

THE RELATIVE IMPACT OF PRINCIPAL MANAGERIAL, INSTRUCTIONAL, AND
TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN MISSOURI

MIDDLE LEVEL SCHOOLS

Review of Related Literature

E. Nyle Klinginsmith

Chapter 2

Review of the Related Literature

Introduction

Organizations are social units created to achieve specific ends (Etzioni, 1961; Morgan, 1997). They are a relatively recent development in the history of mankind. “Only in the last ten or fifteen thousand years have we seen the emergence of institutions more complex than small, nomadic communities. Large organizations came to dominate the social landscape even more recently” (Morgan, p. 7). Relatively new as they are, organizations have become a pervasive part of life in the twenty-first century, and many of life’s important activities occur in them. While they are pervasive, organizations have also been called complex, surprising, deceptive, and ambiguous (Bolman and Deal, 1997). This is increasingly true for today’s organizations as they function in an ever-changing social-political context made even more complex by revolutionary developments in technology, transportation, and communication (Kotter, 1985).

As organizational life has become more commonplace, writers have searched for ways to characterize it with Weber using the lens of sociology and others employing psychology, political science, and anthropology to gain insights (Bolman and Deal, 1997). Still others, including Morgan (1997), have chosen metaphors, using the characteristics of such diverse things as machines and brains in order to better understand and describe organizational life.

Bolman and Deal (1997) have viewed leadership as integral to organizational success, and the improvement of leadership practices as essential to organizational improvement. Leadership can and does exist outside of organizations; but it is an important element of

organizational life (Gardner, 2000). Leadership has often been accompanied by descriptors such as good, effective, exemplary, poor, and terrible. Surprisingly, with all that has been written of it, the term has not been well defined. Rost (1991) indicated that most people who wrote about leadership did so without offering a definition of it. Leithwood, Jantzi and Steinbach (2000a) wrote that while much has been learned about leadership, “it has not depended on any clearly agreed upon definition of the concept, as essential as that would seem at first glance” (p. 5). A number of writers, including Yukl (2002), Rost (1991) and Gardner (2000) have described leadership as an influence process. Yukl (2002) described major research approaches that looked at traits, behaviors, power and influence, situational factors, or employed an integrative approach to leadership. Bennis, Neumann, and Birnbaum (1989) listed contingency theories, cultural and symbolic theories, and cognitive theories including theories about traits, power and influence, and behaviors in their categorization of leadership approaches.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) and Zaleznik (1977), among others, have differentiated between the ideas of leadership and management, viewing them as opposites. Gardner (2000) described leaders as thinking in longer terms, thinking in bigger terms, thinking in terms of renewal, having greater political skills, and placing an emphasis on “the intangibles of vision, values, and motivation” (p. 6), while managers are seen as being more tightly linked to organizations. Others have described management in terms of preserving the status quo, where leaders are seen as challenging it or changing it (Hemphill, 1958; Lippman, 1965). Leadership appears to exist in contrast to management, because leaders value flexibility, innovation, and adaptation, while managers are said to “value stability, order and efficiency” (Yukl, p. 5). These distinctions suggest a dichotomy of management and leadership, yet there are some, including

Bass (1990), Hickman (1990), Kotter, (1988), Mintzberg, (1973), and Rost (1991), who viewed the two as distinct but not incompatible processes.

Organizational members frequently look to leaders to facilitate their efforts, and leaders, in turn, search for ways to enhance their own practice to accomplish that end. “We have certainly tried to make organizations better. Legions of managers go to work every day with that hope in mind,” (Bolman and Deal 1997, p. 8). While authors, consultants and policymakers strive to find new answers to guide organizations, “The most basic change strategy is to improve management and leadership,” (p. 8). Schools are no different than other organizations in this regard. Their primary activities are aimed at educating students, and their principals, as with their leadership counterparts in other organizations, may view their organizational role as essential to the success of their schools. There is a growing body of research and theory about leadership in general and educational leadership that provides principals with guidance as they seek to enhance their professional practice. The accepted wisdom about what constitutes effective leadership in schools has evolved since the emergence of the role of school principal over a century ago (Hallinger, 1992; Leithwood and Duke, 1999).

As organizations, including schools grew in size and complexity in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, leadership roles emerged. Leaders were charged with making their organizations more efficient and more productive, and they sought practices that would help to accomplish this. Leadership theory of the day focused on management and administrative skills such as the classic “PODSCoRB” functions delineated by Gulick and Urwick, (1937), which is reflected four decades later in the list of supervising, planning and organizing, monitoring indicators, coordinating, consulting, and administering that was developed by Mintzberg (1973). Scientific management and efficiency movements influenced public education, too. “The

strategies used by industrialists to organize their factories and make them more efficient began to influence public education. The roles of principals and teachers were prescribed as sets of principles for effective school operations (Williamson and Johnston, 2004).

At the mid-point of the twentieth century, societal challenges to America's schools led, in turn, to challenges of the predominant managerial leadership paradigm. Discontent with schools, which emerged in the 1950's, increased during the 1970's and 1980's. However, as concerns grew with the perceived shortcomings of many schools, researchers identified schools that ran counter to this trend. For example, Brookover and Lezotte (1977) studied schools in Michigan and noted that successful schools shared eight shared characteristics including an emphasis on basic reading and math; teachers who had confidence in the ability and prospects of their students; use of criterion referenced tests as measures of success; and principals who focused on instruction, discipline, and evaluation of student progress. Edmonds' (1979) study gave strong support to the idea that the element of principal leadership was essential to effective schools.

Principals in the 1960's and 70's were challenged to manage programs that resulted from new policies aimed at combating social problems such as poverty and segregation and to manage the introduction of new curricula (Fullan, 1991). Increasingly, principals were expected to be more involved in the instructional process, working with both teacher and student factors in order to promote student success. Later, the argument was advanced that the principal could and should not act alone as the instructional leader in schools, and that a more inclusive model of instructional leadership should emerge. Steller (1988) held for example that teachers should team together to review curriculum, create curriculum, and exchange good practices that would best meet instructional objectives as part of this larger idea of instructional leadership.

Even as the paradigm of instructional leadership was gaining widespread acceptance in the 1980's, criticisms of America's schools continued to mount. In response to these continuing concerns, standards-based education and high-stakes testing came into vogue (Fowler, 2004). There was a call for restructuring schools in order to better meet student needs, and principals were urged to transform schools in order to promote such restructuring (Hallinger, 1992). Instructional leadership was seen as insufficient to improve America's schools, and a third paradigm for principal leadership, based on the model of the "transforming" leader (Burns, 1978) was born. The transformational leader as described by Burns connects organizational members with the larger goals of the organization, which was viewed as essential in an era of restructuring.

These three paradigms – principal as manager, principal as instructional leader, and principal as transformational leader have been described as the three predominant models of principal leadership since the separate role of school principal emerged over a century ago (Hallinger, 1992; Wilmore and Thomas, 2001). Some have suggested that no one model best explains the traits and behaviors that impact student achievement, while others have argued that due to the complex nature of the role of principal and the complex nature of the organizational environment of schools, there should be "a broader model of principal leadership behaviors" (Prater, 2004). Fullan's (1991) review of the research revealed that no clear leadership style could be determined to be more effective than others. Hallinger (1992) argued that it was necessary for principals to integrate a variety of role orientations in order to be successful as school leaders.

Changes and challenges impacting its schools affected America's middle schools no less than their counterparts at the elementary and senior high levels. Leaders of middle level schools

dealt with the same changing environment that was impacting all of American public education, but at the same time, they experienced other changes and challenges that were unique to their level. America's middle level schools had emerged as a separate layer of schools in the early twentieth century, appearing first as junior high schools before being re-invented as middle schools in the 1960's. Both variations developed to meet the unique needs of pre- and young adolescents at times of widespread changes in American society. Included on this list of needs to be met were social-emotional, exploratory, and academic needs, with the latter often emerging as a point of contention, especially as criticisms of America's schools reached a crescendo in the 1980's.

Given the complexity of organizational life, specifically life in schools, the question arises: How can principals, including middle level principals, meet the national call to demonstrate organizational success through improved student achievement? This chapter will review the literature relevant to this question through an examination of six areas. First, the development of the managerial leadership paradigm will be traced through its historical and theoretical perspectives to the emergence of a principal managerial leadership model that will be used in this study. Second, the instructional leadership paradigm will be traced from its inception as a component of the effective schools movement to a framework of principal instructional leadership for schools that will be used in this study. Third, the development of the transformational leadership paradigm will be traced from its historic and theoretical origins to a model of principal transformational leadership for schools that will be used in this study. Fourth, the multifaceted role of the school principal will be reviewed. Fifth, the unique nature of leadership at the middle school level will be studied. Sixth, the empirical evidence of the impact of principal leadership behavior on student achievement will be discussed. This six-part review

of the literature will provide the background for understanding the major concepts underlying this study of the relationship between principal leadership behaviors and student achievement.

Managerial Leadership

Historical perspective of managerial leadership

The rise of the managerial leadership paradigm can be traced to the rise of industrialization and larger business enterprises that first began in Europe and America at the latter stages of the eighteenth century. Adam Smith (1776) was an early proponent of the beneficial effects of specialization of work and division of labor. These ideas called for workers to be focused on and more proficient at specific tasks, which when combined with the specialized work of others, would lead to greater efficiency and productivity. Shortly thereafter, Eli Whitney showcased interchangeable parts for guns, which provided the basis for the related innovation of mass production. The combination of specialization of work, division of labor, interchangeable parts, and mass production led to an age of industrialization with work being done in factories, often located in urban areas, replacing skilled work done at home and in villages. Advances in power technology and transportation spurred this revolutionary change, (Industrial Revolution, 2006).

A contemporary of Adam Smith, Frederick the Great of Prussia, took an ill-prepared, disorganized Prussian army and introduced concepts that revolutionized the military. “Among these reforms was the introduction of ranks and uniforms, the extension and standardization of regulations, increased specialization of tasks, the use of standardized equipment, the creation of a common language, and systematic training that involved army drills,” (Morgan, 1997, p. 16). These reforms resulted in the Prussian Army’s becoming one of the dominant military forces of its day. Military and business leaders, in admiration of the success of the Prussian army, studied

its tenets and copied them, with the hope of making theirs a more efficient organization. The paradigm of managerial leadership emerged, in part, from efforts to emulate this success.

Theoretical perspectives of managerial leadership

“Managerial leadership assumes that the focus of leaders ought to be on functions, tasks, or behaviours and that if these functions are carried out competently the work of others in the organizations will be facilitated.” (Leithwood, Jantzi and Steinbach, 2000b, p 14.) The paradigm of managerial leadership has a number of theoretical roots. In addition to the work of Smith, and to the innovations promoted by Whitney and Frederick the Great, the theoretical roots of managerial leadership were the organizational ideas of classical, scientific, and bureaucratic management.

Managerial leadership also has roots in a view of organizational life that has since been called the structural frame by Bolman and Deal (1997), who credited people such as Fayol (1949) and Gulick and Urwick (1937) as key contributors. According to Bolman and Deal, (1997) “The assumptions of the structural frame reflect a belief in rationality and a faith that the right formal arrangements minimize problems and increase quality and performance” (p. 39). This paradigm calls on managers to establish rational organizations with standardized practices, clear lines of authority, and an idealized bureaucracy. Specialization, division of labor, authority with responsibility, discipline, unity of command and direction, and a centralization of authority characterize organizations as viewed through the lens provided by the structural frame. Similar to this structural frame is Morgan’s (1997) organization-as-machine metaphor which likens organizational members to the components of a machine with the leader’s role that of orchestrating their efficient operation.

Classical management theory emerged at the turn of the twentieth century with its focus on organizational efficiency. Henri Fayol was interested in authority and how it was operationalized in organizations. He advocated the functions of planning, organizing, command, co-ordination and control, as the basis of management through action (Fayol, 2006). Classical management theory, according to Bolman and Deal (1997), included the concept that there is an organizational chain of command from top to bottom with members reporting to one supervisor. Work is divided to promote efficiency; and the organization is characterized by *esprit de corps*, discipline, a subordination of individual interests to the general interest, and by management that is firm, fair, and equitable.

Taylor (1911) proposed the principles of scientific management, which emphasized efficient, scientific methods through a focus on worker selection, training, and monitoring. Taylor and his followers, building on theories that had been advanced by Babbage nearly a century earlier, sought to break down and evaluate tasks through such methods as time and motion studies in order to minimize motion and effort while simultaneously increasing productivity (Babbage, 2006). Morgan (1997) noted that while classical and scientific management theories were similar, there were some important differences; “Whereas the classical management theorists focused on the design of the total organization, the scientific manager focused on the design and management of individual jobs” (p. 17).

The father of sociology, Max Weber, looked at practices bureaucracies in organizations at the turn of the twentieth century (Pfeiffer, 2006). The bureaucratic practices he observed resembled the mechanization found in industry. Bureaucracies routinized the process of management work in organizations just as machines did in industrial production. Practices were standardized with and emphasis on “precision, speed, clarity, regularity, reliability, and

efficiency achieved through the creation of a fixed division of tasks, hierarchical supervision, and detailed rules and regulations” (Morgan, 1997, p. 17).

It has been argued that classical/scientific management practices in industrial organizations of the early twentieth century were dehumanizing and that they resulted in worker dissatisfaction and resistance (Morgan, 1997). As workers began to question and rebel against management practices, new theories of leadership emerged, including the more democratically oriented human relations approach of the 1920’s and 1930’s (Bolman and Deal, 1997).

Managers, especially those managers interested in minimizing worker unrest, began to consider worker needs. Maslow (1954) developed a hierarchy of human needs and posited the idea that once basic needs such as hunger and safety are met, people will actually strive to meet higher order needs such as belongingness, self-esteem, and self-actualization.

Following Maslow’s work, McGregor (1960) proposed the theory that managers tend to have certain assumptions about the motivation of their workers and that these tend to become self-fulfilling prophecies. According to his Theory X, if managers view people as unmotivated and lazy for the most part, they manage accordingly, using strict practices of control that could ultimately result in reduced productivity and a growing militancy among workers. On the other hand, McGregor theorized that those managers who believe their workers to be motivated (Theory Y) would believe “the essential task of management is to arrange organizational conditions so that people can achieve their own goals best by directing their efforts towards organizational rewards” (McGregor, 1960, p. 61.) Basic to a Theory Y orientation is the notion that workers actually want to and will be productive “if management [is] smart enough to align jobs with workers’ needs” (Bolman and Deal, 1997, p.101). In the arena of public education,

Valentine, Clark, Hackmann, and Petzko (2004) noted that principal managerial theory also began to become more democratic and more humanistic after the 1930's.

The principal as managerial leader

School principals occupy leadership positions in their schools and are called on each day to handle a number of tasks. It is through their response to even the most mundane of these tasks that their influence is exercised (Kmetz and Willower, 1982; Harvey, 1986; Davies, 1987; Rosenblatt and Somech, 1998). A review of the literature on principal leadership identifies both direct and inferred functions that can be described as managerial in nature (Rost, 1991). Given the fact that the rise of the role of principal occurred during an era predominated by classical and scientific management and a structural/mechanistic view of organizations, it is not surprising that managerial functions would be present in the role. This managerial orientation is still in evidence in much of the literature written in the past few years, even in literature that addresses other leadership paradigms.

The structural frame and its related managerial theory viewed organizations as being underlain with rationality (Bolman and Deal, 1997). Leadership, according to Glasman (1984) is a rational component of organizational life made up of that portion of policy, daily operations, and decision making which is necessary to keep the school functioning. The work of a school, quite simply stated, is the education of its students, and the responsibility of the leader is to manage those educational functions. What does the term management mean as it is defined in the role of the school principal? A review of the research that addresses this question reveals a diversity of ideas with an underlying commonality.

Managers seek to promote the stability and smooth operation of their organizations. Brewer (1993) noted that principals indirectly affect students by ensuring that schools are

efficiently run operations, and that they enhance the morale of the school through “clear and consistent school rules and policies [that] tend to improve the general disciplinary climate of the school” (p. 218). In a study of effective principal leadership, Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan and Lee (1982) identified organization/coordination as a factor. Specifically, they noted that a principal’s involvement in classroom management has a relationship with school success.

Principals in effective schools provide support to teachers as they deal with those discipline issues that arise in the classrooms. This element of management also manifests itself in control of public spaces in school buildings. Principal attention to disciplinary concerns wherever they may occur helps to minimize their occurrence and results in the structured learning environment that is a characteristic of a successful school. Involvement in staff selection is yet another way principals support a well-run school (Brewer, 1993). With principals seldom being called to deliver direct instruction, the management role in schools manifests itself more in terms of teacher supervision, maintaining staff contact to monitor student progress, and management of the school’s curriculum (Smith, Maehar, and Midgley, 1992). A study by Myers and Murphy (1995) included “organizational control” mechanisms consisting of supervision, input controls (including personnel decisions and budgeting), behavior controls (including the development of job descriptions and textbook adoption), and output controls (including student testing). Rosenblatt and Somech (1999) developed a similar list of principal responsibilities that included security; resource acquisition; routine paperwork; communication with staff, students and outsiders; providing an orderly school schedule; and monitoring teachers.

Alvy and Robbins (2005) listed ensuring school safety, providing for a positive learning environment by making sure classrooms are equipped for students and teachers, providing teaching supplies, and operating school budgets as some of the managerial tasks performed by

principals. Other writers focused more specifically on a principal's preserving the stability of the school environment through protecting or buffering the school's curriculum and instruction, its technical core, from an excessive amount of distractions and interruptions, and by functioning as an effective disciplinarian (Rossmiller, 1992; Eberts and Stone, 1998). Bossert et al. (1982) noted that other managerial functions, such as support of special projects and an organized manner of materials distribution, help to organize the environment and are examples of principal managerial behavior that lead to school effectiveness.

In their review of leadership literature, Duke and Leithwood (1994) identified as many as ten management functions. Included on the list were the provision and distribution of adequate financial and material resources in a manner that enhances their usefulness; anticipation of predictable problems and the development of effective and efficient means for responding to them; management of the school facility and the student body; effective communication with staff, students, parents, and district office personnel; accommodation of district policies and initiatives in a manner that enhances progress towards school goals; buffering staff from disruptions to the instructional program; and handling conflict and the political demands of school functioning.

In an effort to identify characteristics of effective principal leadership, Valentine began the development of the Audit of Principal Effectiveness in 1982. Three domains consisting of nine factors of effective principal leadership were identified. One such domain, The Organizational Environment domain, "provides insight into the ability of the principal to nurture the ongoing climate of the school through development of positive interpersonal relationships among members of the organization and effective day-by-day operational procedures for the school" (Valentine and Bowman, 1988). An analysis of the Interactive Processes factor found

within this domain appears to provide a comprehensive summary of principal managerial leadership factors. Nine items measure the manner in which a “principal organizes tasks and personnel for the effective day-by-day management of the school, including providing appropriate information to staff and students, developing appropriate rules and procedures, and setting the overall tone for discipline in the school” (Valentine and Bowman, 1988, p. 25). Those items are:

1. The principal keeps teachers informed about those aspects of the school program of which they should be aware.
2. When the principal provides teachers with the information about school operations, the information is clear and easily understood.
3. When teachers are informed of administrative decisions, they are aware of what the principal expects of them as it relates to the decision.
4. The principal is able to organize activities, tasks, and people.
5. The principal develops appropriate rules and procedures.
6. The principal uses systematic procedures for staff appraisal, e.g. retention, dismissal, promotion procedures.
7. The principal establishes the overall tone for discipline in the school.
8. The principal establishes a process by which students are made aware of school rules and policies.
9. The principal communicates to teachers the reasons for administrative practices used in the school program (Valentine and Bowman, 1988, p. 20).

A review of the literature supports the appropriateness of the Interactive Process factor from the Audit of Principal Effectiveness as a measure of principal managerial behavior.

Principal communication with staff, which is referenced in three of the items, is an element of principal managerial leadership. Hallinger and Murphy (1985) viewed effective principal communication practices as including regular discussions with staff members in such areas as instructional, administrative, and budgetary decisions. Brookover, Schweitzer, Schneider, Beady, Flood, and Wisenbaker (1978) detailed such formal practices as goal statements, staff bulletins, newsletters and handbooks, staff meetings, parent and teacher conferences, and assemblies, along with informal practices such as conversations as opportunities to practice effective communication skills. Among the tasks of the principal is to ensure that school goals and directives are translated into classroom practice (Hallinger and Murphy, 1985).

Other items of the Interactive Process factor from the Audit of Principal Effectiveness measure the principal's ability to promote an effective learning environment. Writing of an orderly environment, Rossow (1990) stated that behaviors such as assigning duties to teachers, scheduling classes, and managing student assemblies, mundane as they seem, support an academic emphasis. Heck, Larsen, and Marcoulides (1990) noted that principals do not impact academic achievement of students in the same manner as do teachers who have more direct contact.

Principals may, however, impact teaching and classroom practices through such school decisions as . . . setting and communicating high achievement expectations, organizing classrooms for instruction, allocating necessary resources, supervising teachers' performance, monitoring student progress, and promoting a positive, orderly environment for learning (p. 95).

Principals can also provide an orderly environment by ensuring that teachers have the necessary instructional materials and resources to carry out the educational program (Brookover et al.

1978; Davis, 2003). Activities such as organizing programs, monitoring behavior, and enabling teachers to work more effectively with students have a “trickle-down effect through classrooms that nurture student performance’ (Heck, 1993b, p. 160).

The management of student behavior is another characteristic of the effective principal manager that contributes to an orderly, disciplined environment. Principals shape the learning environment by “establishing clear, explicit standards that embody the school’s expectations of students” (Hallinger and Murphy, 1987, p. 58). Such expectations can be communicated through policies and practices of the school (Murphy, Weil, Hallinger and Mitman, 1985; Brewer, 1993; Smith and Andrews, 1989). As they manage student behavior and promote an orderly environment, principals contribute to a more positive school climate and indirectly to improved staff morale and student achievement (Donaldson, 1991; Brewer, 1993).

Summary of managerial leadership literature

For much of the twentieth century leadership in school settings was considered as a management role. Organizations were viewed to be rational in nature, and the managers’ tasks were to insure efficient operation. The primary responsibilities of principals were perceived to be the management of such things as school staff performance and student conduct. Fundamental management tasks regarding buildings and budgets were also emphasized. University programs for training principals reflected this view by offering course work in such areas as finance, business administration, organization and administration of school curriculum, and management of school records and reports (Beck & Murphy, 1993). However, by mid-century, managerial theory was evolving from its classical and scientific origins as greater attention was being paid to worker needs.

Instructional Leadership

Historical perspective of instructional leadership

At the mid-point of the twentieth century major societal changes impacted schools and led to a call for school reform and a new model of principal leadership. The principal managerial leadership model had held prominence through mid-century. In the decade of the 50's, American schools began to come under public scrutiny and criticism, first with the publishing of *Why Johnny Can't Read* (Flesch, 1955), which contended that a lack of attention to phonics instruction was producing a generation of poor readers. Concerns gained momentum with the October 1957 launch of the Russian satellite, *Sputnik*. At the height of the Cold War, America's falling behind the Soviets in the "space race" was viewed as a failure on the part of several elements of American society, including its schools. Articles in popular publications of the time declared that our public schools were falling short in the areas of math, science and foreign language instruction. In response to these concerns, Congress enacted the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (NDEA). Aimed at bolstering science instruction in America's schools and providing funding for prospective college students, NDEA (NDEA, 2006) was another landmark piece of national educational legislation. It was especially significant because local control of schools had been an important norm in education prior to its passage (Hadderman, 1998).

The trend toward a more activist federal government that began with NDEA accelerated under the Democratic administrations in the 1960's. Beginning with Kennedy's New Frontier and continuing with Johnson's Great Society programs, legislation was passed to address social ills that were associated with poverty and racial segregation. One major element of President Johnson's War on Poverty was the passage of the Elementary and Secondary School Act in 1965 (ESEA). Designed to send federal assistance to poor schools, communities, and children, ESEA

has continued to be reauthorized at 5-year intervals (ESEA, 2006). As with NDEA, the Federal government again entered the arena of educational policy with a landmark national initiative. One year later, the Coleman Report, known officially as the Report on Equality of Educational Opportunity (Coleman et al., 1966), looked at the distribution of resources and opportunities among children of different races and used achievement scores as outcome measures.

From its schools' point of view, the American landscape was changing dramatically, and accompanying this change in their social and political contexts came change to schools and to the roles of their leaders (Beck and Murphy, 1993). Schools were now widely perceived as a locus of both societal problems and solutions. As a result of new governmental policy intended to provide programming for poor students, and challenged to implement new curricula in math, science and foreign language, school principals began to see a change in the conceptualization of their roles. No longer was management sufficient, especially after 1979, when Ronald Edmonds asserted that strong principal leadership was a key component of more effective urban schools. Given these developments, a new paradigm of leadership was needed, one in which the school principal was to become a more active participant in the school's instructional activities. The literature of the 1980's and 90's focused on effective schools led by principals who were instructional leaders.

Theoretical perspectives of instructional leadership

Writers such as Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, and Lee (1982), DeBevoise (1984), Heck, Larsen, and Marcoulides (1990), Heck and Marcoulides (1993), and Hallinger and Heck (1998) wrote of the importance of principal leadership as a component of successful schools. Finn (1987) asserted that, "The principalship is probably the single most powerful fulcrum for improving school effectiveness" (p. 20). Steller (1988) identified strong principal leadership as one of five common characteristics of effective schools found throughout the literature of the day

with the others being “clear instructional focus, high expectations and standards, safe and orderly climate and frequent monitoring of student achievement” (p. 14). Lezotte (1991) included instructional leadership in his discussion of the seven characteristics, or “correlates” of effective schools.

In order to become effective instructional leaders, principals were expected to be more knowledgeable about and more involved in their school’s instructional practices than they had been in the past. Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) noted that instructional leaders were characterized by goal setting behavior that motivates staff, a high degree of self-confidence and openness to others, tolerance of ambiguity, testing of organizational and interpersonal limits, a sensitivity to the dynamics of power, the ability to maintain an analytic perspective, and remaining in charge. Bossert et al. (1982) saw the effective principal as one who continually strove to improve the quality of the staff’s performance and to improve teacher morale, both of which would have an impact on student achievement. Their research identified four areas of principal leadership:

1. Goals and Student Achievement Emphasis. The studies reviewed indicated that principals in high achieving schools emphasize achievement through setting instructional goals, developing performance standards for their students, and expressing optimism about the ability of their students to meet instructional goals.
2. Power and Decision Making. Principals in effective schools are more active and more involved in areas of curriculum and instruction. They also understand community power structures and maintain good relationships with parents.
3. Curriculum Organization/Coordination. Principals take a more hands-on approach to instruction through such activities as the observation of teachers, conversations with

teachers, support of teacher efforts at improvement, and establishing teacher and program evaluation procedures. Researchers have shown that successful principals seek clarity in establishing program and curricular objectives, and coordinating content, sequence, and materials involved in instruction.

4. Human Relations. Effective principals differ from their less effective counterparts in their abilities to recognize the unique styles and needs of teachers, and to help them achieve their own performance goals, which in turn may help those teachers to meet their own higher order needs. (Bossert et al., 1982, pp. 37-38)

Glickman (1985) identified direct assistance to teachers, group development, staff development, curriculum development, and action research as the five primary tasks of instructional leadership. Pajak (1989) added planning, organizing and facilitating change, and motivating staff to the list of instructional activities. Wanzare and DaCosta (2001) identified supervision and evaluating instructional activities, providing professional development, working on school curriculum, identifying issues with regard to achieving school goals, protecting learning time, defining and communicating the school's mission, goals, objectives and standards, and working with external constituencies among the major roles of an instructional leader. Smith and Andrews (1989) identified being a resource provider, instructional resources provider, communicator, and visible presence as four dimensions or roles of an instructional leader.

The research of Hallinger and Murphy (1985) indicated that the literature of the time focused on principals' management of curriculum and instructional processes. The instrument they developed reflected this finding as it sought to identify those specific management functions that were associated with curriculum, separate from other typical principal behaviors. They

grouped a list of twenty instructional functions into the three broad categories of defining the school mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting school climate:

1. Defining the School Mission. A clear vision of what the school should be attempting to accomplish is communicated to students and staff in such a manner that a shared purpose develops that unites the efforts of the school members. This dimension is characterized by

- a) Framing school goals. The principal as instructional leader helps to determine areas of focus for staff efforts.
- b) Communicating school goals. The principal ensures that these goals are communicated to all members of the school community (Hallinger and Murphy, 1985, pp. 221-224).

2. Managing the Instructional Program. This dimension focuses on those activities that involve the principal's working with teachers in areas specific to curriculum and instruction. It is characterized by:

- a) Supervising and evaluating instruction. The principal ensures that classroom instructional objectives are coordinated with those of the school; provides support to teachers in instructional matters; and visits classrooms frequently on an informal basis for the purpose of monitoring instruction.
- b) Coordinating curriculum. Through the alignment of classroom objectives with school wide curricular objectives and utilizing achievement assessments, the principal promotes continuity across grade levels and subjects.
- c) Monitoring student progress. This principal utilizes both norm and criterion-referenced information to diagnose programmatic and student weaknesses, to track

changes in the school's instructional program, and to make classroom assignments (Hallinger and Murphy, 1985, pp, 221-224).

3. Promoting a Positive School Learning Climate. The principal influences student success through the norms and attitudes of the staff and students.

- a) Protecting instructional time. Principals provide teachers with blocks of uninterrupted instructional time.
- b) Promoting professional development. Principals support staff efforts at professional improvement.
- c) Maintaining high visibility. The principal is a visible presence around school with frequent interactions with both students and staff.
- d) Providing incentives for teachers. The principal creates a positive learning climate by setting up a work structure that rewards and recognizes teachers for their efforts.
- e) Developing and enforcing academic standards. The principal has a role in setting clearly defined, high standards that support the high expectations that are necessary for improving student learning. Providing incentives for learning. The principal promotes student achievement and improvement through various rewards and recognitions (Hallinger and Murphy, 1985, pp, 221-224).

Cotton (2003) observed that prior to 1985 the emphasis on instructional leadership focused on direct principal behaviors. After that date the focus broadened and researchers asked, "Is the influence of principals on students direct, or is it primarily indirect—mediated through other variables, most notably teacher behavior?" (p. 3). Researchers such as Hallinger and Heck (1999) reviewed studies that looked not only at direct effects of principal instructional leadership on student achievement but also at its impact on teacher and school-level variables. Blase and

Blase (1994) discussed the empowerment of teachers, and Reitzug (1997) advanced the argument that a collaborative model, or shared leadership, is a stronger model than one in which the instructional leadership is centered on the principal. Ogawa and Bossert (1995) described leadership as an organizational quality that exists in interactions as much if not more than in organizational roles. Lambert (2002) wrote of the notion of leadership capacity throughout the organization. Elmore (2000) advocated an organization in which the responsibility for leadership is distributed, since principals lack the time and energy and are not disposed to be instructional leaders, but others can be.

Lashway (1995) contended that it was evident that “high-achieving schools have principals who boldly lead the academic program, set goals, examine curriculum, evaluate teachers, and assess results” (p. 1). Leithwood (1992) spoke of first and second order changes, contending that instructional leadership focused on “first order” changes of “improving the technical, instructional activities of the school through close monitoring of teachers’ and students work” (p. 8). When leaders address building a shared vision, improving communication, and developing a collaborative decision-making processes, they become involved in “second order” changes.

In 1994, Leithwood observed that instructional leaders engage in behaviors such as supervision, coaching, staff development, and modeling designed to influence teachers’ thinking and practice. Writing with Duke in 1999, Leithwood distilled this to a more direct definition of instructional leadership indicating that it consists of teacher behaviors as they engage in those activities that affect student growth. However, they also pointed out that some versions of instructional leadership have a different focus, with such factors as organizational variables, including school culture, having consequences for teacher behavior. Kleine-Kracht (1993)

referred to direct and indirect forms of instructional leadership. Similarly, Sheppard (1996) categorized these as “narrow” and “broad” forms of instructional leadership with the former being restricted to teacher behaviors that enhance learning. Broad forms, on the other hand, included organizational and cultural matters.

Sheppard’s (1996) research of broader leadership identified framing school goals, communicating school goals, supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, monitoring student progress, protecting instructional time, maintaining high visibility, and providing incentives for learning as principal behaviors that contribute to teachers’ professional growth and performance. Blase and Blase (1999b), in their study of elementary and high-school teachers’ perceptions of instructional leadership, determined that teachers’ professional development was the most influential instructional practice.

A number of attempts have been made to assess teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership behavior. Hallinger and Murphy (1987) developed the Principal Instructional Management Scale, which measured instructional leadership in three dimensions: framing the school goals; communicating the school goals; and supervising and evaluating instruction. Andrews joined Soder in a collaborative effort with the Seattle Public School District and the University of Washington to develop the Staff Assessment Questionnaire in 1987. This instrument measured the school organizational characteristics of strong leadership, dedicated staff, frequent monitoring of student progress, high expectations, positive learning climate, early identification of learning problems, curriculum continuity, multicultural education, and sex equity.

Valentine and Bowman’s (1988) Audit of Principal Effectiveness contained two factors, Instructional Improvement and Curriculum Improvement, which represent principal instructional

leadership. Through traits and behaviors such as “clinical supervision, knowledge of effective schooling, and commitment to quality instruction” (p. 25), the principal is seen as influencing in a positive manner the instructional skills present in his or her school. Eight items measure the factor of Instructional Improvement:

1. The principal is knowledgeable of the general goals and objectives of the curricular areas.
2. The principal is knowledgeable of the varied teaching strategies teachers might appropriately utilize during instruction
3. The principal possesses instructional observation skills that provide the basis for accurate assessment of the teaching process in the classroom.
4. The principal actively and regularly participates in the observations and assessment of classroom instruction, including teaching strategies and student learning.
5. The principal has effective techniques for helping ineffective teachers.
6. The principal maintains an awareness and knowledge of recent research about the learning process.
7. When criticizing poor practices, the principal provides suggestions for improvement.
8. The principal is committed to instructional improvement (Valentine and Bowman, 1988, p. 21).

The Curriculum Improvement factor of the Audit of Principal Effectiveness assesses the extent to which “The principal promotes an articulated, outcome-based curriculum through diagnosis of student needs and systematic program review and change,” (Valentine and Bowman, 1988, p. 25). Seven items assess this factor:

1. The principal promotes the development of educational goals and objectives that reflect societal needs and trends.
2. The principal promotes the diagnosis of individual and group learning needs of students and application of appropriate instruction to meet those needs.
3. The principal administers a school-wide curricular program based upon identification of content goals and objectives and the monitoring of student achievement toward those goals and objectives.
4. The principal participates in instructional improvement activities such as program and curriculum planning and monitoring of student learning outcomes.
5. The principal uses objective data such as test scores to make changes in curriculum and staffing.
6. The principal has a systematic process for program review and change.
7. The principal encourages articulation of the curricular program, (Valentine and Bowman, 1988, p. 21).

A review of the literature lends support to the use of the Instructional Improvement and Curriculum Improvement factors from the Audit of Principal Effectiveness to measure principal instructional leadership behavior. Effective principals should know about and understand teaching and learning theory and be current with regard to educational trends (Bossert et al., 1982; Smith and Andrews, 1989). Research indicates that while the traits of principals are important, instructional leadership behaviors such as modeling what is expected, communicating high expectations, challenging staff members, involving them in decisions, and providing them with professional development opportunities are more often associated with positive effects in schools (Kirby, Paradise and King, 1992).

Summary of instructional leadership literature

Many of the first writers who discussed principal instructional leadership focused on curriculum and instruction that is accomplished through close monitoring and accountability of teachers and students (Hallinger, 1992; Beck and Murphy, 1993). Later research focused more on instructional leadership behaviors and their resulting impact on student performance. Student performance on assessments such as standardized testing became identified as the preferred measure of school effectiveness, and principals were expected to facilitate success on such measures. According to Morris, “The measure of a school principal is his or her ability to produce results, namely, reading and mathematics scores and general achievement scores at or above grade level” (1987, p. 16). After the mid-1980’s, the literature focused on indirect effects through the inclusion of teachers in a broader definition of instructional leadership. “Instructional leadership . . . typically assumes that the critical focus for attention by leaders is the behaviours of teachers as they engage in activities directly affecting the growth of students” (Leithwood, Jantzi and Steinbach, 2000a, p. 8). This broader definition of instructional leadership presaged the emergence of yet a third model of principal leadership.

Transformational Leadership

Historical perspective of transformational leadership

In the decade of the 1980’s a concern developed that the United States was in decline as a world economic power. Declining productivity, increasing national debt, and intensified international competition marked by a decline in the value of the dollar were all due, at least in part, to a decline in the quality of America’s schools (Barnett and Whitaker, 1996). The release of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) gave rise to “a tremendous number of state initiatives to improve secondary education that came to be known

collectively as the standards-based reform movement. By 1995, Iowa was the only state that did not have mandatory achievement standards for its students (Williamson and Johnston, 2004. p. 37).

Discontent with American schools continued to increase at the same time that the instructional leadership paradigm began to predominate the literature. Following the publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983, there was a heightened demand to reform America's schools. As the economies of other countries, notably Japan, showed remarkable growth, and as American jobs began to move overseas, its self-image as the world's economic leader suffered. There was a concern that American schools were producing students who were incapable of competing in the emerging global economy (Beck and Murphy, 1992). Release of the results of such measures as TIMSS (NCES, 2006) only added to these concerns. According to Fowler (2004), this continued discontent with America's schools in the late 80's led to a call for greater accountability and standards-based education with high-stakes testing as a major component. These calls for reform reached a crescendo at decade's end when the nation's governors assembled at Charlottesville, Virginia and issued a collective call for standards-based reform.

In response to these events, the latter half of the 1980's saw the term "restructuring" appear with greater frequency in the literature. "Restructuring has no precise definition, but the term suggests that schooling needs to be comprehensively redesigned," (Newman and Wellhage, 1995, p. 1). Restructuring has also been viewed as the "reforming of the interrelationships of an organization; a strategy used to analyze and redesign the organization or structure of education in order to improve student outcomes" (MASSP, 1994). Harvey and Crandall (1988) characterized restructuring as a process of building on what has been successful in schools and rethinking or redesigning elements that have failed. Restructuring called for a number of changes such as

decentralization, shared decision-making, common academic curriculum, flexible scheduling with longer classes, teacher teaming, reduction of tracking and ability grouping, external standards for school accountability, and new forms of assessment (Newman and Wellhage, 1995). To accomplish restructuring, several states passed bills that focused on areas such as teacher licensing, graduation requirements, standardized tests and assessments, accountability standards, curriculum development, and decentralized control (O'Neill 1993).

Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach (2000b) argued that instructional leadership was no longer a suitable paradigm in an era of restructuring because it was not always clear what the means and ends of restructuring would be; because there had been a failure of schools to institutionalize changes tried under previous leadership models; because most school reform was occurring in secondary schools, which they believed to be a poorer fit for instructional leadership than elementary schools; and finally, because professionalism of teaching was at the heart of the restructuring agenda. Instead they advocated a third model of leadership called transformational leadership, one they argued, which would be “potentially more powerful and more elegant as a description of effective leadership in the context of school restructuring” (p. 27).

Theoretical perspectives of transformational leadership

Transformational leadership originated from James McGregor Burns' (1978) landmark study of leadership. Burns determined that great historical leaders held in common a distinctive kind of leadership, which he termed “transforming.” Leadership can be found, according to Burns in relationships between motives, resources, leaders, and followers. Transformational leadership is unique when compared to earlier leadership paradigms in that it focuses on the commitments and capacities of organizational members, (Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach, 2000a, p. 9). It is deemed to be both moral and uplifting because “it raises the level of human

conduct and ethical aspiration of leader and led, and thus has a transforming effect on both,” (Burns, 1978, p 20).

Bass and others have studied transformational leadership in order to determine both its antecedents and its outcomes. Transformational leadership is viewed as being composed of four factors: (1) idealized or charismatic influence, which views leaders as role models for followers, (2) inspiring and motivating followers through a vision of a brighter future, (3) intellectual stimulation of members through the questioning of organizational assumptions and a willingness to innovate, and (4) individualized consideration of organizational members through coaching and mentoring that attends to their needs, including the needs to achieve and grow (Bass, 1998).

Burns contrasted transformational leadership with a model called transactional leadership, which was more political in nature. Bass believed transactional leadership had three dimensions: contingent rewards, management-by-exception, and what he termed a *laissez-faire* form of leadership. In this model, there is a consideration of the needs of the leaders and followers, with interactions that meet the needs of both being the most desirable. Working with Avolio and Jung, Bass studied leadership in varied settings including military, industrial, and educational settings, and among other products, created the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire with version MLQ-5X (Avolio, Bass, and Jung, 1995) being the most recent. As early as 1988, Avolio and Bass proposed a “two-factor theory” of leadership which posited the idea that transformational leadership can be preceded by and depend upon mastery of transactional leadership behaviors. Where Burns saw transactional leadership and transformational leadership as two ends of a leadership continuum with transformational leadership clearly being identified more closely with history’s great leaders, Bass’ two-factor theory held that transactional and transformational leadership could, in fact, build on each other.

Silins (1994) looked at transactional and transformational leadership in schools and determined that they were supportive of each other with transactional behaviors providing links between transformational leadership behaviors and student outcomes.

Principals as transformational leaders

In the 1990's as change became more common, widespread, and rapid (Fullan, 1996; Bjork 1996; Murphy, 1994), organizations, schools included, needed to anticipate change and question their operating norms in order to respond to it (Morgan, 1997; Senge, 1990; Goldring and Rallis, 1993; Murphy and Hallinger, 1992). The times called for schools to learn how to manage internal change in response to or anticipation of external change. Moreover, much of the restructuring literature called for schools to initiate change rather than to simply react to it (Hallinger, 1992).

Murphy and Beck (1994) proposed the thesis that a number of forces including demands for accountability; the perceived economic crisis facing the nation and the belief that schools would play a key role in improving the situation; changes in the social fabric of America, its communities and its schools; and the evolution towards a post-industrial world would, in turn, change the role of the school principal in the twenty-first century. Fullan (1996) asserted that principals must become agents of change, and that previous managerial and instructional models were not sufficient. "We have come a long way since the days of valuing leaders who 'run a tight ship.' We have gone through the phases of the principal 'as administrator, and the principal as instructional leader' to a broader and more fundamental notion of principal as change agent" (p. 701).

Kenneth Leithwood is recognized as a leader in adapting the principles of transformational leadership to the field of education. In 1992, Leithwood and his colleagues

undertook a series of studies aimed at determining the meaning and utility of transformational leadership in schools. Their work uncovered three common goals of principals who exhibited transformational leadership behaviors: (1) to help staff members develop and maintain a collaborative school culture, (2) to foster teacher development, and (3) to help them be more effective problem-solvers. He argued that transformational leadership was relevant for educational leaders because leadership is primarily manifested during times of change, with the nature of change determining the type of leadership needed, and held that the need for reform, change, and restructuring would continue for the foreseeable future (Leithwood, 1993). Seven dimensions of transformational leadership in schools were identified by Leithwood (1994): building school vision; establishing school goals; providing intellectual stimulation; offering individualized support; modeling best practices and important organizational values; demonstrating high performance expectations; creating a productive school culture; and developing structures to foster participation in school decisions. In 1996, Leithwood refined the list to six factors and incorporated these into a survey instrument, the Principal Leadership Questionnaire (PLQ), which consisted of 24 items measuring specific principal behaviors.

1. Identifying and articulating a vision. This factor relates to principal behaviors that are aimed at identifying new opportunities for staff members and developing, articulating, and inspiring others with his or her vision for the future (Jantzi and Leithwood, 1996).
2. Providing an appropriate model. This factor relates to principal behaviors that set an example for the school staff members to follow. These behaviors are consistent with the values that are espoused by the principal (Jantzi and Leithwood, 1996).

3. Fostering the acceptance of group goals. This factor encompasses behaviors that promote cooperation among school staff members and assist them to work in unison toward shared goals (Jantzi and Leithwood, 1996).
4. Providing individualized support. Transformational leaders display respect and concern for the feelings, needs, and problems and an understanding of the skills and interests of organizational members (Jantzi and Leithwood, 1996).
5. Intellectual stimulation. Principal behaviors that challenge staff members to reexamine some of their assumptions about their work and to reconceive ways to do it are representative of this factor (Jantzi and Leithwood, 1996).
6. High performance expectations. This factor involves behavior that demonstrates the principal's expectations for excellence, quality and high performance on the part of the staff (Jantzi and Leithwood, 1996).

Summary of transformational leadership literature

Bennis (2003) called for leaders to engage organizational members in a shared vision, speak with a clear and distinctive voice, operate from a strong moral code, and be able to adapt to constant change. Kouzes and Posner (2002) listed inspiring a shared vision as one of five practices of leaders in extraordinary organizations. Bolman and Deal (1997) observed that establishing and communicating a vision was the one characteristic most universally mentioned by those who studied "good leadership." While there has been some question as to whether a leader creates that vision (Bass, 1985, Bennis and Nanus, 1985) or if it already exists in the organization, waiting to be articulated by the leader (Cleveland, 1985); vision helps members unite around a commonly held view of an idealized organization. It shapes the behavior of leaders and invests it with the power to reshape organizations. The transformational leader is

successful in getting members to embrace the idea that not only will the organization be better, but they as members will also see benefits for their efforts in moving toward that more compelling vision (Hallinger and Murphy, 1985 Hallinger and Heck 1999).

Chase and Kane (1993) asserted that establishing a vision is a characteristic common to effective principals along with setting clear goals, focusing on continuous improvement, maintaining an orderly and positive environment for teaching and learning, allocating resources to support the attainment of goals, setting high standards and expectations for teachers and students, and being confident in their ability to bring about change. According to Yukl (2002), transformational leaders lead by

Articulating a clear and appealing vision, explaining how that vision can be attained, acting confidently and optimistically, expressing confidence in followers, using dramatic symbolic actions to emphasize key values, leading by example and empowering people to achieve the vision.” (p. 263)

Transformational leaders are also successful in obtaining the support of members toward organizational mission and goals. Mission is also seen as a key factor in organizational effectiveness and is often perceived as a commitment to the stated purpose of an organization and its goals, (Cuban, 1984: Kotter, 1996: Senge, 1990).

Fullan, Bertani, and Quinn (2004) listed ten components that make school reform possible. Included are such things as dialogue, a compelling conceptualization, collective moral purpose, capacity building, ongoing learning, productive conflict and a demanding culture.

Newman and Welhage (1995) observed that schools which were most successful in restructuring

Found a way to channel staff and student efforts toward a clear, commonly stated purpose for student learning; they created opportunities for teachers to collaborate and help one

another achieve the purpose; and teachers took collective ‘not just individual’ responsibility for student learning. Schools with strong professional communities were the schools that were better able to offer authentic pedagogy and were more effective in promoting student achievement. (p. 5)

Restructuring is a call to reassess, reorder, reassemble, and recreate educational systems that work for all children (Johnson, 1996). Those who write of school restructuring and of the kind of principal leadership needed for it, often mention transformational leadership as the model of principal leadership most suited for such restructuring to occur.

Multifaceted Role of School Principals

Much has been written about principals in terms of roles, traits, behaviors, styles, cultural and situational factors, power and influence, and types (Yukl, 2002; Bennis, Neumann, and Birnbaum, 1989). The literature on principal leadership can also be discussed in historical terms with principal as manager, principal as instructional leader, and more recently principal as transformational leader each having its turn as a predominant model (Hallinger, 1992; Wilmore and Thomas, 2001). Principals perform a number of tasks and fill many roles as they function in today’s schools and may benefit from a wide variety of perspectives on what constitutes effective leadership, especially as that leadership seeks to impact student achievement.

Among the roles that have been assigned to school principals are staff recruitment; selection, and supervision; implementing and sustaining change; establishing a building schedule; creating a safe environment through school violence prevention; promoting staff development; promoting the creation and implementation of effective curricula; dealing with a diverse community; and encouraging learning that prepares students for the world of tomorrow

(Williams, 1998; Beebe, 1998; Marczely, 1998; Queen and Isenhour, 1998; Davis, 1998; Petzko, 1998; Sprague, Pennell & Sulzberger, 1998; Tatum, 1998; Murphy, 1998; Wallinger, 1998).

As people write of principal leadership, they often do so in terms of the effectiveness of the role. Davis (1998) studied leadership effectiveness and found that, despite years of research, there is no single model or uniform prescription for leadership effectiveness. He argued “effective leadership is multifaceted and often defined through both subjective and objective measures of leadership behavior and its effects on organizational processes and outcomes” (pp. 57-58).

Standards have been developed to address the many competencies required of principals to fulfill their role expectations. In 1996, the Council of Chief State School Officers’ Interstate School Leaders Licensure Council (ISLLC, 1996), along with assistance from 24 state agencies and representatives of professional associations developed six standards to guide principal performance. (Davis and Jazzar, 2005). The standards address ways that administrators impact student success through behaviors that specify a vision of learning that is shared by all members; a school culture that promotes and supports both student learning and the professional development of staff members; school management pieces such as organization, operations, and resources that make for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment; school community relationships; integrity, fairness and ethical conduct of an administrator; and administrative understanding of the larger socio-political context (ISLLC, 2007).

Davis (1998) developed a comprehensive list of skills and behaviors needed by school administrators. In order to be successful in their roles, leaders must be sensitive to the needs of staff members and understand that these needs are sometimes in conflict with the needs of other members. They must possess interpersonal relationship skills and communicate effectively with

staff. Leaders must be able to adapt to new workplace conditions and environmental contexts. They must possess a variety of styles that they can use in individual interactions and in decision-making situations. Effective leaders view their successes or failures as reflective of their own efforts, abilities or motivation and not due to external factors that are out of their control. Finally, they are knowledgeable about school practices, make intelligent choices, and maintain personal balance in their lives.

Tasks and challenges facing principals run the continuum from managerial tasks to leading and facilitating organizational change. Alvy and Robbins (2005) discussed learning experiences that should prove helpful to new principals as they prepare for these widely varied roles. According to Alvy and Robbins, teachers will value leaders who have a focus on student success. New leaders must act ethically as they “behave justly, promote student success, support teacher growth, and foster quality relationships in the school community” (p. 51). New principals must be adept at administrative tasks that ensure the building is safe, clean, organized, equipped for learning, has adequate resources and supplies, and they must operate within budgetary limitations. The authors also held that although principals are barraged with daily administrative duties, they must also be sure to attend to student learning. Teachers will view school leaders as being effective if they have competence in the curricular, instructional and assessment areas that are associated with instructional leadership (Bryk and Schneider, 2002). Bennis and Nanus (1985) viewed leaders as lifetime learners, who are role models for staff learning. Relationships with staff members are important, as well, especially in times of stress when the eyes of organizational members look to the leader (Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee, 2002). Alvy and Robbins (2005) indicated a need for leaders to anticipate problems, orchestrate school-community partnerships, and be life-long learners if they wish to become successful leaders.

Shifting environments impact principal roles

A number of issues conspire to challenge today's school principals. Brown and Moffett (1999) shared the opinion that many of these issues are contradictory in nature: conservative and liberal political viewpoints vying for supremacy in public schools; pedagogical models such as whole language and phonetic instruction; uniform standards in education versus diversity; pluralism versus regionalism; new technology that is constantly being outdated by even newer developments; calls for organizational consistency versus individualization of instruction; calls for ability grouping competing with calls for heterogeneous grouping; calls for standards-based education to meet the perceived shortcomings of urban schools when attention should be paid to the problems of aging facilities and inadequate staffing.

Shifting environments in education today create expectations for school leaders to lead the adoption of changes required for the implementation of new policies (Berman, et al, 1977; Louis, 1999; Heller & Firestone, 1995). Some have argued that transformational leadership is a good fit for meeting these expectations. Goldring, Crowson, Laird, and Berk (2003) held that in addition to a focus on transformational leadership, there needs to be a focus on "a leadership of transition" (p. 474). They described the former in terms of changing structures, purposes, goals and behaviors, while the latter focuses on the initial stages of the change process. During this transitional stage, old patterns are unmade or dismantled while new ones are being made or re-created, and this can create a sense of loss, a sense of displacement, and a period when things feel 'messy' and disordered to organizational members. It is important during such times of change that leaders must help to clarify the direction of the organization to its members. Two ways of doing so, as suggested by Goldring et al., are by helping members to develop a clear picture of what the organization will look like when the transition is successfully completed and

by establishing networks with members that help persuade them that ultimately the change will be beneficial (pp. 474-475).

The primary shift in the policy environment facing today's school principals involves expectations arising from Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) mandates in the Goals 2000 initiatives and more recently through NCLB (Ervay, 2006). "However, it is NCLB's focus on standards, assessments, and adequate yearly progress that has made the greatest change in the principal's job description . . . [and that] forces the principal's compliance with external definitions of academic excellence, in addition to the management of daily building needs" (Ervay, p. 79).

Copland (2003) criticized leadership theory that focuses only on those in formal leadership positions:

What history tells us is that the traditional hierarchical model of school leadership, in which identified leaders in positions of formal authority make critical improvement decisions and then seek, through various strategies to promote adherence to those decisions among those who occupy the rungs on the ladder below has failed to adequately answer the repeated calls for sweeping educational improvements across American schools (p. 375).

Senge (1990) spoke of "reculturing" organizations to effect needed changes, with school reculturation depending on the restructuring of leadership roles and processes. Copland (2003) argued for a distributed leadership model in which leadership "functions or qualities are shared across a much broader segment of the school community" (p. 376). This broader segment includes administrators, teachers, and other professional and community members. Copland

advocated organizational improvement from a cultural perspective, discussing it as an organizational condition or an organizational quality (Murphy, 1994, Ogawa and Bossert, 1995).

Elmore (2000) identified five leadership domains that he labeled policy, professional, system, school, and practice. Elmore's work removed authority and responsibility for improving teaching and learning from administrators and embedded it in the work of everyone involved in "the enterprise of schooling". His view of distributed leadership described it first, as a collective activity that exceeds the sum of its parts; second, as something that spans tasks, responsibilities and power boundaries, as they are traditionally defined in organizations; and finally, distributed leadership, according to Elmore, rests on expert authority rather than on the authority that is associated with organizational leadership roles.

It has been asserted that the professional culture of a school is the best predictor of its success (Rosenholtz, 1991; Little, 1982; Schein, 1992). Sagor (2003) discussed teacher and student motivation in an era of high-stakes testing and cited a list of norms developed by Saphier and King (1985). They had identified norms including collegiality, experimentation, high expectations, trust and confidence, tangible support, reaching out to the knowledge base, appreciation and recognition, caring, celebration and humor, involvement in decision-making protection of what's important, traditions, and honest and open communication as contributing to success.

Leithwood, Jantzi & Steinbach (1998) detailed internal and external stimuli that lead to individual and organizational learning in schools: "Prominent among external stimuli were 'official' sources including new ministry programs, new programs being implemented in one's school, encouragement from administrators to implement new programs, and district policy initiatives" (p. 70). Teachers who helped develop this list identified demographic changes in the

student population as an additional external source. Schools responded differently to these stimuli, and the authors theorized this was due to differences in perceived mission and vision and openness to change, with some schools having cultures that fostered such openness.

In addition to external factors, district-level conditions including culture, structures, strategies, policies, and resources also facilitated organizational learning. Community conditions that promoted positive relationships with parents and patrons, and some ministry factors that provided resources for schools and teachers were also cited as conditions that lead to organizational learning. Specific school-based practices including norms of support, respect and a willingness to take risks were associated with organizational learning. Collaboration and collegial cultures fostered learning along with a norm of continuous professional growth. Structural support through planning meetings, informal problem-solving sessions, regularly scheduled professional development time during school, and shared preparation (planning) periods for teachers who needed to work together also contribute to organizational learning

School-based strategies that supported learning were setting and clarifying short-term goals and establishing professional growth plans. Setting a limited number of goals and providing on-going feedback on progress in meeting those goals was also cited. Teachers also cited their fellow teachers along with professional materials, access to computer technology and curriculum resources as building level supports.

Writing in 1990, Senge identified five attributes or “disciplines” that provide administrators with ways to evaluate organizational growth:

1. Systems thinking. Schools are complex, made up of many parts that interact with each other. Member understanding of this interaction is essential to dealing with the complex challenges in today’s world.

2. Individual mastery. Members must have a high level of skill and must work continuously to develop and improve that skill.
3. Mental models. Schools have an image of who they are and how they do things that can assist in organizational growth.
4. Building a shared vision. Members must share a powerful vision of what they want to be as an organization, and this vision motivates their efforts at growth and improvement.
5. Team building. New learning is constructed in team or group settings. This learning is collective, interactive and dialogic.

Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross and Smith (2000) described a phenomenon they labeled “drowning in events” that confronts many principals. Zmuda, Kuklis, and Kline (2004) described two opposing responses to this phenomenon: An administrative approach that views problems as something to be solved in a prompt and efficient manner, and a leadership approach that sees them as opportunities for learning. While both approaches have merit, schools that have leaders who view problems in the latter light become more competent systems (p.33). Members use systems thinking to envision desired results, define current reality through intelligent use of a variety of data, design and implement staff development that facilitates growth toward goals, develop action plans, and they welcome of accountability as they work together.

The principalship is a multifaceted leadership role. Today’s principals must be adept at managing those ordinary tasks that keep buildings running smoothly, while working with and through teachers to improve instruction and learning. Finally, in an evolving, shifting environment rife with technological, social, and political change they are asked to lead a

corresponding change or restructuring of their schools that will enable those schools to survive and advance.

Context and Theory of Middle Level Leadership

In 2004, Michael Prater studied the impact of various factors of the three predominant leadership paradigms on student success in Missouri's high schools. This study seeks to conduct similar research at middle level schools. A study of managerial, instructional, and transformational principal leadership at the middle level requires some understanding of the context of middle level education. Middle level schools emerged as a separate level of schooling after the turn of the twentieth century. Concerns about the amount of time students should spend in school, what the grade configurations of schools should be, students retention rates, and preparation of students for college or the industrial settings that had emerged at the end of the nineteenth century provided the genesis for the emergence of separate grades for young adolescents (Wiles and Bondi 1986; Valentine, Clark, Hackmann, and Petzko, 2002).

Prior to the twentieth century, fewer than 10% of American adolescents were enrolled in America's secondary schools (Williamson and Johnston, 2004). Colleges of the time accepted most students who applied, but some required entrance exams of aspiring students. In 1893, the Committee of Ten on Secondary Studies which was chaired by Charles Eliot of Harvard (Clark and Clark, 1994, p. 8). recommended that high school subjects such as algebra and foreign languages be moved to elementary grades to help better prepare students for college. In a related development, the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) was formed in 1900 in order to help determine student readiness for college. As more students stayed in school, a variety of concerns, including the preparation of students for college, led to a call for more than four years in secondary school. For example, in 1918, "(The) familiar bulletin, *Cardinal Principles of*

Secondary Education, recommended that a school system be organized into a six-year elementary school and a six-year high school that was designed to serve pupils twelve to eighteen years of age” (Wiles and Bondi, 1986, p. 2). There was a call by some to establish a junior and a senior division of that six-year high school program.

The theoretical impetus to create a separate layer of schools can be traced to the work of people such as G. Stanley Hall (1904), who asserted that youth, ages 10-14, had unique developmental needs. Following Hall’s work, references to providing for individual differences and meeting the needs of early adolescents began to appear with greater frequency in the literature of the day (Wiles and Bondi, 1986). Separate schools containing grades 7-9 appeared first in Columbus, Ohio in 1909, then a year later in Berkeley, California. In 1913, *The Report on Economy of Time in Education* (Baker, 1913) was published and issued a call for junior high schools. Ten years after the first 7-9 grade school began, Briggs (1920) published *The Junior High School*, and this event, which provided significant momentum to the emerging junior high school movement (Valentine et al., 2002).

Several important works in the 1920’s including that of Koos (1927) helped to bring greater identity to junior high schools. Combined with these ideas were other major forces that contributed to the growth of junior high schools, including concerns for economy of time, which called for moving high school course work to younger age groups to provide better preparation for college; concerns about high drop out/poor retention rates; awareness of the variations in the needs of learners; knowledge of the special needs of young adolescents; concerns about overcrowding in schools; and the momentum of the junior high movement, as more and more junior highs opened (Valentine et al., 2004, p. 3).

Gruhn and Douglass (1947) added an important contribution to the literature as they proposed a list of the six basic functions of a junior high school. They labeled these: *integration*, the ability to take previous knowledge and integrate and use that knowledge in an acceptable manner; *exploration*, the opportunity to explore and develop interests; *guidance*, assistance to students in making vocational and social decisions; *differentiation*, meeting the needs of diverse learners; *socialization*, preparing students to be successful in the “social order”; and *articulation*, transition through the educational sequence. Support for these ideas appeared in the writings of Lounsbury (1954) and Van Til, Vars and Lounsbury (1961).

Despite the fact that junior high schools had been created to meet the unique needs of emerging adolescents, few college courses existed to prepare teachers specifically for them working with that age group. In fact, most college preparation was developed for secondary teachers who could be employed to teach at either the junior or senior high level (Weller, 1999). Perhaps as a result, junior high schools were often organized in a manner that paralleled high schools, with teachers “based in academic departments rather than in interdisciplinary groups” (Weller, 1999. p. 3). Still the model grew, and according to Weller, there were over 5,000 junior high schools in America in the year 1960.

At that time of its ascendancy, a series of developments combined to challenge the junior high model. The burgeoning baby-boomer population that was crowding America’s schools created stress on their facilities and led to teacher shortages. This created an environment that made school officials more receptive to new grade configurations. In addition, it was believed that ninth grade students would benefit from greater opportunities provided in high school buildings, and this, it should be noted, was an important consideration in the post-Sputnik world (Valentine et al., 2004; Wiles and Bondi, 1986).

At that time, some critics of junior highs were asserting the need for a different model of middle level education, one that would be more suited to the unique needs of students in the pre-teen and early teenage years (Wiles and Bondi, 1986; Weller, 1999). For a variety of reasons, it was perceived that the junior high structure was not meeting these needs. The junior high had become too much like the high schools, it was argued, with departmental structures, interscholastic sports, selective activities, and conventional bell schedules that were dictated by the need of 9th grade students to earn graduation credits (Anfara, Andrews, and Mertens, 2005; Wiles and Bondi, 1986).

Given an environment in which reconfiguration of grades was possible, even desirable, and given that junior highs were not perceived by some as meeting the needs of young adolescents, several other developments in the early 1960's also contributed to the call for a new model of middle level education. The earliest roots of this change can be traced to the aforementioned works of Hall, Briggs, Gruhn and Douglass, and Koos who had established the need for a separate level of schools for young adolescents and described the characteristics of the schools that would serve them. Since junior highs often mimicked high schools, it was argued that the vision of these pioneers was not being realized.

The work of several people in a wide variety of fields including Dewey (progressive education), Toepfer (adolescent learning), Epstein (brain growth and periodization), and Piaget, Gardner, and Havighurst (learning theories) provided the theoretical basis for a completely different model for the middle grades (Wiles and Bondi, 1986; Weller, 1999). Some of the momentum for the middle school movement may also be traced to the work of NASSP Associate Executive Director, J. Lloyd Trump, who along with others such as William Georgiades, promoted new programs and structures that later came to define middle level education,

including team teaching, teacher advisories, and interdisciplinary curriculum. At the same time, it should be noted that the 1960's were a decade of change for public education as a whole. New curricula were emerging in science, math, and grammar and these, too, contributed to a climate of innovation and change (Valentine et al., 2004).

Taken as a whole these developments, which echoed the conditions that had led to the emergence of junior highs one-half century earlier, created a climate, which was conducive to the emergence of a new middle level model. Notable among those advocating a new model were Eichhorn (1966) and Alexander (1968) who urged that the focus of middle level education be placed more clearly on the unique physical, intellectual, and social/emotional characteristics of the age group. "The point of greatest significance is that the middle school must be uniquely planned, staffed, and operated to provide a program that is truly focused on the rapidly moving and changing learners in transition from childhood to adolescence," (Alexander and George, 1981, p. 9).

Grade configurations of these new middle schools were often different than the standard junior high 7-9 structure. Two reasons for this were first, the earlier onset of puberty noted among American youth at mid-century (Romano and Georgiady, 1994, p. 18), which moved the need for middle school programming to earlier grades, and second, the fact that ninth grade, the freshman year of high school, was held to the need for Carnegie units of credit. This latter factor was important because it dictated the very structure of the school day with implications for a number of issues including inter-disciplinary teaming. As a result, middle schools have often seen eighth grade as the ultimate grade, with the starting point varying from fifth to seventh grade.

By 1967, there were 1,101 middle schools in America, and within another ten years that number had quadrupled (Alexander and George, 1981, p. 13). Accompanying this growth in numbers was a proliferation of publications and conferences focusing on middle schools and young adolescents, which led Valentine et al. (2002) to describe the era from the mid-1960's to the mid 1980's as "the Middle School Era." (p. v). In the midst of this era, the ASCD Working Group on the Emerging Adolescent Learner developed a list of 10 characteristics of a middle school, including:

1. Unique programming for the pre- and early adolescent learner
2. A wide range of intellectual, social, and physical activities
3. A respect for individual differences, while exploring and developing fundamental skills
4. A climate that supports such things as developing abilities, and exploring and weighing options
5. Staff members that are attuned to the needs, interests, and backgrounds of the students
6. A smooth transition from elementary to high school
7. Child centeredness, seeking success for all students
8. Guidance to help produce productive citizens
9. Competent staff equipped for instructing this age group
10. Facilities and time structures that support the program (Gatewood, 1975)

Alexander and George, 1981, revisited the list of junior high functions developed by Gruhn and Douglass (1947), and updated it to include guidance, transition and articulation, block time schedules and interdisciplinary teams, appropriate teaching strategies, exploratory

curriculum, and appropriate core curriculum and learning skills as the new essential features of a middle school. Teacher teams, with a common variant being a four-teacher team, often characterized middle schools with each teacher having a specialty in one of the four core areas. The teams shared a common group of students and a common time for curricular planning and student personnel work. In some instances, these teams have been empowered to set the schedules of their own students, which allows for flexible scheduling. Other characteristics of middle schools were homerooms, exploratory experiences in electives areas, intramural rather than interscholastic athletics, and heterogeneous ability grouping (Valentine et al. 2004).

The end of the Middle School Era in the mid 1980's occurred at a time when middle level schools like their elementary and senior high counterparts were subject to public criticism. At first, middle schools were not subject to as much negative attention as the high schools were facing, but given the fact that middle schools were responsible for preparing students for high school, they inevitably came under fire. Critics of middle schools increased in number and became increasingly vocal, including The Southern Regional Education Board who called middle schools "education's weak link," (Williamson and Johnston, 1998, p. 38). According to Valentine, Clark, Hackman, and Petzko (2004), "Middle level schools arguably [were] subject to as much intense scrutiny and condemnation as elementary or high schools, if not more" (p. 15). At times, criticism came from within the educational community itself, as even some of their high school counterparts voiced criticisms of middle schools (Williamson and Johnston, 1988).

Measures of student outcomes have also fueled concerns about middle schools. In 1995 the Third International Study of Mathematics and Science (TIMSS) showed poor performance of eighth grade students when compared with other economically developed nations as well as with some developing nations. Balfanz and MacIver (2000) noted that the poor quality of

education provided in urban middle schools meant that approximately half of the students were not prepared to be successful at the high school. Results on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) showed little improvement over a 20-year span (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2006). The performance of middle school students on TIMSS and on state assessments contributed to a call for high-stakes testing at all levels of education.

As national calls for reform of schools included specific calls to reform middle level education, there were those who demanded a return to the junior high model in order to rectify this situation (Dickinson and Butler, 2001). In 1989, the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development responded by publishing a report from the Task Force on Education of Young Adolescents. Called *Turning Points*, it represented a set of recommendations for twenty-first century middle schools. The report, rather than calling for a return to a junior high model, called for the schools serving middle level students to more fully adopt practices advocated by middle school experts. The Task Force developed a set of eight recommendations for middle schools:

1. Establish small learning communities, characterized by stable relationships between students and adults, which would in turn foster personal and intellectual development. This implies organizing by interdisciplinary teacher teams and advisor-advisee relationships.
2. Maintain a core academic program that promotes critical thinking skills, learning how to learn, citizenship and ethical behavior and responsibility for self and others.
3. Provide success for all students using cooperative learning and flexible scheduling, while avoiding tracking and ability grouping.
4. Empower teachers to become part of the leadership of the school.
5. Employ teachers trained to work with emerging adolescents.

6. Improve physical and mental health through programs and hiring personnel, such as counselors.
7. Involve families in a meaningful way.
8. Reconnect with the community at large. (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989).

Weller (1999) noted that at least four studies conducted at the time of the release of the Carnegie report supported such middle school practices. Research by a number of people including Felner et al. (1997) had revealed that when schools fully implemented reforms such as *Turning Points*, academic rigor, developmental responsiveness, and social equity were fostered. Dickinson and Butler (2001) addressed what they termed as “the arrested development” of middle schools. They believed the middle school model to be valid, and contended that any perceived problems were due to a number of factors:

1. The transition from junior highs to middle schools being poorly implemented. Junior high teachers were placed in middle schools with little training, and for this reason, many schools never fully implemented the middle school model.
2. Lack of teacher programs at the college level and a lack of certification specific to the middle school level.
3. A focus that was more on structural pieces than on the curriculum. When this concern became identified in 1993 it encountered the beginnings of standardized testing – high-stakes testing era.
4. NMSA has not been aggressive enough in advocating for middle schools including *This We Believe* (National Middle School Association, 1995), its own philosophy document.

5. Lack of research to support middle school concepts
6. Not fully understanding that the original concepts of middle schools were in fact a “total ecology of schooling,” (p. 10).

The calls for school restructuring that began to be heard in the 1990’s were directed at middle schools as well. A decade after the publication of *Turning Points*, Jackson and Davis (2000) published *Turning Points 2000: Educating Adolescents in the 21st Century*. While acknowledging successes of schools that had implemented *Turning Points* reforms, the authors indicated that much work remained to be done. They called for change to be broader and deeper, especially for students in the lowest-performing schools. In 2003, NMSA reissued *This We Believe: Successful Schools for Young Adolescents*. The positions in *This We Believe* were “supported by a burgeoning research base about young adolescent growth and development and successful practices in curriculum, organization, and indeed every aspect of middle level schools” (NATIONAL MIDDLE SCHOOL ASSOCIATION, 2003, p. xi). The paper outlined 14 characteristics, 8 cultural and 6 programmatic, that reassert what it means to be a successful middle school. In combination with *Turning Points 2000*, it provided middle schools and their leaders with a useful template to evaluate their own practices.

Middle Level Leadership

When junior highs began to appear at the beginning of the twentieth century, principal leadership was influenced by the prevalent managerial leadership theories of the time. Valentine et al. (2004) noted that middle level leadership roles started changing after the 1930’s moving from the prevalent management paradigm through democratic and humanistic models, before ultimately arriving at an instructional model in the 1990’s.

Middle schools began to emerge in the 1960's at the beginning of an era of social unrest and educational change in America. The social concerns of the decade were reflected in the 1966 Report on Equality of Educational Opportunity (often called The Coleman Report) (Coleman et al., 1996) which expressed concern about America's poor students, especially its urban poor. Thirteen years later, Edmonds (1979) echoed the call for better schools for America's children, especially its urban poor. By the time of the publication of *A Nation at Risk*, in 1983, much of the literature on principal leadership was beginning to focus on effective schools and instructional leaders.

A review of the literature conducted by Hoy and Miskel (1991) revealed as many as 10 characteristics of successful schools. Weller's (1999) review of those lists found that strong principal leadership, a safe and orderly environment with an emphasis on academic achievement high expectations for both student and teacher success, an academic emphasis based on a collective vision, planning and goal setting, an emphasis on basic skills with quality instruction, continuous monitoring of student progress, and positive relationships with parents were characteristics that were most often found.

Writing about the characteristic of strong principal leadership, Anfara, Brown, Mills, Hartman, and Mahar (2001) noted, "There is a lack of research focused on the middle level principalship" (p. 185). Nonetheless, George and Alexander (1993) viewed such research as essential because "Middle schools are affected by many factors as they seek to become exemplary, but none is more significant than the quality of their leadership," (p. 497). They held the belief that effective leadership is comprised of three sets of global behaviors:

1. A clear understanding of the characteristics and needs of young adolescents that is translated into a vision of appropriate organization

2. Using knowledge of young adolescents to plan a school program with effective implementation and evaluation
3. Engaging all stakeholders in a shared decision-making process aimed at continual improvement, (George and Alexander, p. 497).

Williamson (1991) described the role of the middle school principal as being an inspirational leader, human resource developer, and change agent. Valentine et al., (2004), contended that principal leadership for highly effective middle schools has three elements: reflective practice, collaborative instructional leadership, and transformational leadership (p. 20). Citing studies by Schön (1987) and Mullen, Gordon, Greenlee and Anderson (2002), they advocated the value of a principal's reflecting on his or her own practice and the ability to help their teachers do the same. Bright (1996) argued that reflective practice "is the process which underlies all forms of high professional competence" (p. 166). York-Barr, Sommers, Ghore, and Montie (2001) reported research that made it clear "that when educators engage in high-quality learning experiences, the impact on student learning is positive" (p. 1). To York-Barr et al., the focus of reflection is the examining of one's beliefs, goals, and practices. Lambert (2003) described reflection on practice as reflection on "methods, techniques, strategies, procedures and the like" (p. 7). Through this examination, educators can gain new insights and develop actions for student learning. York-Barr et al. (2001) saw this happening individually, in small groups or teams, and school wide. The data gathered by Blase and Blase (1999a) indicated that conversations with teachers, including instructional conferences, were instrumental to principal instructional leadership and "encouraged teachers to become aware of and critically reflect on their learning and professional practice" (p. 359). Five practices which included making

suggestions; giving feedback; modeling; using inquiry and soliciting advice and opinions; and giving praise were said by Blase and Blase to promote reflection.

Middle school structures, which often provide a common planning time for interdisciplinary teams to work together, are especially supportive of team reflection. Lambert (2003) indicated that time is a critical factor for processes such as reflection and collaboration to be successful. Flowers, Mertens, and Mulhall (2000) added that flexible scheduling, common adjacent classrooms, and team autonomy are other middle school features that may also contribute to collaboration and professional growth. In 1993, George and Alexander recommended that leadership ensure staff members are involved in “carefully planned staff development, (George and Alexander, (p. 503). The National Staff Development Council called for “specific, targeted professional development strategies that support high performance in the middle grades,” (Sparks and Hirsch, 1997, p. 44).

Valentine et al. (2004) stated that instructional leadership, the second element needed for highly effective middle level schools, must be collaborative in nature, “because principals cannot engage in instructional activities in isolation” (p. 21). They suggested that principals should team with internal and external stakeholders, “to promote the formation of a shared vision and common goals” (p. 21). Barth (1990) asserted that no relationship in a school has a greater effect on the quality of that school than the relationship between teacher and principal, and the key to improving schools lies within the improvement of those relationships. Bolman and Deal (1993) stated that the quality of a principal’s leadership is dependent on his or her relationships with staff. In addition to building strong relationships, middle school principals should develop skills in teaming and shared decision-making (George and Grebing, 1992).

Wiles and Bondi (1986) contended that the principal, along with assistants, curricular, team and department leaders, and classroom teachers, together, form the leadership team in middle schools. Among the characteristics of the instructional leaders at the middle level, they proposed

1. understanding the nature of the transescent learner
2. being knowledgeable of new instructional practices in the various disciplines
3. being aware of such organizational structures as interdisciplinary instruction, block scheduling, and flexible time arrangements
4. being creative, dynamic and possessing good communication skills,
5. orchestrating resources to support the program
6. possessing group leadership skills
7. being active in the community
8. seeing the program in the larger K-12 context
9. teaching when possible
10. being knowledgeable about instruction and the teaching and learning processes (p. 162).

In support of understanding the nature of the adolescent learner, McEwin et al. (1996) reminded educators that practices at the middle school level must be responsive to the developmental needs of young adolescents. Valentine et al. (2004) added

Middle level principals and their faculty members must have a solid understanding of effective curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices. They must possess knowledge about emerging adolescents' physical, cognitive, emotional, and social characteristics so that their learning organizations address the developmental needs of children. (p. 21)

Transformational leadership was the third element of leadership added to reflective practice and collaborative instructional leadership for highly effective middle schools as described by Valentine et al. (2004). Many, including Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach (2000b) have considered it as the model of principal leadership most suited to the era of school restructuring. They had argued that instructional leadership focused on core technology, a first-order change, and that this is too limited to transform a school's teaching and learning. Valentine et al. (2004) contended that change in schools will not become sustainable without school restructuring (a second-order change according to Leithwood, 1999). The school culture becomes transformed only as changes are institutionalized.

Transformational leaders must gain commitment of members to the organizational mission and vision. Vision, at the middle level, should be "built solidly on a compassionate understanding of the characteristics and needs of young adolescents" (George and Alexander 1993, p. 504). The National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) pointed out, "Every educational reform report of the last decade concludes that the United States cannot have excellent schools without excellent leaders," (as cited in Thompson, 2004, p. 20). One study of leadership in high-quality middle schools linked "the longevity of commendable programs to a heightened sense of mission, and the resulting clarity of vision . . . based on a familiarity with and an affinity for the characteristics of older children and adolescents," (George and Alexander, 1991, p. 498). While middle level leadership bears similarity to leadership in all levels of education, it has, based on the unique needs of the students being served, a unique perspective. Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1998) reported that teachers who had engaged in organizational and individual learning reported that it impacted their practices, understanding, commitment, and skills. The understanding cited most was the "acceptance of the necessity of

meeting the needs of each individual student and the importance of relating to the “whole child and not only his/her academic development” (p. 78). This point resonates strongly with middle school philosophy. Processes cited in their study were informal discussions with colleagues, usually occurring in team settings; trial-and-error and experimentation with new practices, especially when associated with reflective practices; and spending time in each other’s classes (p. 76).

Empirical Evidence of Principal Leadership on Student Achievement

Calls for school reform or restructuring have been heard since the decade of the 1980’s (Valentine et al. 2004). Accompanying these has been a focus on the role of the school principal as an instrumental agent in effecting school change with researchers and theorists looking at the behaviors of school principals in an effort to determine which, if any, of those behaviors contribute to school success. In addition to an emphasis on behaviors, there has also been a discussion of leadership styles, and a debate as to whether principals directly or indirectly impact student outcomes. This section reviews studies of direct and indirect connections of principal leadership with student achievement.

Heck (1993) determined that the interplay among variables, including the variable of principal leadership, along with school context and student achievement is a complex one. DeBevoise (1984) cited a list of behaviors that lead to success and acknowledged that different styles of leadership could be effective. Similarly, Evans and Teddlie (1995) looked at schools with different socio-economic contexts and determined that different leadership styles work better in different settings, with, for example, a stronger leadership style being more effective in lower SES schools. Larsen (1987) surveyed teachers at higher and lower performing elementary schools in California and determined that principals in higher performing schools were rated

higher than their counterparts on items in the areas of goal setting, school and community relations, supervision and evaluation, school climate, coordination, and staff development. Bamburg and Andrews (1991) studied both high and low-achieving elementary schools and found that principals in higher achieving schools placed greater emphasis on instructional activities while their faculties demonstrated a focus on excellence.

At least two important meta-analyses have looked at the ways that principals impact student achievement. Cotton (2003) chose to look at research conducted after 1970, with a special focus on research done after 1985. She noted that in 1985 there was a shift from effective schools research, based on the work of Edmonds, Brookover, and Lezotte, and instructional leadership research, based on the work of Leithwood, Montgomery, and DeBevoise, to a broader definition of leadership that included teacher behaviors and an interest in the “well being of others” (p. 4). Cotton looked at studies of high-achieving schools and at the characteristics of the leaders in those schools to develop a list of traits and actions they had in common. Waters, Marzano and McNulty (2003) reviewed over 2,000 studies that were published after 1978 and reported results from the 70 studies that reported standardized, objective, and quantitative measures of student achievement. For these studies, achievement was the dependent variable and teacher perception of principal leadership was the independent variable. One conclusion drawn from their research was that while “leaders can have a positive impact on achievement, they also can have a marginal, or worse a negative impact on achievement” (p. 5). They pointed out two characteristics that promote positive change: focus of change, which is their ability to improve school and classroom practices that have a greater likelihood of impacting achievement, and a proper understanding of the magnitude and/or “order” of change and making appropriate adjustments in their practices (p. 5).

The Task Force on Developing Researching Educational Leadership asserted that only the effects of the quality of curriculum and teachers' instruction exceed the effects of leadership on student learning, (Leithwood and Riehl, 2003). The Stanford Educational Leadership Institute conducted a meta-analysis of research on educational leadership and identified three important aspects of a principal's job including teacher support, promoting student learning through curriculum management, and transforming schools into organizations that provide for powerful teaching and learning experiences for students (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, and Mayerson, 2005). LaPointe and Davis (2006) viewed school leadership as influencing student success through two pathways: first through the support of effective teachers and second, through the implementation of effective organizational processes.

Cotton (2003) reported 25 characteristics and behaviors of extraordinary principals. The research of Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) revealed a list of 21 responsibilities of principal leadership. They compared that list to Cotton's (Marzano, Waters, and McNulty, 2005, Appendix B). A synthesis of leadership characteristics of these two important studies shows many factors in common. For example, both studies describe effective principals as creating an orderly and safe environment for students. Both see a school culture that shares a common vision and focuses on achieving that vision. Principals are visible and accessible and they reach out to members of the school community, including staff, students, and parents. Leaders seek to find and celebrate individual success of staff and students. Principals allocate resources to instruction and to the professional development of their teachers making sure that their teachers are aware of current research and best practices, and that they are knowledgeable about and actively involved in the school's curriculum. There is a strong emphasis on monitoring student achievement. Both analyses see effective leaders as innovative and risk taking and supportive of those qualities in

the faculty. Finally, effective leaders develop relationships with staff and provide support and empathy when needed.

In recent years, school success has been increasingly defined as performance on standardized, high-stakes testing (Fowler, 2004). Among the first to study principal leadership and student outcomes was Glasman (1984). His work established that student test scores could be impacted if principals led the analysis and sharing of results with staff. Eberts and Stone (1988) conducted a national study of students at the fourth grade level and supported the notion that principal leadership has a relationship with student outcomes. Whether this relationship is coincidental or causal has been debated by a number of writers including Bossert et al., (1983) and Hallinger and Murphy (1986). Heck and his colleagues (1990) studied the impact of principal leadership on student achievement using results on the California Assessment Program as the measure. While controlling for SES and school level, they determined that, in fact, principal behaviors related to school governance, instructional organization, and school climate do have a relationship with student test scores. Brewer (1993) sought to replicate Eberts and Stone's (1988) research at the secondary level and in doing so determined that teacher selection and goal setting are ways that secondary principals impact student achievement.

Leadership has been characterized as a multidirectional influence relationship between leader and followers with the mutual purpose of accomplishing change where leaders seek to do the right thing, to produce organizational change, and are not afraid to disrupt order and efficiency as they do (Rost, 1991; Bennis and Nanus 1985; and Kotter 1990). Kathleen Cotton (2003) posed the question, "Do successful principals get results primarily by appealing to the self-interest of staff members, or do they somehow lead the staff to transcend self-interest to focus on the well-being of others?" (p. 3-4).

Hallinger and Heck have contributed extensively to the research on principals and student outcomes. Their 1997 review of the literature led to a three-fold classification of principal effects ranging from direct effects by principal actions to mediated effects which see principals influence outcomes through other variables, to a reciprocal effect through which actions of staff members and of the principal affect each other and have an impact on student outcomes (Hallinger and Heck, 1997, pp. 162-163). In earlier research, Heck (1993) had determined that contextual variables such as school size, type of school, and teacher experience had an effect on student outcomes. Hallinger and Heck (1997), building on this reasoning, argued that direct effects studies did not take these factors into account. Mediated effects research held the most promise for consistent results, and they urged researchers using direct effects approaches to control for other variables that affect student outcomes.

Hallinger and Heck (1997) asserted that the internal processes of a school that are linked to student success, such as academic expectations, school mission, instructional organization, and academic learning time could be influenced by principal leadership. This should not cause alarm, they argued, for “achieving results through others is the essence of leadership” (Hallinger and Heck, 1996, p. 39). Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2004) identified four leadership styles that facilitated student achievement through promoting a positive and energizing climate for teachers. They listed visionary, coaching, democratic, and facilitative styles as capable of accomplishing positive results. Characteristics associated with these styles include articulating a shared goal; providing performance feedback with suggestions that help facilitate goal achievement; discussing personal aspirations of members and providing feedback that references those aspirations; and eliciting ‘buy-in’ by listening to members, drawing on their strengths, and creating harmony. Leadership styles that were less likely to facilitate success were labeled as

pacesetting and commanding. Characteristics of these styles include modeling a hard-driving personal style and giving orders with an expectation of immediate compliance. These more authoritarian types tended to depress the motivation of organizational members. Studies of British and Canadian school leaders conducted by the Hay Group (2000) and by Stone, Parker, and Wood (2005) supported these findings.

Even as high-stakes testing has become the measure of school effectiveness following the passage of No Child Left Behind (Ed. Gov., 2006), there continue to be critics as well. The proponents of high-stakes testing argue that it improves both teacher focus on important skills and content while encouraging students to be more serious about learning (Mehrens, 1998, Roderick and Engel, 2001). However, there has also been a discussion of the appropriateness of using high-stakes testing as the measure of school effectiveness. Opponents argue that its shortfalls include limiting the scope of instruction, widening achievement gaps by demotivating students, and undermining organizational culture (Shepard, 1990; Mehrens, 1998; Roderick and Engel, 2001; Sergiovanni, 1999). DeMoss (2002) researched the role of principal in Chicago in mediating the stresses created by an environment of high-stakes testing. According to DeMoss, those principals who established and supported a comprehensive program of academic rigor, assessed student performance and growth, and created a school-wide program for preparation in the basics were seen to improve student scores on high-stakes testing. Sagor (2003) held that principals can and do motivate teachers and students in an era of high-stakes testing if there is a focus on school cultural concerns. Given the universality of high-stakes testing in the United States today, and the focus of attention on it by media and the public, principals are called to lead schools that demonstrate student success on such measures. Given the ubiquitous nature of high-stakes testing and the relatively high importance attached thereto by politicians, the media, and

the public, America's principals are called to lead schools in achieving student success as measured by such testing.

Summary

Researchers often focus on one model of principal leadership, but there are others, such as Leithwood and Duke (1999) who argued that it is unlikely that any one model describes what qualities leaders should possess. Marks and Printy (2003), suggested for example that instructional leadership and transformational leadership should be integrated. Day (2000) contended that managerial leadership was necessary to structure the work done by transformational leadership. Leithwood and Jantzi (2000b) argued that transformational leadership must include management roles along with leadership in order to be successful. Bass, as cited earlier, contended that transactional leadership and transformational leadership complement each other. Prater (2004) studied the effects of factors of each model as they related to student achievement at the high school level and studied the relationships of factors of each model with each other and the effects of factors of each model as they related to student achievement at the high school level.

Today's school principals, whatever their level, operate in a social-political environment that is constantly changing. Changes in technology and communication, combined with changing school populations, and the demands of high-stakes testing have all contributed to a changing context of schooling in America. Middle level principals no less than their counterparts at other levels, deal with this shifting environment while attending to the unique needs of their students.

Three major theoretical models during the junior high and middle school eras, those being managerial, instructional, and transformational, have impacted principal leadership. Each has taken a turn as a predominant leadership paradigm. The literature has sought to explore what

it means to be an effective principal under each model. Theory has been advanced and research conducted to help identify principal behaviors that help schools to be successful in terms of student outcomes. Given the relative dearth of research on middle level leadership, a study organized along lines similar to that conducted by Prater (2004) in which he examined the role of the high school principal through the lenses of those three predominant leadership paradigms, and conducted in a middle level context, would appear to be beneficial.

References

Anfara, V. A., Jr., Andrews, G., & Mertens, S. B. (2005). *The encyclopedia of middle grades education*. Greenwich, CN: Information Age Publishing, 183-212.

Anfara, V. A., Jr., Brown, K. M., Mills, R., Hartman, K., & Mahar, R. J. (2001) in Anfara, V. A., Jr. (Ed.) *The handbook of research in middle level education*. Greenwich, CN: Information Age Publishing.

Alexander, W. M., (1968). *The emergent middle school*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Alexander, W. M., & George, P. S. (1981). *The exemplary middle school*. New York: CBS College Publishing, Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Alvy, H. & Robbins, P. (2005). Growing into leadership. *Educational Leadership* 62(8), 50-54.

Andrews, R. L., & Soder, R. (1987). Principal leadership and student achievement. *Educational Leadership*, 44(6), 9-11.

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1995). *Construct validation and norms for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-Form 5X)*. Binghamton, NY: State University of New York Center for Leadership Studies.

Babbage, C. (2006). Retrieved June 2, 2006 from

<http://www.google.com/search?q=cache:4CtIcRvacRgJ:ei.cs.vt.edu/history/Babbage>.

Baker, J. (1913). *Report of the Committee on the National Council of Education on Economy of Time in Education* (Bulletin 1913, No. 38). Washington, DC: Department of Interior, Bureau of Education.

- Balfanz, R. & MacIver, D. J. (2000). Transforming high-poverty urban middle schools into strong learning institutions: Lessons from the first five years of the Talent Development Middles School. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 5(1 and 2), 137-158.
- Bamburg, J. D., & Andrews, R. L. (1991). School goals, principals, and achievement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 2(3), 176-191.
- Barnett, B. G., and Whitaker, K. S (1996). *Restructuring for student learning* (P. Short, Ed.). Lancaster, PA: Technomic.
- Barth, R. S. (1990). *Improving Schools from within: Teachers, parents, and principals can make the difference*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B, M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Beck, L. G., & Murphy, J. (1992). Searching for a robust understanding of the principalship. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28(3), 387-396.
- Beck, L. G., & Murphy, J. (1993). *Understanding the principalship: Metaphorical themes, 1920-1990*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Beebe, R. J., (1998) Recruiting and selecting new teachers: The recruitment budgeting cycle. *NASSP Bulletin* 82(602), 77-82.
- Bennis, W. G. (2003). *On becoming a leader: updated and expanded*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.

- Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bensinmon, E. M., Neumann, A. & Birnbaum, R., (1989). *Making sense of administrative leadership: The "L" word in higher education*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, DC: School of Education and Human Development The Geroge Washington University.
- Berman, P., McLaughlin, M. W., Bass-Golod, B. B., Pauly, E., & Zellman, G. (1977). *Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. VII, Factors affecting implementation and continuation*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Bjork, L.G. (1996). The revisionists' critique of the education reform reports. *Journal of School Leadership, 6*, 290-315.
- Blase, J. & Blase & J. (1994). *Empowering teachers: What successful principals do*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Blase, J. & Blase & J. (1999a). Principal's instructional leadership and teacher development: Teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(3), 349-378.
- Blase, J. & Blase J. (1999b). Effective instructional leadership through the teachers' eyes. *The High School Magazine, 7*(1), 16-20.
- Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. (1980). *The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1993). *The path to school leadership: A portable mentor*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Bossert, S. T., Dwyer, D. C., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. V. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(3), 34-64.
- Bossert, S. T., Dwyer, D. C., Rowan, B., Lee, G. V., Harrigan, B., (1983). Leadership characteristics that facilitate school change. *Educational Leadership* 49(5), 53-65.
- Bowman, M., & Valentine, J. (1984). *Audit of principal effectiveness: A user's technical manual*.
- Brewer, D. J. (1993). Principals and student outcomes: Evidence from U.S. high schools. *Economics of Education Review*, 12(4), 281-292.
- Briggs, T. H., (1920). *The junior high school*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Bright, R. (1996). Reflecting on “reflective practice”. *Studies in the education of adults* 28(2), 162-184.
- Brookover, W. & Lezotte, L. (1977). *Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University College of Urban Development.
- Brookover, W., Schweitzer, J., Schneider, J., Beady, C., Flood, P., & Wisenbaker, J. (1978). Elementary school climate and school achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 15, 301-318.
- Brookover, W. & Schweitzer, J., Schneider, J., Beady, C., Flood, P., & Wisenbaker, J. (1979). *School social systems and student achievement: Schools can make a difference*. NY: Preager.
- Brown, J. L. & Moffett, C. A. (1999). *The hero's journey: How educators can transform schools and improve learning*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Bryk, A., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.

- Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development (1989). *Turning points: Preparing American youth for the 21st century*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Charles Scribner's Sons (1993). *Public education*. Encyclopedia of American Social History. Retrieved 11/27/05 from <http://www.ere.as.wvu.edu/scopedu.htm>
- Chase, C.M, & Kane, M.B. (1993). The principal as instructional leader: How much time before we act? Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, Task Force on Education for Economic Growth. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED244369)
- Clark, S. N., & Clark, D. C. (1994). *Restructuring the middle level school: Implications for leaders*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Cleveland, H. (1985). *The knowledge executive: Leadership in an information society*. New York: Dutton.
- Coleman, J. et al. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Copland, M. A. (2003). Leadership of inquiry: Building and sustaining capacity for school improvement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 25(4). 375-395.
- Cotton, K. (2003). *Principals and student achievement: What the research says*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Cuban, L. (1984). *How teachers taught: Constancy and change in America's classrooms: 1890-1980*. New York: Longman.
- Cuban, L. (1988). *The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools*. New York: State University of New York Press.

- Davies, L. (1987). The role of the primary school head. *Educational Management and Administration*, 15, 43-47.
- Davis, J. R. (2003). *Learning to lead: A handbook for postsecondary administrators*. Westport, CT: American Council on Education and Praeger.
- Davis, J. & Jazzar, M., (2005). The seven habits of highly effective principal preparation programs. *Principal* 84(5), 18-21.
- Davis, S. H. (1998). Climbing the administrative career ladder: What goes up might come down. *NASSP Bulletin* 82(602), 49-59.
- Davis, S., Dariling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M. A., and Meyerson, D., (2005). *Schol leadership study: Preparing successful principals*. Review of Research
- Day, C. (2000). Beyond transformational leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 57(7), 56- 59.
- Deal, T. E. & Peterson, K. D. (1994). *The leadership paradox: Balancing logic and artistry in schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- DeBevoise, W. (1984). Synthesis of research on the principal as instructional leader. *Educational Leadership*, 41(5), 14-20.
- DeMoss, K. (2002). Leadership styles and high-stakes testing: Principals make a difference. *Education and Urban Society*, 35(1), 111-133.
- Dickinson, T. S. & Butler, D. A. (2001). Reinventing the middle school. *Middle School Journal* 33(1), 7-13.
- Donaldson, G. A. (1991). *Learning to lead: The dynamics of high school principalship*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Duke, D. L., & Leithwood, K. (1994). *Management and leadership: A comprehensive view of principals' functions*. Toronto: OISE, mimeo.

- ESEA (2006). *Elementary and secondary education act of 1965*. Retrieved June 18, 2006 from <http://cwx.prenhall.com/bookbind/pubbooks/burns3/medialib/docs/esea1965.htm>
- Eberts, R. W., & Stone, J. A. (1988). Student achievement in public schools: Do principals make a difference? *Economics of Education Review*, 7(3), 291-299.
- Ed. Gov., 2006: *No child left behind*. Retrieved 10/3/06 from <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml>
- Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37. 15-24.
- Eichhorn, D. (1966). *The middle school*. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education.
- Elmore, R. F. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Washington, D.C.: The Albert Shanker Institute.
- Ervay, S., (2006). Academic leadership in America's public schools. *NASSP Bulletin* 90(2), 77-86.
- Etzioni, A. A. (1961). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York: Free Press.
- Evans, L., & Teddlie, C. (1995). Facilitating change in schools: Is there one best style? *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 6(1), 1-22.
- Fayol, H. (1949). *General and industrial management*. (C. Stours, trans.) London: Pitman. Originally published in 1919.
- Fayol, H. (2006). Retrieved May 23, 2006, from <http://www.onepine.info/fayol.htm>.
- Felner, R., Jackson, A., Kasak, D., Mulhall, P., Brand, S., & Flowers, N. (1997). The impact of school reform for the middle years: A longitudinal study of a network engaged in *Turning Points*-based comprehensive school transformation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 78,(7) 528-532, 541-550.

- Finn, Jr., C. (1987). How to spot an effective principal. *Principal*, 20.
- Flesch, R. (1955). *Why Johnny can't read*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Flowers, N., Mertens, S. B., & Mulhall, P. F. (2000). What makes interdisciplinary teams effective? *Middle School Journal*, 31(4), 53-56.
- Fowler, F. C. (2004). *Policy studies for educational leaders: An introduction*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson Education Inc.
- Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M. (1996). Leadership for change. In K. Leithwood et. al. (Eds.), *International handbook of educational leadership and administration*, (701-722). Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Fullan, M., Bertani, A., & Quinn, J. (2004). Lessons from district-wide reform. *Educational Leadership* 61(6), 42-46.
- Gardner, J. W. (2000). The nature of leadership. In *Educational Leadership*, San Francisco: Jossey –Bass, (3-12).
- Gatewood, T. E. (1975). *The middle school we need: A report from the working group on the emerging adolescent learner*. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- George, P. S., & Alexander, W. M. (1993). *The exemplary middle school* (2nd ed.). Orlando, FL: Harcourt, Brace & Co.
- George, P. S. & Grebing, W., (1992). From junior high to middle school – Principals perspectives. *NASSP Bulletin* (74), 86-94
- Glasman, N. S. (1984). Student achievement and the school principal. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 6(3), 283-296.

- Glickman, A. A. (1985). *Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Glickman, C. D. (1987, April). Good and/or effective schools: What do we want? *Phi Delta Kappan* 68: 622-624.
- Goldring, E. B. & Rallis, S. F. (1993). *Principals of dynamic schools: Taking charge of change*. Newbury Park, CA: 1993.
- Goldring, E. B., Crowson, R., Laird, D. & Berk, R. (2003). Transition leadership in a shifting policy environment. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 25(4), 473-588.
- Goleman, D. (2006). The socially intelligent leader. *Educational leadership* 64(1), 76-81.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2004). *Primal leadership: Learning to lead with emotional intelligence*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Gruhn, W. T., & Douglass, H. R. (1947). *The modern junior high school*. New York: Ronald Press.
- Gulick, L. & Urwick, L. (1937). *Papers on the science of administration*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hadderman, M. (1998). *State vs. local control of schools*. ERIC Digest Series Number 24. Retrieved February 2, 2006 from <http://www.thememoryhole.org/edu/eric/ed291164.html>.
- Hall, G. S. (1904). *Adolescence: Its psychology and its relations to physiology, anthropology, sociology, sex, crime, religion and education* (Vol. 2). New York: D. Appleton.
- Hallinger, P. (1992). The evolving role of American principals: From managerial to instructional to transformational leaders. *Journal of Education, Administration*, 30(3), 35-48.

- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(1), 5-44.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1997). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 8(4), 1-35;
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9(2), 157-191.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1999). Can leadership enhance school effectiveness? In T. Bush, L. Bell, R. Boltan, R. Glatter, & P. Ribbins (Eds.), *Educational management: Redefining theory, policy and practice*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing, 178-190.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. F. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217-247.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. F. (1987). Assessing and developing principal instructional leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 45(1), 54-61.
- Harvey, C. W. (1986). How primary heads spend their time. *Educational Management and Administration*, 14, 60-68.
- Harvey, G., & Crandall, D. P. (1988). *A beginning look at the what and how of restructuring*. Andover, MA: Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands.
- Hausman, C. S., Crow, G. M., & Sperry, D. J., (2000). Portrait of the "ideal principal": Context and self. *NASSP Bulletin* 84(617), 5-15.

Hay Group (2000). *Raising achievement in our schools: Models of excellence for head-teachers in different settings*. Available: www.ncsl.org.uk/media/F7B/52/kpool-hay-models-of-excellence-parts-1-2.pdf

Heck, R. H. (1993b). School context, principal leadership, and achievement: The case of secondary schools in Singapore. *The Urban Review*, 25(2), 151-166.

Heck, R. H., Larsen, T. J., & Marcoulides, G. A. (1990). Instructional leadership and school achievement: Validation of a causal model. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26(2), 94-125.

Heck, R. H., Larsen, T. J., & Marcoulides, G. A. (1993). Principal leadership behaviors and student achievement. *NASSP Bulletin*, 77(553). 20-28.

Heller, M. F., & Firestone, W. A. (1995) Who's in charge here? Sources of leadership for change in eight schools. *Elementary School Journal* 96(1), 65-86.

Hemphill, J. K. (1958). Administration as problem solving. In Andrew Halpin (Ed.), *Administrative theory in education*, (p. 98). Chicago: University of Chicago Administration Center.

Hickman, C. F. (1990). *Mind of a manager, soul of a leader*. New York: John Wiley.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1991). *Educational administration: Theory research and practice*. (4th ed.). NY: McGraw Hill.

Industrial Revolution (2006). Retrieved May 25, 2006 from

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Industrial_Revolution

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (1996). *Standards for school leaders*.

Washington, D.C. : Council of Chief State School Officers

ISLLC (2007). (Retrieved March 6, 2007 from

<http://www.umsl.edu/~mpea/Pages/AboutISLLC/ABoutISLLC.html>

Jackson, A. W., & Davis, G. A. (2000). *Turning Points 2000: Educating adolescents in the 21st century: A report of the Carnegie Corporation of New York*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Jantzi, D., & Leithwood, K. (1996). Toward an explanation of variation in teachers' perceptions of transformational school leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, (32)4, 512-538.

Johnson, R. (1996). School restructuring: A continuing imperative. *IDRA Newsletter*, August 1996. Retrieved April 10, 2006 from <http://www.idra.org/Newsltr/1996/Aug/Roy.htm>.

Kirby, P. C., Paradise, L. V., King, M. I. (1992). Extraordinary leaders in education: Understanding transformational leadership. *Journal of Educational Research* 85(5), 301-311.

Kleine-Kracht, P. (1993). Indirect instructional leadership: An administrator's choice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(4), 1-29.

Kmetz, J. T., & Willower, D. J. (1982). Elementary school principals' work behavior. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(4), 1-29.

Koos, L. V. (1927). *The junior high school*. (Enlarged ed.). Boston: Ginn and Co.

Kotter, J. P. (1985). *Power and influence: Beyond formal authority*. New York: Free Press.

Kotter, J. P. (1988). *The leadership factor*. New York: Free Press, 1988.

Kotter, J. P. (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York: Free Press.

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). Five practices of exemplary leadership. In *The Leadership Challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2-39.
- Lambert, L., (2002). A framework for shared leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 59(8), pp. 37-41.
- LaPointe, M. & Davis, S. H. (2006). Effective schools require effective principals. *Leadership* 36(1), 16-19.
- Larson, T. J. (1987). Identification of instructional leadership behaviors and the impact of their implementation on academic achievement. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 282 286
- Lashway, L. (1995). Can instructional leaders be facilitative leaders? ERIC Digest, 98.
- Lashway, L. (1997). *Multidimensional school leadership*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Lauder, A., (2000). The new look in principal preparation programs. *NASSP Bulletin* 84(617), 23-28.
- Leithwood, K. (1992). The move toward transformational leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 49(5), 8-12.
- Leithwood, K. (1993, October 1993). *Contributions of transformational leadership to school restructuring*. Paper presented at the 1993 Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration, Houston, TX.
- Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(4), 498-51 S.
- Leithwood, K. and Duke, D. L. (1999). A century's quest to understanding school leadership. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.) *Handbook of research on education administration* (2nd ed.), 45-72.

- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D. & Steinbach, R. (1998). Leadership and other conditions which foster organizational learning in schools. In Leithwood and K. S. Louis (Eds.) *Organizational learning in schools*. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger Publishers, 67-90
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D. & Steinbach, R. (2000a). Changing leadership: A menu of possibilities. In *Changing leadership for changing times*. Philadelphia: Open University Press, (3-20).
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D. & Steinbach, R. (2000b). Transformational leadership: A good place to start. In *Changing leadership for changing times*. Philadelphia: Open University Press, (21-42).
- Leithwood, K., & Montgomery, D. (1992). The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement. *Review of educational Research*, 52(3), 309-399
- Leithwood, K. & Riehl, C. (2003). *What we know about successful school leadership*. (a report by Division A of the American Educational Research Association). Philadelphia: Temple University.
- Lezotte, L. (1991). *Correlates of effective schools: The first and second generation*. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.
- Lipham, J. (1965). Leadership and administration. In *Behavioral Science and Educational Administration*. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1964 Yearbook, 119-141.
- Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. *American Educational Research Journal*, 5(19), 325-340.
- Louis, K. S., (1999). Rethinking school improvement, in J. Murphy and K. S. Louis (Eds.) *Handbook of research on educational administration*, (pp. 251-276). Second edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Lounsbury, J. H. (1954). *The role and status of the junior high school*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Nashville, TN: George Peabody College for Teachers.
- Marczely, B. (1998). Defending effective supervision in a litigious climate. *NASSP Bulletin* 82(602), 89-94.
- Marks, H.M., & Printy, S.M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), 370-397.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and Arvada, CO: Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper
- McEwin, C. K., Dickinson, T. S., & Jenkins, D. (1996). *America's middle schools: Practices and progress—A 25-year perspective*. Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Mehrens, W. A. (1998). Consequences of assessment: What is the evidence? *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 6(13). Available from <http://epaa.asu.edu>.
- MASSP (1994). *Michigan schools of the future task force report: Focus on restructuring*, Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan, Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The nature of managerial work*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2006). Missouri Assessment Program. Retrieved from <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divimprove/assess/publications.html>
- Morgan, G. (1997). *Images of organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Morris, V. C. (1987). Educational aims and the management of school. In Lane, J., & Walberg, H. (Eds.). *Effective school leadership*. Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon.
- Mullen, C. A., Gordon, S. P., Greenlee, B. J., & Anderson, R. H. (2002). Capacities for school leadership: Emerging trends in the literature. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 11, 158-198.
- Murphy, J. (1994). Redefining the principalship in restructuring schools. *NASSP Bulletin* 79(560), 94-100.
- Murphy, J., & Beck, L. G. (1994). Reconstructing the principalship: Challenges and possibilities. In Joseph Murphy & Karen Seashore (Eds.), *Reshaping the Principalship: Insights From Transformational Reform Efforts*. (3-29). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1992). The principal in an era of transformation. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 30(3). 77-88.
- Murphy, J., Weil, M., Hallinger, P., & Mitman, A. (1985). School effectiveness: A conceptual framework. *Educational Forum*, 49, 361-374. Murphy, S. H. (1998). Helping student learn to work together as a team. *NASSP Bulletin* 82(602), 83-94.
- Myers, E. & Murphy, J. (1995). Suburban secondary school principals' perceptions of administrative control in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 33(3), 14-37.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. A report to the nation and the Secretary of Education, United States Department of Education*. Washington, DC.
- National Middle School Association (NMSA 1995). *This we believe: Successful schools for young adolescents: A position paper of the National Middle School Association*. Westerville, OH: National Middle School Association.

- National Middle School Association (NMSA 2003). *This we believe: Successful schools for young adolescents: A position paper of National Middle School Association*. Westerville, OH: National Middle School Association.
- NDEA (2006). Government's 50 greatest endeavors. Retrieved February 6, 2006 from: <http://www.brook.edu/gs/50ge/endeavors/elementarysecondary.htm>.
- NCES (National Center for Education Statistics) (2006). *Trends in international mathematics and science study*. Retrieved February 10, 2006 from: <http://nces.ed.gov/times/>
- Newman, F., & Welhage, G. (1995). *Successful school restructuring: A report to the public and educators by the Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, School of Education, Wisconsin Center for Education Research.
- Ogawa, R. T., & Bossert, S. T. (1995). Leadership as an Organizational Quality. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 31(2), 234-243.
- Ogden, E. H., & Germinario, B. (1994). *Nation's best schools: Blueprints for excellence*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- O'Neill, (1993). Turning the system on its head. *Educational leadership* 51(1), 518.
- Pajak, E. (1989). *Identification of supervisory proficiencies project*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Petzko, V. N. (1998). Preventing legal headaches through staff development: Considerations and recommendations. *NASSP Bulletin* 82(602), 35-42.
- Pfeiffer (2006). *Bureaucracy*. Retrieved June 2, 2006 from <http://www2.pfeiffer.edu/~Iridener/DSS/Weber/Bureau.HTML>

- Prater, M. E., (2004). *The relative impact of principal managerial, instructional, and transformational leadership on school achievement*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia.
- Queen, J. A. & Isenhour, K. J. (1998). Building a climate of acceptance for block scheduling. *NASSP Bulletin* 82(602), 95-113.
- Reitzug, U. C. (1997). Images of principal instructional leadership: From supervision to collaborative inquiry. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 12(4), 356-366.
- Riegel, R. P., & Lovell, N. B., (1980). *Minimal competency testing*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Roderick, M., & Engel, M. (2001). The grasshopper and the ant: Motivational responses of low-achieving students to high-stakes testing. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 23(3), 197-227.
- Romano, L. G. & Georgiady, N. P., (1994). *Building an effective middle school*. Dubuque, IA: Brown & Benchmark.
- Rosenblatt, Z., & Somech, A. (1998). The work behavior of Israeli elementary school principals: Expectations versus reality. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34(4), 505-532.
- Rosenholtz, S. J. (1991). *Teacher's workplace: The social organization of schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Rossmiller, R. A. (1992). The secondary school principal and teachers' quality of work life. *Educational Management and Administration*, 20(3), 132-146.
- Rossow, L. F. (1990). *The principalship: Dimensions in instructional leadership*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the 21st century*. New York: Praeger.

Rothberg, & Hill (1992)

Rutter, M. (1979). *Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children.*

Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sagor, R. (2003). *Motivating students and teachers in an era of standards.* Alexandria, VA:

ASCD.

Saphier, J., & King, M. (1985). Good seeds grow in strong cultures. *Educational leadership*

42(6). 67-74.

Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schön, D. A., (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth dimension: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New

York: Doubleday.

Senge, P. M., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R. B., & Smith, B. J. (1994). *The fifth discipline*

fieldbook: Strategies and tools for building a learning organization. New York:

Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. J., (1999). *Lifeworld of leadership: Creating culture, community, and personal*

meaning in our schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shepard, L. A. (1990). Inflated test score gains: Is the problem old norms or teaching to the test?

Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 9(3), 15 -22.

Sheppard, B. (1996). Exploring the transformational nature of instructional leadership. *The*

Alberta Journal of educational Research, 42(4), 325-344.

Silins, H.C. (1994). The relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and

school improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 5(3), 272-298.

- Singleton, Jr., R. A., Straits, B. C., & Straits, M. M. *Approaches to social research* (2nd ed.).
New York: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Adam (1776). *The wealth of nations*. London: Stratton and Caddell.
- Smith, W. F., & Andrews, R. L. (1989). *Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference*. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Smith, J., Maehrer, M., & Midgley C. (1992). Relationship between personal and contextual characteristics and principals' administrative behaviors. *Journal of Educational Research*, 86(2), 111-118.
- Sparks, D. & Hirsch, S. (1997). *A new vision for staff development*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Sprague, M. M., Pennell, D., & Sulzberger, L. (1998). Engaging all middle level learners in multi-disciplinary curricula. *NASSP Bulletin* 82(602), 60-66.
- Steller, A. W. (1988). *Effective schools research: Practice and Promise*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Foundation.
- Stone, H., Parker, J. D., & Wood, I. M. (2005). *Report on the Ontario Principals' Council Leadership Study*. Available: www.eiconsortium.org/research/opc-leadership-study-final-report.htm.
- Tatum, B. D. (1998) What do you do when they call you a racist? *NASSP Bulletin* 82(602), 43-48.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Thompson, S. C. (2004) in Thompson, S. C. (Ed.). *Reforming middle level education: Considerations for policymakers*. Greenwich, CN: National Middle School Association.

- Valentine, J.W., & Bowman, M.L. (1988). Audit of principal effectiveness: A method for self-improvement. *NASSP Bulletin*, 72(508), 18-26.
- Valentine, J. W., Clark, D. C., Nickerson, N. C., & Keefe, J. W., (1981). *The middle level principalship: Vol. 1. A national survey of middle level leaders in schools*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Valentine, J. W., Clark, D. C., Hackmann, D. G., & Petzko, V. N. (2002). *Leadership for highly successful middle schools: A national study of leadership in middle level schools, Volume I*. Reston, VA: NASSP.
- Valentine, J. W., Clark, D. C., Hackmann, D. G., & Petzko, V. N. (2004). *Leadership for highly successful middle schools: A national study of leadership in middle level schools, Volume II*. Reston, VA: NASSP.
- Van Til, W. G., Vars, G. & Lounsbury, J. (1961). *Modern education for the junior high years*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Waller, L. M. (1998). What principals and students should know about college admissions (1998). *NASSP Bulletin* 82(602), 67-76.
- Wanzare, Z, & DaCosta, J. L. (2001). Rethinking instructional leadership roles of the school principal. *Journal of Educational Thought*, 35(3), 265-295.
- Waters, T., Marzano, R., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Waters, T., Marzano, R., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and. Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning.

- Weller, L. D., Jr. (1999). *Quality middle school leadership: Eleven central skill areas*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.
- Whitaker, T., & Turner, E., (2000). What is your priority? *NASSP Bulletin* 84(617), 16-22.
- Wiles, J. & Bondi, J. (1986). *The essential middle school*. Tampa, FL: Wiles, Bondi and Associates.
- Williams, W. W. (1998). Preventing violence in school: What can principals do? *NASSP Bulletin* 82(602), 10-17.
- Williamson, R. D. & Johnston, J. H. (2004) in Thompson, S. C. (Ed.). *Reforming middle level education: Considerations for policymakers*. Greenwich: CN: National Middle School Association.
- Wilmore, E., & Thomas, C. (2001). The new century: Is it too late for transformational leadership? *Educational Horizons*, 79(3), 115-123.
- York-Barr, J., Sommers, W. A., Ghore, G. S., & Montie, J. (2001). *Reflective practice to improve schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Yukl, G. (2001). *Leadership in organizations*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Zaleznik, A. (1977). *Managers and leaders: Are they different?* *Harvard Business Review*, 55(5), 67-78
- Zmuda, A, Kuklis, R., & Kline, E. (2004). *Transforming schools: Creating a culture of continuous improvement*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.