday

32. Objectives aligned to the learning styles of students.

F. The building administrators provide support and techniques for teachers to develop lesson plans that

33. Identify the key meanings or concepts to be taught at the academic and social experience level of students.

34. Provide examples that integrate the lesson to previous concepts taught, related subject areas and students social or life experience.

35. Provide examples that appeal to the different learning styles or multiple intelligence of students.

36 Provide questions to be asked for enabling students to relate their social experiences to the content being taught.

37. Provide questions to be asked that focus on higher order thinking skills.

38. Provide questions to be asked that focus on integrating new knowledge with related subject areas.
39. Contain or indicate student independent practices for ensuring each child had mastered the concepts taught.

40. Contain strategies for meeting the social needs and concerns of students with discipline or learning problems.

G. After observing your teaching, the evaluators discuss with you the effectiveness of

41. Questions used for enabling students to relate the new concepts being taught to their social experiences.

42. Questions used for enabling students to relate the new concepts to previous lessons and/or related subject areas.

43. Questions used for enabling students to respond by using higher order thinking skills.

44. Students answers/responses in relation to your questions

45. Students answers/responses in relation to mastery of the A B C D E concepts being taught.

H. My Grade Level or Departmental Team members discuss with me and demonstrate

46. How to conduct needs assessment and/or students' profile analyses.

47. How to use students' data about their social experiences in writing lesson plans.

48. How to use data on the learning styles, or brain research and multiple intelligence in writing lesson plans.
49. How to construct lesson plans for enabling each student to perform at or above grade level.

50. How to construct lesson plans in order to reduce or prevent discipline problems

51. How to conduct an effective evaluation of my teaching.

I. The Principal and/or the administrative team discuss and demonstrate at grade level, department or conferences

52. How to use data on students' profile and/or learning styles, multiple intelligence, etc. in constructing lesson plans to enable each student to perform at grade level.

53. How to construct lesson plans for enabling each student to perform at grade level

J. Parents of Weak and/or discipline problem students

54. Follow-up on my suggestions on how to supervise homework.

55. Work with me to find mentors to help with homework.

56. Follow-up on suggestions on how to improve discipline.

57. Follow-up on suggestions on how to use home mentors for improving discipline.

K. Workshops presented at my school demonstrate how to

58. Use data on students' social experiences in writing lesson plans to bridge the gap between the new knowledge to be taught and students' experiences.
59. Use theories about learning styles, brain research, and multiple intelligence in constructing lessons.

60. Construct lesson plans for building students' self-esteem.

61. Construct lesson plans for reducing or preventing discipline problem.

62. Construct lesson plans so that each student performs at or above grade level.

63. Construct lesson plans to promote students' achievement on standardized tests effectively.

64. Construct lesson plans to integrate content to be taught with related subject areas.

65. Construct questions for promoting students' higher order thinking skills.

66. Construct questions for eliciting students' responses about their experiences and concerns in relation to the concepts being taught.

67. Construct questions for enabling low achievers to provide responses relevant to the concepts being taught.

L. In the area of the climate of this school

68. I feel there is a sense of belonging and togetherness

69. I am satisfied with the way the faculty members cooperate and work together.

70. I am satisfied with the way the school has provided opportunities for my creative expression.
71. I am satisfied with the accomplishments of this school.  
72. I am satisfied with the way faculty members value the work of one another.  
73. I am satisfied with the way students value teachers.  
74. I am satisfied with the way parents value teachers.  
75. I am satisfied with the way the principal represents  
76. I am satisfied with the way teachers represent this school.  
77. I am satisfied with the way the students represent this school.  
78. I would recommend that other teachers apply for positions in this school.

Use the scale below, and check or circle one response for each item following.

A=All  B=Most  C=Some  D=A few  E=None

M. Considering the nature of the students in your class, and their efforts, how many the

79. Low achievers are capable of performing at or above the national norm on standardized tests?  
80. Low achievers are now performing at or above grade level on my tests?  
81. Weak students demonstrate they learn from strong students when working in cooperative groups?
82. Weak students demonstrate they learn from strong students when working in cooperative groups?

83. Weak students are skilled in asking evaluation questions relevant to the concepts being taught?

84. Weak students are skilled in asking evaluation questions about their real-life experiences relevant to the concepts being taught?

85. Weak students are highly responsive to role-playing strategies?

86. Weak students complete assignments on time?

N. In reading or in your subject area, how many students who

87. Made B grades at the beginning of the school year are now earning A grades?

88. Made C grades at the beginning of the school year are now earning B or better grades?

89. Made D or lower grades at the beginning of the school year are now earning B or better grades?

90. Were weak in use of higher order thinking skills thinking skills are excelling now?

0. In the area of discipline and special needs, how many students who

91. Misbehaved had to be sent to a designated place, and/or the office or counselor, for discipline?

92. Were weak or had behavior disorder had to be sent for psychological testing for special programs?
P. Demographics: For research purposes, please check the following as applied to you:

93. Gender: a) Female      b) Male

94. Experience Level: a) 1-2 years ____; b) 3-5 years; c) 6-10 years ____; d) 11-15 years ____; e) 16 or more years ____

95. Qualifications: a) BA/BS Degree ____; b) Ed.S. etc.

Q. Program and Students: Please check:

96. In what grade level or special level are you teaching?

   a) Special Ed. Programs or Title I, etc. ____; b) PreK-K ____; c) Grades 1-2 ____; d) 3-4 ____; e) 5-6 ____; f) 7-8 ____; g) 9 or above ____

97. Percentage of students who are on free or reduced lunch in your class:

   a) 20% or Less ____; b) 2 1 % to 40%; c) 41 % to 60% 
   d) 6 1 % to 80% ____; e) 8 1 % to 100%

98. Are you teaching in the Sylvan Program?

   Yes ____      No ____

Thank you for your patience and cooperation

(c) Copyright Ganga Persaud, Clark Atlanta University
COMMENTS (Optional)

All comments are strictly confidential and cannot be attributed to any one person.

1. What are the key reasons for students' academic failure? Please list.

2. What facilitative acts/roles of the school administrators have significantly impacted student achievement to date this year? Please list.

3. What facilitative acts/roles of the grade or department teams have significantly impacted student achievement to date this year? Please Est.

4. What facilitative acts/roles of the Central Office Coordinators/Area Team have significantly impacted student achievement to date this year? Please list.

6. Other comments
APPENDIX C

HIGH DEFINITION TRAINING AND THE IMPACT UPON TEACHER'S PERCEPTION OF SELECTED SCHOOL VARIABLES CHART

High Definition Training and the Impact Upon Teacher's Perception of Selected School Variables

1. Pre-Test
2. Independent Variable (Treatment)
3. Post-Test
4. Dependent Variables (Outcome)

Experimental School
8. Principal Leadership Team
9. Instructional Supervisor
10. Grade Level Teaming
11. Parent Support
12. Workshops
13. School climate
14. Student Improvement

Impaired Perceptions

Control School
No Pre-test
No Training

Lower Preceptions compared to Experimental School

1. Principal Leadership Team
2. Instructional Supervisor
3. Grade Level Teaming
4. Parent Support
5. Workshops
6. School climate
7. Student Improvement
APPENDIX D

HIGH DEFINITION TEACHING MODEL

The model shows teachers how to prepare lessons in order to teach for high order thinking skills. Workshops will demonstrate the practical process.
# APPENDIX E

**HIGH DEFINITION TEACHER EMPOWERMENT EVALUATION MODEL (TEEM: SHORT FORM)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher's Name (or Code)</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Beginning Time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Action or References to:</th>
<th>Teacher and Students' Lower Order Thinking Skills: Explains, Questions, Answers</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
<th>Teacher and Students' Higher Order Thinking Skills: Explains, Questions, Answers</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textbook Literal Meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook Inferential Concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Concepts in Same Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Concept in Different Subject Areas (Integration)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Concepts/Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating Various Concepts to Provide Total Meaning/Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Students Concepts, Praising Recognizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PERCENTAGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thinking Skills:
- Lower = Knowledge & Comprehension – Literal Explanation
- Higher = Analysis, Application, Synthesis & Evaluation

Ganga Persaud, © 1999 - Revised
High Definition Teacher Employment Evaluation Model

Teacher Actions

Lower Order Pre Score
Higher Order Pre Score
Lower Order Post Score
Higher Order Post Score

Literal Meaning
Pre
Post
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Teacher Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Actions</th>
<th>Life Experiences</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Order Pre</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Order Pre</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Order Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Order Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCEPTS SAME SUBJECT
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Teacher Actions

Concepts Different Subjects
Pre Post

- Lower Order Pre Score
- Higher Order Pre Score
- Lower Order Post Score
- Higher Order Post Score
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Teacher Actions

Test Concepts
Pre  Post

Low Order Pre Score
Higher Order Pre Score
Low Order Post Score
Higher Order Post Score
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Teacher Actions

Praising-Recognizing

Pre Post

Lower Order Pre Score
Higher Order Pre Score
Lower Order Post Score
Higher Order Post Score

53 54

5 44
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