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Abstract

This paper examined nine doctoral dissertations completed between 1988 and 1996 that had received the Canadian Association for Studies in Educational Administration (CASEA) Thomas B. Greenfield Award. Analysis of the 28 award-winning dissertations completed between 1978 and 2005 was done by the University of Manitoba doctoral cohort under the guidance of Dr. J. Stapleton. My examination utilized the 9 features described in the framework developed by Murphy and Vriesenga (2004). The dissertations were also reviewed for their contributions to the field; attention to various perspective, such as Indigenous/Native and feminist; and indicators of quality using the Greenfield Award criteria.
Introduction

This paper reviewed nine dissertations completed between 1988 and 1996 that had received the Thomas B. Greenfield Award from the Canadian Association for Studies in Educational Administration (CASEA; see Appendix A). Each year, CASEA selects one award-winning dissertation from all submissions. Between 1978 and 2005, CASEA gave this prestigious award to 28 Canadian dissertations. In a seminar on educational administration with Dr. J. Stapleton at the University of Manitoba, our doctoral cohort searched educational administration as a field of study and practice. In particular, we reviewed the works of several leading scholars, including Murphy (2002, 2005) and Young (2004). In addition to examining these American perspectives, we investigated the aforementioned 28 award-winning dissertations. This paper focused only on the middle 9 dissertations; two of my cohort colleagues reviewed the first 10 and the last 9 dissertations, respectively. After categorizing the dissertations chronologically, we reviewed their titles and authors (see Appendix B) as our first method of analysis.

Background for the CASEA Greenfield Award

The Thomas B. Greenfield Award application process and selection criteria are listed annually on CASEA’s (2005) Web site. Graduate students are invited to submit their dissertations, or more commonly, their supervising professors submit the dissertations on their behalf. Derek Allison, an award winner and long-standing committee member of CASEA, indicated that independent student submissions are rare (personal e-mail correspondence, February 2, 2006). Departments may submit several submissions in one year. The awards are open to all graduate students who have completed their dissertations at Canadian universities. Each applicant is required to
submit an unbound copy of the dissertation and a 2,500- to 3,000-word summary of the dissertation. Allison, indicated that several decades back, 15 to 20 dissertations used to be submitted annually; however, over the last few years, that number has dwindled to 3 to 5 submissions (personal e-mail, February 2006).

One important eligibility requirement is that the students must complete their research by the end of the calendar year prior to the conference or that they must be awarded their degrees during that period by a Canadian university. Four other criteria are mentioned on CASEA’s Web site: significance of the research problem; conceptualization, design, and execution of the study; potential for theory development, further research, and improved practice; and relevance to the field of educational administration.

The president of CASEA chooses the chairperson of the awards committee, who then selects the committee members. The annual award-winning dissertation is chosen through a peer-review process. Awards are presented at the annual conference and general meeting, and each award winner is invited to present a summary of his or her research to the membership.

In 1994, the award became known as the Thomas B. Greenfield Award, with the initial award winner receiving the CASEA Award for Dissertation of the Year. Greenfield (1929-1992) was an outstanding Canadian scholar who had a significant influence on educational research. Marcella Derkatz stated in her (1995) dissertation that her study built on Greenfield’s view of research. She referred to Greenfield as a major proponent of the subjectivist interpretive perspective in educational administration. Allison (1999), who credited Greenfield as a researcher who strongly impacted
educational administration in Canada, initiated the process to rename the award in honour of Thomas Greenfield.

**Conceptual Framework**

How can studies in educational administration be classified? After reading the dissertations, I initially applied the general framework agreed upon by our doctoral class that summarized the dissertations in a similar manner by reviewing the title, author, statement of the problem, conceptual framework, methodology, and findings. Thus, all 28 award-winning dissertations were reviewed using this initial process.

Once this primary summary of the dissertations was complete, several other frameworks were considered as alternatives, including those of Heck and Hallinger (1999; 2005); Miklos (1992), Murphy and Seashore Louis (1999), Murphy and Vriesenga (2004), and Willower and Forsythe (1999). One colleague combined Miklos’s framework with that of Murphy and Seashore Louis; the other colleague applied Willower and Forsythe first, followed by Murphy and Seashore Louis. She eventually created an adapted framework to analyze the dissertations. I chose to apply the most recent work of Murphy and Vriesenga. My rationale becomes clear after the following discussion about the limitations inherent in the other six categorization frameworks.

I first considered the framework used by Murphy and Seashore Louis (1999), which used only three lenses to examine the content: technical, managerial, and institutional. These lenses, however, represent three significant areas of educational administration, making this framework the most significant when considering the content of the dissertations. Technical refers to matters concerned with the teaching and learning process; managerial refers to leadership, administration, and organization of schooling;
and institutional pertains to relations between the school and its external environments (i.e. parents or the community). Initially, this system was considered general enough to review the diverse topics in the nine dissertations.

Willower and Forsythe (1999) reviewed theme domains using the concepts of unity and diversity, search for meaning, and the pursuit of relevance. Unity and diversity consider the range of discussion within the field; search for meaning features those striving to find understanding. The third concept, pursuit of relevance, attempts to find connections. This historical account of the scholarship in educational administration also was fitting for a review of the topics because it examined long-term trends in the field.

Murphy (2002) categorized educational administration under three themes: democracy and unity, social justice, and school improvement. He referred to them as three defining elements that are at the centre of school administration. Murphy’s categories could have been used to sort the nine dissertations from 1988 to 1996 by year of award, author, and title. However, once again, this framework limited the analysis to a study of the topic, without regard for other aspects of the document.

Heck and Hallinger (1999) looked directly at methodology (quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods) as the foundation to discuss leadership. This framework for the study of leadership and school improvement also used several lenses to determine perspectives within these three research methodologies. Although several dissertations focused on leadership, not all fell into this category; therefore, this framework had its limitations. Five studies used a qualitative methodology; four used a mixed methodology, which is a combination of qualitative and quantitative research techniques; and none used a quantitative methodology.
Miklos (1992) used a purpose-strategy-data framework to categorize 330 dissertations published at the University of Alberta between 1958 and 1991 in six ways: descriptive, relational, evaluative, development, conceptual, and methodological. Strategies were sorted as surveys, case studies, comparative, causal-comparative, experimental, and panel. Data collection was completed through questionnaires, interviews, observations, documents, and records. Although Miklos, himself concluded that his framework had significant limitations, it presented the most in-depth look at dissertations prior to the in-depth framework developed by Murphy and Vriesenga (2004) to review educational leadership programs.

Related Literature

The conceptual frameworks presented earlier came from the scholarly literature. Several different frameworks were reviewed. Although Miklos (1992) completed the most detailed review of purpose-research-data for 330 dissertations, he noted that his was not an in-depth review. Thus, I continued to search for an in-depth framework and found Murphy and Vriesenga’s (2004) framework, which provided the most in-depth construct to review the Greenfield dissertations. Murphy and Vriesenga’s analysis revealed the most detailed method to review the field. It served as an important roadmap for researchers who wish to take up the challenge of investigating the nature, conditions, and effects of specific programs. It looked at nine dimensions that formed the basis of the methodology used for categorical analysis: design, unit of analysis, sampling strategy, timeframe, data collection, analytic component, purpose, sampling strategy, and conclusion (see Appendix C). Following is a brief description of each component of their framework:
**Design.** Following Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003), this component classifies each study as quantitative, experimental, or quasi-experimental; qualitative or naturalistic; or mixed.

**Unit of analysis.** This component notes the primary focus of the data collection (Patton, 2002). Patton commented:

> Different units of analysis are not mutually exclusive, . . . each unit of analysis implies a different kind of data collection, a different focus of the analysis, and a different level at which statements about findings and conclusions would be made. (p. 228)

**Sampling strategy.** Consistent with the literature on research methods, the sampling strategies in Murphy and Vriesenga’s (2004) framework is divided into probability sampling and nonprobability, or purposive sampling. For purposeful sampling, the framework employs 15 categories discussed by Patton (2002), such as extreme or deviant case sampling and typical case sampling.

**Timeframe.** For each study, the framework records the period of time over which the data are collected and analyzed. Time range notes the length of the study.

**Data collection.** Six categories of data collection are outlined in the framework: observations, questionnaires, interviews, focus group, text, and secondary data or documents. Interviews are further classified as informal, semistructured, or unstructured; observations are labeled as participants’ observations, direct observations, and indirect observations; and questionnaires are placed in one of three groups: face-to-face, self-administered, or telephone.

**Analytic component.** This part of the framework is comprised of two major categories: statistical analysis of univariate, bivariate, or multivariate, and content or case
analysis. The latter category is divided into two clusters: grounded theory and content analysis.

**Purpose.** Murphy and Vriesenga’s (2004) framework identifies this as the intent of the study. It is generally noted in the abstract.

**Sampling strategy and sample.** This component provides details of the data collection process.

**Conclusion.** This component comprises the findings, insights, outcomes, and implications.

**Trends**

Diversity was noted in the topics and range of themes in the nine award-winning dissertations that are the focus of this paper. Themes addressed staff development, the role of the principal, music education, professional decision making and personal ethics, values and morals, politics of policy change, and district-wide vision-making processes. Five of the dissertations paid close attention to the role of the principal in public school education. Only Derkatz (1995) included the culturally diverse context as a significant feature, although Adams (1996) addressed an international comparison.

The methodologies or designs were either mixed or qualitative. None of the dissertations employed a purely quantitative approach. Evans (1990) used hermeneutics within the qualitative methodology. Hermeneutics is a creative and imaginative approach that uses interviews as conversations and particularly notes significant moments. Others used case studies, interviews, surveys, observations, and questionnaires as their approach.

These nine dissertations focused on educators, either teachers or principals, and school boards. A unit of measurement often determines the scope of a study. Studies with
multiple units become very complex through their comparison of responses or perspectives about the same phenomenon. Four of these theses used the systems approach of school boards for school districts; five used individuals in their study.

The sampling ranged from full target populations (Cousins, 1989) to small sampling of staff from two school districts. Most used triangulation of data (teachers, principals, and past literature) to analyze the data relevant to their topics. Only two referred to theoretical sampling and a literature review to develop their conceptual frameworks.

The timeframe for these nine studies ranged from 4 months to several years. Cousins (1989) actually conducted and reported on three progressive studies within the dissertation. Derkatz (1995) appeared to take the most in-depth approach by following the lives of school principals. Mawhinney’s (1994) dissertation was the only one that investigated policy implementation, although Edwards (1988) reviewed staff development implementation.

General trends regarding the data and collection strategies were interviews, literature reviews, surveys, and case studies. Four studies used a mixed approach, and the others used either quantitative or qualitative methodologies. Often, the researchers used literature reviews to initiate the studies, interviews to validate the initial predictions, and surveys to conclude them. Analytic components varied from multiple to bivariate, with only single studies to represent each of grounded theory, content analysis, and hermeneutics.

Questions and purposes were presented for a wide range of topics and themes. Often, the researchers used four to seven questions, although one dissertation had only
one overarching question. Keywords regarding purpose included determined, synthesize, inquire, discern, analyze, develop, interpret, operationalize, and understand. The dissertations incorporated literature reviews, conceptual frameworks, and research questions. Several alternative perspectives on educational leadership were presented within the literature, for example, feminist and Aboriginal, but none of the dissertations researched these topics.

Sampling strategies often include multiple methods of finding supporting evidence for the research questions. Most common were interviews that pertained to a specific topic within the educational system. Only Evans (1990) used interviews as his sole resource. Cousins (1989) conducted the most extensive data collection process, namely, 869 29-page questionnaires with 94 response items. Campbell (1993) transcribed 30 interviews into 636 pages of data, and Derkatz (1995) transcribed 40 interviews in order to review and analyze the data.

The conclusions, findings, and outcomes ranged from one specific concept to seven or eight implications for follow-up. All nine dissertations attempted to link theory and practice in ways that practitioners and future researchers would find efficacious. Mawhinney (1994) developed an interpretative framework to review policy implementation models, Adams (1996) found similarities and preferences expressed by internationally studied decision-making structures, and Walker’s (1992) recommendations enabled the LEADS group of Saskatchewan to develop eight new policies. Four studies gave direct suggestions for practitioners to improve their learning: (a) paying attention to the literature regarding what will happen in education, (b) using performance appraisal data to improve one’s practice, (c) taking a stand, or
(d) suspending morality to survive within a school system.

Other important observations include the fact that six of the nine award winners were female. Six western and central provincial universities were represented by these nine dissertations; the other four were completed in Toronto. None of the dissertations were from eastern Canada. Evans (1990) wrote the shortest dissertation (197 pages). Derkatz (1995) produced the longest dissertation (two volumes of 516 pages). The average length of each dissertation was 356 pages, with an average of 89,000 words each. Although these data often are not an important consideration, they do highlight the comprehensiveness of the studies.

Given that the dissertations were submitted for the Greenfield Award, it is not unexpected that three writers referred specifically to Greenfield in their dissertations. Evans (1990) had Greenfield as an external examiner, Harris (1991) had Greenfield as one of her committee members, and Derkatz (1995) was the only writer who specifically states that she had taken up the challenge to extend Greenfield’s work.

Discussion

A discussion of the CASEA award winners from 1988 to 1996 leads to several key questions and subsequent observations: What benefits or contributions to the field did these dissertations demonstrate? What did this review of the nine award winners reveal about the Canadian context? What could be said regarding a feminist or an Indigenous/Native perspective? How have these studies advanced the field of educational administration in Canada?

Benefits gained from reading these dissertations were threefold: (a) the importance of Greenfield Awards and their marking rubric for PhD dissertations;
(b) what was studied, and what was not studied, for future research opportunities; and
(c) gain an understanding of the depth and breadth of research questions explored within
the Canadian context. Doctoral students reading Greenfield Award winners have the
opportunity to determine what peers consider exemplary research. The marking rubric
may assist dissertation committee work in their reviews of students’ admissions. The
scope of these nine dissertations was broad based, as noted in Murphy and Vriesenga’s
(2004) grid. It showed a broad spectrum of topics, methodologies, analytic components,
purposes strategies, and conclusions.

Canadian context identified definite trends toward the managerial aspects of
school administration, as shown by Murphy and Seashore Louis (1999).

A feminist perspective was not apparent in the dissertations. This was consistent
with Young’s findings (2004) following a review of educational journals from 1988 to
1993. She reviewed publications in reference to Canadian educational journals to identify
research and conceptual knowledge. Of the nine award-winning theses from 1988 to
1996, six were completed by female writers. Adams (1996) researched levels of decision-
making within organizations, Campbell (1993) looked at personal morals and
organizational ethics, Derkatz (1995) inquired about school administrator discussions,
Edward (1988) reviewed educational change, Harris (1991) reviewed music education,
and Mawhinney (1994) developed an interpretive framework for politics of policy
change. This represents significant advancement for female researchers, given that only 3
female writers among the first 10 award-winning dissertations.

Indigenous/Native ways of knowing did not appear within these nine
dissertations. Atleo (2002) presented the beginning of Aboriginal research and writings
with First Nations storytelling by elders. Maenette et al. (2002) were in the vanguard of this alternative way of knowing. Evans’s (1990) study stood apart because he used interviews as conversation to discuss life stories using hermeneutic methodology.

Research inquiry in these nine dissertations demonstrated a movement toward mixed and qualitative methodology. None of the award winners used a purely quantitative methodology, as had been evident in the previous 10 years. The topics revealed a shift to a managerial perspective of administration, leadership, and organization of schooling. All of the award winners followed the four criteria listed on the CASEA (2005) Web site: significance of the research problem; conceptualization, design, and execution of the study; potential for theory development, further research, and improved practice; and relevance to the field of educational administration in Canada.

Conclusion

A final comment about these nine Greenfield award-winning dissertations is that they were works of distinction. Determining their impact on the current field of educational administration would certainly present an interesting research question. We must celebrate and acknowledge each of the distinguished scholars who has contributed to the study of the Canadian educational administration field.
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Appendix B: Greenfield Dissertation Awards, 1988 to 1996

1988 Constance Edward (UBC) *The process of educational change: A staff development initiative in two school districts* (Abstract only).

1989 Bradley Cousins (Toronto) *Factors influencing knowledge utilization: Principals’ use of appraisal data concerning their own performance*

1990 Philip Rodney Evans (Alberta) *Ministrative insight: Educational administration as pedagogic practice*

1991 Carol Harris (Toronto) *Administering music education in three Canadian settings: Philosophy, action, and educational policy*

1992 Keith Walker (Saskatchewan) *Ethical choices: The nature of ethical decision making in educational leadership*

1993 Elizabeth Campbell (Toronto) *Personal morals and organizational ethics: How teachers and principals cope with conflicting values in the context of school cultures*

1994 Hanne Mawhinney (Ottawa) *Interpretative framework for politics of policy change*

1995 Marcella Derkatz (Manitoba) “It’s not the school, it’s the principal of the thing”: School administrators’ talk about administrative behaviour in culturally diverse contexts

1996 Jennifer Adams (Toronto) *Levels of decision making in two public education systems along a centralization-decentralization continuum: The documented, assumed, and desired realities of educators in France and Ontario*
Appendix A: **Thomas B. Greenfield Dissertation Award**

Submissions of Doctoral Dissertations in Educational Administration are invited for the award competition. The CASEA/ACAES Thomas B. Greenfield Award will be presented at the annual conference of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education.

The recipient will be invited to present a paper based on his or her research at the CASEA conference. Travel expenses will be covered, in part, by the association.

**Selection Criteria:**
1. Significance of the research problem,
2. Conceptualization, design, and execution of the study,
3. Potential for theory development, further research, and improved practice, and
4. Relevance to the field of educational administration in Canada.

Eligibility requirements for the EdD or PhD degree in educational administration must have been completed during the calendar year prior to the conference or the degree must have been awarded during that period by a Canadian university. Normally the dissertation is submitted by the supervisor; however, there is nothing to prevent an individual submitting his/her own work. A departmental screening, if there is one, is simply to ensure that the department is willing to submit the dissertation under its name. PhD submissions are not limited to one per department; this is the case only with the Master’s award but not the Greenfield Award.

Submission of the entries: applicants should submit one unbound copy of the dissertation together with a 2,500 to 3,000 word article (less references), giving an overview of the study to the chair of the dissertation award committee. Send documents to

Dr. Derek Allison  
Faculty of Education  
University of Western Ontario  
1137 Western Road  
London, ON  
N6G 1G7  
Telephone: 519-661-2111 ext. 88602  
E-mail: allison@uwo.ca

Submissions must be received no later than February 1, 2006.
Appendix C: Analysis Based on Murphy and Vriesenga’s (2004) Framework

**Categorical Analysis: Part A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, year of award, &amp; university</th>
<th>Area of interest</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Unit of analysis</th>
<th>Sampling strategy</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Data and collections strategy</th>
<th>Analytic component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constance Edwards, 1988 BC</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>Qualitative case study</td>
<td>2 school districts</td>
<td>32 people in 2 districts</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Interviews, documents, &amp; field notes</td>
<td>Bivariate – case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley Cousins, 1989 Toronto</td>
<td>Principal appraisal</td>
<td>Mixed case study, questionnaire, and case studies</td>
<td>Principals’ use of appraisal data</td>
<td>31 participants in 3 school districts, 869 questionnaires, 20 interviews</td>
<td>1984 to 1988</td>
<td>Interviews and questionnaires</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Rodney Evans, 1990 Alberta</td>
<td>School principal</td>
<td>Qualitative Hermeneutics</td>
<td>Life &amp; role of principals</td>
<td>20 interviews</td>
<td>Ten months</td>
<td>Interviews as conversations and significant moments</td>
<td>Hermeneutics-creative imagination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Harris, 1991 Toronto</td>
<td>Music education</td>
<td>Mixed interviews occupations documents &amp; personal exp.</td>
<td>3 school districts</td>
<td>3 case studies</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Semistructured interviews, observations, documents and field notes</td>
<td>Bivariate – the program and the way it is implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Walker, 1992 Saskatoon</td>
<td>Decision-making and personal ethics of leaders</td>
<td>Mixed interviews, surveys &amp; document review</td>
<td>Educational leaders decision-making</td>
<td>Interviews with 10% of membership &amp; survey of full membership of 200 people</td>
<td>January - April 1991</td>
<td>Triangulation of the Tough Choices survey, archival data and 2 interviews</td>
<td>Bivariate - leaders decision-making and their personal ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Campbell, 1993 Toronto</td>
<td>Dealing with conflict of values and morals for teachers and principals</td>
<td>Qualitative interviews</td>
<td>Teachers and principals moral conscience</td>
<td>20 teachers, 10 principals, &amp; school board members</td>
<td>May - August 1990</td>
<td>1-hour taped interviews of 20 teachers and 10 principals, along with the researcher’s journal</td>
<td>Bivariate - individuals moral responsibility and the organizational imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanne Mawhinney, 1994 Ottawa</td>
<td>Politics of policy change</td>
<td>Qualitative interviews</td>
<td>2 school boards and 2 policies</td>
<td>70 policy actors in 2 School divisions</td>
<td>1980 - 1991</td>
<td>Literature review, document analysis, 70 transcribed interviews</td>
<td>Bivariate -- two Ontario policies and two School divisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcella Derkatz, 1995 Manitoba</td>
<td>Principal talk and culturally diverse contexts</td>
<td>Qualitative interviews</td>
<td>Principals talk that shows their values</td>
<td>40 principal interviews of about 600 total</td>
<td>September, 1991 - December 1992</td>
<td>40 interviews</td>
<td>Grounded theory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1

**Part B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, year of award &amp; university</th>
<th>Purpose and questions</th>
<th>Sampling strategy and sample</th>
<th>Conclusions, finding, and recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constance Edwards, 1988 BC</td>
<td>Why and how 2 BC school districts selected and put into place the same staff development program?</td>
<td>29 findings from three types of analysis: the t3 phases of Michael Fullan’s Change Process, comparative analysis, &amp; Interpretive analysis in relation to the literature.</td>
<td>4 recommendations: paying attention to the literature for what will happen, pay attention to local variations, what accounts for local variations, methodology limitations need to be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley Cousins, 1989 Toronto</td>
<td>What is known about knowledge utilization and how this applies the study of principals’ utilization of appraisal data concerning their own performance?</td>
<td>3 parts study: literature review and development of a framework, interviews and case studies to test the model &amp; questionnaire of 29 pages with 94 items.</td>
<td>Performance appraisal practices have the potential to positively and significantly improve principal performance. Seven suggested changes to appraisal practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Rodney Evans, 1990 Alberta</td>
<td>What does it mean to be the principal of the school? The meaning &amp; significance of educational administration as an area of professional practice &amp; an academic field of study.</td>
<td>The researcher became an ‘interlocutor’ drawn into the lives and activities of 9 principals, three stages of conversations emerged and work analyzed.</td>
<td>Rather than a preoccupation with methods and procedures, we need to persistently ask the big questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Harris, 1991 Toronto</td>
<td>What are the supports &amp; barriers surrounding music programs in three school districts in Canada? Which students take music? Why? What kinds of programs are available to them?</td>
<td>Case studies were compiled of three school districts using the data and then they were analyzed with respect to the literature review.</td>
<td>Music education may contribute to the reproduction of an artistically elite student population. Schools can contribute to the provision of the equality of educational opportunity in the arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Walker, 1992 Saskatoon</td>
<td>What is the nature of ethical decision making among educational leaders?</td>
<td>200 members were sent the Tough Choices survey; 2 successive interviews were conducted with twenty members (10 %), &amp; review of archival materials.</td>
<td>8 new policies (such as honor and respect for democracy &amp; commitment to service) were developed by the LEADS group as a result of this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Campbell, 1993 Toronto</td>
<td>What problems do professional teachers and administrators encounter while having on moral conscience, and working within a school district with its own ethical components?</td>
<td>30 transcribed interviews (636 pages), 3 interviews, field notes and researcher’s journal summaries</td>
<td>3 response categories emerged: taking a stand, suspending morality (strategic compliance with the reservation) &amp; conforming and complying (decision based on ethics). Increased need for educators’ moral and ethical awareness and clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanne Mawhinney, 1994 Ottawa</td>
<td>What framework of understanding might be used to study the politics of policy change? A theoretical research on policy studies and the practice of policymaking.</td>
<td>70 policy actors were identified through a network of sampling process and interviews were conducted with respect to the politics of policy change.</td>
<td>Dynamic policy models are needed. The development of an interpretive framework that allows for linkages between ideas, institutions and processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcella Derkatz, 1995 Manitoba</td>
<td>How do Administrators’ understand, interpret, and operationalize their role as educational leaders in schools with respect to culturally diverse societies?</td>
<td>40 principals of approximately 600 in Manitoba, administrators’ values were determined as justifier, advocate and endorser, of variables both of its side and inside the school were also considered</td>
<td>Seven implications showed the school administration use their will and power within the school to shape meaning and values which become a reflection of his or her conceptualize of schooling and education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Adams, 1996 Toronto</td>
<td>To what extent can levels of decision making be determined in 2 educational systems of 2 different countries. How are the documented realities on formal structures different from the assumed realities as seen by teachers &amp; administrators?</td>
<td>One French school system Grades 1 to 5 was compared with an Ontario JK to 8 nondenominational public school</td>
<td>In spite of different historical and social realities, two systems structures and preferences are expressed by two groups of educators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greenfield Award-winning Dissertations, 1988 to 1996 - reviewed using the framework by Murphy and Vriesenga (2004) in their review of Preparation Programs in Educational Administration: Parts 1 & 2