Andrews University

Digital Commons @ Andrews University

Dissertations

Graduate Research

2004

How Instructional Leadership is Addressed in Educational Administration/Leadership Programs

Lolethia Jones Kibble
Andrews University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), and the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kibble, Lolethia Jones, "How Instructional Leadership is Addressed in Educational Administration/Leadership Programs" (2004). *Dissertations*. 488.
<https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations/488>
<https://dx.doi.org/10.32597/dissertations/488>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact repository@andrews.edu.

Seek Knowledge. Affirm Faith. Change the World.

Thank you for your interest in the

**Andrews University Digital Library
of Dissertations and Theses.**

*Please honor the copyright of this document by
not duplicating or distributing additional copies
in any form without the author's express written
permission. Thanks for your cooperation.*

Andrews University

School of Education

HOW INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP IS ADDRESSED IN
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION/LEADERSHIP
PROGRAMS

A Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Lolethia Jones Kibble

April 2004

UMI Number: 3122214

Copyright 2004 by
Kibble, Lolethia Jones

All rights reserved.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3122214

Copyright 2004 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

©Copyright by Lolethia Jones Kibble 2004
All Rights Reserved

HOW INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP IS ADDRESSED IN
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION/LEADERSHIP
PROGRAMS

A dissertation
presented in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Lolethia Jones Kibble

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE:

Chair: James R. Jeffery

Dean, School of Education
James R. Jeffery

Co-chair: Elsie Jackson

Member: Wilfred Futcher

External: Gerald Coy

Date approved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	viii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Problem and Context of the Study	1
Purpose of the Study	4
Significance of the Study	5
Research Questions	6
Conceptual Framework	7
Research Hypotheses	8
Limitations of the Study	9
Definition of Terms	9
Organization of the Study	11
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	12
Introduction	12
Educational Leadership	13
The Development of Instructional Leadership	18
The Effects of Instructional Leadership	23
The Gap Between Value and Practice	27
Barriers to Instructional Leadership Practices	32
Broad-based Interventions	35
Preparation Programs	45
Changing Expectations	46
Innovative Practices	47
Preparation Programs in Transition	52
Restructured Preparation Programs	53
Instructional Leadership in Preparation Programs	55
Summary	58
3. METHODOLOGY	60

Introduction	60
Participants	60
Sampling Type and Sampling Frame	62
Research Design	62
Variables	62
Instrumentation	63
Pilot Study	67
Procedures	67
Data Collection	67
Data Analysis	68
Research Hypothesis	68
Null Hypothesis	69
Summary	71
 4. RESULTS	 73
Introduction	73
Participants	73
Testing of the Hypotheses	74
Hypothesis 9	75
Hypothesis 10	76
Hypothesis 11	76
Hypothesis 12	80
Hypothesis 13	82
Hypothesis 14	84
Hypothesis 15	84
Hypothesis 16	87
Response Summaries	90
Analyzing the Open-ended Questions	95
Summary	100
 5. DISCUSSION	 101
Introduction	101
Summary of the Background and Problem	101
Summary of the Literature	102
Summary of the Methodology	103
Research Questions and Hypotheses	104
Findings and Discussion	105
Research Question 1	107
Research Question 2	109
Research Question 3	113

Research Question 4	116
Findings	117
Conclusions	118
Recommendations for Practice and for Further Research	119
Summary	121
Appendices	
A. QUESTIONNAIRE	123
B. PILOT STUDY	126
C. COVER LETTER	128
REFERENCE LIST	130
VITA	139

LIST OF TABLES

1.	21 Performance Domains	41
2.	Chi Square for Hypothesis 9: Gender and Importance Factors	77
3.	Chi Square for Hypothesis 10: Gender and Emphasis Factors	78
4.	Chi Square for Hypothesis 11: Age and Importance Factors	79
5.	Contingency Table: Age and Importance Factor 10	80
6.	Chi Square for Hypothesis 12: Age and Emphasis Factors	81
7.	Contingency Table: Age and Emphasis Factor 18	82
8.	Chi Square for Hypothesis 13: Service and Importance Factors	83
9.	Chi Square for Hypothesis 14: Service and Emphasis Factors	85
10.	Chi Square for Hypothesis 15: Program Type and Importance Factors	86
11.	Contingency Table: Program Type and Importance Factor 10	87
12.	Chi Square for Hypothesis 16: Program Type and Emphasis Factors	89
13.	Contingency Table: Program Type and Emphasis Factor 10	90
14.	Contingency Table: Program Type and Emphasis Factor 19	90
15.	Participant Profile	91
16.	University Use of Innovative Practices	91
17.	Importance Levels	93
18.	Emphasis Levels	94

19.	Krug's Taxonomy	96
20.	Participant Use of Innovative Practices	97
21.	Satisfaction With Training in Instructional Leadership	98
22.	Importance/Emphasis Levels	106

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my committee for their professional guidance in this process: Dr. Jim Jeffery for his patience with each reading; Dr. Elsie Jackson for her expertise in the dissertation process, keen insights, and her unselfish commitment to my success; and Dr. Wilfred Fatcher for his wisdom, timely responses, and gentle proddings during a time of great physical challenge.

I would like to acknowledge the Allegheny East Conference for financial and moral support, without which, this would not have been possible.

I would like to acknowledge my family, particularly my husband, Harold, who wanted this for me more than I wanted it myself; my daughter, Geoy, for her uncommon wisdom; my son George, for his enduring faith; my five grandchildren, Domonique, Chloe, Ryan, Fayth, and Aenaes, as well as Michelle, Mark and Joey, who have been sorely neglected during this process.

ABSTRACT

HOW INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP IS ADDRESSED IN
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION/LEADERSHIP
PROGRAMS

by

Lolethia Jones Kibble

Chair: James R. Jeffery

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Dissertation

Andrews University

School of Education

Title: HOW INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP IS ADDRESSED IN EDUCATIONAL
ADMINISTRATION/LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS

Name of researcher: Lolethia Jones Kibble

Name and degree of faculty chair: James R. Jeffery, Ph.D.

Date completed: April 2004

Problem

Instructional leadership is a major factor in school effectiveness and student achievement, yet it is not widely practiced by school principals. One of the contributing factors, identified in the literature, is a lack of skills and knowledge. Although there is a great deal of information about principal preparation programs, there is very little information on the preparation of school leaders in the practice of instructional leadership behaviors. The purpose of this study was to examine how instructional leadership is addressed in both traditional and restructured educational administration/leadership programs and to what extent this is related to institutional and demographic factors. Institutional homogenization suggests that a university will conform to the practices of other universities to maintain legitimacy.

Method

I employed a survey design to determine the perceptions and behaviors of department chairs and professors of educational administration/leadership theory as well as the demographic and institutional characteristics that might relate to how instructional leadership is addressed. A questionnaire was developed using demographic characteristics, a list of innovative practices taken from the literature, three open-ended questions, and the 20 National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Curriculum Guidelines for Instructional Leadership as Likert-type questions. Two questionnaires were sent to the educational administration/leadership department chairs from a random sample of 130 universities. Each chair was asked to complete a questionnaire and to request the professor who teaches educational administration/leadership theory to complete the second questionnaire.

Results

The results show that the two hypotheses: (a) there is a difference in the way instructional leadership is addressed, as perceived by the department chairs and the professors of educational administration/leadership, in traditional and restructured programs and (b) the way the department chairs and professors of educational/ administration leadership theory address instructional leadership as related to demographic characteristics, were not fully supported by the findings of the study.

However, using both the quantitative and qualitative data provided by the participants, a description of how instructional leadership is addressed in university-based preparation programs did emerge.

Conclusions

Both department chairs and professors of educational administration/ leadership programs emphasize and perceive instructional leadership behaviors to be important. However, there were discrepancies between the level of importance given to the instructional leadership behaviors and the level of emphasis placed on the same instructional leadership behaviors.

Most of the programs in this study have restructured. Nevertheless, there were very few differences in the way traditional and restructured programs address instructional leadership. Programs identified by the participants as traditional were using some of the same practices associated with restructured programs. However, the way instructional leadership is addressed has only a small relationship to the demographic characteristics.

This study and the new institutional theory suggests that these findings relate to institutional homogenization. Change in an institutional environment is more complex than intervention for a current need or a quest for continuous growth. It is also fueled by a need to maintain its status as a university.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Problem and Context of the Study

School administrators do not spend enough time in the practice of instructional leadership. “Most principals spend relatively little time in classrooms and even less time analyzing instruction with teachers. They may arrange time for teachers’ meetings and professional development, but they rarely provide intellectual leadership for growth in teaching skills” (Fink & Resnick, 2001, p. 598). A survey of 250 principals reported 40% of them seldom or never discussed school goals with students. Thirty-six percent seldom or never recognized teaching at formal ceremonies. Half seldom or never modeled effective teaching strategies. Over one-third seldom or never helped teachers develop good teaching strategies. Almost one-fourth seldom or never discussed assessment results with teachers (Ames, 1989, cited in McEwan, 1998).

School administrators are distracted by the routine day-to-day tasks of managing schools.

It is energizing being in demand, rushing around solving problems, attending to this and that. I was not dealing with the most important business of school, teaching and learning. The truth was that I had fallen into the classic trap--Hyperactive Superficial Principal Syndrome (HSPS). (Marshall, 1996, p. 338)

This self-diagnosis describes an invasive and insidious disease that is pandemic among

school principals.

They wish that they had more time to devote to it. But the ‘real work’ of the principalship that they describe, a world of discipline referrals, parental complaints, and bureaucratic paperwork leaves little room, they believe, for any instructional leadership beyond the traditional teacher evaluation process that they carry out once or twice a year. (Blase & Blase, 1998, p. vi)

Some principals appear oblivious to the mission of schools. In their schools teaching and learning have become solely the domain of the teacher. Each classroom is an island unto itself, rarely intruded upon by the principal for evaluation or improvement, and that is the way many teachers would have it (Smith & Andrews, 1989).

Ever since the National Commission on Excellence in Education’s report, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, in 1983, there has been a greater demand for school reform and improved school leadership. Just prior to this, the effective school movement had begun to focus on the concept of instructional leadership. This led to considerable ferment on what behaviors and practices principals should pursue and to what extent (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1996). Subsequently, the complex network of interrelated activities of the principalship is too often pigeonholed into one of two roles, general manager or instructional leader. While some believe one or the other is more important, others recognize that one is not antithetical to the other (Stronge, 1993), and that the principalship calls for a variety of leadership roles. Still others suggest the role of the instructional leader should not be the domain of the building principal at all, but under the purview of a teacher because of both time and expertise (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1996).

Reportedly, the way principals spend their time is not reflective of the values they

hold. Studies show that principals place a higher value on the role of the instructional leader than on that of the general manager (Andrews & Hallett, 1983; Krajewski, 1978; Martin & Willower, 1981). Yet there is a discrepancy between the value that principals place on instructional leadership behaviors and the way they actually spend their time.

This discrepancy is not just a matter of time management. The literature has identified several other possible barriers and theories that may account for this phenomenon. The barriers have been classified into three general areas: (a) those related to the school district and the organizational context of the school, (b) those related to the professional norms associated with the principalship, and (c) those related to skills and knowledge. The latter area is a major source of frustration for principals. They are trained to be managers, yet expected to perform as instructional leaders (Fink & Resnick, 2001; McEwan, 1998; Smith & Andrews, 1989).

“University-based administration preparation programs have a great deal to do with the shaping of future generations of principals” (Daresh, 1997, p. 32). However, in a study of secondary principals on the sources that helped them to develop as instructional leaders, “graduate-level administrative programs, course work, or professors were not identified by the principals as being an influence” (Niece, 1993, p. 15). Training programs for principals focus primary attention on administrative competencies (Fink & Resnick, 2001; McEwan, 1998; Smith & Andrews, 1989).

After an extensive investigation into educational administration programs, the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (NCEE, 1987) concluded preparation programs have a number of deficits including a lack of definition

of good educational leadership. This led to the recommendation that many educational leadership programs needed to be closed and those remaining needed to be restructured to reflect the professional school model like those in law or medicine.

Purpose of the Study

Since the identification of the school principal as central to effective schools in the 1980s (Edmonds, 1979; Zigarelli, 1996), funds have been poured into training programs for principals. Initiatives from various levels of government and the private sector have focused on ways to improve performance and increase the accountability of the school leader (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Murphy, 1990). Universities and related professional associations began the search for a knowledge base and performance standards that would enhance preparation programs. In 1994 the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) was established to design licensing procedures for professional practice that would be grounded in an understanding of teaching and learning. To further ensure the quality of school leadership, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) appointed a group to develop curriculum guidelines for educational administration programs that would be accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

Some institutions, particularly those that participated in the Danforth Foundation Program for the Preparation of School Principals (DPPSP), have made radical changes in structure, content, and delivery (Bjork & Richardson, 1997; Clark & Clark, 1997; Milstein & Krueger, 1997). They have changed from the traditional teacher-centered, in-

the-classroom, theory-based programs to programs that are student-centered, have a knowledge base from practice, and a focus on clinical experiences. However, the university environment is isomorphic (homogeneous) and may give the appearance of change while remaining the same. Even more damaging is the fact that some universities are moribund and openly determined not to change, but to protect the status quo at the peril of their own goals (Hanson, 2001).

Nevertheless, there is a lack of information on the training of aspiring school principals in the practice of instructional leadership behaviors in either traditional or restructured educational administration/leadership programs. The purpose of this study is to examine how both traditional and restructured educational administration/leadership programs address instructional leadership and to what extent institutional and demographic characteristics are related to how instructional leadership is addressed.

Significance of the Study

Professional practices are important to the function of society. Virtually all of society's "business" is conducted by professionals with specialized training. Leaders are necessary to orchestrate the talents of these professionals (Schon, 1983). Education is not different. It needs effective leadership. Although some of the factors that were thought to determine academic success were not as important as was first supposed, all of the effective schools shared several vitally important characteristics, one of which was a principal who was the instructional leader of the school (Edmonds, 1979).

Less emphasized is the role of the principal as it relates to the performance of

teachers. However, studies show that the principal can have a positive influence on teacher efficacy, job satisfaction, and motivation (Blase & Blase, 1999; Sergiovanni & Carver, 1980; Smith & Andrews, 1989). These findings confirm what has long been assumed about the role of the principal, it is central to the effectiveness of the school.

In view of the pivotal role principals play in schooling, it is important that school leaders enter the profession prepared to serve. Yet, it does not appear that university-based programs provide adequate preparation. There is a need for a more comprehensive view of preparation programs, particularly in the area of instructional leadership.

The results of this study will contribute to the body of knowledge on instructional leadership. In addition to filling in some of the gaps in the literature, there are potential benefits to preparation programs and school districts. The results of this study can provide a foundation for refocusing preparation programs to be more intentional in addressing issues of instructional leadership, particularly the connection between theory and practice. It can be used to develop hiring criteria for professors or to identify staff development needs for the faculty. Relevant content and proven instructional strategies will ensure that prospective principals have the opportunity to acquire the skills necessary to support teaching and learning. Finally, the data can be used to highlight areas school districts should focus on in professional development for practicing principals.

Research Questions

To learn more about how preparation programs address instructional leadership,

the following four research questions were developed:

1. What are the perceptions of the department chair and professors of educational administration/leadership theory regarding the importance of instructional leadership behaviors?
2. To what extent do department chairs and professors of educational administration/leadership theory emphasize instructional leadership behaviors?
3. Are there differences between the way traditional educational administration/leadership programs and restructured educational administration/leadership programs address instructional leadership as it relates to the preparation of school leaders?
4. To what extent are demographic characteristics related to the way instructional leadership is addressed?

Conceptual Framework

This study is based on the concept of institutional homogenization and the proposition that university-based preparation programs are more likely to conform to what other programs are doing to maintain legitimacy, than to promote institutional change for greater effectiveness.

Institutions that provide a similar service or product, to a similar customer, and are supported by similar organizations, are part of an institutional environment that is organized according to professional norms. Collectively, universities create an institutional environment that promotes and rewards conformity. If a university is not conforming or is operating outside of the accepted norms for universities, its legitimacy may be questioned. This exerts pressure on the university to align its program with those

of other universities (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Rowan & Miskel, 1999). The pressure may be coercive in the form of state rules and regulations (Moe, 1995), normative in the form of professional codes and practices by those who have been socialized into the environment (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983), or mimetic in the form of more successful or more prestigious institutions in the field (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). The offending university is very likely to comply, not necessarily because it can better serve the community, but to assure its public that it is modern and rational institution (Rowan & Miskel, 1999).

For almost two decades task forces and commissions have presented a case for reform in educational administration/leadership programs. While there has been much agitation about restructuring, the extent and nature of reform remains unclear. This is particularly true as it relates to instructional leadership. McCarthy (1999a) suggests that preparation programs present knowledge about instructional leadership but do not help future principals develop the skills to translate that knowledge into practice or to connect related subjects such as supervision or curriculum development to the practice of instructional leadership.

Research Hypotheses

Based on the research questions, I formed two hypotheses for this study. Since there has been an increased focus on reforming educational administration/leadership preparation programs during the last two decades, I hypothesized that there is a difference in the way instructional leadership is addressed, as perceived by the department chair and the professors of educational administration/leadership, in

traditional and restructured programs.

I further hypothesized that the way the department chairs and professors of educational/administration leadership theory address instructional leadership is related to demographic characteristics. It is very likely that the previous experience or the lack of experience as a principal would influence how professors address instructional leadership.

Limitations of the Study

The findings of the study were based on the perceptions and behaviors of 49 department chairs and professors of educational administration/leadership, representing 40 universities that offer graduate degrees in educational administration/leadership. Therefore the generalizations and findings of this study are limited to degree programs and do not include institutions that offer licensure courses only.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined as they are used or operationalized in this study.

Behavior: The emphasis level indicated by the participants in this study to the 20 emphasis factors developed from the NCATE Curriculum Guidelines for Instructional Leadership.

Effective schools: Schools in which the students have high levels of achievement and there is (a) a safe and orderly school climate, (b) instructional leadership, (c) high expectations for student success, (d) a pervasive academic focus, and (e) ongoing monitoring and measuring of student progress (Lezotte, 1985).

Institutional homogenization: A form of change in which an institution conforms to resemble other institution in the same institutional environment to maintain legitimacy (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

Instructional leadership: Principal behaviors that influence teaching and learning including (a) defining the school mission, (b) managing curriculum and instruction, (3) supervising teaching, (d) monitoring student progress, and (e) promoting an instructional climate (Krug, 1992).

Perception: The importance level indicated by the participants in this study to the 20 importance factors developed from the NCATE Performance Standards for Instructional Leadership.

Restructured educational administration/leadership programs: Programs that (a) focus on leadership rather than plant management and includes three or more of the following innovations: (b) performance-based criteria, (c) a coordinated curriculum, (d) instructional strategies based on adult learning theory, (e) a systematic and purposeful process for recruiting and selecting candidates, (f) student cohorts, and (g) a partnership with local schools to provide internships and mentoring (Clark & Clark, 1997; Daresh, 1997; Lauder, 2000).

School leaders: Principals of elementary, middle, or secondary schools.

Traditional educational administration/leadership programs: Programs that focus on theory, the principal as the plant manager, and the primary instructional method is the lecture (McCarthy, 1999a).

Organization of the Study

In chapter 1, I explore the background and the problem of this study. I also present the purpose, conceptual framework, research questions and hypotheses that actuate the research.

Chapter 2 contains the literature review. I examine the relevant literature on both the principalship and preparation programs. The review begins with a look at the development of educational leadership, presents a case for instructional leadership, its effects, and its lack of practice. Then I explored the last 20 years and the current status of preparation programs with a focus on instructional leadership.

In chapter 3, I describe the steps taken to address the research questions and to test the hypotheses. The chapter is built around the participants, the instrumentation, and the procedures. It includes the 16 null hypotheses developed to test the two research hypotheses and the methods of analysis.

In chapter 4, I present the results of the study. I begin with a description of the participants. Then I include the quantitative data derived from the testing of the null hypotheses and conclude with the qualitative data which summarizes the participants' responses to the three open-ended questions.

Chapter 5 is a discussion of the study. First, I provide brief summaries of the background and problem, the literature review, the methodology, and I restate the research questions and hypotheses. Finally, I answer the research questions and discuss the substantive findings. The chapter ends with my conclusions and recommendations for practice and for further studies.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This study asserts that many principals do not spend enough time in the practice of instructional leadership because they lack adequate training. In an effort to understand this phenomenon, this review focused on both the evolution and the status of the principalship and university-based preparation programs.

To establish context, the review begins with a look at educational leadership, moves into the development of instructional leadership, makes a case for its effects, and documents its lack of practice. Then it explores educational administration/leadership programs and related activities of the last two decades. Finally, the current status of instructional leadership within preparation programs is examined in order to capture a glimpse of the advances and shortcomings revealed in the literature.

This comprehensive review demonstrates that instructional leadership, as a critical element for prospective school leaders, exists in the literature, primarily, as an ideal to be obtained. “It is fair to state that many (if not most) contemporary higher education programs do not provide adequate preparation in the realm of instructional leadership” (Usdan, 2002, p. 302).

Educational Leadership

Although recent decades have experienced a lack of confidence in leadership, there is a heightened fascination with the subject. The market is saturated with studies, books, and training programs. Various theorists have identified attributes of leaders, explanations about what they do, and how they do it. There are more than 350 recorded definitions of leadership (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). However, according to Yurkl (1994, as cited in Leithwood & Duke, 1999):

It is neither feasible nor desirable at this point in the development of the discipline to attempt to resolve the controversies over the appropriate definition of leadership. Like all constructs in social science the definition of leadership is arbitrary and very subjective. Some definitions are more useful than others, but there is no correct definition. (pp. 4-5)

However, it is generally agreed that the key component in leadership is influence (Heck & Hallinger, 1999; Leithwood & Duke, 1999).

Most definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that it involves a social influence process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person [or group] over other people [or groups] to structure the activities and relationships in a group or organization. (Yurkl, 1994, as cited in Leithwood & Duke, 1999, p. 46)

Any variations in definitions depend upon the source and purpose of the influence to be exerted. Smith and Andrews (1989) suggest that theories and competencies of leadership are consistent for all leaders but of necessity tempered by the type of organization in which it is practiced.

Leadership in school administration did not appear in the literature until well after the turn of the 20th century. It was an outgrowth of scientific management.

However, while scientific management focused on jobs and workers, administrative

management focused on the entire organization (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1996). In the 1960s there was a quest for a science of administration for school leaders, followed in the 1970s by a series of scientific approaches including management by objectives, accountability theories, evaluations, and inservices. A second wave of interest included political science and decision making. Nevertheless, many practitioners felt the new scientific approaches were not in keeping with the goals of education. To some, administration was an intuitive process. "Administrators were born and not made." The unpredictability of the job and the complexities of human nature were seen as variables one could not be trained to manage. Theorists countered that scientific techniques were not a panacea for all the ills of the school, but provided a framework for decision making (Sergiovanni & Carver, 1980).

In addition to theoretical developments, the focus of the school leader has changed in response to historical conditions. According to Grogan and Andrews (2002), Lucas traced the impact of the times on the focus of the principal and the school. The 1920s were characterized by a connection between school and family values. During the 1930s organizational theories influenced schools towards scientific management, but the competing forces of World War II turned the focus of the 1940s and 1950s towards a more democratic society. The space race of the 1960s led to a concern for academic excellence, particularly in science and mathematics. The social unrest of the 1970s turned schools away from academics to other student needs. Eventually, public confidence began to wane. Among the causes was the poor academic standing of American students in the global arena. By the 1980s, we were "A Nation at Risk." A

growing concern for accountability emerged. This resulted in a variety of initiatives, such as standards and charter schools, to increase student achievement through improved schools and the accountability of teachers and principals.

Educational leadership has also evolved in function. Leithwood and Duke (1999) identified six categories of leadership prominent in educational literature. They analyzed all of the articles on leadership in the four major school-leadership journals written in the English language: *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *Educational Management and Administration*, *Journal of Educational Administration*, and *Journal of School Leadership* from 1985 to 1995. The first significant articles were found in the 1988 editions. The results identified 121 articles on leadership containing 20 different models. The most frequently mentioned models were instructional leadership (13 times), transformational leadership (11 times), contingent leadership (9 times), moral leadership (8 times), managerial leadership (8 times), and cultural leadership (6 times). The remaining 14 models were found in 5 or fewer articles. Each of the 20 concepts was assigned to one of six broader categories: (a) instructional, (b) transformational, (c) moral, (d) participative, (e) managerial, or (f) contingent leadership. Although the definitions vary and are arbitrary, the six categories are distinct in their foci and locus of leadership power. The key assumptions on which each is based are as follows:

1. Instructional leadership focuses on the teacher behaviors that directly affect student achievement.
2. Transformational leadership focuses on the commitments and capacities of organizational members (higher levels of personal commitment to organizational goals

and a greater capacity to achieve them).

3. Moral leadership focuses on the values and ethics of the leader.
4. Participative leadership focuses on the decision-making processes of the group.
5. Managerial leadership focuses on the functions and tasks of the leader.
6. Contingent leadership focuses on the response of the leader to unique

circumstances (Leithwood & Duke, 1999).

All of these leadership models, except instructional leadership, have counterparts in non-school literature. Although there are lessons to be learned from the corporate world on leadership, Sergiovanni (1996) cautioned that schools should be careful not to import theories from organizational management because schools should not be organizations but communities--“collections of individuals who are bonded together by natural will and who are together bound to a set of shared ideas and ideals” (p. 48). As such the principal practices pedagogy in which he or she builds, serves, protects and cares for the purposes of the school. According to Selznick (1948, as cited in Sergiovanni, 1996), this requires thoughtful, sensitive leadership, not the clear-cut actions of an engineer that are necessary for the precise design of an organization. In this model, leadership is viewed as a process of influencing others. By using a different base for power, there are different and more productive responses from the followers (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1996).

Current literature on school leadership reflects an effort to find what Siegrist (1999) called “the fit” between leadership and administration (p. 6). This has led to a broader view of the principalship. Percell and Cookson (1982) synthesized 75 studies on

behaviors exhibited by strong principals into the following: he or she “demonstrates a commitment to academic goals, creates a climate of high expectations, functions as the instructional leader, is forceful and dynamic, consults effectively with others, creates order and discipline, marshals resources, and evaluates their results” (p. 8).

A more precise, yet comprehensive view of what principals should do has been articulated by the Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) and published by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) in 1996. The ISLLC is a group of 32 education agencies and 13 administration associations established to work collaboratively to develop and implement standards, assessments, professional development, and licensure procedures for school leaders--to raise the bar to enter and remain in the profession. It has developed a set of 6 standards for the school administrator, with descriptors that match the expectations for effective school leadership:

1. Vision of Learning: Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the greater school community.

2. School Culture and Instructional Program: Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff development.

3. Management: Ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

4. Collaboration with Families and the Community: Collaborating with family

and community members, responding to diverse needs, and interest and mobilizing community resources.

5. Acting with Integrity, Fairness, and Ethics: Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

6. Political, Social, Economic, Legal, and Cultural Context: Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context (CCSSO, 1996, p. 10).

The Development of Instructional Leadership

The focus on instructional leadership can be traced back to the effective schools movement of the late 70s and early 80s. Edmonds (1979), in trying to ensure equitable schooling for the urban poor, provided the impetus for the effective schools movement, and subsequently, the focus on the instructional leader. In contrast to studies by Coleman (1965) and Jensen (1969), that show poor achievement was an inherent disability of the poor, studies by Brookover and Lezotte (1977) and Madden, Lawton, and Sweet (1976) showed that all students can learn in an effective school (as cited in Edmonds, 1979). This led to the identification of five characteristics of effective schools: (a) a safe and orderly school climate, (b) instructional leadership, (c) high expectations for student success, (d) a pervasive academic focus, and (e) ongoing monitoring and measuring of student progress (Lezotte, 1985). Over the years a wide array of characteristics has appeared in the school effectiveness research, but the inclusion of instructional leadership is consistent across most studies.

Although Edmonds's research has been criticized for its quality (Ellis & Fouts,

1993; Smith & Andrews, 1989), there is a correlation between high test scores and the list of effective school characteristics (Ellis & Fouts, 1993).

Since the beginning of the effective schools movement, a body of information on the behaviors that comprise instructional leadership has been developed. However, there is little agreement in the literature on the instructional leadership construct. In its broadest terms instructional leadership includes any function that promotes the effective and efficient operations of the school. The more narrowly defined terms limits the focus to teaching and learning and includes the supervision and evaluation of teachers as well as staff development (Stronge, 1993).

Thomas Sergiovanni (1984) proposed one of the first models for instructional leadership. It was a broad concept that included five leadership forces: technical--traditional management practices; human--interpersonal skills that impact communication, motivation, and facilitation of other roles; educational--knowledge of teaching, learning, and curriculum; symbolic--representation of what is important about school; and cultural--values and beliefs (1984). In keeping with the demand for change in the 1970s and 1980s, Michael Fullan suggested a sixth force, change agent--facilitator of continuous improvement (Fullan, 1982).

Subsequently, numerous models for instructional leadership have been proposed. Some definitions of instructional leadership are more prescriptive than descriptive. In addition to describing what instructional leaders should do, they focus on how it should be done.

Smith and Andrews (1989) define instructional leadership as a blend of

supervision, staff development, and curriculum development. They conceptualize it in terms of four critical interactions between the principal and the teachers: (a) resource provider, (b) instructional resource, (c) communicator, and (d) visible presence. As a resource provider “the principal marshals personnel, building, district, and community resources to achieve the mission and goals of the school” (p. 9). “The instructional resource is actively engaged in the improvement of classroom circumstances that enhance learning” (p. 12) by providing knowledge and skills. As communicator, “the principal articulates a vision of the school that heads everyone in the same direction” (p. 15). “The visible presence is felt throughout the school, as the keeper of the vision, constantly displays behavior that reinforces school values” (p. 18).

Similarly, McEwan (1998) identified seven steps to effective instructional leadership:

1. Establish clear instructional goals.
2. Be there for your staff.
3. Create a school culture and climate conducive to learning.
4. Communicate the vision and mission of your school.
5. Set high expectations for your staff.
6. Develop teacher leaders.
7. Maintain a positive attitude towards students, staff, and parents.

Blase and Blase (1999) limit instructional leadership to supervision and use the terms interchangeably. However, supervision, as an external imposition of do's and don't's upon the classroom teacher, has in many schools succumbed to coaching,

collaboration, and transformational leadership (Blase & Blase, 1999).

The most widely tested model for instructional leadership is by Hallinger and Murphy (1985, as cited in Leithwood & Duke, 1999). It is made up of three broad categories: (a) defining the school mission, (b) managing the instructional program, and (c) promoting school climate. Associated with these categories of practice are 21 functions.

However, Krug (1992) argues that his “five-factor taxonomy: (a) defining mission, (b) managing curriculum and instruction, (c) supervision of teaching, (d) monitoring student progress and (e) promoting instructional climate was structurally more tenable, simpler, and not appreciably less precise” (p. 431).

Defining School Mission: Everyone associated with the school should understand why it exists. There should be clearly framed school goals and purposes that are articulated to teachers, students, parents and the community. When the mission is clearly understood by all and is the driving force of the school, it helps to sort out internal and external pressures. It is the criteria for decision making and evaluating whether teachers and programs are contributing effectively to the mission of the school.

Managing Curriculum and Instruction: The primary service of a school is instruction. Effective leaders provide information that teachers need to plan instruction and develop curriculum. Principals must be aware of newly emerging theories, essential materials, and cost. Without a broad base of knowledge, the principal cannot provide the resources necessary to carry out the school’s mission.

Supervising Teaching: The mission is carried out primarily by the teachers. Staff

development rather than performance evaluation is the primary focus. The effective instructional leader is “prospective rather than retrospective regarding staff and is focused on what can be, not what was” (Krug, 1992, p. 433). The focus is on coaching, counseling, and mentoring teachers.

Monitoring Student Progress: The primary product is graduates who have the technical and life skills to cope in an increasingly competitive world. He or she should be equipped with the knowledge and skills for the next level. Effective instructional leaders provide a first-level, quality-control check. Principals should be aware of a variety of ways to assess student achievement and how to use the results to enhance teaching and learning.

Promoting Instructional Climate: The primary objective is to motivate people by creating the conditions under which they will want to do what needs to be done. This is accomplished when the atmosphere is exciting, both teachers and students are recognized for their accomplishments, and there is a shared sense of purpose.

The role of the instructional leader has not been limited to the principalship or supervisors of instruction. In an attempt to respond to educators who wanted to know the next step for the effective schools movement, Lezotte (1991) noted that, in the “first generation,” instructional leadership focused primarily on the principal, in the second generation, the concept has broadened. It is a dispersed concept that includes all adults within the school setting, particularly the teacher. This changes the concept of principal from a “leader of followers,” to a “leader of leaders.” The new role is to create a community of learners around shared values and to serve as coach, partner, and

cheerleader. The “second generation” recognizes that leadership is delegated from among those who follow and that expertise is held by many. This includes the possibility of the teacher serving as the instructional leader. Currently, teachers share in solving instructional problems, mentoring, peer coaching, and leading study groups (Blase & Blase, 1998).

The Effects of Instructional Leadership

“Every educational reform report of the past decade has concluded that schools are only as good as their administrators” (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1996, p. 548). The literature shows that the function of the principal as it relates to teaching and learning has a positive impact on student achievement, teacher performance, and school improvement programs.

Using the National Educational Longitudinal Study for the years 1988, 1990, and 1992, Zigarelli (1996) collapsed the effective schools variables from five studies into six constructs: (a) employment of quality teachers, (b) teacher participation and satisfaction, (c) principal leadership and involvement, (d) a culture of academic achievement, (e) positive relations with the central school administration, and (f) high parental involvement. The independent effect of each construct was empirically tested on student achievement levels.

All of the effective schools research concluded that principals with strong leadership skills and a willingness to actively participate in the classroom create better schools. Moreover, schools that afford principals more control over hiring and firing of personnel and do not overwhelm them with other managerial tasks, are believed to be more effective. (Zigarelli, 1996, p. 103)

Zigarelli found that the most important effective-schools correlates were (a) a culture of

academic achievement, (b) principal's autonomy in hiring teachers, and (c) high teacher morale. This study was based on the work of five major proponents: Block, Coyle and Witcher, Downer, Edmonds, and Purkey and Smith.

Similarly, Hallinger and Heck (1996) examined 40 studies on the role of the principal and school effectiveness conducted between 1980 and 1995. This period begins where two earlier, but separate studies by Bossert and by Bridges ended. According to Hallinger and Heck (1996), the results of these two studies were contradictory. Bridges (1982) dismissed the studies from 1967-1980 as "atheoretical," methodologically unsound, and of little or no "practical utility." On the other hand Bossert (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982) found that the principal had a positive impact on a variety of in-school factors and through these factors had an effect on student achievement. Hallinger and Heck (1996) reconciled the incongruence of these earlier studies as being, in part, a matter of difference in research focus and took into consideration the findings of both.

The criteria for the 40 studies selected by Hallinger and Heck was that each used the principal's beliefs and behaviors as the independent variables and school performance as the dependent variable. The study employed a modification of Pitner's 1988 conceptual framework for studying principal effects when using a non-experimental design: direct-effects, antecedents-effects, mediated-effects, reciprocal-effects, and moderated-effects. Hallinger and Heck (1996) did a content analysis using only four models: direct effect with and without antecedent variables and mediated-effects with and without antecedent variables.

In the direct-effects models, the effects of the principals were weak, conflicting, or nonexistent. In the more rigorous, mediated-effects models, the studies supported the notion that the principal's leadership can make a difference, but context matters. This context is focused on school processes that are directly linked to student learning, including school policy and teacher practices. The fact that the effects are indirect, supports the role of leadership to influence and accomplish goals with and through others. The mediating variable that was most consistent as a significant factor across the studies was the setting of goals. The principal's vision for learning when stated as academic goals, drives the focus of the school. Hallinger and Heck (1996) not only found the studies to be theoretically informed but found that measurement scales were less of an issue and that using Pitner's frame of reference as an underlying model, made a difference in the results.

Studies not reviewed by Hallinger and Heck had like findings. In a 2-year study in Seattle schools by Andrews and Soder (1987), 67 elementary-school teachers and 20 high-school teachers were given questionnaires with 18 different interactions involving the principal as a resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence. The results showed that the normal equivalent scores of students in schools led by principals identified as strong instructional leaders were significantly greater in both total reading and total mathematics than those of students in schools rated as having average or weak instructional leaders as principals.

Among the effects of instructional leadership that are directly linked to student learning are those that add to teacher morale. Studies in a variety of fields show that job

satisfaction has a positive affect on work performance. In a 1953 study, Chase found that an important factor relating to teacher satisfaction was the dynamic and stimulating leadership of the principal. This includes helpfulness, opportunities for professional growth, respect, and friendliness. Dissatisfaction on the other hand has been linked to poor performance (Chase, 1953). Teacher satisfaction and motivation, studied by Herzberg in 1966 and replicated by Sergiovanni, showed that incompetent, inadequate, or unfair administrative and supervisory practices contribute to teacher dissatisfaction (as cited in Sergiovanni & Carver, 1980). It was also concluded that the teachers' perception of the school principal as an instructional leader is the most powerful determinant of teachers' satisfaction with their professional role (Smith & Andrews, 1989).

Sheppard (1996, as cited in Blase & Blase, 1998) also synthesized research studies on instructional leadership behaviors that are linked to student achievement and found a positive relationship between instructional leadership and teacher commitment, professional involvement, and innovativeness. Sheppard's findings contradicted those of others who found that routine instructional leadership behaviors negatively affected teachers, increasing teacher docility, and reducing teacher innovativeness and creativity. Many agree that principals have an effect on what teachers and students do in the school, but the nature and degree of that effect are unclear.

Finally, three instructional leadership processes identified by Murphy (1995): (a) defining and sustaining educational purpose, (b) developing and nurturing community, and (c) fostering personal and organizational growth--are linked to school improvement programs including Foxfire, Accelerated Schools, the Coalition of Essential Schools, the

Center for Educational Renewal, the League of Professional Schools, and Impact II.

The Gap Between Value and Practice

Although research shows that instructional leadership has a positive impact on the development of effective schools, there is a gap between value and practice. Ironically, Krajewski (1978) found that principals placed a higher value on instructional leadership activities than on management functions. Yet the same principals spent less time on instructional leadership behaviors than on management functions.

The incongruence between what principals believe and what they do was also seen in a similar study by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) in 1978, with similar results (as cited in Smith & Andrews, 1989).

The Lake Washington School District in Kirkland, Washington, wanted to change the principals' focus from management to improving instruction. The appointed task force began with a time-utilization study. It looked at five dimensions of the job: improvement of instruction, community relations, student services, operations, and evaluations. The principals were first asked what percentage of their time should be devoted to each dimension and then they were asked to keep a log of the actual times devoted to each dimension for 2 weeks. The elementary school principals indicated that ideally they should devote 35% of their time on improving instruction, 14% to community relations, 12% to student services, 9% to operations, and 30% to evaluations. The study showed that the actual time devoted was 24% to improving instruction, 16% to community relations, 21% to student services, 13% to operations and 26% to evaluations. Less time was spent on the job dimensions that the principal indicated should receive the

most time and more time was spent on the dimensions the principals indicated should receive the least amount of time (Smith & Andrews, 1989). Similar discrepancies were noted among secondary principals.

There are also differences in principal behaviors and practices based on size (large, small, or medium), type (elementary, middle, or senior high schools), and location of school (urban, suburban, and rural) as well as the gender of the principal. Based on a study of 1006 principals in Washington state, Andrews and Hallett (1983) concluded:

1. Principals in various types and sizes of schools do not hold different values about what is important in the principals' job or in how principals should spend their time.
2. High-school principals feel they need to spend more time to get the job done than do elementary principals.
3. High-school principals do spend more time on the job site and that time is for supervising students and managing the building.
4. Principals in large and small school districts spend less time in supervising students than their counterparts in a medium-sized school district.
5. Principals in larger school districts spend more time coordinating with external agencies than principals in small and medium-sized districts.
6. In larger schools more time is spent in community relations and more total time is spent on the job.

None of these differences relate to school improvement or teacher evaluations.

Smith and Andrews (1989) did a similar study with principals in a school district

in the Pacific Northwest. Employing the definition of an instructional leader by Andrews and Soder (1987), one who is perceived as (a) a resource provider, (b) an instructional resource, (c) a communicator, and (d) a visible presence, they used principals that were viewed as strong instructional leaders. The 21 principals selected varied in type and size of school managed, as well as gender and years of experience. There were 11 elementary school principals, 5 middle school principals, and 5 high school principals. The building sizes ranged from 125 elementary to 2,600 high-school students. There were 11 females and 10 males, years of experience ranged from 3 to over 16 years. Each agreed to keep a time log on how they spent their day using the same methodologies developed by Andrews and Hallet (1983) in the study cited above. Then a comparison was made using the same rankings and data gathered from the 1,006 principals also cited earlier.

The average principal spent 27% of the time on educational program improvement, 28% of the time on student related services and activities, and 39% of the time on building management and operations. Strong instructional leaders spent 41% of their time on educational program improvement, 18% of their time on student related services and activities, and 34% of their time on building management and operations. The principals who were identified as strong instructional leaders also had an average work day of 10.75 hours compared to the 10.00 hours of other principals. When the length of day is considered, the principals who were strong instructional leaders and the other principals who were not, spend about the same amount of time on management. The major difference is in the amount of time spent on student services and instruction.

There are also differences in perception. The study by Ames (1989, as cited in

McEwan, 1998) shows that not only do principals fail to do the basic tasks of talking to students about the goals of education or helping teachers to develop instructional strategies, there are discrepancies between what they say they do and their teachers' perceptions of what they do. While half of the principals said they spent time supervising teachers, the teachers reported that only 30% of the principals spent time supervising teachers. Likewise, three-fourths of the principals said they manage curriculum, but the teachers reported that less than half of the principals managed curriculum.

Krug (1992) suggests that the potential power of an event is in the interpretation. In a study to assess principals' perceptions of their daily activities as it relates to instructional leadership, an experience sampling methodology was used to record the work of 81 principals. For five times a day, for 5 consecutive days, the principals were paged. At each page they were to record what they were doing and then evaluate the activity according to the 5 dimensions of instructional leadership in Krug's Taxonomy. The same activities were interpreted differently by different principals. For example principal A interpreted disciplining a student as unrelated to school mission, while principal B interpreted it as an opportunity to communicate the purposes and goals of the school. One argument cited the circumstance as the reason for the difference in the interpretation. Another cited the principal's belief system as the reason. Although the reasons were not clear, it was concluded that it was how the principal interpreted the event, rather than the event, that made it a matter of instructional leadership.

In an era of outcomes and accountability, principals who fail in the practice of instructional leadership put themselves in professional jeopardy. In a study by Bulach,

Boothe, and Pickett (1998), to identify the most harmful mistakes principals make as perceived by their teachers, 14 mistakes were identified. Two focused on instructional leadership: (a) a lack of leadership priorities, which ranked third and (b) a lack of knowledge about curriculum and instruction, which ranked fourth. Only mistakes related to relationships and communications ranked higher.

Also focusing on the mistakes of principals, a survey of Indiana superintendents was used to determine the degree of relationship between a principal's failure to meet the six standards of the ISLLC and the principal's removal from his or her position. The study required the superintendent to think of a principal who had recently been removed from the principalship and with that principal in mind, indicate the degree to which he or she failed to meet each standard. The superintendents indicated on a five-point Likert scale the degree to which they believed the dismissed principal failed to meet each standard. The mean for each standard was calculated to determine the relative importance of the failure of the principal to meet each of them. The largest mean, 4.11, related to instructional leadership: Standard 2--the school culture and instructional program. Interestingly, Standard 6--understanding and responding to the political, social legal, and economical culture--had the lowest means, 3.55. This could be an indication of where principals place their focus. Nevertheless, the overall conclusion was that principals who failed did not demonstrate an attainment of the professional standards by the ISLLC (Coutts, 1997).

In reviewing the study by Coutts (1997), Keeler (2002) questioned whether it necessarily followed that because a principal who had been removed from the

principalship did not meet all of the ISLLC standards, that preparation in the standards would lead to administrative success. She also described a study by Coleman, Copeland, and Adams (1999) using a factor analysis of each set of performance indicators associated with the ISLLC standards. The results did not endorse the use of the six standards, as written. Instead, the results pointed out the “obtuse nature” of the language used in each of the six standards (as cited in Keeler, 2002, p. 582).

Barriers to Instructional Leadership Practices

We do not have data on all principals, or even most, but if the few thousands we have met or the several thousands whose teachers have responded to our surveys are representative, then we feel justified in stating that many principals do not treat instructional leadership as a prime concern, except in response to questionnaires. (Acheson & Smith, 1986, p. 19)

The implication of this indictment and the consensus of this literature review are that principals are aware of and value behaviors that support teaching and learning, but still fail to practice them. The literature also indicates there are a number of factors that may contribute to the gap between the value and the practices of school principals: (a) those that related to the school district and organization of the school, (b) those related to the professional norms associated with the principalship, and (c) those related to knowledge and skills.

The way schools are organized is a barrier to the practice of instructional leadership by the principal of the school. Fink and Resnick (2001) explained that anyone familiar with the school system is not surprised at this conundrum. They described a typically bifurcated school system with an administrative line and a support line.

Theoretically, accountability for student learning is administrative, yet the support line

manages what students should learn and how they should be taught. Such a system may free the principal to focus on other areas but it also puts distance between the principal and issues of teaching and learning.

According to Neuman and Pelchat (2001, p. 733), a lot of “lip service” is paid to the idea of principals being instructional leaders, while they are given more and more responsibilities in the area of management and very little training in instructional leadership. The primary attention of training programs reinforces the principal’s role as manager, yet once employed, principals are rewarded for student achievement (Neuman & Pelchat, 2001). If time is not properly allocated, management can consume the principal’s day. Schools provide a myriad of services to students and parents. The typical school program may include, in addition to the regular classroom activities, providing breakfast and aftercare, drug awareness, anti-gang/violence and drug free programs, IEP’s, parent groups, and community efforts.

When principals are in the classroom, they may not be sure what to look for or how to interpret and provide intervention for what they do see. So they seldom visit except to do perfunctory evaluations (Fink & Resnick, 2001). Many teachers are not uncomfortable with this arrangement. They assume pedagogy is in the purview of the teacher and that interventions by supervisors and principals are “an intrusion on the teacher’s professional judgments and prerogatives” (p. 599). They also noted that “teacher contracts are often written to protect teachers from arbitrary judgments by principals and others” (p. 599).

This may be a downside of the teacher empowerment movement. The second

wave of the school reform movement tried to be more inclusive of teachers through shared governance and participatory management. It reflects the recommendation of the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession and the Holmes Group for “lead teachers” in the role of instructional leaders. Instructional leadership for teachers has taken various forms such as peer coaching, collegial investigations, and study teams (Blase & Blase, 1998). Some believe that school management and instructional leadership are two separate sets of tasks and cannot be performed by one person. They suggest that teachers should replace principals as the instructional leaders (Smith & Andrews, 1989).

There are those who do not agree that this is good for schools. Smith and Andrews (1989) suggested that such efforts “reflect a political orientation” and have not included considerations of achievement or other school outcome measures. Although teachers may be more involved with the instructional leadership role, as the chief administrator, the principal needs to bring a working knowledge of instruction and curriculum to the collaboration. However many principals are not prepared to do this. “The training that candidates receive from administration preparation programs is often inadequate while ongoing professional development is episodic at best” (Tirozzi, 2001, p. 437). The focus in preparation programs reinforces the role of plant manager. Smith and Andrews (1989) also suggest part of the problem is principals do not reflect on the purposes of schooling, curriculum, and instruction. They lack the four competencies of leadership: management of meaning, management of attention, management of trust, and management of self (Bennis, 1984). Principals must have a clear understanding of the

purpose of schooling, keep the school focused on teaching and learning, act so others will be willing to follow, and know what he or she can or cannot do as a leader (Smith & Andrews, 1989).

Finally, there are also three theories that might explain why principals do not spend more time in the practice of instructional leadership.

1. The *role theory* suggests that the principal's behavior is shaped by the perception of teachers, students, parents, and those who interact within the work setting. The role is further defined by job descriptions, day-to-day developments, and orders from the superintendent. These roles may conflict or be fluid depending upon the circumstances of the school at any given time.

2. The *expectancy theory* says a principal will react based on his or her expectations of the consequences of the behavior. In other words, attention will be given to those things that are perceived to bring the most benefit or the least amount of negative consequences.

3. Finally, the *adaptive-reactive theory* suggests that the principal adapts to the external environment such as size or location of the school and performs accordingly. These theories imply that it is possible for one to act based on external forces that may counter what one knows to be the best action. Collectively these theories provide a foundation for explaining and predicting principal behaviors (Smith & Andrews, 1989).

Broad-based Interventions

“At a time when the nation is deeply concerned about the performance of its schools and near-to-obsessed with the credentials and careers of those who teach in them,

scant attention has been paid to the preparation and qualification of those who lead them” (Peterson & Finn, 1985, p. 42). In the years that followed this statement, the school leader became the focal point of educational emphasis. National and local agencies, private foundations, and professional organizations established commissions, made recommendations, and provided resources to enhance the development of school principals.

In 1986, the height of the concern for school leaders, the Leadership Development Act (LEAD) provided funds for technical support centers in every state and the District of Columbia. The resulting academies provided inservices in exemplary school leadership practices. Though not connected to a university, the centers often used university staff and were reportedly effective (McCarthy, 1999a).

Local agencies also began to assess to determine what they could do to foster instructional leadership. According to Anderson (2001) the Illinois School Code requires that a minimum of 51% of the principal’s time must be dedicated to instructional leadership. Supporting this mandate, several initiatives were put into place. The Chicago School Board policy requires that aspiring principals complete 84 hours of targeted instruction, a day-long experience in the Chicago Principal Assessment Center, a 90-day internship, and an exit interview to help refine their skills. LAUNCH (Leadership Academy and Urban Network for Chicago) was created to identify, recruit, and support those who wanted to become principals in the Chicago City School System (Anderson, 2001). Currently, there is an array of highly rated professional development programs by organizations such as ASCD, NASSP, NAESP, and many universities (Peterson, 2002).

Philanthropic organizations have also supported major initiatives in this area. Among them is the Danforth Foundation. Two Danforth programs, one for principal preparation and one for improving the professorate, have been the source of almost 100 presentations at national, state, and regional conferences (Danforth Foundation, 1992). From 1987 to 1992, the Danforth Foundation Program for the Preparation of School Principals (DPPSP) provided grants to 22 universities to implement innovative programs that integrate practice, knowledge, and theory in the preparation of school leaders (Danforth Foundation, 1992). The programs focused on recruiting potential leaders from minority and female populations, collaboration with school districts in program design, student cohort groups, internships, and funding (Danforth Foundation, 1992).

In the spring of 1991, participants from 21 of the 22 participating universities in the DPPSP completed surveys on the evolution of their programs, the program's unique characteristics, and the lessons learned from the experience. The participants in the program were 75% female and 33% ethnic minorities. Twenty-five percent of these were in certificate programs. The others were in masters, specialist, or doctoral programs. Although programs varied, they all had an emphasis on leadership, administration, communication, and current issues (e.g., diversity and at-risk populations). One third of the programs revised or developed new courses. All found ways to link theory to practice. Sixteen percent of the programs had a single director but most had some form of advisory. The classes were held in the late afternoon, evening, night, or weekends to accommodate the work schedules of the students.

Among the skills promoted by the DPPSP, leadership was rated as "highly

important.” Communication and administration were rated “important” and more than half of the respondents rated curriculum and instruction, supervision, planning, government and legal issues, technology, and public relations “high.” Topics not perceived as directly related to the principalship (e.g., interviewing and resume writing) rarely received “high” ratings. The internship was the “integrating” experience for the classroom work. The venues included schools, central offices, and businesses not related to education. Most programs used trained practitioners as mentors with funds for substitutes provided by the school district.

More than 500 students completed these programs during the four 18 months cycles of the DPPSP. At the time of the survey, 50% of them had found positions. Also at the time of the survey, 19 of the initial 22 programs were fully operational and 9 were committed to continuing the new program design (Danforth Foundation, 1992).

Practitioner and professor-oriented organizations offered comparable support in a different direction—finding a knowledge base (Donmoyer, 1999). In 1987, the University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA) established the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (NCEEAA) in response to concerns about the preparation of school leaders. As a result the NCEEAA (1987) found a number of deficiencies including “lack of definition of good educational leadership . . . lack of collaboration between school districts and universities. . . lack of systematic professional development for school administrators . . . and lack of sequence, modern content, and clinical experiences” (pp. vi-xvii). Among their eight recommendations was that 300 of the 500 programs should discontinue offering courses in educational administration. The

remaining programs should adhere to a professional school model such as those used in law and medicine, with more clinical experiences and involvement from outstanding practitioners in the field. The NCEE (1987) also recommended the establishment of the National Policy Board in Educational Administration (NPBEA). As a result the NPBEA was established with the following nine-item agenda for reforms in preparation programs:

1. Develop recruitment strategies to attract the most capable candidates of diverse race, ethnicity, and gender.
2. Raise entrance standards to ensure that all have strong analytical abilities, high administrative potential, and have demonstrated success in teaching, including a master's degree.
3. Ensure the quality of faculty in administration preparation by strengthening the recruitment, selection, and staff development; maintain at least five full-time faculty; ensure a student-faculty ratio that is comparable to other graduate programs.
4. Make the doctorate of Educational Administration a prerequisite for certification and state licensure; abolish the specialist and master's degree programs.
5. Require 1 full-time year of academic residency, 1 full-time year of field residency.
6. Develop the curriculum around a core of knowledge grounded in the problems of practice: including societal and cultural influences, teaching and learning processes, organizational theory, leadership and management processes, policy studies, and moral and ethical dimensions.

7. Partner with local school districts to establish sites for clinical study, field residency, and applied research.

8. Establish national standards boards to administer certification and encourage states to require examination for licensure.

9. Withhold accreditation from preparation programs that do not meet the National Policy Board Educational Administration standards (NPBEA, 1989).

There was a flurry of activities to develop standards and guidelines. In 1994, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) was established, under the guidance of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), to help states work together to establish standards, professional development, assessment, and licensure procedures. In 1996 the consortium adopted the ISLLC Standards for School Leaders, currently in use in 35 states (CCSSO, 2001).

During this same period, the National Association of Secondary Principals (NASSP) in conjunction with the National Association of Elementary Principals (NAESP) founded the National Commission for the Principalship to explore preparation, certification, and licensing procedures. The commission asserted that the existing programs were outdated and the other processes were irrelevant. Subsequently 21 performance domains were identified for the principal by the NPBEA. Figure 1 presents the 21 domains, grouped in four categories. Later, the knowledge and skill base were delineated for each domain (Jackson & Kelley, 2002; McCarthy, 1999a).

Table 1

Twenty-one Performance Domains.

<p style="text-align: center;">Functional Domains</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leadership 2. Information collection 3. Problem analysis 4. Judgment 5. Organizational oversight 6. Implementation 7. Delegation 	<p style="text-align: center;">Programmatic Domains</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Instruction and the learning environment 9. Curriculum design 10. Student guidance and development 11. Staff development 12. Measurement and evaluation 13. Resource allocation
<p style="text-align: center;">Interpersonal Domains</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 14. Motivating others 15. Interpersonal sensitivity 16. Oral and nonverbal expression 17. Written expression 	<p style="text-align: center;">Contextual Domains</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 18. Philosophical and cultural values 19. Legal and regulatory application 20. Policy and political influence 21. Public relations

Also in 1994, the NPBEA established a group to design performance-based standards to be used by National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) to review educational leadership programs. They were adopted by NCATE in the spring of 1995. They include 11 knowledge and skill domains and one process domain (the internship) listed in four categories of leadership: (a) strategic, (b) instructional, (c) organizational, and (d) political and community leadership. The category for instructional leadership, lists the following 20 guidelines, divided into three areas, for instructional leadership (NPBEA, 1996).

In Area I, Curriculum, Instruction, Supervision, and the Learning Environment:

1. Create with teachers, parents, and students a positive school culture that promotes learning (e.g., holds high expectations, focuses on accomplishments and

recognition, and promotes a supportive culture).

2. Develop collaboratively a learning organization that supports instructional improvement, builds an appropriate curriculum, and incorporates best practices.

3. Base curricular decisions on research, applied theory, informed practice, the recommendations of learned societies, and state and federal policies (e.g., cognitive development, human development, learning styles, contemporary methodologies, content priorities, special needs legislation and topics such as the least restrictive environment etc.).

4. Design curricula with consideration for the philosophical, sociological, and historical foundations, democratic values, and the community's values, goals, social needs, and changing conditions.

5. Align curricula goals and objectives with instructional goals and objectives and desired outcomes when developing scope, sequence, balance, etc.

6. Develop with others curriculum and instruction appropriate for varied teaching and learning styles and specific student needs based on gender, ethnicity, culture, social class, and exceptionalities.

7. Utilize a variety of supervisory models to improve teaching and learning (e.g., clinical, developmental, cognitive and peer coaching, as well as applying observation and conferencing skills).

8. Use various staffing patterns, student grouping plans, class scheduling forms, school organizational structures, and facilities design processes, to support various teaching strategies and desired student outcomes.

9. Assess student progress using a variety of appropriate techniques.

In Area II, Professional Development and Human Resources:

10. Work with faculty and other stakeholders to identify needs for professional development, to organize, facilitate, and evaluate professional development programs, to integrate district and school priorities, to build faculty as resource, and to ensure that professional development activities focus on improving student outcomes.

11. Apply adult learning strategies to professional development, focusing on authentic problems and tasks, and utilizing mentoring, coaching, conferencing and other techniques to ensure that new knowledge and skills are practiced in the workplace.

12. Apply effective job analysis procedures, supervisory techniques and performance appraisal for instructional and non instructional staff.

13. Formulate and implement a self-development plan, endorsing the value of career-long growth, and utilizing a variety of resources for continuing professional development.

14. Identify and apply appropriate policies, criteria and processes for the recruitment, selection, induction, compensation and separation of personnel, with attention to issues of equity and diversity.

15. Negotiate and manage effectively collective bargaining or written agreements.

In Area III, Student Personnel Services:

16. Apply the principles of student growth and development to the learning

environment and the educational program.

17. Develop with the counseling and teaching staff a full program of student advisement, counseling, and guidance services.

18. Develop and administer policies that provide a safe school environment and promote student health and welfare.

19. Address student and family conditions affecting learning by collaborating with community agencies to integrate health, social, and other services for students.

20. Plan and manage activity programs to fulfill student development, social, cultural, athletic, leadership and scholastic needs; working with staff, students, families, and community (NPBEA, 2002).

Figure 2 shows the alignment between Krug's Taxonomy (1992) and the NCATE Curriculum Guidelines for Instructional Leadership. The first category, defining mission, is addressed in the NCATE Guidelines for Political and Community Leadership.

Krug's Taxonomy	NCATE Guidelines for Instructional Leadership
Defining mission	
Managing curriculum	Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
Supervising teaching	Standards 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15
Monitoring student progress	Standards 9, 16, 19, 20
Promoting instructional climate	Standards 1, 2, 17, 18

Figure 1 *Krug's Taxonomy and the NCATE Curriculum Guidelines for Instructional Leadership*

Preparation Programs

Participants on task forces, reform commissions, and the general public assumed the findings, recommendations, and models for principal preparation programs would be catalysts for change within the academic community. But this did not “rattle the foundation” of most educational administration programs (Duke, 1992, p. 764).

In a review on the structure of units and degree offerings by McCarthy (1999a), there are almost 500 educational leadership programs in the United States: 371 degree programs and more than a 100 providers of licensure courses. The nearly universal “one best model of leadership preparation program,” as described by Cooper and Boyd, “is state controlled, closed to non-teachers, credit-driven, and certification bound” (as cited in McCarthy, 1999a). Since the early 1970s most educational leadership doctoral programs include a specific number of required courses in educational administration and leadership, written and oral qualifying exams, and possibly an internship and residency requirement. The course offerings have been relatively stable. McCarthy (1999b) reports that according to Pohland and Carlson, the course offerings in 1993, administrative theory, leadership, educational law, decision making, school district administration, business finance/ budgeting, organizational development and school community, were consistent with the programs in 1976. This does not necessarily mean that course content has not been changed or updated. Getting approval for new courses is often a time consuming process. “One way to circumvent the process is to offer new content under old course names” (McCarthy, 1999a, p. 126).

Changing Expectations

For the last two decades there has been a cry for school leaders who could restructure schools and improve student achievement. As early as 1989 the NPBEA recommended that preparation programs focus on societal and cultural influences in schooling, teaching and learning processes and school improvement, organizational theory; methodologies of organizational studies and policy analysis, leadership and management processes and functions, policy studies and politics of education, and the moral and ethical dimensions of schooling. Only two of the content areas recommended by the NPBEA--leadership and organizational development--were among the seven most frequently reported content specializations of faculty members in 1994 (McCarthy & Kuh, 1997). The other five are law, organizational theory, the principalship, finance, and supervision of instruction. This finding is very interesting because course offerings are influenced by faculty specialization. It should also be noted that state licensure procedures also impact on course offerings (McCarthy, 1999b).

McCarthy suggests, "A central criticism of preparation programs grounded in the social sciences has been that course content gives insufficient attention to curriculum, instruction and learning, and the linkages between preparation and practice" (McCarthy, 1999a, p. 125). Drawing from Griffith, Stout, and Forsyth, Jenkins and Behar, and Murphy, McCarthy also reports that even when university preparation programs provide the theory, they do not provide the types of experiences that will help prospective principals turn theory into practice once they are in the principalship. According to Cambron-McCabe, "The disconnect between what is taught in many university

preparation programs and what practitioners need to be able to do in their schools and school districts is frequently cited among stakeholders in educational leadership preparation” (cited in Young & Petersen, 2002, p. 151).

The new role requires preparation that emphasizes curriculum, teaching and learning, the social context of education, school culture, and values. “The new view focuses on the centrality of student learning” (McCarthy, 1999a, p. 126).

Innovative Practices

To attract and prepare potential school leaders, preparation programs must make structural changes to be more effective in content and delivery (Daresh, 1997; Lauder, 2000; Milstein & Krueger, 1997). Clark and Clark (1997) describe five key elements of effective leadership preparation programs: (a) a strong sense of purpose, (b) a knowledge base drawn from the world of practice, (c) instructional practices that facilitate involvement, (d) professional learning communities, and (e) selection procedures. The research translates these elements into several innovations that are also aligned with the reforms recommended by the NPBEA (Barnett, Basom, Yerkes, & Norris, 2000; Daresh, 1997; Jackson & Kelley, 2002; Lauder, 2000; Peel, Wallace, Buckner, Wrenn, & Evans, 1998; Peterson, 2002). They include the following practices:

Multiple Approaches to Leadership: Traditional management approaches alone are ineffective for creating new schools that function well for students. Similarly, instructional leadership alone tends to overlook other dimensions of leadership within the school setting (Heck & Hallinger, 1999). It is critical for principals to operate in a fair, ethical, and moral fashion (Daresh, 1997). The principal should be a moral steward,

educator, and community builder (Murphy, 2002). Approaches to conceptualizing school leadership in contemporary literature offer an eclectic and overlapping perspective on what should be the focus of the leader's attention and how leadership should manifest itself in practice (Leithwood & Duke, 1999). These new approaches to school leadership include instructional, transformational, moral, participative, managerial, and contingent leadership.

Performance-based Standards: Preparation programs should have a knowledge base from the world of practice that emphasizes the skills required for the principalship (Milstein & Krueger, 1997). A critical criteria is the adoption of measurable, performance-based criteria such as the 21 Performance Domains by the NPBEA, the NCATE guidelines, or ISLLC standards (Lauder, 2000).

Coordinated Curriculum: Curricula coherence and alignment should exist within and across programs and provide an integrated set of topics, skills, and concepts based on learning objectives. There should also be linkages between the program, certification, and licensure requirements (Peterson, 2002). However, there is a gradual recognition that the preparation of school leaders is an incremental process of career formation. Universities are identifying the courses that serve as core experiences and a logical sequencing of courses is taking shape (Daresh, 1997).

Adult Learning Theory: Andragogy suggests that adults learn better when they can direct their own learning, influence decision making, focus on problems relevant to practice, use their experiential background, and form strong relationships with peers (Caffarella, 1993). Problem-based learning and learner-identified projects allow students

to draw from a variety of resources such as research and prior experiences (Milstein & Krueger, 1997). In addition to learning problem solving, students learn teamwork, as well as administrative and project development skills (Jackson & Kelley, 2002). These along with theory-to-practice activities such as role play, reflective groups, and simulations enable students to apply theoretical knowledge in a non-threatening environment. The participants, with the support of an instructor and classmates, develop skills through application and reflection (Lauder, 2000).

Although traditional pedagogy, as used with children, is generally inappropriate for adults (Caffarella, 1993), instruction should be delivered in a way that models better approaches to instruction in schools (Milstein & Krueger, 1997).

Recruitment and Selection: The diverse population in schools demands that a purposeful selection is made from a diverse group of candidates (Milstein & Krueger, 1997). Targeted audiences should be identified to receive information about the educational leadership program, processes for application, and criteria for admission. Recruitment should also include an ongoing liaison with practitioners who might encourage talented teacher-leaders to consider a preparation program and serve as mentors to these or other worthy candidates. Eventually, a program's reputation for quality will discourage less qualified students from applying (Milstein & Krueger, 1997).

To select candidates with the greatest potential for leadership, traditional processes should be supplemented with interviews, in-basket activities, a description of previous leadership experiences, and verification of a disposition or personality type that is aligned with the principalship. Dispositions such as flexibility, enthusiasm, sense of

humor, compassion for children, courage, a developed ego and drive, emotional maturity cannot be taught and are difficult to influence in adults. Assessment centers and a variety of instruments are available to diagnose disposition (Clark & Clark, 1997; Lauder, 2000).

Student Cohorts: One of the more popular innovations is student cohorts. “Half of the UCEA units used cohorts at the master’s level and 80% used them at the doctoral level” (McCarthy, 1999a, p. 128). In a typical cohort model, students take all or a significant portion of their course work with a fixed group that learns with and from each other rather than randomly enrolling in courses of their own choosing and at their own pace.

The strengths and weaknesses of student cohorts have been analyzed in several studies (Barnett et al., 2000). Strengths reported by graduates include the development of social and interpersonal relationships, better integration into the university, increased contact with faculty, clearer program structure and course sequencing, higher program completion rates, and the development of professional networks. Student cohorts model actual learning collaborations and networking, enhancing the probability that these practices will be implemented in the workplace. Milstein and Krueger (1997) report that the reason for such positive outcomes is that cohorts provide peer support and motivation to get through the difficult times in the program. Weaknesses noted by users were structural and organizational such as the “lock step” nature of sequencing, “group think,” shifts in power between faculty and students, and the influence of more dominant members (Barnett et al., 2000).

Internships with Experienced Mentors: Internships provide authentic experiences and foster real-life, problem-solving skills that cannot be gained if training is limited to theory and information giving (Leithwood, 1994; Milstein & Krueger, 1997). Milstein and Krueger (1997) describe six internship criteria:

1. Sufficient time on task: The internship should take place over the school year, during the school day, and with sufficient time and regularity to ensure that the intern is able to internalize the role.

2. Placement with a mentor and mentor training: Mentoring includes modeling, empathetic interactions, and an introduction to the best practices by an experienced administrator who wants to serve as a guide. Nevertheless, experienced principals should be trained to mentor. The principal and the intern should also share a common vision for the internship experience (Gray, 2001).

3. Multiple and alternative internships: Several experiences permit the intern to observe a variety of leadership styles.

4. Reflective seminars: There should be structured times to allow students to share and analyze their experiences.

5. Site supervisor: This role should include frequency and depth of interaction.

6. Program coordinator: The overseer should be a practitioner-scholar who understands the needs of the intern and has a legitimate place in both the university and the school district (Milstein & Krueger, 1997).

Preparation Programs in Transition

In spite of the continuing efforts of graduate schools, organizations and foundations, states and school districts, many programs in educational leadership are doing an inadequate job in preparing leaders to deal with the problems and issues of today (Tirozzi, 2001; Young & Petersen, 2002). However, the current context for leadership preparation programs is a complex one. Some of the factors affecting educational leadership programs include: institutional support for educational leadership, professional development for faculty, increased numbers of preparation programs, a pool of capable and diverse applicants, ongoing program enhancement, program content, licensure and accreditation, and focus on the profession (Young & Petersen, 2002). Nevertheless, many programs are involved in improvement efforts. “Yet, some faculty report that their efforts have, at worse failed, or been thwarted and, at best, received little support or recognition” (Young & Petersen, 2002, p. 143).

In 1993, a university joined forces with a school district to change the way educational administration programs were structured and functioned. The Leadership Training Consortium (LCT) integrated university academic preparation with clinical experience. After overcoming issues of content, time, staffing, and instructional strategies, the program received national recognition for its efforts. Nevertheless, after 3 years, the new modules continued to be subsumed under old course numbers and titles and the program continued to be classified as experimental (Bjork & Richardson, 1997).

Universities may see the need to change, and still preserve existing practices as long as the perceived benefits outweigh the cost (Mitchell, 1996). New institutional

theory suggests that organizations adopt structures that reflect cultural norms to maintain legitimacy rather than change their practices to meet environmental needs or internal goals (Ginsberg, 1996; Hanson, 2001). This organizational conformity to institutional codes suggests that all organizations in the same institutional environment will come to resemble one another. Institutional environments produce homogenization among organizational forms (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Various processes such as coercive homogenization through formal rules, normative homogenization through professional codes, and mimetic homogenization through the desire to duplicate more successful or prestigious institutions (Rowan & Miskel, 1999) pressure universities into change. “Overcoming tendencies towards non-rational, sub-optimal behavior may require considerable time and resources to change the understanding of professionals regarding their task and responsibilities” (Bjork & Richardson, 1997, p. 5).

A more collaborative effort is needed by universities and school districts to improve educational leadership programs. There is also a need for an alignment of the demands for university scholarship and rigor with the demands of the practitioner for more hands-on, labor intensive approaches to educational leadership (Clark & Clark, 1997). “Without such investments, innovations will be marginal and lack permanent and substantial change in schools or universities” (Bjork & Richardson, 1997, p. 6).

Restructured Preparation Programs

“Disappointment in the traditional theory-based preparation programs, coupled with the public demand for increased expertise in the principalship, has produced a wave of new and redesigned principal preparation programs” (Lauder, 2000, p. 23). The most

noticeable change in preparation programs has been from plant manager to educational leader with emphasis on ethics, cultural diversity, and social activism. The impetus for the shift has come from the decentralization in many school districts and the subsequent school-based management, shared governance, team leadership, and other reforms that call for principals to facilitate, coach, and mentor teachers (McCarthy, 1999b).

Innovative educational leadership programs like those associated with the Danforth Foundation are models for change. These programs “use current research as well as recommendations from learned societies, partnerships with research institutions, and cutting edge technology to deliver programs designed with the students in mind” (Siegrist, 1999, p. 6). Most tend to be more demanding, use cohorts, a careful screening and selection process, sequenced courses, and a strong collaboration with local school districts (Jackson & Kelley, 2002).

This review identified 41 restructured programs. Those associated with the Danforth Foundations were the most frequently cited. The Danforth Foundation has provided support for 22 restructured programs: The University of Alabama, Florida State University, Georgia State, Ohio State, University of Houston, University of Massachusetts, University of Oklahoma, University of Washington, City College of New York, Brigham Young, East Tennessee State, San Diego State, University of Tennessee at Knoxville, University of Virginia, University of Connecticut, University of New Mexico, Virginia Tech, Western Kentucky, California State University at Fresno, University of Florida, Iowa State, and Old Dominion.

Research by Siegrist (1999) identified nine additional universities that have

innovative programs reflecting the current research: Northern Arizona University at Flagstaff; Ashland University in Ohio; University of Texas-Pan America at Edinburg; Western Carolina University at Cullowee; Columbus and Valdosta State University in Georgia; Southern, Central, and Northwest Universities in Missouri; and the University of New Mexico.

The restructuring of the University of Arizona educational administration program was described in detail by Clark and Clark (1997). Restructuring began after the university had been placed under receivership by the dean and provost during the 1992-1993 school year.

Jackson and Kelley (2002) cites six exceptional and innovative programs including three from the Danforth group: University of Washington, East Tennessee State University and California State University at Fresno; as well as the University of Louisville and Wichita State University; and a non-university program, the San Antonio Region 20 Educational Center.

Other outstanding programs include Hofstra; the University of Miami-Ohio; Harvard; Fordham University; the University of Utah; University of California at Berkeley; the University of Missouri-Columbia; and the University of San Diego (Young & Petersen, 2002).

Instructional Leadership in Preparation Programs

“Principals who have heretofore worked well with teachers, students, parents, and the community are now being evaluated on the basis of their success in increasing student achievement” (Usdan, 2002, p. 302). Instructional leadership has now become

the major [if not, in many cases, the exclusive] criteria for administrative success. Since 1980, instructional leadership has been one of the two images (the other one is transformational leadership, popularized in the 1990s) that has dominated the landscape of educational leadership research from a structural-functional perspective (Heck & Hallinger, 1999). Instructional leadership has been identified as key to effective schools with high student achievement and teacher job satisfaction (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Smith & Andrews, 1989). Beck and Murphy (1993) dubbed instructional leadership the “dominant metaphor of the 1980s.” Drake and Roe (1986) identified instructional leadership as “the principal’s major task” (p. 151). According to Reitzug (1997), “The advocacy for principals as instructional leaders is readily apparent in textbooks on the principalship” (p. 324). Ubben and Hughes (1992) devote a chapter in their book to instructional leadership and several chapters to various aspects of the concept. Rossow (1990) entitled his textbook for principals, *The Principalship: Dimensions in Instructional Leadership*. Performance standards for the principalship, such as those established by NCATE, ISLLC, and the 21 Performance Domains, all include instructional leadership.

Daresh (1997) notes that “many preservice programs have begun to focus on the inclusion of more learning experiences directed towards helping future principals recognize the need to oversee teaching and learning activities as their primary area of responsibility and attention” (p. 5). Although many programs have changed or are in the process of changing, only 2 of the 41 programs most frequently identified in the literature as restructured, the University of Alabama and California State University at Fresno,

report a primary focus on instructional leadership.

The educational leadership program at the University of Alabama focuses on the “survival” and the instructional leadership skills needed by the entry-level administrator. The content is presented in 2-hour modules during the summer. The instructors for the modules are drawn from across the university and the field. Integrating seminars are conducted to help students reflect and synthesize what was presented in the modules (Milstein & Krueger, 1997). All candidates must have a recommendation from their superintendent and their school principal to be accepted into the program (Danforth Foundation, 1992).

California State University has a two-tiered program that is aligned with the state licensure requirements. Course offerings are sequenced and focus on instructional leadership and emphasize participative learning. Workshops designed by students are offered and presented for academic credit. To ensure that the structure, content, and delivery are relevant, there is an advisory committee made up of leading administrators in the area. Tier 1 focuses on instructional leadership and includes 120 hours of field experience as a master teacher. This earns the student a provisional license. Once tier 1 graduates have a position (usually as a vice principal) they return to the university for tier 2. The second tier focuses on transformational leadership. The NAESP Personal Development Inventory is completed by the students and used to guide their work (Danforth Foundation, 1992; Jackson & Kelley, 2002; Milstein & Krueger, 1997).

While many universities are restructuring their programs to provide more opportunities to develop leadership skills along the academic line, there remains a gap between the academic and the real world. . . . Those who want to become instructional leaders must seek out training and development opportunities through

networking with colleagues, joining professional organizations, and completing personal programs of self-improvement. (McEwan, 1998, p. 12)

Summary

The literature shows the centrality of the principal to school effectiveness. The aggregate of the effective school correlates, clearly places the responsibility for developing effective schools where high levels of student achievement are the norm, with the school leader. Studies also show that what the principal does as an instructional leader has a positive effect on teacher performance. These effects are mediated through school processes such as setting goals and staff development opportunities. Several studies show that although many principals understand and value the practice of instructional leadership, most of their time is devoted to issues of management. Various theories and factors have been proposed to explain this phenomenon including the structure of the school system, the norms associated with the principalship, and a lack of knowledge and skills.

The National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration identified a number of deficits in university-based preparation programs (NCEE, 1987). This led to a series of recommendations and initiatives from various levels of government and the private sector to improve performance and increase the accountability of the school leader (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Murphy, 1990). Several innovative practices have been identified to enhance preparation programs: (a) a focus on leadership, (b) performance-based standards, (c) adult learning theory, (d) coordinated curricula, (e) recruitment and selection processes, (f) student cohorts, and the (g)

internships. Yet there appears to be an “institutional inertia,” a reluctance to move beyond the scientific methods and traditional models of the past when it comes to educational administration programs (Siegrist, 1999). Nevertheless there are some restructured programs, particularly those associated with the Danforth Foundation. Among these, at least two, the University of Alabama and California State University at Fresno, have a focus on the practice of instructional leadership.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the steps taken to determine how educational administration/leadership programs address instructional leadership. It is comprised of seven sections: participants, sample type and sample frame, research design, variables, instrumentation, pilot study, and procedures. The two units of analysis, the number of participants, and the process used to determine that number are described. It also includes the type of sampling utilized and the sampling frame from which the participants were selected. The research design is described, followed by the identification the variables and how they were operationalized for the study. Then the structure of the instrument is laid out along with the results of the pilot study. The procedure section explains the data collection and methods of analysis. Finally it lists the 16 null hypotheses developed from the two hypotheses.

Participants

The participants in this study were the department chairs and professors of educational administration/leadership theory. These two entities function in determining how instructional leadership is addressed within the unit. The department chair plays a

strategic role in the faculty and department's success in designing and delivering the leadership program (Young, Petersen, & Short, 2002). As the chief academic officer of the department, he or she is responsible for revising existing curricula, developing new curricula, and promoting faculty development. According to the Pew Policy Round Table, teaching and learning are the first domains of the department's responsibility and the quality and coherence of the department's major are essential to that responsibility (Stark, Briggs, & Rowland-Poplowski, 2002).

However, the department chairs can only describe what they do to promote instructional leadership. They cannot provide a comprehensive picture of what happens within a class, other than their own. It is the professor who teaches educational administration/leadership theory that provides the knowledge base and helps to shape the beliefs and behaviors of the prospective principals. The instructor has firsthand knowledge of the content that is actually being taught as well as the instructional strategies that are being used for delivery.

To determine how many participants were necessary to detect any effects that might result from the independent variables, given the size of the effect, the type of statistical test used, and the significance level, a power analysis was done with respect to a single chi-square test. The analysis was done for a power of .90 and for a power of .99 using an alpha level of .01 and a "medium effect size." For 4 levels of respondents, $df=9$, the required n is 261 for power of .90, and 389 for power of .99 (Cohen, 1971, tables 7.4.1, 7.4.2, and 7.4.3, pp. 247-249). Based on the results and using two participants, both the department chair and professor who teach educational

administration/leadership theory, from each university, 130 department chairs were randomly selected from the ordered list of 371 universities.

Sampling Type and Sampling Frame

The study involved educational administration/leadership department chairs and professors of educational administration/leadership theory from a random sample of 130 universities offering graduate degrees in educational administration/leadership programs. Mailing labels of all known American universities that offer graduate degrees in educational administration/leadership were obtained from the *Educational Administration Directory*. This nationally representative list contains all of the universities, both public and private, from the 50 states and Canada. The labels were listed by state and alphabetically ordered. By removing Canadian labels and copying the sheets of labels, a master list was developed and numbered 1 to 371. Finally, a randomized ordering of the numbers, 1 to 371, was generated by computer and used to select the participants.

Research Design

I used a survey design to ascertain how educational administration/ leadership programs address instructional leadership. The survey facilitated the collection of data that was not observable and that was from a widely dispersed sample. The design allowed me to describe and make generalizations about what happens in university-based preparation programs across the nation.

Variables

The independent variables were the demographic characteristics of the participants: gender, age level, ethnicity, position (department chair, professor of educational leadership administration theory, or department chair and professor), years at the university level, job history, and training.

The dependent variables were the perceptions and behaviors of the department chairs and the professors. Although behavior can be measured, there is no direct measure of subjective states of mind such as perception. However, in this study, perception could be measured by the correlation of responses to related statements and questions. Subsequently, the two dependent variables were operationalized as the importance level indicated by the participants to 20 importance factors and the emphasis level indicated by the participants to 20 emphasis factors.

Instrumentation

There are several possible approaches to an investigation of university-based preparation programs. However, many researchers have identified the structural arrangement as central to the effectiveness of an organization (Peterson, 2002). The four most commonly identified structural arrangements in educational administration include mental discipline or processes (e.g., judgment, problem solving, and reflection), administration (roles, functions, and tasks), content (knowledge, both discipline-based and practice-based), and methods (strategies) for content delivery (Murphy, 2002; Peterson, 2002). These components are interrelated and may be institutionalized or the practice of a given professor. This study addressed both possibilities.

To collect the data necessary to answer the research questions, a four-part, 56-item questionnaire was designed based upon a comprehensive review of the literature. Although self-made instruments are not recommended at the dissertation level (Rudestam & Newton, 2001), an appropriate instrument was not found. However, efforts were made to establish construct and concurrent validity.

1. All key terms were defined within the questionnaire.
2. To support the responses to the question in Part II, this section was followed by seven innovative practices associated with restructured programs.
3. The NCATE Curriculum Guidelines were selected not only on the basis of content but also on the basis that the content would very likely be familiar and similarly understood by all participants.
4. Three open-ended questions were used to include more subjective information from the participants.
5. A pilot study was done using participants from among the same population selected for the study.

The questionnaire was designed to examine the structural arrangements of educational administration/leadership using both quantitative and qualitative data. Although the study focused primarily on the perceptions and behaviors of the participants, it did include other elements that might impinge on the understanding of the results.

The questionnaire has four parts. In Part I, the participants were asked to check all demographic data that applied to them. Part II of the instrument asked the

participants to characterize their institution as traditional or restructured by placing a check mark in front of the appropriate descriptor. A traditional institution was defined as one that had not made major changes in curriculum and instruction during the last 10 years. A restructured program was defined as one that had made major changes during the last 10 ten years. To support the selection of the participants and to ensure a common language, particularly for those who had not been at the university 10 years, participants were asked to check all of the following innovative practices that applied to the institution: (a) a focus on leadership, (b) performance-based standards, (c) a coordinated curriculum, (d) strategies based on adult learning theory, (e) a systematic and purposeful process for recruiting and selecting candidates, (f) student cohorts, and (g) internships with experienced mentors. Each of the seven practices was briefly defined on the questionnaire. See Appendix A.

Part III was made up of three open-ended questions that allowed the participants to be more subjective in expressing their opinions.

1. How do you define instructional leadership?
2. What strategies do you use to promote instructional leadership behaviors in your educational administration/leadership program/class?
3. How satisfied are you that your department/class is providing adequate training in instructional leadership behaviors. Please explain your response.

Part IV was designed to test the null hypotheses. It addresses the perceptions and behaviors of the participants as it relates to instructional leadership behaviors. The format was based on a dissertation by Linda Stevens (2001), *Selected North Carolina*

Principals' Perceptions of the Importance and Practice of Principals' Instructional Leadership Behaviors and Preservice Preparation Practices. The major differences are that Stevens used a Likert-type scale employing preparation practices by Clark and Clark (1997) and principal behaviors by Smith and Andrews (1989) in a Delphi study. This study utilized the 20 NCATE Curriculum Guidelines for Instructional Leadership in a survey design to measure the perceptions and behaviors held by the department chairs and professors of educational administration/leadership theory. NCATE is education's mechanism to help establish high quality in the field. The U.S. Department of Education and the Council for Higher Education recognize NCATE as a national accrediting organization for teacher preparation. NCATE Curriculum Guidelines for Instructional Leadership emphasize the performance and the application of knowledge and skills within three administrative areas: (a) curriculum, instruction, supervision and the learning environment; (b) professional development and human resources; and (c) student personnel services.

The NCATE Curriculum Guidelines for Instructional Leadership were used as importance and emphasis factors. They were modified to be more concise and listed with a four-option Likert-type scale on each side. The participants were asked to rate each standard as to its importance and how much emphasis he or she actually placed on the standard in the process of instructing aspiring school leaders. The scale on the left contained the importance levels designed to measure perception. The participants were asked to rate each standard as 1 = not important, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = important, and 4 = very important by circling the corresponding number. The scale on the right side

contained the emphasis levels designed to measure behavior. The participants were asked to indicate the level of emphasis they placed on each standard by circling the number 1 = no emphasis, 2 = slight emphasis, 3 = moderate emphasis, and 4 = strong emphasis. See Appendix A.

Pilot Study

A pilot study, to assess the suitability of the instrument, was done using 10 randomly selected department chairs as the panel of experts. The chairs were asked to complete the questionnaire and then to complete an assessment on the clarity and preciseness of each part of the questionnaire and related directions. See Appendix B. The primary concern was construct validity. Would the questions mean the same thing to each participant? Six of the 10 department chairs responded. No patterns of concern emerged in the responses. However, minor word changes were suggested and incorporated into the instrument.

Procedures

Data Collection

The subjects were surveyed using a two-step process to encourage optimal participation. The first step was to mail copies of the survey with a cover letter and self-stamped, addressed envelopes to the department chairs. See Appendix C. Each department chair received two questionnaires. The chair was asked to complete a questionnaire and to request the professor who teaches educational leadership theory to participate in the study by completing and mailing the second questionnaire. If the chair

also taught educational leadership theory, the second questionnaire was to be discarded.

Three weeks after the initial mailing and one week after the requested return date, a reminder was mailed to all nonrespondents on the master list. The reminder emphasized the importance of their response to the study and the need for a high return rate.

The mailing labels on the returned questionnaires had been coded with a number that corresponded to the numbered master list of department chairs. An “A” or “B” was added to the number so that a comparison of the responses from the same university could be made. The returned questionnaires were then processed as follows:

1. The receipt of the returned questionnaires was noted on the master list.
2. The questionnaires were given two numbers as they were removed from the envelopes. First, they were given the code from the envelope. Then the questionnaires were numbered consecutively for data entry.

Data Analysis

Since the purpose was to describe how instructional leadership is addressed, descriptive statistics were used to determine measures of central tendency and variability. The open-ended questions were analyzed for answers to the research questions, components of Krug’s Taxonomy, NCATE curriculum guidelines, innovative practices, and any emerging similarities among the participants’ responses.

Research Hypotheses

Based on the four research questions, the following two hypotheses were

established:

1. There is a difference in the way instructional leadership is addressed, as perceived by the department chair and the professors of educational administration/leadership, in traditional and restructured programs.
2. The way the educational administration/leadership department chairs and professors of educational/administration leadership theory address instructional leadership is related to demographic characteristics.

Null Hypotheses

From the two hypotheses, 16 null hypotheses were developed. Each hypothesis was tested by chi-square for the 20 importance factors and the 20 emphasis factors with an alpha level of .01. The alpha level was selected to reduce the likelihood of a Type I error. The contingency coefficient was used to indicate the magnitude of the relationship between the variables. The null hypotheses are as follows:

1. There is no difference between the responses of males and females to any of the 20 importance factors.
2. There is no difference between the responses of males and females to any of the 20 emphasis factors.
3. There is no difference among the responses of those in different age groups to any of the 20 importance factors.
4. There is no difference among the responses of those in different age groups to any of the 20 emphasis factors.
5. There is no difference among the responses of those from different ethnic

groups to any of the 20 importance factors.

6. There is no difference among the responses of those from different ethnic groups to any of the 20 emphasis factors.

7. There is no difference between the responses of the department chairs and the instructors to any of the 20 importance factors.

8. There is no difference between the responses of the department chairs and the instructors to any of the 20 emphasis factors.

9. There is no difference among the responses of those with different years of service at the university level to any of the 20 importance factors.

10. There is no difference among the responses of those with different years of service at the university level to any of the 20 emphasis factors.

11. There is no difference among the responses of those with different job histories to any of the 20 importance factors.

12. There is no difference among the responses of those with different job histories to any of the 20 emphasis factors.

13. There is no difference between the responses of those who have done formal course work in educational administration and those who have not to any of the 20 importance factors.

14. There is no difference between the responses of those who done formal course work in educational administration and those who have not to any of the 20 emphasis factors.

15. There is no difference between the responses of those at universities with

traditional programs and those at universities with restructured programs to any of the 20 importance factors.

16. There is no difference between the responses of those at universities with traditional programs and those at universities with restructured programs to any of the 20 emphasis factors.

Summary

This study employed a survey design to examine how instructional leadership was addressed in educational administration/leadership programs. The participants were the department chairs and professors of educational administration/ leadership from a random sample of a 130 universities.

A self-styled questionnaire was developed using demographic characteristics, a list of innovative practices taken from the literature, three open-ended questions; and Likert-type questions using the 20 NCATE Curriculum Guidelines for Instructional Leadership. The department chair was asked to complete a questionnaire and to request the professor who teaches educational leadership theory to complete the second questionnaire.

To analyze the data, descriptive statistics were used to determine measures of central tendency and variability. Sixteen null hypotheses were developed from the two research questions. Each hypothesis was tested by chi-square for the 20 importance factors and the 20 emphasis factors with an alpha level of .01. The contingency coefficient was used to indicate the magnitude of the relationship between the variables. The open-ended questions were analyzed for answers to the research questions,

components of Krug's Taxonomy, innovative practices identified in the literature, and emerging patterns among the participants' responses.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter describes the results of the study. It begins with a description of the participants and the remaining data are divided into two sections: quantitative and qualitative. The quantitative data are organized around the testing of the null hypotheses and conclude with a summary of the responses. The qualitative data are organized around the participants' responses to the three open-ended questions.

Participants

Only 49 of the 260 questionnaires mailed to the department chairs of 130 universities were returned and used for this study. These questionnaires represented 40 different universities, 12 department chairs, 13 department chairs who also teach educational administration/ leadership theory, and 22 instructors (two participants did not respond to the questions). While the majority of the professors (42) described their universities as restructured, several (7) described their universities as traditional.

The responding participants were comprised of 61.2% males and 36.7% females (2% did not respond to the question). In response to age, 2% were 35 or younger, 25.5% were between the ages of 36 and 50, and 69.4% were 51 or older (2% did not respond to

the question). Ethnically, the participants were 83.7% White, 8.2% African American, 4.1% Hispanic, and 2% checked “other” (2% did not respond to the question). Of the 49 returning questionnaires, 24.5% were from department chairs, 26.5% were from professors who served as both the chair and the instructor, and 44.9% were from instructors (4.1% did not respond to the question). The results showed that 28.6% of the participants had served at the university level less than 5 years, 30.6% had served at the university level between 6 and 10 years, and 38.8% had served at the university level for more than 10 years (2% did not respond to the question). The job histories showed that 6.1% had no previous experience in an elementary, middle, or secondary school setting as a teacher or as an administrator, 12.2% had been administrators, 14.2% had been teachers, and 63.3% had been both school administrators and school teachers (4.1% did not respond to the question). Of the 49 participants, 98% (2% did not respond to the question) had formal training in instructional leadership.

Testing of the Hypotheses

Of the 16 null hypotheses developed for this study, 8 were not tested. Hypotheses 1 through 6 could not be tested because of the low response frequency in the categories. For hypotheses 7 and 8, 98% of the respondents had formal training in instructional leadership and 2% did not respond to the question. The following 8 were not tested:

1. There is no difference among the responses of those from different ethnic groups to any of the 20 importance factors.
2. There is no difference among the responses of those from different ethnic groups to any of the 20 emphasis factors.

3. There is no difference between the responses of the department chairs and the instructors to any of the 20 importance factors.

4. There is no difference between the responses of the department chairs and the instructors to any of the 20 emphasis factors.

5. There is no difference among the responses of those with different job histories to any of the 20 importance factors.

6. There is no difference among the responses of those with different job histories to any of the 20 emphasis factors.

7. There is no difference between the responses of those who have done formal course work in educational administration and those who have not to any of the 20 importance factors.

8. There is no difference between the responses of those who did formal course work in instructional leadership and those who did not to any of the 20 emphasis factors.

Hypothesis 9

There is no difference between the responses of males and females to any of the 20 importance factors.

This hypothesis was tested by chi-square with an alpha of .01. Where there were expected frequencies of less than 5, response categories were combined. In most cases the first three categories were combined. If in the resulting 2 X 2 table there was still an expected frequency of less than 5, the Yates Correction was used. Table 1 gives the chi-square results for all hypotheses on gender and importance factors. From the table it is evident that no variable showed a significant difference between any of the factors.

Hypothesis 9 is therefore retained.

Hypothesis 10

There is no difference between the responses of males and females to any of the 20 emphasis factors.

This hypothesis was tested by chi-square with an alpha of .01. Where there were expected frequencies of less than 5, response categories were combined. In most cases the first three categories were combined. If in the resulting 2 X 2 table there was still an expected frequency of less than 5, the Yates Correction was used. Table 2 gives the chi-square results for all hypotheses on gender and emphasis factors. From the table it is evident that no variable showed a significant difference between any of the factors.

Hypothesis 10 is therefore retained.

Hypothesis 11

There is no difference among the responses of different age groups to any of the 20 importance factors.

This hypothesis was tested by chi-square with an alpha of .01. Where there were expected frequencies of less than 5, response categories were combined. In most cases the first three categories were combined. If in the resulting 2 X 2 table there was still an expected frequency of less than 5, the Yates Correction was used. Table 3 gives the chi-square results for all hypotheses on age groups and importance factors.

Of the 20 variables, only one shows a significant difference among the age categories, Importance Factor 10: Identifies needs and programs that integrate priorities

Table 1

Chi-Square for Hypothesis 9: Gender and Importance Factors

Variables	χ^2	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
1. Creates a culture that promotes learning.	0.000 (Y)	1	1.0000
2. Develops a learning organization.	0.002 (Y)	1	0.9605
3. Bases curricula decisions on research and policies.	0.546 (Y)	1	0.4598
4. Designs curricula with consideration for values, goals, and social needs.	1.600	1	0.2059
5. Aligns curricula and instructional goals and objectives with outcomes.	0.027	1	0.8697
6. Plans for varied learning/teaching styles ethnicity, culture, and social classes.	2.192	1	0.1387
7. Uses a variety of supervisory models.	0.213	1	0.6442
8. Uses a variety of staffing patterns, students groupings, scheduling, and facility designs.	1.813	1	0.1782
9. Uses a variety of techniques to assess student progress.	0.000 (Y)	1	1.0000
10. Identifies needs and programs that integrate priorities, build faculty, focus on students.	0.2305	1	0.6000
11. Uses adult learning strategies e.g., authentic problems/tasks, coaching, and mentoring.	0.467	1	0.4945
12. Uses job analysis, supervision, and appraisals for instructional and non-instructional staff.	0.139	1	0.7091
13. Formulates and manages a self-development plan, endorsing career-long growth.	0.000	1	1.0000
14. Uses recruiting, selection, induction, separation processes with attention to equity and diversity.	0.277	1	0.5990
15. Negotiates and manages collective bargaining and written agreements.	1.674	2	0.4330
16. Applies principles of growth and development to the learning environment.	0.000 (Y)	1	1.0000
17. Develops a program for advisement, counseling, and guidance services.	0.024	1	0.8776
18. Provides for a safe environment and for student health and welfare.	0.672	1	0.4123
19. Collaborates with community agencies on health, social, and other student services.	0.022	1	0.8811
20. Plans and manages programs for students, cultural, athletic, leadership and scholastic needs.	2.678	1	0.1018

Note. (Y) indicates the Yates Correction was used.

Table 2

Chi-Square for Hypothesis 10: Gender and Emphasis Factors

Variables	X^2	df	p
1. Creates a culture that promotes learning.	0.242	1	0.6228
2. Develops a learning organization.	0.374	1	0.5408
3. Bases curricula decisions on research and policies.	0.242	1	0.6228
4. Designs curricula with consideration for values, goals, and social needs.	1.097	1	0.2950
5. Aligns curricula and instructional goals and objectives with outcomes.	0.022	1	0.8811
6. Plans for varied learning/teaching styles ethnicity, culture, and social classes.	1.920	1	0.1659
7. Uses a variety of supervisory models.	1.871	2	0.3924
8. Uses a variety of staffing patterns, students groupings, scheduling, and facility designs.	0.905	2	0.6361
9. Uses a variety of techniques to assess student progress.	0.673	1	0.4119
10. Identifies needs and programs that integrate priorities, build faculty, focus on students.	0.823	1	0.3643
11. Uses adult learning strategies e.g., authentic problems/tasks, coaching, and mentoring.	0.470	1	0.4928
12. Uses job analysis, supervision, and appraisals for instructional and non-instructional staff.	0.009	2	0.9954
13. Formulates and manages a self-development plan, endorsing career-long growth.	2.618	2	0.2701
14. Uses recruiting, selection, induction, separation processes with attention to equity and diversity.	0.091	1	0.7624
15. Negotiates and manages collective bargaining and written agreements.	1.813	1	0.1782
16. Applies principles of growth and development to the learning environment.	1.813	1	0.1782
17. Develops a program for advisement, counseling, and guidance services.	6.745	2	0.0343
18. Provides for a safe environment and for student health and welfare.	0.139	1	0.7091
19. Collaborates with community agencies on health, social, and other student services.	0.420	2	0.8105
20. Plans and manages programs for students, cultural, athletic, leadership and scholastic needs.	1.270	1	0.2598

Table 3

Chi-Square for Hypothesis 11: Age and Importance Factors

Variables	X^2	df	p
1. Creates a culture that promotes learning.	0.003 (Y)	1	0.5692
2. Develops a learning organization.	0.084 (Y)	1	0.7725
3. Bases curricula decisions on research and policies.	1.445 (Y)	1	0.2293
4. Designs curricula with consideration for values, goals, and social needs.	0.069 (Y)	1	0.7925
5. Aligns curricula and instructional goals and objectives with outcomes.	0.000 (Y)	1	1.0000
6. Plans for varied learning/teaching styles ethnicity, culture, and social classes.	0.018	1	0.8943
7. Uses a variety of supervisory models.	0.108	1	0.7429
8. Uses a variety of staffing patterns, students groupings, scheduling, and facility designs.	0.001	1	0.9798
9. Uses a variety of techniques to assess student progress.	0.000 (Y)	1	1.0000
10. Identifies needs and programs that integrate priorities, build faculty, focus on students.	6.994 (Y)	1	0.0082*
11. Uses adult learning strategies e.g., authentic problems/tasks, coaching, and mentoring.	1.507 (Y)	1	0.2196
12. Uses job analysis, supervision, and appraisals for instructional and non-instructional staff.	0.698	1	0.4036
13. Formulates and manages a self-development plan, endorsing career-long growth.	0.158	1	0.6907
14. Uses recruiting, selection, induction, separation processes with attention to equity and diversity.	0.072	1	0.7884
15. Negotiates and manages collective bargaining and written agreements.	0.419	2	0.8111
16. Applies principles of growth and development to the learning environment.	0.000 (Y)	1	1.0000
17. Develops a program for advisement, counseling, and guidance services.	0.918	1	0.3381
18. Provides for a safe environment and for student health and welfare.	0.022 (Y)	1	0.8831
19. Collaborates with community agencies on health, social, and other student services.	0.622	1	0.4304
20. Plans and manages programs for students, cultural, athletic, leadership and scholastic needs.	1.368	1	0.2422

Note. (Y) indicates the Yates Correction was used.

* indicates the variable was significant at level .01.

build faculty, and focus on students. Table 4 shows the contingency table for this variable. The table indicates that participants, ages 50 or younger, had a significantly greater tendency to rate this factor "important," while participants, ages 51 or older, had a significantly greater tendency to rate this factor "very important."

Table 4

Contingency Table: Age and Importance Factor 10

Age	Important		Very Important		Totals
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
50 or younger	5	(71.4)	2	(28.6)	7
51 or older	7	(16.5)	35	(83.3)	42
Totals	12		24		49

Hypothesis 12

There is no difference among the responses of different age groups to any of the 20 emphasis factors.

This hypothesis was tested by chi-square with an alpha of .01. Where there were expected frequencies of less than 5, response categories were combined. In most cases the first three categories were combined. If in the resulting 2 X 2 table there was still an expected frequency of less than 5, the Yates Correction was used. Table 5 gives the chi-square results for all hypotheses on age and emphasis factors.

Of the 20 variables, only one shows a significant difference among the age

Table 5

Chi-Square for Hypothesis 12: Age and Emphasis Factors

Variables	χ^2	df	p
1. Creates a culture that promotes learning.	0.022 (Y)	1	0.8831
2. Develops a learning organization.	0.000 (Y)	1	1.0000
3. Bases curricula decisions on research and policies.	0.694 (Y)	1	0.4048
4. Designs curricula with consideration for values, goals, and social needs.	0.355	1	0.5513
5. Aligns curricula and instructional goals and objectives with outcomes.	0.622	1	0.4304
6. Plans for varied learning/teaching styles ethnicity, culture, and social classes.	0.270	1	0.6035
7. Uses a variety of supervisory models.	0.046	1	0.8297
8. Uses a variety of staffing patterns, students groupings, scheduling, and facility designs.	5.094	1	0.0240
9. Uses a variety of techniques to assess student progress.	3.378	1	0.0661
10. Identifies needs and programs that integrate priorities, build faculty, focus on students.	0.006	1	0.9384
11. Uses adult learning strategies e.g., authentic problems/tasks, coaching, and mentoring.	0.006	1	0.9384
12. Uses job analysis, supervision, and appraisals for instructional and non-instructional staff.	0.210	2	0.6471
13. Formulates and manages a self-development plan, endorsing career-long growth.	1.481	2	0.2237
14. Uses recruiting, selection, induction, separation processes with attention to equity and diversity.	0.801	1	0.3709
15. Negotiates and manages collective bargaining and written agreements.	3.567	1	0.0589
16. Applies principles of growth and development to the learning environment.	1.607	1	0.2050
17. Develops a program for advisement, counseling, and guidance services.	2.970 (Y)	1	0.0848
18. Provides for a safe environment and for student health and welfare.	7.265	1	0.0070*
19. Collaborates with community agencies on health, social, and other student services.	0.708	1	0.4001
20. Plans and manages programs for students, cultural, athletic, leadership and scholastic needs.	1.169	1	0.2797

Note. (Y) indicates the Yates Correction was used.

* indicates the variable was significant at level .01.

categories, Emphasis Factor 18: Provides a safe environment and for student health and welfare. Table 6 shows the contingency table for this variable. The table indicates that the participants, ages 50 or younger, had a significantly greater tendency to rate this factor as receiving moderate emphasis, while the older participants, ages 51 or older, tended to rate the factor as receiving strong emphasis.

Table 6

Contingency Table: Age and Emphasis Factor 18

Age	<i>n</i>	Moderate Emphasis		Strong Emphasis	
		%	<i>n</i>	%	Totals
50 or younger	12	(80)	3	(20)	15
51 or older	13	(38.2)	21	(61.8)	34
Totals	25		24		49

Hypothesis 13

There is no difference among the responses of those with different years of service at the university level to any of the 20 importance factors.

This hypothesis was tested by chi-square with an alpha of .01. Where there were expected frequencies of less than 5, response categories were combined. In most cases the first three categories were combined. If in the resulting 2 X 2 table there was still an expected frequency of less than 5, the Yates Correction was used. Table 7 gives the chi-square results for all hypotheses on service and importance factors.

Table 7

Chi-Square for Hypothesis 13: Service and Importance Factors

Variables	X^2	df	p
1. Creates a culture that promotes learning.	0.000 (Y)	1	0.1000
2. Develops a learning organization.	0.040 (Y)	1	0.8412
3. Bases curricula decisions on research and policies.	1.035 (Y)	1	0.3089
4. Designs curricula with consideration for values, goals, and social needs.	0.567	1	0.4516
5. Aligns curricula and instructional goals and objectives with outcomes.	0.138	1	0.7107
6. Plans for varied learning/teaching styles ethnicity, culture, and social classes.	0.063	1	0.8015
7. Uses a variety of supervisory models.	1.510	1	0.2191
8. Uses a variety of staffing patterns, students groupings, scheduling, and facility designs.	0.291	1	0.5895
9. Uses a variety of techniques to assess student progress.	0.027	1	0.8690
10. Identifies needs and programs that integrate priorities, build faculty, focus on students.	0.011(Y)	1	0.9169
11. Uses adult learning strategies e.g., authentic problems/tasks, coaching, and mentoring.	0.951	1	0.3295
12. Uses job analysis, supervision, and appraisals for instructional and non-instructional staff.	0.032	1	0.8575
13. Formulates and manages a self-development plan, endorsing career-long growth.	0.248	1	0.6187
14. Uses recruiting, selection, induction, separation processes with attention to equity and diversity.	0.007	1	0.9325
15. Negotiates and manages collective bargaining and written agreements.	3.058	2	0.2168
16. Applies principles of growth and development to the learning environment.	0.333 (Y)	1	0.5636
17. Develops a program for advisement, counseling, and guidance services.	0.000	1	1.0000
18. Provides for a safe environment and for student health and welfare.	0.860	1	0.3538
19. Collaborates with community agencies on health, social, and other student services.	2.225	1	0.1358
20. Plans and manages programs for students, cultural, athletic, leadership and scholastic needs.	2.549	1	0.1104

Note. (Y) indicates the Yates Correction was used.

From the table it is evident that no variable showed a significant difference between any of the factors. Hypothesis 13 is therefore retained.

Hypothesis 14

There is no difference among the responses of those with different years of service at the university level to any of the 20 emphasis factors.

This hypothesis was tested by chi-square with an alpha of .01. Where there were expected frequencies of less than 5, response categories were combined. In most cases the first three categories were combined. If in the resulting 2 X 2 table there was still an expected frequency of less than 5, the Yates Correction was used. Table 8 gives the chi-square results for all hypotheses on service and emphasis factors. From the table, it is evident that no variable showed a significant difference between any of the factors. Hypothesis 14 was therefore retained.

Hypothesis 15

There is no difference between the responses of those at universities with traditional programs and those at universities with restructured programs to any of the 20 importance factors.

This hypothesis was tested by chi-square with an alpha of .01. Where there were expected frequencies of less than 5, response categories were combined. In most cases the first three categories were combined. If in the resulting 2 X 2 table there was still an expected frequency of less than 5, the Yates Correction was used. Table 9 gives the chi-square results for all hypotheses on program type and importance factors.

Table 8

Chi-Square for Hypothesis 14: Service and Emphasis Factors

Variables	χ^2	df	p
1. Creates a culture that promotes learning.	2.848	1	0.1150
2. Develops a learning organization.	0.504	1	0.4778
3. Bases curricula decisions on research and policies.	0.860	1	0.3538
4. Designs curricula with consideration for values, goals, and social needs.	2.673	2	0.2627
5. Aligns curricula and instructional goals and objectives with outcomes.	0.948	1	0.6225
6. Plans for varied learning/teaching styles. ethnicity, culture, and social classes.	1.688	2	0.4300
7. Uses a variety of supervisory models.	2.673	2	0.2627
8. Uses a variety of staffing patterns, students groupings, scheduling, and facility designs.	5.171	1	0.2702
9. Uses a variety of techniques to assess student progress.	1.896	2	0.3874
10. Identifies needs and programs that integrate priorities, build faculty, focus on students.	0.599	2	0.7412
11. Uses adult learning strategies e.g., authentic problems/tasks, coaching, and mentoring.	0.599	2	0.7412
12. Uses job analysis, supervision, and appraisals for instructional and non-instructional staff.	0.822	2	0.6630
13. Formulates and manages a self-development plan, endorsing career-long growth.	1.582	2	0.4533
14. Uses recruiting, selection, induction, separation processes with attention to equity and diversity.	1.211	1	0.2712
15. Negotiates and manages collective bargaining and written agreements.	0.322	2	0.8512
16. Applies principles of growth and development to the learning environment.	2.137	2	0.3435
17. Develops a program for advisement, counseling, and guidance services.	0.050	2	0.9752
18. Provides for a safe environment and for student health and welfare.	3.954	2	0.1385
19. Collaborates with community agencies on health, social, and other student services.	4.077	2	0.1302
20. Plans and manages programs for students, cultural, athletic, leadership and scholastic needs.	2.798	2	0.2469

Table 9

Chi-Square for Hypothesis 15: Program Type and Importance Factors

Variables	χ^2	df	p
1. Creates a culture that promotes learning.	0.000 (Y)	1	1.0000
2. Develops a learning organization.	0.009 (Y)	1	0.9262
3. Bases curricula decisions on research and policies.	3.063 (Y)	1	0.0801
4. Designs curricula with consideration for values, goals, and social needs.	3.716 (Y)	1	0.0539
5. Aligns curricula and instructional goals and objectives with outcomes.	1.837 (Y)	1	0.1752
6. Plans for varied learning/teaching styles ethnicity, culture, and social classes.	0.004 (Y)	1	0.9512
7. Uses a variety of supervisory models.	2.667 (Y)	1	0.1024
8. Uses a variety of staffing patterns, students groupings, scheduling, and facility designs.	0.987 (Y)	1	0.3206
9. Uses a variety of techniques to assess student progress.	3.561 (Y)	1	0.0592
10. Identifies needs and programs that integrate priorities, build faculty, focus on students.	6.994 (Y)	1	0.0082*
11. Uses adult learning strategies e.g., authentic problems/tasks, coaching, and mentoring.	0.784 (Y)	1	0.3760
12. Uses job analysis, supervision, and appraisals for instructional and non-instructional staff.	0.000 (Y)	1	1.0000
13. Formulates and manages a self-development plan, endorsing career-long growth.	1.118 (Y)	1	0.2905
14. Uses recruiting, selection, induction, separation processes with attention to equity and diversity.	0.170 (Y)	1	0.6800
15. Negotiates and manages collective bargaining and written agreements.	0.109 (Y)	1	0.7412
16. Applies principles of growth and development to the learning environment.	0.000 (Y)	1	1.0000
17. Develops a program for advisement, counseling, and guidance services.	0.000 (Y)	1	1.0000
18. Provides for a safe environment and for student health and welfare.	0.204 (Y)	1	0.6514
19. Collaborates with community agencies on health, social, and other student services.	0.000 (Y)	1	1.0000
20. Plans and manages programs for students, cultural, athletic, leadership and scholastic needs.	0.004 (Y)	1	0.9512

Note. (Y) indicates the Yates Correction was used.

* indicates the variable was significant at level .01.

Of the 20 variables, only 1 showed a significant difference among traditional and restructured program types, Importance Factor 10: Identifies needs and programs that integrate priorities, build faculty, and focus on students. Table 10 shows the contingency table for this variable.

The table indicates that the participants at traditional universities had a significantly greater tendency to rate this factor as being important, while participants at restructured universities had a significantly greater tendency to rate this variable as being very important.

Table 10

Contingency Table: Program Type and Importance Factor 10

Program Type	Important		Very Important		Totals
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Traditional	5	(71.4)	2	(28.6)	7
Restructured	7	(16.4)	35	(83.3)	42
Totals	12		37		49

Hypothesis 16

There is no difference between the responses of those at universities with traditional programs and those at universities with restructured programs to any of the 20 emphasis factors.

This hypothesis was tested by chi-square with an alpha of .01. Where there were

expected frequencies of less than 5, response categories were combined. In most cases the first three categories were combined. If in the resulting 2 X 2 table there was still an expected frequency of less than 5, the Yates Correction was used. Table 11 gives the chi-square results for all hypotheses on traditional and restructured program types and the 20 emphasis factors.

Of the 20 variables tested, two show a significant difference between traditional and restructured program types; the first is Emphasis Factor 10: Identifies needs and programs that integrate priorities, build faculty, and focus on students. The second one is Emphasis Factor 19: Collaborates with community agencies on health, social, and other student services. Tables 12 and 13 show the contingency tables for differences associated with these two variables.

Table 12 indicates that participants at traditional universities had a significantly greater tendency to rate Emphasis Factor 10: Identifies needs and programs that integrate priorities, build faculty, and focus on students, as being moderately emphasized, while participants at restructured universities had a significantly greater tendency to rate this factor as being strongly emphasized.

Table 13 indicates that participants at traditional universities had a significantly greater tendency to rate Emphasis Factor 19: Collaborates with community agencies on health, social, and other student services, as being slightly emphasized, while participants at restructured universities had a significantly greater tendency to rate this factor as being strongly emphasized.

Table 11

Chi-Square for Hypothesis 16: Program Type and Emphasis Factors

Variables	X^2	df	p
1. Creates a culture that promotes learning.	5.104 (Y)	1	0.0239
2. Develops a learning organization.	0.084 (Y)	1	0.7725
3. Bases curricula decisions on research and policies.	5.104 (Y)	1	0.0239
4. Designs curricula with consideration for values, goals, and social needs.	2.134 (Y)	1	0.1441
5. Aligns curricula and instructional goals and objectives with outcomes.	3.743 (Y)	1	0.0530
6. Plans for varied learning/teaching styles ethnicity, culture, and social classes.	3.442 (Y)	1	0.0636
7. Uses a variety of supervisory models.	6.292 (Y)	1	0.0121
8. Uses a variety of staffing patterns, students groupings, scheduling, and facility designs.	0.823 (Y)	1	0.3642
9. Uses a variety of techniques to assess student progress.	3.281 (Y)	1	0.0701
10. Identifies needs and programs that integrate priorities, build faculty, focus on students.	9.156 (Y)	1	0.0025*
11. Uses adult learning strategies e.g., authentic problems/tasks, coaching, and mentoring.	3.833 (Y)	1	0.0502
12. Uses job analysis, supervision, and appraisals for instructional and non-instructional staff.	0.278 (Y)	1	0.5977
13. Formulates and manages a self-development plan, endorsing career-long growth.	0.987 (Y)	2	0.3206
14. Uses recruiting, selection, induction, separation processes with attention to equity and diversity.	0.170 (Y)	1	0.6800
15. Negotiates and manages collective bargaining and written agreements.	0.000 (Y)	1	1.0000
16. Applies principles of growth and development to the learning environment.	2.134 (Y)	1	0.1441
17. Develops a program for advisement, counseling, and guidance services.	2.043	1	0.3600
18. Provides for a safe environment and for student health and welfare.	0.003 (Y)	1	0.9535
19. Collaborates with community agencies on health, social, and other student services.	8.211 (Y)	1	0.0042*
20. Plans and manages programs for students, cultural, athletic, leadership and scholastic needs.	0.000 (Y)	1	1.0000

Note. (Y) indicates the Yates Correction was used.

* indicates the variable was significant at level .01.

Table 12

Contingency Table: Program Type and Emphasis Factor 10

Type	Moderate Emphasis		Strong Emphasis		Totals
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Traditional	7	(100.0)	0		7
Restructured	13	(31.0)	29	(69.0)	42
Totals	20		29		49

Table 13

Contingency Table: Program Type and Emphasis Factor 19

Type	Slight Emphasis		Strong Emphasis		Totals
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Traditional	5	(71.4)	2	(28.6)	7
Restructured	6	(14.3)	36	(85.7)	42
Totals	11		38		49

Response Summaries

From a random sample of 130 universities with degree programs in educational administration/leadership, 49 participants responded to the questionnaires for this study. The participants were primarily white males, ages 51 or older, with more than 10 years of experience in the university setting. Table 14 summarizes the profile of the participants.

Table 14

Participant Profile

Sex	61.2% Males	Service	26.5% Chairs/instructors
	36.7% Females		44.9% Instructors
Age	2.0% 35 or Younger	Job History	28.6% Less than 5 years
	25.5% 36 to 50		30.6% 6 to 10 years
	69.4% 51 or Older		38.8% More than 10 years
Ethnicity	83.7% Whites	Training	6.1% No experience
	8.2% African Americans		12.2% Administrators
	4.1% Hispanics		14.2% Teachers
	2.0% Other		63.3% Admin/teachers
Position	24.5% Department chairs		98.0%

Note. Percentages were less than 100 because some participants did not answer the question.

The responding participants represented 40 different universities. The majority (85.7%) of these universities were described as restructured. To validate the description, the participants checked the practices that were characteristic of their universities from a list of innovative practices associated with restructured programs. Table 15 presents the percentage of the universities using each practice.

Table 15

University Use of Innovative Practices

Practices	Non Use	Use
1. A focus on leadership	7.5	92.5
2. Performance based	12.5	87.5
3. A coordinated curriculum	27.5	72.5
4. Strategies using adult learning theory	22.5	77.5
5. Recruiting and selection	47.5	52.5
6. Student Cohorts	42.5	57.5
7. Internships	12.5	87.5

The table shows that these innovative practices are widely used by the universities in this study. But there were some discrepancies among of participants from the same university. Of the 9 pairs of chairs and instructors, only 1 pair agreed on every item, 4 disagreed on one item, 3 disagreed on two items, and 1 disagreed on three items. At one university the pair of participants did not agree on program type. One checked traditional and the other checked restructured.

Table 16 shows a summary of the perceptions of the participants about instructional leadership as indicated by their responses to each of the importance factors. Of the 20 factors, 17 (85%) were rated “very important” by more than 50% of participants. All of the nine importance factors in Area I: Curriculum, instruction, and the classroom environment were rated “very important” by more than 50% of the participants. Four of the six factors in the Area II: Public relations and human resources, and four of the five factors in the Area III: Student personnel services were rated “very important” by more than 50% of the participants.

Table 17 shows a summary of the behaviors of the participants as indicated by their responses to the 20 emphasis factors. The ratings for the emphasis factors were lower and more widely dispersed than the ratings for the importance factors. Of the 20 factors, only 8 (40%) were rated “strongly emphasized” by more than 50% of the participants. Six of the factors were from the curriculum, instruction, and learning the environment and two of the factors were from the professional development and human resources. None of the factors receiving a rating of “strong emphasis” by more than 50% of the participants were in student personnel services.

Table 16

Importance Levels

Factors	0	1	2	3	4
1. Creates a culture that promotes learning.	8.2			10.2	81.6
2. Develops a learning organization.	8.2			8.2	83.7
3. Bases curricula decisions on research and policies.	6.1		2.0	6.1	85.7
4. Designs curricula with consideration for values, goals, and social needs.	6.1		2.0	24.5	67.3
5. Aligns curricula and instructional goals and objectives with outcomes.	6.1		2.0	20.4	71.4
6. Plans for varied learning/teaching styles ethnicity, culture, and social classes.	6.1		2.0	26.5	65.3
7. Uses a variety of supervisory models.	6.1	2.0	4.4	24.5	63.3
8. Uses a variety of staffing patterns, students groupings, scheduling, and facility designs.	6.1	2.0	6.1	32.7	53.1
9. Uses a variety of techniques to assess student progress.	10.2	2.0		10.2	77.6
10. Identifies needs and programs that integrate priorities, build faculty designs.	8.2	4.1	12.2	75.5	
11. Uses adult learning strategies e.g., authentic problems/tasks, coaching, and mentoring.	12.2			28.6	59.2
12. Uses job analysis, supervision, and appraisals for instructional and non-instructional staff.	12.2		12.2	26.5	49.0
13. Formulates and manages a self-development plan, endorsing career-long growth.	10.2		6.1	16.3	67.3
14. Uses recruiting, selection, induction, separation processes with attention to equity and diversity.	8.2		8.2	26.5	57.1
15. Negotiates and manages collective bargaining and written agreements.	10.2	6.1	24.5	32.7	26.5
16. Applies principles of growth/ development to the learning environment.	10.2	2.0		12.2	75.5
17. Develops a program for advisement, counseling, and guidance services.	8.2		10.2	44.9	36.7
18. Provides for a safe environment and for student health and welfare,	8.2		8.2	12.2	71.4
19. Collaborates with community agencies on health, social, and other student services.	8.2		8.2	28.6	55.1
20. Plans and manages programs for students, cultural, athletic, leadership and scholastic needs.	8.2		2.0	24.5	65.3

Note. 0 = no response, 1 = not important, 2 = somewhat important, 3 = important, 4 = very important.

Table 17

Emphasis Levels

Factors	0	1	2	3	4
1. Creates a culture that promotes learning.	8.2		2.0	18.4	71.4
2. Develops a learning organization.	8.2			28.6	63.3
3. Bases curricula decisions on research and policies.	6.1		6.1	16.3	71.4
4. Designs curricula with consideration for values, goals, and social needs.	8.2	2.1	10.2	32.7	46.9
5. Aligns curricula and instructional goals and objectives with outcomes.	6.1		10.2	28.6	55.1
6. Plans for varied learning/teaching styles ethnicity, culture, and social classes.	8.2		12.2	40.8	38.8
7. Uses a variety of supervisory models.	6.1		16.3	26.5	51.0
8. Uses a variety of staffing patterns, students groupings, scheduling, and facility designs.	6.1		20.4	36.7	36.7
9. Uses a variety of techniques to assess student progress.	12.2		6.1	28.6	53.1
10. Identifies needs and programs that integrate priorities, build faculty, focus on students.	8.2		4.1	28.6	59.2
11. Uses adult learning strategies e.g., authentic problems/tasks, coaching, and mentoring.	8.2		12.2	38.8	40.8
12. Uses job analysis, supervision, and appraisals for instructional and non-instructional staff.	8.2		14.3	32.7	44.9
13. Formulates and manages a self-development plan, endorsing career-long growth.	8.2		16.3	22.4	53.1
14. Uses recruiting, selection, induction, separation processes with attention to equity and diversity.	8.2	2.1	10.2	36.7	42.9
15. Negotiates and manages collective bargaining and written agreements.	8.2	10.2	34.7	28.6	18.4
16. Applies principles of growth/ development to the learning environment.	10.2	2.0	6.1	34.7	46.9
17. Develops a program for advisement, counseling, and guidance services.	10.2		34.7	38.8	16.3
18. Provides for a safe environment and for student health and welfare.	8.2		4.1	38.8	49.0
19. Collaborates with community agencies on health, social, and other student services.	8.2	2.0	12.2	44.9	32.7
20. Plans and manages programs for students, cultural, athletic, leadership and scholastic needs.	8.2		12.2	34.7	44.9

Note. 0 = no response, 1 = no emphasis, 2 = slight emphasis, 3 = moderate emphasis, 4 = strong emphasis.

Analyzing the Open-ended Questions

In order to develop a more complete understanding of university-based preparation programs, from the perspective of the participants, three open-ended questions were developed for this study. Four of the 49 participants did not respond to any of the open-ended questions. The others responded to one or more questions. The responses received were analyzed for themes, patterns, and key concepts related to the research questions.

Question 1 asked: How do you define instructional leadership?

Forty-three (87.7%) of the participants responded to this question. No formal definition of instructional leadership was included. One participant alluded to formal definitions and authors in the following statement: "Not one definition is used. . . . use several authors but stress the following . . . leading, guiding, and developing personnel in their respective positions by providing professional development, training, time, and dollars to support and enhance growth."

Participants described instructional leadership in terms of one or more administrative tasks. They most commonly (51.1%) defined it as managing teaching and learning. Typical responses were, "Being able to focus a group of people on the teaching and learning in a school." "Leadership that maintains a focus on instruction by diverting human and other resources, e.g., organizational structure, to that end." "It involves the ability to help teachers improve their practices and enhance the learning of their students." Teaching and learning and other themes that emerged are included in Krug's taxonomy. Table 18 presents the number of responses for each of five categories. Twenty-eight of the definitions referred to themes that were found in Krug's Taxonomy.

Table 18

Krug's Taxonomy

Themes	Responses
1. Defining school mission	1
2. Managing curriculum and instructions	22
3. Supervising teaching	4
4. Monitoring student progress	0
5. Promoting an instructional climate	1

Of the 15 remaining definitions, 2 referred to making children first and 13 referred to general leadership themes. These generic definitions made no reference to education. "An influence relationship between leaders and followers who intend real change and reflect mutual purposes." "Working with and through other to achieve goals (usually common goals)." The ability to lead a district or school building in day-by-day "operations and long-term planning." "The ability to empower others." "Servant leadership is the model we teach and use."

Question 2 asked: What strategies do you use in your department/class to promote instructional leadership behaviors?

Most (97.6%) of the responses included one or more adult learning strategies: role play, reflections, simulations, and action research. The strategies compare positively with the innovative practices associated with restructured universities included in this study. Table 19 presents the distribution of the strategies.

Table 19

Participant Use of Innovative Practices

Practices	Responses
1. A focus on leadership	0
2. Performance-based instruction	4
3. Coordinated curriculum	5
4. Adult learning strategies	48
5. Recruitment and selection	0
6. Student cohorts	0
7. Internships	2

There is a discrepancy in the number of participants who identified these characteristics as being a part of their universities and the number who identified them as being a part of their practices. Of the responses that referred to performance-based instruction, 2 referred to standards. One referred to ISLLC standards and the other to NCATE guidelines. Those that mentioned curriculum primarily focused on courses in instructional leadership. Of the 48 strategies that related to adult learning theory, 12 were case studies, 9 were field experiences, 7 were various types of discussions, and 4 were problem-based activities. All others were mentioned less than four times.

Typically there were no differences among the responses of the department chairs, the instructors, and those who do both. However, the department chairs included areas related to professional development and human resources, while the other participants referred only to areas associated with curriculum, instruction, and the learning environment. The following responses are from department chairs.

1. "Consult with faculty on needs, provide resources for instruction, schedule

professional development seminars/workshops.”

2. “(a) Multiple types of assessment, (b) curriculum alignment with standards/goals, (c) inservice activities germane to instruction, (d) delegation of some activities to the department curriculum committee or the assessment committee, (e) advisory council.”

3. “Hiring experts, standards aligned, standards aligned to the course outline.”

Question 3 asked: How satisfied are you that your department/class is providing adequate training in instructional leadership? Please explain your response.

Many of the participants (57.2%) were satisfied to very satisfied with their program. Typical responses were: “Very satisfied, we recently reviewed our program and believe they are in line with department objectives.” “Extremely, our follow-up job surveys with employers indicate strong satisfaction with our graduates.” Table 20 presents the distribution of satisfaction levels.

Table 20

Satisfaction With Training in Instructional Leadership

Satisfaction Level	<i>n</i>	%
1. Satisfied to very satisfied	28	57.2
2. Moderately to somewhat satisfied	9	18.4
3. Dissatisfied	2	4.1
4. No descriptor, but a response	6	12.2
5. No Response	4	8.1

Of the 37 who were satisfied, 8 were satisfied because of the program (new courses and revisions), 6 because of job placement for graduates, 4 because of feedback from graduates, 3 because of graduate performance on state exams, 3 because of the results of reviews or accreditation processes. Of the remaining 13, 5 gave no explanation for their satisfaction levels, and 8 wrote brief general statements such as “have improved lately” and “continually growing.”

Two of those who were somewhat satisfied were in the process of restructuring. The others explained their answer by stating a need. Five needed new approaches to delivery, two needed internship requirements.

There were six who did not give a level of satisfaction but provided explanations. “Great courses but need an internship component.” “It varies tremendously depending upon the teacher.” “We have not stressed best practices--techniques. It may not be enough to leave this to the teachers themselves or to other departments.” “We continue to refine the process.” “In the process of putting additional emphasis on instructional leadership to provide more practical experience.” “Monitored by chair, student feedback, collaboration, services to schools.”

The two participants who were not satisfied had this to say: “No. We are beginning to restructure and we are still in the process.” “Dissatisfied, this department focuses on idiosyncratic particulars without good application or integration.” Although latter was from a traditional program and the former was from a restructured program, those from traditional programs reported a lower levels of satisfaction. Of the 9 who were moderately to somewhat satisfied, 4 were from traditional programs. This represents 57%

of the 7 traditional programs that participated in this study.

Summary

In summary, there was a low response rate. Only 49 professors responded to the questionnaires. The participants were primarily white males, over the age of 51. Slightly more than half of the participants were department chairs, half of whom also taught educational leadership theory. Most had been teaching at the university level for more than 10 years. Most also had experience as both teachers and administrators of elementary, middle, or secondary schools. All of those who responded to the question had formal training in instructional leadership.

The quantitative data show that the majority of the universities in this study were restructured. Most of the 20 importance factors were rated “very high” by more than 50% of the participants. The ratings for the 20 emphasis factors were lower and more widely dispersed among the four categories.

The qualitative data from the open-ended questions showed that most of the participants have a working knowledge of instructional leadership and are using adult learning strategies to provide training in this area. Although some could identify areas in their program that needed improvement, most were also satisfied with the training in instructional leadership provided by their university.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This exploratory study into how traditional and restructured educational administration/leadership programs address instructional leadership resulted in a promising description of preparation programs. Many (85.7%) of the participating professors identified their university as restructured. Although 14.3% of the professors identified their university as traditional, all of the universities were implementing two or more practices associated with restructured programs.

This chapter begins with a brief summary of each of the first three chapters. After which, the research questions and hypotheses are restated. Most of the chapter is devoted to answering the research questions and discussing the findings within the context of institutional homogenization. This concept links together the critical aspects of change in preparation programs. The chapter ends with my conclusions and recommendations for practice and further study.

Summary of the Background and Problem

Instructional leadership is a major factor in school effectiveness and student achievement, yet it is not widely practiced by school principals (Blase & Blase, 1998;

APPENDICES

Fink & Resnick, 2001; McCarthy, 1999a; Smith & Andrews, 1989). The literature identified and classified the possible barriers into three general areas: (a) those related to the school district and the organizational context of the school, (b) those related to the professional norms associated with the principalship, and (c) those related to a lack of knowledge and skills. This study focused on the third barriers, a lack of knowledge and skills. The purpose was to examine how both traditional and restructured programs address instructional leadership in training future principals and to what extent are demographic and institutional characteristics related to how the topic is addressed.

Summary of the Literature

The literature reviewed was both sparse and ambiguous about the specifics of preparation in instructional leadership behaviors. However, the literature did confirm the importance of instructional leadership (Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Sheppard, 1996; Smith & Andrews, 1989; Zigarelli, 1996), the need for wider practice (Fink & Resnick, 2001; Marshall, 1996), and the need for more extensive training in this area (McCarthy, 1999a; Tirozzi, 2001; Usdan, 2002).

Shortly after instructional leadership was identified as pivotal to school effectiveness, public and private agencies began to address the lack of focus and effectiveness in educational administration programs (NPBEA, 1989). From the literature, it appears that the two interests converged and instructional leadership was subsumed in the movement to restructure educational administration programs. Subsequently, innovative practices for more effective programs were identified and

became a part of the reform efforts in many universities. The literature reviewed for this study identified 41 restructured programs. However, only two of these programs are described as having a concentration in instructional leadership: the University of Alabama (Milstein & Krueger, 1997) and California State University at Fresno (Jackson & Kelley, 2002; Milstein & Krueger, 1997). Nevertheless, advocates continue to say instructional leadership is not adequately addressed in preparation programs (McCarthy, 1999a; Tirozzi, 2001; Usdan, 2002).

Summary of the Methodology

I used a survey design to ascertain how instructional leadership was addressed in university-based programs. The department chairs and professors of educational administration/leadership theory, from a random sample of 130 universities, were asked to respond to questions about the training in instructional leadership behaviors at their university. A questionnaire was constructed using the following demographic characteristics: gender, age, ethnicity, position, years at the university level, job history, and training. In addition, a list of innovative practices taken from the literature was turned into a checklist. Finally, three open-ended questions, as well as, 20 Likert-type questions using the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Curriculum Guidelines for Instructional Leadership were developed.

Two questionnaires were sent to the department chairs. Each was asked to complete a questionnaire and to request the professor who teaches educational leadership theory to complete the second questionnaire. If the chair also taught educational

leadership theory, the second questionnaire was to be discarded. There were 49 responses. The returned questionnaires represented 40 universities.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

To guide this study, four research questions were developed.

1. What are the perceptions of department chairs and professors of educational administration/leadership theory regarding the importance of instructional leadership behaviors?
2. To what extent do department chairs and professors of educational administration/leadership theory emphasize instructional leadership behaviors?
3. Are there differences between the way traditional and restructured educational administration/leadership programs address instructional leadership as it relates to the preparation of school leaders?
4. To what extent are demographic characteristics related to the way instructional leadership is addressed?

Based on the research questions, two research hypotheses were formulated.

1. There is a difference in the way instructional leadership is addressed, as perceived by the department chairs and professors of educational administration/leadership, in traditional and restructured programs.
2. The way department chairs and professors of educational/administration leadership theory address instructional leadership is related to demographic characteristics.

Discussion and Findings

From the two research hypotheses, 16 null hypotheses were developed. The 20 NCATE Curriculum Guidelines for Instructional Leadership were used as importance and emphasis factors to test the null hypotheses. The differences were negligible. Only 8 of the 16 null hypotheses could be tested because of the low response rate (37.6%). Three of the 8 were retained. There were 5 significant differences among the variables tested. Therefore, the two research hypotheses were not fully supported by the results. A summary of the responses to the 20 factors is presented in Table 21. The factors are divided into three areas: (a) Curriculum, instructional, and the learning environment; (b) Professional development and human resources; and (c) Student personnel services.

Although there was only partial support for the hypotheses, the findings of this study do provide a description of how instructional leadership is addressed in university-based preparation programs. The discussion of the findings is organized around the four research questions and uses both the results of the hypotheses testing and the responses to the open-ended questions. The discussion integrates the results of this study with the existing literature within the conceptual framework of institutional homogenization.

As a form of change, institutional homogenization is subtle and different in origin from evolution or reformation. It is fueled by pressure to conform and become like other institutions within the institutional environment rather than a desire to be more effective. Institutional homogenization offers a possible explanation of how change takes place within the university environment and could help identify interventions to alter some of the structural and normative aspects of preparation programs.

Table 21

Importance/Emphasis Levels

Factors	1	2	3	4
Area I. Curriculum, Instruction, and Learning Environment				
1. Creates a culture that promotes learning.	0.0/ 0.0	0.0/ 2.0	10.2/18.4	81.6/71.4
2. Develops a learning organization.	0.0/ 0.0	0.0/ 0.0	8.2/28.6	83.7/63.3
3. Bases curricula decisions on research and policies.	0.0/ 0.0	2.0/ 6.1	6.1/16.3	85.7/71.4
4. Designs curricula with consideration for values, goals, and social needs.	0.0/12.1	2.0/10.2	24.5/32.7	67.3/46.9
5. Aligns curricula and instructional goals and objectives with outcomes.	0.0/ 0.0	2.0/10.2	20.4/28.6	71.4/55.1
6. Plans for varied learning/teaching styles ethnicity, culture, and social classes.	0.0/ 0.0	2.0/12.2	26.5/40.8	65.3/38.8†
7. Uses a variety of supervisory models.	2.0/ 0.0	4.4/16.3	24.5/26.5	63.3/51.0
8. Uses a variety of staffing patterns, students groupings, scheduling, and facility designs.	2.0/ 0.0	6.1/20.4	32.7/36.7	53.1/36.7†
9. Uses a variety of techniques to assess student progress.	2.0/ 0.0	0.0 / 6.1	0.2/28.6	77.6/53.1
Area II. Professional Development and Human Resources				
10. Identifies needs and programs that integrate priorities, build faculty and focus on learning.	0.0/ 0.0	4.1/ 4.1	12.2/28.6	75.5/59.2
11. Uses adult learning strategies e.g., authentic problems/tasks, coaching, and mentoring.	0.0/ 0.0	0.0 /12.2	28.6/38.8	59.2/40.8†
12. Uses job analysis, supervision, and appraisals for instructional and non-instructional staff.	0.0/ 0.0	12.2/14.3	26.5/32.7	*49.0/44.9†
13. Formulates and manages a self-development plan, endorsing career-long growth.	0.0/ 0.0	6.1/16.3	16.3/22.4	67.3/53.1
14. Uses recruiting, selection, induction, separation processes with attention to equity and diversity.	0.0/ 2.1	8.2/10.2	26.5/36.7	57.1/42.9†
15. Negotiates and manages collective bargaining and written agreements.	6.1/10.2	24.5/34.7	32.7/28.6	*26.5/18.4†
Area III. Student Personnel Services				
16. Applies principles of growth/ development to the learning environment.	2.0/ 2.0	0.0/ 6.1	12.2/34.7	75.5/46.9†
17. Develops a program for advisement, counseling, and guidance services.	0.0/ 0.0	10.2/34.7	44.9/38.8	* 36.7/16.3†
18. Provides for a safe environment and for student health and welfare.	0.0/ 0.0	8.2/ 4.1	12.2/38.8	71.4/49.0†
19. Collaborates with community agencies on health, social, and other student services.	0.0/ 2.0	8.2/12.2	28.6/44.9	55.1/32.7†
20. Plans and manages programs for students, cultural, athletic, leadership and scholastic needs.	0.0/ 0.0	2.0/12.2	24.5/34.7	65.3/44.9†

Note. 1 = not important/no emphasis, 2 = somewhat important/slight emphasis, 3 = important/moderate emphasis, 4 = very important/strong emphasis.

Percentages are less than 100 because some participants did not respond to the question.

* Factors not rated as "very important" by more than 50% of the participants.

† Factors not rated as receiving a "strong emphasis" by more than 50% of the participants.

Research Question 1

Question 1 asked: What are the perceptions of department chairs and professors of educational administration/leadership theory regarding the importance of instructional leadership behaviors?

Based on the responses to the 20 “importance” factors, 17 (85%) were rated “very important” by more than half of the participants. All of the importance factors in the area of curriculum, instruction, and the classroom environment were rated “very important” by more than 50% of the participants. Four of the six factors (66%) in the area of professional development and human resources, and four of the five factors (80%) in the area of student personnel services were rated “very important” by more than 50% of the participants. The profiles of these participants varied widely and showed no patterns of demographic or institutional characteristics.

Responses to the open-ended questions supported parts of the quantitative findings. Department chairs, professors, and professors who served in both positions stated that behaviors related to the area of curriculum, instruction, and the learning environment were important in defining instructional leadership behaviors. However, only those who serve as department chairs, exclusively, identified behaviors related to the area of professional development and human resources as important. There were no references to pupil personnel services in the responses to the open-ended questions.

Although it is generally agreed that it is appropriate for professors to value and place stronger emphasis on tasks that relate directly to teaching and learning, supporting tasks should not be neglected. The three importance behaviors that did not receive a

rating of “very important,” Factors 12, 15, and 17, by more than half of the participants, were not directly related to teaching and learning. Yet teacher supervision, student advisement, and negotiations on behalf of teachers play a role in these processes. Teacher supervision has been identified as a major component in instructional leadership (Krug, 1992; Smith & Andrews, 1989; Stronge, 1993). However, Factor 12: Job analysis, supervision, and appraisals for instructional and non-instructional staff was not rated as “very important” by more than half of the participants. The problem may have been in the construction of the factor itself. It is ambiguous. Factor 12 refers to both instructional and non-instructional staff. This may have caused the participants to give the factor a lower rating. A professor teaching a course on instructional leadership is not likely to address issues of non-instructional staff.

The other two factors that were not rated “very important” by more than half of the participants, also mediate instruction and student achievement. Research shows that Factor 15: A program for student advisement, counseling, and guidance services, may be necessary before learning is possible for some students. Similarly, but perhaps not as emphatically, negotiating agreements on behalf of teachers relates to student achievement. Agreements on compensation, benefits, and working conditions impact job satisfaction and subsequently teacher commitment and performance (Blase & Blase, 1999; Sergiovanni & Carver, 1980; Smith & Andrews, 1989).

The disconnect between what is addressed in preparation programs and some of the issues future practitioners will face in the work place were noted by Murphy (2002) and Cambron-McCabe (as cited in Young & Petersen, 2002). The lack of attention to

supporting tasks is also consistent with a study of the participants in the Danforth Foundation Program for the Preparation of School Principals (Danforth Foundation, 1992). In the study, topics not perceived as directly related to instruction and learning rarely received “high” ratings. A possible reason is these topics may conflict with preconceived notions of what is legitimate content and what is not.

One of the ways in which individuals learn to accept institutional norms is by accepting their historical significance within the institutional environment (Bjork & Richardson, 1997). Factors 12, 15, and 17 are relatively new instructional leadership behaviors. This lack of historical significance may also account for the lack of importance placed on student personnel services by any of the participants to the open-ended questions.

Research Question 2

Question 2 asked: To what extent do department chairs and professors of educational administration/leadership theory emphasize instructional leadership behaviors?

Based on the responses to the 20 emphasis factors developed from the NCATE standards, only 8 (40%) of the factors received a rating of “strong emphasis” by more than 50% of the participants. Six of the behaviors were from the area of curriculum, instruction, and the learning environment:

Emphasis Factor 1: Creates a culture that promotes learning.

Emphasis Factor 2: Develops a learning organization.

Emphasis Factor 3: Bases curricula decisions on research and policies.

Emphasis Factor 5: Aligns curricula and instructional goals and objectives with outcomes.

Emphasis Factor 7: Uses a variety of supervisory models.

Emphasis Factor 9: Uses a variety of techniques to assess student progress.

The two remaining factors were from the area of professional development and human resources:

Emphasis Factor 10: Identifies needs and programs that integrate priorities, builds faculty, and focuses on student learning.

Emphasis Factor 13: Formulates and manages a self-development plan, endorsing career-long growth.

None of the factors receiving a rating of “strong emphasis” by more than 50% of the participants were in the area of student personnel services. Only 16.3% of the participants emphasized counseling and guidance services for students.

In responding to the open-ended questions related to research question 2, participants listed behaviors similar to the 8 factors that are being strongly emphasized to substantiate why they were satisfied with the instructional leadership training provided by their university. In the following example from the responses, “We recently reviewed our programs and believe they are in line with department objectives,” the participant reflected Factor 5: Aligns curricula and instructional goals and objectives with outcomes.

Although the findings indicate that the 20 factors were being emphasized, two items prevalent in the literature did not receive a “strong emphasis” rating from more than

50 % of the participants: diversity and student services. Factor 14: Uses recruiting, selection, induction, separation processes with attention to equity and diversity was rated “strong emphasis” by 42.9% of the participants. Even more strikingly, items on student growth and development, counseling, safety, health, and programming did not receive a rating of “strong emphasis” by more than that 50% of the participants.

The ratings for the emphasis factors were also lower and more widely distributed among the four categories than they were for the importance factors. For example, Factor 3: Bases curricula decisions on research and policies, received the highest percentage (85.7%) of the “very important” ratings. Factor 3 also received the highest percentage (71.4%) of the “strong emphasis” ratings, but the emphasis level was considerably lower than the importance level. A similar pattern is seen in factors that received low ratings. Factor 15: Negotiate and manages collective bargaining and written agreements received the lowest (26.5%) percentage of the “very important” ratings and next to the lowest (18.4 %) of the “strong emphasis” ratings.

This discrepancy between what professors do and what they value is in harmony with the findings of several studies on how principals spend their time. In these studies principals allocated more time to instructional leadership in writing than to general management, but in actuality, spent more time performing general management tasks than providing instructional leadership (Heck & Marcoulides, 1993; Krajewski, 1978; Smith & Andrews, 1989). The reasons associated with the lack of practice include structures related to how schools are organized, professional norms, and a lack of knowledge and skills (Smith & Andrews, 1989). It is reasonable that these barriers exist for university

professors as well, since they are in a similar (and in a broader sense, the same) institutional environment.

New institutional theory suggests that these discrepancies relate primarily to the professional norms and concomitantly to the structures of the university environments. To maintain the legitimacy of the university, a model for performance may be perpetuated although it is recognized that another course of action would be more effective. When new faculty join the university environment, these models are already in place and provide a normative understanding of “the way things are done here.”

Meyer and Scott (1991, as cited in Rowan & Miskel, 1999) make a distinction between institutional environments (such as schools) in which the demands and rewards are for conformity and technical environments (such as business firms) in which the demands and rewards are for performance. Traditionally, education has been a weak technical environment, but a strong institutional environment. A demand for change in an institutional environment such as that of the university before it reaches critical mass, might appear to be a threat to the legitimacy of the university because it is not “the way things are done.”

This does not mean new ideas never gain legitimacy or that an institutional environment is fixed. “Under some conditions . . . interested parties institutionalize demands for better practice” (Rowan & Miskel, 1999, p. 365). The findings of this study suggest that after years of pressure from public and private agencies within the institutional environment, institutional homogenization, a process of conformity, is taking place under the guise of reform.

Over the past 20 years, there have been institutional-building activities by interested parties or parties within the environment such as funding for research or new policies. The Danforth Foundation was a major supporter of reform in educational leadership programs. The University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) worked to provide a knowledge and skills base for school leaders. As institutional-building activities are institutionalized, universities comply to maintain legitimacy as a university (Rowan & Miskel, 1999). The universities in this study may have experienced a demand for more performance at a time when there was no longer the conflicting demand for more conformity because performance had become (or is becoming) the criteria for legitimacy.

Research Question 3

Question 3 asked: Are there differences between the way instructional leadership is addressed, as perceived by the department chairs and professors of educational administration/ leadership, in traditional and restructured programs?

There were three significant differences between traditional and restructured programs:

1. Participants from programs identified as traditional had a greater tendency (71.4%) to rate Importance Factor 10: Identifies needs and programs that integrate priorities, build faculty, and focus on student learning “important,” while participants from programs identified as restructured had a greater tendency (83.3%) to rate this behavior “very important.”

2. Participants from programs identified as traditional had a greater tendency (100%) to rate Emphasis Factor 10: Identifies needs and programs that integrate priorities, build faculty, and focus on student learning as receiving “moderate emphasis,” while participants from programs identified as restructured had a greater tendency (69.0%) to rate this behavior as receiving “strong emphasis.”

Participants from restructured programs tended to rate the 20 factors higher than professors from traditional programs. These two findings above also indicate that professors from universities identified as restructured had fewer discrepancies between what they perceived to be important and what they actually emphasized in their classes. They rated Factor 10 “very important” and also rated it as receiving “strong emphasis.”

3. Participants from programs identified as traditional had a greater tendency (71.4%) to rate Emphasis Factor 19: Collaborates with community agencies on health, social, and other student services, as receiving “slight emphasis,” while participants from programs identified as restructured had a greater tendency (85.7%) to rate this behavior as receiving “strong emphasis.”

Like Factors 12, 15, and 17, Factor 19 is a relatively new instructional leadership behavior and does not have historical significance within the university environment. The relationship between academic achievement and well being did not gain prominence in education until the 1970s (Grogan & Andrews, 2002).

The responses to the open-ended questions revealed that there were very few differences between the responses of the participants from traditional and restructured programs. However, participants from traditional programs were less satisfied with their

programs and could list needs that, if provided, would make the programs more effective.

The responses also revealed that some courses had been revised and new courses had been developed to support the emphasis on instructional leadership. This has at least two positive implications about the university environment. First, either the professors saw the need for change or there were mandates for the change. Professors do not readily develop new courses. Obtaining approval for a new course is a time-consuming process that professors try to circumvent by changing the content, without changing the course title (McCarthy, 1999b). Second, new courses may also represent changes in the preparation of the professors. Course offerings are also limited by the specializations of the faculty (McCarthy, 1999b). Although training and specialization are not synonymous, 98% of the participants in this study had formal training in instructional leadership.

It appears that the universities in this study have restructured or are in the process of restructuring. Most participants (85.7%) identified their university as restructured and the patterns of practice they described were consistent with what was recommended in the literature. Using the seven innovative practices associated with restructured programs: (a) focus on leadership, (b) performance-based standards, (c) a coordinated curriculum, (d) strategies based on adult learning theory, (e) recruitment and selection process, (f) student cohorts, and (g) an internship with an experienced mentor, to verify the responses of the participants, this study shows that there are very few traditional programs.

Although some universities may not have had formal plans to restructure, a process of homogenization has taken place. The participants (14.3%) that identified their university as traditional, also indicated the use of two or more innovative practices.

Among these practices was a focus on leadership. Most of the universities (92.5%) in this study have a focus on leadership. This is in harmony with the finding by McCarthy (1999b) that the only consistent change in preparation programs has been from a focus on the principal as plant manager to a focus on the principal as leader. Of the 49 universities studied, 87.5% were also performance-based and used the ISLLC, NCATE or similar performance standards. Other practices were not as widespread, but many were being implemented at some level by the universities in this study.

Research Question 4

Question 4 asked: To what extent are demographic characteristics related to the way instructional leadership is addressed?

The relationship between the demographic characteristics and the way instructional leadership is addressed was very small. Out of 280 possibilities, there were only two significant relationships among the seven demographic characteristics (gender, age level, ethnicity, position, years of service at the university level, job history, and training) and both were related to age:

1. Participants, ages 50 or younger had a greater tendency (71.4%) to rate Importance Factor 10: Identifies needs and programs that integrate priorities, build faculty, and focus on student learning as “important,” while participants ages 51 and older had a greater tendency to rate this behavior as “very important.”

2. Participants, ages 50 or younger had a greater tendency to rate Emphasis Factor 18: Provide for a safe environment and for health and welfare, as receiving “moderate

emphasis,” while participants, ages 51 or older (61.8%), tended to rate this behavior as receiving “strong emphasis.”

Although the relationship to age is important, particularly since many (69.4%) of the professors in this study were ages 51 or older, there were no relationships to age among the responses to the open-ended questions. However, because the question relates to demographics as a whole, it should be noted that there were differences in the responses to the open-ended questions based on the position held by the participants. While the department chairs, the professors, and those who serve in both positions referred to behaviors related to curriculum, instruction, and the classroom environment, only those who serve exclusively as department chairs referred to behaviors related to professional development and human resources.

Findings

Based on the results of the hypotheses testing using the NCATE Program Standards for Instructional Leadership as importance and emphasis factors and the responses to the open-ended questions, there are four major findings of this study.

1. The participants of this study perceived instructional leadership behaviors, as outlined in the 20 factors, to be important.
2. The participants of this study were emphasizing the 20 factors at some level in their classes.
3. There was very little difference in the way traditional and restructured programs address instructional leadership.

4. The only relationships between the demographic characteristics and the way instructional leadership was addressed was by age and the positions held by the participating professors (department chair, professor, or both).

Conclusions

The results generated by this study both expand and support current literature on instructional leadership and allow me to draw four conclusions:

1. The department chairs and professors of educational administration/leadership programs emphasize and perceive instructional leadership behaviors, as outlined in the NCATE Program Standards for Instructional Leadership, to be important, particularly those in the area of curriculum, instruction, and the learning environment.
2. There are discrepancies between the level of importance given to instructional leadership behaviors and the level of emphasis placed on the same instructional leadership behaviors.
3. Most of the preparation programs were identified as restructured. However, there were very few differences in the way traditional and restructured programs address instructional leadership. Traditional programs are using some of the same practices as restructured programs.
4. The way instructional leadership is addressed has only a small relationship to the demographic characteristics used in this study. The structures of the university determine how instructional leadership is addressed. These structures reflect the

norms of the university environment. The only statistically significant finding among the demographic characteristics was by age, however the open-ended questions showed a relation to the participants' position and as well.

The findings suggest that these conclusions relate to institutional homogenization. Change in the university environment is complex and involves perceptions of legitimacy as well as a need to be more effective. Notwithstanding this caveat, important changes have taken place in educational administration/leadership programs within the last decade.

Recommendations for Practice and for Further Research

Although the generalizability of the results are limited by the sampling procedures and the qualitative nature of some of the questions, the results do suggest several recommendations for practice and for further study.

Every school should have a principal who functions as the instructional leader, who knows what effective instruction looks like, how to evaluate it, and how to help teachers improve their instructional practices. To accomplish this, universities must continue to strengthen preparation programs. The legitimacy of the university lies in its ability to continuously conduct, synthesize, and apply research. The findings of this study suggest opportunities to strengthen preparation programs in areas related to student personnel services and other administrative practices that mediate teaching and learning.

1. Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that university-based preparation programs emphasize the linkages that strengthen the connections between the theory and the practice of instructional leadership.

2. Since school districts will employ the prospective principals that are trained in university-based programs, it is recommended that school districts become advocates for adequate training in the skills of instructional leadership.

3. Because many of the practitioners now in service do not have adequate training in instructional leadership, it is recommended that instructional leadership becomes a focus in professional development and that school districts partner with universities to provide inservice programs for current principals.

4. To overcome the limitations of this study and to fill in remaining gaps, it is recommended that this study be replicated using a larger sample and sending questionnaires directly to both the department chairs and the professors. Additionally, the list of innovative practices could be eliminated and the participants justify their description of their university as traditional or restructured in an open-form response.

5. Based on the number of participants who identified new courses, another recommendation would be a content analysis of the courses designed for the study of instructional leadership. In addition to information on content, it could include such questions as, How do the new courses fit into the curriculum? Do they replace traditional courses such as curriculum development or supervision? What are the strategies used for delivery?

6. To determine the effectiveness of restructured programs, it is recommended that these programs be studied from at least two perspectives: (a) to ask principals about the effects of the program on their performance and (b) to ask teachers about the nature and effects of the principal's interactions on their performance as classroom teachers.

Summary

Studies show that although instructional leadership is not routinely practiced by school principals, it is a major factor in school effectiveness. One of the reasons for a lack of practice is inadequate preparation in the skills and knowledge of instructional leadership behaviors. Public and private agencies have called into question the assumption that inert discipline-based theories that lack related linkages or opportunity for practice, could produce an effective instructional leader. As a result, a cadre of innovative practices have been identified to restructure preparation programs. By exploring how traditional and restructured programs address instructional leadership, this study examined the perceptions about these innovations and the extent to which they were being implemented.

The findings show that institutional homogenization is taking place within the university environment. Whether a conscious or unconscious decision to conform to maintain legitimacy or to be more effective, most of the universities in this study are perceived to be restructured by the participants in this study. The participants perceive the instructional leadership behaviors, outlined in the NCATE Program Standards, to be important and were emphasizing these behaviors in their classes.

The analysis of the qualitative data shows that the participants have a working knowledge of instructional leadership and are making a concerted effort to use the structures, content, and methods of delivery necessary to prepare principals who are able to support teaching and learning. Ultimately, this study shows that substantial progress was made in instructional leadership training when the institutional environment, the university, its supporting and receiving agencies, addressed the same issues.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

By taking the time to complete this questionnaire, you imply your consent to participate in this survey.

**A Survey on How Instructional Leadership is Addressed
in Educational Administration/Leadership Programs**

Part I. The Professor - ✓ Check all that apply.

Gender: 1. ☐ Male 2. ☐ Female	10. ☐ Other Background Current Position(s): 11. ☐ Department Chair 12. ☐ Professor of Educational/ Administration Theory	17. ☐ Elementary, Middle or Secondary School Vice Principal 18. ☐ Elementary, Middle or Secondary School Principal 19. ☐ Central Office Personnel
Age: 3. ☐ Less than 35 4. ☐ 36 to 50 5. ☐ More than 51	Years at the University Level: 13. ☐ Five years or less 14. ☐ Six to 10 years 15. ☐ More than 10 years	Training: 20. ☐ I have had formal course work in educational administration/leadership theory. 21. ☐ I have not had formal course work in educational administration/ leadership theory.
Ethnicity: 6. ☐ White American 7. ☐ African American 8. ☐ Hispanic American 9. ☐ Asian American	Job History: 16. ☐ Elementary, Middle or Secondary School Teacher	

Part II. The Educational Administration/Leadership Program - ✓ Check all that apply.

1. What word best describes the Educational Administration/Leadership program at your university?

- (a) ☐ Traditional (has not made major changes in content and delivery during the last fifteen years)
(b) ☐ Restructured (has made major changes in content and delivery during the last fifteen years)

2. Which of the following characteristics is a part of your Educational Administration/Leadership program?

- (a) ☐ A focus on leadership based on influence, ethics, and group processing
(b) ☐ Performance-based founded on measurable criteria, e.g., NCATE, ISLLC Standards.
(c) ☐ A coordinated curriculum that sequences core experiences.
(d) ☐ Strategies based on adult learning theory, e.g., problem-based learning, theory-to- practice activities.
(e) ☐ A process for recruiting and selecting candidates based on the demands of the principalship, including personal characteristics and diversity.
(f) ☐ Student cohorts, fixed groups taking classes and completing the program together.
(g) ☐ Internships with mentoring by experienced administrators.

Part III. Perspective on Instructional Leadership

1. How do you define instructional leadership? _____

2. What strategies do you use to promote instructional leadership behaviors in your educational administration department/class? _____

3. How satisfied are you that your department/ class is providing adequate training in instructional leadership behaviors? Please explain your response. _____

Part IV. NCATE Guidelines for Instructional Leadership

Circle a number on the left to indicate the importance of each guideline. Circle a number on the right to indicate the extent to which each guideline is emphasized in your educational administration program/class.

Importance Level				Circle one number on each scale	Emphasis Level			
Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important		No Emphasis	Slight Emphasis	Moderate Emphasis	Strong Emphasis
Curriculum, Instruction, Supervision and the Learning Environment								
1	2	3	4	1. Create with teachers, parents, and students a positive school culture that promotes learning.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	2. Develop collaboratively a learning organization that supports instructional improvement, builds an appropriate curriculum, and incorporates best practices.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	3. Base curricular decisions on research, applied theory, informed practice, the recommendations of learned societies, and state and federal policies.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	4. Design curricula with consideration for the philosophical, sociological, and historical foundations, democratic and community values, goals, social needs and changes.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	5. Align curricula goals and objectives with instructional goals and objectives and desired outcomes when developing scope, sequence, balance etc.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	6. Develop with others curriculum and instruction appropriate for varied teaching and learning styles and specific student needs based on gender, ethnicity, culture, social class and exceptionalities.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	7. Utilize a variety of supervisory models to improve teaching and learning.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	8. Use various staffing patterns, student grouping plans, class scheduling forms, school organizational structures, and facilities design processes, to support various teaching strategies and desired student outcomes.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	9. Assess student progress using a variety of appropriate techniques.	1	2	3	4
Professional Development and Human Resources								
1	2	3	4	10. Work with faculty and other stakeholders to identify needs for professional development, to organize, facilitate, and evaluate professional development programs, to integrate district and school priorities, to build faculty as resource, and to ensure that professional development activities focus on improving student outcomes.	1	2	3	4

1	2	3	4	11. Apply adult learning strategies to professional development, focusing on authentic problems and tasks, and utilizing mentoring, coaching, conferencing and other techniques to ensure that new knowledge and skills are practiced in the workplace.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	12. Apply effective job analysis procedures, supervisory techniques and performance appraisals for instructional and non instructional staff.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	13. Formulate and implement a self-development plan, endorsing the value of career-long growth, and utilizing a variety of resources for continuing professional development.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	14. Identify and apply appropriate policies, criteria and processes for the recruitment, selection, induction, compensation and separation of personnel, with attention to issues of equity and diversity.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	15. Negotiate and manage effectively collective bargaining or written agreements.	1	2	3	4
				Student Personnel Services				
1	2	3	4	16. Apply the principles of student growth and development to the learning environment and the educational program.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	17. Develop with the counseling and teaching staff a full program of student advisement, counseling, and guidance services.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	18. Develop and administer policies that provide a safe school environment and promote student health and welfare.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	19. Address student and family conditions affecting learning by collaborating with community agencies to integrate health, social, and other services for students.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	20. Plan and manage programs to fulfill student development, social, cultural, athletic, leadership and scholastic needs; working with staff, students, families and community.	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX B
Lolethia Kibble
8440 Hines Road
Disputanta, VA 23842
Phone/Fax (804) 541-9003

November 2002

Dear Department Chair:

I am a doctoral student at Andrews University working on my dissertation. My focus is instructional leadership. The purpose of the enclosed questionnaire is to learn how preparation programs address the practice of instructional leadership and to what extent promoting instructional leadership is influenced by institutional and demographic factors. The results from this study can help to provide a criteria for addressing instructional leadership more effectively.

However to determine the suitability of the instrument for this purpose, I need the cooperation of professors like yourself to participate in the pilot study. Please complete the enclosed survey and assessment.

Begin by entering your starting time on the one-page assessment and complete the questionnaire. After completing the questionnaire, write your completion time and complete the assessment questionnaire. Please return the completed forms in the enclosed envelop prior to December 15, 2002.

Thank you for your time and your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Lolethia Kibble

Questionnaire Assessment

Directions: Fill in the beginning time and complete the questionnaire. Then fill in the completion time and complete the assessment.

Beginning Time ____ / Completion time ____

Directions: Circle T(true) or F (False) to each statement and add comments, e.g. suggestions, re-wordings.

Part I: The Professor

T F This section is easy to understand as worded.

Comments _____

Part II: The Educational Administration/ Leadership Program

T F This section is easy to understand as worded.

T F Professors of Educational Leadership should be able to understand the questions in a consistent way.

T F Professors of Educational Leadership should be able to answer the questions accurately.

Comments on #1: _____

Comments on #2: _____

- (a) _____
- (b) _____
- (c) _____
- (d) _____
- (e) _____
- (f) _____
- (g) _____

Part III: Perspective on Instructional Leadership

T F Professors in Ed Lead should be able to understand the questions in a consistent way.

T F Professors in Ed Lead should be able to answer the questions accurately.

Comments _____

Part IV: NCATE Standards for Instructional Leadership

T F The directions are clear.

T F This section is easy to understand as worded.

T F Professors of Ed Lead should be able to understand the questions in a consistent way.

T F Professors of Ed Lead should be able to answer the questions accurately.

Comments _____

Thank You!

APPENDIX C

Lolethia Kibble
8440 HINES ROAD
DISPUTANTA, VA 23842
PHONE/FAX (804) 541-9003

February 2003

Dear Department Chairperson:

I am a doctoral student at Andrews University working on my dissertation. My focus is instructional leadership. The purpose of the enclosed questionnaire is to learn how preparation programs address the practice of instructional leadership and to what extent promoting instructional leadership is influenced by institutional and demographic factors. The results from this survey could potentially be used to make decisions about more effective preparation programs for aspiring school principals.

However to gather the information necessary to complete the study, I need the firsthand knowledge of department chairs, like yourself. Please complete one of the enclosed questionnaires and ask the professor who teaches educational leadership theory, to complete and mail the second questionnaire. However, if you teach educational leadership theory, discard the second questionnaire. The average completion time is 15 minutes. For your convenience and to help assure confidentiality, I have enclosed two stamped, pre-addressed envelopes. I would appreciate it if the completed questionnaire(s) is returned by March 14, 2003.

By taking the time to complete the enclosed questionnaire, you imply your consent to participate in this survey. All responses will be held in the strictest confidence. If you would like to have a summary of the survey results, please enclose your business card.

Thank you for your time and your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Lolethia Kibble

REFERENCE LIST

REFERENCE LIST

- Acheson, K., & Smith, S.C. (1986). *It is time for principals to share the responsibility of instructional leadership with others*. Eugene, OR: Oregon School Study Council.
- Anderson, P. K. (2001, June). But what if . . . supporting leaders and learners. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(10), 737-39.
- Andrews, R.L. & Hallett, J. (1983). *A study of the perception and performance of the role of principals in Washington state*. Seattle: University of Washington.
- Andrews, R. L., & Soder, R. (1987). Principal leadership and student achievement. *Educational Leadership*, 44(2), 9-11.
- Barnett, B. G., Basom, M. R., Yerkes, D. M., & Norris, C. J. (2000). Cohorts in educational leadership programs: Benefits, difficulties, and the potential for developing school leaders. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(2), 255-282.
- Beck, L. G., & Murphy, J. (1993). *Understanding the principalship: Metaphorical themes, 1920-1990*. New York: Teachers' College Press.
- Bennis, W. (1984, August). The four competencies of leadership. *Training and Development Journal*, 38(8), 15-19.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: Strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Bjork, L.G., & Richardson, M. D. (1997, Fall). Institutional barriers to educational leadership training: A case study. *The Educational Forum*, 62, 74-81.
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (1998). *Handbook of instructional leadership: How really good principals promote teaching and learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (1999). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(3), 349-378.

- Bossert, S., Dwyer, D., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(3), 34-64.
- Brookover, W., & Lezotte, L. (1977). *Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Bridges, E. (1982). Research on the school administrator: The state-of-the-art, 1967-1980. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(3), 12-33.
- Bulach, C., Boothe, D., & Pickett, W. (1998). "Should not" for school principals: Teachers share their views. *ERS Spectrum*, 16(1), 16-20.
- Caffarella, R. S. (1993). Self-directed learning. In S. B. Merriam (Ed.), *An update on adult learning theory* (pp. 25-36). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Chase, F. S. (1953). Professional leadership and teacher morale. *Administrator's Notebook*, 1, 1-4.
- Clark, D. C., & Clark, S. N. (1997). Addressing dilemmas inherent in educational leadership preparation programs through collaborative restructuring. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 72(2), 21-41.
- Cohen, J. (1971). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. New York: Academic Press.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). *Interstate school leaders' licensure consortium: Standards for school leaders*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2001). *Interstate school leaders' licensure consortium*. Retrieved March 2002, from <http://www.ccsso.org/isllc.html>
- Coutts, J. D. (1997, Fall). Why principals fail: Are national standards valid measures of principals' performance? *ERS Spectrum*, 15(4), 20-24.
- Danforth Foundation. (1992). *Taking stock: A study of the Danforth Programs for the Preparation of School Principals*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Dares, J. C. (1997, January). Improving principal preparation: A review of common strategies. *NASSP Bulletin*, 81(585), 3-8.

- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147-160.
- Donmoyer, R. (1999). The continuing quest for a knowledge base: 1976-1998. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration: A project of the American Educational Research Association* (2nd ed., pp. 25-41). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Drake, T. L., & Roe W. H. (1986). *The principalship* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Duke, D. (1992, June). The rhetoric and the reality of reform in educational administration. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 73(10), 764-770.
- Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 15-23.
- Ellis, A. K., & Fouts, J. T. (1993). Effective schools movement. In *Research on educational innovation* (pp. 75-870. Princeton Junction, NJ: Eye On Education.
- Fink, E., & Resnick, L. B. (2001, April). Developing principals as instructional leaders. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(8), 598-606.
- Fullan, M. (1982). *The meaning of educational change*. New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Ginsberg, R. (1996). The new institutionalism, the new science, persistence and change: The power of faith in schools. In R. Cowson, W. Boyd, & H. Mawhinney (Eds.), *In The politics of education and the new institutionalism: Reinventing the American school* (pp. 153-166). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- Gray, T. (2001, May). Principal internships: Five tips for a successful and rewarding experience. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(9), 663-65.
- Grogan, M., & Andrews, R. (2002). Defining preparation and professional development for the future. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 192-212.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R.H. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 32(1), 325-44.
- Hanson, M. (2001, December). Institutional theory and educational change. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(5), 637-661.

- Heck, R. H., & Hallinger, P. (1999). Next generation methods for the study of leadership and school improvement. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration: A project of the American Educational Research Association* (2nd ed., pp. 141-159). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Heck, R. H., & Marcoulides, G. (1993, May). Principal leadership behaviors and school achievement. *NASSP*, 77(553), 20-28.
- Jackson, B. L., & Kelley, C. (2002). Exceptional and innovative programs in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 192-212.
- Keeler, C. M. (2002, September). Exploring the validity of standards for school administration preparation. *Journal of School Leadership*, 12, 579-602.
- Krajewski, R. (1978). Secondary principals want to be leaders. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 60, 65-69.
- Krug, S. E. (1992, August). Instructional leadership: A constructivist perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28(3), 430-443.
- Lauder, A. (2000). The new look in principal preparation programs. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84(617), 23-28.
- Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(4), 498-518.
- Leithwood, K., & Duke, D. L. (1999). A century's quest to understand school leadership. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration: A project of the American Educational Research Association* (2nd ed., pp. 45-72). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lezotte, L. W. (1985). *The five correlates of effective schools*. Okemis, MI: Effective Schools Products.
- Lezotte, L. W. (1991). *Correlates of effective schools: The second generation*. Okemis, MI: Effective Schools Products.
- Lunenburg, F. C., & Ornstein, A. C. (1996). *Educational administration: Concepts and practices* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Marshall, K. (1996, January). How I confronted HSPS (Hyperactive Superficial Principal Syndrome) and began to deal with the heart of the matter. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(5), 336-345.

- Martin, W. J., & Willower, D. J. (1981). The managerial behavior of high school principals. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 17(1), 69-90.
- McCarthy, M. (1999a). The evolution of educational leadership preparation programs. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration: A project of the American Educational Research Association* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McCarthy, M. (1999b, Winter). How are school leaders prepared? *Educational Horizons*, 77(2), 74-80.
- McCarthy, M., & Kuh, G. (1997). *Continuity and change: The educational professorate*. Columbia, MO: University Council for Educational Administration.
- McEwan, E.K. (1998). *Seven steps to effective instructional leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Meyer, J. W. & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structures as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83, 340-363.
- Milstein, M. M., & Krueger, J. (1997). Improving education administration preparation programs: What we have learned over the past decades. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 72(2), 100-116.
- Mitchell, D. (1996). Institutional theory and the social structure of education. In R. Cowson, W. Boyd, & H. Mawhinney (Eds.), *In the politics of education and the new institutionalism: Reinventing the American schools* (pp. 168-188). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- Moe, T. M. (1995). The politics of structural choice; Toward a theory in public bureaucracy. In O. E. Williamson (Ed.), *Organization theory: From Chester Barnard to the present and beyond* (pp. 116-153). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Murphy, J. (1990). The reform of school administration: Pressures and calls for change. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The reform of American public education in the 1980s: Perspective and cases* (pp. 277-303). Berkeley: McCutchan.
- Murphy, J. (1995). Rethinking the foundations of leadership preparation: Insights from school improvement efforts. *Design for Leadership: The Bulletin for the National Policy Board for Educational Administration*. 6(1), 1-4, 6.

- Murphy, J. (2002, April). Reculturing the profession of educational leadership: New blueprints. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 176-191.
- National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. (1987). *Leaders for America's schools*. Temple, AZ: University Council for Education Administration.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1989). *Improving preparation of school administration: An agenda for reform*. Charlottesville, VA: National Policy Board for Educational Administration.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1996). *National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education curriculum guidelines for advanced programs in educational leadership for principals, superintendents, curriculum directors, and supervisors*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum.
- Neuman, M., & Pelchat, J. (2001, June). The challenge of leadership: Focusing on student achievement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(10), 733-736.
- Niece, R. D. (1993). The principal as instructional leader: Past influences and current resources. *NASSP Bulletin*, 77(553), 13-16.
- Peel, H. A., Wallace, C., Buckner, K. A., Wrenn, S. L., & Evans, R. (1998). Improving leadership preparation programs through a school, university and professional organization partnership. *NASSP Bulletin*, 82(602), 26-34.
- Percell, C., & Cookson, P. (1982). The effect of principals in action: A research summary. *NASSP Bulletin*, 22.
- Peterson, K. D., & Finn, C. E. (1985). Principals, superintendents, and the administrator's art. *The Public Interest*, 79(2), 42-62.
- Peterson, K. (2002, April). The professional development of principals: Innovations and opportunities. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 213-232.
- Reitzug, U. C. (1997). Images of principals instructional leadership: From supervision to collaborative inquiry. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 12(4), 356-366.

- Rossow, L. F. (1990). *The principalship: Dimensions in instructional leadership*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Rowan, B., & Miskel, C. G. (1999). Institutional theory and the study of educational organizations. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration: A project of the American Educational Research Association* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rudestam, K. E., & Newton, R. R. (2001). *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content and process* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How principals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1984). Leadership and excellence in school. *Educational Leadership*, 41(5), 4-13.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1996). *Leadership for the schoolhouse: How is it different? Why is it important?* San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Carver, F. D. (1980). *The new school executive: A theory of administration* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Sheppard, B. (1996). Exploring the transformational nature of instructional leadership. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 42(4), 325-344.
- Siegrist, G. (1999). Educational leadership must move beyond management training to visionary and moral transformational leaders. *Education*, 120(2), 297-303.
- Smith, W. F., & Andrews, R. L. (1989). *Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Stark, J. S., Briggs, C. L., & Rowland-Poplowski, J. (2002, June). Curriculum leadership roles of chairpersons in continuously planning departments. *Research in Higher Education*, 43(3), 329-355.
- Stevens, L. C. (2001). *Selected North Carolina principals' perceptions of the importance and practice of principals' instructional leadership behaviors and preservice preparations*. Retrieved March 2002, from <http://www.il.proquest.com/hp/product/dissertations.html>

- Stronge, H. S. (1993). Defining the principalship: Instructional leader or middle management. *NASSP Bulletin*, 77(553), 1-6.
- Tirozzi, G. N. (2001, February). The artistry of leadership: The evolving role of the secondary school principal. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(6), 434-440.
- Ubben, G. C., & Hughes, L. W. (1992). *The principal: Creative leadership for effective schools*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Usdan, M. D. (2002, April). Reactions to articles commissioned by the national commission for the advancement of educational leadership preparation. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 300-307.
- Young, M. D., & Petersen, G. J. (2002). The national commission for the advancement of educational leadership: An introduction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 130-136.
- Young, M. D., Petersen, G. J., & Short, P. M. (2002). The complexity of substantive reform: A call for interdependence among key stakeholders. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 137-175.
- Zigarelli, M. A. (1996). An empirical test of conclusions from effective schools research. *Journal of Education*, 90(2), 103-111.

VITA

VITA

Name: Lolethia Jones Kibble

Place of Birth: Alabama, Mobile, U.S.A.

Undergraduate and Graduate Schools Attended:

Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan
Western Maryland College, Baltimore, Maryland
Wilkes University, Pine Forge, Pennsylvania
Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Saint Joseph's University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Community College of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Oakwood College, Huntsville, Alabama

Degrees Awarded:

Doctor of Philosophy, Andrews University, 2004

Masters of Arts, Saint Joseph's University, 1980

Bachelors of Arts, Saint Joseph's University, 1975

Professional Experience:

2000 - Present	Associate Superintendent for Curriculum and Professional Development, Allegheny East Conference, Pine Forge, Pennsylvania
1992 - 2000	Superintendent of Schools, Allegheny East Conference, Pine Forge, Pennsylvania
1990 - 1992	Associate Superintendent for Curriculum and Professional Development, Allegheny East Conference, Pine Forge, Pennsylvania
1989 - 1990	Teacher, Larchwood School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
1984 - 1989	Principal, Larchwood School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
1979 - 1984	Teacher, Larchwood School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
1978 - 1979	Teacher, Havetown School, Havertown, Pennsylvania
1976 - 1978	Teacher, Larchwood School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania