

School Leadership Review

Volume 4, Number 2

Spring 2009

Peggy Gill, Editor
The University of Texas at Tyler
University of Texas System

Wesley Hickey, Editor
The University of Texas at Tyler
University of Texas System

Dimensions of Educational Leadership: Cultural, Ethical, and Moral	3
Richard A. Gregory, California State University – Northridge	
Modeling Instructional Best Practices: Pedagogy of College of Education Professors	22
Kathleen Taylor Campbell, Southeastern Louisiana University	
Rayma Harchar, Southeastern Louisiana University	
Thomas DeVaney, Southeastern Louisiana University	
Deborah McCarthy, Southeastern Louisiana University	
Relationship Between Student Academic Achievement and Gender of Campus Administrator	36
Pam Winn, Tarleton State University	
Susan Erwin, Tarleton State University	
Jim Gentry, Tarleton State University	
Mary Cauble, Tarleton State University	
Ethical Development and Diversity Training for Educational Leaders.....	55
Ilene L. Ingram, Oakland University	
Shannon Flumerfelt, Oakland University	
Teacher Perceptions of the Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals	80
Don Leech, Valdosta State University	
James L. Pate, Valdosta State University	
Nicole M. Gibson, Valdosta State University	
Ronny Green, Valdosta State University	
Robert Smith, Valdosta State University	

*A nationally refereed journal sponsored and published by the
Texas Council of Professors in Educational Administration*

Advisory Board

Connie Ruhl-Smith, Bowling Green University
James Smith, Bowling Green University
John Hoyle, Texas A&M University
Beverly Irby, Sam Houston State University
Genevieve Brown, Sam Houston State University
Martha Ovando, University of Texas

Editorial Review Board

Lloyd Goldsmith, Abilene Christian University
Julia N. Ballenger, Stephen F. Austin State University
Timothy B. Jones, Sam Houston State University
Jimmy Byrd, University of North Texas
Casey Graham Brown, Texas A&M University-Commerce
Ernest Horany, Texas A&M University-Commerce
Claudio Salinas, Texas A&M University-Laredo

Other Reviewers

Tod Farmer, Tarleton State University
Julie Combs, Sam Houston State University
Bernita Krumm, Oklahoma State University
Jason Mixon, The University of Texas at Tyler
Carol Ritter, Sam Houston State University
Lu Anna Stephens, San Angelo State University
Francis Duffy, Galludet University
Barbara Foster, Texas A&M International University
Gary Clarke, Louisiana State Department of Education
Kathleen Neal, Ashland University
Shannon Flumerfelt, Oakland University
Vance Vaughn, The University of Texas at Tyler
Genie Linn, The University of Texas at Tyler
Ross Sherman, The University of Texas at Tyler

Call for Papers

The next issue of *School Leadership Review* will be published in Fall 2009.
The theme for the Fall 2009 issue will be online teaching.

Submission Guidelines

- Submissions should be 2000 – 3000 words in length (@ 20 pages).
- Manuscripts must use APA 5th edition.
- Manuscripts must include cover page with contact information.
- Manuscripts may be submitted at any time.
- Submit manuscripts electronically in Word to pgill@uttyler.edu and whickey@uttyler.edu.

Dimensions of Educational Leadership: Cultural, Ethical, and Moral

Richard A. Gregory, California State University – Northridge

Given the current state of affairs in the school districts of America, almost any observer could proclaim that a change in policy and leadership is urgently needed. The national pundits and politicians continue to blame the usual suspects: entrenched school cultures, teacher unions, shortened school years, and administrative bloat, to name a few. National educational leadership organizations (NCPEA, UCEA, and AASA) are hard at work defining a Knowledge Base (KB) for the training of educational leaders of the future.

While this author certainly applauds the efforts of these professional organizations, there are some things that university professors can do within leader preparation programs across America. As will be discussed in this article, universities can begin to prepare new and current leaders in the key dimensions of leadership. Training in administration science, e.g. finance, law, human resources, facilities management, and technology are necessary and should be required. However, the key leadership dimensions of ethical, moral and cultural leadership are and remain, critical to the success of the school leader and the organization.

To the credit of the universities now embarking on the rollout of the new doctorate of education (Ed.D.) programs, these critical key dimensions are being taught and applied in the educational setting. The California State University System is currently including coursework in new Ed.D. Programs that focus on leading change through cultural and ethical leadership. Perhaps the lessons of Enron and World.com are instrumental. However, given the budgetary and financial checks and balances placed

upon school districts, money fraud has never been the critical issue. The failure of students, drop outs, and widening minority student achievement gaps are the bottom line. Simply stated, that is our reason for existence!

Ford Motor Company builds cars; education builds and prepares future citizens of America. The focus necessarily centers on how moral and ethical leaders can lead cultural change that results in learning for all students, regardless of cultural markers or identifiers.

Unfortunately, some of the principal preparation programs still lack an emphasis on training and application of key dimensions of educational leadership. Giving credit to the work of NASSP and NAESP with principal preparation, universities can and should provide the cultural and ethical training. Think back to your master's preparation for your first administrative credential. Did you receive any training about ethics, moral purpose, or cultural competence? Perhaps you were allowed to select an elective and maybe one of the aforementioned was taught as a survey course with little or no application to the schooling environment. A typical offering in many programs was, and perhaps still is today, *Cultural Diversity in America*. Of course, this was required by the university board of regents and was designed to prepare the administrator for the cultural issues soon to be encountered upon graduation.

Given the competitive nature of area administrator preparation programs and national online programs, most universities have streamlined/reduced the typical program to 30 to 33 semester hours, including the practicum/internship/fieldwork. One institution in the California State University System of 23 campuses, offers an MA in Educational Leadership with the Tier 1 credential (principal) in one year!

Both leadership theory and practice can be taught within the preparation program for principals, even with the shortened curriculum. Again, as suggested earlier in this paper, it is not a matter of just teaching about the need for a personal code of ethics. Being exposed to the Code of Ethics of AASA, NAESP and NAESP is certainly assistive in building the ethics repertoire. This author, based on 35 years in K-12 education, would argue strongly for integrating cultural and ethical decision-making in all coursework using the models and approaches within this article. The remainder of this paper discusses some of the notable approaches in teaching the key dimensions of educational leadership.

A Brief Comparison of Three Multicultural/Diversity Models

As mentioned in the abstract of this paper, the works of Lindsey et al. (2005) Nieto (2004) and Banks (2004) are certainly informative works done by highly respected multicultural scholars. While each approach is different and uses different terms, each has a very similar outcome: the desire to move people from a monoculture belief system to a cross-cultural system of literacy or proficiency.

All three models, Lindsey et al. (2005), Nieto (2004) and Banks (2004) have stages of development, beginning with a lack of awareness of the moral urgency and ending with an affirmation of multicultural competence or proficiency. In addition, each of the three models addresses individual attitudes, behaviors, and practices and to a varying degree, how the organization and the educational system are impacted at specific stages or levels.

It is possible for individuals and organizations to celebrate and train for diversity, understand the historic distrust present through studies of poverty and racism (Ogbu &

Simons, 1998), develop skills for cross-cultural communication (Banks, 2004; Senge, 2005), and learn to live harmoniously with other cultural groups. As Schein (1985) reminds the organizational leadership, if they are not conscious of the cultures in which they are embedded, those cultures will manage them. Cultural analysis is especially valuable for dealing with aspects of organizations that seem irrational, frustrating and intractable (Banks, 2004). Paying attention to issues of organizational culture (Schein, 1985) alone will not prepare leaders in the intractable diversity-driven issues of the school (Banks, 2004). Knowledge of both is critical to the educational leader.

Nieto (2004) proposes a multicultural model that has five levels of multicultural education: monocultural education, tolerance, acceptance, respect and affirmation, solidarity, and critique. Each level is examined through the seven characteristics of multicultural education: antiracist/discriminatory, basic, pervasive, important for all students, education for social justice, process, and critical pedagogy. For example, if all levels and characteristics were arrayed in a 5 X 7 theoretical matrix, the level of acceptance would reflect basic characteristics through a diversity of lifestyles and values other than just those of the dominant group. Further, Nieto (2004) acknowledges that cultural components include the same elements as Lindsey et al. (2005). According to Nieto (2003), multicultural education needs to be about much more than ethnic tidbits and cultural sensitivity.

The Banks (2001, 2004) model is a typology addressing the six stages of cultural development: cultural psychology captivity, cultural encapsulation, cultural identity clarification, biculturalism, multiculturalism and reflective nationalism, and globalism and global competency. The model focuses primarily on race, ethnicity, class, gender,

and to some extent, religion and culture. Through cultural development at each stage, students clarify cultural, national and global identifications. Students move from exposure to own culture (Stage 1); to clarifying attitudes and cultural identity (Stage 3); to an ability to function within cultures globally through reflective and clarified national and global identifications (Stage 6).

The process/model of Cultural Proficiency (Lindsey, et al. 2003, 2005) as adapted from the Cross (1989) cultural competence model is becoming more popular with schools and organizations searching for methods to respond to cultural diversity and the widening minority achievement gap as researched by D'Amico (2001). Lindsey, Nuri Robins, & Terrell (2003) adapted the Cross (1989) model to schools and other community organizations as a process to address the differences in schools. The focus is on behaviors, practices, and policies that can be applied to both the individual and the organization.

The Cultural Proficiency process is notably different than most diversity or multicultural training programs currently being used in diverse environments. The typical diversity training begins with learning about the nature of diversity and then to more in-depth studies of race or ethnicity. Perhaps some additional elements are added such as language or culture.

Cultural Proficiency (Lindsey, et al. 2003) is an inside-out approach that begins with the individual or organization examining behaviors, practices, policies and belief system. It is not an off-the-shelf program with quick fixes and recipes for success. If becoming culturally proficient were easy, we would all be proficient. Further, Cultural Proficiency will look different in each environment, as individuals and organizations

apply the tools and measure their success along the continuum of proficiency. Simply stated, cultural competence is behavior that is aligned with standards designed to gain cultural proficiency. Four tools have been identified for developing individual and organizational cultural competence (Lindsey et al. 2003).

The Guiding Principles: Underlying values of the approach.

The Continuum: Provides terms that identify productive and non-productive policies, practices, and behaviors.

The Essential Elements: Five identified standards measuring growth to proficiency along the continuum.

The Barriers: Three caveats in resistance to change: 1) presumption of entitlement, 2) unawareness of the need to adapt, and 3) systems of oppression.

Unfortunately, most school and central office administrators unless recently trained, have not been exposed to the work of Lindsey et al. (2003, 2005), Nieto (2004) or Banks (2004). Given the current national dialogue regarding the Knowledge Base (KB) in Educational Administration, our universities can also focus on diversity programs that meet the ELCC standards. As Achilles (2005) reminds us, until we know and use the Knowledge Base related to school outcomes we cannot expect educational excellence to happen.

All three models have much to offer organizations and individuals interested in gaining an understanding of working with the diverse cultures of the 21st century. However, the Cultural Proficiency model as adapted for schools by Lindsey et al. (2003, 2005) holds great promise for schools of the future. It begins with an inside-out process which forces the participants to question their assumptions and beliefs held not only

about their culture, but the cultures of those who are different from their culture. Moreover, because it is not an off-the-shelf program it will look different in every organization. What will remain firm are the essential elements and the guiding principles of Cultural Proficiency. These are the lenses by which individuals and organizations examine the continuum and determine their journey along the continuum to Cultural Proficiency.

Gregory and Hoffmeyer (2006) studied the effects of training Texas preservice principals in the use and reflections of the cultural proficiency model. Students were exposed to the tools of the Cultural Proficiency (CP) model throughout the semester. Means and standard deviations of pre and post training were computed and the differences between the means were analyzed using the t test for correlated samples. The mean and standard deviation measures on the pre score were 85.29 and 8.86 respectively. The mean and standard deviation measures on the post score were 93.66 and 6.91. The standard deviation had decreased while the mean increased 8.37 points with the post score analysis, yielding a significant difference in the means, $p < .01$. While not scientific evidence, this initial, directional evidence shows clearly that students respond more positively to the questions on the scaled instrument after exposure to the CP model.

Moral and Ethical Considerations in Administrator Preparation

While a number of cultural competence teaching approaches (Banks, 2004; Nieto, 2004; Lindsey et al. 2005) are well-researched and deployed in various school districts, there still seems to be something missing at the center of the cultural change approach. The educational leadership literature of the last fifteen years discusses the need for multi-faceted change approaches. Fullan (2003) asserts that while many aspects of the school

principalship do not pertain to moral issues, moral purpose must be the driver above all other leader capacities. Sergiovanni (1992) offers that, while moral authority is practiced by many school leaders it is not acknowledged as a form of leadership. While both authors believe that moral purpose and authority are of significant importance to school leaders, there is no clear nexus in how moral leadership is practiced in schools today.

Strike, Haller, and Soltis (1998) ask why administrative ethics coursework is only offered at a few universities. Strike, et al. (1998) opines that perhaps this situation is due to administration being a science and not dealing with values and value judgments. Further, Strike, et al. (1998) believes that value judgments are moral judgments and should be at the heart of the school administrators' job.

Johnson (2001) approaches the question of ethics through a metaphor he calls "Casting light or shadow." We can cast light by building ethical capacity in our future and present leaders with clear ethical outcomes (sound ethical reasoning, strong character, follow-through, ethical climate, ethical decision making, and others) in the workplace. Leaders also can cast shadows in the workplace through abuse of power and privilege, deceit, disloyalty, and inconsistency, among others.

Research and practice of decision-making formats (Cooper, 1998; Kidder, 1995; Nash, 1989) clearly show that principals and educational leaders can be trained to make ethical decisions. However, in order to learn and practice the decision-making formats one must first know and understand basic ethical principles. This takes training time for new leaders to practice in an actual case study environment with time for relevant discussion. Ideally then, principal preparation can and should require a specific course

on ethics. If we wait until the doctoral level, we have missed the opportunity to impact the learning environment in each of our schools.

The typical university principal preparation curriculum is usually heavy on administration science. While specific tests such as Praxis address acting in an ethical manner, pre-service leaders need instruction and practice in ethical applications in the schooling environment. Universities can begin with ensuring that a block of ethics instruction and practice is included in the basic leadership course. By teaching the normative leadership styles of transformational and stewardship/servant theory, in concert with clarifying personal values (Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Rokeach, 1973), and basic ethical principles that can be applied in the decision-making formats, preparation programs can make a difference in the learning environment. It really doesn't matter how well the beginning principal knows school finance and business operations, school law or human resource management; without the theory and practice of ethical, moral and cultural dimensions that build leader character, the school will fail because the leader failed.

While there are other models of transformational leadership, the Kouzes and Posner (2007) five exemplary practices model is evidence-based, drawing best leadership data from six continents, through extensive survey and interview data. One of the behaviors in the Kouzes and Posner model requires the leader to clarify personal values. This author, like Kouzes and Posner believes this is a beginning essential in finding your voice and gaining credibility. One can hardly act ethically or moral if they have not first identified their core values. The very essences of transformational leadership involve motivating followers to act ethically, focusing on instrumental and terminal values

(Rokeach, 1973), and inspiring all to higher levels of morality. At the core of transformational leadership are the foundations of ethical principles such as altruism and communitarianism.

In servant leadership (Greenleaf & Spears, 2002) combine the fit of ethical principles and the transformational leadership practice. Again, leaders pay attention to the needs of followers, relying on persuasion rather than coercion, and employing foresight and vision to enhance the growth of individuals and organizations.

Of course, leaders will need to employ more leadership styles and practices than just transformational and servant styles. As with ethical principles and decision-making formats, which we will discuss next, there will be times when situational, transactional and even autocratic styles will be needed to save the day. However, by combining servant and transformational leadership practices, one will be able to act ethically, with moral purpose, to transform the diverse cultural environments present in most school communities of the 21st century.

Ethical Principles and Decision-making Formats

Having discussed briefly the leadership styles best fit with acting ethically, a discussion of the moral and ethical dimensions of leadership through the principles and the ethical decision-making formats is next. Most people have had initial exposure to the ethical principles at some time in their lives. Most have heard of the Golden Rule for individual relationships and experienced group decisions that were “made for the good of all.” Carried to the next level, however, the application level, few people have worked with practicing the principles and using one, two or even three to help make an ethical decision.

In teaching my contemporary leadership course of masters' students, I spend about three hours teaching the ethical principles and three decision-making formats. This includes a PowerPoint presentation and case study analysis employing the principles within an ethical decision-making format. The principles used are 1) utilitarian, 2) Kant's categorical imperative, 3) altruism, and, 4) communitarianism. Not much detail is needed to explain each principle. The details within the PowerPoint slide prompting discussion are replicated for the reader here.

- Utilitarian- Do what is best for the greatest number of people
- Kant's Categorical Imperative- Do what is right no matter what the cost!
- Altruism- Do to others what you would like them to do to you (golden rule)
- Communitarianism- Shoulder your responsibilities, seek the common good!

As the class discussion progresses, it is obvious that most students have experienced the principles at some point in their lives. Not much time is needed here and we move on to the discussion of the decision-making formats. This will take most of the time in class as students experience for the first time, the decision-making formats of Kidder (1995), Nash (1989), and Cooper (1998).

The intent of using ethical guidelines or formats is to employ moral reasoning and, hopefully, gain congruence with personal values that were identified and clarified during the earlier discussions. In addition this gives one an organized, rational, approach to solving a moral issue. A brief discussion of each ethical decision-making process is provided for the reader. Some comparative analysis is offered by the author.

Kidder's Nine Checkpoints (Kidder, 1995)

Ethicist Rushworth Kidder (1995) developed this approach to help people deal with ethical issues beginning with defining the dilemma to following up after the decision is made. What is particularly strong with the approach is the attention paid to making decisions between two good or right issues. Kidder gives the practitioner effective language in dealing with an issue of moral consequences. Kidder (1995) believes the decision ultimately requires courage and practitioners learn from the lessons each time they use the approach, gaining insight into the next moral issue that will surface. The approach uses nine steps and seems to be thorough and efficient in time required.

Step 1- Recognize that there is a moral problem and not just an issue of manners or social convention.

Step 2- Determine the Actor. Kidder (1995) opines that we are all involved in moral issues and we must determine the players in each instance.

Step 3- Gather the Relevant Facts bearing on the moral dilemma.

Step 4- Test for Right vs. Wrong Issues. This is a three-part test involving 1) the gut-level or stench test, 2) the front page of the newspaper test, and 3) what would my family or mother think of me when making this decision?

Step 5- Test for right versus right issues. For example: truth v. loyalty, self v. community, short-term v. long term and justice v. mercy. These are the hard decisions!

Step 6- Apply the appropriate ethical principle for resolution, e.g. utilitarian, altruism, categorical imperative, communitarianism or a combination thereof.

Step 7- Is there a third way through this dilemma?

Step 8- Make the decision. Obvious but sometimes overlooked! Here is where the tired leader must now summon the moral courage to make the decision.

Step 9- Revisit and reflect on the decision. Did I learn anything from this process and did new ethical issues surface?

Nash's 12 Questions (Nash, 1989)

Ethics consultant Laura Nash (1989) proposes a 12 questions approach to help individuals and organizations identify the responsibilities of dealing with moral choices. Nash argues that even if the decision is not reached, the process is useful in surfacing ethical concerns that may have remained hidden. Nash's approach focuses heavily on gathering facts which can slow down the process of getting to the decision. Moreover, the process of getting to the decision or surfacing the ethical issue is extremely time-consuming. The approach follows with each of the 12 questions and some comparative discussion points with the Kidder (1995) approach.

1) Have you identified the problem accurately? Assemble the facts. This question is similar to step 3 of the Kidder approach.

2) How would you define the problem if you stood on other side of the fence?
This Step encompasses both steps 2 and 7 in the Kidder approach.

3) How did this situation occur in the first place? This question is quite similar to Step 1 in Kidder as one determines the issue background.

4) To whom and to what do you give your loyalties as a person or group and as a member to the organization? The issue of loyalty relates closely with the test for right versus right in Kidder approach at Step 5.

- 5) What is your intention in making this decision? Identify your intention and connect this with the consequences in question 6, following.
- 6) How does this intention compare with the likely results? What are the likely consequences of the decision?
- 7) Whom could your decision or action injure? Try in advance, to determine harmful consequences.
- 8) Can you engage the affected parties in a discussion of the problem before you make your decision? If possible, engage in a conversation with the affected parties to understand how your actions will affect them. (This is the time-consuming part of the model)
- 9) Are you confident that your position will be as valid for a long period as it seems now? Will the decision stand the test of time? Do not make a choice that will not be justifiable now and months from now.
- 10) Could you disclose without qualm your decision or action to your boss, your colleagues, your family, or society as a whole? This question is almost identical to the right versus wrong three-part test in Step 4 of the Kidder approach.
- 11) What is the symbolic potential of your action if understood? Misunderstood? What you intend may not be what the public perceives.
- 12) Under what conditions would you allow exceptions to your stand? Moral consistency is critical, but is there any basis for making an exception?

Cooper's Active Process (1998)

The Cooper Active Process (1998) model was developed primarily for use by public administrators. It utilizes four levels of analysis including level 1- expressive,

level 2- moral rules, level 3- ethical analysis and, level 4- post ethical. Cooper (1998) believes that we move between all levels when we analyze a moral issue. This may begin with a gut-level, emotional response, then a search for moral reasons, and on to analysis in some manner.

Cooper (1998) opines that while people are still venting and expressing frustrations, they are probably not ready to apply moral rules or principles. Cooper offers four additional steps of analysis for administrators to move them beyond the emotions and frustration into in-depth analysis.

- 1) Examining the ethical issue. At this step it is important to recognize the ethical dilemma and not just accept the issue as a practice issue.
- 2) Identifying alternative courses of action. At this step brainstorming options are important so as not to fall into the either/or analysis of two options.
- 3) Projecting the probable consequences. As with the Nash model, the attempt is made to project the positive and negative outcomes of the decision.
- 4) Finding a fit. This step acknowledges that there will be no perfect solution. One selects the best fit based on determination of the moral rules in play, and justification and defense of the decision in public.

All three decision-making processes are somewhat different in the way each approaches the ethical dilemma. The intent of providing choice to students in systematic processes is important in administrator preparation. It gives the future school administrator an improved skills and tool set in solving the difficult moral issues faced daily in the school community.

Moral dilemmas involving cultural competence and diversity will increase the difficulty of ethical decisions. The understanding of how cultural issues become a matter of moral reasoning and ethics are of paramount importance to the educational leader. Without this knowledge base and practice, it will be nearly impossible to impact the learning environment in the school community. Moreover, by employing the ethical principles in an appropriate, systematic decision-making process, and combining cultural knowledge, there can be an opportunity for improved decisions, based on knowledge and practice.

We all want to believe that ethical decisions are made on the basis of right versus wrong. Some are that easy, but most are decisions between right versus right and sometimes people are harmed by the decision. Additionally, educational leaders can find themselves in situations involving conflicts of interest. Therefore, it strengthens the leader when s/he knows the correct principles to consider and employs them within a decision-making format to resolve the dilemma. Not all will view the principles and formats in the same manner. That is not the issue here. What we should be emphasizing with our students is the need to use constant, unchanging principles in an organized manner to determine an outcome. If we do not give practicing leaders this vital knowledge and practice, we will continue to see the ethical relativism, devoid of standards and common principles, that surface daily in our culture.

References

- Achilles, C. (2005). Drama in Education Administration: A Farce or Morality Play? In *Crediting the Past, Challenging the Present, Creating the Future*. National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) Sam Houston State University.
- Banks, J. (2001). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum and teaching*, 4thed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Banks, J. (2004). Teaching for Social Justice, Diversity, and Citizenship in a Global World. *The Educational Forum*, 68 no4 296-305.
- Cooper, T. (1998). *The responsible administrator*. (4th Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cross, T. (1989). *Toward a culturally competent system of care*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Child Development Program, Child and Adolescent Service System Program.
- D'Amico, J. (2001). A closer look at the minority achievement gap. *ERS Spectrum*, 19(2), 4-10.
- Fullan, M. (2003). *The Moral Imperative of School Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Greenleaf, R. & Spears, L. (2002). *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. (25th Ann. Ed.) Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Gregory, R. & Hoffmeyer, C. (2006). Cultural Proficiency: A Moral Imperative for Educational Administration? *National Council of Professors of Educational Administration Yearbook: Unbridled Spirit: Best Practices in Teaching*,

- Scholarship, & Service for Effective Educational Administration.* pp. 61-68,
Lancaster, PA: Pro>Active Publications.
- Johnson, C. (2001). *Meeting the Ethical Challenges of Leadership: Casting Light or Shadow.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Kidder, R. (1995). *How good people make tough choices: resolving the dilemmas of ethical living.* New York: Fireside.
- Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. (2007). *The Leadership Challenge.* 4th Ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lindsey, R., Nuri Robins, K. & Terrell, R. (2003). *Cultural proficiency: a manual for school leaders,* 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks. CA: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Lindsey, R., Roberts, L. & CampbellJones, F. (2005). *The culturally proficient school: an implementation guide for school leaders.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Nash, L. (1989). Ethics without a sermon. In K.R. Andrews (Ed) *Ethics in practice: Managing the moral corporation.* 243-257. Boston: Harvard Business School Reform
- Nieto, S. (2003). Profoundly Multicultural Questions. *Educational Leadership,* 60 no4 6-10 D 2002/Ja 2003.
- Nieto, S. (2004). *Affirming diversity: the sociopolitical context of multicultural education.* 4th ed. Boston: Pearson-Allyn and Bacon.
- Ogbu J. & Simons, H. (1998). Voluntary and Involuntary Minorities: A Cultural-Ecological Theory of School Performance with Some Implications for Education. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly,* 29 no02 155-88 Je 1998.

- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The Nature of Human Values*. New York: Free Press.
- Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership: A dynamic view*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Senge, P. (2005, February). *Keynote Address*. Presented at the annual conference of the American Association of School Administrators. San Antonio, TX.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1992). *Moral Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Strike, K., Haller, E., & Soltis, J. (1998). *The Ethics of School Administration*. 2nd ed. New York: Teachers College Press.

Modeling Instructional Best Practices: Pedagogy of College of Education Professors

Kathleen Taylor Campbell, Southeastern Louisiana University
Rayma Harchar, Southeastern Louisiana University
Thomas DeVaney, Southeastern Louisiana University
Deborah McCarthy, Southeastern Louisiana University

In light of increased accountability for K-12 student achievement, critics have questioned the quality of teachers and school principals as well as the university programs that prepare them for these roles (Lambert, 1996; Levine, 2005; Murphy, 1992). Regarding the preparation of teachers, critics have stated that education courses are vapid, impractical, segmented, and directionless (Glenn, 2000). Two national reports that have made recommendations for teacher redesign are noteworthy. The report of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, *What matters most: Teaching for America's future* (Lambert, 1996), found that teacher preparation education is thin and fragmented and recommended that universities reinvent teacher preparation. The Glenn Commission's report, *Before It's Too Late* (2000), called for the identification of exemplary teacher preparation programs to be held up as models for other programs to emulate.

Similar charges have been leveled against university preparation programs for school principals. A report by the Southern Regional Education Board (Fry, O'Neill, & Bottoms, 2006) stated, "Given the urgency for increased student achievement, it would seem that redesigning principal preparation programs around leadership practices that have a high impact on students' learning would be a high priority at every university. Yet, it is not" (p. 2). The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 and research (Bottoms, O'Neill, Fry, & Hill, 2003; Cotton, 2002; Mazzeo, 2003;) substantiate both a

scant supply of talented candidates to lead schools and the importance of these individuals in improving student achievement.

For the past decade, university principal preparation programs have been under vigorous scrutiny. Levine (2005) claimed the quality of most preparation programs for school leaders ranged from “inadequate to appalling” (p. 24), and Hess and Kelly (2005) reported that principals are not mastering the skills necessary to lead school improvement and increase student achievement in the 21st Century.

As a consequence of these charges, some state departments of education mandated that state universities redesign teacher preparation and principal preparation programs to provide a plethora of authentic field experiences preparing students and candidates to assume their respective roles of teacher and school leader. The Louisiana Department of Education, for example, mandated that all state universities redesign their teacher preparation and principal preparation programs prior to the end of 2008, after which the former programs would not meet certification standards.

A critical role of teacher is, obviously, to use high quality instruction that reaches diverse learners and increases student achievement (Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 2001). Similarly, one of the most important roles of school principal is that of an instructional leader, one who not only recognizes and reinforces high quality teaching but also understands how to help the faculty employ instructional best practices and how to provide appropriate professional development to improve teachers’ classroom teaching (Cotton, 2002).

In order to fulfill such a responsibility, professional standards from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Educational

Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) dictate that teacher preparation and principal preparation programs equip candidates with a repertoire of instructional best practices. Modeling has been demonstrated to be an effective teaching strategy (Bandura, 1971; Oser and Baeriswyl, 2001). Thus, modeling instructional best practices by the university professors who train pre-service teachers is an effective means of preparing them to implement high quality instruction leading to increased student achievement. Similarly, modeling instructional best practices by the university professors who train aspiring school principals is an effective means of preparing them to recognize and reinforce high quality instruction in their future role of instructional leader.

Research suggests that constructivism is an approach that improves student learning (Jensen, 1998; Lambert et al, 2002; Martin, 2009). Furthermore, the Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) performed a meta-analysis on various instructional practices and identified nine instructional strategies falling under the umbrella of constructivism that demonstrated significant gains in student achievement (Marzano et al, 2001; Marzano, 2003). The present study is focused on the use of those instructional best practices in the redesigned teacher and principal preparation programs at a southeastern university.

Theoretical Framework

Constructivism is a very broad learning theory rooted in the use of prior knowledge and personal experiences to form new knowledge, the connection of what is already known to new information, preferably completed in a social setting; and self-examination (Lambert et al, 2002). Constructivism is the umbrella learning theory that supports the use of instructional strategies in the present study.

Bruner (1960) describes three stages of learning: acquisition, transformation, and evaluation. According to Bruner, in the process of acquisition, the student usually learns information that “runs counter to or is a replacement for what the person has previously known implicitly or explicitly. At the very least it is a refinement of previous knowledge” (p. 48). By transformation, Bruner meant the ability to manipulate knowledge and apply it to new tasks. Constructivists recognize the importance of allowing students “to draw on what they know and reshape it in new and meaningful ways” (Lambert, et al, 2002, p.26).

Bruner (1960) proposed in his final stage that equally important to the act of learning is evaluation, or checking for understanding. The student, with the teacher’s help, determines if he or she is manipulating the new information to fit the task. Tomlinson and McTighe (2006) recognized the importance of self-assessment as well in their description of the teaching patterns of differentiated instruction by including the opportunities for students to self-assess and examine their metacognitive strategies.

Constructivists value the social aspect of learning and recognize that their students bring personal histories to the learning experience. In John Dewey’s estimation, “the only true education comes through the stimulation of the child’s powers by the demands of the social situations in which he finds himself” (Dewey, 1964, p. 472).

Vygotsky (1998) is known for his contribution to constructivism by insisting that “What the child can do today in cooperation and with guidance, tomorrow he will be able to do independently” (p. 202). Vygotsky emphasized the effect of environment and culture on learning, terming the relationship between a child’s psychological

development and the social reality in which he or she exists as the *social situation of development* (p. 198).

Bandura (1971) also emphasized the social aspect of constructivism or the necessity of shared inquiry in learning. According to Bandura, “In the social learning system, new patterns of behavior can be acquired through direct experience or by observing the behavior of others” (p. 3). In other words, direct experience is valuable in influencing behavior, but behavior is also influenced by example.

Various instructional strategies that are effective for learners have been identified that fall under the umbrella of constructivism. After a meta-analysis of various instructional practices, the Mid-Continent Research for Learning and Education (McREL) identified nine practices that showed average percentage gains in student achievement ranging from 22 to 45 percent (Marzano et al, 2001). Many of those practices are included in the present study, which focused on the use of the following strategies, or categories of instructional best practices: cooperative learning, higher order questioning, nonlinguistic representations or graphic organizers, and teacher behaviors such as advanced notice of assessments and assignments, the use of homework as reinforcement, analysis of assessment results to adjust instruction, timely feedback, and opportunities for student self-assessment (Marzano, 2003; Tomlinson & McTighe, 2006). Other pedagogical practices that were surveyed included the use of technology, differentiated instruction, and writing activities in the classroom; the provision of rubrics and extra help; and curriculum mapping and the setting of objectives aligned with both student needs and the curriculum.

The objective of the present study was to measure the perceptions of undergraduate and graduate students regarding their professors' use of instructional best practices.

Methods

In November, 2007, an instructional best practices survey was developed and administered to 15 graduate and undergraduate classes in the college of education in a southeastern university. The survey contained items requesting demographic information and items requesting students to rate the extent to which each instructional best practice was used by their instructor.

Sample

The survey was completed by 182 students enrolled in redesigned teacher and principal certification programs. One hundred sixty-four students were female (90.1%), 11 were male (6.0%), and 7 did not provide gender information. Demographic data indicates that the undergraduate students were exclusively Teacher Education students while the largest number of graduate students was in the Educational Leadership program. Additional examination of the demographics shows that 10 of the 11 male students were in a graduate level Educational Leadership course, and all of the undergraduate students were female.

Instrument

An instructional best practices survey was developed and identified 16 practices based on the findings of Marzano et al (2001), Marzano (2003), and Tomlinson and McTighte (2006). For each practice, the respondent was directed to indicate the extent of use within the class. The survey utilized a Likert-style format of 1-3, corresponding to

Never/Rarely, Occasionally, and Frequently. The purpose of a three-point scale was to pinpoint use or nonuse of instructional best practices rather than require judgments of gradations of use; therefore ratings of frequent or occasional use indicated use whereas ratings of never/rarely indicated nonuse. The alpha reliability estimate for the total scale was .84.

Results

The results show that the students believed their instructors were frequently using all of the various instructional best practices contained on the survey. Of the 16 practices contained on the survey, 13 were reported as being used frequently by over 70% of the students. The three practices that were reported as being used the least often were graphic organizers, curriculum mapping, and writing activities in the class. Although they were used least frequently, they were reported as being used at least on an occasional basis by over 80% of the students.

To further understand the perceived use of instructional best practices, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted to identify categories of practices. The analysis was conducted using principal components extraction and the number of extracted factors was based on eigenvalues greater than 1. The unrotated factor solution produced 4 factors; however, one factor did not have any instructional best practices loadings greater than .5. Because 9 of the 16 practices loaded on the first factor and unrotated solutions are generally difficult to interpret, a rotation technique was used to create a more interpretable solution.

All of the items in the analysis concerned instructional best practices, so it was possible for the resulting factors to be correlated. Therefore, as suggested by Field

(2005), subsequent factor analyses were conducted using oblique (direct oblim) and orthogonal (varimax) rotational techniques. Because the correlation matrix contained in the oblique rotation indicated weak correlations among the factors and the orthogonal technique produced a more interpretable solution, the practices were grouped on the basis of the varimax rotated solution. The results of the exploratory factor analysis are contained in Table 1.

Table 1

Instructional Best Practices Factor Solution using Varimax Rotation

Extent to which class instructor does/uses	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
Homework assignments to provide reinforcement	.717			
Time for students to give peer feedback	.682			
Extra help opportunities to students	.672			
Time for students to self-assess	.660			
Data to plan for future instruction	-			
Graphic organizers		.762		
Cooperative learning		.634		
Curriculum mapping		.562		
Differentiated instruction		.552		
Writing activities in class		.526		
Higher order thinking techniques	-	-		
Advance notice of assessments and assignments			.737	
Objectives aligned with student needs and curriculum			.685	
Rubrics			.608	
Timely feedback to students			.506	
Technology in the classroom to enhance instruction				.838
Percent Variance Explained	55.87	17.98	14.61	8.00

The four factors identified can be described as related to (a) student assistance, (b) classroom instruction, (c) assignments and grading, and (d) technology. Only two practices (higher order thinking techniques and using data to plan future instruction) did not have a loading above .5 on any factor. Collectively, the four factors accounted for

55.87% of the variance in the responses with the first three factors accounting for approximately equal amounts of variance.

Table 2 shows the level of instructor use that was reported by students when practices are organized by category. The results suggest that students perceived that instructors were frequently utilizing student assistance practices and practices related to assignments and grading. Technology was also being reported as a frequently used practice. However, the level of use of classroom instructional practices appears to be more diverse and substantially lower than practices in the other three categories. Because the type of instructional practice that is used in a classroom is often dependent upon the lesson being presented, the level of use for these practices can be expected to be lower. Therefore, a more realistic measure of the use of these practices would be based upon the combined responses for Frequently and Occasionally (or an examination of the Never/Rarely responses). When these responses are combined, the results indicate a more realistic picture of use versus nonuse rather than frequency of use.

Table 2

Student Reported Level of Instructor's Use of Instructional Best Practices by Category

Extent to which instructor does/uses...	Never/Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	n
Student Assistance				
Homework assignments to provide reinforcement	15 (8.3%)	45 (24.9%)	121 (66.9%)	181
Time for students to give peer feedback	9 (5.0%)	42 (23.2%)	130 (71.8%)	181
Extra help opportunities to students	12 (6.7%)	30 (16.7%)	138 (76.7%)	180
Time for students to self-assess	9 (5.0%)	48 (26.5%)	124 (68.5%)	181
Classroom Instruction				
Graphic organizers	40 (22.2%)	67 (37.2%)	73 (40.6%)	180
Cooperative learning strategies	3 (1.7%)	36 (20.0%)	141 (78.4%)	180
Curriculum mapping	33 (18.6%)	66 (37.3%)	78 (44.1%)	177
Differentiated instruction	15 (8.3%)	46 (25.3%)	120 (66.3%)	181
Writing activities in class	10 (5.6%)	70 (38.9%)	100 (55.6%)	180
Assignments and Grading				
Advance notice of assessments and assignments	2 (1.1%)	20 (11.0%)	159 (87.8%)	181
Objectives aligned with student needs and curriculum	3 (1.7%)	19 (10.5%)	159 (87.8%)	181
Rubrics	9 (5.0%)	32 (17.7%)	140 (77.3%)	181
Timely feedback to students	6 (3.3%)	22 (12.2%)	152 (84.4%)	180
Technology				
Technology in the classroom to enhance instruction	8 (4.4%)	33 (18.2%)	140 (77.3%)	181

While the results indicate that students believed the majority of the instructional best practices surveyed were used frequently by their instructors, they also suggest that the instructors are using all of the practices occasionally or more frequently. The implication is that students in redesigned teacher preparation and principal preparation programs at this southeastern university are being exposed to instructional best practices.

The redesigned programs at this southeastern university also address the charges made by Glenn (2000) regarding teachers' ability to implement high quality instruction

and by Hess and Kelly (2005) regarding principals' ability to recognize and reinforce high quality instruction. Professors in the redesigned programs in the present study model the use of instructional best practices, thus helping pre-service teachers and aspiring school principals develop a repertoire of instructional best practices leading to student achievement.

Limitations

Limitations of the study included class size and number of classes. Class size ranged from 4 to 23. Consequently, larger classes may have had an undue influence on the overall percentage of usage reported. The number of classes is also a limitation because, when averaging across classes, one class with very high ratings can have a strong influence on the overall average for that particular practice. Another limitation is that the study was conducted at only one university.

Recommendations

Several recommendations are deemed appropriate to the study. (1) For future study, carefully select the classes to be surveyed, with particular attention to educational technology courses since those appear to be different from the other two program areas. (2) Attempt to get an equal number of classes from each program at both graduate and undergraduate levels. (3) Extend the research to include several state universities with redesigned teacher and principal preparation programs. (5) Include a definition or brief description of each best practice so that students understand exactly what they are rating. (6) Survey education majors in different phases of their program to track their development of a repertoire of instructional skills.

Educational/Scientific Importance of the Study

The study of redesigned college of education programs has received little attention to date, and the present study provides a snapshot of undergraduate and graduate perceptions of its effectiveness, specifically with regard to the instructional strategies used. The present study indicated that professors in the redesigned teacher and principal preparation programs do use instructional best practices in their classes and are therefore modeling high quality teaching. It can be inferred that pre-service teachers will add these instructional best practices to their pedagogical repertoire. Likewise, candidates for the school principalship will not only be able to recognize high quality instruction but also be able to provide struggling and new teachers with appropriate pedagogical methods as a future instructional leader. The study also confirms the rationale underlying the current emphasis on authentic field experiences in both redesigned teacher and principal preparation programs; that is, the modeling of instructional practices and the hands-on experiences with those practices are approaches for learners to construct their own repertoire of pedagogical skills.

References

- Bandura, A. (1971). *Social learning theory*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.
- Bottoms, G., O'Neill, K., Fry, B., & Hill, D. (2003). *Good principals are the key to successful schools: Six strategies to prepare more good principals*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Bruner, J. (1960). *The process of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cotton, K. (2003). *Principals and student achievement: What the research says*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Dewey, J. (1964). My pedagogic creed. In R. D. Archambault (Ed.), *John Dewey on education: Selected readings* (pp. 427-439). New York: The Modern Library.
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using spss*. London: Sage.
- Fry, B., O'Neill, K., & Bottoms, G. (2006). *Schools can't wait: Accelerating the redesign of university principal preparation programs*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Glenn, J. (Ed.) (2000). *Before it's too late: A report to the nation from the national commission on mathematics and science teaching for the 21st century*. Retrieved January 21, 2008, from <http://www.ed.gov/inits/Math/glenn/report.pdf>
- Hess, F. M., & Kelly, P. M. (2005). The accidental principal. *Education Next*, 5(3). Retrieved May 17, 2006, from <http://www.educationnext.org/20053/34.html>
- Jensen, E. (1998). *Teaching with the brain in mind*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Lambert, L. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future .
- Lambert, L., Walker, D., Zimmerman, D., Cooper, J., Lambert, M. D., Gardner, M. E. et al. (2002). *The constructivist leader*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Levine, A. (March, 2005). *Educating school leaders*. Washington, DC: The Education Schools Project.
- Martin, D. (2009). *Elementary science methods: A constructivist approach*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D., & Pollock, J. (2001) *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mazzeo, C. (2003). *Improving teaching and learning by improving school leadership* [Issue brief]. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association Center for Best Practices.
- Murphy, J. (1992). *The landscape of principal preparation: Reframing the education of school administrators*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002). Retrieved January 18, 2008, from <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/107-110.pdf>
- Oser, F. K., & Baeriswyl, F. J. (2001). Choreographies of teaching: Bridging instruction to learning. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (4th ed.) (pp 1031-1065). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Tomlinson, C., & McTighe, J. (2006). *Integrating differentiated instruction and understanding by design*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Vygotsky, L. (1998). *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky: Volume 5: Child psychology* (R. Rieber, Ed.). NY: Plenum Press.

Relationship Between Student Academic Achievement and Gender of Campus Administrator

Pam Winn, Tarleton State University
Susan Erwin, Tarleton State University
Jim Gentry, Tarleton State University
Mary Cauble, Tarleton State University

Studies of the effectiveness of women's leadership have been recommended by researchers for over three decades (e.g. Eckman, 2004; Edson, 1988; Schmuck, 1981; Shakeshaft, 1989). Burke & Nelson (2002) and Smulyan (2000) have suggested that a woman's leadership experience is fundamentally influenced by gender. As greater numbers of women fill educational administration positions previously held by men (Addi-Raccah, 2006; Rusch & Marshall, 2006), opportunities to study leadership differences and effectiveness of men and women in meeting unique demands of their campuses can be measured. Although issues related to women leaders in superintendent positions have been explored (Tallerico, 1999; Brunner, 1999; Blount, 1998; Grogan, 1996), few studies have investigated women's leadership at the campus level (Goldberg, 1991; Ortiz 1982; Shakeshaft, 1989; Schneider, 1986). Furthermore, identification of the complex leadership attributes of women might clarify the dynamics of their advancement into campus administration (Burke & Nelson, 2002).

However, determining whether the gender of a public school campus administrator significantly affects a school's academic performance is a precursor to more detailed studies of engendered leadership differences. The purpose of this study was to determine to what degree student academic achievement was affected by the gender of a school's principal. A Texas principal evaluation database provided demographic data regarding campus administrators and state accountability ratings based

on campus-wide student academic achievement. Should a significant relationship be found between the gender of the campus leader and campus-wide student academic achievement, future investigations would be needed to determine which specific leadership attributes vary most between men and women in positions of campus administration.

Review of Literature

Throughout the past three decades, studies have been undertaken to determine to what degree men and women differ in terms of leadership. Related topics addressed in this review included an examination of: 1) the shifting leadership trends of professional women, particularly women educational leaders; 2) differences in the career pathways of men and women into educational leadership; and finally, 3) the role of school administrators in student academic achievement.

Trends in Women's Leadership

In 2008, women were considered for top elective offices by both American political parties; still, only 16% of the House of Representatives, 16% state governors, and 24% state legislators in the United States were women and internationally, the US ranked 85th in the world in number of women holding seats in a lower house, legislative bodies (Pew, 2008). This poll revealed Americans rated women leaders higher on seven of eight leadership qualities, yet men were perceived to be better leaders overall. Pew (2008) reported that only one third of all practicing lawyers and physicians, and fewer than 2% of CEOs of Fortune 500 companies are women, even though women currently comprise 57% of all college students and nearly half of all students in MBA, law, and

medical programs. Furthermore, women comprised 46% of the workforce, but only 38% held management positions.

Similar gender trends in leadership have been reflected in education. Women represent 79% of the educational workforce, but only between 14-18% of school superintendents are women (Brunner & Grogan, 2005; Couse & Russo, 2006; Glass, 2000). As Skrla (1999) found, women educators were 40 times less likely to serve as superintendents than their male counterparts.

Trends in School Leadership

Recently, administrative roles in public schools have shifted from a management model (male-orientation) to one focused on student learning and accountability (female-orientation) (Tallerico & Blount, 2004), and reform efforts related to the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 reinforce this practice (Bjork, 2000). Based on this shifting trend in management emphasis, the future may feature greater numbers of women educators in historically male-dominated administrative positions.

Growing shortages of secondary principals (Eckman, 2004; Houston, 1998; Protheroe, 2001; Young & McLeod, 2001) and shortages in early childhood leadership (Couse & Rousso, 2006; Kagan & Bowman, 1997; National Association for the Education of Young Children [NAEYC], 2002) have opened doors for women leaders. Recent efforts to reinvent the principalship in an effort to recruit and retain school leaders (Boris-Sacter & Langer, 2002; Mathews & Crow, 2003) have included a shifting focus from management to instructional leadership, while improving mentoring, staff support, compensation, working conditions, professional development, and principal preparation (Adams & Hambright, 2004; Ferrandino & Tirozzi, 2001; Institute for Educational

Leadership, 2000). In addition, policy changes to promote the balance of family and work obligations have been suggested (Eckman, 2004). These efforts appear to have produced an administrative environment more conducive to women's leadership needs.

These changes may partially explain why the majority of students in educational administrative preparation programs are women (Rusch, & Marshall, 2006) and why greater numbers of women are entering education leadership positions (Addi-Raccah, 2006; Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000). Women currently represent a majority of elementary school principals and women are beginning to gain positions in secondary school administration (Rusch, & Marshall, 2006). This may indicate the traditional role expectations that women teach in high school and men lead (Marshall 1997) may be weakening. Collard (2003) found that small, collaborative school cultures typically found in elementary schools may affect the satisfaction of women in these leadership positions. On the other hand, as school size increases, as is typical of secondary schools, this collaborative atmosphere crumbles (Collard, 2001).

Leadership Stereotypes

Administrative selection criteria based on male-oriented management models have typically discounted instructional leadership skills which often require no formal certification (Addi-Raccah, 2006; Newton, 2006), and evidence suggests women view their administrative skills in terms of instructional leadership (Acker, 1995; Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992; Fauth, 1984; Glass et al., 2000; Pitner, 1981; Shakeshaft 1989, 1999). Women's leadership style consistently has been described as collaborative and empowering (power to, rather than power over), with a focus on student instruction (Andrews & Basom, 1990; Ah Nee-Benham and Cooper, 1998; Bjork, 2000; Brunner,

2000; Grogan, 1996, 1999; Noddings 1990, 1991; Regan and Brooks 1995).

Nevertheless, as Mathews (2001) points out, the prevailing perception that women are better instructional leaders places them in subordinate, administrative positions to men in educational leadership. It is not altogether clear that instructional leadership skills are related to gender (Hall, 1997; Johnson, 1996; Reay, 1997; Reay & Ball, 2000). However, when expertise in instructional leadership is needed, women are hired more often than men (Addi-Raccah, 2006; Glass et al., 2000). In addition, there is evidence that when administrative recruitment emphasizes instructional leadership, more women apply for positions (Newton, Giesen, Freeman, Bishop, & Zeitoun, 2003).

Women's Career Path to Educational Leadership

Teachers exhibit leadership skills in the classroom, where they collaborate with adults in a variety of roles and direct student learning (Whitebook, 1997). The knowledge and skill of classroom teachers enhances their leadership ability (NAEYC, 2002). As reported in the section above, women comprise nearly four of every five classroom teaching positions (Brunner & Grogan, 2005; Couse & Russo, 2006; Glass, 2000). However, women's leadership aspirations beyond middle management are negatively affected by limited opportunities to experience administrative duties, while lack of mentors and negative perceptions of women's abilities compound the problem (Glass et al., 2000). Therefore, women educators typically enter leadership with little administrative experience but with longer careers in teaching than their male counterparts, where they develop relational expertise with young people and adults (Lárusdóttir, 2007). Many women administrators begin their careers as preschool or elementary level teachers and enter campus administration at this level (Taba, Castle,

Vermeer, Hanchett, & Flores, 1999; Whitebook, 1997). Among first-time principals, women are likely to be older and have more classroom experience than men (Glass *et al.*, 2000; National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2000; Ortiz 1982, Paddock, 1981, Schneider, 1986; Shakeshaft, 1989).

Effect of Campus Leadership on Student Academic Performance

Three decades of educational research has confirmed the importance of effective school leadership on student success (Edmonds, 1979; Lesotte, 1991, 1992; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Reynolds, 1990). School leadership has been cited as second only to classroom instruction in influencing student academic achievement (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). Furthermore, countries worldwide have recognized that as school administrator responsibilities continue to increase, there is a growing need to develop effective school leadership (Olson, 2008). For these reasons, gender-oriented leadership skills may impact student learning as never before.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The literature reviewed indicates differences between educational leaders in terms of gender. Current trends find more women entering school leadership positions (Addi-Raccah, 2006; Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000; Rusch, & Marshall, 2006), while it is clear women come to leadership positions from different career pathways than do men (Glass *et al.*, 2000; Lárusdóttir, 2007; NCES, 2000; Ortiz 1982 Taba, et al., 1999; Paddock, 1981, Schneider, 1986; Shakeshaft, 1989; Whitebook, 1997). Regardless of gender, however, evidence clearly demonstrates the importance of school administrators in the academic achievement of students (Edmonds, 1979; Leithwood, et al., 2004; Lesotte, 1991, 1992; Marzano, et al., 2005; Olson, 2008; Reynolds, 1990). In summary, the

number of women in school leadership is increasing, and the leadership experiences of those women differ from those of their male counterparts. Considering the influence of campus administrators on student achievement, it is important to determine the degree to which the gender of campus leaders impacts student achievement. In addition, many researchers have called for studies to test current scholarship, maintaining that the principalship is a gendered role (Addi-Raccah, 2006; Eckman, 2004; Regan & Brooks, 1995; Oplatka & Atias, 2007; Shakeshaft, 1995). Consequently, the purpose of this study was to determine whether student achievement varied according to the gender of the campus leader in Texas K-12 public schools.

Method

Sample

Data accessed in August 2008 represent records of 701, K-12 public school administrator assessments from schools located throughout the state of Texas. Due to missing data or incomplete data from respondents, 672 (95.9%) respondents' data were deemed useable for analysis. Demographics reported included: Female administrators 52% (351) outnumbered male administrators 48% (321) slightly by 4.3% (29). Elementary/Middle school, Junior High/High School, and Alternative schools represented 47% (313), 47.4% (319), and 6% (40), respectively.

Data Source

Every five years in Texas, principals are required to participate in a state-approved, professional development assessment of their performance. Records from one such assessment, Principal Assessment of Student Success (PASS), provided data for this study (see Appendix A). One component of PASS requires school administrators to

identify their gender and the Texas state accountability rating for their school (see Appendix B). Because Texas accountability ratings are based on student achievement on state academic proficiency tests, the state ratings were used to measure student academic achievement.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to report Texas school accountability ratings by gender. Percentages and frequency counts were reported. A chi-squared, cross tabulation (2 x 4) table was utilized to determine dependent/independent relationship between gender and Texas accountability ratings. Pearson's chi-squared statistic (X^2) and Cramer's V (ϕ_c) effect size measures were reported.

Findings

Of the school campuses represented by principals in the sample, Texas accountability ratings varied: academically acceptable 57% (381), recognized 34% (230), exemplary 7% (49), and academically unacceptable 2% (12). When accountability ratings were compared by the gender of the principal, the following emerged (by male and female, respectively): academically acceptable 31% (203)/26% (178), recognized 13% (91)/21% (139), exemplary 3% (19)/4% (30), and academically unacceptable 1.2% (8)/0.6% (4). Gender differences of principals by accountability ratings were statistically significant $X^2(3, N = 672) = 14.149, p = 0.003, \phi_c = 0.145$. The small effect size of 0.145 (Rea & Parker, p. 203) suggested 14.5% of the variance in Texas accountability ratings were accounted for by the gender of the principal. Male principals outnumbered female principals in schools with academically acceptable ratings. However, female principals

were more numerous in schools with exemplary and recognized state ratings. Males were more numerous in schools with academically unacceptable state ratings.

Conclusion

The findings in this study suggest female principals are as effective, or more effective as their male counterparts with regard to student academic achievement; thus gender should not exclude women from administrative positions. Influencing factors that might account for these findings include: 1) accountability requirements increase as grade level increases; 2) women are more likely to head elementary level schools, whereas men are more likely to head secondary schools; 3) career pathways to the principalship are different for men and women.

First, the accountability requirements for student achievement increase with grade level. At the time the data were collected, not all subjects were tested at all grades levels. Elementary campuses in Texas were academically rated based on student test scores in grade: 3 (reading and math), 4 (writing), and 5 (reading and math). Middle school campuses were rated based on student test scores in grades 6, 7, and 8 (reading, math, and writing). While high school campuses were rated based on student test scores in grade: 9 (math and ELA), 10 (math, ELA, and science), and 11 (math, ELA, science, and social studies). The academic accountability requirements increase by number of subjects and grades tested as the campus grade level increases. Thus, it becomes more difficult for a campus to earn a higher accountability rating as the grade level increases.

Secondly, more women enter the principalship at the pre-school/elementary level (Whitebook, 1977; Taba et al., 1999) rather than at the secondary level, where accountability standards are more complex. Although study findings showed campuses

with the highest ratings (Exemplary and Recognized) were more likely to have female principals, it did not take into account the campus level (i.e., elementary or secondary). Consequently, though women leaders appeared to outperform their male counterparts at the highest levels of campus ratings, campus level accountability standards may account for some of this difference.

A third possible explanation for the findings, as noted in the literature (Glass *et al.*, 2000; Lárusdóttir, 2007; NCES, 2000; Ortiz 1982 Taba, et al., 1999; Paddock, 1981, Schneider, 1986; Shakeshaft, 1989; Whitebook, 1997), is that the career pathway to the principalship varies for males and females. In general, women spend more time in the classroom before entering administration; this additional experience provides greater opportunity to develop instructional expertise and relational skills with students. In addition, accountability ratings based on academic achievement may shift emphasis from school management (male-orientation) to student learning (female-orientation) (see Tallerico & Blount, 2004) favoring women's leadership strengths. Because this study only examined the gender of campus leadership in terms of student achievement measured by school accountability ratings, the role of instructional leadership was emphasized. This may have been an advantage to the women leaders sampled.

Furthermore, while women may enter the principalship with more years of classroom experience, they also bring fewer skills in management due to lack of administrative experience (Glass, et al., 2000). It should be noted that in addition to instructional management, a variety of skills are required for the principalship including, but not limited to, judgment, problem analysis, measurement and evaluation, delegation, motivation of others, and organizational oversight. Krüger, van Eck, & Vermeulen (2005)

found that effective educational leadership depends on the integration of instructional and management models. The National Policy Board of Educational Administration (NPBEA) identified 21 skills for the principalship that were categorized into three domains: functional, programming, and interpersonal (Thompson, 1993).

Because both men and women proved successful in academic leadership, other contributors to their overall performance should be identified. Further research is needed to identify the impact of engendered leadership on student achievement in terms of school size and school grade level. Finally, the interrelationship of gender with other attributes of successful leaders (e.g., NPBEA knowledge and skill domains) is recommended. Specifically, these interrelationships should be studied among leaders of schools with the highest academic ratings to identify the key leadership factors responsible for increased student achievement.

References

- Adams, K., & Hambright, W. (2004, May). Encouraged or discouraged? Women teacher leaders becoming principals. *Clearing House*, 77(5), 209-211.
- Accountability Manual (2007, May). Texas Education Agency. Austin TX: Department of Assessment, Accountability, and Data Quality Division of Performance Reporting. (Retrieved May 17, 2008 from <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2007/manual/index.html>)
- Acker, S. (1995). The headteacher as career broker: Stories from an English primary school. In D. Dunlap & P. Schmuck (Eds.), *Women leading in education*, (pp. 49–67). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- Addi-Racah, A. (2006, August). Accessing internal leadership positions at school: Testing the similarity-attraction approach regarding gender in three educational systems in Israel. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(3), 291-323.
- Ah Nee-Benham, M. & Cooper, J. (1998). *Narratives of diverse women in school leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Andrews, M., & Ridenour, C. (2006, September). Gender in schools: A qualitative study of students in educational administration. *Journal of Educational Research*, 100(1), 35-43.
- Bjork, L. (2000, February). Women in the superintendency: Advances in research and theory. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(1), 5–17.
- Blount, J. (1998). *Destined to rule the schools: Women and the superintendency, 1973-1995*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Boris-Schacter, S., & Langer, S. (2002). Caught between nostalgia and utopia. *Education Week*, 11(21), 34-37.
- Brunner, C. (Ed.). (1999). *Sacred dreams: Women and the superintendency*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Brunner, C. (2000, February) Unsettled moments in settled discourse: Women superintendents' experiences of inequality. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(1), 76–116.
- Brunner, C. and Grogan, M. (2005, November). Motivation theory and attitudes of aspiration: Why do[not] women central office administrators seek the superintendency? Paper presented to the Fall Conference of the University Council for Educational

- Burke, R., & Nelson, D. (2002). Advancing women in management: Progress and prospects. In Burke, R., & Nelson, D. (Eds.), *Advancing women's careers: Research and practice* (pp. 3–15). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Collard, J. (2001, July). Leadership and gender: An Australian perspective. *Educational Management & Administration*, 29(3), 343-355.
- Collard, J. (2003, March). Principal well-being in complex times. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 31(1), 2-14.
- Couse, L., & Russo, H. (2006, February). Service-learning: Mentoring leadership skills in the experienced teacher. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 14(1), 33-48.
- Eagly A., Johannesen-Schmidt, M., & van Engen, M. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin* 129, 569–591.
- Eagly, A., Makhijani, M., & Klonsky, B. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111, 3–22.
- Eckman, E. (2004, August). Similarities and differences in role conflict, role commitment, and job satisfaction for female and male high school principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(3), 366-387.
- Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37, 15-24.
- Edson, S. (1988). *Pushing the limits: The female administrative aspirant*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- Fauth, G. (1984). Women in educational administration: A research profile. *Educational Forum*, 49, 65-79.
- Ferrandino, V., & Tirozzi, G. (2001). How do you reinvent a principal? *Education Week*, 20(20), 8-9.
- Glass, T. (2000) Where are all the women superintendents? *School Administrator*, 6(57), 28-32.
- Glass, T., Bjork, L., & Brunner, C. (2000) *The study of the American school superintendency. A look at the superintendent of education in the new millennium*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Goldberg, C. (1991). *A study of the career paths of administrators in central office positions in New York state public schools*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 341 145)
- Grogan, M. (1996) *Voices of women aspiring to the superintendency*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Grogan, M. (1999). Equity/quality issues of gender, race, and class. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(4), 518-536.
- Grogan, M. (2000). Laying the groundwork for a reconception of the superintendency from feminist postmodern perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36, 117-142.
- Houston, P. (1998). The ABC's of administrative shortages. *Education Week*, 17(38), 32-44.
- Institute for Educational Leadership. (2000, October). *Leadership for student learning: Reinventing the principalship*. A report of the Task Force on the Principalship,

- School Leadership for the 21st Century Initiative. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Kagan, S., & Bowman, B. (1997). *Leadership in early care and education*. Washington, DC: National Association for Education of Young Children.
- Krüger, M., van Eck, E., & Vermeulen, A. (2005, August). Why principals leave: Risk factors for premature departure in the Netherlands compared for women and men. *School Leadership & Management*, 25(3), 241-261.
- Lárusdóttir, S. (2007, April). 'The fact that I'm a woman may have been the defining factor.'. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 35(2), 261-276.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning. A commissioned report*. New York: Wallace Foundation.
- Lesotte, L. (1991). *Correlates of effective schools: The first and second generation*. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products.
- Lesotte, L. (1992). "Principal" insights from effective schools. *Education Digest*, 58(3), 14-17.
- Marshall, C. (Ed). (1997). *Feminist critical policy analysis: A perspective from primary and secondary schooling*. New York: Routledge.
- Marzano, R., Waters, T, & McNulty, B. (2005) *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria VA and Aurora, CO: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Matthews, J. (2001). Chief academic officers. *The School Administrator*, 58(6), 12-17.

- Matthews, L., & Crow, G. (2003). *Being and becoming a principal: Role conceptions for contemporary principals and assistant principals*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- National Association for the Education of Young Children [NAEYC]. (2002). Standards for early childhood professional preparation: Advanced programs. Retrieved July 28, 2008 from http://www.naeyc.org/faculty/pdf/advanced_standards.pdf#xml=http://naeychq.naeyc.org/tehis/search/pdfhi.txt?query=standards+for+early+childhood&pr=naeyc&prox=sentence&rorder=750&rprox=500&rdfreq=1000&rwfreq=1000&rlead=1000&sufs=2&order=r&cq=&id=452256037e
- National Center for Education Statistics [NCES]. (2002). Profile of undergraduates in U.S. postsecondary institutions: 1999–2000. Retrieved August 28, 2008 from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/2002168.PDF>
- Newton, R. (2006, October). Does recruitment message content normalize the superintendency as male? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(4), 551-577.
- Newton, R., Giesen, J., Freeman, J., Bishop, H., & Zeitoun, P. (2003). Assessing the reactions of men and women to attributes of the principalship. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39, 505-531.
- Noddings, N. (1990). Feminist critiques in the professions. In C. B. Cazden (Ed.), *Review of research in education*, (pp. 393-424). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Noddings, N. (1991). The gender issue. *Educational Leadership*, 49(49), 65–70.
- Olson, L. (2008, April). Lack of school leadership seen as a global problem. *Education Week*, 27(33), 8.

- Oplatka, I., & Atias, M. (2007, January). Gendered views of managing discipline in school and classroom. *Gender & Education, 19*(1), 41-59.
- Ortiz, F. (1982). *Career patterns in education: Women, men, and minorities in school administration*. New York: Praeger.
- Paddock, S. (1981). Male and female career paths in school administration. In P. Schmuck, W. Charters, & R. Carlson (Eds.), *Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differentials* (pp. 187–198). New York: Academic Press.
- Pew Research Center. (2008, August). *A paradox in public opinion: Men or women: who's the better leader?* Retrieved September 3, 2008 from <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/932/men-or-women-whos-the-better-leader>
- Pitner, N. (1981). Hormones and harems: Are the activities of superintending different for a woman? In P. Schmuck, W. Charters, Jr., & R. Carlson (Eds.), *Educational Policy and Management* (pp. 273-295). New York: Academic Press.
- Protheroe, N. (2001). *Attracting and retaining high quality people for the principalship: Problems and possibilities*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, Seattle, WA.
- Rea, L. M., & Parker, R. A. (1992). *Designing and conducting survey research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Reay, D. and Ball, S. (2000). Essentials of female management. *Educational Management and Administration, 28*(2), 145–159.
- Regan, H. and Brooks, G. (1995). *Out of women's experience: Creating relational leadership*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.

- Reynolds, D. (1990). An introduction to managing school effectiveness. *School Organisation*. 10(2-3), 163-165.
- Rusch, E., & Marshall, C. (2006, July). Gender filters and leadership: Plotting a course to equity. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 9(3), 229-250.
- Schneider, G. (1986). *Career path and mobility differences of women and men in educational administration*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1989). *Women in educational administration*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1995). A cup half full: A gender critique of the knowledge base in educational administration, in: R. Donmoyer, M. Imber, & J. Scheurich (Eds.), *The knowledge base in educational administration: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 139–157). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1999). The struggle to create a more gender-inclusive profession. In J. Murphy and K. Louis (Eds), *Handbook of research on educational administration*, (2nd ed., pp. 99–116). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Skrla, L. (1999, April). *Femininity/masculinity: Hegemonic normalizations in the public school superintendency*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- Smulyan, L. (2000) Feminist cases of nonfeminist subjects: Case studies of women principals. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 13, 589–610.

- Taba, S., Castle, A., Vermeer, M., Hanchett, K. & Flores, D. (1999). Lighting the path: Developing leadership in early education, *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 26(3), 173–177.
- Tallerico, M. (1999). Women and the superintendency: What do we really know? In C. Brunner (Ed.), *Sacred dreams: Women and the superintendency* (pp. 29–48). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Tallerico, M., & Blount, J. (2004, December). Women and the superintendency: Insights from theory and history. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(5), 633-662.
- Tallerico, M., & Burstyn, J. (1996). Retaining women in the superintendency: The location matters. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32, 642-664.
<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2007/manual/index.html>
- Thacker, R. (1995). Gender, influence tactics, and job characteristics preferences: New insights into salary determination. *Sex Roles*, 32, 617–638.
- Thomson, S. (Ed.). (1993). *Principals for our changing schools: The knowledge and skills base*. Fairfax, VA: National Policy Board for Education Administration.
- Whitebook, M. (1997). Who's missing at the table? Leadership opportunities and barriers for teachers and providers. In S. Kagan & B. Bowman (Eds.), *Leadership in early care and education*. Washington, DC: National Association for Education of Young Children.
- Young, M., & McLeod, S. (2001, October). Flukes, opportunities, and planned interventions: Factors affecting women's decisions to become school administrators. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(4), 462.

Ethical Development and Diversity Training for Educational Leaders

Ilene L. Ingram, Oakland University
Shannon Flumerfelt, Oakland University

In the 21st century schools must meet the challenges of current and anticipated increases in racial and ethnic student populations. In turn, school principals must be prepared to lead diverse student populations to high levels of achievement. To facilitate adequate leadership preparation, therefore, the diversity training of educational leaders in given settings must be reworked so that the achievement gap between non-white and white students can be closed. Furthermore, restructuring of principal training is best accomplished through consensus within the profession, based on the tenets of the democratic values of respect, acceptance, and appreciation of diversity.

The purpose of this paper is to add to the body of knowledge in educational leadership degree and certification programs in regard to diversity standards and social justice relevance. This paper provides an overview of a social justice agenda that includes five key elements. The first is a discussion of the term diversity and American demography. The second element is a summary of the sociopolitical context of social justice. The third element is an examination of multicultural education. The fourth element is an overview of educational administration programs. The last element is a review of the moral and ethical leadership standards for educational administrators.

Diversity and American Demography

An analysis of American demography is useful in understanding the diversity picture in the country. Such an analysis provides for the variety and specificity of indigenous, migrant, and imported populations; the particular scale and regional uniqueness of demographic configurations and patterns of settlement; and the historically embedded

characteristics of dominant cultures and the history of their interaction with minority groups. The current state of diversity and American demography in the Consensus 2000 report outlines unprecedented diversity (Prewitt, 2003-2004). Hence, the data indicate a variation towards more diversity and demographic shifts. This degree of transformation greatly impacts the practice of school leaders as facilitators of social justice and diversity issues.

Sociopolitical Context of Social Justice

Current educational reform proposals are deeply rooted in attitudes, values, and beliefs about diversity. There are a variety of interpretations of what diversity and social justice mean. Moreover, there are political implications embedded in the term diversity, when linked to social justice. Those interpretations represent a wide polarization of political agendas, including what the national agenda for education should be. When one attempts to understand what it means to implement effective politically-motivated school policies, the complexity of the sociopolitical context of social justice is confounding. Hence, to understand the term diversity, the sociopolitical inflection of social justice must be considered next.

Social justice has a particular interpretation in the U.S. when conservative groups describe it. The conservative view tends to emphasize rights, laws and the legal system based on the belief that the taxonomy of social justice begins with a shared view of diversity. In turn, this foundation is essential in establishing a commonly held goal of unity of thought. A detractor to this ideology is the belief in diversity of thought. Diversity of thought is viewed as contrary to the establishment of one society, the “melting pot” concept. Hence, diversity is held in opposition to the implications for

assimilation in the “melting pot” and threatens the conservative view of the essential notion of unity of thought for a successful society (Schlesinger, 1991; Wills, 1994). This view is justified by the experiences of earlier immigrants who readily embraced *one American* society and developed unity by participating in the “melting pot” dynamics (Gibson & Follo, 1998). This formula for assimilation is one that is readily applied to the role of education whereby conservatives argue that one important role of education is to accomplish the same results for diverse groups. One shortcoming of this view is the difficulty in determining which one ideology to rally society around. Thus, when schools contribute to the making of *one American* society via this way of thinking, this approach privileges the Western ideologies of the prevailing White, Christian Eurocentric view, as it has historically. In addition, English is the preferred language to this pedagogy. Furthermore, since this ideology is not claimed as representative of various constituents in American society, it is easy for non-white groups to become disenfranchised with this perspective.

While conservatives focus on the word “justice,” conversely, liberals consider more broadly the word “social” in the term social justice. Liberals and growing numbers of educators are concerned about the historical record of underachievement of non-white students. In this view, there is criticism of the analytical, rational “justice” paradigm advocated by conservatives. Since this conservative paradigm reinforces the favoritism inherent in a system that allows a dominant group to both make and benefit from the laws of the land, the need to mend the “torn social fabric,” a term Darling-Hammond (2005) coined to describe the racial and ethnic divide in the U.S., emerges as a call to action from the liberal camp. Hence, an examination of cultural issues of “social” justice

emerges from this platform of unequal institutional norms and social structures in schools. Typically, such an examination results in dissonance. This dissonance reverberates as dissatisfaction with the notion of schools serving society as meritocracies whereby the inequitable practices of society are embedded in education systems that lead to inequitable outcomes. Kozol's work (2005) brings forth the "in use" shortcomings of the educational system to serve all children. He vehemently describes the shortcomings of the 50 year-old moral victory of *Brown v. Board of Education* when the evidence of social justice is sorely lacking in educational systems and the schools continue to fail the most vulnerable groups of children in our society who are poor and largely African American.

Multicultural and Multicultural Education

In order to understand diversity, the terms *multicultural* and *multicultural education* must be defined. Nieto (2004) does this well, providing the explanation that the term *multicultural* means *inclusive* because it includes *all* people. *Multicultural education* is in reference to studying the histories, cultures, and stories of *all* people who populate the world. Following the civil rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s, the case to reframe the racially and culturally biased school curriculum was made by Banks (1994) and other multicultural scholars. These multiculturalists and education scholars provided an historical analysis of how those who have political and economic power have held preeminence regarding how knowledge is constructed (Gay, 2004; Gollnick & Chinn, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Nieto, 1997; Sleeter, 1996). They argued that a curriculum constructed from the White supremacy paradigm was not relevant to

garnering a better understanding of multiculturalism and appreciation of diversity in a pluralistic society like the U.S.

Interpretations of conservative and liberal views of multiculturalism and multicultural education produce different results in schools (Nieto, 1997). Gibson and Follo (1998) stated the proponents of *one American* culture, conservatives, believe that multicultural education should not receive merited consideration in the curriculum or, if at all, only “ . . . where there is ethnic diversity or a predominant non-white population” (p. 17). On the other hand, multicultural advocates, liberals, argue that the study of multicultural and multiethnic groups has a *legitimate* place in the curriculum. According to Gay (2004):

As a concept, idea, or philosophy, multicultural education is a set of beliefs and explanations that recognize and value the importance of ethnic and cultural diversity in shaping lifestyles; social experiences; personal identities; and educational opportunities of individuals, groups, and nations. Consequently, it has both descriptive and prescriptive dimensions. (p. 33)

Gay furthers this thinking as an advocate for multicultural education. As multicultural education grows and more explicitly defines its domains and goals to include descriptive, prescriptive and critical types of theorizing, such as delineating the differences in views of social justice, these dimensions will be more evident and overtly presented in curriculum content.

Educational Administration Programs

In terms of school leadership development, Gay (2004) describes the importance of including multicultural education theory and its meaning for school administration. Levine (2005) has been critical of university leadership programs in this regard because they generally lack content needed for educating a population undergoing dramatic demographic and diversity change. Levine points out the increasing racial, ethnic, cultural, and socioeconomic diversity in the student body as negatively correlated to the recent rise in segregated schooling by race and income. Training educational leaders for multiculturalism and multicultural education is one way to influence educational policy and change the educational landscape to create positive school outcomes. He laments that leadership preparation programs appear to be unaware of this phenomenon and the potential for school improvement and better education outcomes in addressing it.

Nieto (2004) made a strong argument in her book, *Affirming Diversity: The Sociopolitical Context of Multicultural Education*, and stated that educational systems that prepare school leaders do have a history of racism, exclusion, and debilitating ideology. Furthermore, she contested that school leaders in general do not understand how to make equity and social justice actionable. Understanding concepts of cultural, ethnic, and racial diversity and their implications is difficult and such complexity lends to pedagogy for minority student populations bound in low expectations, under achievement, and marginalization. Subsequently, the dynamics for all students to learn are missing when diversity and multiculturalism is not embraced. This condition is in great contrast to the desired outcome of administrators actively engaging the tenets of social justice in schools.

In an important paper entitled, *Reculturing the Profession of Educational Leadership: New Blueprints*, Murphy (2002) argued that a new construct for educational leadership must have a social justice focus. Unfortunately, the current educational administration knowledge base does not do this well. It compromises efforts to prepare principals to value diversity and social justice since the existing body of knowledge in the field is predominantly positivist or functionalist (Scheurich, 1995). According to Murphy (2002), “The default to positivism and our fascination with building the academic infrastructure of school administration has produced some serious distortions in what is primarily an applied field” (p. 69). Furthermore, theories of knowledge in the field privilege a White male perspective. Feminist theory and critique, and the voices of “critical” others, are conspicuously absent in the knowledge discourse. Expressing concerns about the knowledge base, Brown and Irby (2006) concluded, “. . . such a knowledge base is inadequate as a conceptual foundation for understanding and informing practice in organizations, as well as for advancing diversity and social justice” (p. 7).

Beyond educational leadership programming, criticism of university programs in a broader sense has been put forth by the late Ernest Boyer (1996). He was highly critical of a lack of focus by schools and universities to contribute to solutions embedded in social justice. He felt that the higher education community should readily provide multiple venues for community-based dialogue. In essence, Boyer called on schools and higher education to stop abrogating their moral mission. Mallory and Thomas (2003) reinforced this view and posited that a vital mission of “. . . colleges and universities is to serve as sites of open inquiry, leading to a deeper understanding of contemporary social

challenges” (p. 2). They go on to say that while the need for sustained forms of inclusive dialogues related to paramount ethical and social issues facing our broader society is critical, “. . . there seem to be few examples in higher education of such conversations” (p. 2).

If higher education was aligned with the mission of social justice, it is possible that leadership programs would also be more closely aligned with it. Certainly, because our democratic way of life requires a concern for equity, the moral and ethical dimensions of school agency are vitally important. Furman and Starratt (2002) describe this well,

Since democratic leadership is moral, leadership practices proceed from this moral sense. It is intentional leadership aimed at enacting the values of democratic community; sociality for its own sake, open inquiry in pursuit of the common good; a deep respect for individuals; celebrating differences; and a sense of interdependence with all life. (p. 124)

Moral and Ethical Leadership Standards for Educational Leaders

Ciulla (2004) describes ethics as being the heart of leadership. Changing historical and incomplete understandings of what it means to lead diverse schools, along with the need for principals to be presently concerned about all children, compels school leaders to be aware of their own moral and ethical platforms and praxis. Leadership programs do have a moral responsibility to train principals to apply moral reasoning and ethical principles to all kinds of situations, problems, and ethical dilemmas encountered on the job (Brown, 2006; Fullan, 2003; Johnson, 2005; Kallio, 1999; Rebore, 2001; Starratt, 2004). Hence, for leadership development programs, the moral and ethical development

of leaders depends on providing learning opportunities to do so. In turn, the standards for practicing and aspiring leaders must adequately address their development needs for diversity, social justice, and multiculturalism.

Educational leadership programs may rely on the work of John Dewey (1916), who first taught that a key element to making democracy work is the moral and ethical agency of educators. In this sense, his appeal to democratic education suggested that the educational system and democracy are co-dependent for sustainability. Beckner (1994) and Shapiro and Stefkovice (2001) develop this concept further and indicate that ethical training of leaders must be deliberate. They challenge institutions to make ethical education a necessary inclusion in the training of educational leaders by including ethical training as a program standard and by providing the processes, protocols and structures to accommodate the development of knowledge, values and applications of social justice.

In spite of the complexities of today's era, it is possible, and is, in fact, necessary to develop a shared vision of leadership in regard to diversity and social justice. The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation and call for accountability, although challenging forces for change, do create positive conditions for school improvement and the alignment of standards for leadership preparation. Brown (2006) states, "Making it possible for all students, regardless of their social, cultural, and economic backgrounds, to achieve high academic standards requires greater leadership skills on the part of the principal than ever before" (p. 525). The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards honor that reality through the comprehensive *Standards for School Leaders*. Many leadership programs across the country have adopted the ISLLC standards. The ISLLC standards' taxonomy for leadership development includes the

learning behaviors of knowledge, performance, and dispositions indicators. The series of standards each begins with a lead phrase regarding the work of a school administrator as one promoting student success through the behavior descriptions in the standards. When taken as a whole, the ISLLC standards support the belief that leadership programs must more broadly focus on the dynamic, complex and diverse schools that await program graduates. Furthermore, ISLLC Standard 5 addresses the issue of ethical and diversity development.

These standards are contrasted with Murphy's (2006) analysis of leadership programs, encumbered with traditional content, largely irrelevant to the issues of social justice and diversity. As society's attention is increasingly focused on schools and the expectation is for all students to achieve at high levels, despite socioeconomic status, cultural and language diversity, educational leadership training programs must increase the pace of diversity training of principals. So, it is timely to examine programming outcomes for content, program design and other pedagogical improvements that will render school administrators equipped and capable of leading with the acumen of social relevance.

The Study

The Aim

The issues of diversity training for educational leaders for this paper draw upon a study conducted at a Midwestern university's graduate educational leadership program. The purpose of the study was to determine if ethical development based on knowledge, dispositions and performance occurred for educational leadership students, either practicing or aspiring school administrators. The study examined significant differences

between practicing and aspiring administrators, graduate students completing an Educational Specialist degree, in terms of the program's standards for ethical development of school leaders. The study reported on here was theoretically framed by Ingram and Flumerfelt (2007) as a discourse on educating multicultural America.

Methodology

The program's standards, the Interstate School Leaders' Consortium Standards (ISLLC), were self-reported in students' individual professional growth plan statements. Specifically, the study used mixed methods analysis of student professional growth plans against ISLLC Standard 5, which states school administrators promote student success through integrity, fairness and ethics. This examination was done to identify significant differences between practicing and aspiring administrator-students in order to better understand student achievement and program effectiveness. ISSLC Standard 5 is further delineated by behavior descriptors in three categories of Knowledge, with five explications, Dispositions, with eight explications, and Performances, with 16 explications. In total, 29 descriptions of ethical school leadership behavior were examined against students' professional growth plans.

The data were categorized by two samples, practicing administrators (n=8, 23.5%) and aspiring administrators (n=26, 76.5%), using qualitative methods. Upon review, written descriptions of behaviors expressed as knowledge, dispositions or performance, were categorized as one of 29 descriptions of Standard 5 (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). Once the professional growth plans were examined by the two authors who are also program coordinators, the results were forwarded to two statisticians for analysis. There were no missing data in the study.

Two statistical tests were used for the quantitative data analysis, the t-test and the cross-tab analysis with a chi-square test. The t-test analysis was conducted with the Knowledge, Dispositions and Performances by examining significant differences in the means of the two samples at an alpha level of .1 to reject the null hypothesis. The cross-tab analysis compared the observed frequency of these distributions with the frequencies expected by chance alone. An alpha level of .1 rejected the null hypothesis that there was no difference between practicing and aspiring administrator-students.

The t-test results showed that there is a significant difference between the self-reported student achievement in ethics in the professional growth plans of the practicing and aspiring administrator-students. Table 1 below presents the mean scores, standard deviations (SD), the degrees of freedom (df), and the probability that differences are not due to chance.

Table 1

Mean Scores of Aspiring and Practicing Administrators on ISLLC Standard 5, Ethics

Group	Mean	SD	t – value	df	Probability*
Aspiring Administrators	11.46	3.47	-6.617	10.54	<.000
Practicing Administrators	21.75	3.96			
*p<.1					

From these results, it can be seen that there were significant differences in the results between aspiring and practicing administrators regarding self-reported ethics development that were not due to chance.

The cross tab analyses also showed differing patterns of evidence for ISLLC Standard 5 by the three areas of growth, Knowledge, Dispositions and Performances. In the Knowledge area, four out of the five behavior descriptors were significantly different. The four behavior descriptors are listed in Table 2 below.

Table 2

Evidence of Individual Behavior Descriptors of ISLLC Standard 5 Ethics/Knowledge

Group	Expected Count	Actual Count	X ²	P
Behavior Descriptor: <i>Knowledge and understandings of the purpose of education and the role of leadership in modern society</i>				
Aspiring Administrator	6.9	4	6.98	.008
Practicing Administrator	2.1	5		
Behavior Descriptor: <i>Knowledge and understandings of various ethical frameworks and perspectives on ethics</i>				
Aspiring Administrator	9.2	6	7.22	.007
Practicing Administrator	2.8	6		
Behavior Descriptor: <i>Knowledge and understandings of the values of the diverse school community</i>				
Aspiring Administrator	6.9	4	6.98	.008
Practicing Administrator	2.1	5		
Behavior Descriptor: <i>Knowledge and understandings of the philosophy and history of education</i>				
Aspiring Administrator	2.3	1	3.40	.085
Practicing Administrator	.7	2		

In the Dispositions area, three out of the eight behavior descriptors were significantly different. The three behaviors descriptors are listed in Table 3 below.

Table 3

Evidence of Individual Behavior Descriptors of ISLLC Standard 5 Ethics/Dispositions

Group	Expected Count	Actual Count	X ²	P
Behavior Descriptor: <i>Believes in, values and is committed to the ideal of the common good</i>				
Aspiring Administrator	19.9	18	3.22	.073
Practicing Administrator	6.1	8		
Behavior Descriptor: <i>Believes in, values and is committed to accepting the consequences for upholding one's principles and actions</i>				
Aspiring Administrator	14.5	12	4.24	.039
Practicing Administrator	4.5	7		
Behavior Descriptor: <i>Believes in, values and is committed to using the influences of one's office constructively and productively in the service of all students and their families</i>				
Aspiring Administrator	13.0	11	2.62	1.06
Practicing Administrator	4.0	6		

In the Performances area, 11 out of the 16 behavior descriptors were significantly different. The 11 behaviors descriptors are listed in Table 4 below.

Table 4

Evidence of Individual Behavior Descriptors of ISLLC Standard 5 Ethics/Performances

Group	Expected Count	Actual Count	X ²	P
Behavior Descriptor: <i>Facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring values, beliefs and attitudes that inspire others to higher levels of performance</i>				
Aspiring Administrator	19.1	17	3.77	.052
Practicing Administrator	5.9	8		
Behavior Descriptor: <i>Facilitates processes and engages in activities accepting responsibility for school operations</i>				
Aspiring Administrator	13.0	9	10.46	.001
Practicing Administrator	4.0	8		
Behavior Descriptor: <i>Facilitates processes and engages in activities considering the impact of one's administrative practices on others</i>				
Aspiring Administrator	10.7	6	14.95	<.001
Practicing Administrator	3.3	8		
Behavior Descriptor: <i>Facilitates processes and engages in activities using the impact of the office to enhance the educational program rather than for personal gain</i>				
Aspiring Administrator	7.6	2	25.11	<.001
Practicing Administrator	2.4	8		
Behavior Descriptor: <i>Facilitates processes and engages in activities protecting the rights and confidentiality of students and staff</i>				
Aspiring Administrator	12.2	10	3.28	.070
Practicing Administrator	3.8	6		
Behavior Descriptor: <i>Facilitates processes and engages in activities demonstrating appreciation for and sensitivity to the diversity in the school community</i>				
Aspiring Administrator	5.4	2	11.2	.001
Practicing Administrator	1.8	8		
Behavior Descriptor: <i>Facilitates processes and engages in activities recognizing and respecting the legitimate authority of others</i>				
Aspiring Administrator	12.2	9	6.87	.009
Practicing Administrator	3.8	7		
Behavior Descriptor: <i>Facilitates processes and engages in activities examining and considering the prevailing values of the diverse school community</i>				

Aspiring Administrator	6.1	3		
Practicing Administrator	1.9	5	8.83	.003
Behavior Descriptor: <i>Facilitates processes and engages in activities expecting others in the school will demonstrate integrity and exercise ethical behavior</i>				
Aspiring Administrator	10.7	7		
Practicing Administrator	3.3	7	9.27	.002
Behavior Descriptor: <i>Facilitates processes and engages in activities opening the school to public scrutiny</i>				
Aspiring Administrator	3.8	0		
Practicing Administrator	1.2	5	19.05	<.001
Behavior Descriptor: <i>Facilitates processes and engages in activities applying laws and procedures fairly, wisely and considerately</i>				
Aspiring Administrator	4.6	1		
Practicing Administrator	1.4	5	14.48	<.001

Findings

The results of the study are informative regarding to training school administrators, specifically in understanding the differences in diversity learning results of practicing and pre-service leaders. As indicated in Tables 2, 3 and 4 above, there are significantly different learning outcomes in the area of diversity and social justice between the pre-service and practicing administrators. The findings point to the accumulating effect of such differences in the areas of knowledge, disposition and performances. Upon examining the study results described above individually by behavior descriptors, the reported differences are disturbing, but somewhat predictable, since it is assumed that a practicing administrator might learn more from an educational leadership program than a pre-service administrator would. But, when examining the sum total of differences, the accumulating effect of the results in terms of implementing social justice, the differences become alarming. In other words, an individual and summative evaluation of the results whereby the differences are considered separately is not as informative as a formative evaluation of the results' differences for diversity

training matters for practicing and aspiring administrators. This is important because developing perspectives of social justice are not solely the responsibility of the building administrator, but should involve collaborative work in the school community in fashioning a shared mission, vision and goals. When those perspectives are not shared among formal degree cohort colleagues in a program based on standards that specifically describe learning outcomes as described in Tables 2, 3 and 4, then the concern surfaces that a more dispersed perspective, and possibly a poorly defined one, clearly exists in the schools served by the study's participants.

While the results of the study do not justify generalizations beyond the sample, for those two groups in the sample, there is regional representation of schools. For the schools represented in this region, there are concerns regarding the implementation of social justice tenets. For example, Table 1 highlights the overall analysis of learning results for diversity in this regard. That is, it concludes that there are significant differences in those results for the two sample groups, pre-service and current school leaders. Given the advanced level of responsibility and experience assumed by practicing school administrators, this conclusion is somewhat predictable. What is of concern, however, is that these two sample groups participated in learning cohorts in one graduate leadership degree program, and in the end, describe different learning results. From these findings, it is suggested that the degree program under examination must consider differentiating instruction in order to advance the learning outcomes of the aspiring administrators in diversity development. Or, the alternative is to accept the differentiated results knowing that these program graduates will practice leadership in the areas of diversity and social justice with significantly different developmental abilities overall.

Table 2 highlights the differences in the knowledge development of four behavior descriptors between the two groups. These knowledge differences do impact learning cultures in schools and learning experiences in classrooms. They include differences in knowledge regarding the purpose of schools, the ethical frameworks of diversity, the values of the diverse community and the history and philosophy of schools in terms of diversity. These differences mean that aspiring leaders self-report that they do not understand the purpose of schools in terms of providing equal, equitable and adequate educational experiences for all. They do not have the knowledge needed to understand the impact of diverse perspectives on learning itself and the value of education for different ethnic backgrounds. On a most basic level, they do not have adequate knowledge on the frameworks of education as related to diversity.

Table 3 highlights the differences in the values development of three behavior descriptors between the two groups. These values differences include overt behaviors, behaviors that hold promise for modeling for students' values aligned with the tenets of social justice and diversity, unfortunately. They include behavior differences in demonstrating the value in the common good, upholding one's principles in the face of opposition and using the administrative office appropriately for diversity matters. The absence of these values-based behaviors by aspiring administrators means that school environments are lacking critical advocates for social justice. The absence of learning results in these specific areas means that the formal degree program under study is not providing developmentally appropriate values-development learning experiences for the aspiring administrators. Three of the values that drive effective behavior for social justice and diversity in schools are not developed.

Table 4 highlights the differences in performance development of behavior descriptors between the two groups. This list is extensive, including 11 significantly different areas of performance. These areas of difference relate to actions taken with a degree of effectiveness in terms of demonstrating leadership competence in ways that advance the tenets of social justice in schools. Items such as inspiring others, accepting responsibility, influencing the practice of others reflect proficiency in acting in socially responsible manner are missing for the pre-service administrators. Other critical learning outcomes are lacking in the pre-service group, such as using the principal's office for educational gain, protecting rights and confidentiality, considering prevailing values of diversity and demonstrating diversity sensitivity. These learning outcomes are indicative of practices based on an understanding of the power of the administrative office in advancing diversity tenets. Additional learning results are deficient as well and are based on facilitating a respect for legitimate authority, opening the school to public scrutiny and applying the law fairly without bias are indicative of leadership practice grounded in a broad and fair perspective of the school's role in society.

Overall, these differences in knowledge, values and performance learning outcomes in the two groups represent a noteworthy set of differences in the area of diversity development. The three areas of learning and the 17 behavior areas of difference when considered as a total picture of learning outcomes is alarming. Even if the differences are due to the combination of formal and on-the-job learning practicing administrators have the benefit of drawing upon, the fact that the final self-reported learning outcomes are so divergent indicates that pre-service administrative graduates differentiated learning experiences. If a standard of diversity training for school leaders

is desired, then a common standard of learning outcomes is sensible. In the program under study, the data demonstrate specifically where this did not occur for diversity in the areas of knowledge, dispositions and performances.

Conclusion

Much can be learned from the findings of this study. In particular, specific change strategies regarding diversity training for aspiring and practicing principals can be made. The program under study provided significantly different learning outcome results for social justice and diversity between practicing and aspiring administrators. Hence, recommendations for program improvement include approaches regarding program design, content design, instructional delivery and assessment methods are put forth.

Strategies such as differentiating instruction to provide more experiential and culturally diverse field-based study and internships are given. Additional suggestions, such as individualizing instruction with more specific and formative assessment of learning against the ISLLC standards throughout the tenure of the program are made as well. Using threaded curriculum approaches, whereby diversity and social justice are repeating themes of study through the variety of courses, is essential. Developing additional authentic assessment measures, beyond the methods used for this study, are recommended in order to better triangulate learning outcome data.

The study's findings confirm that educational leaders cannot practice what they do not know or value. In examining the professional growth plans of the two groups, narrative descriptions did uncover matters of understanding, values and actions that distinguished the graduates as individuals. (Combs, Blume, Newman & Wass, 1974) In doing so, individual perspectives on learning outcomes were obtained, but also the two

student groups could be compared to identify the critical learning differences that occurred. As the aspiring principals did not develop in several diversity areas, it is concluded that the cultural consciousness of this group lacks the capacity as administrators to implement the mission that all children can learn.

Covey (1992) makes a powerful argument that one's attitudes, beliefs, and values are the foundations for guiding principals at all time, at all places and in all situations. The ISLLC Standard 5 clearly states that aspiring and practicing principals must articulate and share knowledge, dispositions and performances with members of the school community, education's stakeholders and broader society. It is expected, therefore, that in matters of diversity, preparation should be of the highest quality. Leadership graduates must understand, value, and be willing to act in ways that weave diversity into the fabric of American society. Aspiring and practicing school administrators must be challenged to value diversity in the district, school and classroom and must be prepared to advocate for social justice. In this sense, school principals have the potential for serving as powerful change agents in promoting participation for all students in all schools in all of society. There is clearly more work to do in this regard.

References

- Banks, J. A. (1994). *An introduction to multicultural education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Beckner, W. (1994). *Ethics for school leaders*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Boyer, E. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach, Vol 1, No. 1*.
- Brown, P. F. (2006). Preparing principals for today's demands. *Phi Delta Kappan, 87(7)*,

- 525-526.
- Brown, G., & Irby, B. J. (2006). Expanding the knowledge base: Socially just theory in educational leadership programs. In Dembowski, F. L., & Lemasters, L. K. (Eds.), *Unbridled spirit: Best practices in educational administration - The 2006 Yearbook of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration* (pp. 7-13). Lancaster, PA: Pro Active Publications.
- Ciulla, J. B. (2004). Leadership ethics: Mapping the territory. In J. B. Ciulla (Ed.), *Ethics: The heart of leadership* (pp. 1-24). Westport, CO: Praeger Publisher.
- Combs, A. W., Blume, R. A., Newman, A. J., & Wass, H. L. (1974). *The professional education of teachers: A humanistic approach to teacher preparation*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Covey, S. (1992). *Principal-centered leadership*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2005). Educating the New Educator: Teacher Education and the Future of democracy. *The New Educator*, 1:1-18.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy in Education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2003). *How to design and evaluate research in education*, (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fullan, M. (2003). *The moral imperative of school leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Furman, G. C., & Starratt, R. J. (2002). Leadership for democratic community in schools. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century*. (pp. 105-133). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gay, G. (2004). Curriculum theory and multicultural education. In J. A. Banks & C.A.

- M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. (2nd ed.), pp. 30-49. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gibson, S. L., & Follo, E. J. (1998). The status of multicultural education in Michigan. *Multicultural Education*, 6(2), pp. 17-22.
- Gollnick, D. M., & Chinn, P. C. (2001). *Multicultural education in a pluralist society*. (6th ed.), New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Ingram, I. L. & Flumerfelt, S. F. (2007). A diversity training matter for aspiring and practicing principals. In M. A. McMorris & T. J. Manson (Eds.), *Hostile Corridors: Advocates and Obstacles to Educating Multicultural America* (pp. 349-357). Mason, OH: Thomson.
- Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards for School Leaders. (1996). Council of Chief State School Officials. Retrieved January 24, 2006 from <http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/isllcstd.pdf>
- Johnson, C. (2005). *Meeting the ethical challenges of leadership: Casting light on shadow*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kallio, B. R. (1999). Ethics education in school administrator preparation programs. In L. T. Fenwick (Ed.), *School leadership: Expanding horizons of the mind and spirit* (pp. 222-230). National Council of Professors of Educational Administration.
- Kozol, J. (2005). *The shame of the nation: The restoration of apartheid schooling in America*. New York: Corwin Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995, Fall). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 33(3), 465-492.
- Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. NYC: The Education Schools Project.

- Columbia University.
- Mallory, B. L., & Thomas, N. L. (2003). When the medium is the message: Promoting ethical action through democratic dialogue. *Change*, 2-9.
- Murphy, J. (2002). Reculturing the profession of educational leadership: New blueprints. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (pp. 65-82). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Murphy, J. E. (2006). Elephants or dinosaurs: A call to action for ed schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(7), 529-536.
- Nieto, S. (1997). School reform and student achievement: A multicultural perspective. In J. S. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (3rd ed., pp. 385-407). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Nieto, S. (2004). Affirming diversity: *The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. (4th ed.). New York: Pearson.
- Prewitt, K. (2003-2004). Demography, diversity, and democracy: The 2000 census story. In J. A. Kromkowski (Ed.), *Race and Ethnic Relations*. (pp. 151-154). Guilford, CO: McGraw-Hill Dushkin.
- Rebore, R. W. (2001). *The ethics of educational leadership*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Scheurich, J. J. (1995). The knowledge base in educational administration: Post positivist Reflections. In Donmoyer, R. Imber, M., & J. J. Scheurich (Eds.), *The knowledge base in educational administration: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 17-31). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Schlesinger, A. (1991). *The disuniting of America: Reflection on a multicultural society*.

- Knoxville, TN: Whittle Direct Books.
- Shapiro, J. P., & Stefkovice, J. A. (2001). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Sleeter, C. E. (1996). *Multicultural education as social activism*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Starratt, R. J. (2004). *Ethical leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wills, G. F. (1994, November). A kind of compulsory chapel: Multiculturalism in a campaign to lower America's moral status. *Newsweek*, p. 84.

Teacher Perceptions of the Instructional Leadership Practices of Principals

Don Leech, Valdosta State University
James L. Pate, Valdosta State University
Nicole M. Gibson, Valdosta State University
Ronny Green, Valdosta State University
Robert Smith, Valdosta State University

In today's world school leadership, particularly instructional leadership, has taken on a new look. The era of high- stakes accountability has changed almost everything. The instructional leader of the 80's was presented as an efficient top-down, task oriented manager who was focused on curriculum and instruction rather than buildings and budgets (Lashway, 2002). Gone are the days when principals spent most of their time with bus schedules, fire drills, and general curriculum, says the National Association of Elementary Principals (Henry, 2001). Leaders must keep abreast of state and federal goals, the latest technologies and teaching practices, as well as learn to use data to identify learning gaps among all students.

The 21st century instructional leader is portrayed as a democratic community minded leader who builds consensus around a vision grounded in agreed upon standards for student learning with a commitment to be accountable for results. No matter how desirable it is for principals to be instructional leaders, the fact remains managerial responsibilities have not gone away (Lashway, 2002). Someone must to be responsible for and assure those managerial tasks are completed. In other words instructional leadership is necessary but not sufficient to create an effective school.

As educators continue to develop school cultures which enable all learners to achieve at their highest levels, the role of the principal becomes paramount. This survey research project endeavors to explore the instructional dimension of the principalship.

A Discussion of Related Literature

The literature on instructional leadership is filled with references to the principal as the primary source of this leadership in effective schools. The principal has to be the person instructional personnel look to for leadership (Edmonds, 1981). Principals should be primarily instructional leaders and lead schools in a way that places student and adult learning at the center (Stricherz, 2001).

School effectiveness literature illustrates the importance of the principal in providing effective leadership and supportive management in schools (Purkey & Smith, 1983). Effective schools have effective leaders (Smith, Maehr, & Midgley, 1992). Effective change in classrooms comes about through a conscious focus on instructional leadership by the principal (Fink & Resnick, 2001). Helping to define priorities in instruction is a primary element of instructional leadership (Tice, 1992).

Effective principals are those who operate to identify, establish, and supervise the shared mission of the school with members of the school community (Lambert, 2002). Principals should insist on a student learning focus, encourage and support leadership in others, model and participate in collaborative practices, ask questions, and facilitate a dialog that focuses on student learning.

Blasé and Blasé (1998) describe instructional leadership as complex and demanding. Their studies, based on teachers' perceptions, found instructional leaders

provide not only insights into what helps teachers to grow, but what followers want and find helpful from their leaders. They asked teachers to describe principals who had a positive influence on student learning. Two broad themes emerged: talking with teachers and promoting professional development. The principal has been characterized as the “chief learning officer” who bears “ultimate responsibility for success or failure of the enterprise, which would indicate an important role for principals in program implementation (Bottoms & O’Neill, 2001). Bloom, Castague, and Warren, (2002) believe there is little doubt that an effective principal is prerequisite to school improvement.

Writing and research related to leadership in education has often concentrated on what makes up the leadership function. Scholars have been successful in making up lists of what instructional leaders do or should do, but practitioners are far from taxonomy of what comprises leadership because both leadership and management are contested notions. Instructional leadership is about leading teachers’ professional learning (Southworth, 2002).

Educators have known some principals are more effective than others. Principals have been told they must be effective instructional leaders, yet exactly what that means has remained vague (Waters, Marzano & McNulty, 2004). Waters, et. al. believe if instructional leadership matters, it could be empirically defined, and effective leaders would know not only what to do, but how, when, and why to do it. They identified a positive relationship between school leadership and student achievement. They identified 21 key areas of leadership responsibility significantly correlated with student achievement. Effective instructional leaders understood which changes were most likely

to improve student achievement, what those changes implied for everyone, and how to structure their leadership practices for success.

Five types of administrative behaviors (a) defining goals and mission of the school, (b) promoting an instructional climate, (c) supervising teachers, (d) overseeing curriculum, and (e) monitoring student progress have been consistently identified as occurring in effective schools (Blank, 1987, Purkey & Smith 1983). These behaviors are regularly and consistently reported as important and recent works have supported these claims (Murphy, 1988, Blasé & Blasé, 1998, Henry, 2002).

The days for the principal as the lone instructional leader are over. No longer can one administrator serve as the instructional leader for the entire school without the substantial participation of other educators (Lambert 1998; Lambert, Collay, Deitz, Kent, & Richert, 1997; Olson, 2000; Poplin, 1994; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001). Fullan (2002) defined instructional leadership as the central role for the principal and a valuable first step in increasing student learning, but says that definition does not go far enough. Because principals are not directly involved with instruction, their role consists more of monitoring student progress through teacher contact, supervising teachers, and managing school curriculum and staff development (Meyer, Scott, and Deal, 1983).

Liethwood, Jautzi, and Yeoman (1999) believe the most fully developed model of instructional leadership is the one developed by Hallenger and his associates and consists of three broad categories of leadership practice: defining school mission; managing the instructional program; and promoting the school climate. According to Hallenger and Heck (1997) leadership practices contribute to the outcomes desired by school but the contribution is always mediated by other people, events, and organizational factors such

as teacher commitment, instructional practices, or school culture. This is consistent with the proposition that leaders achieve their results primarily through other people.

Instructional leadership has been linked to high levels of professional knowledge, skill and understanding about pedagogy, knowledge of curricular, pupil learning, adult learning, and human interaction, skills in change management, group dynamics, interpersonal relations, and communications. Also certain personal qualities and individual attributes may be important such as high energy levels, resilience, determination, empathy, and optimism (Blasé & Blasé, 2000; Southworth, 2002).

Hallenger and Murphy (1987), through their research and experience suggested principals are unlikely to be strong instructional leaders unless three conditions are met: district decision makers must reduce the barriers that keep principals from performing their instructional leadership role; instructional leadership must be defined in terms of observable practices and behaviors principals can implement; and assessment methods must generate reliable, valid data on instructional leadership behavior and provide information principals can use in their professional development.

Four obstacles suggested by Hallenger and Murphy (1987) which seriously restrain principals from exercising strong instructional leadership are: lack of knowledge of curriculum and instruction; professional norms; district office expectations; and role diversity. Professional norms that suggest educational decision making in the teacher's domain mitigate against strong instructional leadership. Principals often informally trade their authority in the areas of curriculum and instruction for compliance by teachers on other issues. These trades result in territorial boundaries that limit the frequency and

depth of principals' classroom visitation as well as their initiative in consulting with teachers about instructional matters.

Hallenger and Murphy (1987) also believe the principal's role comprises three dimensions of instructional leadership activity; defining the school mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting the school learning climate. Managing the instructional program consists of supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, and monitoring student progress. They say instructional leaders have a clear vision of what the school is trying to accomplish and defining the mission entails leading the staff in developing school wide goals and communicating them to the entire school community. The sense of mission evolves from a feeling of purpose shared by staff, students, and community. School goals are articulated to promote both accountability and instructional improvement. Coordinating curriculum is the process of ensuring that students receive appropriate instruction in areas identified by the district (Hallenger & Murphy, 1987).

Sheppard (1996) itemizes the following principal behaviors as being connected to teachers' professional growth and performance: framing school goals, communicating school goals, supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, monitoring student progress, protecting instructional time, providing incentives for teachers, maintaining high visibility, promoting professional development, and providing incentives for learning.

To change the expectations for instructional leadership to one of student learning being the priority, leadership roles could be described as anything done to improve teaching and learning. The role of principals, superintendents, and other educational

leaders have expanded during the past decade to include a larger focus on teaching and learning, professional development, data-driven decision making, and accountability (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2000). Richard Elmore (2000) described the principal's role as being responsible for designing and implementing a well-focused school improvement plan while working with other key players in the improvement process in a distributed leadership model. Elmore believes each role leads to a different kind of expertise that leaders must both respect and cultivate for there to be success in providing leadership.

Recently instruction has surged back to the top of the leadership agenda driven by the relentless growth of standards-based accountability systems. Explicit standards of learning coupled with heavy pressure to provide tangible evidence of success have reaffirmed the importance of instructional leadership (Lashway, 2002).

With this importance reaffirmed, what remains is to more clearly define instructional leadership and the many responsibilities for those who are considered instructional leaders. The issue most prevalent in the literature is the importance of the role principals plays in the instructional leadership process. What remains unclear is how these roles are to be fulfilled in today's schools by principals.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine how teachers perceive the changing instructional leadership role of principals and to what extent the instructional leadership is practiced. The research further attempted to determine whether instructional leadership practices of principals were consistent with the new paradigm for instructional leadership

established by the accountability movement. Three major research questions were addressed:

1. How do teachers perceive their principal's supervisory activities in instruction?
2. How active are principals perceived to be in overseeing instructional support programs?
3. How do teachers perceive their principal's participation in activities that promote an instructional climate?

Methodology

Through a review of the related literature, a survey instrument designed by King (2002) was adapted for use in the study. The survey consisted of 20 closed-ended responses divided into 4 sections. The first section of the survey requested information on how often the respondent's principal participated in activities related to instructional leadership, such as visiting classrooms, providing feedback on lesson plans, and conversing with teachers about instruction. Responses to these items ranged from "never", "rarely (or 1-2 times per year)", "often (or 3-5 times per year)", or "very often (or 6 or more times per year)" (coded 0 - 3). Embedded in this section were two items that did not follow the response format. One item asked respondents how satisfied they were with the level of support their principal provided in the area of curriculum and instruction. Forced responses were "not satisfied", "somewhat satisfied", "satisfied" or "very satisfied" (scored 0 - 3). The second item asked respondents to identify their principal as either (a) teacher focused, (b) management focused, or (c) learning focused.

In the second section, respondents were asked how active their principal is in supervision of the following instructional support programs: (a) special education, (b) library media, (c) guidance counseling, and (d) ESOL. Responses ranged from “not active”, “somewhat active”, “active”, or “very active” (coded 0-3).

The third section consisted of five Likert scaled responses to statements describing the principal. Responses ranged from 0 (strongly disagree) to 3 (strongly agree). No neutral response was provided so respondents were forced to either agree or disagree.

The fourth section solicited demographic information. Respondents were asked to provide their years of teaching experience (1-5 years, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, more than 20), their gender, ethnicity, highest academic degree, and the grade level assignment (pk-5, 6-8, 9-12).

The survey was administered to 168 teachers enrolled in Educational Leadership classes as graduate students at a regional university. The participants represented 27 rural school districts in the university’s service area. Participation was voluntary and the surveys were completed anonymously. The completed questionnaire item responses were tabulated and are presented as proportions. In addition, subscale scores were calculated to explore differences in the perceptions of elementary, middle, and high school teachers.

Results

Characteristics of Participants

Of the 168 study participants, 137 (81.5 %) answered all items. Because the study was a preliminary investigation, the decision was made to omit incomplete surveys. Of

the complete case respondents, 103 (75.2 %) were female (92 Caucasian, 9 African American, and 2 Hispanic) and 34 were Caucasian males. Slightly over half of the respondents (96 or 53.2 %) had 10 or fewer years of teaching experience while 12 (8.8 %) had more than 20 years of experience. The majority were pre-K through 5th grade teachers (67 or 48.9 %), with 32 (23.4%) teaching 6th through 9th grades and 38 (27.7%) teaching grades 9 through 12. Most respondents, 72 (52.6 %) held a Master's degree while 56 (40.7 %) held a Bachelor's and 9 (6.6 %) had completed a Specialist's degree.

Summary of Research Questions

Research Question 1: How do teachers perceive their principal's supervisory activities in instruction?

Four survey items addressed the frequency at which principals engaged in the supervision of teaching and learning activities. Responses to the individual items are presented in Table 1.

Table 1.

Item Responses (in percentages) to Principals' Instructional Supervision Activities (n = 137)

Item	Never	Rarely	Often	Very often
How often does your principal:				
visit your class in an instructional supervision role?	8.0	62.8	23.4	5.8
provide feedback on your lesson plans?	40.1	40.9	14.6	4.4
conference with you about your teaching performance?	35.8	49.6	12.4	2.2
converse with you about teaching and learning?	13.1	44.5	29.9	12.4

As can be seen, the majority (over 65 %) of teachers report that their principal never or rarely engages in these activities. In addition, 75 respondents (54.7 %) reported being “not satisfied” or only “somewhat satisfied” with the level of support provided by their principal in the area of curriculum and instruction decisions (item 4). Indeed, the majority (90 or 65.7 %) identified their principal as “management focused” while only 36 (26.3 %) described their principal as “learning focused, and a mere 11 respondents (8.0 %) reported that their principal is “teaching focused” (item 6). To assess differences in the perceptions of elementary, middle, and high school teachers, responses were summed across the four items to create a subscale score. Internal consistency using Cronbach’s α indicates acceptable reliability for the subscale at .76. The mean and standard deviation for each school level are shown in Table 2.

Table 2.

Means and Standard Deviations for Subscale 1: Teachers' Perceptions of Principal's Supervision of Teaching and Learning Activities

	N	Mean	SD
Elementary School	67	4.6	2.2
Middle School	32	4.7	2.5
High School	38	3.5	2.4

A one-way ANOVA was conducted on the total scores using a family-wise $\alpha = .05$. Pairwise comparisons were made using Bonferroni's adjustment. The overall F-test indicated statistical significance ($F(2, 134) = 3.71, p = .03$) among the groups. The pairwise comparisons revealed that elementary and middle school teachers rated their principals higher, on average, than the high school teachers for these activities; however, due to differences in sample size statistical significance was found between elementary and high school teachers only ($p = .04$). The estimated effect size for the mean difference between elementary and high school teachers' perceptions, calculated using Cohen's d statistic was found to be .55.

Research Question 2: How active are principals perceived to be in overseeing instructional support programs?

To determine the involvement of principals in overseeing curriculum, respondents were asked to rate their principal's activity level in four common educational programs. Their responses are shown in Table 3.

Table 3.

Item Responses (in percentages) to Principals' Instructional Support Supervision Activities (n = 137)

Item	Not Active	Somewhat Active	Active	Very Active
How active is your principal in the supervision of the:				
special education program?	32.1	43.1	19.7	5.1
Library media program?	38.7	43.8	13.9	3.6
guidance program?	29.2	42.2	21.7	3.7
ESOL program?	42.3	42.3	11.7	3.6

For each program, less than 25 % of the teachers viewed their principal as being “active” or “very active.” Only 12.5 % reported their principal to be active in supervising the ESOL program.

Item responses were summed across the four items to create a subscale with an internal consistency reliability of $\alpha = .90$. A one-way ANOVA revealed no statistically significant differences among elementary, middle, and high school teachers' perceptions for this subscale ($F(2, 134) = 1.56, p = .21$). Table 4 presents the mean and standard deviation for each school level.

Table 4.

Means and Standard Deviations for Subscale 2: Teachers' Perceptions of Principal's Instructional Support Supervision Activities

	N	Mean	SD
Elementary School	67	4.0	3.2
Middle School	32	3.5	2.6
High School	38	2.8	2.5

Research Question 3: How do teachers perceive their principal's participation in activities that promote an instructional climate?

Survey respondents were asked to rate their agreement to five statements addressing the principal's participation in promoting an instructional climate. Table 5 summarizes the responses to each item.

Table 5.

Item Responses (in percentages) to Principals' Activities to Promote an Instructional Climate (n = 137)

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
My principal: encourages discussion among teachers about teaching and learning.	6.6	16.8	47.4	29.2
possess sufficient knowledge of curriculum and instruction necessary to lead teachers in the development of an effective instructional program.	3.6	25.5	46.0	24.8
develops a culture of high expectations for ALL students in the school.	5.8	14.6	53.3	26.3
designs teacher professional growth opportunities that are aligned with school and student learning goals.	2.9	21.2	56.9	19.0
encourages teachers to share the responsibility for leading the instructional program.	5.8	20.4	49.6	24.1

In general, teachers report their principal engages in activities that promote an instructional climate. For each item, over 70 % of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the statement described their principal.

The item responses were summed to create a subscale with an internal consistency reliability of $\alpha = .88$. Because Levene's statistic indicated a violation of the homogeneity

of variance assumption ($F(2, 134) = 4.4, p = .014$), the Brown-Forsythe robust test was used to assess differences among elementary, middle school, and high school teacher perceptions. Statistical significance was found among the three groups ($F(2, 134) = 3.6, p = .03$). Further examination using Bonferroni's adjustment revealed a statistical significance between elementary and high school teacher perceptions ($p = .03$) but not between elementary and middle school ($p = .4$) nor between middle and high school teacher perceptions ($p = 1.0$). The estimated effect size between elementary and high school teachers' perceptions was $d = .58$. Elementary principals were perceived to promote an instructional climate more often than other levels. The mean and standard deviation for each grade level is shown in Table 6.

Table 6.

Means and Standard Deviations for Subscale 3: Teachers' Perceptions of Principal's Activities to Promote an Instructional Climate

	N	Mean	SD
Elementary School	67	6.3	1.8
Middle School	32	5.7	1.8
High School	38	5.2	2.3

Discussion and Conclusions

The results of this study are both promising and disconcerting. Most teachers appear to agree that their principal seeks to promote an instructional atmosphere. Principals are seen as being knowledgeable about curriculum and as promoting student learning and teacher professional development. However, the majority still describe the principal's leadership as focused on management issues rather than instructional issues.

The data indicate a focus by principals on the daily operational and maintenance activities associated with school operation rather than the activities associated with the instructional leadership function as identified in the survey and gleaned from the literature.

Principals are viewed as having very little, if any, involvement with the supervision of instructional support programs such as special education, library media and guidance services, and ESOL. Each of these programs is instrumental in the success of a school's instructional program. Principals must lead in developing a common sense of connection for these support programs to school's mission for teaching and learning.

In relation to Blase and Blase's (1998) two premises concerning instructional leadership, promoting professional development and talking with teachers, principals received high marks in the area of staff development in that an overwhelming majority of the respondents indicated they "agree" or "strongly agree" their principal promotes teacher professional growth. On the other hand, principals are perceived as having very little dialogue with teachers pertaining to the praxis of teaching. Almost 36% reported their principal "never" conferenced with them about teaching performance and 58% "never" or "rarely" converse with them about teaching and learning. Additionally, teachers reported principals appear to infrequently monitor and assess classroom instruction. It is discouraging that about 73% "rarely" or "never" had classroom visits related to instructional supervision.

The data do reflect that elementary school principals are perceived as promoting instructional leadership more often than their high school counterparts. This observation may be a reflection of the different backgrounds and experiences of these principals and

the cultural differences in elementary and high schools. Elementary schools often project a more collegial culture than high schools (Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp, 1991).

While it is possible these instructional leadership duties are delegated to other school administrators, research on effective schools (Lezotte, 2001) consistently identify strong instructional leadership by the principal as a correlate of high-achieving schools. Hallenger & Murphy (1987) purport principals shape the learning climate by directly or indirectly maintaining high visibility in order to communicate priorities and model expectations; and establishing clear, explicit standards that embody the school's expectations of students. Therefore, the principal is a key player in today's school reform and accountability movements.

Although only teachers' perceptions about their principal are presented in this study, the preliminary findings indicate principals are not fully embracing their role as the instructional leader. These data indicate the instructional leadership function is not being practiced to any degree in the schools sampled.

In a time of increased demands for student achievement brought about by the federal No Child Left Behind law and state accountability systems, it is imperative for principals to embrace the instructional leadership function and make it their chief role. The principal is the primary source of instructional leadership in effective schools (Edmunds, 1981, Purkey & Smith, 1983, Stricherz, 2001).

Further investigation into the reasons principals often fail to carry out the instructional leadership function is needed. It seems clear improved student achievement results from effective instructional leadership in schools (Waters, et. al, 2004). With the weight of accountability wresting heavily on principals every effort should be made to

insure that they have the skills and resources necessary to balance the roles of daily manager and instructional leader. The instructional leadership function can no longer be ignored. Superintendents and school boards should demand this from all principals.

There are also implications for leadership preparation programs at colleges and universities. Those who prepare future principals must focus their efforts to assure graduates of their programs are well trained in how to carry out instructional leadership functions. This training should address not only the knowledge base needed, but should provide opportunities for practice in actual school settings.

The responsibilities for and expectations of student success continue to increase with each day. If student achievement is to improve in schools the practice of instructional leadership must also improve. Principals must be true instructional leaders. They should and must know what is going on in the classrooms and converse with teachers about instruction. Principals must monitor student and teacher progress toward the school vision, mission, and goals. They must lead collaborative, continual efforts to improve teaching and learning within their schools.

References

- Blank, R. K. (1987). The role of principal as leader: Analysis if variation in leadership of urban high schools. *Journal of Educational Research*, 81(2)
- Blasé, J. and Blasé, J. (1998). *Handbook of instructional leadership: How really good principals promote teaching and learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Blasé, J. & Blasé, J. (2000). Principals' perspectives on shared governance leadership. *Journal of School Leadership*, 10(1).

- Bloom, G., Castagues, C., & Warren, B. (2002). More than mentors: Principal coaching. *Leadership*, 32(5).
- Bottoms, G. & O'Neill, K., (2001). *Preparing a new breed of school principals: It's time for action*. Atlanta, GA. Southern Regional Education Board.
- Edmonds, R. (1981) *Improving the effectiveness of New York City public schools*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 243980).
- Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Washington, DC: The Albert Shanker Institute. Retrieved November 5, 2005, from <http://www.shankerinstitute.org>.
- Fink, E., & Resnick, L. (2001, April). Developing principals as instructional leaders. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(8).
- Fullan, M. (2002). The change leader. *Educational Leadership*, 59(8).
- Hallenger, P., & Heck, R. (1997). Exploring principal's contributions to school effectiveness'. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 8(4).
- Hallenger, P. & Murphy, J., (1987). Assessing and developing principal leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 45(1).
- Henry, T. (2001, October 30). *USA Today*. Arlington, VA.
- Hoy, W., Tarter, C., & Kottkamp, R. (1991). *Open schools/healthy schools: Measuring organizational climate*. London: Sage.
- Institute for Educational Leadership. (2000, October). *Leadership for student learning: Reinventing the principalship*. Washington, DC: Author.
- King, S. (2002). Teachers' perceptions of principal leadership behaviors. Unpublished paper. Valdosta State University.

- Lambert, L. (1998). *Building leadership capacity in schools*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD
- Lambert, L. (2002). A framework for shared leadership. *Educational Leadership*, May 2002
- Lambert, L., Collay, M., Dietz, M. E., Kent, K., & Richert, A. E. (1997). *Teachers as constructivist leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Lashway, L. (2002). Rethinking the principalship. *Research Roundup*, 18(3). Retrieved March 3, 2005 from http://eric.uoregan.edu/publications/roundup/Spring_2002.html.
- Lezotte, L. (2001). Distortions and misconceptions of the effective schools movement. *The School Administrator*, 58. 51-54.
- Liethwood, K., Jautzi, D., & Yeomans, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Meyer, J. W., Scott, W. R. & Deal, T.E. (1983) Institutional and technical sources of organizational structure: Explaining the structure of educational organizations. In J. W. Meyer & W. R. Scott (Eds.), *Organizational Environments: Ritual and Rationality*. Beverly Hills, CA.
- Murphy, J., (1988). Methodological measurement and the conceptual problems in the study of instructional leadership. *Education Evaluations and Policy Analysis*, 10.
- Olson, L. (2000, November 1). Principals try new styles as instructional leaders. *Education Week*, 20(9). Retrieved June, 15, 2004 from http://www.edweek.org/ew/vol-20_09thiswk.html.

- Poplin, M. (1994, November). *The restructuring movement and voices from the inside: Compatibilities and incompatibilities*. Seminar conducted at the meeting of the Association of California School Administrators, Palm Springs, CA.
- Purkey, S. C. & Smith, M. S. (1983). Too soon to cheer? Synthesis of research on effective schools. *Educational Leadership*, 40.
- Sheppard, B. (1996). Exploring the transformational nature of instructional leadership. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 42(4).
- Smith, J., Maehr, M., & Midley, C. (1992). Relationship between personal and contextual characteristics and principal's administrative behavior. *Journal of Educational Research*, 86(20).
- Spillane, J., Halverson, R. & Diamond, J. (2001). *Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective (Research News and Comment)*. *Educational Researcher*, 30(3).
- Southworth, G. (2002). Instructional leadership in schools: Reflections and empirical evidence. *School Leadership & and Management*. 22(1).
- Stricherz, M. (2001, November 7). Elementary principals' group calls for focus on leading instruction. *Education Week*. Washington
- Tice, T. N. (1992) Instructional leadership. *Education Digest*, 57(5).
- Waters, T., Marzano, R., & Mc Nulty, B. (2004). Leadership that sparks learning. *Educational Leadership*, 61(7).

Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling

Sam Houston State University

A Member of The Texas State University System



Master of Arts

Instructional Leadership
Counseling-LMFT, LPC

Master of Education

Educational Administration
Instructional Leadership
Higher Education Leadership (pending)
Counseling-School Counseling

Doctor of Education

Educational Leadership
Specializations:
PK-12 School Administration
Community College
Higher Education Executive Leadership

Doctor of Philosophy Counselor Education

Nationally & Internationally Recognized Professors 2007-2008

32 fulltime Faculty and 40 Lecturers
166 Tier I and Tier II publications
235 Refereed Presentations

Eight faculty officers for regional/state and
Six faculty national/international officers

98% faculty members score above national average in at least one class
Seven journal editors

Over 8 million in grants funded under the USDOE, IES, NSF, TEA, TACS