

A STUDY OF SELECT TEXAS PRINCIPAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS AND THEIR
RELATIONSHIP TO ADULT LEARNING AND THE PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP
RESPONSIBILITIES OF THEIR GRADUATES

Delesa Haynes Styles, B.S., M.Ed.

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

December 2010

APPROVED:

Jane B. Huffman, Major Professor
Linda Stromberg, Committee Member and
Program Coordinator for
Educational Administration
Mary Ann Coe, Committee Member
Nancy Nelson, Chair, Department of
Teacher Education and Administration
Jerry R. Thomas, Dean of the College of
Education
James D. Meernik, Acting Dean of the Robert B.
Toulouse School of Graduate Studies

Styles, Delesa Haynes. A select study of Texas principal preparation programs and their relationship to adult learning and the professional leadership responsibilities of their graduates. Doctor of Education (Educational Administration), December 2010, 143 pp., 8 tables, references, 151 titles.

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between principal preparation programs in Texas and professional leadership practices and responsibilities based on Mid-continent Research for Educational and Learning's (McREL) 21 leadership responsibilities. The study also examined the relationship between Texas principal preparation programs and Knowles's principles of adult learning. Through an online survey, the study solicited practicing principals' perceptions as to whether McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities and Knowles's principles of adult learning were included in their principal preparation programs. Quantitative findings indicated there were no significant differences between principals' perceptions of their principal preparation programs and the university/certification program in which they obtained their principal certification. Additionally, there were no significant differences between principals' perceptions of their programs and the year their principal certification was completed. There were also no significant differences between principals' perceptions of their programs and the geographic location of the school district in which they were presently employed. However, the study found there were significant differences in two areas of leadership responsibilities when comparisons were generated between principals who were fully certified before assuming the role of principal and those who were not fully certified: 1) ideas/beliefs and 2) optimizer.

Principals who had not completed their certification program scored the two areas higher than those who had.

The study also utilized qualitative methodology through in-depth interviews with principal program coordinators and practicing principals. Program coordinators and principals revealed leadership responsibilities of “communication,” “culture,” and “visibility” as areas of emphasis and importance in their programs. The need for more emphasis in the area of “discipline” was communicated mutually by program coordinators and principals. Principals stated areas of “knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment” and “resources” as leadership responsibilities needing more emphasis. Both program coordinators and principals concurred principal preparation programs should have more emphasis and importance placed upon Knowles’s principles of adult learning.

Copyright 2010

by

Delesa Haynes Styles

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to gratefully acknowledge Dr. Jane Huffman for your reassuring guidance and invaluable insight as my major professor. Dr. Linda Stromberg and Dr. Mary Ann Coe, I sincerely appreciate your astute contributions as committee members. A significant debt is owed to Dr. Matthew Capps and Forrest Lane for being so giving of your time and expertise with the statistical analysis and data interpretation of this study.

MSU/UNT colleagues, thank you for memories and friendships that will last a lifetime. Your support, humor, and genuine understanding often sustained me.

I extend my deepest gratitude to my parents, Ray and Janice Haynes, for modeling the value of hard work and making many sacrifices for my college education that I appreciate even more as a parent. Simply imagining your faces as I place the final copy of this paper in your hands was enough to keep me writing. I love you both dearly.

To my children, Jarrett, Peyton, Corbin, and Addison, you bring indescribable joy to my life. My projected graduation date of 2007 has evolved to the present, largely because I simply could not bear missing many of your “first” and “last” milestones. Nevertheless, you were humbly self-sufficient and compassionate beyond your years of maturity when I was often preoccupied with studying or writing, and I will treasure having more time to spend with you. Always know I love you to the moon—and back.

Finally, to my husband, Jeff, thank you for making every effort to keep a sense of balance in our family. You have been my “rock” and are as responsible for the completion of this study as I am. Your support never wavered, and early on, you came to the wise realization the paper would be finished on His timeline and not mine. I can hardly wait to spend a happy-go-lucky, agenda-free Saturday with you. I love you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
Chapters	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Theoretical Background	4
Purpose of the Study.....	9
Statement of the Problem	10
Research Questions.....	11
Definition of Terms.....	12
Limitations.....	12
Significance of the Study.....	13
Organization of Study.....	15
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	16
Introduction	16
Lack of Research	18
Historical Background	20
McREL's 21 Leadership Responsibilities	30
Adult Learning Theory.....	34
Reform Movements.....	36
Alternative Certification Programs.....	43
Texas Programs	44
A Promising University and District Partnership: The University of North Texas and the Dallas Independent School District.....	46
Texas High School Project (THSP): Pilot High School Principal Certification Program	48
THSP's Education Leadership Initiative	48
Pilot High School Principal Certification Program Description.....	48

Emerging Trends in International Leadership Education....	49
Summary.....	50
3. METHODOLOGY.....	53
Purpose.....	53
Research Questions.....	53
Research Design.....	53
McREL’s 21 Leadership Responsibilities.....	54
Knowles’s Principles of Adult Learning.....	56
Context.....	57
Study Participants	57
Instrumentation	58
Collection of Data.....	59
Analysis of Data	61
Summary.....	62
4. ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF THE DATA.....	63
Description of the Population	63
Data Analysis	65
McREL’s 21 Leadership Responsibilities.....	65
Knowles’s Principles of Adult Learning.....	72
Interviews with University and Education Service Center Education Leadership Preparation Coordinators.....	76
McREL’s 21 Leadership Responsibilities.....	76
Knowles’s Principles of Adult Learning.....	82
Interviews with Practicing Principals	85
McREL’s 21 Leadership Responsibilities.....	86
Knowles’s Principles of Adult Learning.....	90
Summary.....	92
5. SUMMARY, INTERPRETATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	95
Introduction	95
Description of the Population	96
Discussion of Findings	97

Principal Surveys:	
McREL’s 21 Leadership Responsibilities.....	97
Principal Surveys: Knowles’s Principles of Adult Learning	99
Interviews with University and Education Service Center Education Leadership Preparation Coordinators.....	100
McREL’s 21 Principal Leadership Responsibilities.....	101
Knowles’s Principles of Adult Learning.....	103
Interviews with Practicing Principals	104
McREL’s 21 Principal Leadership Responsibilities.....	105
Knowles’s Principles of Adult Learning.....	107
Implications	108
Recommendations for Future Research	110
Conclusion	111
APPENDICES	113
REFERENCES.....	131

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The complexity and variety of the demands and expectations placed upon school leaders have never been greater. The principal's position is often described as a confusing one in these times of change. Cushman (1992) stated that interviews with administrators from widely different schools across the country bring out time and again the core dilemma principals share: how to reconcile strong leadership with the participatory decision-making that forms the bedrock of any sustained change effort. Bloom (1999) maintained today's school leaders are expected to function as education professor, teacher supervisor, budget manager, counselor, local politician, social worker, disciplinarian, visionary, assistant custodian, and bureaucrat.

Additionally, as standards-based school reform nears its twentieth anniversary, policy makers continue to assert the need for strong principal leadership, and with good reason. Virtually every state, as well as the federal government, puts accountability for results directly at the school level. New principals assuming leadership of today's schools face a dramatically different environment than principals a decade ago. Administrative roles which were once clearly-defined in an organizational hierarchy as having complete autonomy have given way to a model of principal as facilitator (Schargel, 1994). Perhaps this change has been most apparent in job announcements, where increasingly the emphasis is upon candidates with effective skills in collaboration and communication. This is contrasted with skills required of principals in the past such as knowledge of more traditional administrative and managerial tasks (Jean & Evans, 1995).

At the same time, researchers have found some principals and principal preparation programs to be ineffective (Brent & Haller, 1998). Of the roughly 250,000 school administrators currently employed in the United States, nearly all were trained at schools of education, mostly in programs devoted to educational administration or education leadership. Levine (2005a) asserted over the last 15 years, however, those programs—currently numbering more than 600—have faced a steady stream of criticism, their reputations have plummeted, and their hold over the licensure of administrators has begun to loosen, as districts and states explore alternative forms of recruitment and training.

Based on a study to determine the effectiveness of principal preparation programs as perceived by school principals and superintendents, Farkas, Johnson, Duffet, Foleno, and Foley (2001) reported 69% of principals and eighty percent of superintendents surveyed believed training programs “are out of touch with the realities of what it takes to run today’s school districts” (p. 31). Over 85% of both groups believed overhauling preparation programs would help improve leadership.

These and other studies have prompted university professors to criticize their own programs as being too traditional, too slow to change, unable to reflect current practice, and generally inadequate. Moreover, many university faculties admit they have not engaged in the national conversation around educational leadership, hence limiting their ability to address the fact that they are not adequately equipped to prepare principals for leadership roles. Some faculty recognize they are detached from current school issues and are reluctant to adopt the language, practices, and/or standards under which today’s schools operate (Murphy, 2001a). Michelle Young, Executive

Director of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), conceded changes at the university level have been slow, and faculty are not always well-connected with the field and are sometimes complacent about adopting standards (Norton, 2002).

Additionally, in a National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) publication (1992), *Developing School Leaders: A Call for Collaboration*, the authors noted preparation programs in educational administration have not responded to environmental changes by remaining preset into modes of thinking and structures of practice. They assert administrator training has failed to keep pace with changing times and changing expectations of leaders evolving over the past three decades. Young, Crow, Orr, Ogawa, and Creighton (2005) also maintained there is no question there are too many programs in educational leadership that provide inadequate preparation. However, stakeholders in the field are leading a charge to change this circumstance.

Indeed, in response to such reports, prominent professional associations such as the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) and the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) have proposed standards for graduate-level principal training programs (Lashway, 2003). Fullan (2001) stated:

Clearly these are exciting times—there is a lot going on. Not the least of these developments is the new realization that leadership is key to large scale improvement yet must be radically different than it has been. Further, effective leadership is in very short supply. We can therefore expect to see leadership development initiatives dominating the scene over the next decade. Leadership required in a culture of change, however, is not straightforward. We are living in chaotic conditions. Thus leaders must be able to operate under complex, uncertain circumstances. (xii-xiii)

Because principal preparation programs need to be proactive in approaching the education of future school leaders, the purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between principal preparation programs in Texas and leadership responsibilities based on Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning's (McREL) 21 leadership responsibilities. The study also examined the relationship between Texas principal preparation programs and Knowles's principles of adult learning. This chapter briefly establishes the theoretical background of the study, introduces the questions that were examined, and clarifies the significance of the study.

Theoretical Background

According to Malone and Caddell (2000), the principalship has gone through five evolutionary stages: one teacher (one-room school), head teacher, teaching principal, school principal, and supervising principal. The principalship is currently in a sixth stage—the principal as “change agent” (p. 163). For purposes of this study, the principalship as it has evolved in the last twenty years will be the focus of discussion.

As early as Lortie's study (1975), a tridimensional concept of principal preparation research was recommended to include the following: (a) field-based practice, (b) professional growth opportunities, and (c) formal academic preparation. According to Bloom (1999), school effectiveness research in the 1980s brought a new focus upon the importance of instructional leadership. Daresh and Playko (1992) asserted many principal preparation programs during this time began to focus on good leadership as being good management.

DyceFaucett (2005) suggested that although there is little research concerning the effectiveness of graduate-level administration programs during the 1980s, there are

several studies that conclude principal training programs were unreliable in providing principals with certain skills and knowledge needed to be exceptionally good at performing the duties of the job. The findings of such studies point to the fact these programs had serious shortcomings. For example, studies by Murphy and Hallinger (1987) and Peterson and Finn (1985) concluded principal training programs commonly emphasized building management rather than instructional leadership. Topics included school law and finance to the detriment of an understanding of good teaching practice, student performance, and the need to secure additional financial resources. Moreover, studies of this nature recommended the establishment of administrative training programs that prepared educational leaders to address the practical realities of the workplace, to meet student and school needs, and to lead school improvement as change agents.

Shen, Cooley, Ruhl-Smith, and Keiser (1999) affirmed the research in the 1990s and outlined the elements of an effective administrative preparation program to include the following: (a) the knowledge of legal responsibilities associated with the school system, (b) the use of research concerning effective learning practices to assist in the decision-making process, and (c) the ability to articulate and exemplify the role of the principalship and the meaning of education in contemporary society.

Regardless of the format, Yee (1997) and others believed leadership preparation programs often failed as effective approaches for developing leadership capabilities of school administrators. In general, the criticisms had two foci. First, educational administrators were not as competent as administrators in other fields. Secondly, administrative behaviors had not met the public's changing expectations of schools and

their purpose. The National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration's report, *Leaders for American's Schools* (Griffiths, Stout, & Forsyth, 1988), found the majority of education programs for aspiring educational leaders ranging from "embarrassing to disastrous" (p. 84) and concluded certification, as it exists today, is not proof of quality.

Fullan (2003) stated that the 1990s was a dismal decade for the principalship. Expectations for schools increased, policies became more prescriptive but lacked coherence, implementation strategies were neglected, on-the-job leadership training and professional development were missing, and few noticed the looming exodus of principals through normal and early retirements. Above all, the principalship was becoming increasingly unattractive, especially to those who wanted to make a difference.

According to Tirozzi (2002), mastering university coursework only represented one aspect of being ready for the role of the principalship. University and college principal preparation programs did little to ready principals for the instructional demands and real-world situations they faced on a daily basis. In a study involving 25 administrators who participated in one of five different programs, new entrants into educational leadership positions did not feel fully prepared for the reality of the tasks required in their jobs (Kraus & Cordeiro, 1995). The new assistant principals and principals found the workload, immediacy of issues, time demands, and politics of the job overwhelming at times. Today's school principals need adeptness at addressing multiple and often confusing issues (Hargreaves & Fullan, 1998; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999).

Literature began to emphasize the need for principal preparation to include a school-based setting to allow for the application of theory to meaningful leadership practice (Peebles, 2000). The research purported all school leaders require training and preparation in educational and administrative theory and essential leadership skills basic to the challenge of responding to complex and challenging tasks (Whitaker & Turner, 2000). Lease (2002) added that moving toward the creation of instructional leaders and not simply building managers is the challenge facing existing preparation programs.

Lashway (2003) summed up the argument, stating:

Dissatisfied practitioners, policy-makers, and professors have a long history of taking potshots at programs they see as unimaginative, overly theoretical, and impervious to reform. However, the recent activity goes beyond the usual carping and tinkering with course content. The unrelenting pressure of standards-based reform is stirring major changes in recruitment, curriculum, and licensure. (p. 2)

Recently, faculty in most university-based programs for training aspiring administrators are working to identify how preparation programs can better produce candidates who are prepared for leadership roles. Fullan (2003) affirmed leadership in the present decade is equivalent to “what standards were to the 1990s for those interested in large-scale reform. Standards, even when well implemented, can only take us part way to successful large-scale reform. It is only leadership that can take us all the way” (p. 16).

Across the nation, many scholars, policy makers, policy analysts, school leaders, professional organizations, and foundations have been addressing the need to improve leadership preparation programs with aggressive and complex changes. Recent years have witnessed numerous focused, effective efforts to improve leadership preparation,

led by professional associations as well as states, foundations, and other key players in educational leadership. Many reforms have already led to updates and improvements in the preparation of both school and school system leaders. For example, the national standards movement in leadership preparation has developed sets of standards currently being used in several states and institutions to reform and assess preparation programs. Several involved collaborations between professional associations and universities. Young et al. (2005) stated the most prominent is the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), a consortium of 32 educational agencies and 13 education administration associations that developed a set of criteria and standards for administrative practice.

Faced with shortages in principals' and superintendents' offices, states have also launched efforts both to enlarge the leadership pool and enhance its quality. A number of states (e.g., Iowa, Delaware, Mississippi, and North Carolina) have instituted creative reforms in preparation and certification. According to the Education Commission of the States, 24 policy changes in 17 states regarding school leadership licensure/certification have occurred since 2000 (Young et al. 2005). There is evidence that numerous programs have re-conceptualized the knowledge base and changed the structure of their programs, particularly those for aspiring principals (Grogan & Andrews, 2002). Restructured programs also consider and utilize adult learning theories. Lumsden (1992) maintained more energy is being devoted to assessing and addressing deficiencies in preservice training so future principals will be better prepared for the baptism into the realities of leadership.

Additionally, work conducted by the Danforth Foundation, in collaboration with selected universities throughout the country, emphasized the need for change in the training of leaders in education (Milstein, 1993; Murphy, 1995). Both the Murphy and Milstein studies found administrative preparation programs attracted different types of adult learners to the principalship. Moreover, evidence from a three-year principal preparation redesign project (Valentine, 2001) showed when a program was restructured to be concept driven (culture, empowerment), cohort-based, carefully mentored, and with a year-long, full-time intensive internship at the school site, prospective school leaders scored higher on the new ISLLC performance assessments. They also received higher evaluations by prospective employers, and performed the daily demands of the principalship at a higher level (Grogan & Andrews, 2002). This confirmed findings by Gregory (1992); Playko and Daresh (1989); and Andrews, Ostrander and Mueller (1989).

In conclusion, Lashway (1999) stated:

The current dialectic periods of the development of principal training in the United States has been characterized by highly critical evaluations of administrator preparation programs and persistent efforts to transform the profession. In particular, there has been better communication among the diverse groups interested in the preparation of school leaders, and a notable effort to define rigorous standards for the profession. The current period is difficult to see clearly, and we are far from certain what future historians will say about it. Most likely, we are about to enter another era of ferment, having decided that the existing paradigm is inadequate but not yet sure what should replace it. (p. 2)

Purpose of the Study

The importance of the principal to the success of a school is reported extensively in the research (Fullan, 1993; Dufour & Eaker, 1992; Schlechty, 1990; Institute for Educational Leadership, 2000). Berman and McLaughlin (1975) argued building-level

principals are responsible for implementing new initiatives and improving teaching and learning. Similarly, Edmonds (1979) proposed that the most significant and necessary component in an effective school is strong administrative leadership, and it is the leadership provided by the principal that makes all other necessary elements possible. Still others like Cornett (1983), Hall (1984), Duke (1982), Rutherford (1985), and Reed (1988) asserted that the principal, more than any other person, contributes to the success or failure of a public school.

The primary purpose of this study was to probe whether recent policy efforts to improve principal training programs in Texas have produced desired results. More specifically, surveys, document analysis, and interview methods were utilized to determine whether practicing principals believed their principal preparation programs reflected those skills principals need to be effective administrators. The findings from this study could have important implications for future school leaders and principal preparation programs across the state of Texas and elsewhere.

Statement of the Problem

Contributing to the difficulty of adequately preparing school leaders are a number of significant structural changes in schools occurring in recent years and impacting the work of the school principal. According to Young, Peterson, and Short (2002), federal programs, in an attempt to meet the needs of special education and other targeted students and accountability requirements, including the broad and complex requirements of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation, placed ever-increasing accountability for academic success on the principal. Adoptions of state curriculum standards, the changing structure of families and society, an increasingly diversified

student population, and more responsibility in site-based decision making added to the complexity of being a principal. McCarthy (1999) described the principalship as one of the most complex balancing acts in public education.

John Stewart (1991), Superintendent of Schools in Polk County Florida, noted:

Nothing is as potentially damaging for a school as an unprepared or ill- prepared principal. Without the proper background, education, guidance, and on-the-job training, a principal can ruin staff morale, sour community opinions about the school and seriously disrupt the learning process for students. Even with the best intentions, a poorly trained school administrator has the capacity to create havoc within the school community. (p. 1)

A compelling need exists for research in the areas of principal preparation programs. To broaden the knowledge base of educational research, this study examined Texas principal preparation programs and their relationship to principal leadership practices and responsibilities based on Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning's (McREL) 21 leadership responsibilities. The study also examined the relationship between Texas university principal preparation programs and Knowles's principles of adult learning.

Research Questions

Two research questions were formulated to guide this study:

1. To what degree are McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities addressed in Texas principal preparation programs?
2. To what degree are Knowles's principles of adult learning addressed in Texas principal preparation programs?

Definition of Terms

The terms used in the context of this study are as follows:

- Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standards. A set of standards adopted in 2001 by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education used for the accreditation of postsecondary educational leadership programs.
- Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. A set of common and established standards for the professional development of educational administrators.
- Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL). A private, nonprofit organization dedicated to improving education for all through applied research, product development, and service.
- Southern Regional Education Board (SREB). Founded in 1948, SREB is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that works with 16 member states to connect leaders and agencies working to improve public pre-K-12 and higher education. SREB was America's first interstate compact for education.
- Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TExES) Principal Examination. A test of the content and professional knowledge required of an entry-level principal or assistant principal in the state of Texas.

Limitations

This study had several limitations possibly affecting its generalizability. First, the information generated by this study, while useful in identifying specific student perspectives on the value of selected administrator preparation programs, was limited

by the unique characteristics of the principals who participated in the study and the programs in which they were enrolled. Second, limitations on validity and reliability occur anytime a study utilizes self-reports or surveys. Third, this study utilized an online survey instrument, which may have limited the ability of participants to respond to the survey.

Significance of the Study

Fullan (1993) purported the most consistent finding in school improvement efforts is that success is dependent upon leadership. Effective schools have effective principals and effective teacher leaders. Chenoweth, Carr, and Ruhl (2002) added the preparation of competent school leaders is a critical element to successful school reform and increased student achievement.

At the same time, universities, as open systems, are sensitive to wider social pressures, including the widely-held perception that they need new ways to prepare school leaders (Clark & Clark, 1996; Lewis, 1997.) Facing new roles and heightened expectations, principals require new forms of training, and university preparation programs are coming under increased scrutiny. In particular, federal and state accountability expectations that principals have a positive impact on student achievement challenges traditional assumptions, practices, and structures in leadership preparation programs (Lashway, 2003).

Does research support these claims of inadequacy? Louis Wildman (2001), after a review of the literature, reached the inevitable conclusion the research is limited. He found a few studies evaluating different dimensions of leadership programs, but nothing that would permit any conclusions about their overall effectiveness. Copeland (2004)

added: “Empirical data are scant that describe exemplary and proven effective principal preparation programs” (p. 9). Likewise, Lashway (2003) stated: “At this point, most of the debate over principal preparation programs is based on relatively small-scale case studies and surveys, supplemented by professional judgment about best practices” (p. 2-3).

The multiple challenges to traditional university-based principal preparation cannot be countered without empirical evidence that leadership studies lead to effective school leadership (Muth & Barnett, 2001; Young et al., 2002). According to Adamowski (2005), there is scarce evidence one particular method for preparing leaders is the most effective. There is also little existing evidence linking the ISLLC standards to actual performance in a leadership role relative to student achievement; therefore, there is a need for experimentation and different models. He purported there should also be a period of “falling out” before program coordinators will have a better sense of the best approach to preparing leaders—or if there even is one best approach (p. 17).

This study, therefore, sought to assess principals’ and principal preparation program coordinators’ perceptions of the adequacy of their graduate-level training programs and whether the training aligned with the research supporting adult learning and leadership responsibilities. This study’s findings will possibly assist universities, alternative certification programs, and state agencies in rethinking and redesigning educational leadership programs for the licensure and certification of future school leaders.

Organization of the Study

This chapter provides an overview of the study, which includes purpose of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, key terms, limitations, and significance of the study. Chapter 2 offers a more detailed discussion of the literature regarding principal preparation programs, including a historical perspective as well as state, national, and international reform efforts. A summary of adult learning theory is addressed because of its relevance to the field of education and this study. Chapter 3 provides an overview of the research design, subjects, instrumentation, data collection methods, and data analysis procedures. Chapter 4 describes the findings from the study in detail. Data presentation, analysis, and interpretation are provided. Chapter 5 presents the summary, interpretations, and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Today, school principals are asked to lead in a new world marked by unprecedented responsibilities, challenges, and managerial opportunities. In this new era of accountability, where school leaders are expected to demonstrate bottom-line results and use data to drive decisions, the skill and knowledge of principals matter more than ever. Hess and Kelly (2005b) maintained school principals are “the front-line managers, the shop stewards, the bridge commanders—the ones who will lead a team to new levels of effectiveness. Or not” (p. 1).

Leading schools and districts has become more complex than ever before, due in part to increased pressure to perform, increased diversity of students, and an unstable political environment within which schools must operate (Education Policy and Leadership Center, 2006). Additionally, superintendents make clear they hold new and more demanding expectations for principals. Farkas, Johnson, and Duffet (2003) noted when today’s superintendents “describe what they are trying to accomplish” they use the words “accountability, instructional leadership, closing the achievement gap, [and] teacher quality” (p. 22). Decades of effective schools research—going back to the work of Ron Edmonds in the 1960s—continue to find a strong relationship between effective instructional leadership of schools and high levels of student achievement.

Farkas et al. (2001) found superintendents are also skeptical about the quality of new principals they see coming into the profession: only 1 in 3 (33%) superintendents say quality has improved in recent years (36% say it has stayed about the same and

29% say it has gotten worse.) The reality, according to 6 in 10 superintendents, is “you sometimes have to settle and take what you can get” when looking for a principal (p. 23).

Authors Leithwood, Seashore Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstorm (2004) make two important claims regarding the role of principal leadership in improving student achievement. First, “leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all school-related factors that contribute to what students learn at school” (p. 7). Second, “leadership effects are usually largest where and when they are needed most” (p. 7). Without a powerful leader, troubled schools are unlikely to be turned around. The authors stress “many other factors may contribute to such turnarounds, but leadership is the catalyst” (p. 7).

With the passage of the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) in 2001, pressure on school leaders has intensified. The multiple expectations of the job may be deterring many prospective leaders who feel unprepared to keep up with the diverse demands of contemporary school leadership. According to the National Conference of State Legislatures (2002), the shortage of quality teachers translated to a shortage of potential school leaders:

- By 2008, the number of principals needed to fill new positions created by growth increased by 10 percent to 20 percent.
- Forty percent of school administrators were eligible to retire within six years.
- Location and size of the district did not appear to be a factor; urban, suburban, and rural district all faced shortages, although urban districts were facing more immediate shortages. (p. 1)

Moreover, Hess and Kelly’s (2005a) study indicated preparation of aspiring principals has not kept pace with changes in the larger world of schooling, leaving

graduates of principal preparation programs ill-equipped for the challenges and opportunities posed by an era of accountability. Educational leadership professors have observed: “Leadership during this Age of Accountability has become more stressful, more political, more complex, and more time-consuming” (p. 35).

Adding to the complexity of the principalship, a recent study conducted by Farkas et al. (2003) revealed principals suggesting they are not fully equipped for all of the challenges they face. Principals themselves are among the first to agree they need to be more effectively prepared for their jobs. As programs struggle to redefine themselves they are continually challenged to address age-old criticisms of academia by spotlighting how to blend theory and practice. All but 4% of practicing principals report on-the-job experiences or guidance from colleagues has been more helpful in preparing them for their current position than their graduate school studies.

The purpose of this review of literature was to examine the research regarding principal preparation programs and attempt to add to the research base. While conducting a comprehensive review of literature, it became evident very little research was available. The review includes a historical perspective, as well as an overview of adult learning theory, reform movements, alternative certification programs, Texas programs, emerging trends in international leadership education, and promising practices.

Lack of Research

Murphy and Vriesenga (2004) maintained the field of educational leadership has suffered from a general dearth of systematic scholarly inquiry. They observed the overall landscape of educational administration research is “considerably bleaker than

most would prefer” (p. 11). Hess and Kelly (2005a) concurred, stating: “Almost no current research systematically documents the content studied in the nation’s principal preparation programs, the instructional focus, or the readings assigned to students” (p. 5). Lashway (2003) noted educational administration scholars have termed the body of research on administrator preparation “scant” (p. 1). For instance, a recent effort to analyze the state of administrator preparation conducted by the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation (NCAELP) commissioned six papers which yielded essays on topics such as the challenges of reforming administrator preparation (Young et al., 2002), the need to rethink the foundations of leadership preparation (Murphy, 2002), promising training programs across the country (Jackson & Kelley, 2002), and a self-evaluation for preparation programs (Glasman, Cibulka, & Ashby, 2002). While useful, the NCAELP effort did not seek to present systematic data regarding what preparation programs do or what they teach.

Likewise, the larger body of literature on educational administration preparation reflects the NCAELP effort and consists primarily of essays or anecdotal descriptions of particular programs. According to Murphy and Vriesenga (2004), between 1975--2002, 296 articles on any facet of administrator preparation were published in academic journals. Of these, just 81 (or 27.4%) were empirical in some sense, and only 19 of those addressed any element of administrator preparation curricula. Only a small body of empirical work reached publication. Ultimately, they concluded: “From the extant research, we know almost nothing about the traditional curricular domains of preparation programs nor the shape of curriculum in a post-theory era where issues around teaching and learning and community are reshaping the profession” (p. 24).

According to Fry, O'Neil, and Bottoms (2006), state leaders have relied on universities to get the job done—with modest state guidance in the form of certification test, accreditation and program approval, and more recently school administrator standards. But, as a growing body of research makes clear, many universities are not getting the job done and are in no particular hurry to redesign their programs to ensure aspiring principals are thoroughly prepared for their role in improving curriculum, instruction, and student achievement (p. 4).

Bruner, Greenlee, and Hill (2006) added:

We have found that keeping up with the rapidly changing demands on schools and the needs of our students have given us an opportunity to reflect on leadership preparation programs. Like others, we struggle to adapt our program to prepare leaders for schools that do not yet exist, that serve a more diverse constituency, and that are highly accountable for student performance. K-12 schools are loosely coupled, living systems constantly dealing with changing demands. These changing demands call for reflective, metacognitive leaders that are problem solvers with good decision making skills. (p. 19)

Indeed, the principal's critical role in the No Child Left Behind era may have been taken for granted. Hess and Kelly (2005a) maintained: "There is growing evidence to suggest the revolution in school organization, management, and curricular affairs may have left *principals* behind" (p. 1).

Historical Background

Providing quality principal preparation internship programs at the nation's graduate schools of education has long been a topic of graduate schools of education (Hackmann, Schmitt-Oliver & Tracy, 2002). According to Murphy (2001b), educational leadership is being recast with materials from the intellectual and moral domains of the profession. A key element of this emerging vision is a deeper understanding of the centrality of learning, teaching and school improvement within the role of the school

administrator—a shift in focus from educational administration as management to educational administration primarily concerned with teaching and learning. Following is a synopsis of how the field of education leadership programs has evolved.

Murphy (2001b) explained during the first half of the 20th century, business exerted considerable influence over preparation programs for school administrators. Preparation was highly technical and little thought was given to the theoretical underpinnings of the work of superintendents and principals. The dominant trend between 1950 and 1985 was the infusion of content from the social sciences into preparation programs. This was a movement intended to produce a foundation of scientifically supported knowledge in educational administration and also represented a trend toward theory-oriented substance based on disciplines outside education.

Engler and Edlefsen (2005) maintained standards based curriculum became a prime consideration in all curriculum areas with the advent of the school reform movement that began with the release of *A Nation At Risk* in 1983. Noteworthy efforts have been taken to define the knowledge base in educational administration and to create standards for use in administrator preparation programs (Donmoyer, Imber, & Scheurich, 1995). According to Bruner et al. (2006), the criticisms, studies, and commissions emanating from individual researchers, foundations, policy boards, and governmental agencies began being heard at a pivotal time. Women, African Americans, and other diverse groups, long excluded from the ranks of university faculty, began careers as assistant professors in preparation programs, as did many baby boomers. These newly represented groups of educators embarked on their academic careers with extensive real world administrative experience and a notion they could

change things (p. 2). This synergy produced redesigned preparation programs focusing on team building, goal setting, collaborative decision-making, and conflict resolution (Crews & Weakley, 1995), in addition to an increased emphasis on improving student outcomes (Cambron-McCabe, 1993).

Conversely, Hallinger (2006) noted in two respects, the landscape of school leader preparation today is little changed since 1987:

1. Global interest in the preparation and development of school leaders continues to be driven first and foremost by the policy logic that leadership makes a difference in reform implementation, school improvement, and student learning.
2. Systematic investigations of the impact, costs, and benefits of preparation programs on participants and their schools are almost as hard to find today as in 1988. (p. 2)

This observation notwithstanding, over the next two decades the preparation and development of principals and other educational leaders evolved into a growth industry, one which continues to attract increasing global interest and investment.

Smallwood and Jazzar (2006) maintained today's reforms in preparation programs of educational administrators were propelled into motion by the National Council on Excellence in Educational Administration (NCEE) in 1987. The NCEE faulted educational administrator preparation programs for having numerous deficiencies including an ineffective alignment of preparation programs to job demands of educational administrators. Responding to the NCEE's recommendations, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) in 1989 echoed the sentiments of NCEE (Griffiths et al., 1988; Murphy, 1992; Murphy & Hallinger, 1987). NPBEA and its many membership organizations have attempted to define standards.

Addressing leadership development, Fullan (2003) stated, "The 1990s was a decade of neglect in terms of leadership development" (p. xiii). He stated we are

presently paying for it as “people try to play catch-up in the face of massive demographic departures and the reluctance of good people to take the role of principal under current conditions” (p. xiii). There is a vast need for new leadership, yet conditions make the job unattractive. Leadership development has suffered from a lack of attention and it will be difficult to fill vacancies, much less with people who possess highly developed leadership qualities.

In the mid 1990s, according to Smallwood and Jazzar (2006), the University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA) invited scholars across the nation to define the knowledge base in educational administration. Although considered a risky initiative purporting to delimit the field of study, the UCEA’s summit was fruitful in bearing a system of documents entitled *Primis*. UCEA launched a series of case studies that explored the dynamics of changing traditional preparation programs into experimental training models (Milestein, 1992; Murphy, 1992). A continuous stream of responses resulted over the ensuing years (Peterson & Finn, 1985; Heller, Conway, & Jacobsen, 1988; Muse & Thomas, 1991, Protheroe, 1998; Murphy & Forsyth, 1999; Young & Petersen, 2002).

Close on the heels of the knowledge-based *Primis*, members of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), a national non-profit school leadership organization, labored extensively to strengthen preparation programs in school leadership. In 1996, with assistance from 24 state agencies and various professional associations, the CCSSO’s Interstate School Leaders Licensure Council (ISLLC) developed 6 standards for school leaders designed to guide principal performance (Green, 2001). The developers of the ISLLC standards based their choices on research

about effective educational leadership and thus, expected their standards to influence leadership preparation programs. The ISLLC (1996) standards were consciously designed to focus “on matters of learning and teaching and the creation of powerful learning environments” (p. 8). The standards were developed from the research discoveries that emerged from effective schools research (Murphy, 2003).

Murphy (2001b) suggested the ISLLC standards provide the DNA for reculturing the profession of school administration. They also provided a platform for the reconstitution of leadership preparation programs and for certification and recertification of school leaders. The 6 ISLLC standards were deliberately broad, representing a core of knowledge, dispositions, and performances that lead to effective leadership and enhanced educational outcomes (Green, 2001). The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the National Policy Board (NPB) have adopted the 6 ISLLC standards for school leaders as the basis for their own standards for advanced programs in educational leadership—the standards used to accredit educational leadership programs in many colleges and universities across the nation. The standards emphasized the belief that school administrators ensure the success of all students. Effective school leadership by the principal-as-change-agent is also embodied within the 6 standards formulated by ISLLC (1996) and the Council of Chief State School Officers. The standards state educational leaders should promote the success of all students by doing the following:

1. Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.
2. Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.
3. Ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

4. Collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.
5. Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.
6. Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. (pp.12-22)

Although it was the desire of the consortium to raise the bar for the practice of school leadership, the ISLLC standards were also developed to be compatible with the new National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) curriculum guidelines. The ISLLC standards have either been adopted or adapted by 44 states. Engler and Edlefsen (2005) stated, “While this is a commendable achievement, the question still remains: How can principal preparation programs align with these standards in a timely and comprehensive manner?” (p. 7)

With support from the Wallace Foundation, the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) organized the SREB Leadership Initiative in 2000 to work with SREB states on a long-term basis to redesign leadership preparation and certification systems around a focus on the core functions of the school—curriculum, instruction, and student learning. To begin this work, SREB conducted research, collected data about the need to reform educational leadership preparation programs and created a model for the redesign of educational leadership preparation programs. According to Fry et al. (2006), a set of conditions of redesign was developed to provide a vision of more effective programs and guide the redesign process in the desired direction.

Similar to the ISLLC standards, the Educational Leadership Constituent Council standards (ELCC) were created jointly in 2001 by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and ISLLC to address new standards for the preparation and development of school principals. According to Wilmore (2002), these

standards were of critical importance in creating, nurturing, and sustaining a culture and climate that valued the soul of the school within its political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. The ELCC framework is organized around seven basic standards and addresses technology more than ISLLC. The standards include the following:

1. Facilitates the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school district vision of learning supported by the school community;
2. Promotes a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practices to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff;
3. Manages the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment;
4. Collaborates with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources;
5. Acts with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner;
6. Understands, responds to, and influences the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context;
7. Completes an administrator internship. The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in Standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit.

Despite the aforementioned leadership initiatives, in 2005, American Enterprise Institute researchers Hess and Kelly (2005a) studied the content of 31 principal preparation programs across the nation and concluded there is serious reason to doubt whether principals are mastering the skills requisite for success as 21st century school leaders. Deficiencies they cited included the lack of attention to management and topics such as the use of data, research, technology, the hiring or termination of personnel, and using data to evaluate the performance of personnel in a systematic way. Almost 30% of total instruction focused on technical law or finance problems; 11% addressed curriculum and pedagogy, and discussions of staffing focused more on traditional

faculty oversight than on using new managerial tools to improve school results.

According to Hess and Kelly (2005a), what principal preparation programs were doing was understandable. They prepared principals for schools as they have traditionally been managed. Moreover, many practicing principals were uncomfortable with the changing environment or less than eager to exploit new managerial freedoms.

Consequently, it should not be surprising professors of education administration have been slow to change. This reflects a fundamental structural reality.

A well-known four-year study led by the president of Teachers College of Columbia University, Arthur Levine (2005a), raised the stakes in the debate by harshly assessing the quality of educational administration programs. The Education Schools Project studied 28 representative administrator preparation programs from around the country. The research involved surveys of thousands of education-school deans, faculty members, alumni, and school principals. The report concluded educational administration was the weakest program schools of education offered. Few strong programs existed and most programs were “little more than a grab-bag of survey courses” (p. 28). The majority of [educational administration] programs ranged from “inadequate to appalling, even at some of the country’s leading universities” (p. 23). Their shortcomings included irrelevant and incoherent curricula, low admission and graduation standards, inadequate clinical instruction, weak faculties, degrees that were irrelevant to the jobs students eventually held, insufficient financial support, and poor research. In particular, Levine found the typical course of studies required of principal candidates was largely disconnected from the realities of school management, though

Levine did not seek to analyze the content of these courses. The only institutions the study recommended were in Britain. Levine (2005a) purported his study was:

the latest in a long line of reports going back decades that have decried the state of school-leadership programs. In recent years, the pace of such criticism has accelerated, and while many university programs say they are undergoing program redesign, education schools have for the most part continued to conduct business as usual...too many have chosen to ignore not only their own shortcomings, but also the extraordinary changes in the nation and the world. (p. 6)

Archer (2005) of *Education Week* called Levine's study a "damning assessment of the programs that prepare most of the nation's principals and superintendents" (p. 1). Even those programs claiming to have made major improvements were found to have "little connection to the realities of running a school or district" (p. 1).

According to Tirozzi and Ferrandino (2005), the presidents of the National Association of Elementary School Principals and National Association of Secondary School Principals immediately affirmed the study's conclusions, agreeing administrator preparation programs "fall woefully short" of what is needed to improve schools (p. 12).

Hess and Kelly (2005b) agreed with Levine stating, "The disappointing state of principal preparation is disturbing news" given that 48 states require principals to be certified in educational administration. They were puzzled as to why there seemed to be such a "wide gulf" between what principals say they needed to know to do their job and what they were taught in education programs required by state departments of education. They continued, stating, "Given what practicing principals say, schools of education seem to be missing a golden opportunity to contribute to school improvement" (p.1).

According to Fry, Bottoms, O'Neill, and Jacobson (2004), states evidently did not view the system as "broken" (p. 6). In fact universities and school districts continued to evaluate their programs by using criteria that had little to do with whether they produced graduates who could change school and classroom practices and raise student achievement. Instead they evaluated their programs based on high enrollments and large numbers of graduates; national accreditation; high passing rates on state-required examinations; high percentages of graduates who found jobs, whether in leadership or non-leadership roles; and school district-administered annual performance evaluations of graduates that focused more on management responsibilities than on improving school and classroom practices.

Conversely, Dr. John Hoyle (2007) of Texas A&M University stated: "As is so often the case, however, what 'everyone' takes for granted deserves a second look" (p. 3). Very few studies have been conducted on educational leadership preparation programs, meaning there is simply very little basis in the literature for this assumption.

Additionally, Young et al. (2005) found Levine's report "to be troubling in many respects" (p. 1). They stated:

The report overlooks the aggressive and complex change underway in leadership preparation programs. It leaves the impression that efforts to improve leadership programs are non-existent or barely underway. In fact, across the nation, many scholars, policy makers, policy analysts, school leaders, professional organizations, and foundations have been addressing this need for years. Such experts have already raised concerns about ineffective preparation programs and have promoted drastic reform and restructuring of educational leadership preparation. (p. 1)

Despite budding efforts to rethink preparation, the results of recent studies cannot be lightly dismissed. Beyond the 2005 Levine study, recent research and commentary has focused on the need to reshape the principal's role so school leaders

are more focused on increasing student achievement, driving school improvement, and meeting the challenges of standards-based accountability and charter schools (Grogan & Andrews, 2002; Portin, Schneider, DeArmond, & Grundlach, 2003).

Hence, considering the noble efforts put forth for educational leadership preparation program improvements, directors of educational administrator preparation programs continued their search for significant program improvements. Despite these efforts, many preparation programs continued to lack the curricular coherence, rigor, pedagogy, and structure to provide the kinds of knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to produce a large supply of exceptional school and district leaders (Jackson & Kelly, 2002).

Schmoker (2006) summarized the state of affairs, stating:

Administrator preparation programs are in a uniquely powerful position to radically alter current practices and expectations, to positively and powerfully affect how leaders lead and teachers teach in every state or province, district, and school. At the state, university, district, and school levels, what are we waiting for? (p. 162)

McREL's 21 Leadership Responsibilities

According to Waters and Cameron (2007), Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) has completed multiple meta-analytic studies on the practices of effective schools, teachers, and principals over the past several years; however, they recognized “simply knowing *what* to do is often not enough to transform schools and classrooms. Leaders also must know *why* certain practices are important, *when* they should be used, and *how* to apply them skillfully in their own schools and classrooms” (p. 1).

McREL saw a need to connect their research findings to existing research-based knowledge on change management, diffusion theory, collective efficacy, institutional theory, living systems theory, community development, asset utilization, and school improvement. Waters and Cameron (2007) stated the result of this effort is the Balanced Leadership Framework, which groups 21 leadership responsibilities into an organizing structure: Leadership, Focus, Magnitude of Change, and Purposeful Community. They maintained this framework “not only organizes the myriad of responsibilities of school leaders, but also and perhaps more importantly, helps them connect their vision for their schools with a plan of action.” (pp. 15-16) Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003) added, “Effective leaders understand how to balance pushing for change, while at the same time, protecting aspects of culture, values, and norms worth preserving” (p. 1).

The notion of “balanced leadership” emerged from the observations of McREL’s research team as they reflected on the research findings through the lens of decades of combined experience working with and in schools. For example, in the 1990s, many efforts were made to identify important leadership responsibilities, functions, and practices for school leaders. What these efforts produced was an extraordinarily wide range of responsibilities without distinction between important and essential responsibilities. According to Waters and Grubb (2004), 184 indicators for the 6 standards for school leaders were developed in the United States by the ISLLC and the National Policy Board for Educational Administration in 1996. In addition to being overwhelming in scope, the ISLLC standards provide no guidance on which standards

or indicators should be prioritized—or what is essential for principals to know and be able to do to improve student achievement.

Waters and Cameron (2007) concurred, stating: “Principals are asked to fulfill many and varied responsibilities that are *important* in running a school. Not all of them, however are *essential* to improving student achievement” (p. 18). Therefore, it is their hope their research findings “can help principals balance their time and efforts in fulfilling *important* and *essential* responsibilities” (p. 18).

The balanced leadership framework developed by McREL shows how specific leadership responsibilities can be linked to areas of influence that are critical to continuous school improvement. Bailey, Cameron, and Cortez-Ford (2004) supported McREL’s balanced leadership framework because the structure assumes for sustainable school improvement to be realized, school leaders (including principals and teacher-leaders) must better understand three crucial principles: (1) the relationship between research-based leadership responsibilities and practices; (2) those areas of influence associated with sustainable school improvement, including establishing a community of purpose; and (3) change can vary dramatically in terms of its focus and magnitude. The 21 leadership competencies are:

1. Affirmation: Recognizes and celebrates accomplishments and acknowledges failures
2. Change agent: Is willing to challenge and actively challenges the status quo
3. Communication: Establishes strong lines of communication with and among teachers and students
4. Contingent Rewards: Recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments
5. Culture: Fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation
6. Discipline: Protects teachers from issues and influences that would detract from their teaching time or focus
7. Flexibility: Adapts his or her leadership behavior to the needs of the current situation and is comfortable with dissent

8. Focus: Establishes clear goals and keeps those goals in the forefront of the school's attention
9. Ideas/Beliefs: Communicates and operates from strong ideals and beliefs about schooling
10. Input: Involves teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies
11. Intellectual Stimulation: Ensures faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices and makes the discussion of these a regular aspect of the school's culture
12. Involvement in Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment: Is directly involved in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices
13. Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment: Is knowledgeable about current curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices
14. Monitoring, Evaluating: Monitors and evaluates the effectiveness of school practices and their impact on student learning
15. Optimizer: Inspires and leads new and challenging innovations
16. Order: Establishes a set of standard operating procedures and routines
17. Outreach: Is an advocate and spokesperson for the school to all stakeholders
18. Relationships: Demonstrates an awareness of the personal aspects of teachers and staff
19. Resources: Provides teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their jobs
20. Situational Awareness: Is aware of the details and undercurrents in the running of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems
21. Visibility: Has quality contact and interactions with teachers and students. (pp. 42-43)

Waters et al. (2003) emphasized “not all change is of the same magnitude. Some changes have greater implications than others for staff members, students, parents, and other stakeholders” (p. 6). Moreover, they defined the terms “first order” and “second order” change to make this distinction:

On both individual and collective levels, changes that are consistent with existing values and norms, create advantage for individuals or stakeholder groups with similar interests, can be implemented with existing knowledge and resources, and where agreement exists on what changes are needed and on how the changes should be implemented can be considered first order.

A change becomes second order when it is not obvious how it will make things better for people with similar interests, it requires individuals or groups of stakeholders to learn new approaches, or it conflicts with prevailing values and norms. (p.7)

Additional research from Waters et al. (2003) revealed there were specific leadership practices more appropriate for first order change while others were more appropriate for second order change. Leadership practices were ranked according to their magnitude of change appropriate for first order change and second order change, with “culture,” “order,” discipline,” “resources,” and “curriculum, instruction, and assessment” listed respectively as the first five responsibilities on the continuum; however, the authors stressed:

It is important to note that not all changes represent the same order of change for each individual or stakeholder group....A proposed change might represent a first order change for some and a second order change for others....Leaders should keep in mind that while only some of the responsibilities listed are required to lead first order change, skillful use of all responsibilities is required to successfully lead second order change....Leaders must tailor their own leadership practices based on the magnitude or “order” of change they are leading (p. 7).

Adult Learning Theory

While the research in the leadership preparation field has been characterized as scant and of limited methodological quality (McCarthy, 1999; Murphy & Vriesenga, 2004), the studies have served to foment ideas related to adult learning and to diffuse new approaches for educating administrative aspirants.

Extensive research on adult learning has been utilized to improve the quality and effectiveness of leadership program field experiences. Orr (2006) states, “When adult learning theory was connected to leadership development, field experiences became developmental, with infused reflective practices that augmented the learning. Field-initiated research documented strengthening the mentoring roles of university and field-based supervisors” (p. 2).

According to Smith (2002), while the concept of andragogy has been in spasmodic usage since the 1830s, it was Malcolm Knowles who popularized its usage for English language readers. Andragogy is defined as a set of assumptions about how adults learn. According to Knowles, Holton, and Swanson (1998), its roots can be traced back to Alexander Kapp, a German grammar teacher who used it to describe Plato's educational theory. It appeared again in 1921 when another German social scientist, Eugen Rosenstock, claimed "adult education required special teachers, special methods, and a special philosophy" (p. 59). There is evidence discussion of andragogy continued in Europe until Dusan Savicevic, a Yugoslavian adult educator, first discussed the concept in the United States. Knowles heard about the term and in 1968 used it in an article in *Adult Leadership*. From that point on, Knowles became known as the principle expert on andragogy, although numerous adult educators including Brookfield (1986), Mezirow (1991), Lawler (1991), and Merriam and Caffarella (1999) have addressed the concept and/or discussed how it can be used to facilitate adult learning.

Knowles (1984) premised andragogy on at least four crucial assumptions about the characteristics of adult learners that are different from the assumptions about child learners on which traditional pedagogy is premised. A fifth was added later.

1. Self-concept: As a person matures his self concept moves from one of being a dependent personality toward one of being a self-directed human being.
2. Experience: As a person matures he accumulates a growing reservoir of experience that becomes an increasing resource for learning.
3. Readiness to learn: As a person matures his readiness to learn becomes oriented increasingly to the developmental tasks of his social roles.
4. Orientation to learning: As a person matures his time perspective changes from one of postponed application of knowledge to immediacy of application, and accordingly his orientation toward learning shifts from one of subject-centeredness to one of problem-centeredness.

5. Motivation to learn: As a person matures the motivation to learn is internal (p. 12).

Higher education has given priority to the integration of adult learning theory in the design of instruction so faculty can create lessons that are not only effective but meaningful from the learner's standpoint. Knowles's (1980) theory of andragogy outlined effective methodologies for adult learning. When this theory is integrated into the design of learning environments, it is possible to create lessons that not only serve the needs of students but also focus on their requirements as an adult. Fidishun (1999) stated: "Andragogy includes ideas such as an adult's readiness to learn, the role of the learner's experiences, the faculty member as a facilitator of learning, an adult's orientation to learning, and the learner's self concept" (p. 2).

Reform Movements

According to Olson (2007), for decades, preservice training for principals resembled the following: While working as teachers, the prospective principals took occasional courses at an education school on such topics as school finance, law, and educational theory. After a few years they completed a culminating field assignment, which might have involved shadowing their own principals. Candidates then applied for jobs in administration. This scattershot approach increasingly is giving way to dramatically different forms of principal preparation. The focus is less on creating efficient managers than on preparing individuals who can lead a school to higher student achievement.

In this changing context, Hess and Kelly (2005a) maintained an array of scholars have asked whether traditional approaches to preparing and licensing principals are sufficient (Elmore, 2000; Hess, 2003; Murphy, 2001a, Tucker, 2003). Young and

Kochan (2004) asserted, "In order to build programs that support leadership for learning, we must rethink and revise our practice in several areas" (p. 121).

Murphy (2006) noted there is a considerable body of work being amassed on the topic of leadership education for school administrators and his most recent analysis lead him to the following two major conclusions about initial preparation programs in the United States:

- On the upside, a good deal of energy and hard work is being poured into attempts to revitalize preparation programs.
- On the downside, we are not seeing much in the way of real improvement; that is, most of the change is on the margins. (p. 1)

Murphy (2001b) continued, adding, "The problem with educational leadership preparation programs today is that they are driven by neither education nor leadership" (p.1). School administration is being reshaped by forces in the environment that demand we rethink the business of school leadership. Economic, social, and political environments surrounding schools are undergoing dramatic changes. Orr (2006) concurred, stating "the *hows and whats* of leadership preparation have become hotly debated questions in recent years" (p. 1).

Likewise, Fry et al. (2006) affirmed: "The state is in the driver's seat when it comes to the design and quality of principal preparation and it appears that in many states, the ignition key is still in the off position" (p. 13). Leaders in universities are aware of the issue, and they are waiting and willing to comply when their states raise the bar. During interviews with SREB staff, several university representatives stated their faculties would get serious about changing the program when the state stopped certifying their graduates and districts stopped hiring them. In other instances, they told

interviewers substantial changes in programs would be made only when the state required it.

Fry et al.'s (2006) study of the progress of pacesetter universities in SREB states committed to redesigning their principal preparation programs led to four conclusions:

1. Current state policies and strategies intended to promote redesign of principal preparation programs have produced episodic change in a few institutions but have fallen short in producing the deeper change that would ensure all candidates master the knowledge and skill needed to be effective school leaders today.
2. There is a lack of urgency for refocusing the design, content, process, and outcomes of principal preparation programs based on the needs of schools and student achievement and little will happen until there are committed leaders of change at every level—state, university, and local school districts.
3. States and districts cannot depend on universities to change principal preparation programs on their own because the barriers to change within these organizations are too deeply entrenched.
4. The issue is not whether principal preparation programs need to change, but how can states plan and carry out a redesign initiative that gets the right results? (pp. 3-4)

Indeed, a number of preparation programs are currently considering redesign. This means findings may become dated as new training programs are launched in the years ahead. It also means findings could be of immediate value in helping principal preparation providers revisit their assumptions as they work to rethink their programs. That said, the SREB (2003), whose leadership initiative is driving preparation and certification reform in its 16 member states, has cautioned: “Redesigning leadership preparation programs does not mean simply rearranging old courses—as staff at some universities and leadership academies are inclined to do. True redesign requires a new curriculum framework and new courses aimed to producing principals who can lead schools to excellence” (p. 7).

Similarly, Murphy (2006) stated if principal preparation programs “do not get off the road we have traveled for the last 40 years, it is highly unlikely that we will be able to reach a different destination” (p. 1). In particular, his assessment maintained we would be advantaged if we rebuilt and recultured preparation programs, not on traditional scaffolding (e.g., debates about the knowledge base, designing programs for administrative roles, trying to discern what social science discipline will save us), but around a set of powerful design principles. Murphy and his colleagues forged a framework of six guiding principles that collectively meet the criterion of fostering the reculturing of preparation programs:

1. Foundation-based programs. Many departments are silent about what grounds their programs and institutions and need to begin by addressing the mission or the foundation of the program, i.e. what the program stands for, in a phrase or a sentence (e.g., justice, standards, equitable learning).
2. Value-based admissions. Improvement of initial preparation programs will depend on our willingness to move to mission or value-based recruitment and selection instead of using criteria that have questionable linkages to effective leadership (e.g., GPAs, standardized test scores, letters of recommendation).
3. Zero-based curriculum development. The rebuilding process begins by pulling all the existing courses off the table and asking what offerings make sense given the foundation(s) that anchor the program. Existing courses can always be reintroduced in whole or part as appropriate, but it is very difficult to move them off the playing field after the game has begun.
4. Practice-anchored learning experiences. The scaffolding for preparation programs needs to be forged from authentic issues of practice (e.g., reading meltdown in the middle grades or closing a high school). Knowledge needs to be introduced in the context of problems and opportunities. In other words, situated learning needs to be highlighted.
5. Community-grounded culture. The culture, the norms, and the structures of our organizations do not support collaborative efforts inside departments nor between colleagues in the academic and practice arms of the profession. Departments of educational administration need to spend as much time working to create a learning organization and communities of professional practice as they do supporting skill and knowledge development of individual faculty members.
6. Outcome-based accountability. Our assessment is that colleagues are having a difficult time recognizing, understanding, and meeting the challenges of a new era of accountability and new ways of thinking about program

development. Switching the *DNA* of accountability from process to outcome is critical for the long-term health and long-term success of our preparation programs. (pp. 1-3)

Likewise, Fry et al. (2004) maintained SREB staff interviewed educational leadership department heads from 22 universities about changes in their departments on four benchmarks of redesign. The four benchmarks are:

1. extent to which courses incorporate new content, practical assignments and assessments, all focusing on the leader's role in school improvement;
2. emphasis on the principal's role in curriculum, instruction, and student achievement;
3. the degree of joint effort between universities and local school districts in selecting and preparing school principals;
4. the scope of restructuring to include a series of well-planned, in-school experiences and provide future principals with opportunities to observe, participate in and lead school improvement. (p. 11)

The interviews revealed approximately one-third of the university programs made promising progress on each of the four benchmarks of redesign. The following conditions were cited as reasons for making progress:

1. having someone in the department to lead change;
2. being a member of a redesign network;
3. receiving encouragement and support from university administrators;
4. hiring new faculty with school-based or research-based expertise in curriculum, instruction, and school improvement;
5. involving school district personnel with specialized skills and knowledge for redesign;
6. restructuring the system to recognize and reward faculty for their work. (p.11)

The lack of progress was blamed most often on:

1. lack of institutional will to redesign leadership programs, generally because these programs are not a university priority or because the university complacently depends on national accreditation as a marker of effectiveness;
2. lack of adequate resources, such as enough faculty and expertise to undertake the redesign work, support for professional development, and released time for aspiring principals to attend class, do in-depth assignments and projects in schools, and serve internships in diverse settings;
3. ability to get almost all graduates licensed by the state using the existing program;

4. lack of strong direction and urgency for change from the state. (p. 11)

Additionally, Fry et al. (2006) offered the following recommendations as “an urgent mayday call” for key state, university, and district leaders to get serious about their responsibility to provide higher-quality programs that prepare more capable school principals:

1. Policy makers should take the bold steps that will motivate universities to work with local districts to select the right people for leadership preparation and develop, in partnership, new program designs based on well-defined conditions and curriculum frameworks that will produce a new generation of principals.
2. State agencies should find new ways to support universities and districts in the design and implementation of new and more powerful preparation programs and to implement more effective program approval processes.
3. University presidents should recognize that a continuing supply of high-performing principals is critical to the economic growth of their region and to be evaluated and held accountable for providing quality preparation programs, including sufficient funding, staffing, and other institutional support necessary to meet high standards.
4. Departments of educational leadership should awaken from their complacency, reject the status quo, and respond to appeals and criticisms from the field by identifying new content that addresses what principals need to know in order to do their jobs and by devising instructional processes that ensure principals master the essential knowledge and skills.
5. Local school districts should become proactive in accepting co-ownership of principal preparation, identify what principals need to know and be able to do on the job, and take the necessary steps to ensure universities provide programs that address their needs for improved schools and student achievement.
6. Local school boards should provide the working conditions and resources that will make it possible for a pool of aspiring principals handpicked by the board as the most promising candidates to complete high-quality preparation programs, including substantial internships supported by exemplary mentor principals. (pp. 11-12)

Recapping the exigency of their recommendations, Fry et al. (2006) emphasized compelling research evidence stressed high quality school leadership as a “big part” of the answer in addressing the national question, “How can we leave no child behind?” (p. 4). Because students and teachers are under enormous pressure to perform, the

education climate has never been more conducive to change. “Schools simply can’t wait for principal preparation programs to find solutions to their design problems on their own.” (p. 4). United leadership from higher education and K-12 leaders at the state and local level is as essential as the commitment of governors and state legislators in making the preparation of quality school leaders a state priority.

In summarizing the reform movements of principal preparation programs, Cambron-McCabe (2006) stated: “Since entrenched mental models of how organizations work dominate our thinking, the assumptions underlying these constructs restrict our ability to see other possibilities. This may be the most intractable impediment to preparing school leaders to transform existing institutions” (p. 1). Morgan (1997) identified a number of metaphors that give us insight into these limitations. The machine metaphor, which heads his list and is most frequently used to characterize schools, involves highly mechanistic structures focused on hierarchy, control, predictability, accountability, rationality, and uniform outcomes. Senge (2000) cautioned that the thinking behind this industrial structure stifles innovation and only leads to recreating the schools we now have. The result may be some improvement in the status quo but not the transformation we desire. Senge noted: “The challenge is not to come up with a simple set of fixes. Indeed, the machine-age concept of ‘fixes’ is part of the problem” (p. 51). Rather, he argued schools are under stress and need to evolve as living systems do.

And what would it mean if we shifted our thinking to considering schools, as well as other organizations, as living systems? Cambron-McCabe (2006) purported, “Living systems evolve, grow, and renew themselves. They are non-linear, learning, and

purpose-driven. They focus on wholes, not parts. At the cores, these systems are self-organizing and governed by relationships and connectedness” (p. 2).

It remains to be seen whether preparation programs are intent on answering the challenge of substantially reforming administrator preparation, program accreditation, and state licensing standards but the flurry of redesign efforts is a promising development.

Alternative Certification Programs

According to Levine (2005b), leadership programs face a rising number of non-university competitors, and the states are opening pathways into leadership professions that bypass education schools. In 2003, a majority of states had no requirements for top-level school administrator positions, or they had alternative certification programs or a policy of exceptions that allowed candidates without education-school preparation to become superintendents and principals. In the years ahead those numbers are likely to increase. He stated, “It is not an exaggeration to say that school-leadership programs are at risk of becoming superfluous” (p. B16).

Consequently, several of the nation’s largest cities have taken advantage of the flexibility by hiring candidates without degrees in education or people who are not educators to head their school systems. At the same time, a growing number of competitors—including states, school districts, individual schools, foundations, professional associations, and other nonprofit and commercial organizations—are developing their own programs.

Levine (2005b) stated educational-administration programs will hopefully “embrace change rather than watch the states and the marketplace take away their franchise” (p. 3). He also maintained:

Because such an extraordinary number of school administrators are needed in the years ahead as people retire, it is unrealistic to expect that alternative programs can fill the gap. Aside from being unproven, they are too few and too small, even with their recent proliferation. (p. 3)

The state of Texas has led the charge in creating university-based leadership programs with a balance of theory and field experiences. Below is a brief summation of several promising practices in educational leadership programs in Texas.

Texas Programs

In describing the Texas administrative certification program, Fuller and Orr (2006) provided an historical account, stating, “Texas principal certification programs offer a typical policy context, with many of the requirements and opportunities for leadership licensure and advancement as other states” (p. 4). From 1987 through 2003, all prospective principals were required to take and pass the Examination for the Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET) Principalship or mid-level management test. In 2003, prospective principals were required to take and pass the Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TExES) Principal test. Texas also requires its administrator preparation programs to provide structured field-based practicum and preparation along with the state’s educational leadership standards. Additionally, first-time principals are required to complete a one-year induction with mentoring. Beginning in 1996, the state offered an alternative route to licensure for teachers and principals,

but not non-educators. The state also had in place an administrator reciprocity agreement.

Fuller and Orr (2006) emphasized the importance of understanding the state context in order to evaluate the institutional and career advancement trends. Texas is a geographically large and diverse state, with sprawling rural regions and five major urban concentrations as well as numerous suburban districts and many medium-sized cities. Texas has a wide variety of different types of school districts and schools spread across a vast geographic area that is much larger than most states in the nation. In recent years, it has experienced both an increase in and diversification of its school-aged population and schools, “yielding implications for the need for more educational leaders” (p. 5).

Fuller and Young (2006) explained that “using Texas data is beneficial” in that Texas has over 8,000 schools and 1,050 school districts; Texas is a large and diverse state, both in terms of the number of districts, schools, principals, and teachers, and the demographics of districts, schools, principals, and teachers (p. 4). Texas has an abundance of inner-city, suburban, small city, and rural districts and schools, as well as schools that serve large percentages of poor and minority students and schools that serve large percentages of affluent and white students.

Thus, the state of Texas lends credibility to the field of educational research, not only because of the diverse student populations but also in terms of the abundant range of school district sizes, from urban to rural areas. The discussion that follows is just one example of an innovative partnership between a Texas university and a large urban Texas school district.

A Promising University and District Partnership: The University of North Texas and the Dallas Independent School District

The Dallas Independent School District (DISD) works in partnership with the University of North Texas (UNT) to set a higher standard for the selection of leadership candidates. According to Fry et al. (2006), the UNT–DISD approach is a joint effort to identify and prepare small teams of teacher leaders who can meet the university’s graduate admission requirements and who have demonstrated leadership initiative and a passion for improving student achievement and quality teaching that helps students meet high standards. According to the formal agreement between the university and district, the program seeks to prepare future leaders who will “work with staff to further a comprehensive school improvement plan where classroom instruction is linked to the standards and goals of the Texas state accountability system” (p. 49).

Fry et al. (2006) maintained early on, the university and district described in a memorandum of understanding the type of school leaders they expected the program to produce. They identified seven qualities the leaders would possess, including:

1. Support rigorous academic standards and instructional methods that motivate and engage students.
2. Make meaningful connections between the abstract aspects of the curriculum and real-world learning experiences.
3. Create and manage a system of support enabling all students to meet high standards and motivating faculty to have high expectations for all students.
4. Set priorities for change that can be measured and managed realistically.
5. Create a personal, caring school environment that helps students meet higher standards.
6. Apply research knowledge to improve school practices.
7. Use technology for management and instructional purposes. (p. 50)

With these qualities as a foundation, Fry et al. (2006) explained participant selection involved three steps. First, DISD identified 10 principals who had demonstrated a commitment to school improvement and had shown they were good

mentors for aspiring leaders. Second, the identified principals were asked to nominate teachers in their schools who were successful in getting high achievement from all students and had demonstrated leadership in working with others to improve school and classroom practices. Principals nominated 38 teachers who attended an orientation session to learn more about the program. In the third step, five interview teams consisting of two principals and a UNT faculty member interviewed the candidates. Each interview followed a set of questions reflecting the SREB critical success factors for school leaders. The interview teams ranked the candidates and the UNT design team enrolled the top applicants the interview teams recommended. UNT organized the first cohort of 27 graduate students into 10 teams comprised of two to four participants who worked on projects to improve their schools.

Fry et al. (2006) stated DISD paid half of the course tuition for the 27 graduate students and provided stipends and mentor training for the participating principals. The district also paid costs for the cohort to travel to the state capital to attend appropriate administrator conferences, tour the Texas Education Agency and meet with state officials and legislative aides. DISD invited students in the cohort group and UNT faculty to participate in its professional development programs. The benefits of a joint selection process were visible to district administrators, even in the early stages of program implementation. The first cohort graduated in summer 2004 and over half are currently serving as assistant principals or in some other school leadership position in the Dallas Independent School District. Joe Neely, former Specialist in University Relations for Dallas Independent School District stated, "We are delighted with the results of this program and feel that the reason for success was the careful processes the university

and district jointly planned for selection at the beginning of the program” (p. 49).

Because of the program’s success, DISD signed letters of agreement with UNT to form Cohorts 2 and 3. Students from the three cohorts have since completed their coursework and many of the graduates are currently serving as school administrators.

In addition to the aforementioned partnership between DISD and UNT, the following provides examples of other innovative programs in Texas that relate to principal certification and leadership initiatives.

Texas High School Project (THSP): Pilot High School Principal Certification Program

The Texas High School Project (THSP, 2006) originated as a \$261 million public-private initiative dedicated to increasing graduation and college enrollment rates in every Texas community. THSP focused on the most challenged school districts in the state, with an emphasis on urban areas and districts along the Texas-Mexico border.

THSP’s Education Leadership Initiative

THSP’s (2006) \$4.2 million Education Leadership Initiative was established in recognition of the critical role quality school leaders, including principals and teacher leaders, play in the success of school reform efforts targeting high-need students. A primary goal was to strengthen the connection among leadership development, a focused learning environment, and increased student performance through pilot high school principal certification programs, meaningful leadership training for principals and teacher leaders in struggling schools, and training and support for district leaders.

Pilot High School Principal Certification Program Description

Through the Education Leadership Initiative, THSP (2006) funded pilot programs for principal certification at six universities in Texas. These pilot programs were

proposed to take a first step toward re-inventing how principals are prepared in Texas, in recognition of the changing role of this position and the unique challenges of leading reform. At each university, the program has been formed as a distinctive track of approximately 10 students intended to develop high school leaders capable of leading change in districts or charter schools with a high minority, low socioeconomic population. The programs lead to a master's degree in education administration and principal certification valid in the state of Texas.

Emerging Trends in International Leadership Education

Rusch, Crawford, and Wolverton (2006) stated, "Perspectives that cross programs, nations, and disciplines require an intentional choice to learn outside a zone of familiarity" (p. 1). Additionally, Lugg (2006) maintained issues of leadership should be addressed from a global perspective. "While leadership preparation and development issues in the U.S. remain a central scholarly concern, in a truly global environment, we cannot afford to ignore intellectual and professional innovations that arise far beyond our proverbial backyard" (p. 1). Leadership education should be examined and pushed beyond the existing disciplinary borders and metaphorical school house walls.

Barnett (2006) noted there are distinct and subtle differences between leadership education in the United States and other countries. The most striking difference is the tendency for American universities to provide preservice preparation (e.g., master's degrees, licensure and certification programs), whereas professional associations and school districts are responsible for the ongoing professional development and support for educational leaders. This demarcation is not as evident in other countries because

formal university pre-accreditation (preservice) coursework is not required to become school administrators.

Although Barnett (2006) maintained the norm in the United States is for individual teachers and administrators to attend professional development sessions, Sparks and Hirsch (1997) described three powerful ideas altering the shape of schools and staff development: results-driven education, systems-thinking, and constructivism. Major shifts in staff development resulting from the aforementioned ideas include movement from individual development to individual and organizational development; from fragmented, piecemeal improvement efforts to staff development driven by a clear, coherent plan; from a focus on adult needs and satisfaction to a focus on student needs and learning outcomes; from training conducted away from the job to multiple forms of job-embedded learning; and from staff development as a frill to staff development as indispensable.

Summary

The extensive review of relevant literature has assessed the progress of principal preparation programs, as well as outlined promising reform movements evolving in Texas, nationally, and internationally. Although empirical research regarding principal preparation programs was limited, descriptive studies and journal articles provided background information and insight to the field.

Fry et al. (2004) predicted states, universities, and districts will face major challenges as they take the actions necessary to put good leaders in every school.

There are four main challenges:

1. Getting more well-qualified future school leaders who are committed to being principals who improve student achievement.

2. Implementing leadership programs to prepare school principals to lead curriculum and instruction and to increase student achievement.
3. Licensing principals based on their performance.
4. Creating leadership academies for improving low-performing schools. (p. 20)

Furthermore, Fry et al. (2006) maintained in an era of higher standards and greater accountability, it is critical for schools to have leaders who are prepared to do everything necessary to improve teaching and learning. Implemented correctly, principal preparation programs can help states put a quality principal in every school who knows how to lead changes in school and classroom practices that result in higher student achievement.

According to Bruner et al. (2006), for educational leadership programs to survive, our conflicts must be recognized, embraced, and addressed. Wheatley (1992) identified the importance of conflict, disequilibrium, surprise, and loss of control when she wrote: "To stay viable, open systems maintain a state of non-equilibrium, keeping the system off balance so that it can change and grow" (p.78). Bruner et al. (2006) added: "We are off balance at a critical juncture in educational leadership today. Though the locus of control is shifting, we still have some leeway in determining how we change and grow. Our direction will be influenced by our ability to be proactive" (p. 21).

In summary, a thorough and comprehensive literature review revealed there is more pressure on today's principals to improve student performance and it is debatable whether today's leadership programs in graduate schools of education adequately ready new principals to handle the ever-increasing responsibilities. New principals enter the job knowledgeable in their coursework but they will ultimately encounter challenges on the job that cannot be taught in a classroom or read in a book. Additionally, concepts garnered from the literature highlight recent efforts to redesign principal preparation

programs; however, empirical studies are limited. It is for the purpose of reducing the current gap of knowledge of this subject that the original research component of this dissertation was designed.

Chapter 3 discloses the methods and procedures used to collect and analyze the research data in the study, as well as explain the purpose of the research, the research questions, design, and context. The selection of study participants, development of the instrument to be used, data collection, and data analysis are also addressed.

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

This chapter details the methods and procedures used to collect and analyze the research data in the study. The purpose of the research will be explained, along with the research questions, design, and context. The selection of study participants, development of the instrument to be used, data collection, and data analysis will also be addressed. The chapter concludes with a summary.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to assess the relationship between principals' perceptions of their principal preparation programs and Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning's (McREL) 21 leadership responsibilities. A secondary component of the study examined the relationship between principals' perceptions of their principal preparation programs and Knowles's principles of adult learning.

Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. To what degree are McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities addressed in Texas principal preparation programs?
2. To what degree are Knowles's principles of adult learning addressed in Texas principal preparation programs?

Research Design

The theoretical framework for this study utilized two perspectives: McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities and Knowles's principles of adult learning. Both quantitative and qualitative research methods addressed the research questions. This supports research findings of Boodhoo and Purmessur (2009), who asserted there has

been an increasing use of qualitative research during the past decade. They maintained both quantitative and qualitative approaches are complementary and should be equally emphasized.

Hatch (2002) also validated the use of qualitative research, citing previous research from Bogdan and Biklen (1992), Hammersley and Atkinson (1983), Lincoln and Guba (1985), and Spradley (1979). He asserted, “Data take on no significance until they are processed using the human intelligence of the researcher” (p. 7). This enables qualitative researchers to make sense of the actions, intentions, and understandings of those being studied. Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom and Anderson (2010) concurred, stating, “Although leadership is widely thought to be a powerful force for school effectiveness, this popular belief needs to be justified by empirical evidence. One type is evidence from qualitative studies.”

Data were obtained from multiple data sources, including questionnaires, interviews, and data analysis documents. These multiple data sources compensated for “omissions or distortions that may arise from the use of one method” (Gredler, 1996, p. 203). Moreover, qualitative research methods allow for opportunities to focus on insights, discoveries, and interpretations of educational phenomena.

McREL’s 21 Leadership Responsibilities

According to Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2003), researchers at McREL examined 69 studies in their meta-analysis looking for specific behaviors related to principal leadership and identified 21 categories of behaviors they refer to as “responsibilities” (p. 41). The 21 leadership competencies are:

1. Affirmation: Recognizes and celebrates accomplishments and acknowledges failures
2. Change agent: Is willing to challenge and actively challenges the status quo
3. Communication: Establishes strong lines of communication with and among teachers and students
4. Contingent Rewards: Recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments
5. Culture: Fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation
6. Discipline: Protects teachers from issues and influences that would detract from their teaching time or focus
7. Flexibility: Adapts his or her leadership behavior to the needs of the current situation and is comfortable with dissent
8. Focus: Establishes clear goals and keeps those goals in the forefront of the school's attention
9. Ideas/Beliefs: Communicates and operates from strong ideals and beliefs about schooling
10. Input: Involves teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies
11. Intellectual Stimulation: Ensures faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices and makes the discussion of these a regular aspect of the school's culture
12. Involvement in Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment: Is directly involved in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices
13. Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment: Is knowledgeable about current curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices
14. Monitoring, Evaluating: Monitors and evaluates the effectiveness of school practices and their impact on student learning
15. Optimizer: Inspires and leads new and challenging innovations
16. Order: Establishes a set of standard operating procedures and routines
17. Outreach: Is an advocate and spokesperson for the school to all stakeholders
18. Relationships: Demonstrates an awareness of the personal aspects of teachers and staff
19. Resources: Provides teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their jobs
20. Situational Awareness: Is aware of the details and undercurrents in the running of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems
21. Visibility: Has quality contact and interactions with teachers and students. (pp. 42-43)

Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2003) emphasized the 21 responsibilities

identified in their meta-analysis are not new to the literature on leadership, stating:

Each one has been mentioned explicitly or implicitly by a host of researchers and theorists. Indeed, we refer to these behaviors as responsibilities because they are, or at least should be, standard operating procedures for effective principals. Perhaps this wide array of behaviors explains why it is so difficult to be an effective school leader. The variety of skills a leader must master is daunting indeed. (p. 62)

They continue, stating:

What is new to the leadership literature is the quantification of the relationship each responsibility has with student academic achievement. This is perhaps the first time in the history of leadership research in the United States that we can point to a set of competencies (responsibilities) that are research based. We believe this to be a significant addition to the knowledge base regarding school leadership. (p. 62)

With the identification of 21 leadership responsibilities, the concept of instructional leadership is no longer an abstraction or left only to theory. The same can also be said regarding principles of adult learning, which are addressed in the following section.

Knowles's Principles of Adult Learning

According to DiLello and Vaast (2003), adults learn differently than children. The child education model, also referred to as pedagogy, places the ultimate responsibility for learning on the teacher. The teacher determines what the student should learn, how and when the material is taught, and has the final say on whether learning has occurred. The pedagogical model is based on the assumption the teacher is an expert and students have little to offer to the learning environment.

Adult learning theory, on the other hand, recognizes that adult learners bring a wealth of experience to the training environment. In addition, adult learners have a complex set of needs and presentation requirements that must be fulfilled for learning to occur. In 1970, Knowles wrote a book titled, *The Modern Practice of Adult Education*

that introduced four principles of adult learning. According to DiLello and Vaast (2003), “Thirty years later, this book is still the leading resource for adult education theorists” (p.

2). There are four principles at the heart of Knowles’s adult learning theory:

1. Adults need to be involved in the planning and evaluation of their instruction.
2. Experiences (including mistakes) provide the basis for learning activities.
3. Adults are most interested in learning subjects that have immediate relevance to their job or personal life.
4. Adult learning is problem-centered rather than content-oriented. (p. 2)

Context

This study was conducted in north central Texas, encompassing three Education Service Centers (ESCs) serving 194 public school districts in approximately 32 counties. Urban, suburban and rural public schools were represented:

1. Region 9 is comprised of approximately 12 counties, and includes 38 public school districts. The Education Service Center for Region 9 is located in Wichita Falls, Texas.
2. Region 10 serves approximately 9 counties and is comprised of 80 public school districts. The Education Service Center for Region 10 is located in Richardson, Texas.
3. Region 11 Education Service Center, located in Fort Worth, Texas serves approximately 10 counties and 76 public school districts.

Study Participants

This study targeted current elementary and secondary principals whose schools are in Education Service Centers 9, 10, and 11, all located in north central Texas. Participants were selected through school districts’ websites and Education Service Centers’ website information. Follow-up interviews were conducted with five of the study participants who most favorably ranked their preparation program. Five principal preparation program coordinators from universities around the state of Texas and an Education Service Center were also interviewed.

Instrumentation

Written permission was requested and granted (Appendix A) to quote from, adapt, and cite in this study the source, *School Leadership That Works: From Research to Results* (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). The material is copyrighted by McREL, which requested a standard scholarly citation to the material along with the statement, "Used by permission of McREL."

Instruments used in the study included a program participant questionnaire (Appendix B), which was submitted electronically to 100 randomly-selected practicing principals in Education Service Centers 9, 10, and 11. As data were collected, individual follow-up interviews were conducted with five respondents who most favorably ranked their principal preparation programs. (Appendix C). Five Texas principal program coordinators were also interviewed (Appendix D).

Information was gathered from the questionnaire each participant completed. The participant questionnaire (Appendix B) consisted of 37 questions divided into three sections and was designed for collection of different types of data: (a) background data about each of the participants, (b) the name of the school district and school in which each participant was currently employed, (c) questions about the participant's perception of his/her principal preparation program in relation to McREL's leadership responsibilities; and (d) questions about the participant's perception of his/her principal preparation program in relation to Knowles's principles of adult learning. The questions were designed to categorize responses to the research questions of the study.

The second and third components of the study included individual interviews with five practicing principals and five principal preparation program coordinators. The

interview questions (Appendixes C and D) utilized a qualitative approach. Hatch (2002) validated qualitative research by relying on prior research from Bogdan and Biklen (1992), Erickson (1986), Hammersley and Atkinson (1983), Jacob (1988), and Lincoln and Guba (1985). When research settings are controlled, contrived, or manipulated, as in traditional research, Hatch maintained “the outcomes are studies that tell us little more than how individuals act in narrowly defined and inherently artificial contexts. In qualitative work, the intent is to explore human behaviors within the contexts of their natural occurrence” (pp. 6-7).

Hatch (2002), cited additional research from Mishler (1986), Seidman (1998), and Spradley (1979), and stated, “Qualitative researchers utilize special interview strategies that are different in nature from interviews done in quantitative studies,” asking open-ended questions, encouraging participants to explain their unique perspectives on the issues at hand, and listening intently for special language and other clues that reveal meaning structures participants use to understand their worlds. He added, “Interviewers enter interview settings with questions in mind but generate questions during the interview in response to informants’ responses, the social contexts being discussed, and the degree of rapport established” (p.23).

Collection of Data

Multiple methods were used to collect and analyze data for this study. The use of varying sources of data as well as varying methods of data collection—including data analysis documents, surveys, and interviews—verified the validity of the study.

The study began in the summer of 2009. In addressing the first component of the study, 100 randomly selected principals were sent questionnaires (Appendix B) to

complete and return electronically. To create the random pool of participants, public school districts were alphabetized and every other district was highlighted. Next, to create an equal representation of elementary and secondary schools, the first school listed alphabetically with each district was selected, based upon the following criteria: 1) elementary, 2) secondary, and 3) in some cases, pre-kindergarten-12 campuses. Cover letters, along with consent forms (Appendix E) were sent to all participants.

Different types of data were collected: (a) background data about each of the participants, (b) the name of the school district and school in which each participant was currently employed, (c) the perceptions of the participants regarding McREL's leadership responsibilities, and (d) the perceptions of the participants regarding Knowles's principles of adult learning. The survey tool utilized an online questionnaire (Appendix B), which allowed participants to log onto a survey website, respond to each Likert-scale item, and electronically submit the questionnaires.

After the questionnaire and interview guides were developed, different techniques were used to gather data. Nonrespondents were sent reminder notices by email and telephone to encourage questionnaire completion and return. To ensure more in-depth answers to research questions, follow-up interviews utilizing a standard set of questions were held with five principal respondents (Appendix C) who most favorably ranked their principal preparation program and five principal preparation program coordinators (Appendix D). A structured interview was conducted individually with the participants. Questions for the interviews were derived from McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities and Knowles's principles of adult learning. The eight questions were essentially the same for both groups and mostly comprised open-ended questions to

allow for greater explanation of answers. Answers were sought for specific components of the preparation program beneficial to leadership development, as well as those pieces that were not beneficial. A structured interview approach allowed participants to express themselves. Interviews were conducted on site for principal preparation coordinators at the university or Education Service Center where they were employed and via telephone for the principals. Interviews were tape recorded and transcribed with the participants' permission.

Analysis of Data

As each portion of data was collected, it was analyzed for interpretation to research questions. Spreadsheets and tables were developed to add meaning, clarity, and for ease in examination of data. Responses from interviews and open-ended questions on questionnaires were analyzed for themes. The themes were compared to questionnaire responses to corroborate answers. Personal quotes from interviewees were included to add to the meaning of findings.

Hatch (2002) supported the use of analyzing data qualitatively, maintaining qualitative researchers employ an inductive approach to data analysis. He stated, "Qualitative researchers do not begin with a null hypothesis to retain or reject. They collect as many detailed specifics from the research setting as possible, then set about the process of looking for patterns of relationships among the specifics" (p. 10). He also substantiated his argument for qualitative research by relying on research from Erickson (1986) and Lincoln and Guba (1985), stating, "Findings generated from this process are said to be grounded in the data—generated from the ground up. The overall pattern of data analysis in qualitative work is decidedly inductive, moving from specifics to analytic

generalizations” (p. 10). Bogdan and Biklen (1992) concurred, adding, “You are not putting together a puzzle, whose picture you already know. You are constructing a picture that takes shape as you collect and examine the parts” (p. 29).

Summary

This chapter provided an overview of the methodology used in the study, which integrated quantitative and qualitative research designs. The selection of sites, the approval process, the participants, the survey instruments, the data collection process, and the data analysis parameters were also described. Chapter 4 presents the study findings while Chapter 5 discusses the conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

The purpose of this study was to assess the relationship between principals' perceptions of their principal preparation programs and Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning's (McREL) 21 leadership responsibilities. A secondary component of the study examined the relationship between principals' perceptions of their principal preparation programs and Knowles's principles of adult learning.

Two research questions guided this study:

1. To what degree are McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities addressed in Texas principal preparation programs?
2. To what degree are Knowles's principles of adult learning addressed in Texas principal preparation programs?

The results from the analysis of the data presented in this chapter are divided into several sections. The first section consists of descriptive data of the population used in the study. The second section includes presentation and analysis of the statistics as they relate to the two research questions. The third and fourth sections include feedback from principal preparation program coordinators and practicing public school administrators, respectively, as it relates to the study. The final section is the chapter summary.

Description of the Population

This study targeted practicing public elementary and secondary principals who were employed in school districts within the geographic regions of Education Service Centers 9, 10, and 11, all located in north central Texas. The three centers serve 194

public school districts in approximately 32 counties. Urban, suburban and rural public schools were represented. The first portion of the study utilized a 38 question survey (Appendix B), which was electronically submitted to 100 principals. To create a random pool of participants, public school districts were alphabetized and every other district was highlighted. Next, to create an equal representation of elementary and secondary schools, the first school listed alphabetically with each district was selected, based upon the following criteria: 1) elementary, 2) secondary, and 3) in some cases, Pre-Kindergarten-12 campuses. A total of 37 responses were electronically returned for a 37% response rate.

The principals who responded to the study represented the following:

- Fourteen participants represented districts in Education Service Center 9
- Ten participants represented districts in Education Service Center 10
- Thirteen participants represented districts in Education Service Center 11

The 37 schools reflected the following:

- Elementary campuses (Grades Pre-Kindergarten-5): 11
- Secondary campuses (Grades 6-12): 20
- All-level campuses (Grades Pre-Kindergarten-12): 6

Of the 37 participants, 23 were male and 14 were female. Ages of the participants ranged from 35-68, with the average age being 49 and a median age of 50. Years of experience as a principal averaged 7.04 with a range from 1-25 years, and a median of 6 years. Participants reported as serving a range of 1-12 years in their present schools, with the average being 3.92 years and a median of 3 years.

Thirty-three principals had master's degrees, while four had doctoral degrees. One principal had a master's degree in a field other than education and was currently enrolled in graduate classes to receive administrative certification. The average year for graduating with principal certification was the year 2000, with a range from 1978 to the

aforementioned participant working toward certification. The median year for graduation was 2002.

Data Analysis

In this section, each research question is examined with corresponding data tables representing the statistical findings. Data analysis compared responses by geographic locations of the school district in which the principals were currently employed at the time of the study, as well as the university in which the principals received their principal certification. Data analysis also compared the year the principals completed their educational administration degree or certification, and if the principals were certified administrators or non-certified administrators at the time of the study.

McREL's 21 Leadership Responsibilities

For Table 1, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare participants' responses of McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities, based upon the geographic location of the Education Service Centers (9, 10, and 11) serving their school districts. Comparisons were generated between groups for each of the 21 leadership responsibilities. For example, when comparisons were generated between groups under the first responsibility, affirmation, there was no statistical significance. In fact, none of the comparisons between groups of the 21 leadership responsibilities were statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 1

Comparison of Responses by ESCs to McREL's 21 Leadership Responsibilities

Responsibility		SS	df	MS	F	p	η^2
Affirmation	Between Groups	0.69	2	0.34	0.69	0.51	0.03
	Within Groups	16.88	34	0.50			
	Total	17.57					
Change Agent	Between Groups	0.29	2	0.15	0.44	0.65	0.02
	Within Groups	11.38	34	0.33			
	Total	11.67					
Communication	Between Groups	0.75	2	0.38	1.02	0.37	0.05
	Within Groups	12.55	34	0.37			
	Total	13.30					
Contingency Rewards	Between Groups	0.23	2	0.11	0.23	0.79	0.01
	Within Groups	16.53	34	0.49			
	Total	16.76					
Culture	Between Groups	0.16	2	0.08	0.25	0.78	0.01
	Within Groups	10.55	34	0.31			
	Total	10.71					
Discipline	Between Groups	2.19	2	1.10	2.31	0.11	0.11
	Within Groups	16.13	34	0.47			
	Total	18.32					
Flexibility	Between Groups	0.37	2	0.19	0.66	0.52	0.03
	Within Groups	9.52	34	0.28			
	Total	9.89					
Focus	Between Groups	0.01	2	0.01	0.02	0.98	0.00
	Within Groups	8.69	34	0.26			
	Total	8.70					
Ideas/Beliefs	Between Groups	1.09	2	0.54	1.98	0.15	0.10
	Within Groups	9.35	34	0.27			
	Total	10.44					
Input	Between Groups	0.23	2	0.11	0.26	0.77	0.01
	Within Groups	14.58	34	0.43			
	Total	14.81					
Intellectual Stimulation	Between Groups	0.09	2	0.04	0.12	0.89	0.00
	Within Groups	12.24	34	0.36			
	Total	12.33					
Involvement in Curriculum	Between Groups	1.48	2	0.74	1.45	0.25	0.07
	Within Groups	17.33	34	0.51			
	Total	18.81					
Knowledge of Curriculum	Between Groups	0.34	2	0.17	0.38	0.69	0.02
	Within Groups	15.34	34	0.45			
	Total	15.68					

(table continues)

Table 1 (continued).

Responsibility		SS	df	MS	F	p	η^2
Monitoring/Evaluation	Between Groups	1.10	2	0.55	2.04	0.15	0.10
	Within Groups	9.17	34	0.27			
	Total	10.27					
Optimizer	Between Groups	2.14	2	1.07	2.82	0.07	0.14
	Within Groups	12.89	34	0.38			
	Total	15.03					
Order	Between Groups	2.12	2	1.06	2.86	0.07	0.14
	Within Groups	12.58	34	0.37			
	Total	14.70					
Outreach	Between Groups	2.00	2	1.00	2.11	0.14	0.11
	Within Groups	16.11	34	0.47			
	Total	18.11					
Relationships	Between Groups	3.70	2	1.85	3.15	0.06	0.15
	Within Groups	19.98	34	0.59			
	Total	23.68					
Resources	Between Groups	2.11	2	1.06	2.95	0.07	0.14
	Within Groups	12.16	34	0.36			
	Total	14.27					
Situational Awareness	Between Groups	0.42	2	0.21	0.59	0.56	0.03
	Within Groups	11.91	34	0.35			
	Total	12.33					
Visibility	Between Groups	1.04	2	0.52	1.44	0.25	0.07
	Within Groups	12.26	34	0.36			
	Total	13.30					
Overall inclusion of McREL's 21 Leadership Responsibilities	Between Groups	0.24	2	0.12	0.34	0.71	0.01
	Within Groups	12.03	34	0.35			
	Total	12.27					

Table 2 reflects the results of an ANOVA, which compared participants' responses to McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities, based upon the universities the participants attended. Comparisons were generated between groups. None of the comparisons between groups of the 21 leadership responsibilities were statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 2

Comparison of Responses by University Attended to McREL's 21 Leadership Responsibilities

Responsibility		SS	df	MS	F	p	η^2
Affirmation	Between Groups	1.99	2	1.00	2.17	0.13	0.11
	Within Groups	15.58	34	0.46			
	Total	17.57					
Change Agent	Between Groups	0.77	2	0.38	1.19	0.32	0.06
	Within Groups	10.91	34	0.32			
	Total	11.68					
Communication	Between Groups	0.57	2	0.29	0.76	0.47	0.04
	Within Groups	12.73	34	0.37			
	Total	13.30					
Contingency Rewards	Between Groups	1.85	2	0.92	2.11	0.14	0.11
	Within Groups	14.91	34	0.44			
	Total	16.76					
Culture	Between Groups	0.70	2	0.35	1.19	0.32	0.06
	Within Groups	10.00	34	0.29			
	Total	10.70					
Discipline	Between Groups	2.45	2	1.22	2.62	0.09	0.13
	Within Groups	15.88	34	0.47			
	Total	18.33					
Flexibility	Between Groups	0.26	2	0.13	0.45	0.64	0.02
	Within Groups	9.64	34	0.28			
	Total	9.90					
Focus	Between Groups	0.64	2	0.32	1.35	0.27	0.07
	Within Groups	8.06	34	0.24			
	Total	8.70					
Ideas/Beliefs	Between Groups	0.43	2	0.22	0.74	0.49	0.04
	Within Groups	10.00	34	0.29			
	Total	10.43					
Input	Between Groups	0.63	2	0.31	0.75	0.48	0.04
	Within Groups	14.18	34	0.42			
	Total	14.81					
Intellectual Stimulation	Between Groups	0.93	2	0.47	1.39	0.26	0.07
	Within Groups	11.39	34	.34			
	Total	12.32					
Involvement in Curriculum	Between Groups	2.57	2	1.28	2.69	0.08	0.13
	Within Groups	16.24	34	0.48			
	Total	18.81					
Knowledge of Curriculum	Between Groups	0.77	2	0.38	0.87	0.43	0.04
	Within Groups	14.91	34	0.44			
	Total	15.68					

(table continues)

Table 2 (continued).

Responsibility		SS	df	MS	F	p	η^2
Monitoring/Evaluation	Between Groups	0.69	2	0.35	1.23	0.30	0.06
	Within Groups	9.58	34	0.28			
	Total	10.27					
Optimizer	Between Groups	0.85	2	0.42	1.01	0.37	0.05
	Within Groups	14.18	34	0.42			
	Total	15.03					
Order	Between Groups	1.73	2	0.87	2.27	0.12	0.11
	Within Groups	12.97	34	0.38			
	Total	14.70					
Outreach	Between Groups	0.90	2	0.45	0.88	0.42	0.04
	Within Groups	17.21	34	0.51			
	Total	18.11					
Relationships	Between Groups	2.95	2	1.47	2.42	0.10	0.12
	Within Groups	20.73	34	0.61			
	Total	23.68					
Resources	Between Groups	2.03	2	1.01	2.82	0.07	0.14
	Within Groups	12.24	34	0.36			
	Total	14.27					
Situational Awareness	Between Groups	0.14	2	0.07	0.20	0.82	0.01
	Within Groups	12.18	34	0.36			
	Total	12.32					
Visibility	Between Groups	1.78	2	0.89	2.63	0.09	0.13
	Within Groups	11.52	34	0.34			
	Total	13.30					
Overall inclusion of McREL's 21 Leadership Responsibilities	Between Groups	0.09	2	0.04	0.12	0.88	0.00
	Within Groups	12.18	34	0.36			
	Total	12.27					

Table 3 illustrates findings from an independent sample *t*-test which compared participants' responses to McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities, based upon the year the study participants received their degree in educational leadership. Because ISSLC (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium) standards were implemented in the mid 1990s and consequently, many universities began the process of restructuring their educational leadership programs, the participants were divided into two groups: those who received their educational leadership degrees/certifications from 1978-1999 and those who received their educational leadership degrees/certifications from 2000-2009.

There were no statistical differences based upon the year the participants received their degrees.

Table 3
Comparison of Responses by Program Completion/Graduation Year to McREL's Leadership Responsibilities

Responsibility	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
Affirmation	-0.73	35	0.47	-0.24
Change Agent	0.38	35	0.71	0.12
Communication	0.99	35	0.33	0.33
Contingency Rewards	-1.06	35	0.30	-0.35
Culture	1.45	35	0.16	0.49
Discipline	-0.05	35	0.96	-0.01
Flexibility	0.48	35	0.63	0.16
Focus	0.20	35	0.84	0.06
Ideas/Beliefs	-0.68	35	0.50	-0.22
Input	0.21	35	0.83	0.07
Intellectual Stimulation	-0.06	35	0.95	-0.02
Involvement in Curriculum	0.19	35	0.85	0.06
Knowledge of Curriculum	1.38	35	0.18	0.46
Monitoring/Evaluation	0.65	35	0.52	0.21
Optimizer	-0.91	35	0.37	-0.30
Order	-0.37	35	0.71	-0.12
Outreach	-0.69	35	0.49	-0.23
Relationships	-0.98	35	0.33	-0.33
Resources	0.55	35	0.59	0.18
Situational Awareness	-0.06	35	0.95	-0.02
Visibility	1.58	35	0.12	0.53
Overall inclusion of McREL's 21 Leadership Responsibilities	0.59	35	0.56	0.19

For Table 4, an independent sample *t*-test compared responses based upon the yes/no responses of the participants when asked if they had served as an administrator before completing their administrative certification. Based upon limited responses, the findings indicated a significant difference in two areas of McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities: ideas/beliefs and optimizer. Those participants who had not completed their educational leadership graduate programs/certifications scored the two areas

higher than those who had; however, a study with a larger sample size could possibly yield more validity.

Table 4
Comparison of Responses by Certification/Non-Certification to McREL's Leadership Responsibilities

Responsibility	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
Affirmation	-1.02	35	0.31	-0.34
Change Agent	-1.30	35	0.20	-0.43
Communication	-1.43	35	0.16	-0.48
Contingency Rewards	-1.28	35	0.21	-0.43
Culture	-1.50	35	0.14	-0.50
Discipline	-1.06	35	0.29	-0.35
Flexibility	-0.57	35	0.57	-0.19
Focus	-0.96	35	0.34	-0.32
Ideas/Beliefs	-2.63	35	*0.01	-0.88
Input	-1.65	35	0.11	-0.55
Intellectual Stimulation	-1.31	35	0.20	-0.44
Involvement in Curriculum	-0.06	35	0.95	-0.02
Knowledge of Curriculum	0.39	35	0.70	0.13
Monitoring/Evaluation	-1.69	35	0.10	-0.57
Optimizer	-2.62	35	*0.01	-0.88
Order	-1.83	35	0.08	-0.61
Outreach	-1.18	35	0.25	-0.39
Relationships	-1.32	35	0.19	-0.44
Resources	-0.88	35	0.39	-0.29
Situational Awareness	-0.73	35	0.47	-0.24
Visibility	-0.86	35	0.39	-0.29
Overall inclusion of McREL's 21 Leadership Responsibilities	-0.95	35	0.35	-0.32

Knowles's Principles of Adult Learning

For Table 5, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare participants' responses of Knowles's principles of adult learning, based upon the geographic location of the Education Service Centers (9, 10, and 11) serving their school districts. Comparisons were generated between groups for each of the 21 leadership responsibilities. There was no statistical significance. In fact, none of the comparisons between groups of the four adult learning principles were statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

*Table 5
Comparison of ESC Responses to Knowles's Principles of Adult Learning*

Principle		SS	df	MS	F	p	η^2
Adults need to be involved in the planning and evaluation of their instruction.	Between Groups	1.03	2	0.52	1.79	0.18	0.09
	Within Groups	9.78	34	0.29			
	Total	10.81					
Experiences (including mistakes) provide the basis for learning activities.	Between Groups	0.18	2	0.09	0.17	0.85	0.01
	Within Groups	17.82	34	0.52			
	Total	18.00					
Adults are most interested in learning subjects that have immediate relevance to their job or personal life.	Between Groups	0.08	2	0.04	0.09	0.92	0.00
	Within Groups	16.73	34	0.49			
	Total	16.81					
Adult learning is problem-centered rather than content-oriented.	Between Groups	0.31	2	0.16	0.47	0.63	0.02
	Within Groups	11.26	34	0.33			
	Total	11.57					
Overall inclusion of Knowles's Principles of Adult Learning	Between Groups	0.04	2	0.02	0.06	0.94	0.00
	Within Groups	12.93	34	0.38			
	Total	12.97					

Table 6 reflects the results of an ANOVA, based upon the responses to Knowles's principles of adult learning, according to the university attended by the

participants. Comparisons were generated between groups. There were statistical differences in regard to one area, “Adult learning is problem-centered rather than content-oriented”; however, because of the small scale of the study, there were not enough responses from each university to determine where those differences were.

Table 6
Comparison of Responses by University Attended to Knowles’s Principles of Adult Learning

Principle		SS	df	MS	F	p	η^2
Adults need to be involved in the planning and evaluation of their instruction.	Between Groups	0.63	2	0.31	1.05	0.36	0.05
	Within Groups	10.18	34	0.30			
	Total	10.81					
Experiences (including mistakes) provide the basis for learning activities.	Between Groups	2.61	2	1.30	2.88	0.07	0.14
	Within Groups	15.39	34	0.45			
	Total	18.00					
Adults are most interested in learning subjects that have immediate relevance to their job or personal life.	Between Groups	2.57	2	1.28	3.07	0.06	0.15
	Within Groups	14.24	34	0.42			
	Total	16.81					
Adult learning is problem-centered rather than content-oriented.	Between Groups	3.39	2	1.69	7.03	*0.00	0.29
	Within Groups	8.18	34	0.24			
	Total	11.57					
Overall inclusion of Knowles’s Principles of Adult Learning	Between Groups	1.34	2	0.67	1.95	0.16	0.10
	Within Groups	11.64	34	0.34			
	Total	12.98					

Table 7 illustrates findings from an independent sample *t*-test which compared responses to Knowles’s principles of adult learning, based upon the year the participants received their degree/principal certification in educational leadership. Because ISSLC (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium) standards were implemented in the mid 1990’s and consequently, many universities began the process of restructuring their educational leadership programs, the participants were divided into

two groups: those who received their educational leadership degrees/certifications from 1978-1999 and those who received their educational leadership degrees/certifications from 2000-2009. There were no statistical differences based upon the year the participants received their degrees.

Table 7
*Comparison of Responses by
 Program Completion/Graduation Year to Knowles's Principles of Adult Learning*

Principle	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
Adults need to be involved in the planning and evaluation of their instruction.	0.87	35	0.39	0.29
Experiences (including mistakes) provide the basis for learning activities.	-0.47	35	0.64	-0.15
Adults are most interested in learning subjects that have immediate relevance to their job or personal life.	-0.29	35	0.77	-0.09
Adult learning is problem-centered rather than content-oriented.	0.29	35	0.78	0.09
Overall inclusion of Knowles's Principles of Adult Learning	0.21	35	0.83	0.07

For Table 8, an independent sample *t*-test compared responses to Knowles's principles of adult learning based upon the yes/no answers of the participants when asked if they had served as an administrator before completing their administrative certification. The results did not indicate a significant difference.

Table 8
Comparison of Responses by Certification/Non-Certification to Knowles's Principles of Adult Learning

Principle	<i>T</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
Adults need to be involved in the planning and evaluation of their instruction.	-0.08	35	0.94	-0.02
Experiences (including mistakes) provide the basis for learning activities.	-1.42	35	0.16	-0.48
Adults are most interested in learning subjects that have immediate relevance to their personal life.	-0.54	35	0.59	-0.18
Adult learning is problem-centered rather than content-oriented.	-1.27	35	0.21	-0.42
Overall inclusion of Knowles's Principles of Adult Learning	-1.37	35	0.18	-0.46

Interviews with University and Education Service Center Educational Leadership Program Coordinators

The following section includes excerpts from face-to-face interviews with five educational leadership program coordinators. Four of the program coordinators were practicing professors employed with universities around the state of Texas, while one program coordinator was employed with an Education Service Center (ESC), also located in Texas.

The program coordinators were asked eight open-ended questions (Appendix D) and given the opportunity to elaborate on each topic. The questions were designed to elicit information regarding principal preparation programs. Permission was granted for the interviews to be digitally recorded and later transcribed. Program coordinators provided substantive comments in some areas; however, other topics were only slightly addressed, if at all. Participants' answers to each question were transcribed and responses were read and re-read to identify categories of responses.

The responses below are divided into two sections: McREL's 21 areas of leadership responsibilities and Knowles's principles of adult learning. Additionally, the sections are organized by numbered questions as they were represented in the study to assist the reader in analyzing and synthesizing the information.

McREL's 21 Leadership Responsibilities

Question 1: Were you familiar with McREL's 21 areas of leadership responsibilities, as discussed in School Leadership That Works: From Research to Results (Marzano, Waters, McNulty, 2005) before you participated in this study?

All five program coordinators were familiar with McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities, especially in terms of the content of the responsibilities; however, other

standards or authors were cited as being utilized to bridge the concepts critical to principal preparation. One of the program coordinators stated, “We come from a different angle but I do think it is common ground, so this is not apples and oranges; its apples and apples in my opinion.”

Another coordinator shared, “It’s always good to go back and revisit McREL’s and remind yourself why you’re focused on the goals which you’re focused.”

Question 2: Does your university’s principal preparation program address McREL’s 21 areas of leadership responsibilities?

Program coordinators communicated their educational leadership programs addressed the leadership responsibilities through selected courses, but not necessarily consolidated into 21 leadership responsibilities. To clarify, one of the coordinators stated, “If we look down the list of these 21 leadership responsibilities, in some class or another, we probably address most of these.” This response paralleled responses of other coordinators. The coordinator continued, stating:

As far as what our courses are kind of addressing, we don’t base our courses on McREL’s leadership responsibilities. The courses have to address the nine Texas principal competencies and we also have the NCATE (National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education) and ELCC (Educational Leadership Constituent Council) standards so we have to show that we’re meeting those. Of course, they kind of go along with McREL’s 21 leadership responsibilities.

Likewise, a coordinator explained, “Our program is aligned to ELCC through NCATE, but the list of traits is about the same. Most of them are covered if embedded in ELCC but there are some areas we aren’t as strong.” In a similar response, a coordinator shared:

We work hard to integrate not only these leadership responsibilities but we integrate from the state competencies and standards so they can be supportive of each other. Sometimes that’s very clean and easy to manage and sometimes

it gets a little bit fuzzy. One of the challenges is helping folks understand that even though they're at an elementary school and they want to remain at an elementary school and they would never want to be a high school principal, we're certifying Early Childhood-12 so we are going to require EC-12 experiences. Great leadership is great leadership in any capacity. You're going to have the same skills and methods. You may tweak them a little bit; you may explain things a little differently. There are always hot spots regardless of where you're at. Anyway, that's how we address the 21 areas of principal leadership responsibilities but we do weave them in with the standards and competencies because that is our accountability as it is right now.

Lastly, a coordinator added:

I would say we don't focus on these in "name." What we do focus on is the standards. We really base ours a lot on the ELCC standards, which are program standards which determine or say what an administrator should know and be able to do. That's not all we're using right now but that's what we're focusing on at this point. We're also trying to look at—either creating or finding—a standard for social justice. That's a big push in our program and a conversation that we're currently having with the faculty.

Question 3: Are there any areas of McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities that your university's principal preparation program places emphasis/importance? If so, which area(s)?

Program coordinators generally communicated their programs discussed most, if not all, areas of McREL's leadership responsibilities in various courses; however, they elaborated the following were emphasized:

1. *Change agent.* One coordinator maintained:

There are several of our classes that concentrate on change at the principal level and I'm pleased to think that is a focus piece for us. I think that's an important thing that we do and I think we do it pretty well.

2. *Communication.* This area was considered "a strong aspect of the program," according to one coordinator. Another shared, "When you look at communication, there's just so many facets of communication; the continual focus on communication, there's always a lot of time given to that."

3. *Culture*. This was the only area all five coordinators specifically mentioned as being emphasized. According to one coordinator, “It’s one we definitely get at in a big way.” Another concurred, stating:

Culture is a major, major piece of our program; culture and climate, shared beliefs, the management/leadership conundrum piece, etc. It’s very easy to see when you walk into a school what type of climate it has: How receptive? Are people welcome? Are certain people of higher status treated differently? I mean the whole “social justice” piece. Culture is a *major* [italics added] piece of our program and I think we do a good job of that in my opinion.

4. *Flexibility*. A coordinator defined flexibility as, “The adaptability, the multitasking, wearing the hats of manager, the efficiency piece, and the stakeholder piece.”

5. *Ideas/beliefs*. A coordinator shared:

We talk about social justice and what that means with people; what they believe, which kids should be learning. We emphasize all kids should be learning. You can’t just go along with the general phrase. You have to look at those kids who are being left out or at the margins and ask yourself why they are being left out.

6. *Input*. As one coordinator stated, “Input: the empowerment piece. Yes, no question about the importance of that.”

7. *Monitoring and evaluating*. A coordinator explained:

I think we spend a good amount of time on the clinical supervision processes of being proactive rather than punitive. Yes, managerially, you have to do it; you have to put stuff in their files, etc. but we really work hard from the outset of our program talking about being collaborative and collegial. Yes, there are times that you have to be authoritative when you’re looking at questionable teaching or teaching that needs to improve but one of the positives in our program is looking at the clinical supervision process as being collaborative and collegial and helpful, from the assessment of development as to where that teacher is.

8. *Relationships*. According to one coordinator: “The professional learning communities piece is a real strong piece of our program early on.”

9. *Resources.*

10. *Situational awareness.* A coordinator shared:

I think we're getting stronger in this area. I think people have to take their blinders off and that's the thing that makes the principalship so difficult. You're constantly juggling all of it. The principal looks at decision making from multiple contexts and that's a hard piece to sell.

11. *Visibility.* A coordinator stated, "We teach this area under communication but yes, it is addressed."

Question 4: Conversely, are there any areas of McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities that are omitted/not addressed in your university's principal preparation program? If so, which area(s)?

Coordinators were generally in agreement as they elaborated on their responses, stressing leadership responsibilities were not necessarily "omitted"; however, some areas possibly received less emphasis than others. The following areas of leadership responsibilities were noted as being less emphasized:

1. *Affirmation/contingent rewards.* A coordinator revealed, "We are deficit in those that speak to total quality, such as affirmation and contingent rewards."

2. *Change agent.* A coordinator suggested, "I think we could do a better job on change agent."

3. *Contingent rewards.* One coordinator, stated:

Yes, we do talk about it. Is that a critical piece of our program? Probably not as strong as it should be. The intrinsic/extrinsic reward pieces of how a principal goes about that in challenging up and coming teachers/teacher leaders to assume roles so that they don't become stagnant, but then the flip side is, "You're asking me to do this and I have so much to do already." It's a real dichotomy.

4. *Discipline.* According to one coordinator. "Yes, we do talk about it, but probably not as strongly as we should in terms of forms of discipline." Another shared:

We could probably do more with discipline but I don't know where we would put it in our curriculum. We do deal with discipline strategies and students have an internship and practicum so they get hands on but I think it's difficult to prepare for the role of what an assistant principal is going to have to do. We talk about school-wide discipline plans, we learn about discipline approaches but when you're an assistant principal, for instance, you're really sort of dealing with the "when the discipline plan doesn't work."

5. *Focus.*

6. *Ideas/beliefs.*

7. *Intellectual stimulation.* A coordinator mentioned this area was "hit on" but not emphasized. Another stated:

The only variance I see that someone might not recognize immediately is our "intellectual stimulation" is going to be addressed a little differently. We do focus on theories and we do focus on practices but it's not going to be so much from the academic side of the house; its going to be, "Okay, this is what the theory says, this is what it looks like," and then we bring in the, "How does that make people feel?"; the emotional part of it. We don't omit anything but you may have to ponder it a moment or two before you really see the exact connection.

8. *Involvement in curriculum, instruction and assessment.* According to one coordinator:

This is an area of "middle ground" that we have to strengthen. I think all of us in our program talk about, "How do we ramp up our courses to where the concept of principal as instructional leader becomes more paramount?" because--as you know--it's the baseline of the state exam. Do I think as a program we're spending more time on principals as instructional leaders? Yes. Do we have a long way to go? Yes. We're not where we need to be.

9. *Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment.* A program coordinator commented this area was "a growing piece of our program. We're 'middle of the road' right now and we need to become stronger."

10. *Monitoring/evaluation.* According to a coordinator, "In the area of Monitoring/Evaluating, we are weak."

11. *Optimizer*. A coordinator stated, “We’ve done a lot of new and challenging things but I just don’t know that we’ve ever really focused on ‘optimizer.’”

12. *Orderliness*. A coordinator shared:

This is an area that is a low touch area in our program that should be a high priority. We don’t do enough relative to “principal as a resource allocator.” We don’t delve--into our curriculum--what you could call “administrative management” or what you call “the business of running the school” with regard to resource allocation, budgeting, prioritization.

Finally, a coordinator candidly commented on an area not specifically listed under McREL’s 21 principal leadership responsibilities:

Right now, I’ll tell you what we’re dealing with, and when I look at these, I don’t see it specifically listed here. We hear--from our interns--they feel like for certification requirements, there needs to be more school law and I really don’t have an issue with that because I think school policy is the first thing you should start learning when you go into a new position. I think probably bringing in case law and situational awareness would be very helpful and so we’ve had to work hard in looking at how we’re going to do that.

Knowles’s Principles of Adult Learning

Question 1: Were you familiar with Knowles’s principles of adult learning before you participated in this study?

Four of the five coordinators were familiar with Knowles. One stated, “No, not under the name of ‘Knowles.’”

Question 2: Does your university’s principal preparation program address Knowles’s principles of adult learning?

A coordinator noted, “The principles of adult learning are addressed, to a degree.” Another stated, “Knowles’s principles of adult learning were addressed in many aspects. Is there room for improvement? I would say ‘yes’ to that too.”

In a similar response, another professor shared:

I would say a majority of those we do focus on. The principles are primarily couched in two of our educational leadership courses: our clinical supervision class and the human development class. We are looking at this at greater length: how adults think, how they function, how to deal with them.

A coordinator similarly shared:

We're not perfect on any of them but I think we've considered all of them. There are some of them we can address a lot better. I'd say we could probably address *all* [italics added] of them a little bit better but I think all of them have been considered in planning.

Likewise, another coordinator elaborated, stating:

I would say overall, in our program, they are addressed, within limits. We're on the road to addressing these but I think that we could do a better job on this. I have students read several articles on adult learning and some of them are based on Knowles's work. For one thing, since we are teaching adults, if we didn't do quite a bit of this, our students are very willing to give feedback. Fortunately, for me, I haven't been on the end of having a bunch of bad student evaluations, but if the students are very dissatisfied, a lot of them have to do with some of these Knowles's characteristics.

Lastly, a coordinator elaborated:

Choice is good for the individual and goes along with the principles of adult learning. That's something we really try to strive for here--keeping the adult learner in mind. There's an overriding factor and we always have to respect this in the adult learner--their responsibilities as a family member or a professional in a school district are going to drive their decisions.

Question 3: Are there any areas of Knowles's principles of adult learning that your university's principal preparation program placed emphasis/importance? If so, which area(s)?

1. *Experiences (including mistakes) provide the basis of learning activities.* A coordinator shared, "We do believe in this, so we try to make things as experiential as possible. We do emphasize making mistakes and try not to count off for that."

2. *Adult learning is problem-centered rather than content-oriented.* A coordinator stated, "A couple of our courses, like our internship and especially our practicum are problem-centered." Another shared, "This is probably our strongest area because we have a lot of project-based classes." Additionally, a coordinator elaborated:

We are trying to move toward problem-based learning. We have pulled out a lot of materials on problem-based learning. We have a case study that is very much problem-centered and it deals with a problem that's ill defined and difficult for them [the students] to grapple with but they have to come together as a group and deal with that.

Finally, a coordinator shared:

By and large, most candidates for a teacher or principal or superintendent certification want to have some sort of control over the process and you have to respect that from the principles of adult learning. When I was reading over these earlier, I really had to sort of chuckle and appreciate this area because we are in the midst of that right now. We have to remember that it has to be problem-centered rather than content-centered because we think they need this content, this content, and this content, but we have to deliver that from a problem-based learning environment.

3. *Adults are most interested in learning subjects that have immediate relevance to their job or personal life.* A coordinator explained:

This is the constructivist approach piece and that's what we talk about in professional development: determining what can be most beneficial to people to allow them to get better in their jobs and providing them an opportunity to discuss--in professional development--what's applicable, and how you can go out and use it.

Concurring, another coordinator commented, "I think, probably, we have made an effort in this area about trying to make it relevant through the internship and practicum. We have two semesters of practical application." Another purported:

Those things we do. For instance, I just finished teaching a school law course and students could immediately see how that impacted their thinking as teachers and future leaders. The same is true in a lot of our courses around teaching and supervision.

Question 4: Conversely, are there any of Knowles's principles of adult learning that are omitted/not addressed in your principal preparation program? If so, which area(s)?

1. Adults need to be involved in the planning and evaluation of their

instruction. A coordinator revealed:

That's probably the one that's going to be the least used. That will be new to a university faculty in general. I think it's an interesting thing. There are personalities that would prefer to know exactly what they're going to be doing--down to the week--and then there are those who really will be more into that, so I'll be curious to know how much input do they want. It's like anything--it's like principals giving teachers input, like the shared decision-making cabinet--they want input on some things, but not everything. I would want to see more examples of how that's played out.

2. Experiences (including mistakes) provide the basis for learning activities. A

coordinator commented, "We probably overlook this area because we're constrained by time."

3. Adults are most interested in learning subjects that have immediate relevance

to their job or personal life. A coordinator shared:

To me, that one is a little difficult for us because they're all training to become principals and assistant principals but they're teachers right now. Some of our content is hard for them to apply right now. We do try to make the work apply to leadership as opposed to just administration. We're called "educational administration" but we keep thinking about changing our term to "educational leadership."

Interviews with Practicing Principals

Five principals were interviewed who were employed in school districts within the geographic regions of Education Service Centers 9, 10, and 11. Principals were chosen who favorably ranked their educational leadership programs based upon the responses given to the survey regarding McREL's 21 areas of leadership responsibilities and Knowles's principles of adult learning (Appendix B). Three principals worked in school

districts in ESC 9, one was employed with a school district in ESC10 and one principal worked in a school district in ESC 11. They were employed in the following types of schools:

- Elementary (Pre-Kindergarten-Grade 4): One principal
- Middle School/Junior High (Grades 6-8): One principal
- High School (Grades 9-12): Two principals
- All Level (Pre-Kindergarten-Grade 12): One principal

In a format similar to the interview process of the university program coordinators, principals were also asked eight open-ended questions (Appendix C) and given the opportunity to elaborate on each topic. The questions were designed to elicit information regarding principal preparation programs. Permission was granted for the interviews to be digitally recorded and later transcribed. Once all the answers from participants to a particular question were transcribed, responses were read and re-read to identify categories of responses. Responses were then coded according to those categories and interpreted. The process was repeated for each open-ended question.

The responses below are divided into two sections: McREL's 21 areas of leadership responsibilities and Knowles's principles of adult learning. Additionally, the sections are organized by numbered questions as they were represented in the study to assist the reader in analyzing and synthesizing the information.

McREL's 21 Leadership Responsibilities

Question 1: Were you familiar with McREL's 21 areas of leadership responsibilities, as discussed in School Leadership That Works: From Research to Results (Marzano, Waters, McNulty, 2005) before you participated in this study?

Only one principal was specifically familiar with McREL's leadership responsibilities and shared, "I was made aware of them during one of my graduate school courses. Marzano's book was actually one of our books that we read."

The other principals were familiar with the areas, but not explicitly under the term "McREL." For example, a principal acknowledged:

I was not familiar with McREL's specifically. Obviously, I'm familiar with the concepts because of different leadership classes and styles and philosophies that I've been taught and also believe in, but I wasn't specifically familiar with them being put together and packaging them in this type of format.

Likewise, another commented, "I went through the leadership development program that was originally the Dupont Training and I never saw the areas listed as 'McREL's' but there's different ways to present this same thing."

Question 2: How effectively did your principal preparation program address McREL's 21 areas of leadership responsibilities?

Responses were similar, with the majority of the principals communicating, overall, their programs "did a really good job" or an "an above-average job." One commented, "I think all of these were a component in my master's program. They talked about all of these different areas being important to the principalship." Accordingly, another added:

My school did a really good job of touching on all of them at some point. I felt like some of them were probably hit a little more in depth than others and I think that probably is based upon the professors that we had, and maybe what their knowledge was and their experiences that they had.

Conversely, a principal elaborated:

The program I went through dealt a lot with the communication, the culture, the learning communities and that type of stuff, but not necessarily all of them. Did it prepare me how to come and actually implement that? I don't feel like it fully

prepared me for that. I don't think any one program can fully prepare someone for going into an unknown situation because each situation is so unique. People who are teaching those courses have not been in the situation so they can tell you what the *book* [italics added] said to do but they don't know what their gut feeling is on how to actually handle the situation because they've never been faced with it. It's almost better in that instance to have a good mentor or a good network of other principals that you can say, "Hey, I've got this going on, what do you think should I do?" versus a program at a university.

Question 3: Were there any areas of McREL's 21 principal leadership responsibilities that your principal preparation program placed emphasis/importance? If so, which area(s)?

Principals communicated the following areas were emphasized:

1. *Affirmation.*

2. *Change agent.*

3. *Communication.* All five principals stated communication was an area of emphasis. A principal commented, "In my program, they were really heavy on involving as many stakeholders as we could involve."

4. *Culture.* Four of the five principals communicated culture was emphasized. A principal noted:

Probably the most important is--if I had to simply narrow it to one--it would probably be culture. They really stressed the whole idea of having a good campus culture and the need for the whole staff to work as a team for one common mission, one common vision and goal.

5. *Flexibility.*

6. *Input.*

7. *Outreach.*

8. *Resources.*

9. *Visibility.* Three of the five principals mentioned visibility was an area of emphasis in their principal preparation programs.

Question 4: Conversely, were there any areas of McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities that were omitted/not addressed in your principal preparations program? If so, which area(s)?

Principals communicated the following areas did not receive much emphasis:

1. *Contingent rewards.* A principal explained:

I think they went over it but not to the level that I think is very, very important now because we try to do so much on our campus to celebrate different things. I think after I got into administration, I began to understand how important that part is. So often, at the secondary level, everything we communicate is, "You've got to do this; you've got to do this," so we really try to hammer the celebrations weekly and in every meeting that we walk into, whether it be a department meeting, a staff meeting, whatever it is, we always try to celebrate every single time that we can.

2. *Discipline.* A principal shared, "We covered discipline probably more from school law than we did from maybe an active way of trying to help set up a discipline model or a matrix or something of that nature." A second principal commented:

You always have an idea when you come into administration, you're going to have to go through the route of being the disciplinarian at one time or another and I think there's probably a little bit more that could be emphasized on discipline. From my experience, and the people around me that I have a relationship with through administration, that's the one thing that will burn out administrators faster than anything; continually dealing with discipline of students and then dealing with the angry parents.

3. *Knowledge of curriculum, instruction and assessment.* A principal shared, "I don't know that I understood how involved I would be with curriculum. This is an area that's really important when you're in charge. The buck stops with you and I don't think we got great training this area."

Similarly, another principal shared:

When I took the curriculum course in order to get my certification, I didn't see the relevance at all. I would have appreciated it more if the instructor would've said, "Here's the different types of curriculum that are offered and the most popular ones,' and exposed us and made us familiar with them. I wish the program would have focused more on the various types of curriculum, the differences in types of curriculum, looked at the TEKS (Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills), and said, "Here's why this is developmentally appropriate, here's why this is not." Instead, we looked at how to create a curriculum for a whole district, step by step, doing the professional learning communities, gathering all the information and stuff and that would've been, to me, more beneficial after I'd had the foundation knowledge of the different types of curriculum and what's expected.

4. *Order.*

5. *Resources.* One of the principals stated, "I'm sure they talked about it but I don't remember spending a lot of time on it." Another elaborated:

One of the areas that I feel like was lacking in my program was fully understanding the purchasing and budgeting of a campus, and all the rules and regulations about purchasing and what money can be used where and how. They really glossed over what the financial aspect entailed and that's just a real learning curve for anybody that takes over at the principal level. An experienced secretary, if you have one, kind of teaches you on the job.

Knowles's Principles of Adult Learning

Question 1: *Were you familiar with Knowles's principles of adult learning before you participated in this study?*

None of the principals were familiar with Knowles's principles of adult learning.

One principal elaborated, "I was familiar with the concepts, but not familiar with Knowles himself."

Question 2: *Did your principal preparation program address Knowles's principles of adult learning?*

Two principals maintained, "Yes, in some of the courses," and "I know they touched on these."

On the other hand, another principal expressed a different viewpoint, stating, “I don’t feel like adult education was addressed except when they were talking about professional development for your teachers and for yourself. That’s when it went into the adult learner.”

Question 3: Were there any of Knowles’s principles of adult learning that your principal preparation program placed emphasis/importance? If so, which area(s)?

1. *Adults need to be involved in the planning and evaluation of their instruction.*

A principal elaborated:

That was touched on a lot. Every professor I had talked about that, especially if you’re looking at your professional learning communities, and your collaboration, your site-based, all that kind of stuff where adults are involved in the planning and all stakeholders are involved.

Similarly, another principal stated:

Somewhere along the line when I was taking my coursework for principal certification, the whole description of the principalship changed and it became more of a collaborative approach, with teachers involved and brainstorming, like site-based decision making. I think that was the emphasis in my program, rather than using a more directive approach. When I was a teacher, that wasn’t really the way it was. The principal was supposed to be the one who had all the answers and told everybody what to do and it was just a real directive approach rather than collaborative. We had a site-based team and the principal let you know that you could talk about it, but *his word* [italics added] was going to be *the last word* [italics added]. Nowadays, if you’re going to make headway, the last word is “consensus.”

2. *Adults are most interested in learning subjects that have immediate relevance to their job or personal life.* An administrator revealed:

I happened to be fortunate to get in a course that broke into literacy circles. Reading books and having discussions with the people in my learning circle was invaluable. That was probably one of the biggest things I brought out of my certification process.

Another principal shared:

Through my college program, it really was just discussing what's relevant to me and how can I use it to do my job better. Anybody in the workforce already, they want it to be quick and to the point and moving. They don't want to go through the "explore and engage and explain and elaborate" and all that--they don't want to go through the 5Es. They want to get down to it and see where it can go.

Question 4: Conversely, were there any of Knowles's principles of adult learning that were omitted/not addressed in your principal preparation program? If so, which area(s)?

1. *Adult learning is problem-based rather than content-oriented.* A principal commented, "That's the least of the four that I remember spending much time on. I don't remember making the connection."

2. *Experiences (including mistakes) provide the basis for learning.* A principal suggestion, "This area wasn't a major topic like these others may have been."

Two administrators commented adult learning received limited consideration in their programs, with one specifically stating, "I don't know if there was really *any* [italics added] emphasis on adult learning and how adults learn."

On the other hand, another principal shared:

I think some areas of adult learning were emphasized more than others but all of this was touched on. I was fairly well prepared book-wise and I had a pretty comprehensive background. I think what I was lacking was just experience when I came on board. About my fifth or sixth year, I started being a little more relaxed. Truly, it really took a long time to feel comfortable and confident.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between principals' perceptions of their principal preparation programs and Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning's (McREL) 21 leadership responsibilities. A secondary

component of the study examined the relationship between principals' perceptions of their principal preparation programs and Knowles's principles of adult learning.

Through an online survey, the study solicited practicing principals' perceptions as to whether McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities and Knowles's principles of adult learning were included in their principal preparation programs. Quantitative findings indicated there were no significant differences between principals' perceptions of their principal preparation programs and the university/certification program in which they obtained their principal certification, the year their principal certification was completed, or the geographic location of the school district in which they were presently employed. However, the study found there were significant differences in two areas of leadership responsibilities when comparisons were generated between principals who were fully certified before assuming the role of principal and those who were not fully certified: 1) ideas/beliefs and 2) optimizer. Principals who had not completed their certification program scored the two areas higher than those who had.

The study also utilized qualitative methodology through in-depth interviews with principal program coordinators and practicing school administrators. Program coordinators and principals revealed leadership responsibilities of "communication," "culture," and "visibility" as areas of emphasis and importance in their programs. The need for more emphasis in the area of "discipline" was communicated mutually by program coordinators and principals. Principals stated areas of "knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment," and "resources" as leadership responsibilities needing more emphasis. Both program coordinators and principals communicated

principal preparation programs should have more emphasis and importance placed upon Knowles's principles of adult learning.

With the data collected and analyzed, the following chapter synthesizes the data into a discussion regarding interpretations, implications, and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

In the past decade, effective school leadership and the need to prepare principals for their roles began to receive significant attention by education reformers. Recently, the focus has elevated considerably more as states are reexamining their policies to recruit, prepare, support, and retain effective school leaders. In developing a starting point for a six-year study, Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom and Anderson (2010) claimed “leadership is second only to classroom instruction as an influence on student learning.” After six additional years of research, they are even “more confident” about this claim, stating, “To date, we have not found a single case of a school improving its student achievement record in the absence of talented leadership” (p. 9).

Given the importance of effective school leadership, the purpose of this study was to assess the relationship between principals’ perceptions of their principal preparation programs and Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning’s (McREL) 21 leadership responsibilities. A secondary component of the study examined the relationship between principals’ perceptions of their principal preparation programs and Knowles’s principles of adult learning. Two research questions guided this study:

1. To what degree are McREL’s 21 leadership responsibilities addressed in Texas principal preparation programs?
2. To what degree are Knowles’s principles of adult learning addressed in Texas principal preparation programs?

Description of the Population

This study targeted practicing public elementary and secondary principals, whose school districts were geographically located in Education Service Centers (ESCs) 9, 10, and 11, all located in north central Texas. The three centers serve 194 public school districts in approximately 32 counties. Urban, suburban and rural public schools were represented. The first portion of the study utilized a 38 question survey (Appendix B) electronically submitted to 100 principals. To create a random pool of participants, public school districts were alphabetized and every other district was highlighted. Next, to create an equal representation of elementary and secondary schools, the first school listed alphabetically with each district was selected, based upon the following criteria: 1) elementary, 2) secondary, and 3) in some cases, Pre-Kindergarten-12 campuses. A total of 37 responses were electronically returned for a 37% response rate. The 37 schools reflected the following:

- Elementary Campuses (Grades Pre-Kindergarten-5): 11
- Secondary Campuses (Grades 6-12): 20
- All-Level Campuses (Grades Pre-Kindergarten-12): 6

The principals who responded to the study represented the following:

- Fourteen participants represented districts in Region 9
- Ten participants represented districts in Region 10
- Thirteen participants represented districts in Region 11

Of the 37 participants, 23 were male and 14 were female. Ages of the participants ranged from 35-68, with the average age being 49 and a median age of 50. Years of experience as a principal averaged 7.04 with a range from 1-25 years, and a median of 6 years. Participants reported as serving a range of 1-12 years in their present schools, with the average being 3.92 years and a median of 3 years.

Thirty-three principals had master's degrees, while four had doctoral degrees. One principal had a master's degree in a field other than education and was currently enrolled in graduate classes to receive administrative certification. The average year for graduation with principal certification was the year 2000, with a range from 1978 to the aforementioned participant working toward principal certification. The median year for graduation was 2002.

Discussion of Findings

In this section, the results related to each research question are presented. The discussion of the findings will address the quantitative and qualitative findings respectively, and as well similar themes and patterns.

Principal Surveys: McREL's 21 Leadership Responsibilities

Statistical analysis was conducted to compare participants' survey (Appendix B) responses to McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities based upon four criteria. The criteria are listed below with a brief discussion of each.

1. Comparison of responses by ESCs to McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities:
A one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare participants' responses of McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities, based upon the ESCs (9, 10, and 11) of the districts in which they were currently employed. None of the comparisons between groups were statistically significant at the 0.05 level.
2. Comparison of responses by university attended to McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities: A one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare participants' responses of McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities, based upon the

- universities the participants attended. None of the comparisons between groups were statistically significant at the 0.05 level.
3. Comparison of responses by program completion/graduation year to McREL's leadership responsibilities: An independent sample *t*-test compared participants' responses to McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities, based upon the year the participants received their degree in educational leadership. Because ISSLC (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium) standards were implemented in the mid 1990's and consequently, many universities began the process of restructuring their educational leadership programs, the participants were divided into two groups: those who received their educational leadership degrees/certifications from 1978-1999 and those who received their educational leadership degrees/certifications from 2000-2009. There were no statistical differences based upon the year the participants received their degrees.
 4. Comparison of responses by certification or non-certification to McREL's leadership responsibilities: An independent sample *t*-test compared participants' responses to McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities, based upon the yes/no responses of the participants when asked if they had served as an administrator before completing their administrative certification. The results indicate a significant difference in two areas of McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities: Ideas/beliefs and optimizer. Interestingly, those participants who had not completed their educational leadership graduate programs/certifications scored the two areas higher than those who had. One

might conclude that perhaps those new to administration viewed their positions more favorably/optimistically than those who had been in the field for longer periods of time.

Principal Surveys: Knowles's Principles of Adult Learning

Statistical analysis was conducted to compare participants' survey (Appendix B) responses to Knowles's principals of adult learning based upon four criteria. The criteria are listed below with a brief discussion of each.

1. Comparison of ESC responses of Knowles's principles of adult learning: A one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare Knowles's principles of adult learning responses of the participants, based upon the ESCs (9, 10, and 11) of the district in which they were currently employed. None of the comparisons between groups of the four adult learning principles were statistically significant at the 0.05 level.
2. Comparison of responses by university attended to Knowles's principles of adult learning. An ANOVA generated comparisons based upon the responses to Knowles's principles of adult learning, according to the university attended by the participants. There were statistical differences in regard to one area, "Adult learning is problem-centered rather than content-oriented;" however, because of the small scale of the study, there were not enough responses from each university to determine where those differences were.
3. Comparison of responses by program completion/graduation year to Knowles's principles of adult learning: An independent sample *t*-test compared participants' responses to Knowles's principles of adult learning,

based upon the year the participants received their degree in educational leadership. As mentioned in the previous section, ISSLC standards were implemented in the mid 1990's and consequently, many universities began the process of restructuring their educational leadership programs; therefore, the participants were divided into two groups: those who received their educational leadership degrees/certifications from 1978-1999 and those who received their educational leadership degrees/certifications from 2000-2009. There were no statistical differences based upon the year the participants received their degrees.

4. Comparison of responses by certification/non-certification to Knowles's principles of adult learning: An independent sample *t*-test compared responses to Knowles's principles of adult learning based upon the yes/no answers of the participants when asked if they had served as an administrator before completing their administrative certification. The results did not indicate a significant difference.

Interviews with Principal Preparation Program Coordinators

Face-to-face interviews were conducted with five educational leadership program coordinators. Four of the program coordinators were practicing professors employed around the state of Texas, while one program coordinator was employed with an Education Service Center, also located in Texas. The program coordinators were asked eight open-ended questions (Appendix D) and given the opportunity to elaborate on each topic. Permission was granted for the interviews to be digitally recorded and later transcribed. As participants' answers to each question were transcribed, responses

were read and re-read to identify categories of responses. Responses were then coded according to those categories and interpreted. The process was repeated for each open-ended question. The responses below are divided into two sections: McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities and Knowles's principles of adult learning.

McREL's Leadership Responsibilities

All program coordinators were familiar with McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities, although other standards were cited as having more emphasis, such as the TExES (Texas Examination of Educator Standards), ELCC (Educational Leadership Constituent Council), and NCATE (National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education). Considering McREL's Balanced Leadership Framework was developed in the mid 2000s and is relatively new to the field of educational leadership, it is possible it has had limited exposure.

Responses were similar when coordinators were asked if the 21 leadership responsibilities were addressed in their principal preparation programs. All stated the responsibilities were addressed but in most cases, they were addressed under the other aforementioned standards.

When asked if there was emphasis/importance placed in any areas of McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities the program coordinators stressed all areas were at least "touched upon." The only area all five coordinators specifically mentioned as being emphasized was "culture." Given the amount of research devoted to the importance of school culture and climate, this outcome came as no surprise. As far back as 1932, Waller noted "schools have a culture that is definitely their own" (p. 103). Organizational culture can be a highly powerful force in the school improvement process and Owens

(2004) noted, “culture may often be the most powerful determinant of the course of change in an organization” (p. 191).

Coordinators shared similar responses when asked if any areas of McREL’s principal leadership responsibilities were omitted/not addressed in their programs, stating some areas possibly received less emphasis but were not necessarily omitted. “Intellectual stimulation” was noted by two coordinators as being an area addressed but lacking emphasis. Intellectual stimulation, by definition, ensures faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices, and ensures discussion of best practices is a regular aspect of the school’s culture. Given the vast amount of information program coordinators are responsible for delivering through a succinct coursework timeline, it is not surprising they would appreciate the luxury of having more time to devote to the area of intellectual stimulation.

“Discipline” was also noted by two program coordinators as an area which more emphasis could be placed; interestingly, principal interviewees concurred that indeed, “discipline” was an area they would have possibly benefitted from having more emphasis placed. The complexity of contemporary discipline issues ranges from student rights versus school rules, bullying and preventing school violence, misuse of zero tolerance policies, and addressing challenging behaviors of children with disabilities, to name a few. It is understandable there is frustration among principals who realize their campuses’ accountability ratings often rest squarely on their ability to provide a safe and orderly learning environment. Principals communicated they are often not able to collectively identify and implement feasible solutions to discipline problems. It is promising that the program coordinators in this study recognized the plea of

practitioners in the field, but the question remains as to whether programs will be redesigned to include additional focus in the area of discipline.

Knowles's Principles of Adult Learning

Most of the university program coordinators were familiar with Knowles's principles of adult learning, although one coordinator was not familiar with the name "Knowles." When asked if the principles were addressed in their principal preparation program, all shared they were addressed but there was room for improvement.

Asked if emphasis/importance was placed in any areas of Knowles's principles of adult learning, most of the coordinators mentioned the principle, "Adult learning is problem-centered rather than content-oriented," specifically including areas such as the internship and practicum. Two mentioned the principle, "Adults are most interested in learning subjects that have immediate relevance to their job or personal life."

Program coordinators varied in their responses when asked if any of Knowles's principles of adult learning had been omitted/not addressed. "Adults need to be involved in the planning and evaluation of their instruction," "Experiences (including mistakes) provide the basis for learning activities," and "Adults are most interested in learning subjects that have immediate relevance to their job or personal life" were mentioned as possibly needing more consideration. Program coordinators expressed interest in learning more about the needs of adult learners, but as mentioned previously, unless there is open discussion and reconsideration of program design, coordinators will feel pressured to continue with business as usual due to the time constraints of course requirements.

Interviews with Practicing Principals

Five principals were interviewed who were employed in school districts within the geographic areas of Education Service Centers 9, 10, and 11. Principals were chosen who favorably ranked their educational leadership programs based upon the responses given to the survey regarding McREL's 21 areas of leadership responsibilities and Knowles's principles of adult learning (Appendix B). Three principals represented school districts in ESC 9, one represented ESC 10 and one represented ESC 11. They were employed in the following types of schools:

- Elementary (Pre-Kindergarten-Grade 4): One principal
- Middle School/Junior High (Grades 7-8): One principal
- High School (Grades 9-12): Two principals
- All level (Pre-Kindergarten-Grade 12): One principal

In a format similar to the interview process of the university program coordinators, principals were also asked eight open-ended questions (Appendix C) and given the opportunity to elaborate on each topic. Permission was granted for the interviews to be digitally recorded and later transcribed. As participants' answers to each question were transcribed, responses were read and re-read to identify categories of responses. Responses were then coded according to those categories and interpreted. The process was repeated for each open-ended question. This methodology supports the findings of Merriam (1988) who stated, "Qualitative studies are particularly useful for addressing problems in which understanding is sought in order to improve practice" (p. 32). He continued, stating, "Qualitative research is exploratory, inductive, emphasizes process rather than ends, and strives to understand how all the parts work together to form a whole" (p.16).

The responses below are divided into two sections: McREL's 21 areas of leadership responsibilities and Knowles's principles of adult learning.

McREL's 21 Leadership Responsibilities

When asked if they were familiar with McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities, only one principal said yes, while the others stated they were more familiar with the 21 leadership concepts, but not specifically "packaged" under McREL. Although program coordinators were more familiar with McREL, their responses were similar to the principals' responses, in that they were familiar with the concepts, but not necessarily categorized under "McREL."

Principals communicated their principal programs "did a really good job" or "an above-average job" overall in effectively addressing McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities. Again, this was comparable to the responses disclosed by program coordinators.

When asked if there were any areas of McREL's leadership responsibilities that emphasis/importance was placed, the principals agreed the main areas of focus in their programs were "communication," "culture," and "visibility." In fact, all five interviewees specifically mentioned "communication." The importance of "culture" was also stressed by four principals, while three stated "visibility" was also emphasized. Interestingly, the principal's responses corresponded closely with the program coordinator's responses regarding the areas of emphasis. This supports contemporary research emphasizing the need for principals to create in their schools the collaborative culture of a professional learning community. On the continuum of McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities based upon what is essential for principals to know and be able to do to

improve student achievement, Waters et al. (2003) listed “culture” as the first priority.

Dufour (2001) affirmed the importance stating:

Creating a collaborative culture has been described as “the single most important factor” for successful school improvement initiatives, “the first order of business” for those seeking to enhance their schools’ effectiveness, an essential requirement of improving schools, the critical element in reform efforts, and the most promising strategy for sustained, substantive school improvement (p. 1).

Principals also agreed with program coordinators in the area of “discipline” when asked if there were any areas of McREL’s 21 leadership responsibilities that were omitted/not addressed. Principals also shared they would possibly have benefited from more training in “knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment” and “resources.” As one principal succinctly stated, “These two areas are really important when you’re in charge. The buck stops with you and I don’t think we got great training in either area.”

Fundamental areas of responsibility such as discipline, curriculum, and budgeting school resources require realistic and practical approaches. When any of these three critical areas of responsibility are out of balance in a school setting, it undermines the principal’s ability to lead. Moreover, on the continuum of McREL’s 21 leadership responsibilities based upon what is essential for principals to know and be able to do to improve student achievement, Waters et al. (2003) ranked “discipline,” “resources,” and “curriculum, instruction, and assessment” only behind “culture” and “order” as being top priorities. If program coordinators did nothing but consider revising the course requirements for discipline, curriculum, instruction and assessment, and resources to include more relevant, real-world application, the restructuring could positively alter

principals' perceptions of their programs and more importantly, provide them with the essential skills they urgently need to effectively lead today's schools.

Knowles's Principles of Adult Learning

None of the principals were familiar with Knowles's principles of adult learning and responses were mixed when asked if their principal preparation program addressed the principles. Two principals stated some of their courses addressed the principles but other principals communicated they were not addressed.

Two principals stated there were two areas of Knowles's principles of adult learning in which emphasis/importance was placed during their principal preparation program: "Adults need to be involved in the planning and evaluation of their instruction" and "Adults are most interested in learning subjects that have immediate relevance to their jobs or personal life."

When asked if there were any areas of Knowles's principles of adult learning omitted/not addressed in their principal preparation programs, the principals all responded differently. "Adult learning is problem-based rather than content-oriented" was given as a response from one principal while another stated, "Experiences (including mistakes) provide the basis for learning" received little emphasis. Additionally, two principals shared adult learning principles were not addressed in their programs, with one elaborating, "I don't know if there was *any* [italics added] emphasis on adult learning and how adults learn."

Although there is no one theory or model of adult learning that explains all there is to know about adult learners, those responsible for developing principal preparation programs should consider realigning coursework with adult learning principles. As

mentioned previously, it appears some of the reluctance to address the needs of adult learners is due to the time constraints imposed by the plethora of course content coordinators are expected to deliver; however, just as it is no longer acceptable in the 21st century for classroom teachers to “stand and deliver” instruction without involving and engaging students, the needs of the adult learner can no longer be neglected and overlooked.

Implications

The importance of principal leadership in creating conditions conducive to effective change has become a significant concern of educators. The results of this study support the need to continue to bridge communication between those in positions to implement policy for educational leadership programs and those currently serving in educational leadership roles.

The data from this research revealed promising practices in the following areas:

1. Although the sample size was small, the survey results revealed no statistical significance among ESCs, universities attended, or the year the educational leadership degrees were completed, i.e. it appears educational leadership programs are somewhat aligned across the state and program graduates are entering the field of administration with essentially the same educational background experiences.
2. There was a general consensus among program coordinators and practicing principles that there was a concentrated effort to address all areas of McREL’s 21 leadership responsibilities through Texas, NCATE and ELCC standards.

3. Program coordinators and practicing administrators alike revealed “communication,” “culture,” and “visibility” were areas of emphasis/ importance when addressing McREL’s 21 areas of leadership responsibilities. As mentioned in the previous section, the research supporting school climate and culture cannot be underestimated.

Concerns and need for improvement were revealed in the following areas:

1. The need for more emphasis in the area of “discipline” was communicated by both program coordinators and principals.
2. There seemed to be a disconnection between program coordinators and principals in the area of “knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment” and “resources.” While program coordinators did not reveal a need for more emphasis in either area, practicing principals stated both were significant areas in which they would have benefitted from more training.
3. In general, it appeared there was not much emphasis and importance placed upon Knowles’s principles of adult learning. Program coordinators used phrases such as, “trying to move toward problem-based learning,” “new to university faculty in general,” “within limits,” and “constrained by time” when addressing adult learning. By and large, it appears delivery of instruction has remained traditional. Perhaps the challenge has been, as one professor shared, that most students in educational leadership classes are primarily teachers and some of the content in the principal preparation courses is difficult for them to apply immediately.

Although a single study will not provide all-inclusive evidence for designing principal preparation programs with adult learning theories in mind, it is important for conversations to continue to occur between policy makers implementing standards for those who will eventually lead schools and current principals in the field who could provide invaluable feedback.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study examined the relationship between principals' perceptions of their principal preparation programs and Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning's (McREL) 21 leadership responsibilities. A secondary component of the study examined the relationship between principals' perceptions of their principal preparation programs and Knowles's principles of adult learning.

The findings of this study lead to several recommendations for future research. Due to geographic limitations of the study, program coordinators and principals often mentioned they were more familiar with Texas, NCATE, and ELCC standards rather than McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities. A study examining the relationship between the aforementioned standards and principal preparation programs in Texas could possibly yield more transparent and meaningful findings.

Second, with online certification programs gaining immense popularity, a similar study which examines McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities and Knowles's principles of adult learning through online principal certification programs could potentially provide useful information to university and alternative certification program coordinators around the state.

Third, traditional principal preparation programs have given only marginal consideration to social justice concerns. Two program coordinators in this study specifically mentioned the emerging social justice dialogue in the field of educational administration and the challenges that must be considered as universities prepare future school leaders. According to Tooms, Lugg, and Bogotch (2010), new leaders will need to critically inquire about structures and norms that result in inequitable schooling for many students and learn to undertake an advocacy role. Research that delves into social justice concerns as related to principal preparation programs will unquestionably benefit future school leaders.

Finally, another topic of research could involve studying innovative principal preparation programs that incorporate novel certification routes, and consequently, create unique opportunities for school leaders graduating from the program. For example, Zigler and Allen (2007) alluded to the principalship and its associated training as being at a “tipping point.” They contended the current principal paradigm is too complex and that perhaps a shared leadership paradigm warrants consideration. They proposed that this shared leadership among teacher leader programs and principal preparation programs may be the beginning of change for modeling dual instructional leadership efforts in Pre-Kindergarten-12 schools.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to add to the educational research and expand the knowledge of study in the areas of principal preparation programs and adult learning theories. The findings of this study are in no way conclusive or lead to statistically significant claims; rather, the findings add to the knowledge base of understanding the

critical attributes necessary to develop educational leadership programs that will effectively address the skills needed to be a 21st century school administrator.

DeVita (2010) stated:

“School leadership” was hardly a hot issue 10 years ago. Indeed, it was seen as a distraction, noticeably absent from most major school reform efforts.... Leadership is now on the agenda. Federal officials increasingly accept that school improvement cannot succeed without effective school leadership. In fact, the word “principals” appears 24 times in the Federal Register notice of the Race to the Top education reform program. More to the point, one of Race to the Top’s four aims is the development not only of great teachers but also great principals. Recognizing the connection between teaching and leadership, and the interdependence of the two, represents enormous progress. (p. 2)

Louis et al. (2010) concurred, stating, “It is difficult to imagine a focus for research with greater social justification than research about successful educational leadership” (p. 7). No doubt, principals are crucial to the school improvement process; therefore, it is imperative to continue transforming principal preparation programs to empower future school leaders to effectively lead the charge.

APPENDIX A
RESEARCH CONSENT FORM

October 27, 2008

Permission is hereby granted to Delesa Styles to quote from, adapt and cite in her doctoral dissertation the following material which is copyrighted by McREL:

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.

We request a standard scholarly citation to this material along with the statement "Used by permission of McREL."

We understand your dissertation will not be commercially published. This permission is limited to the material and purpose stated. Prior written permission is required for any additional uses.

Sincerely,

Director of Information Resources

APPENDIX B

PRINCIPAL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Survey Instrument

Purpose of Study: To ascertain principals' views of the quality of their principal preparation programs.

Section I: Background Information

1. School:
School District:
2. Counting the 2008-09 school year, how many years have you been a principal at your present school?
3. How many total years have you been a principal, including your present assignment?
4. What institution sponsored your formal educational leadership preparation program leading to your school leader license or certification?
5. What degree or certificate do you hold, or what program are you enrolled in, that is specifically related to your role as principal?
 - a. Master's
 - b. Alternative Certification
 - c. Doctorate (Ed.D or Ph.D)
 - d. Other (please specify)
6. What year did you earn your principal certification or advanced degree in educational leadership/mid-management?
7. Did you begin your role as principal before becoming fully certified?
8. If you do not hold a degree or certificate specifically related to your role as principal, are you currently enrolled in a program to receive administrative certification? If you answered yes, please specify the institution you are currently enrolled to receive certification.
9. What is your year of birth?
10. What is your gender?
 - a. Male
 - b. Female

Section II: The next portion of the survey involves 21 leadership responsibilities, based on McREL's Balanced Leadership Framework as discussed in *School Leadership That Works: From Research to Results* (Marzano, Waters, McNulty, 2005)

The numbers on the 1-4 scale represent the following:

(1) Never (2) Almost Never (3) Almost Always (4) Always

How effectively did your principal preparation program prepare you in the following areas of leadership responsibilities? (Select one answer for each item below.)

1. Affirmation: Recognizes and celebrates accomplishments and acknowledges failures
2. Change agent: Is willing to challenge and actively challenges the status quo
3. Communication: Establishes strong lines of communication with and among teachers and students
4. Contingent rewards: Recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments
5. Culture: Fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation
6. Discipline: Protects teachers from issues and influences that would detract from their teaching time or focus
7. Flexibility: Adapts his or her leadership behavior to the needs of the current situation and is comfortable with dissent
8. Focus: Establishes clear goals and keeps those goals in the forefront of the school's attention
9. Ideas/beliefs: Communicates and operates from strong ideals and beliefs about schooling
10. Input: Involves teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies
11. Intellectual stimulation: Ensures faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices and makes the discussion of these a regular aspect of the school's culture
12. Involvement in curriculum, instruction, and assessment: Is directly involved in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices

13. Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment: Is knowledgeable about current curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices
14. Monitoring, evaluating: Monitors and evaluates the effectiveness of school practices and their impact on student learning
15. Optimizer: Inspires and leads new and challenging innovations
16. Order: Establishes a set of standard operating procedures and routines
17. Outreach: Is an advocate and spokesperson for the school to all stakeholders
18. Relationships: Demonstrates an awareness of the personal aspects of teachers and staff
19. Resources: Provides teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their jobs
20. Situational awareness: Is aware of the details and undercurrents in the running of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems
21. Visibility: Has quality contact and interactions with teachers and students
22. Overall, how effective was your principal preparation program in addressing McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities?

Section III: The final portion of the survey involves Knowles's principles of adult Learning.

The numbers on the 1-4 scale represent the following:

(1) Never (2) Almost Never (3) Almost Always (4) Always

How effectively did your principal preparation program address the following components of Knowles's principles of adult learning? (Select one answer for each item below.)

1. Adults need to be involved in the planning and evaluation of their instruction.
2. Experiences (including mistakes) provide the basis for learning activities.
3. Adults are most interested in learning subjects that have immediate relevance to their job or personal life.
4. Adult learning is problem centered rather than content-oriented.
5. Overall, how effective was your principal preparation program in addressing the four components of Knowles's principles of adult learning?

APPENDIX C

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Were you familiar with McREL's 21 areas of leadership responsibilities, as discussed in *School Leadership That Works: From Research to Results* (Marzano, Waters, McNulty, 2005) before you participated in this study? (see attached)
2. Did your principal preparation program address McREL's 21 areas of leadership responsibilities?
3. Were there any areas of McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities that your principal preparation program placed emphasis/importance? If so, which area(s).
4. Conversely, were there any areas of McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities that were omitted/not addressed in your principal preparations program? If so, which area(s)?
5. Were you familiar with Knowles's principles of adult learning before you participated in this study? (see attached)
6. Did your principal preparation program address Knowles's principles of adult learning?
7. Were there any of Knowles's principles of adult learning that your principal preparation program placed emphasis/importance? If so, which area(s).
8. Conversely, were there any of Knowles's principles of adult learning that were omitted/not addressed in your principal preparation program? If so, which area(s)?

McREL's Balanced Leadership Framework

21 Leadership Responsibilities

from *School Leadership That Works:*

From Research to Results

(Marzano, Waters, McNulty, 2005)

1. Affirmation: Recognizes and celebrates accomplishments and acknowledges failures
2. Change agent: Is willing to challenge and actively challenges the status quo
3. Communication: Establishes strong lines of communication with and among teachers and students
4. Contingent rewards: Recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments
5. Culture: Fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation
6. Discipline: Protects teachers from issues and influences that would detract from their teaching time or focus
7. Flexibility: Adapts his or her leadership behavior to the needs of the current situation and is comfortable with dissent
8. Focus: Establishes clear goals and keeps those goals in the forefront of the school's attention
9. Ideas/beliefs: Communicates and operates from strong ideals and beliefs about schooling
10. Input: Involves teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies
11. Intellectual stimulation: Ensures faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices and makes the discussion of these a regular aspect of the school's culture
12. Involvement in curriculum, instruction, and assessment: Is directly involved in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices
13. Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment: Is knowledgeable about current curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices

14. Monitoring, evaluating: Monitors and evaluates the effectiveness of school practices and their impact on student learning
15. Optimizer: Inspires and leads new and challenging innovations
16. Order: Establishes a set of standard operating procedures and routines
17. Outreach: Is an advocate and spokesperson for the school to all stakeholders
18. Relationships: Demonstrates an awareness of the personal aspects of teachers and staff
19. Resources: Provides teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their jobs
20. Situational awareness: Is aware of the details and undercurrents in the running of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems
21. Visibility: Has quality contact and interactions with teachers and students

Knowles's Principles of Adult Learning

1. Adults need to be involved in the planning and evaluation of their instruction.
2. Experiences (including mistakes) provide the basis for learning activities.
3. Adults are most interested in learning subjects that have immediate relevance to their job or personal life.
4. Adult learning is problem-centered rather than content-oriented.

APPENDIX D
UNIVERSITY PROGRAM COORDINATOR
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

UNIVERSITY PROGRAM COORDINATOR
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Were you familiar with McREL's 21 areas of leadership responsibilities, as discussed in *School Leadership That Works: From Research to Results* (Marzano, Waters, McNulty, 2005) before you participated in this study? (see attached)
2. Does your university's principal preparation program address McREL's 21 areas of leadership responsibilities?
3. Are there any areas of McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities that your university's principal preparation program places emphasis/importance? If so, which area(s).
4. Conversely, are there any areas of McREL's 21 leadership responsibilities that are omitted/not addressed in your university's principal preparations program? If so, which area(s)?
5. Were you familiar with Knowles's principles of adult learning before you participated in this study? (see attached)
6. Does your university's principal preparation program address Knowles's principles of adult learning?
7. Were there any of Knowles's principles of adult learning that your university's principal preparation program placed emphasis/importance? If so, which area(s).
8. Conversely, were there any of Knowles's principles of adult learning that were omitted/not addressed in your principal preparation program? If so, which area(s)?

McREL's Balanced Leadership Framework

21 Leadership Responsibilities

from *School Leadership That Works:*

From Research to Results

(Marzano, Waters, McNulty, 2005)

1. Affirmation: Recognizes and celebrates accomplishments and acknowledges failures
2. Change agent: Is willing to challenge and actively challenges the status quo
3. Communication: Establishes strong lines of communication with and among teachers and students
4. Contingent rewards: Recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments
5. Culture: Fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation
6. Discipline: Protects teachers from issues and influences that would detract from their teaching time or focus
7. Flexibility: Adapts his or her leadership behavior to the needs of the current situation and is comfortable with dissent
8. Focus: Establishes clear goals and keeps those goals in the forefront of the school's attention
9. Ideas/beliefs: Communicates and operates from strong ideals and beliefs about schooling
10. Input: Involves teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies
11. Intellectual stimulation: Ensures faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices and makes the discussion of these a regular aspect of the school's culture
12. Involvement in curriculum, instruction, and assessment: Is directly involved in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices
13. Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment: Is knowledgeable about current curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices
14. Monitoring, evaluating: Monitors and evaluates the effectiveness of school practices and their impact on student learning

15. Optimizer: Inspires and leads new and challenging innovations
16. Order: Establishes a set of standard operating procedures and routines
17. Outreach: Is an advocate and spokesperson for the school to all stakeholders
18. Relationships: Demonstrates an awareness of the personal aspects of teachers and staff
19. Resources: Provides teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their jobs
20. Situational awareness: Is aware of the details and undercurrents in the running of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems
21. Visibility: Has quality contact and interactions with teachers and students

Knowles's Principles of Adult Learning

1. Adults need to be involved in the planning and evaluation of their instruction.
2. Experiences (including mistakes) provide the basis for learning activities.
3. Adults are most interested in learning subjects that have immediate relevance to their job or personal life.
4. Adult learning is problem-centered rather than content-oriented.

APPENDIX E

COVER LETTER AND CONSENT FORMS

Dear Principal,

I am a doctoral student in the Educational Administration Department at the University of North Texas, as well as a high school principal. In these roles, I am very interested in researching elements of university preparation programs that impact principals' perception of their ability to do their jobs effectively.

In your role as principal, I would like to ask that you take a few minutes to log onto the attached link and complete the survey regarding your principal preparation program. The survey should take no longer than 10-15 minutes but the results are expected to be very beneficial for analyzing differences that may positively impact future principal preparation programs. Participants returning surveys will have their names placed in a drawing to receive one of four gift cards valued at \$25 each to a restaurant of their choice. Odds of winning will be determined by the number of responses received.

This study does not involve any foreseeable risks and the results will be kept confidential. Names of the participants will only be known to me. School and personally identifiable information will be eliminated before final submission. Pseudonyms will be used in the final report and survey results will be aggregated.

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact Delesa Styles at (xxx) xxx-xxxx or Dr. Jane B. Huffman, UNT Department of Educational Administration at (940) 565-2832. This study has been approved by the University of North Texas Institutional Review Board (IRB). If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the UNT IRB at (940) 565-3940.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you may discontinue your participation at any time. Your refusal to participate will involve no penalties or loss of privileges or rights.

I would like to thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this survey. A copy of the results of this study will be available to you at your request.

Sincerely,

Delesa Styles

Dear Principal,

I am a doctoral student in the Educational Administration Department at the University of North Texas, as well as a high school principal. In these roles, I am very interested in researching elements of university preparation programs that impact principals' perception of their ability to do their jobs effectively.

In your role as principal, I would like to ask your permission to interview you, either face-to-face or by telephone. The interview will address your principal preparation program and the questions are attached for your preview. The interview should take no longer than one hour but the results are expected to be very beneficial for analyzing differences that may positively impact future principal preparation programs.

This study does not involve any foreseeable risks and the results will be kept confidential. Names of the participants will only be known to me. School and personally identifiable information will be eliminated before final submission. Pseudonyms will be used in the final report and survey/interview results will be aggregated.

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact Delesa Styles at (xxx) xxx-xxxx or Dr. Jane B. Huffman, UNT Department of Educational Administration at (940) 565-2832. This study has been approved by the University of North Texas Institutional Review Board (IRB). If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the UNT IRB at (940) 565-3940.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you may discontinue your participation at any time. Your refusal to participate will involve no penalties or loss of privileges or rights.

I would like to thank you in advance for taking the time to participate in this study. A copy of the results will be available to you at your request.

Sincerely,

Delesa Styles

Dear University Program Coordinator,

I am a doctoral student in the Educational Administration Department at the University of North Texas, as well as a high school principal. In these roles, I am very interested in researching elements of university preparation programs that impact principals' perception of their ability to do their jobs effectively.

In your role as university program coordinator, I would like to ask your permission to interview you, either face-to-face or by telephone. The interview will address principal preparation programs and the questions are attached for your preview. The interview should take no longer than one hour but the results are expected to be very beneficial for analyzing differences that may positively impact future principal preparation programs.

This study does not involve any foreseeable risks and the results will be kept confidential. Names of the participants will only be known to me. School and personally identifiable information will be eliminated before final submission. Pseudonyms will be used in the final report and survey/interview results will be aggregated.

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact Delesa Styles at (xxx) xxx-xxxx or Dr. Jane B. Huffman, UNT Department of Educational Administration at (940) 565-2832. This study has been approved by the University of North Texas Institutional Review Board (IRB). If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the UNT IRB at (940) 565-3940.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you may discontinue your participation at any time. Your refusal to participate will involve no penalties or loss of privileges or rights.

I would like to thank you in advance for taking the time to participate in this study. A copy of the results will be available to you at your request.

Sincerely,

Delesa Styles

REFERENCES

- Adamowski, S. (2005). The relevance of leadership training. *University Council for Educational Administration, XLVI* (2), 17-19.
- Andrews, R. L., Ostrander, K., & Muller, K. (1989). Planning a program for the training of principals: The agony and the ecstasy. *The Journal of California Association of Professors of Educational Administration (CAPEA)*, 1(1), 66-67.
- Archer, J. (2005). Study blasts leadership preparation. *Education Week* 24(27), 1.
- Bailey, J., Cameron, G., & Cortez-Ford, E. (2004). *Helping school leaders develop the capacity necessary for continuous improvement: McREL's balanced leadership framework*. Regional Educational Laboratory. Contract #ED- 01-CO-0006. Deliverable #2004-16.
- Barnett, B. G. (2006). Emerging trends in international leadership education. *Journal of Research on Educational Leadership* (1)1. Retrieved September 1, 2010 from http://www.ucea.org/storage/JRLE/pdf/vol1_issue1_2006/Barnett.pdf
- Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M.W. (1975). *Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. IV: The findings in review*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- Bloom, G. (1999). Sink or swim no more! *Thrust for Educational Leadership*, 29(1), 14-17.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Boodhoo, R., & Purmessur, R. D. (2009). Justifications for qualitative research in organizations: A step forward. *Journal of Online Education*. New York, NY. Retrieved September 1, 2010 from <http://www.nyu.edu/classes/keefe/waoe/deeprosh2.pdf>
- Brent, B., & Haller, E. (1998). Who really benefits from graduate training in Educational administration? *American Association of School Administrators (AASA) Professor*, 22(1), 1-7.
- Brookfield, S. D. (1986). *Understanding and facilitating adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Bruner, D. Y., Greenlee, B. J., & Hill, M. S. (2006). *The reality of leadership preparation in a rapidly changing context: Best practice vs. reality*. University of South Florida. Retrieved September 1, 2010 from http://www.ucea.org/Storage/JRLE/pdf/vol2_issue2_2007/Bruneretal.pdf

- Cambron-McCabe, N. (1993). Leadership for democratic authority. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *Preparing tomorrow's school leaders: Alternative designs*. University Park, PA: University Council for Educational Administration.
- Cambron-McCabe, N. (2006). Challenging the current organization of schools. *Journal of Research on Educational Leadership* (1)1. Retrieved September 1, 2010 from <http://www.ucea.org/JRLE/issue.php>
- Chenoweth, T., Carr, C., & Ruhl, T. (2002). *Best practices in educational leadership programs*. Paper presented at the Administrator Licensure Planning Forum. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon.
- Clark, D. C., & Clark, S. N. (1996). Better preparation of educational leaders. *Educational Researcher*, 25(9), 18-20.
- Copeland, S. (2004). A study of field experiences and leadership opportunities in principal preparation programs in the 16 SREB member states. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65(06), 2033. (UMI No. 3137783)
- Cornett, L. (1983). *The preparation and selection of school principals*. Southern Regional Education Board. Atlanta, GA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED231052)
- Crews, A. C. & Weakley, S. (1995). *Hungry for leadership: Educational leadership programs in the SREB states*. Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta. Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC 391 250).
- Cushman, K. (1992). The essential school principal: A changing role in a changing school. *Horace*, (9)1. Retrieved September 1, 2010 from <http://www.essentialschools.org/resources/92>
- Dareh, J.C., & Playko, M.A. (1992). *The professional development of school administrators: Preservice, induction, and inservice applications*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Devita, C. M. (2010). *Educational leadership: An agenda for school improvement*. The Wallace Foundation's National Conference. Washington, D. C. Retrieved September 1, 2010 from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/KnowledgeCenter/KnowledgeTopics/CurrentAreaofFocus/EducationLeadership/Documents/education-leadership-an-agenda-for-school-improvement.pdf>
- DiLello, A., & Vaast, K. (2003). *Using adult learning theory*. Retrieved March 10, 2008 from <http://www.clomedia.com/content>

- Donmoyer, R., Imber, J., & Scheurich, J. J. (Eds.). (1995). *The knowledge base in educational administration: Multiple perspectives*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- DuFour, R. (2001, Winter). In the right context: The effective leader concentrates on a foundation of programs, procedures, beliefs, expectations, and habit. *Journal of Staff Development* (22)1. Retrieved September 1, 2010 from <http://www.learningforward.org/news/jsd/dufour221.cfm>
- DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (1992). *Creating the new American school: A principal's guide to school improvement*. Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.
- Duke, K. M. (1982). What can principals do? Leadership functions and instructional effectiveness. *NASSP Bulletin*, 66(456), 1-12.
- DyceFaucette, K.J. (2005). Perceptions of the efficacy of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration standards in guiding principal preparation: A survey of New York State principals. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66(03), 839. (UMI No. 3169558)
- Edmonds, R. (1979). *A discussion of the literature and issues related to effective schooling*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED170394)
- Education Policy and Leadership Center (2006). *Preparing and supporting superintendents and principals*. Harrisburg, PA.
- Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. New York: Albert Shanker Institute.
- Engler, C., & Edlefsen, C. (2005). Gender, politics and the ISLLC standards: A closer look. *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* 2(1), 7.
- Erickson, F. (1986). Some approaches to inquiry in school-community ethnography. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 8, 58–69.
- Farkas, S., Johnson, J., & Duffet, A. (2003). *Rolling up their sleeves: Superintendents and principals talk about what's needed to fix public schools*. New York: Public Agenda.
- Farkas, S., Johnson, J., Duffet, A., Foleno, T., & Foley, P. (2001). *Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about school leadership*. Washington, D.C. ISBN: 1-889483-74-5. Retrieved September 1, 2010 from http://www.publicagenda.org/files/pdf/ahead_of_the_game.pdf

- Fidishun, D. (1999). *Andragogy and technology: Integrating adult learning theory as we teach with technology*. Retrieved March 10, 2008 from <http://www.mtsu.edu/~itconf/proceed00/fidishun.htm>
- Fry, B., Bottoms, G., O'Neill, K., & Jacobson, A. (2004). *Progress being made in getting a quality leader in every school*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Fry, B., O'Neill, K., & Bottoms, G. (2006). *Schools can't wait: Accelerating the redesign of university principal preparation programs*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of education reform*. Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M. (2003) *The moral imperative of school leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Fuller, E. & Orr, M. T. (2006). *Texas leadership preparation programs and their graduates' employment transitions and retention: A trend comparison of institutional outcomes, 1995-2005*. Paper prepared for the 2006 University Council of Educational Administration Annual Convention, San Antonio, Texas.
- Fuller, E. & Young, M. (2006). *Careers in motion: An examination of the career paths of principals in Texas*. Paper prepared for the 2006 University Council of Educational Administration Annual Convention, San Antonio, Texas.
- Glasman, N., Cibulka, J., & Ashby, D. (2002). Program self-evaluation for continuous improvement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38 (2), 257-288.
- Gredler, M. E. (1996). *Program evaluation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Green, R. L. (2001). *Practicing the art of leadership: A problem-based approach to implementing the ISLLC standard*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gregory, R. (1992). *Reflectivity in decision-making of principals prepared in a traditional course driven program when compared to those prepared in an integrated, cohort driven program*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming.
- Griffiths, D. E., Stouts, R. T., & Forsyth, P. B. (1988). *Leaders for America's schools The report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration*, Berkeley, CA: McCuthchan.

- Grogan, M., & Andrews, R. (2002). Defining preparation and professional development for the future. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 233-256.
- Hackmann, D.G., Schmitt-Oliver, D. M., & Tracy, J. C. (2002). *The standards-based administrative internship: Putting the ISLLC standards into practice*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Hall, G. (1984). Effects of three principal styles of school improvement. *Educational Leadership*, 41(5), 22-29.
- Hallinger, P. (2006). Scholarship in school leadership preparation: The unaccepted challenge. *Journal of Research on Educational Leadership*, 1(1). Retrieved September 1, 2010 from http://www.ucea.org/storage/JRLE/pdf/vol2_issue3_2007/NormoreArticle.pdf
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1983). *Ethnography: Principles and practices*. London: Tavistock.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (1998). *What's worth fighting for out there?* New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Heller, R., Conway, J., & Jacobsen, S. (1988). Here is your blunt critique of administrator preparation. *Executive Educator*, 10(9), 18-21.
- Hess, F. M. (2003). *A license to lead? A new leadership agenda for America's schools*. Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute.
- Hess, F. M., & Kelly, A. P. (2005a). *Learning to lead? What gets taught in principal preparation programs*. Program on Education Policy and Governance. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University. ED485999
- Hess, F. M., & Kelly, A. P. (2005b). The accidental principal: What doesn't get taught at ed school? *Education Next*, 5(3). Retrieved December 21, 2007 from <http://www.hoover.org/publications/ednext/3219521.html>
- Hoyle, J. (2007). Educational leadership preparation programs lacking in quality? Bunk! *School Leadership News*, 19 (3). Retrieved September 1, 2010 from [http://www.aera.net/uploadedFiles/Divisions/Administration_\(A\)/Newsletters/DivA_Fall_2007.pdf](http://www.aera.net/uploadedFiles/Divisions/Administration_(A)/Newsletters/DivA_Fall_2007.pdf)

- Institute for Educational Leadership (2000). *Leadership for student learning: Reinventing the principalship*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). (1996). *Standards for school leaders*. Washington DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Jackson, B., & Kelley, C., (2002). Exceptional and innovative programs in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 192-212.
- Jacob, E. (1988). Clarifying qualitative research: A focus on traditions. *Educational Researcher*, 17, 16-24.
- Jean, E. W., & Evans, R. D. (1995). *Internships/mentorships for first-year principals: Implications for administrative certification and graduate program design*. A Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council (CSPAC) research study. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 390805)
- Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From andragogy to pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Cambridge Adult Education.
- Knowles, M. S. et al. (1984). *Andragogy in action. Applying modern principles of adult education*, San Francisco: Josser Bass. A collection of chapters examining different aspects of Knowles's formulation.
- Knowles, M. S., Holton III, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (1998). *The adult learner*. Houston: Gulf Publishing.
- Kraus, C. M., & Cordeiro, P. A. (1995). *Challenging traditions: Re-examining the preparation of educational leaders for the workplace*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration. Salt Lake City, UT.
- Lashway, L. (1999). Preparing school leaders. *National Association of Elementary School Principals*, 15(3), 1-4. ED 440468.
- Lashway, L. (2003). *Transforming principal preparation*. Washington DC: US Department of Education: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. ERIC Document Reproductions Service No. ED 473360.
- Lawler, P. A. (1991). *The keys to adult learning: Theory and practical strategies*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools.
- Lease, A. J. (2002). New administrations need more than good grades. *School Administrator*, 59(6), 40-42.

- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinback, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. New York: Wallace Foundation.
- Levine, A. (2005a). *Educating school leaders*. The Education Schools Project. Retrieved December 10, 2005 from http://www.edschools.org/reports_leaders.htm
- Levine, A. (2005b). Change in the principal's office: The role of universities. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, (51)32. Retrieved October 21, 2007 from http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/mastplan/edd/che_review04152005.htm
- Lewis, A. C. (1997). Standards for new administrators. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 79(2), 99-100.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lortie, D., (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Louis, K. S., Keithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). *Learning from leadership: Investigating the links to improved student learning*. New York, NY: Wallace Foundation.
- Lugg, C. A. (2006). Why a journal of research on leadership education? *Journal of Research on Educational Leadership* (1)1. Retrieved September 10, 2010 from <http://www.ucea.org/JRLE/pdf/vol1/issue1/lugg.pdf>
- Lumsden, L. S. (1992). *Prospects in principal preparation*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 350726)
- Malone, B., & Caddell, T. (2000). A crisis in leadership: Where are tomorrow's principals? *Clearing House*, 73(3), 162-164.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. McREL: Aurora, CO.
- McCarthy, M. (1999). The evolution of educational leadership preparation programs. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration: A project of the American Educational Research Association* (pp. 110-139). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- Merriam, S. (1988). *Case study research in education. A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Merriam, S. B. & Caffarella, R. S. (1999). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Milstein, M. M. (1992). *The Danforth program for the preparation of school principals (DPPSP) six years later: What we have learned*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Minneapolis, MN.
- Milstein, M. (1993). *Changing the way we prepare educational leaders: The Danforth experience*. Newbury Park, PA: University Council for Educational Administration.
- Mishler, E. G. (1986). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Morgan, G. (1997). *Images of organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Murphy, J. (1992). *The landscape of leadership preparation: Reframing the education of school administrators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Murphy, J. (1995). Rethinking the foundations of leadership preparation: Insights from school improvements efforts. *Design for leadership: The bulletin of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration*, 6(1).
- Murphy, J. (2001a). The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: Standards for school leaders. *The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) Professors*, 24(2), 2-8.
- Murphy, J. (2001b). The changing face of leadership preparation. *The School Administrator* 58(10). Retrieved December 21, 2007, from <http://www.aasa.org/publications/saarticledetail.cfm>
- Murphy, J. (2002). *Reculturing the profession of educational leadership: New blueprints*. Paper prepared for the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Programs. Columbia, MO: University Council for Educational Administration.
- Murphy, J. (2003). *Reculturing educational leadership: The ISLLC standards ten years out*. Retrieved October 13, 2004, from the National Policy Board for Educational Administration website: <http://www.npbea.org/Resources/cataloguehtml>.

- Murphy, J. (2006). Some thoughts on rethinking the pre-service education of school leaders. *Journal of Research on Educational Leadership* (1)1. Retrieved September 10, 2010 from <http://peabody.vanderbilt.edu/x4942.xml?show=SelectedPublications>
- Murphy, J., & Forsyth, P. B., (1999). *Educational administration: A decade of reform*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1987). *Approaches to administrative training in education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Murphy, J., & Vriesenga, M. (2004). *Research on preparation programs in educational administration: An analysis*. Monograph prepared for the University Council for Educational Administration. Columbia, MO: UCEA.
- Muse, I., & Thomas, G. (1991). The rural principal: Select the best. *Journal of Rural and Small Schools*, 4(3), 32-37.
- Muth, R., & Barnett, B. (2001). Making the case for professional preparation: Using research for program improvement and political support. *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development*, 13, 109-120.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. (1992). *Developing school leaders: A call for collaboration*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- National Conference of State Legislatures. (2002). *The role of school leadership in improving student achievement*. Retrieved May 26, 2008 from <http://www.ncsl.org/programs/educ/leaderoverview.pdf>
- Norton, J. (2002). *Preparing school leaders: It's time to face the facts*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Olson, L. (2007). Getting serious about preparation. Supplement to *Education Week*. Retrieved September 10, 2010 from <http://www.edweek.org/media/03wallace2007.pdf>
- Orr, M. T. (2006). Research on leadership education as a reform strategy. *Journal of Research on Educational Leadership* (1)1. Retrieved September 10, 2010 from <http://www.edleaderprep.org/publications/>
- Owens, R. G. (2004). *Organizational behavior in education: Adaptive leadership and school reform* (8th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Peebles, L. D. (2000). Millennial challenges for educational leadership: Revisiting issues of diversity. *Marching to a New Millennium*. Lanhan, MD: Scarecrow.
- Peterson, K. D., & Finn, C. E. (1985). Principal, superintendents, and the administrator's art. *The Public Interest*, 79, 42-62.
- Playko, M., & Daresh, J. (1989). *Entry year programs and principal development*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration. Retrieved September 10, 2010 from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED311586.pdf>
- Portin, B., Schneider, P., DeArmond, M., & Grundlach, L. (2003). *Making sense of leading schools: A study of the principalship*. Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education.
- Protheroe, N. (1998). *School administration under attack: What are the facts?* Princeton, NJ: Educational Research Service.
- Reed, E. (1988). *Relationship between the Gallup Principal Perceiver and the Career Plan 360# as a measure/predictor of principal performance in the Texas Mentor School Network*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University.
- Rusch, E., Crawford, J., & Wolverton, M. (2006). Beyond the launch: The future of research on leadership education. *Journal of Research on Educational Leadership* 1, 1. Retrieved September 10, 2010 from http://www.ucea.org/storage/JRLE/pdf/vol1_issue1_2006/Beyond%20the%20Launch.pdf
- Rutherford, W. L. (1985). School leaders as effective leaders. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 67(1), 31-34.
- Schargel, F. P. (1994). *Transforming education through total quality management: A practitioner's guide*. Princeton, NJ: Eye on Education, Inc.
- Schlechty, P. C. (1990). *Schools for the 21st century: Leadership imperatives for educational reform*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Schmoker, M. (2006). *Results now: How we can achieve unprecedented improvements in teaching and learning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Senge, P. (2000). The industrial age system of education. In P. Senge, N. Cambron-McCabe, T. Lucas, B. Smith, J. Dutton, & A. Kleinter, (Eds.). *Schools that learn*. (p. 27-58). New York: Doubleday.
- Shen, J., Cooley, V. E., Ruhl-Smith, C., & Keiser, N. M. (1999). Quality and impact of educational leadership programs: A national study. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(1/2), 3-19.
- Smallwood, E., & Jazzar, M. (2006). *A baker's dozen for principal preparation programs*. Retrieved January 11, 2007 from <http://cnx.org/content/m14138/latest/>
- Smith, M. K. (2002). Malcolm Knowles, informal adult education, self-direction and Anadragogy. *The Encyclopedia of Informal Education*. Retrieved September 1, 2010 from www.infed.org/thinkers/et-knowl.htm.
- Southern Regional Education Board. (2003). *Good principals are the key to successful schools: Six strategies to prepare more good principals.* Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Sparks, D., & Hirsh, S. (1997). *A new vision for staff development*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD and National Staff Development Council.
- Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Stewart, J. A. (1991). Priming the pump: Interns in Polk County. *Updating School Board Policies*, 22,(3) 1-3.
- Texas High School Project. (2006). *Pilot high school principal certification program*. University Council for Educational Administration. 2006 Annual Conference. San Antonio, Texas.
- Tirozzi, G. N. (2002). Associations and the principalship: A history of advocacy, a horizon of opportunity. *The principal challenge: Leading and managing schools in an era of accountability*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Tirozzi, G., & Ferrandino, V. (2005). Short-changing tomorrow's school leaders. *Education Week*, 24(29), 12.
- Tooms, A. K., Lugg, C. A., & Bogotch, I. (2010). Rethinking the politics of fit and educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 46(1). 96-131.
- Tucker, M. (2003). Out with the old. *Education Next*, 3(4), 20-24.
- Valentine, J. (2001). Goals 2000. *Principal leadership development project: Final report*. Final Report of Goals 2000 Grant. Columbia, MO.

- Waller, W. (1932). *The sociology of teaching*. New York: Wiley.
- Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNutty, B. A. (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., & Cameron, G. (2007). *The balanced leadership framework: Connecting vision with action*. Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Waters, T., & Grubb, S. (2004). *Leading schools: Distinguishing the essential from the important*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Wheatley, M. J. (1992). *Leadership and the new science*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Whitaker, T., & Turner, E. (2000). What is your priority? *NASSP Bulletin*, 84, 16-21.
- Wildman, L. (2001, August). *Research on the preparation of school administrators*. Paper prepared for the Board of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. Bakersfield, CA.
- Wilmore, E. L. (2002). *Principal leadership: Applying the new Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standards*. Corwin Press: Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Yee, A. (1997). *Developing educational leaders for the 21st century*. Alberta: The University of Calgary.
- Young, M. D., Crow, G., Orr, M. T., Ogawa, R., & Creighton, T. (2005). An educative look at "Educating School Leaders". *University Council for Educational Administration XLVI* (2), 1-4.
- Young, M., & Kochan, F. (2004). UCEA leaders respond: Supporting leadership for America's schools." *Better Leaders for America's Schools: Perspectives on the Manifesto*. Columbia, MO: University Council for Educational Administration 115-129.
- Young, M. D., & Peterson, G. T. (Eds.) (2002). Ensuring the capacity of university-based educational leadership preparation: The collected works of the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation (Special Issue). *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2).
- Young, M. D., Peterson, G. T., & Short, P. M. (2002). The complexity of substantive reform: A Call for interdependence among key stakeholders. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 130-136.

Zigler, T. A., & Allen, J. G. (2007). Teacher leadership: The “tipping pont” in principal preparation programs. In L. LeMasters & R. Papa (Eds.), *2007 Yearbook of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA)* (pp. 444-451). Lancaster, PA: Pro-Active Publications.