University of Tennessee, Knoxville

TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange

Doctoral Dissertations

Graduate School

12-2006

Instructional Leadership and Academic Performance in Tennessee High Schools

Denise Minton Johnson
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss

Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons

Recommended Citation

Johnson, Denise Minton, "Instructional Leadership and Academic Performance in Tennessee High Schools. " PhD diss., University of Tennessee, 2006.
https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/4252

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Denise Minton Johnson entitled "Instructional Leadership and Academic Performance in Tennessee High Schools." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Educational Administration.

Gerald Ubben, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Judith Boser, Ernest W. Brewer, Gregory C. Petty

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Denise Minton Johnson entitled " Instructional Leadership and Academic Performance in Tennessee High Schools." I have examined the final paper copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Educational Administration and Policy Studies.

Gerald Ubben, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Judith Boser

Ernest W. Brewer

Gregory C. Petty

Accepted for the Council:

Interim Dean of Graduate Studies

Thesis
2006b
.J63

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE IN TENNESSEE HIGH SCHOOLS

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Denise Minton Johnson

December 2006

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my husband, Walker, for his encouragement, support, and for always believing in me and to my mother, Heidi C. Minton, whose life epitomized the meaning of lifelong learning.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people have helped to make this achievement come true. I especially wish to thank my committee chair, Dr. Gary Ubben, who came to my rescue during a crucial time and guided me through this journey with inordinate patience and a sense of humor. Thanks to my committee members, Dr. Judith Boser, Dr. Ernest W. Brewer, and Dr. Gregory C. Petty, for their input and guidance and to Dr. Michael Winstead for his assistance during the research and data analysis process.

I would also like to recognize the members of the Graf Scholars cohort: Connie, Duran, Edd, Faye, Gene, Jess Ann, Karen, Linda, Myrna, Patton, and Susan. Their friendship, humor, and support enabled me to endure the endless hours of coursework and Saturday forums. Special thanks goes to Steve Moser for helping to keep me on track and for being supportive during the rocky times. Finally, I wish to thank my good friend, Ann Tuggle, for being my "learning buddy", for always encouraging me, and for always being there when I needed her.

ABSTRACT

During this era of high academic accountability, principals are expected to be learning leaders and to orchestrate their schools' academic improvement. Despite these high expectations, few studies have linked principal instructional leadership behavior with student academic achievement. The purpose of this study was to determine if differences in instructional leadership behavior existed between principals of high-achieving, high-performing, low-achieving, and low-performing schools.

The population of this study was public high school principals in Tennessee. Two hundred seventy-six (276) principals whose schools' State of Tennessee Report Cards contained three years of academic achievement and academic performance data were surveyed using the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale, an instrument used to measure the frequency of instructional leadership behavior implementation within ten domains of instructional leadership.

Both *t* tests and an ANOVA were used to analyze data. A .05 significance level was used for all statistical tests. No statistical differences were found between high and low-achieving schools or high and low-performing schools. However, when achievement and performance data were combined, statistical significance was found in four domains of instructional leadership: framing school goals, protecting instructional time, maintaining high visibility, and promoting professional development.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE 1

INTRODUCTION 1
Statement of the Problem 5
Purpose of the Study 5
Research Questions 5
Definition of Terms 6
Assumptions 7
Limitation and Delimitations 7
Organization of the Study 8

CHAPTER TWO 9

REVIEW OF LITERATURE 9
Definitions of Instructional Leadership 9
Conceptual Frameworks 11
Attributes, Behaviors, and Competencies 13
Vision and Mission 15
Culture and Climate 20
High Visibility 28
Focus on Results 30
Quality Staff Development 33
Empowerment 34
Contextual Variables That Influence Instructional Leadership 41
Barriers to Instructional Leadership 45
Instructional Leadership Versus Management 49
Developing Instructional Leaders 51
Summary 54

CHAPTER THREE 56

METHODOLOGY 56
Research Questions 56
Data Sources 56
Study Design 57
Population 58
Procedure 59
Data Analysis 60
Instrumentation 60
Summary 65

CHAPTER FOUR 66

DATA DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS 66
Data Description 66
Principal Demographics 67
Data Analyses 71
Data Analysis Summary 101
Summary 107

CHAPTER FIVE 111

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 111
Design Summary 112
Summary of Findings 112
Conclusions 112
Implications 116
Recommendations 117

REFERENCES 119

APPENDICES 139

VITA 144

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Number of Schools and Percentage of Principal Response by Quadrant 67

Table 2: Principal Gender by Quadrant 69

Table 3: Principal Experience by Quadrant 70

Table 4: Overall Years of Principal Experience 70

Table 5: Difference in Leadership Between High and Low Achieving Schools 73

Table 6: Difference in Leadership Between High and Low Performing Schools 74

Table 7: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Domain 1 75

Table 8: Differences in Leadership Behavior in Question 1 of Domain 1 77

Table 9: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 3 of Domain 1 77

Table 10: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 5 of Domain 1 78

Table 11: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Domain 2 78

Table 12: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 6 of Domain 2 80

Table 13: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 9 of Domain 2 80

Table 14: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 10 of Domain 2 81

Table 15: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Domain 3 82

Table 16: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 11 of Domain 3 83

Table 17: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 12 of Domain 3 83

Table 18: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 14 of Domain 3 84

Table 19: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Domain 4 85

Table 20: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 16 of Domain 4 86

Table 21: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Domain 5 87

Table 22: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 23 of Domain 5 88

Table 23: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Domain 6 89

Table 24: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 28 of Domain 6 90

Table 25: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 29 of Domain 6 91

Table 26: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 30 of Domain 6 91

Table 27: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Domain 7 92

Table 28: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 31 of Domain 7 93

Table 29: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 34 of Domain 7 94

Table 30: Difference In Leadership Behavior in Domain 8 95

Table 31: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Domain 9 96

Table 32: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 41 of Domain 9 97

Table 33: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 45 of Domain 9 98

Table 34: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Domain 10 99

Table 35: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 49 of Domain 10 100

Table 36: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 50 of Domain 10 101

Table 37: Difference in Principal Leadership Behavior Between High Achieving/Low-Achieving and High-Performing/Low-Performing Schools 102

Table 38: Difference in Leadership Behavior in the Ten Domains of the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale 104

Table 39: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Questions of the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale 108

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Academic achievement/performance matrix 61

Figure 2: Quadrant mean scores for Domain 1 75

Figure 3: Quadrant mean scores for Domain 2 79

Figure 4: Quadrant mean scores for Domain 3 82

Figure 5: Quadrant mean scores for Domain 4 85

Figure 6: Quadrant mean scores for Domain 5 87

Figure 7: Quadrant mean scores for Domain 6 89

Figure 8: Quadrant mean scores for Domain 7 93

Figure 9: Quadrant mean scores for Domain 8 95

Figure 10: Quadrant mean scores for Domain 9 97

Figure 11: Quadrant mean scores for Domain 10 99

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The twenty-first century ushered in the demand for high levels of academic accountability in public education, both at the state and federal levels. A survey of secondary principals conducted between 2000-02 revealed that the majority of states rely on standardized testing as the most prevalent measure of student achievement. Schools are also required to meet state or district performance goals and have formal school improvement plans (Cooley & Shen, 2003). The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 set high achievement goals for all students and imposed sanctions for those schools failing to meet them. Despite increasing accountability, secondary principals in ten states, including Tennessee, reported that nearly half of their schools failed to meet district and state standards. This failure rate was due to two factors: the effectiveness of the school and the criteria set for schools to reach academic standards (Cooley & Shen).

Principals are considered to be the key players both for creating and sustaining well-run schools and for developing schools with high student achievement (Glanz, 2006c; Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Hoy & Hoy, 2006; Matthew & Crow, 2003; Zepeda, 2003). A principal's major role is to help provide the focus and support system to enable teachers to develop their classrooms for greater instructional effectiveness (Fullan, Hill, & Crevola, 2006). Studies have indicated that a high positive correlation exists between certain principal instructional leadership behaviors and student achievement (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

The role of the principal as instructional leader emerged in the late 1980s. This focus was based on research that found that children, particularly poor children and

children of color, showed increases in achievement if guided by strong instructional leaders (Grogan & Andrews, 2002). The studies of Weber (1971), Brookover and Lezotte (1979), and Edmonds (1979) established five characteristics present in schools that seemed to have a significant effect on student achievement: (1) high expectations for student achievement; (2) strong administrative leadership; (3) a safe and orderly environment conducive to learning; (4) an emphasis on basic skills acquisition; and (5) frequent monitoring of student progress. Edmonds added that a common purpose and clear goals tied with the instructional leadership of the principal contributed to school effectiveness.

Longitudinal studies completed in New York, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and Maryland indicated that no single factor contributed to exceptional schools. However, these schools demonstrated a group of positive factors that, characterized as a whole, made a difference in school performance. Among these factors were those related to the principal: (1) strong leadership; (2) strong principal participation in the classroom instructional program and in actual teaching; (3) higher principal expectations for student and teacher performance; and (4) greater principal control over the functioning of the school, curriculum, program, and staff (Austin, 1979).

Smith and Andrews (1989) characterized a strong instructional leader as one who gives curriculum and instruction the highest priority, rallies and mobilized resources to enable the accomplishment of goals, and creates a climate of high expectations for academic achievement and respect for all students. Edmonds (1979) saw instructional leadership as an indispensable characteristic of effective schools, "without which the

disparate elements of good schooling can neither be brought together nor kept together" (p. 22).

As recently as fifteen years ago, principals were largely responsible for scheduling, managing buses, ensuring a safe building, ordering supplies, and other managerial tasks (Glanz, 2006c). According to Young (2004), "that principalship doesn't exist anymore" (p.50). Though still accountable for managerial tasks, principals today are ultimately responsible for providing top-quality instructional leadership that reflects best practices for the chief purpose of ensuring student achievement (Glanz). Principals are supposed to focus on student achievement, yet students come to school less prepared to focus on learning, due to enormous pressure placed on them by the breakdown of family structures and the out-of-school demands that compete for their learning time (Grogan & Andrews, 2002).

While the principal workweek averages 62 hours, less than one third of that time is spent in instructional activities (Schiff, 2002). School districts that wish to cultivate strong instructional leaders must realign the practices, responsibilities, and duties assigned to principals, delegating many of the nonacademic tasks to other administrators and staff (Cross & Rice, 2000; Reeves, 2006), yet the principal ultimately must play the orchestrating role (Glanz). Cotton (2003) contended that the key difference between highly effective and less effective principals is that the former are highly involved in the curricular and instructional life of their schools.

Where schools are successful, one will find principals who place academics first and know how to motivate staff and teachers. They must also thoroughly understand the curriculum, master data interpretation, and use data to improve student opportunities to

learn (Cross & Rice, 2000). Principals in nationally recognized schools placed high priority on strong goal orientation, active assessment, strong focus on academic subjects, and teacher-initiated instruction (Arnn & Mangieri, 1988). Effective leaders serve as role models, making sure their actions are consistent with their values and sending a strong message about what work is important. They also inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and challenge the heart by praising people and recognizing success (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Principals who aspire to be strong instructional leaders must also understand the theories underlying organizational change (Fullan, 2001), knowing what behaviors impact both first and second order change. They understand how to do the "right work" (Marzano, 2005). When leaders shift their focus from larger numbers of random practices, they can maximize their energy and focus their effort on the things that are most important (Reeves, 2006).

Despite its importance, far less research has been conducted on the leadership-achievement relationship than one might expect. Hallinger and Heck (1996) identified only 40 studies that addressed the relationship between school leadership and student academic achievement. In their analysis of research over the last 35 years, Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) found more than 5000 articles and studies that addressed leadership in schools, but only 69 that examined the quantitative relationship between building leadership and the academic achievement of students. Research has also provided little insight into how principals contribute to their schools' academic achievement. (Donmoyer, 1985).

Though not without controversy, Hershberg (2005) argued that shifting to value-added assessment model is the key to raising the achievement for all students. However,

this model has only been adopted by three states: Tennessee, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. Only four other states, Arkansas, Minnesota, Colorado, and Florida, have passed legislation calling for the introduction of the value-added model.

Statement of the Problem

While many studies and articles address the topic of school leadership, few examine the quantitative relationship between building instructional leadership, student achievement, and student academic gain.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if differences in instructional leadership behavior existed among principals of high-achieving, high-performing, low-achieving, and low-performing schools as measured by principal perceptions and their responses to the PIMRS. (See definition of terms)

Research Questions

This study was guided by three research questions. These questions were designed to examine possible differences in instructional leadership behavior as measured by principal responses to the PIMRS.

1. Do principals of high-achieving high schools perform a different set of instructional leadership behaviors than principals of low-achieving high schools?

2. Do principals of high-performing high schools perform a different set of instructional leadership behaviors than principals of low-performing high schools?

3. Do differences in instructional leadership behaviors exist between principals of (a) high-achieving, high-performing schools; (b) high-achieving, low-performing schools; (c) low-achieving, high-performing schools; and (d) low-achieving, low-performing schools?

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined below. These definitions will enable the reader to better understand the terminology used in this study.

1. American College Test (ACT): The ACT test is a widely accepted college entrance exam that assesses high school students' general educational knowledge and their ability to complete college-level work. The test is comprised of two segments: (1) a multiple-choice segment that covers the skill areas of English, mathematics, reading, and science; and (2) a writing test. A school's three-year mean ACT score was used in this study as the measure of academic achievement.

2. Gain Score: The gain score is the difference between the projected score and observed three-year value-added score based on the three-year ACT average. A school's gain score was used to determine if the school was considered to be high or low performing.

3. High achieving school: A high-achieving school is one whose three year composite ACT was higher than 20.5. The 2005 three-year mean score for the state was 20.5.

4. High performing school: A high performing school is one whose three-year value-added gain score is .1 or greater. These students are making significantly more progress than students in an average school in the state. A value-added score of zero indicates that students are making one year's academic growth at a particular school.

5. Instructional leadership: For operational purposes of this study, instructional leadership is defined as any action or behavior the principal employs to ensure higher student achievement or higher student academic growth.

6. Low achieving school: A low achieving school is one whose three-year composite ACT score was less than 20.5. The 2005 three-year mean score for the state was 20.5.

7. Low performing school: A low performing school is one whose three-year value-added gain score is -.1 or greater. These students are making significantly less progress than students in an average school in the state. A value-added score of zero indicates that students are making one year's academic growth at a particular school.

8. Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS): The PIMRS is a 50-question survey instrument designed by Phillip Hallinger (1983). This instrument was designed to measure the frequency in which principals engage in specific instructional leadership behaviors. These behaviors are linked to 10 domains of instructional leadership.

9. Value-Added: Value-added is a statistical formula developed by Dr. William Sanders to measure student progress within a grade and subject. At the high school level a prediction formula is used based on student's previous academic performance for ACT, Gateway, and End of Course assessments and writing assessments. This diagnostic tool is designed to improve educational opportunity for students at various achievement levels.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made in this study. It was assumed that these would not adversely affect the study's outcome.

1. The Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) is a valid and reliable measure of instructional leadership behavior.

2. The ACT test is a valid measure of student achievement.

3. A school's value-added score is a valid measurement of student academic growth.

Limitation and Delimitations

A limitation of this study was the perceptions principals held regarding their instructional leadership and the impact of social desirability on these perceptions. When asked to self-assess, respondents tend to either overestimate or underestimate skills or behaviors (Hallinger, 1983).

The delimitations of the study are that it focused solely on the high school principalship and the responses given to the survey instrument. It was assumed that the data generated from surveys of high school principals would provide a different set of behaviors from that of elementary principals due to differences in goals, structure,

organization and delivery, and linkages to the parents and community (Firestone & Herriott, 1982; Smith & Andrews, 1989). In addition, while others besides the principal may be involved in instructional leadership roles at the high school level, the principal, by virtue of the title, is deemed the instructional leader of the school.

Organization of the Study

This study was organized following the sequence described here. Chapter One includes the introduction, problem statement, purpose of the study, assumptions, research questions, limitations and delimitations, and a summary of the study.

Chapter Two includes a review of literature, focusing on the issues germane to instructional leadership. These issues include definitions of instructional leadership, conceptual frameworks, competencies and behaviors associated with the role, variables that impact principal performance as instructional leaders, barriers to performance as the instructional leader, and suggestions for development of instructional leadership.

Chapter Three describes the research methods and procedures that frame the study. Chapter Four contains the findings and subsequent data analysis for the study. Chapter Five includes a summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations drawn from the analysis of the data.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter discusses the issues relevant to principal instructional leadership. It is divided into 6 major parts. Part 1 defines instructional leadership. Part 2 discusses the conceptual frameworks around which instructional leadership is constructed. Part 3 describes the competencies and behaviors associated with the principal's role as the instructional leader. Contextual variables and other barriers that impact a principal's performance as an instructional leader are examined in part 4. Part 5 discusses the potential role conflict between instructional leadership and management. Part 6 offers suggestions for the development of instructional leaders.

Definitions of Instructional Leadership

The role of the principal as the instructional leader of the school and its impact on student achievement first emerged in the effective schools research (Andrews & Soder, 1987; Austin, 1979; Brookover et al., 1978; Edmonds, 1979; Lyons & Shealtham, 1988). Although support was found for the necessity of strong leadership in effective schools, the findings were in conflict. A major reason for these discrepancies was the absence of a clear definition for the concept (Hallinger & Murphy, 1987; Sheppard, 1982; Stronge, 1993).

Both broad and narrow interpretations of instructional leadership appeared in the literature (Sheppard, 1982). The narrow interpretation focused on instructional leadership as a separate entity from management (Murphy, 1998) and was defined as those actions directly related to teaching and learning, observable behaviors such as classroom supervision (Sheppard). Shelland (2003) more narrowly defined instructional leadership

as the knowledge and skills principals must possess to actively support the academic program. Stevens (2001) viewed instructional leaders as persons who specialize in implementing and revising the curriculum. Lipham, Rankin, and Hoeh (1985) defined it as improving the instructional program through assessment of program objectives, planning for improvement, and implementing program change.

A broader interpretation defined instructional leadership as all leadership activities and behaviors that promote the growth of student learning (DeBevoise, 1984; Donmoyer & Wagstaff, 1990) or the guidance and direction of instructional improvement (Elmore, 2000). Under this conceptual view, managerial behaviors were considered to contribute as much to student learning as did those behaviors directly related to student learning (Donmoyer & Wagstaff, 1990; Murphy, 1988). Hallinger (1993) and Hallinger and Murphy (1985) referred to instructional leadership as instructional management, accepting management as an integral part of concept.

This lack of a concise definition is one of the weaknesses in the research on instructional leadership (Hallinger & Murphy, 1987) and leads to miscommunication, role conflict, and low principal evaluation ratings (Avila, 1990; Stronge, 1993). Ginsberg (1988) asserted that this miscommunication is perhaps the major obstacle for effective instructional leadership. Faced with both varied definitions and an array of behaviors, principals are confused about what they should be doing. Avila argued that principals should themselves craft a definition for instructional leadership as it fits their situation through a sense of literature, discussions with peers and supervisors, and staff input. That definition, and those tasks associated with it, should then be shared with staff in order to establish common expectations from which both parties can operate.

Conceptual Frameworks

Several frameworks for instructional leadership emerged from the literature. Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, and Lee (1982) proposed a model in which instructional leadership is influenced by person, school, and community factors. This behavior in turn influenced school climate and organization that impacted student achievement. Unlike subsequent frameworks, no specific behaviors were linked to the instructional leadership of the principal.

The Hallinger and Murphy (1985) framework was based on observations of elementary principals and a review of the literature on school effectiveness. From these analyses they created a framework based on functions and processes. The three major functions of instructional leadership were defining the mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive school climate. Defining the school mission included framing school goals and communicating these goals to the staff and community. Principals managed the instructional program by supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating curriculum, and monitoring student progress. A positive school climate was created by protecting instructional time, promoting professional development, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers, enforcing academic standards, and providing academic incentives for students.

The Murphy (1990) model was developed from four major sources: the literature on effective schools, on school improvement, on staff development, and on organizational change. From this review a framework based on four dimensions of instructional leadership was developed and broken down into sixteen different behaviors.

Murphy's four dimensions were developing mission and goals, managing the educational production function, promoting academic learning climate, and developing a supportive work environment. The first three dimensions and behaviors mirrored the Hallinger and Murphy (1985), model but the fourth dimension, developing a supportive work environment, added the behaviors of creating a safe, orderly environment, providing opportunities for meaningful student involvement, developing staff collaboration and cohesion, securing outside resources in support of school goals, and forging links between the home and the school.

The Weber (1996) model identified five essential domains of instructional leadership based on his review of the literature: defining the mission, managing curriculum and instruction, promoting a positive learning climate, observing and improving instruction, and assessing the instructional program. This model was consistent with both the Hallinger and Murphy (1985) and Murphy (1990) models and contained many of the same elements. The major difference was the addition of the assessment function in which the instructional leader contributed to the planning, designing, administering, and analysis of assessments to evaluate the effectiveness of the curriculum. Weber also advocated for the imperativeness of leadership, regardless of who wore the instructional leadership mantle, asserting that professionals needed a single point of contact who served as the advocate for teaching and learning.

Alig-Mulcarick and Hoy (2005) proposed a more simplified model with three dimensions: defining and communicating shared goals, monitoring and providing feedback on the teaching and learning process, and promoting school-wide professional development. As in the other models, specific behaviors were aligned with each function.

All of these models show the importance of three fundamental leadership functions: defining and communicating goals, monitoring and providing feedback on the teaching and learning process and promoting the importance of professional development. These three processes are consistent with Locke and Latham's (1984) goal-setting theory, which is one of the most effective theories of motivation (Hoy & Miskel, 2001).

These functions of instructional leadership apply the goal-setting theory in an educational setting. The instructional leader works with staff to establish shared goals and to embrace them. The leader then monitors the goals and provides feedback on them as they pertain to the specific goals related to the teaching and learning process. Finally, it is the leader's responsibility to provide the resources and staff development to help teachers achieve their goals and to increase both their craftsmanship and efficacy.

Attributes, Behaviors, and Competencies

Just as there was no concise definition for instructional leadership, no generic list or template of leadership attributes, behaviors, or competencies existed in the literature (Goldberg, 2001). A plethora of characteristics for effective instructional leadership emerged. Some of these correlated to the strict interpretation of instructional leadership and included: the amount of content, academic focus to coursework; focus and sequence to coursework; breadth and depth of content; differential access to knowledge; homework as an extension of content; curricular alignment and quality of course objectives; teaching as an experimental science; monitoring student performance; evaluating student outcomes; demonstrating the use of varied evaluation strategies; promoting the use of responsive and authentic forms of assessment; and the examination of the congruence between the taught and tested curriculum (Behar-Horenstien & Ornstein, 1999; Gersten

& Carnine, 1981; Hallinger & Murphy, 1987; Krug, 1993; Lipham, Rankin, & Hoeh, 1985; Murphy, 1990; Sagor, 1992).

Other behaviors found in the literature were more conceptual skills and correlated to the broad interpretation of the definition. These skills included visibility in the classroom, good listening skills, the ability to empower faculty, the propensity to set clear goals and have these goals serve as a source of motivation, a high degree of self-confidence and openness to others, a tolerance for ambiguity, a tendency to test the limits of interpersonal and organizational systems, a sensitivity to the dynamics of power, an analytical perspective, the ability to take charge of their jobs, knowledge of their beliefs, a clear vision, staff communication, a safe environment, quality instruction, monitoring of school performance, framing goals, protecting instructional time, incentives for teachers, providing staff development, treating teachers as professionals, creating a non-restrictive work environment, modeling participatory decision-making, leading by consensus building, demonstrating reflective listening, understanding the context under which the school operates, high expectations of trust, and the courage to seek assistance (Blum, Butler, & Olsen, 1987; Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986; Cross & Rice, 2000; DeBovoise, 1984; Lewellen, 1990; NAESP/NASSP/ERS, 2000; Newfeld & Freeman, 1992; Sergiovanni & Starrett 1998). Despite the many behaviors found in the literature, six key behaviors or competencies emerged throughout: leading through vision and mission, the creation of a culture and climate for learning, high visibility, a focus on results, creating quality staff development, and the empowerment of others. These are discussed in greater detail.

Vision and Mission

Instructional leaders lead through vision and mission (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; DuFour & Eaker, 1998; Fullan, 1992; Herman, 1990; Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Marriott, 2001; McEwan, 1998; Murphy, 1988; Ovard, 1990; Ripley, 1997; Rogus, 1990; Rosson, 1990; Schlechty, 1991; Senge et al., 1994; Sergiovanni, 1984; Spady, 2001;Welch, Lindsey, & Halfacre, 2001). Missions serve as the building blocks that anchor the organization (DuFour & Eaker). Missions must be clear and focused, as they are the reasons for the organization's existence (DuFour & Eaker; Rosson). In discussing the mission of the organization, all stakeholders must be able to answer three key questions: (1) Why are we here?, (2) How are we doing?, and (3) What evidence do we have for our answer?

Missions must be more than just half-hearted affirmations (DuFour & Eaker, 1998). If the mission of a school is high levels of student learning, then the principal and staff must ask themselves what they expect students to learn and how they will fulfill the collective responsibility to ensure that this learning takes place. The key to a successful mission is the willingness to accept responsibility for making it happen, for fulfilling the purpose of the organization.

As instructional leaders, principals must also have a personal mission that meshes with that of the organization. This mission serves as the driving force in meeting expectations and directing activities used to motivate staff to improve performance, which results in improved student learning.

If the mission of an organization is its purpose, then the vision is the guiding star that gives it its sense of direction (DuFour & Eaker, 1992). Visions are vital to all effective organizations.

> To choose a direction, a leader must first have developed a mental image of the possible and desirable future state of the organization. This image... may be as vague as a dream or as precise as a goal or mission statement. The crucial point is that a vision articulates a view of a realistic, credible, attractive future for the organization, a condition that is better in some important ways than what now exists. (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 84)

The definition of vision differs. Sergiovanni (1984) defined vision as the "desired state of affairs that induces commitment among those working in the organization (p.8). Spady and Schwahn (2001) defined it as the "clear, concrete picture of what you want your organization to look like when accomplishing its purpose and operating at is absolute or ideal best (p. 11) and McEwan (1998) saw it as " a driving force reflecting the leader's image of the future, based on his or her values, beliefs, and experiences" (p. 69).

Despite these differences, albeit subtle, the literature advocated that schools must be managed by vision and values, rather than by programs and the exercise of authority (Schlechty, 1991). Schools must be lead by those who have a clear vision of what is important (Bennis & Nanus, 1985) and can translate that vision into good realities. A school's vision lies at the heart of its activity (Rogus, 1990). Students and teachers want to know what is of value to the school and to its leadership (Sergiovanni, 1984).

Just as instructional leaders must have their personal missions, they must also hold their own visions and understand their own values. These values rest upon the ability of the leader to answer six questions: (1) Who am I?; (2) What do I stand for? ;

(3) What will I ask them to do?; (4) What will I not ask them to do?; (5) What will I do for them?; and (6) What will I not do for them? (Welch, Lindsey, & Halfacre, 2001).

The answers to these questions help to formulate values from which visions and missions arise. Typically, educational leaders view leadership through "educentric" eyes and experiences (Spady & Schwan, 2001). That is, they look first at the issues, problems, and challenges they face and then for the best solutions for those problems. Thus, the existing system and problems drive the leadership actions they take. In contrast, a Total Leader Model reverses this dynamic by asking educators to look at education with an out-of-the-box perspective. Total leaders inherently view changing conditions as opportunities to create new futures for themselves and their organizations, not as threats to their existence. The orientations and skills of visionary leaders are necessary to carry out this change function (Spady & Schwan). Bryan Smith (in Senge et. al, 1994) offered four scenarios for implementing a vision within an organization:

1. Telling-the principal knows what the vision should be and announces it to the staff;
2. Testing-the principal has an idea what the vision should be, but "runs it up the flag pole" to staff before proceeding;
3. Consulting-the principal appoints a committee to develop a vision for review, but reserves the right to ignore suggestions once they are made; and
4. Co-creating-the principal and staff build a vision together.

In educational organizations clearly defined visions are not articulated by a leader at the top and then instilled by followers (Murphy, 1988). Principals become blinded by their own vision when they feel they must manipulate teachers to conform to it. The most

effective approach to develop ownership of a vision is to involve those in the planning process who will be affected by its implementation (Fullan, 1992; Rogus, 1990).

Shared visions offer many benefits (DuFour & Eaker, 1998). Shared visions motivate and energize people. When people connect everyday work with shared purpose, they find their jobs more meaningful. Shared visions create more proactive orientation. Schools tend to be reactive and problem-driven. When problems arise, schools attempt to restore the status quo. A shared vision helps focus on creating a new future.

A shared vision gives direction to the organization by simplifying the decision-making process and empowering those in the organization to act with greater confidence. Rather than ask the principal for approval, staff members need only to ask, Is this in line with our vision? They then should act accordingly. Shared vision creates an agenda for action by helping to assess current practices and to identify discrepancies between what is envisioned and currently reality. A shared vision helps to bridge the gap between what currently exists within the organization and what will be.

To bring an organization to the point consistent with the vision is a long-term process that requires an action plan (Herman, 1990; Rogus, 1990). Herman advocated that principals should involve all stakeholders in the following activities:

1. reaching consensus on the beliefs that provide the underpinnings for the culture of the school;

2. collecting important data such as disaggregated student test scores and school climate measures;

3. collecting external data such as those related to demographic, political, economic, and attitudinal data; and

4. identifying those few Critical Success Factors that are absolutely necessary to achieve a productive and caring school.

DuFour and Eaker (1992) advocated the use of a task force to achieve consensus on a school's vision. In organizing this group, the following factors should be taken into consideration: (1) representation from the diverse groups with the school, teachers, parents, administrators, students, and community and business leaders; (2) the influence of the individuals within their group; (3) the ability of group members to maintain a broad perspective and be able to compromise; (4) the inclusion of key policy makers; and (5) the principal's role as chair to model the importance of the process.

One effective strategy to reach consensus was to ask a number of different groups to respond to one or more key questions: (1) What do you believe are the characteristics of an exemplary school? (2) In what ways would you like our school to be significantly different three years from now? (3) What have we accomplished in the past three years that you find as a source of pride? (4) What can we do in the next three years that would make us proud? Once the vision statement has been developed it should be evaluated using the following criteria: (1) Is it written? (2) Is it widely disseminated? (3) Is it widely supported? (4) Is it used in the daily operation of the school (DuFour & Eaker, 1992)? A strong, collaboratively developed vision enables the organization to move from vision to strategies and action. Effective visions obligate people to act because commitments have been made to them during the development process (Sergiovanni, 2005).

A school's vision, once established, must be periodically revisited. Nanus (1992) wrote,

> sooner or later the time will come when an organization needs redirection or perhaps a complete transformation, and then the first

> step should always be a new vision, a wake-up call to everyone in the organization that fundamental change is needed and is on the way. (p. 9)

In reviewing visions of organizations, DuFour and Eaker (1998) suggested questions that should be posed: (1) Has current research presented any new insights into how schools can fulfill their missions more effectively? (2) Has there been any change in the factors that impact our school? (3) Is the school described in our vision the school we still wish to create?

Maintaining a vision relies upon values and on modeling the vision throughout the organization. Ovard (1990) maintained principals must hold fast to some long-standing values: the value and importance of education for all American youth; that quantity should not be the first solution to improve quality; that education must take stands against claims of school failure. Modeling the vision is a strategic leadership process needed to move an organization toward a positive school culture. "While the process begins with the exploration of thoughts and words that define professional values, it is the concrete, daily behavior of the school leader that communicates what is valued and important in a school" (Marriott, 2001, p.75). Thus, as the instructional leader, the principal must facilitate the development of the vision and mission for the school and communicate their importance daily. Where vision and mission are concerned, principals should adhere to both "loose" and "tight" leadership styles, encouraging autonomy while at the same time demanding adherence to shared vision and values (DuFour & Eaker, 1998).

Culture and Climate

Instructional leaders help to create a culture and climate conducive to high levels of student learning. Culture is defined as the set of norms, beliefs, assumptions,

behaviors, and attitudes by a given set of people during a given time (Lambert, 1998). These unwritten expectations are built up over time as parents, teachers, students, and administrators work together to solve problems, deal with challenges, and, at times, cope with failure (Peterson, 2002). Culture is reflective of the norms and values of many. It is the group's expectations, a consensus of what is important. It is the way everyone conducts business (Deal & Peterson 1999). More simply stated, it is "the way we do things around here" (DuFour & Eaker, 1998, p. 133).

Strong cultures can improve both the internal and external productivity of schools (Deal & Kennedy, 1993). In many schools teachers and students do not know what is expected of them nor do they understand their actions are related to school-wide efforts, thus divisive subcultures form. Strong cultures provide the internal cohesion that makes it easier for all constituents to contribute to the instructional process. The lack of a cohesive culture makes it difficult to secure external support. A strong culture communicates a school's identity and makes it easier for outsiders to get involved in a school's mission and vision. Culture is the foundation for school improvement and can either energize or undermine the elements of the process (Saphier & King, 1995). "A school's culture can dictate whether attempts at collaboration and continuous improvement will flourish or wither on the vine" (Roy, 2005, p. 3).

In positive cultures certain norms exist (DuFour & Eaker, 1998; Fullan, 2001; Hord, 1997; Lambert, 1998; Saphier & King, 1995; Taylor, 2002). These norms include a widely shared sense of purpose and values; norms of continuous learning and improvement; a commitment to and a sense of responsibility for the learning of all students; collaborative and collegial relationships; opportunities for staff reflection,

collective inquiry, and personal practice; experimentation; trust and confidence; appreciation and recognition; caring, celebration, and humor; involvement in decision-making; protection of what is important; traditions; and honest, open communication. In addition, schools with strong cultures often have a common professional language, stories of success, extensive opportunities for quality professional development, and ceremonies that celebrate improvement, collaboration, and learning (Deal & Peterson, 1999).

The antithesis of a positive culture is one with "toxic" norms that hinder growth and learning (Peterson, 2002). Schools with toxic cultures lack a clear sense of purpose, have norms that reflect inertia, blame students for lack of progress, discourage collaboration, and often have actively hostile relations among staff. Principals are the key to addressing negativity and working to shape more positive cultures (DuFour & Burnette, 2002; Peterson).

Principals and other school leaders can and should shape school culture. They can do this through three key processes. First, they read the culture, understanding the history as well as the current norms and values: what is seen, not seen, heard, and experienced in the school. Second, they assess the culture to determine which elements support the vision and which elements can hinder its implementation. Finally, they actively shape the culture by reinforcing positive aspects and working to transform those aspects that are negative (Barth, 2002; Deal & Peterson, 1999; DuFour & Burnette, 2002; Peterson, 2002; Zepeda, 2004). Shaping culture is akin to gardening. Just as weeds can take over a garden left unattended, so bad cultures will drive out the good unless the desired culture is tended (DuFour & Eaker, 1998).

Bulach (2001) recommended a four-step process for the identification and shaping of a school's culture. The first step is the expectations diagnosis. Faculty members are asked to write their expectations of the principal regarding the rules for faculty behavior on index cards. This diagnosis creates a subtle shift in power. Principals enforce the expectations of the faculty rather than their own. Instead of using position and power to enforce rules, principals use moral power to motivate others to do what is right (Sergiovanni & Starrett, 1998). In Step Two teachers perform an expectations diagnosis with their students. This process leads to the same power shift in the classrooms. In Step Three the principal asks the staff for feedback about the existing norms they previously identified. This helps to build trust and allows principals to anticipate future problems that may arise. In the final step the administration conducts a year-end assessment of the culture in order to gain information about the school's strengths and weaknesses. This information can be used to develop a plan for the upcoming year. Involving staff members in helping to shape a culture encourages and seeks a win/win result.

In their study of seven high-achieving, high- poverty, urban middle schools, Picucci, Brownson, Kaklert, and Sabel (2002) found in these schools leaders committed to creating cultures that valued equity and high expectations. These leaders promoted their values through dialogue, actions, and symbolic gestures. The study also found that these principals built consensus by acting with caution, asking staff members to make tough choices, identifying advocates, sharing authority, supporting staff members, eliminating distractions, and giving staff members time to collaborate.

Once established, strong cultures become imbedded in the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of staff members. When a strong, positive culture exists in a school, members

feel a responsibility to protect it. Tending to culture is nonlinear and requires rapid response to unanticipated problems. Cultural norms are invisible and implicit; they are made up of subtleties in the day-to day workings of the school. At no time is the culture of a school complete and permanent. Culture needs on-going attention from all involved (DuFour & Burnette, 2002). Whatever principals and the administrative team model will profoundly shape the culture of a school (Zepeda, 2004). Principals in healthy cultures: (a) are visible to all stakeholders; (b) communicate regularly and purposefully; (c) never forget they are role models; (d) are passionate about their work; (e) accept responsibility for the school's culture; (f) are organized; (g) exhibit a positive outlook; (h) take pride in the physical environment of the school; (i) empower others appropriately; and (j) demonstrate stewardship by protecting the school and its people.

In contrast, principals in unhealthy cultures: (a) are rarely seen outside their office; (b) find little time for communication; (c) feel that other people are responsible for the building's physical needs; (d) see themselves as the "boss" of the school and seldom empower others; (e) are poorly organized; and (f) habitually make excuses for their school's shortcomings, blaming inadequacies on outside influences (Fiore, 2001).

Cultures are built through the everyday business of school life. Principals who seek to be culture- builders must bring an ever-present awareness of the cultural norms to their daily interactions, decisions, and plans, thus shaping the way these events take place (Saphier & King, 1985). Those who are able to foster shared beliefs and a sense of community have a positive influence on student achievement (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003).

Climate is defined as the perceptions held by those in the organizations of the various aspects of the environment in the organization, perceptions that affect their attitudes and behaviors (Hoy & Miskal, 1996; Owens, 2004). No single factor determines a school's climate; it is the interaction of variables that can lead to optimum levels of teaching and learning (Frieberg, 1998). Culture is one of these variables. The others are the ecology- the building and facilities, technology, and pedagogical inventions; the structure-the hierarchy, bureaucracy, communication, and decision-making patterns; and the milieu-the race, ethnicity, SES, skills, and leadership. A change in one of the variables affects a change in the others and can lead to significant improvement in climate (Owens).

Two major components comprise the climate of a school, the interactions between the principal and the teachers and teacher behaviors (Hoy & Forsyth, 1986). Principal-teacher interaction was described as supportive, directive, or restrictive. Principals who were supported were described as having genuine care for teachers; they respected teachers' professional competencies and looked out for their welfare. Directive principals were more task-oriented with little consideration for the personal needs of their teachers. These principals seemed more aggressive and controlling. Restrictive principals burdened teachers with paperwork and actually hindered teachers' work by their actions.

Hoy and Forsyth (1986) also characterized the behaviors of teachers. Teachers who demonstrated open, professional relationships with mutual respect for their colleagues were said to demonstrate collegial behavior. Teachers were said to have intimate behavior if they were socially supportive of each other and held personal

friendships among peers. Other teachers were disengaged. For these teachers there was no professional focus. They were non-productive and held no respect for their colleagues.

Climates are formed by the collective interaction of the principals and teachers, operate on a continuum, and are described as either open or closed. Open climates are characterized as having a high degree of authenticity and genuine behavior. In these climates there exists no burdensome paperwork, close supervision, impersonal relationships, nor a plethora of rules or regulations. Leadership emerges easily as needed from both teachers and the principal.

In closed climates both the principal and teacher simply go through the motions, with the principal stressing routine trivia and unnecessary busywork. Principals exert close supervision over teachers, which leads to frustration and apathy. The behavior of both the principal and teachers is not genuine; there is much game playing. Skiptunas (1990) found climates less positive in schools where the faculties and students deemed the principal as less effective.

Climate often focuses primarily on the degree of satisfaction by members of the organization. However, a school that seeks to improve must regard climate as both the satisfaction of teachers and students and productivity, which is described in terms of student achievement (DuFour & Eaker, 1992). Schools that are effective in terms of student achievement were characterized by: (a) high expectations for student achievement; (b) protected instructional time; (c) an orderly atmosphere, conducive to learning; and (d) a closely monitored learning program.

A random sample of Michigan elementary schools were studied to determine if a correlation existed between school level SES, racial composition, and climate to mean student achievement. The result of this study showed the highest correlation with achievement was climate (Brookover, et al., 1978).

Climate, like culture, requires on-going attention from all people in the organization. Principals ranked establishing a positive climate as the top priority for what they perceived they should be doing and actually were doing (Whitaker & Turner, 2000). Climate Watchers was identified as a group process of supportive interaction designed to accomplish a common goal: to change negative beliefs and behaviors in the climate to common norms that support high achievement for all students. The essential aspects of this process were:

1. identifying both effective and ineffective behaviors and attitudes;
2. explaining why and how these factors relate to achievement;
3. creating an awareness of the existence of these behaviors and attitudes;
4. setting up a forum for the discussion of these; and
5. setting up a procedure for reporting changes, or lack of, in perceptions and behavior.

This type of group process provided the basis for cooperative peer forces that yielded powerful results in changing behaviors (Brookover et al., 1978).

As instructional leaders, principals can shape the climate of their schools both in direct and indirect ways. These behaviors include maintaining high visibility in order to model expectations and communicate priorities; creating a rewards system that reinforces academic achievement and productive effort; protecting instructional time; and selecting,

supporting, and participating in high-quality staff development (Hallinger, 1987). Peters and Waterman (1982) saw this as a " a vast network of influence of informal open communication. . . .a virtual technology of keeping in touch" (pp. 121-122). This requires considerable energy and planning, but principals who are committed to promoting a positive climate must be prepared to meet this challenge (DuFour & Eaker, 1992).

High Visibility

Instructional leaders are highly visible (Bennett, 1988; Blasé & Blasé, 1998; Little & Bird, 1987; Niece, 1983; Smith & Andrews, 1989; Whitaker, 1997). The test of instructional leadership is its influence at the classroom level (Little & Bird). "The most important part of school is not in the office, but in the classrooms, halls, playgrounds, and cafeterias. Principals will never have a sense of the school unless they immerse themselves in its atmosphere" (Whitaker, 1997, p. 155).

One strategy that emerged from the literature to establish high visibility was the walkthrough, a strategy that provides an entire school with feedback about what is it is or is not doing (Carney, 2003; Davidson-Taylor, 2002; Downey et al, 2004; Ginsberg & Murphy, 2002; Richardson, 2001; Ryan, 2002; Schmidt, 2003). To implement successful walkthroughs, schools need to be familiar with their data about student achievement and have deep conversations about what teachers will do to improve student learning. Teachers must be clear about what is to happen in each classroom, and principals must ensure that teachers are provided with staff development opportunities needed to make changes.

School-based teams conduct walkthroughs. These teams are comprised of the principal, assistant principal, and three or four teachers on a rotating basis. The team spends ten to fifteen minutes in each targeted classroom, walking around and talking with one or two students. Following the walkthrough process, the team debriefs and the principal then provides feedback to teachers.

Hall (2001) recommended several questions that may be used to guide classroom visits: (1) Is there a clear academic focus?; (2) What is the level of student engagement?; (3) What do the walls of the classroom show?; (4) How well do students understand the assignment?; and (5) Do students communicate effectively and demonstrate critical thinking skills? Davidson-Taylor (2002) suggested other evidence of student engagement that may be used: quality of student work, quality of student talk, writing in all content areas, curriculum pacing and usage, technology, rigorous curriculum, displays of student work, clearly communicated learning expectations, and student behavior.

> Observed and being observed, getting and giving feedback about one's work in the classroom, may be among the most powerful tools for instructional improvement and professional recognition. (Little & Bird, 1987, p. 122)

Blasé and Blasé (1998) conducted a study of more than 800 elementary, middle, and high school teachers in public schools in several regions in the United States. They asked teachers to describe in detail the characteristics of school principals that influenced them, positively and negatively, in their classroom instruction. The good principals described in the study made informal visits to classrooms and although these visits were usually unannounced, teachers viewed them positively. Teachers speculated that these principals used visits to motivate teachers, monitor instruction, be accessible and provide

support, and to keep informed. According to the data, these visits enhanced teacher motivation, self-esteem, sense of security, or morale.

This same study also found that visits could be detrimental. Ineffective principals actually interrupted and interfered with teachers in their classrooms. Teachers indicated that these interruptions were used to demonstrate power, to monitor, or to inform. Also on the downside were principals who made no, or few, visits. Teachers associated lack of principal visibility with lack of goals, preoccupation with non-instructional concerns, or avoidance of work. These principals were deemed completely ineffective as instructional leaders. Teachers reported that these principals had adverse effect on teacher motivation and self-esteem. They also responded with a significant increase in anger, psychic pain, and feelings of abandonment.

Even those principals who were described as interruptive or interfering faired better with teachers than those who were not visible in classrooms at all. The extent to which principals make systematic and purposeful visits to classrooms and interact frequently with teachers and students correlated positively to student achievement (Marzano, Waters, & Mc Nulty, 2005).

Focus on Results

Instructional leaders are focused on results (Marshall, 2003; Foriska, 1994; Lashway, 2000, 2002; DuFour, 2002; Hoover, 2002; Trimble, 2003; Schlechty, 1991). Accountability is about a school's obligation to society, so it will never be just an internal matter. With school report cards now commonplace and with real consequences riding on the outcome, schools are faced with a higher level of scrutiny than ever before.

The Southern Regional Education Board (1998) described accountability as a system of five closely linked processes: high standards that set the target; carefully designed assessments that measure the target; assessment results that are widely disseminated and publicized; results that have consequences, that are high stakes; and high priority professional development. The greatest challenge for principals is to find the right kind of leadership to meet the challenge of accountability, leadership that is facilitative and focused on conditions under which student performance can thrive. How can principals provide this leadership?

First and foremost, principals must champion standards, sending the message that standards are a priority by discussing them as part of every faculty meeting and as part of the teacher evaluation process (Lashway, 2002). Principals must also have an understanding of the kinds of classrooms that support student achievement and they must create the organizational environment that allows teachers to create the right kinds of classroom conditions. This understanding can be especially difficult at the secondary level where knowledge is specialized and the principal cannot be an expert in all fields (Lashway, 2000). Principals must also help teachers develop assessment literacy, which is the capacity of teachers, both individually and collectively, to: (1) examine student data and make sense of it; (2) set goals and develop an improvement plan from the data; and (3) become influential in discussions about the use and misuse of student data (Schmoker, 1999).

Principals who provide results-oriented leadership must first shift from a focus on instruction to a focus on learning. If schools want to be places where **all** students learn, the focus must be on results (O'Neill & Conzemues, 2006).

> We still do not give results the central concern they deserve...We talk as though we want results, but we generally fail to make the kind of systematic, organized effort that produce them. (Schmoker, p.3)

In order to facilitate this paradigm shift, principals must help teachers:

1. clarify outcomes for each course taught and for each unit within each course taught;

2. make sure that crystal-clear, manageable, grade-by-grade targets are in place before the beginning of each year;

3. develop common assessments; and

4. use student work and assessment data to fine-tune teaching and learning and to target those students who are experiencing difficulty (DuFour, 2002; Marshall, 2003; Schmoker).

Principals and teachers should form partnerships with teaching and learning as the primary goal (Hoy & Hoy, 2006).

Although principals may not be present for the actual work teachers do, they should monitor the process by sitting in on meetings, watching model lessons, analyzing data from sample units, making daily classroom visits, randomly talking to students about their work, and providing feedback to all teachers (Marshall, 2003). The foundation for results is based on meaningful, informed teamwork, clear, measurable goals, and regular collection and analysis of student performance data (Schmoker, 1999). Senge (1990) refers to this as systems mastery. Principals who establish clear goals and keep these goals in the forefront of the school's attention positively impact student achievement (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

Quality Staff Development

Instructional leaders provide quality professional development (DuFour, 1991, 2004; National Staff Development Council, 2003; Payne & Wolfson, 2000; Smith & Andrews, 1989). Because professional development is critical for the success of student achievement and for the school improvement process, principals must place a high priority on the professional development of the adults within a school (Payne & Wolfson). The principal as staff developer is an integral part of the concept of the principal as instructional leader. One of the best indicators of instructional leadership is a program of on-going staff development and a climate in which that program can flourish (DuFour, 1991). Teachers who regard principals as instructional leaders cite the principal's active involvement in staff development activities as evidence of instructional leadership (Smith & Andrews).

Payne and Wolfson (2000) identified five components of the principal's role in providing leadership for professional development. The principal serves as a role model for continuous learning and inspires others. As the leader of a learning organization, the principal sets high expectations for lifelong learning. The principal motivates and supports professional development by removing barriers and obstacles that deter growth and positive change. The principal provides resources essential to teachers' growth and facilitates their professional growth activities.

The best staff development occurs in the workplace rather than in workshops (DuFour, 2004) and leaders must understand that simply shifting to site-based staff development does not ensure improved learning for either adults or students. In

facilitating staff development, leaders will increase the likelihood that the school's capacity will be enhanced if they address four questions:

1. Does the professional development increase the staff's capacity to achieve the school's vision and goals?

2. Does the school's approach to staff development challenge staff members to act in new ways?

3. Does staff development focus on results rather than activities?

4. Does staff development demonstrate a sustained commitment to achieving important goals?

Instructional leadership plays a pivotal role in ensuring that the staff development is designed to achieve the objectives of high levels of learning for adults and students alike (DuFour, 2004; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). Principals must help to design staff development that increases the school's capacity, allocate resources for that purpose, and model lifelong learning by becoming an active participant in all staff development activities. Principals who are deemed instructional leaders value their role as staff developers. They view their key function as that of facilitator, driven by the vision for the school and utilizing teacher leadership in its implementation. In all cases staff development is tied to evaluation and school goals.

Empowerment

Instructional leaders empower others (Barth, 1988; Browder, 1994; Childs-Bowen, Moller, & Scrivner, 2000; Chirichello, 2001; Glatthorn & Newberg, 1984; Kanpol, 1990; Kouzes and Posner, 1987; Lieberman, 1988; Rallis, 1998; Supovitz, 2000). As with other behaviors associated with instructional leadership, and the concept in general, there was a divergence of opinion concerning the definition of empowerment.

In the broadest sense teacher empowerment is any activity or means that enhances the professional status of teachers (Browder). Most definitions linked empowerment with school restructuring efforts aimed at redistributing decision-making powers. Teacher empowerment was defined as:

1. involving teachers in the important decisions that affect their students, classrooms, and schools (Rist, 1990);

2. involving people authentically in dealing with their own professional lives (Brandt, 1989);

3. the restructuring of schools and the changing of teacher roles through initiatives shaped by practitioners and guided by craft wisdom (David, 1989; Murphy, 1990);

4. interactive teachers collaborating with other educators in site-based decision-making (Rushcamp & Roehler, 1992); and

5. the process of turning followers into leaders themselves (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Empowerment first grew from the ever-increasing bureaucratization in the schools that removed teachers from the operational process (Maeroff, 1998). Browder (1994) believed that the purposes of empowerment include a search for ways to: (a) boost the status of teachers toward greater self-esteem and higher regard for teachers from others; (b) make teachers even more knowledgeable about greater collegiality between teachers themselves as well as administrators and others within the subject matter and the pedagogical craft used to teach learners; and (c) foster beliefs that hold significant influence over the teachers' work, thereby increasing teacher access to policy-making power.

Kanpol (1990) asserted that empowerment is a multi-faceted concept and that distinctions must be made between institutional and cultural empowerment, both of which impacts teachers and principals. Institutional empowerment may mean that teachers may resist structural restraints, but it may also mean that teachers have a voice concerning the curriculum, scheduling, and discipline procedures, staff hiring, school needs assessments, evaluation procedures, and working conditions. Cultural empowerment of teachers involves their awareness of the effects of the decisions made and a subsequent action to change something. Principals are the key to developing collaborative cultures (Glanz, 2006).

The role of the principal regarding institutional empowerment is to not only empower teachers with decision-making possibilities, but also to know when this empowerment will benefit both sides. Principal institutional empowerment is possible only when teachers are empowered as well. For principals to be culturally empowered, three conditions are necessary: (1) a context in schools to discuss the ramifications of decisions made; (2) to base changes on these decisions; and (3) to question and change the basic assumptions of a school philosophy.

Formally distributing leadership roles is a good organizational strategy that helps principals overcome the time constraints of the job and frees up time for instructional focus (Supovitz, 2000). Principals may be the only individuals who can see the big picture in schools, but they cannot perform every function without help (Rollins, 1988). Elmore (2005) argued that the problem of increased student improvement is one of building capacity and specialization. Building capacity is not possible if control is limited

to a few individuals. He advocated broadened distribution of leadership and envisioned leadership as the specialization of responsibilities, based on predispositions, interests, aptitudes, prior knowledge, skills, and specialized roles. In such a view, the principal's role becomes one of

> organizing those diverse competencies into a coherent whole (and this) requires an understanding how individuals vary, how the particular knowledge and skill of one person can be made to complement that of another, and how the competencies of some can be shared with others. In addition, organizing diverse competencies requires understanding when the knowledge and skill possessed by the people within the organization is not equal to the problem they are trying to solve, searching outside the organization for new knowledge and skill, and bringing it into the organization. (p.15)

Lieberman (1988) asserted "the best way to lead is to empower others by finding ways for all members of the community to participate in shaping a school's values and in developing procedures for attaining those goals" (p. 649).

Glatthorn and Newberg (1984) advocated the team approach, especially in secondary schools for two reasons. First, secondary schools are more decentralized. There are fewer consensuses about school goals due to the size of faculty and diversity of academic background. Secondary teachers have more influence in the daily issues of classroom management and curricular decisions than do secondary principals as secondary principals work with subject matter specialists as opposed to elementary generalists. Second, secondary principals execute responsibilities differently that do their elementary counterparts. Howell (1981) reported that secondary principals spend 20% of their time on instructional leadership activities as opposed to 30% of time spent by elementary principals on the same type tasks. Secondary principals are concerned about

instructional leadership, but there are more pressing demands on their time, thus they delegate responsibilities.

In empowering others to lead, Rallis (1998) raised an issue that principals may face: that of teachers assuming greater control of work and responsibility for their own growth versus a strong principal to guide the school and faculty. If instructional leadership is leadership that informs and guides teachers' decision-making so that practice can mesh with policy, then the logical leaders are teachers and thus there should be no conflict.

Before principals can become leaders of leaders, they must reflect on their own personal beliefs about leadership and the empowerment of others (Childs-Bowen, Moller, & Scrivner, 2000). They must ask themselves if they are comfortable with shared management, open and honest two-way communication, trust building, and the use of personal power to influence others in achieving school goals. If principals can move past the "I" in leadership and embrace the collective "we," they can learn with teachers or even step aside to let others lead (Chirichello, 2001).

For better or worse, principals have a major influence on teacher leadership (Barth, 2001). Teacher leaders cannot develop without principal support (Murphy, 2005). In developing shared leadership within schools principals should articulate goals, relinquish power, entrust others to act, involve teachers in decision-making, assign responsibilities wisely, share responsibilities for failure, attribute success to teachers, believe in teachers, and admit ignorance. They should define teacher leadership, be comfortable with teacher leaders, and encourage them to lead by creating an instructional council. Principals must also help teachers develop the skills of group leadership and

facilitation, collaboration, problem solving and the skills to overcome isolation. Teachers should be trained in the use and abuse of power and ethical concerns and allowed to be responsible for staff development (Barth,1988; Buckner & McDowelle, 2000; Cunard 1990; Roy, 2006).

In schools that achieve the goal of collective governance, principals and teachers lose their sense of "them and us" and focus on a common mission. They value collaboration, diversity, equity, critical inquiry, continuous improvement, and reflective and ethical practice. In these schools leadership is an influencing relationship between principals and teachers who have a common commitment to continuous improvement. Involving staff in developing school policy and using a leadership team in decision-making had one of the highest effect sizes (.30) when measuring its effect on student achievement (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

Given the opportunity, support, and affirmation, most teachers will respond to the call to leadership (Zepeda, Mayers, & Benson, 2003), yet some may be resistant to shared leadership for several reasons: (1) fear of stepping over the line, (2) fear of repercussion from colleagues who disagree, (3) fear their opinions will not be valued, (4) discomfort in working with other adults, (5) taking time from instruction, (6) failure to see the value of their involvement, (7) too busy dealing with day to day crises to see the big picture, (8) lack of consensus-building skills, and (9) not trained to help peers grow. (Danielson, 2006; Hoerr, 1996; Meadows & Saltzman, 2002) Meadows and Saltzman suggested strategies to overcome resistance. They recommended that principals: (a) stay focused on what's best for students; (b) give the staff skills needed to work with each other; (c) create schedules that provide teachers opportunities for collaboration; (d) create an

atmosphere in which teachers feel free to take risks; (e) support teachers as they become risk-takers and learn new behaviors; and (f) model shared decision-making. Principals who empower teachers by delegating responsibility help promote commitment and a willingness to innovate and establish more broad-based action for change within their schools (Marks & Printy, 2003). Schools cannot improve without the systematic participation of all those within the organization (Glanz, 2006). Thus, instructional leadership can itself be transformational (Marks & Printy, 2003).

Instructional leadership is more than a discrete set of behaviors. It is not just an attitude to provide support for good teaching; nor is it a philosophical bias, a written mission statement, or rhetoric about the importance of instruction (Pellicer, Anderson, Keefe, Kelley, & McCleary, 1990). Leadership does not produce quick results nor is it based on high profile actions that hinder day-to day operations. Leadership cannot be the result of policies or legal mandates (Mitchell & Tucker, 1992). Rather, instructional leadership is a shared responsibility, situational and planned, characterized by informed behaviors that involve risk-taking, and enhanced by a common purpose that is student-centered. In order to have positive impact on student achievement principals need not only to focus on key behaviors, they must understand the magnitude of change implied by these behaviors (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). Principals who view and implement instructional leadership from a more holistic perspective can make great strides in transforming their schools into places that possess the attributes of true professional learning communities (DuFour & Eaker, 1998; Hord, 2004). While the literature correlated the behaviors described above to strong instructional leadership, Hallinger and Heck (1996) contended that principals do not have a direct effect on

student achievement. Rather their effect is indirect, with instructional leadership having a more positive impact on a school's academic press, the extent to which the school places strong emphasis on academic and intellectual activity (Alig-Mielcarek & Hoy, 2005).

Contextual Variables That Influence Instructional Leadership

Instructional leadership is not a simple, one-dimensional construct, but instead is shaped by other variables (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982; Boyan, 1988; Hallinger & Murphy, 1987; Hausman, Crow, & Sperry, 2000). Three personal characteristics were discussed as potentially influencing principals' instructional leadership behavior: gender, training, and experience. A number of studies have shown that women are better principals than men. They more readily exchange information, work longer hours, are more inclined to be innovative, and are more likely to empower others.

Pre-service principal training can impact how a principal functions as an instructional leader. Ginsberg (1988) argued that few college programs offer courses in instructional leadership, but instead train principals to be managers rather than instructional leaders (Rallis & Highsmith, 1986). Peel et al. (1998) identified four areas relevant to helping improve principal preparation programs: field-based experience, theory to practice, mentoring, internships, and cohort study.

School level factors are also shaping factors. Instructional leadership is impacted by the clarity and complexity of instructional technology, the process an organization employs to accomplish its goals. Clarity refers to the extent in which the instructional process is understood and can be specified. In situations characterized by greater clarity, closer supervision by the principal is possible. Effective urban elementary schools emphasize a limited number of learning objectives that are coordinated to assessments

and implemented through a more uniform pedagogical approach. This clarity makes it possible for principals to provide a more valid assessment of classroom instruction (Hallinger & Murphy, 1987).

Where clarity is less clear, a highly directive approach by the principal may be counterproductive, creating high levels of administrator-staff conflict. In these contexts principals rely more on indirect leadership behaviors such as symbolic, facilitative, or political strategies (Deal & Celotti, 1980).

Complexity refers to the degree in which the process requires interdependence and coordination among the teaching staff. The principal's role in coordinating the school's program is tempered by its complexity. The greater the complexity, the greater the demands for effective coordination (Hallinger & Murphy, 1987).

The composition of the staff was another school variable impacting instructional leadership. An observational study found that principals who were the most directive had staffs that were less mature or less stable (Dwyer, Lee, Rowan, & Bossert, 1983). As staffs matured and stabilized, principals shifted from a more directive style to one that was more informal and facilitative (Cohen, Miller, Bredo, & Duckworth, 1977).

A fourth contextual variable found to impact instructional leadership is that of school level. A tendency has existed to generalize findings from studies of elementary principals to their secondary counterparts (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). Secondary schools differ from elementary schools in many aspects, such as goal structure, administrative organization and delivery, and linkages to parents and community. Conclusions drawn from these differences suggest that prescriptions for strong instructional leadership at the elementary level may not apply to the secondary principal

(Firestone & Herriott, 1982). Although principals at both levels spent less time on instructional leadership than they felt they should spend, secondary principals spent less time on instructional matters than their elementary counterparts (Kmetz & Willower, 1982; Smith & Andrews, 1989).

Instructional leadership at the secondary level differs from the elementary level in two distinct ways. Secondary principals cannot rely on the direct leadership utilized by elementary principals due to the multi-leveled structure and specialized subject areas that limit the principal's ability to be personally involved in all aspects of the instructional program. Instead principals must rely on more indirect and symbolic expressions (Firestone & Herriott). The second difference lies in the technical complexity of secondary schools. As a result of this complex structure secondary principals must rely on others such as assistant principals and department heads to carry out the instructional program, yet they must insure that these functions are performed in the absence of direct leadership. The team's ability to function effectively is shaped by the position, power, or prestige of the principal (Pellicer, Anderson, Keefe, Kelley, & McCleary, 1990).

The variable thought to have the greatest impact on principal behavior is the social context, particularly the socio-economic status of the student and the community population served by the school. Research indicated that principal instructional leadership was the key to success in schools serving the urban poor (Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger & Murphy, 1987).

Purkey and Smith (1983) found that the mission in effective, low SES schools was limited, characterized by the pursuit of clear, but limited, academic goals, strong administrative involvement in these goals, and pride in the community and high

expectations from parents. As managers of the instructional programs, principals in effective, low SES schools displayed a more directive supervisory role than those principals in wealthier school settings. In establishing positive learning climates, principals in effective, low SES schools were highly sensitive to the social contexts of their schools; held high, but realistic, expectations; and established an elaborate system of student rewards. These climates were established without the community support associated with effective schools in higher socio-economic contexts.

Teachers validated these differences in principal instructional leadership behavior. Principals in highly effective, low SES schools were described as Initiators/Managers. Principals in this classification held strong beliefs about what a good school should be. They worked directly to attain the vision for the school and held high expectations for all stakeholders. They established rapport with the faculty, responded to situations, and inaugurated actions to support change. Conversely, principals in less effective low SES schools were characterized as Responders/Managers. These principals allowed others to lead, while they focused on tasks and personal relations. They held no vision about how the school should change. These principals also failed to establish rapport with the faculty and to respond to situations (Evans & Teddlie, 1995). In his study of high-performing, high-poverty schools, Elmore (2005) found leaders who articulated expectations for student learning coupled with a sense of urgency for improvement. To support this improvement these leaders adopted challenging curricula and invested heavily in staff development.

District characteristics also shape instructional leadership behavior. Districts influence principals in three ways. The first is through support in terms of resources,

technical assistance, better information, or increased authority. Second, instructional leadership is also promoted is through a district culture that makes teaching and learning the highest priority. A third way that districts can influence instructional leadership behavior is through the manipulation of controls. Traditionally, districts have not exercised much control over principals, particularly in the area of curriculum and instruction (Deal & Celotti, 1980). Superintendents can hold principals more accountable through systematic assessments of their instructional leadership (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985).

In a study of South Carolina principals, Rose (1991) found no correlation between instructional leadership behavior and school SES, school level, school size, gender, or years of experience of the principal, all of which were supported by the literature as possible affecting variables. One explanation for these findings was due in part to the South Carolina Educational Improvement Act of 1984 that mandated specific instructional leadership behaviors. Since these behaviors were monitored, principals believed themselves to adhere to the expectations.

Barriers to Instructional Leadership

Instructional leadership is the key component of the principalship, yet most principals never achieve the goal (Ginsberg, 1988). A variable that had both positive and negative impact on a principal's instructional leadership was that of time. Finding the time necessary to be the instructional leader in the school was a major barrier to effectively assuming that role (Buchen, 2002; Ginsberg). Although principals placed the highest value on instructional leadership behaviors, discrepancies existed as to how they actually spent their time (Krajewski, 1978; Whitaker & Turner, 2000). Given all their

other duties (discipline, scheduling, food services, bus schedules), many principals found themselves fortunate to leave their office more than 30 minutes per day, relegating instructional leadership to the back burner (Buchen; Fink & Resnick, 2001; Ginsberg, 1988; Howell, 1981; Mazzarella, 1976).

Principals identified as strong instructional leaders spent more time on instructional activities than principals considered average (Smith & Andrews, 1989). Average principals considered instructional improvement to be the part of the job that should receive the greatest amount of time and energy; however, they spent more time on management (39%) and student services (28%) than on instruction (27%). Principals considered to be strong instructional leaders spent almost the same amount of time on management functions (34%), yet they spent considerable more time on instruction (41%). Thus the issue for average principals was not misplaced values, but rather poor allocation of time or poor behavioral patterns (Smith & Andrews, 1989). Principals will make time for instructional leadership if they value it and believe that it makes a difference in the development of their teachers and in student achievement (Glanz, 2006). To be effective instructional leaders, Rogus (1988) asserted that principals must spend time in the "ought" rather than in the "what is".

In addition to time, other constraints precluded principals from fulfilling their role as instructional leaders (Buchen, 2002; Ginsberg, 1988). One constraint was the lack of ability. Not all principals have the ability to be instructional leaders. While lacking the skills for this role, they may be superb managers (Buchen). Hurley (2001) suggested splitting the principalship into two parts, instructional leader and manager, thus eliminating the conflict.

A second constraint was credibility. If principals have been away from the classroom more than five years, problems of credibility may arise. Buchen suggested that principals go back into the classroom to experience teachers' challenges first hand. Principals are limited in knowledge, especially those operating in the secondary arena. Although most principals can demonstrate competence in at least one subject area, they cannot be competent in all. Buchen asserted that, with this limitation, principals should function as an interdisciplinary generalist, providing leadership like that of an orchestra leader, guiding the whole rather than demonstrating expertise in every field.

Instructional leadership requires principals to be highly visible and to communicate with individual teachers. This communication is best accomplished through the evaluation process, an area criticized extensively by teachers (Buchen). He advocated that the evaluation timetable should be revised so that the evaluation process should be stretched over a month-long period rather than a single-occasion process. This would allow both the principal and teacher to discuss goals and teacher practice, establish benchmarks for measuring progress and change, and to evaluate changes that were identified. The principal can then better assess what the school can do to provide the necessary professional development.

The lack of a precise definition of instructional leadership was perhaps the major obstacle for effective instructional leadership (Ginsberg, 1988). Faced with both varied definitions and an array of behaviors, principals remain confused about what it is they should do as instructional leaders, yet pronouncements about its importance abound. Another barrier was the lack of training. Most states require potential principals to earn a certain number of college credits and to pass an examination to attain certification as an

administrator, yet few college programs offer courses in instructional leadership (Ginsberg, 1988). Principals are trained to be managers rather than instructional leaders and are simply not prepared to meet this goal (Rallis & Highsmith, 1986).

The technology of teaching also presented problems for principals. As with the definition of instructional leadership, there is no clear definition of what it is to be a good teacher. Mitchell and Kerchner (1983) identified four ways of looking at teaching: labor, craft, profession, or art. How principals view teaching will influence their instructional leadership (Ginsberg). This could lead to conflict if the principal's view is disparate from those of the teacher. As instructional leaders principals must understand how to work with teachers to improve teaching and improve student learning. They must engage in a variety of instructional improvement strategies, not for the purpose of evaluation, but for the purpose of engaging teachers in instructional dialogue about classroom practice (Glanz, 2006).

A lack of rewards, incentives, or accountability exists for effective instructional leadership. Although lip service is given to the concept, it is not tied to principal remuneration. Salaries for principals are based on many factors, least of which is their ability to be effective instructional leaders (Ginsberg).

Two final barriers to instructional leadership were teacher contracts and collective bargaining. In many school districts principals are limited by collective bargaining and teacher contracts. Principal behaviors in terms of evaluation, supervision, due process, and, in many cases, curriculum are negotiated and prescribed by teacher contracts. Thus, principals are limited as to what they are able to do within these arenas (Ginsberg).

Instructional Leadership Versus Management

If the principal behaviors described in the literature can, in fact, lead to higher student achievement, then must principals choose between instructional leadership and managing the daily tasks of managing a school? Donmoyer and Wagstaff (1990) defined an instructional leader as someone who has a significant impact on student opportunities to learn in the classroom. This definition eliminates the instructional leader/manager distinction. Effective management is critical in an effective school (Shelland, 2003). Strong management skills enable principals to develop a school culture and climate that fosters instructional improvement and student achievement. Segregating instructional leadership from management does an injustice to the principalship. There is "little evidence to suggest that learning would be enhanced if principals ignored their broad-based managerial responsibilities in favor of a more narrowly-focused orientation *toward* instruction" (Stronge, 1990, p. 3). Hallinger and Murphy (1985) used the term instructional management when describing the behaviors of principals that affect student achievement.

Donmeyer and Wagstaff (1990) identified six managerial tasks that can have a significant impact on teaching and learning: (1) scheduling based on educational concerns that positively impact student learning; (2) articulating policies, rules, and norms; (3) hiring of personnel; (4) supervising personnel; (5) coordinating pupil services; and (6) engaging in the budget process. All of these tasks can have positive and negative effects on instruction, and the principal's job is to see that these positively impact student learning. Bossert, Dwyer, Rowen, and Lee (1982) recognized four key areas of principal leadership: goals and production emphasis, power and decision-making,

organization/coordination, and human relations. By engaging in these behaviors, principals enhance the school climate and instructional organization that, in turn, facilitates student learning.

Roe and Drake (1974) and Lipham and Hoeh (1974) believe principals cannot be both effective instructional leaders and managers.

> It is virtually impossible to assume that the principal can be a real instructional leader and at the same time be held strictly accountable for the general operational and management detail required by the central office. (Roe & Drake, p. 14)

While principals conceive themselves to be instructional leaders, they find themselves consumed by daily administrative detail and the problems of maintaining the school organization, its teachers, and students.

Hurley (2001) contended that principals should not be forced to be super-leaders and super-managers. He advocated splitting the principalship into two parts-instructional leader and manager. This split, he contended, would rescue principals from bureaucratic overload and make the position more attractive to future candidates.

Chirichello (2001) studied a small Massachusetts district (two elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school) where a co-principal structure was in place. The goal of the superintendent in setting up this structure was to decrease time on managerial tasks and maximize time spent on instruction. Overall, those people interviewed felt that this structure strengthened relationships, collaboration, and collegiality in both the system's elementary schools. The principals interviewed felt that that the goal had been met. The co-principalship allowed each principal to spend more time with people. The

challenge was to reconcile individual differences. Teachers felt that having two principals afforded them greater accessibility to the principals and allowed for quicker feedback. In discussions with principals about the advisability of splitting the principalship, Kennedy (2002) found that principals did not see the need for this structure, but when pushed, they admitted many of the tasks that consumed much of their time could be better handled by a manager than by a principal.

Developing Instructional Leaders

If principals are to be successful in leading schools that provide the best education for all children, then learning and school improvement should form the core of their responsibilities (Murphy, 2002). Yet, as the literature shows, instructional leadership is not the realm in which most principals spend their time (Fink & Resnick, 2001; Howell, 1981). Thus the question is, "Can instructional leadership be learned?"

Murphy advocated that standards may be one avenue toward this goal. Developed by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), the Standards for School Leaders were released in 1996. A number of principles guided the development of these standards:

1. They are anchored on valued outcomes rather than functions and tasks.
2. They value student learning and demand success for all youngsters.
3. They shift the center of school leadership from management and administration to learning and school improvement.
4. They underscore the collaborative nature of school-based leadership, stressing the importance of access, opportunity, and empowerment for teachers, parents, and all members of the school community.
5. They establish an integrated and coherent framework for action.

6. They are designed to shape and direct action of those who are in the position to do the work of reshaping the principalship (Murphy).

In addition to the design of the standards, the ISLLC team developed a four-part strategy designed to change the focus of the principalship from management to learning. The first part of the strategy called for the adoption of the ISLLC standards throughout the nation to redefine the way states operate licensure, professional development, and principal preparation programs.

The second part of the strategy was to redesign the university education of prospective principals. As part of this goal, ISLLC formed a partnership with Educational Testing Service to create the School Leaders Licensure Assessment, first administered in 1998. The purpose of this exam was two-fold: (a) to help ensure that school leaders are capable of leading schools where all children have the opportunity to be successful; and (b) to encourage universities to highlight learning and school improvement in their administrative preparation programs.

The third part of the strategy called for the restructuring of professional development for school and district administrators to include both multi-day training and portfolios. The fourth element was to encourage states and districts to bring their evaluation systems into alignment with the ISLLC standards in order to provide benchmarks to which they can look to strengthen their administrative evaluation process (Murphy, 2002).

The National Staff Development Council (2001) advocated that the federal government, states, and local districts adopt staff development policies that are targeted at upgrading leadership capabilities. At the federal level the government can:

1. expand Title I legislation to include principal professional development and fund such programs;

2. adopt provision of the Administrators' School Leadership legislation;

3. create a National Board on School Leadership;

4. create an awards program that recognizes outstanding leadership development programs;

5. establish urban grow-your-own programs for principals; and

6. conduct research and forge coalitions on professional development.

States can improve their professional development by:

1. developing quality review and accountability for professional development programs;

2. making greater investments in school-based professional development for school leaders;

3. creating leadership networks for principals;

4. establishing a new position of state staff development director;

5. incorporating professional development into school evaluations;

6. creating incentives for better principal performance;

7. funding teacher leadership academies;

8. providing tools to evaluate staff development; and

9. advancing teacher leadership incentives.

Local school districts should:

1. encourage principals to distribute leadership in their schools;

2. improve the selection and continuous learning of principals;

3. create apprenticeship programs and grow-your-own programs for principals;

4. establish support networks for school leaders;

5. provide coaches for principals;
6. require a focus on instruction; and
7. make time for staff development.

Fink and Resnick (2001) advocated the development of principal learning through the development of a principal learning community, a model called the cognitive apprenticeship. Through a multi-year process, principals learned and practiced skills in their own school settings with the aid of peers. While most of the staff development was dispersed throughout individual schools, principals met monthly to build system-wide patterns of improvement in teaching and learning and establish a core of common commitments. These meetings also provided a venue from which to introduce new initiatives and to analyze data. Reeves (2006) encouraged local school systems to develop their own leadership programs focusing on four key areas: people, strategies, organization and system leadership. Principals would then be afforded opportunities to participate in support groups, study groups, inter-visitation, mentoring, and individualized coaching. The purpose of such programs would be to create a corps of strong instructional leaders who shared a common set of commitments to teaching and learning, along with a sense of belonging to a demanding professional learning community.

Summary

No single definition, conceptual framework, or a behavioral model of instructional leadership emerged from the literature. This lack of concise definition and structure leads to miscommunication, role conflict, and low principal evaluations as

instructional leaders. Despite the many behaviors found in the literature, six key behaviors consistently emerged: leading through vision and mission, the creation of a culture and climate for learning, high principal visibility, a focus on results, creating quality staff development, and the empowerment of others. Gender, training, experience, and school level emerged as contextual barriers to instructional leadership, time was the most discussed as the variable that most impacted a principal's ability to function effectively as an instructional leader.

While management duties consumed much of a principal's time, the literature did not view management as separate from instructional leadership, but rather the two were linked as necessary prerequisites for high student achievement. Finally, the 1996 ISLLC Standards for Leaders were viewed as the vision for the development of instructional leaders with the federal and state governments as well as local school districts assuming the responsibility for implementing the professional development necessary to reach this goal.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine if differences in instructional leadership behavior exist among principals of high-achieving, high-performing, low-achieving, and low-performing schools.

Research Questions

Three research questions guided this study. Each question was designed to examine possible differences in instructional leadership behavior as measured by principal responses to the PIMRS. These responses were compared to student achievement and academic growth data.

1. Do principals of high-achieving high schools perform a different set of instructional behaviors than principals of low-achieving high schools?

2. Do principals of high-performing high schools perform a different set of instructional behaviors than principals of low-performing high schools?

3. Do differences in instructional leadership behaviors exist between principals of (a) high-achieving, high-performing schools; (b) high-achieving, low-performing schools; (c) low-achieving, high-performing schools; and (d) low-achieving, low-performing schools?

Data Sources

Two data sources were used in this study. The Tennessee Department of Education 2005 Report Card was used to provide the academic achievement data as reflected by a three-year ACT mean score and value-added academic gain data as reflected by a mean three-year ACT value-added score. These data were published on the Tennessee Department of Education website. The second data source was the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS), a survey instrument developed to align

specific instructional leadership behaviors to the major dimensions and functions of instructional management (Hallinger, 1983). This instrument provided principals' perceptions of the frequency in which they implemented specific instructional leadership behaviors. These perceptions were used to established instructional leadership behavior profiles.

Study Design

The conceptual framework underlying this study was the instructional leadership model proposed by Hallinger and Murphy (1985). This model viewed instructional leadership as an umbrella for a compendium of interwoven dimensions, domains, and behaviors. Under this umbrella instructional leadership was delineated into three dimensions: defining the mission, managing curriculum and instruction, and promoting school climate. Mission was defined as framing and communicating school goals. Instruction was described as supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating curriculum, and monitoring student progress. Principals create positive school climates by protecting instructional time, promoting staff development, maintaining high visibility, providing teacher incentives, enforcing academic standards, and providing incentives for students. The PIMRS (Hallinger, 1983) was used to ascertain the frequency in which principals engaged in specific behaviors associated with each of the above functions.

This was a survey study; comparing student academic achievement and academic gain data and principal perceptions of the frequency in which they engaged instructional leadership behaviors as measured by their responses to the PIMRS. Using data retrieved from the Tennessee Department of Education 2005 Report Card, schools were

categorized based on student achievement and student academic gain. These data served as independent variables for the study. Using the PIMRS, high school principals were surveyed to determine their perceptions on the frequency in which specified instructional leadership behaviors were implemented. From this survey profiles of instructional leadership behavior were generated. These survey data served as the dependent variables for the study.

Population

The population of this study was principals of public high schools in Tennessee. A list of these schools was generated from the Tennessee Secondary Schools Athletic Association membership. This list provided the school name, address, telephone number, and principal name. This data source was used because it provided the most recent information for these schools. This population consisted of 304 high schools and represented urban, rural, and suburban communities. Each school on the TSSAA list was searched on the Tennessee Department of Education 2005 Report Card website to obtain both a three-year mean ACT composite score and a three-year ACT value-added score. These scores provided the school achievement and performance data respectively. Any school not listed on this website or whose listing did not include both data sources were eliminated from the study. This left a population of 276. Each of the principals of the 276 schools were requested to complete a PIMRS survey. During the survey process schools were placed in an achievement/performance matrix. Schools that did not fit within the definitions of the matrix (n= 23) were also eliminated from the study. The remaining number of schools actually used in the study was 251.

Procedure

A list of Tennessee high schools (n= 304) was generated from the Tennessee Secondary Schools Athletic Association membership. Each school on this list was searched on the Tennessee Department of Education website to generate a three-year mean ACT composite score, and a value-added score for the three-year mean composite ACT score. These scores provided school achievement and performance data, respectively. Any school whose listing did include a complete data profile was eliminated from the study. The remaining population was 276.

Permission was obtained to use the PIMRS, the survey instrument used in this study, and a user fee was paid. The survey was typed on a scan form that allowed recipients to bubble their responses. A cover letter on University of Tennessee letterhead describing the project accompanied each survey. This survey packet was sent to each of the 276 high schools via first class mail addressed to the principal of the school by title. After two weeks a follow-up postcard was sent to those principals that did not respond to the initial mailing. A second letter with an accompanying survey instrument was sent within one week after the postcard reminder. This second survey mailing was also sent via first class mail addressed to the principal of each school by title. These procedures were designed to help ensure a high return rate.

While the survey was underway, schools were divided into four quadrants based on their three-year ACT and value-added composite scores: (a) high achieving, high-performing schools; (b) low achieving, high performing schools; (c) high-achieving, low-performing schools; and (d) low-achieving, low-performing schools. These quadrants were the foci for the research questions in this study. Schools that fell on either the ACT

or value-added mean and thus could not be classified into one of the quadrants were not used in the study (n=23) (Figure 1).

Data Analysis

Mean scores were calculated from survey items to establish an instructional leadership profile of respondents. A *t* test was used to determine if statistical differences in principal instructional leadership existed between high and low achieving and high and low performing schools within the ten dimensions of instructional leadership listed on the survey instrument. A second *t* test was also used to determine if statistical differences existed between the same groups on individual questions within each dimension. An ANOVA was used to determine if statistical differences existed between each quadrant of the achievement/performance matrix on the ten domains of instructional leadership reflected on the survey instrument as well each individual question within each domain.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument used to establish the instructional leadership profiles was the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale, developed by Philip Hallinger (1983). The methodology used to develop this instrument followed the steps prescribed by Latham and Waxley (1981) for constructing behaviorally anchored rating scales. Behaviorally anchored rating scales rely upon descriptions of job-related behaviors for the development of scale items. The strength of this approach lies in its specificity of what is expected and should be observed. Thus the scales can be used to form the basis for a job description, feedback for staff development or for evaluation (Hallinger, 1983).

Low Achievement (ACT score of 19.7 or less) High Performance (ACT gain of .5 or greater)	High Achievement (ACT score of 21 or greater) High Performance (ACT gain of .5 or greater)
Low Achievement (ACT score of 19.7 or less) Low Performance (ACT gain score of -.6 or greater)	High Achievement (ACT score of 21 or greater) Low Performance (ACT gain score of -.6 or greater)

Figure 1. Academic achievement/performance matrix.

While constructing items for the survey instrument, Hallinger incorporated input from knowledgeable persons from the field of education who identified critical dimensions of a principal's job. In addition critical dimensions of the same job were deduced from the literature on effective schools. Seven criteria were used to judge the adequacy of the instrument:

1. Empirical grounding- the job functions incorporated into the study conceptualized were grounded in prior research findings. The strength of empirical support was estimated for each job function.

2. Content validity-items making up each subscale of the instrument were representative and relevant to the critical requirements of the job; each item assigned to a subscale achieved an average agreement of .80.

3. Reliability-subscales achieved a reliability coefficient of at least .80 to be considered valid.

4. Validity (analysis of variance)- the subscales discriminated among principals at the .05 level of statistical significance.

5. Construct validity (subscale inter-correlation)-groups of items with each subscale correlated more strongly with each other than with other subscales.

6. Construct validity (conceptual-empirical linkages)- a comparison of the subscales' conceptualization based on previous research with the empirical results of the study showed expected relationships between the variables.

7. Construct validity (documentary support)- an analysis of school documents related to instructional management behavior yielded profiles similar to those obtained from the teacher questionnaire (Hallinger, 1983).

Though initially validated at the elementary level, other studies expanded on its validation to include secondary schools (Hallinger, 2003; Jones, 1987; Tarasiena, 1993).

The PIMRS (Hallinger) consisted of 50 questions, grouped in sets of five, each aligned to equate specific behavior to ten domains of instructional leadership: (a) framing the school goals; (b) communicating the school goals; (c) supervising and evaluating

instruction; (d) coordinating the curriculum; (e)monitoring student progress: (f) protecting instructional time; (g) maintaining high visibility; (h) providing incentives for teachers; (i) promoting professional development; and (j) providing incentives for learning (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). Principals were asked to rate the frequency of their instructional management behavior based on a five-point Likert- type scale. Two additional demographic questions were added to the survey instrument: gender and years of experience.

Hallinger (2003) reviewed the use of this instrument since its inception. Since its development the PIMRS has been used in 57 studies, 5 masters theses and 27 doctoral dissertations. Forty-four (44) of these studies were conducted between 1983 and 1991 and reflect the interest in instructional leadership following the emergence of the effective schools movement.

During the mid-1990's, the attention shifted to school restructuring and transformational leadership, thus the decrease in the number of studies completed between 1991-2000 (Hallinger). Studies using the PIMRS were conducted in seven countries. Sixty-nine (69) studies were completed in the United States in 57 universities. Forty-one (41) studies were completed at the elementary level versus 23 studies completed at the high school level. Hallinger attributed this difference to easier access to principals at the elementary level and the link between the effective schools and instructional leadership, as the effective schools' studies were conducted at the elementary level.

In his review Hallinger found three types of studies most popular among the studies of instructional leadership: role group perceptions, antecedent studies, and effect

studies. In the role group studies, statistically significant disagreement was found across role groups with principal self- reports yielding higher ratings than reports from their teachers.

In the antecedent studies the most frequent approach was to determine how personal characteristics such as gender, years of experience, years of teaching experience prior to the principalship, age, and ethnicity influenced instructional leadership. The most significant finding from these studies was the higher level of instructional leadership among female principals, both at the elementary and secondary levels (Hallinger). Years of experience and prior teaching experience also yielded significant findings, though mixed, with negative correlations reported from studies conducted in Asia. Researchers who studied the correlation between instructional expertise and leadership found mixed results.

In those studies using the leadership effects approach, Hallinger found the foci centered around intervening variables such as teacher morale, teacher self efficacy, school culture, or climate. None of these studies yielded consistently positive results. Studies focusing on school outcomes, primarily student achievement, also failed to yield significant results. The same is true with those studies using a comparative group design, where two or more groups were contrasted on a common assessment.

These findings were attributed to the models and the inadequate statistical tests used to explain the relationship between instructional leadership and school effectiveness as more advanced use of inferential statistics is required (Bridges, 1982). Cuban (1988) questioned the validity of the focus on the instructional leadership role given the difficulty of enacting it within the context of the real school setting. While Hallinger

recognized the limitations of the reviewed studies, he contended they provide a useful base from which to build.

Summary

This survey study was designed to measure the frequency in which principals engaged in instructional leadership behavior. Principals of 276 Tennessee high schools were surveyed using the PIMRS (Hallinger, 1983), a 50-question Likert-type instrument designed to measure the frequency in which principals engage in specific leadership behaviors linked to ten domains of instructional leadership. The survey responses were then compared to the schools' academic/performance data obtained from the 2005 Tennessee Report Card. Schools were placed in one of four achievement/ performance quadrants based on their achievement and performance data. Both T-tests and an ANOVA were used to analyze data derived from both sources.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS

This chapter analyzed instructional leadership behavior data derived from principal responses to the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) and school achievement and performance data derived from the 2005 Tennessee Department of Education Report Card. The purpose of this study was to determine if differences in instructional leadership behavior exist between principals of high-achieving, high – performing, low-achieving, and low-performing schools as measured by principal responses to the PIMRS.

Data Description

The population of this study consisted of 304 Tennessee high schools. Three-year achievement (ACT) and performance (value-added) data were obtained for each school from the 2005 Tennessee Report Card. Those schools that did not have the data profile listed were eliminated from the study.

The remaining 276 schools were placed in one of four quadrants: (a) high-achieving, high-performing; (b) high-achieving, low performing; (c) low-achieving, high-performing; and (d) low-achieving, low performing. Schools classified as high-achieving, high-performing had a three year mean ACT score of 20.6 or higher and a gain score of .1 or greater. Sixty-two (62) schools qualified for this quadrant. Thirty-eight (38) principals from this quadrant responded to the survey.

Schools classified as high-achieving, low-performing had a three year mean ACT score of 20.6 or higher but had a gain score of -.1 or greater. Fourteen (14) schools fit into this quadrant. Eight (8) principals from this quadrant responded to the survey.

Those schools classified as low-achieving, high-performing had a three-year mean ACT score of 20.4 or less and a gain score of .1 or greater. Fifty-two (52) schools fit this classification. Thirty-three (33) principals from this group responded to the survey.

Low-achieving, low-performing schools were those whose three year ACT mean score was 20.4 or less with a gain score of -.1 or greater. One hundred twenty-two (122) schools fit this quadrant. Seventy-three (73) principals from this group responded to the survey (Table 1).

Principal Demographics

A total of 152 principals responded from all quadrants surveyed. Gender and years of experience were included as part of the survey instrument. In the high-achieving, high-performing quadrant 33 of the respondents (86.8%) were male and 5 were female (13.2%). Of the eight respondents in the high-achieving, low-performing quadrant, 5 were male (62.5%) and 3 were female (37.5%). Gender was most equal in the low-

Table 1: Number of Schools and Percentage of Principal Response by Quadrant

Quadrant	Number of Schools	Number of Respondents	Percentage
HA/HP	62	38	61
HA/LP	14	8	57
LA/HP	52	33	63
LA/LP	122	73	60

achieving, high-performing quadrant. Eighteen (54.5%) of these respondents were male and 15 (45.5 %) were female. Males dominated the low-achieving, low-performing quadrant. Fifty-five of the respondents (75.3%) were male while 18 (24.7%) were female (Table 2).

Respondents were also asked to indicate their years of experience as a principal. The survey data indicated the majority of respondents in each quadrant had ten years or less principal experience. In the high-achieving, high-performing quadrant 31.6% had 0-5 years experience; 23.7% had 6-10 years experience; 13.2 % had 11-15 years experience; 13.2% had 16-20 years experience; and 18.4% had more than 20 years experience.

In the low-achieving, high-performing quadrant 37.5 % had 0-5 years experience; 31.3% had 6-10 years experience; 15.6% had 11-15 years experience; 3.1% had 16-20 years experience; and 12.5 % had 20 or more years experience as a principal.

In the high-achieving, low-performing quadrant 37.5% of the respondents had 0-5 years experience and 62.5% has 6-10 years experience. None of the respondents in this quadrant had more than 10 years experience as a principal.

The low-achieving, low-performing quadrant was more evenly distributed. 34.2% had 0-5 years experience; 30.1% had 6-10 years experience; 9.6 % had 11-15 years experience; 6.8% had 16-20 years experience; and 19.2% had 20 or more years of principal experience (Table 3).

Overall, fifty-two (34.4%) respondents had 0-5 years experience as a principal. Forty-six (30.5%) had 6-10 years experience. Seventeen (11.3%) had 11-15 years experience, while 11 (7.3%) had 16-20 years experience. Twenty-five (16.6%) had 20 or more years experience as a principal (Table 4).

Table 2: Principal Gender by Quadrant

Quadrant	Males	%	Females	%
HA/HP	33	86.8	5	13.2
HA/LP	5	62.5	3	37.5
LA/HP	18	54.5	15	45.5
LA/LP	55	75.3	18	24.7
Overall	111	73.0	41	27.0

Table 3: Principal Experience by Quadrant

Quadrant	Years of Experience				
	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	16-20 years	20+ years
HA/HP	31.6%	23.7%	13.2%	13.2%	18.4%
LA/HP	37.5%	31.3%	15.6%	3.1%	12.5%
HA/LP	37.5%	62.5%	0	0	0
LA/LP	34.2%	30.1%	9.6%	6.8%	19.2%

Table 4: Overall Years of Principal Experience

Years of Experience	Frequency	Percentage
0-5	52	34.4
6-10	46	30.5
11-15	17	11.3
16-20	11	7.3
20+	25	16.6
Total	151	100.0

Data Analyses

The Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale, a 50- question survey instrument, was developed around functions and processes of principal instructional leadership. The three major functions were defining the mission, managing instructional time, and promoting a positive school climate.

Defining the school mission included framing school goals and communicating these goals to the staff and community. Principals managed the instructional program by supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating curriculum, and monitoring student progress. A positive school climate was created by protecting instructional time, promoting professional development, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers, enforcing academic standards, and providing academic incentives for students.

The survey instrument focused on ten domains: framing school schools, communicating school goals, supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, monitoring student progress, protecting instructional time, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers, promoting professional development, and promoting incentives for learning. Five specific behavioral questions relating to each domain were included on the survey instrument. The data were analyzed both by individual question and by domain. Two sample *t*-tests and an ANOVA were used for data analysis. The analyses were based on the following research questions:

Research Question 1: Do principals of high-achieving high schools perform a different set of instructional leadership behaviors than principals of low-achieving high schools?

No significant difference was found in instructional leadership behaviors between principals of high-achieving and low-achieving schools in any of the ten domains of the PIMRS (Table 5).

Research Question 2: Do principals of high-performing schools perform a different set of instructional leadership behaviors than principals of low-performing schools?

No significant difference was found in instructional leadership behaviors between principals of high-performing and low-performing schools in any of the ten domains of the PIMRS (Table 6).

Research Question 3: Do differences in instructional leadership behaviors exist among principals of (a) high-achieving, high-performing schools; (b) high-achieving, low-performing schools; (c) low-achieving, high-performing schools; and (d) low-achieving, low-performing schools?

There were significant differences between the instructional leadership of principals of high-achieving, high-performing, high-achieving, low-performing, low-achieving, high-performing, and low-achieving, low-performing schools in Domain 1: Framing School Goals (Table 7). The mean scores for Domain 1 were 4.52 for the high-achieving, high-performing schools, 3.98 for the high-achieving, low-performing schools, 4.45 for the low-achieving, high-performing schools, and 4.51 for the low-achieving, low-performing schools (Figure 2).

Table 5: Difference in Leadership Between High and Low Achieving Schools

Domain	HA Mean	LA Mean	Significance*
Frame Schools Goals	4.4039	4.4930	.332
Communciate School Goals	3.9935	4.0447	.662
Supervise and Evaluate Instruction	4.3069	4.3035	.969
Coordinate the Curriculum	4.2549	4.2303	.817
Monitor Student Progress	4.1490	4.2276	.498
Protect Instructional Time	4.3520	4.2693	.425
Maintain High Visibility	3.8650	4.0191	.191
Provide Incentives For Teachers	4.0939	4.0027	.478
Promote Professional Development	4.3429	4.2577	.473
Promote Incentives For Learning	3.9346	3.9511	.899

*.05 significance level

Table 6: Difference in Leadership Between High and Low Performing Schools

Domain	HP Mean	LP Mean	Significance*
Frame Schools Goals	4.48853	4.4489	.670
Communciate School Goals	4.0862	3.9811	.333
Supervise and Evaluate Instruction	4.3580	4.2600	.218
Coordinate the Curriculum	4.2773	4.2050	.463
Monitor Student Progress	4.2027	4.2039	.991
Protect Instructional Time	4.3059	4.2892	.865
Maintain High Visibility	3.9674	3.9687	.991
Provide Incentives For Teachers	4.0995	3.9805	.329
Promote Professional Development	4.3785	4.2128	.140
Promote Incentives For Learning	3.9040	3.9820	.518

*.05 significance level

Table 7: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Domain 1

Domain	Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig*
Framing School Goals	HA/HP (4.52)	LA/HP (4.45)	.0743	.547
		HA/LP (3.98)	.5382	.003*
		LA/LP (4.51)	.0061	.953
	LA/HP (4.45)	HA/LP (3.98)	.4639	.013*
	LA/LP (4.51)	LA/HP (4.45)	.0682	.529
		HA/LP (3.98)	.5321	.002*

*.05 significance level

	HP	LP
HA	4.52	3.98
LA	4.45	4.51

Figure 2: Quadrant mean scores for Domain 1

There were also significant differences in instructional leadership behaviors among principals of high-achieving, high-performing and high-achieving, low-performing schools, low-achieving, high-performing and high-achieving, low-performing schools, and high-achieving, low-performing and low-achieving, low-performing schools on Question 1 of Domain 1: Do what extent do you develop a set of annual school-wide goals (Table 8)?

There were also significant differences between.high-achieving, high-performing and high-achieving, low-performing schools and high-achieving, low-performing and low-achieving, low-performing schools on Question 3 of Domain 1: To what extent do you use needs assessment or other formal and informal methods to secure staff input on goal development (Table 9)?

There were also significant differences between high-achieving, high-performing and high-achieving, low-performing schools and low-achieving, low-performing, and high-achieving, low-performing schools on Question 5 of Domain 1: To what extent do you develop goals that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school (Table10)?

There were no significant differences among principal instructional leadership behaviors between any of the four quadrants in Domain 2: Communicating School Goals (Table 11). The mean scores for this Domain 2 were 4.09 for high-achieving, high-performing schools, 3.65 for high-achieving, low-performing schools,

Table 8: Differences in Leadership Behavior in Question 1 of Domain 1

Question 1: Do what extent do you develop a set of annual school-wide goals?

Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig*
HA/HP (4.65)	LA/HP (4.43)	.22	.227
	HA/LP (3.64)	1.01	.000*
	LA/LP (4.50)	.15	.330
LA/HP (4.43)	HA/LP (3.64)	.79	.004*
LA/LP (4.50)	LA/HP (4.43)	.07	.657
	HA/LP (3.64)	.86	.001*

*.05 significance level

Table 9: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 3 of Domain 1

Question 3: To what extent do you use needs assessment or other formal or informal methods to secure staff input on goal development?

Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig.*
HA/HP (4.35)	HA/LP (3.37)	.62	.022*
LA/LP (4.41)	HA/LP (3.37)	.68	.008*

*.05 significance level

Table 10: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 5 of Domain 1

Question 5: To what extent do you develop goals that are easily understood by teachers in the school?

Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig.
HA/HP (4.57)	HA/LP (4.09)	.48	.029*
LA/LP (4.65)	HA/LP (4.09)	.56	.008*

* .05 significance level

Table 11: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Domain 2

Domain	Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig*
Communicate School Goals	HA/HP (4.09)	LA/HP(4.09)	.0010	.995
		HA/LP (3.65)	.4321	.068
		LA/LP (4.03)	.0601	.655
	LA/HP (4.09)	HA/LP (3.65)	.4312	.073
		LA/LP (4.03)	.0591	.674
	LA/LP (4.03)	HA/LP (3.65)	.3720	.096

*.05 significance level

4.09 for low-achieving/high-performing schools, and 4.03 for low-achieving/low-performing schools (Figure 3).

However, there were significant differences between all quadrants on Question 6 of Domain 2: To what extent do you communicate the school's mission effectively to members of the school community (Table 12)? There were also significant differences among high-achieving/ high-performing and high-achieving/ low-performing schools and low-achieving/ high-performing and high-achieving/ low-performing schools in Question 10 of Domain 2: To what extent do you ensure that the school's academic goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the school (e.g. posters or bulletin boards emphasizing academic progress) (Table 13)? There were also significant differences between high-achieving/high-performing and low-achieving/low-performing schools in Question 10 of Domain 2: To what extent do you refer to the school's goals or mission in forums with students (e.g. in assemblies or discussions) (Table 14)?

	HP	LP
HA	4.09	3.65
LA	4.09	4.03

Figure 3: Quadrant mean scores for Domain 2

Table 12: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 6 of Domain 2

Question 6: To what extent do you communicate the school's mission effectively to members of the school community?

Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig*
HA/HP (4.31)	LA/HP (4.00)	.31	.118
	HA/LP (3.40)	.91	.003*
	LA/LP (4.00)	.31	.064
LA/HP (4.00)	HA/LP (3.40)	.60	.049*
	LA/LP (4.00)	.00	1.000
LA/LP (4.00)	HA/LP (3.40)	.60	.035*

*.05 significance level

Table 13: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 9 of Domain 2

Question 9: To what extent do you ensure that the school's academic goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the school (e.g. posters or bulletin boards emphasizing academic progress)?

Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig*
HA/HP (3.55)	HA/LP (2.60)	.95	.032*
LA/HP (3.66)	HA/LP (2.90)	1.06	.019*

*.05 significance level

Table 14: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 10 of Domain 2

Question 10: To what extent do you refer to the schools goals or mission in forums with students (e.g. in assemblies or discussions)?

Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig*
LA/HP (3.71)	HA/LP (2.90)	.81	.038*

*.05 significance level

There were no significant differences between any of the quadrants in Domain 3: Supervising and Evaluating Instruction (Table 15). The mean scores for Domain 3 were 4.38 for the high-achieving, high-performing schools, 4.05 for the high-achieving, low-performing schools, 4.34 for the low-achieving, low-performing schools, and 4.29 for the low-achieving, low-performing schools (Figure 4). There were significant differences between low-achieving, high-performing schools and high-achieving, low-performing schools in Question 11 of Domain 3: To what extent do you ensure that the classroom priorities of teachers are consistent with the goals and direction of the school (Table 16)?

There were significant differences between low-achieving/high-performing and high-achieving/low-performing schools in Question 12 of Domain 3: To what extent do you review student work products when evaluating classroom instruction (Table 17)?

Table 15: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Domain 3

Domain	Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig*
Supervising Evaluating Instruction	HA/HP (4.38)	LA/HP (4.34)	.0391	.739
		HA/LP (4.05)	.3217	.064
		LA/LP (4.29)	.0876	.374
	LA/HP (4.34)	HA/LP (4.05)	.2826	.108
		LA/LP (4.29)	.0485	.637
	LA/LP (4.29)	HA/LP (4.05)	.2341	.153

*.05 significance level

	HP	LP
HA	4.38	4.05
LA	4.34	4.29

Figure 4: Quadrant mean scores for Domain 3

Table 16: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 11 of Domain 3

Question 11: To what extent do you ensure that classroom priorities of teachers are consistent with the goals and direction of the school?

Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig*
LA/HP (4.51)	HA/LP (4.00)	.51	.028*

*.05 significance level

Table 17: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 12 of Domain 3

Question 12: To what extent do you review student work products when evaluating classroom instruction?

Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig*
LA/HP (4.51)	HA/LP (4.00)	.51	.028*

*.05 significance level

There were also significant differences between low-achieving, high-performing and low-achieving, low-performing schools on Question 14 of Domain 3: To what extent do you point out specific strengths in teacher's instructional practices in post-observation feedback (e.g. in conference or written evaluation) (Table 18)?

There were no significant differences in principal instructional leadership behavior between any of the quadrants in Domain 4 (Table 19). The mean scores for Domain 4 were 4.35 for the high-achieving, high-performing schools, 3.93 for the high-achieving, low-performing schools, 4.20 for the low-achieving, high-performing schools, and 4.24 for the low-achieving, low-performing schools (Figure 5).

Table 18: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 14 of Domain 3

Question 14: To what extent do you point out specific strengths in teacher's instructional practices in post-observation feedback (e.g. in conference or written evaluation)?

Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig*
LA/HP (4.54)	LA/LP (4.77)	-.23	.041*

*.05 significance level

Table 19: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Domain 4

Domain	Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig*
Coordinating Curriculum	HA/HP (4.35)	LA/HP (4.20)	.1450	.319
		HA/LP (3.93)	.4177	.052
		LA/LP (4.24)	.1013	.406
	LA/HP (4.20)	HA/LP (3.93)	.2727	.210
	LA/LP (4.24)	LA/HP (4.20)	.0437	.732
		HA/LP (3.93)	.3164	.119

*.05 significance level

	HP	LP
HA	4.35	3.93
LA	4.20	4.24

Figure 5: Quadrant mean scores for Domain 4

There was significant difference between high-achieving, high-performing and high-achieving, low-performing schools in Question 16 of Domain 4: To what extent do you make clear who is responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels (e.g. the principal, vice-principal, or teacher-leaders) (Table 20).

There were no significant differences in instructional leadership behaviors between any of the quadrants in Domain 5 of the PIMRS: Monitoring Student Progress (Table 21). The mean scores for Domain 5 were 4.22 for the high-achieving, high-performing schools, 3.87 for the high-achieving, low-performing schools, 4.18 for the low-achieving, high-performing schools, and 4.25 for the low-achieving, low-performing schools (Figure 6). There was significance difference between high-achieving, low-performing and low-achieving, low-performing schools in Question 23 of Domain 5: To what extent do you use tests and other performance measures to assess progress toward school goals (Table 22)?

Table 20: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 16 of Domain 4

Question 16: To what extent do you make clear who is responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels (e.g. the principal, vice-principal, or teacher-leaders?

Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig.*
HA/HP (4.35)	HA/LP (3.93)	.56	.031*

*.05 significance level

Table 21: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Domain 5

Domain	Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig*
Monitoring Student Progress	LA/LP (4.25)	HA/HP (4.22)	.0250	.851
		LA/HP (4.18)	.0729	.602
		HA/LP (3.87)	.3773	.090

*.05 significance level

	HP	LP
HA	4.22	3.87
LA	4.18	4.25

Figure 6: Quadrant mean scores for Domain 5

Table 22: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 23 of Domain 5

Question 23: To what extent do you use tests and other performance measures to assess progress toward school goals?

Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig.*
LA/LP (4.25)	HA/LP (3.87)	.53	.026*

*.05 significance level

There was significant difference between high-achieving, high-performing schools and low-achieving, high-performing schools in Domain 6 of the PIMRS: Protecting Instructional Time (Table 23). The mean scores for Domain 6 were 4.44 for the high-achieving/ high-performing schools, 4.05 for the high-achieving/ low-performing schools, 4.13 for the low-achieving/ high-performing schools, and 4.33 for the low-achieving/ low-performing schools (Figure 7).

There was significant difference between high-achieving, high-performing and low-achieving, high-performing schools in Question 28 of Domain 6 of the PIMRS: To what extent do you ensure that tardy and truant students suffer specific consequences for missing instructional time (Table 24)?

Table 23: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Domain 6

Domain	Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig*
Protecting Instructional Time	HA/HP (4.44)	LA/HP (4.13)	.3049	.037*
		HA/LP (4.05)	.3814	.061
		LA/LP (4.33)	.1109	.347

*.05 significance level

	HP	LP
HA	4.44	4.05
LA	4.13	4.33

Figure 7: Quadrant mean scores for Domain 6

Table 24: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 28 of Domain 6

Question 28: To what extent do you ensure that tardy and truant students suffer specific consequences for missing instructional time?

Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig.*
HA/HP (4.67)	LA/HP (4.45)	.38	.031*

*.05 significance level

There was significant difference between high-achieving, high-performing and high- achieving, low-performing schools in Question 29 of Domain 6 of the PIMRS: To what extent do you encourage teachers to use instructional time for teaching and practicing new skills and concepts (Table 25)?

There was significant difference between high-achieving, high-performing schools and high-achieving, low-performing schools in Question 30 of Domain 6 of the PIMRS: To what extent do you limit the intrusion of extra-and co-curricular activities on instructional time (Table 26)?

There was significance difference between high-achieving, low-performing and low achieving, low-performing schools in Domain 7 of the PIMRS: Maintaining High Visibility (Table 27).

Table 25: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 29 of Domain 6

Question 29: To what extent do you encourage teachers to use instructional time for teaching and practicing new skills and concepts?

Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig.*
HA/HP (4.79)	HA/LP (4.36)	.43	.045*

*.05 significance level

Table 26: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 30 of Domain 6

Question 30: To what extent do you limit the intrusion of extra-and co-curricular activities on instructional time?

Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig.*
HA/HP (4.46)	HA/LP (3.91)	.55	.039*

*.05 significance level

Table 27: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Domain 7

Domain	Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig.*
Maintaining High Visibility	LA/LP (4.03)	HA/LP(3.96)	.0782	.562
		LA/HP (3.98)	.0494	.740
		HA/LP (3.55)	.4879	.027*

*.05 significance level

The mean scores for Domain 7 were 3.96 for the high-achieving, high-performing schools, 3.55 for the high-achieving, low-performing schools, 3.98 for the low-achieving/high-performing schools, and 4.03 for the low-achieving/low-performing schools (Figure 8).

There was also significant difference between high-achieving/ high-performing, and high-achieving/ low-performing and low-achieving/ high-performing and high-Achieving/low-performing and high-achieving/ low-performing and low-achieving/ low-performing schools in Question 31 of Domain 7 of the PIMRS: To what extent do you take time to talk informally with students and teachers during recess and break (Table 28)?

	HP	LP
HA	3.96	3.55
LA	3.98	4.03

Figure 8: Quadrant mean scores for Domain 7

Table 28: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 31 of Domain 7

Question 31: To what extent do you take time to talk informally with students and teachers during recess and breaks?

Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig.*
HA/LP (4.69)	HA/LP (4.00)	.69	.005*
LA/HP (4.69)	HA/LP (4.00)	.69	.005*
LA/LP (4.53)	HA/LP (4.00)	.53	.022*

*.05 significance level

There was also significant difference between high-achieving/ low-performing and low-achieving/ low-performing schools in Question 34 of Domain 7 of the PIMRS: To what extent do you cover classes for teachers until a late or substitute teacher arrives (Table 29)? There were no significant differences between any of the quadrants in Domain 8 of the PIMRS: Providing Incentives for Teachers (Table 30). The mean scores for Domain 8 were 4.16 for the high-achieving/high-performing schools, 3.87 for the high-achieving/ low-performing schools, 4.02 for the low-achieving/high-performing schools, and 4.00 for the low-achieving/low-performing schools (Figure 9).

Table 29: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 34 of Domain 7

Question 34: To what extent do you cover classes for teachers until a late of substitute teacher arrives?

Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig.*
LA/LP (3.87)	HA/LP (2.91)	.96	.020*

*.05 significance level

Table 30: Difference In Leadership Behavior in Domain 8

Domain	Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig.*
Providing Incentives For Teachers	HA/HP (4.16)	LA/HP (4.02)	.1406	.448
		HA/LP (3.87)	.2852	.259
		LA/LP (4.00)	.1607	.278

*.05 significance level

	HP	LP
HA	4.16	3.87
LA	4.02	4.00

Figure 9: Quadrant mean scores for Domain 8

There was significant difference between high-achieving/ high-performing and high-achieving/low-performing schools in Domain 9 of the PIMRS: Promoting Professional Development (Table 31). The mean scores for Domain 9 were 4.46 for the high-achieving, high-performing schools, 3.93 for the high-achieving, low-performing schools, 4.26 for the low-achieving, high-performing schools, and 4.26 for the low-achieving, low-performing schools (Figure 10).

There were also significant differences between high-achieving/ high-performing, low-achieving/ high-performing, low-achieving/ low-performing and high-achieving/ low-performing schools in Question 41 of Domain 9 of the PIMRS: To what extent do you ensure that in-service activities attended by the staff are consistent with the school's goals (Table 32)?

Table 31: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Domain 9

Domain	Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig.*
Promoting Professional Development	HA/HP (4.46)	LA/HP (4.26)	.2039	.227
		HA/LP (3.93)	.5359	.021*
		LA/LP (4.26)	.2061	.127

*.05 significance level

	HP	LP
HA	4.46	3.93
LA	4.26	4.26

Figure 10: Quadrant mean scores for Domain 9.

Table 32: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 41 of Domain 9

Question 41: To what extent do you ensure that in-service activities attended by staff are consistent with the school's goals?

Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig.*
HA/HP (4.66)	HA/LP (4.00)	.66	.010*
LA/HP (4.59)	HA/LP (4.00)	.59	.026*
LA/LP (4.48)	HA/LP (4.00)	.48	.047*

*.05 significance level

There was also significant difference between high-achieving, high-performing and high-achieving, low-performing schools in Question 45 of Domain 9 of the PIMRS: To what extent do you set aside time at faculty meetings for teachers to share ideas or information from in-service activities (Table 33)? There were no significant differences between any of the quadrants in Domain 10 of the PIMRS: Promoting Incentives for Learning (Table 34). The mean scores for Domain 10 were 4.02 for the high-achieving/high-performing schools, 3.64 for the high-achieving/ low performing schools, 3.78 for the low-achieving/ high-performing schools, and 4.03 for the low-achieving, low-performing schools (Figure 11).

Table 33: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 45 of Domain 9

Question 45:	To what extent do you set aside time at faculty meetings for teachers to share ideas or information from in-service activities?			
	Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig.*
	HA/HP (3.95)	HA/LP (3.18)	.77	.045*

*.05 significance level

Table 34: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Domain 10

Domain	Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig.
Promoting Incentives For Learning	HA/HP (4.02)	LA/HP (3.78)	.2414	.171
		HA/LP (3.64)	.3803	.142
	LA/HP(3.78)	HA/LP (3.64)	.1389	.597
	LA/LP (4.03)	HA/HP (4.02)	.0154	.918
		LA/HP (3.78)	.2568	.904
		HA/LP (3.54)	.3957	.108

*.05 significance level

	HP	LP
HA	4.02	3.64
LA	3.78	4.03

Figure 11: Quadrant mean scores for Domain 10.

There were significant differences between high-achieving, high-performing and low-achieving, high-performing and high-achieving, low-performing schools in Question 49 of Domain 10 of the PIMRS: To what extent do you contact parents to communicate improved or exemplary student performance or contributions (Table 35)?

There was also significant difference between high-achieving, low-performing and low-achieving, low-performing schools on Question 50 of Domain 10 of the PIMRS: To what extent do you support teachers actively in their recognition and/or reward of student contributions to and accomplishments in class (Table 36)?

Table 35: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 49 of Domain 10

Question 49: To what extent do you contact parents to communicate improved or exemplary student performance or contributions?

Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig.*
HA/HP (3.76)	LA/HP (3.11)	.65	.017*
	HA/LP (3.00)	.76	.039*

*.05 significance level

Table 36: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Question 50 of Domain 10

Question 50:	To what extent do you support teachers actively in their recognition and/or reward of student contributions to and accomplishments in class?			
	Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig.*
	LA/LP (4.47)	HA/LP (4.00)	.47	.043*

*.05 significance level

Data Analysis Summary

No significant differences were found in principal instructional leadership behaviors between high-achieving and low-achieving schools (Research Question 1) nor were there significant differences in instructional leadership behaviors of principals of high-performing and low-performing schools (Research Question 2) in any of the 10 Domains of the PIMRS (Table 37).

When achievement and academic performance were combined, significant differences were found in four of the ten domains of the PIMRS. Significances were found between all quadrants in Domain 1: Framing School Goals. Significant

Table 37: Difference in Principal Leadership Behavior Between High Achieving/Low-Achieving and High-Performing/Low-Performing Schools

Domain	HA/LA Sig.*	HP/LP Sig.*
Frame School Goals	.332	.670
Communicate School Goals	.662	.333
Supervise and Evaluate Instruction	.969	.218
Coordinate the Curriculum	.817	.463
Monitor Student Progress	.498	.991
Protect Instructional Time	.425	.865
Maintain High Visibility	.191	.991
Provide Incentives for Teachers	.478	.329
Promote Staff Development	.473	.140
Promote Incentives for Learning	.899	.518

*.05 significance level

difference was found between HA/HP and LA/HP schools in Domain 6: Protecting Instructional Time. Significance was found between HA/LP and LA/LP schools in Domain 7: Maintaining High Visibility. There was also significant difference between HA/HP and HA/LP schools in Domain 9: Promoting Professional Development. There were no statistical significances between any of the quadrants in any of the remaining six domains (Table 38).

Significant differences were also found between quadrants in some questions within the domains of the PIMRS when achievement and academic performance were combined. Significant differences were found between all quadrants in Question 1 of Domain 1 (Framing Goals): To what extent do you develop a set of annual school-wide goals? Statistical differences were found between HA/HP and HA/LP schools and HA/LP and LA/LP schools in Question 3 of Domain 1: To what extent do you use needs assessment or other formal methods to secure staff input on goal development? Significant differences were found between HA/HP and HA/LP and HA/LP and LA/LP schools in Question 5 of Domain 1: To what extent do you develop goals that are easily understood by teachers in the school? No differences were found between any of the quadrants in either question 2 or 4 of Domain 1.

In Domain 2, Communicating School Goals, significant differences were found between all quadrants in Question 6: To what extent do you communicate the schools' mission effectively to members of the school community? Significant differences were also found between HA/HP and LA/LP and HA/LP schools in Question 9: To what extent

Table 38: Difference in Leadership Behavior in the Ten Domains of the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale

Domain	Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Difference	Sig
Framing School Goals	HA/HP (4.52)	HA/LP (3.98)	.5382	.003*
	LA/HP (4.45)	HA/LP (3.98)	.4639	.013*
	LA/LP (4.51)	HA/LP (3.98)	.5321	.002*
Communicating School Goals	No statistical significance			
Supervising and Evaluating Instruction	No statistical significance			
Coordinating the Curriculum	No statistical significance			
Monitoring Student Progress	No statistical significance			
Protecting Instructional Time	HA/HP (4.44)	LA/HP (4.13)	.3049	.037*
		HA/LP (4.05)	.3814	.061
		LA/LP (4.33)	.1109	.347
Maintaining High Visibility	LA/LP (4.03)	HA/HP (3.96)	.0782	.562
		HA/LP (3.55)	.4879	.027*
		LA/HP (3.98)	.0494	.740
Promoting Incentives for Teachers	No statistical significance			
Promoting Professional Development	HA/HP (4.46)	HA/LP (3.93)	.5359	.021*
		LA/HP (4.26)	.2039	.227
		LA/LP (4.26)	.2061	.127
Promoting Incentives for Learning	No statistical significance			

*.05 significance level

do you ensure that the school's academic goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the school? Significant difference was found between LA/HP and HA/LP schools in Question 10 of Domain 2: To what extent do you refer to the school's goals and mission in forums with students? No other statistical differences were found in other questions within the domain.

In Domain 3, Supervising and Evaluating Instruction, significant differences were found in three of the five questions within the domain. Significant difference was found between LA/HP and HA/LP schools in Question 11: To what extent do you ensure that classroom priorities of teachers are consistent with the goals and direction of the school? There was significant difference between LA/HP and HA/LP schools in Question 12: To what extent do you review student work products when evaluating classroom instruction? Significant difference also found between LA/HP and LA/LP schools in Question 14: To what extent do you point out specific strengths in teachers' instructional practices in post-observation feedback?

In the five questions of Domain 4, significant difference was found only in one question, Question 16: To what extent do you make clear who is responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels? This difference existed between HA/HP and HA/LP schools.

Significant difference between HA/LP and LA/LP schools was found in Question 23 of Domain 5: To what extent do you use tests and other performance measures to assess progress toward school goals? No other significant differences were found in the remaining four questions of this domain.

In Domain 6, Protecting Instructional Time, significant differences were found in three of the five questions. Significant difference was found between HA/HP and LA/HP schools in Question 28: To what extent do you ensure that tardy and truant student suffer consequences for missing instructional time? Significant difference was found between HA/HP and HA/LP schools in Question 29: To what extent do you encourage teachers to use instructional time for teaching and practicing new skills and concepts? Significant difference was also found between HA/HP and HA/LP schools in Question 30: To what extent do you limit the intrusion of extra and co-curricular activities on instructional time?

Significant differences were found in two of the five questions of Domain 7. Differences were found between all quadrants in Question 31: To what extent do you take time to talk informally with students and teachers during recess and breaks? In Question 34, covering for teachers, significant difference was found between HA/LP and LA/LP schools.

There were no significant differences found in any of the questions of Domain 8. In Domain 9, significant differences were found in Questions 41 and 49.

In Question 41, significant differences existed between HA/HP and HA/LP, LA/HP and HA/LP, and LA/LP and HA/LP schools. This question dealt with the principal's role in ensuring that staff development was consistent with school goals. Question 45 asked the extent time was set-aside at faculty meetings to share information from in-service activities. Significant difference existed between HA/HP and HA/LP schools.

In Domain 10 significant difference was found in two questions. Differences were found between Ha/HP and LA/HP and HA/LP schools in Question 49: To what extent do you contact parents to communicate improved or exemplary student performance or contribution? Significant difference was also found between HA/LP and LA/LP schools in Question 50: To what extent do you support teacher activity in their recognition and/or reward of student contribution to and accomplishments in class (Table 39)?

Summary

Significant differences were found in principal instructional leadership behavior in four of the ten domains of the PIMRS: framing goals, protecting instructional time, maintaining high visibility, and promoting staff development. While principals may not be able to affect student academic achievement, which has traditionally been linked to socio-economic status, they can indirectly have positive impact on student academic performance.

High school principals in Tennessee are still predominantly male. Of the respondents, 73% were male and 27% were female. High school principals in Tennessee do not hold lengthy tenure in the principalship. Sixty-four percent of the principals who responded to the survey instrument had 10 years or less principal experience. This same trend held true when length of service was examined by achievement/performance quadrants: 54.9% of principals in the high-achieving, high-performing quadrant; 68.8% of those respondents in the low-achieving, high-performing quadrant; 100 in the high-achieving, low-performing quadrant; and 64.3% in the low-achieving, low-performing quadrant had 10 years or less years of experience as a principal.

Table 39: Difference in Leadership Behavior in Questions of the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale

Domain	Question	Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Diff.	Sig.
Framing School Goals	1	HA/HP (4.65)	HA/LP (3.64)	1.01	.004*
		LA/HP (4.43)	HA/LP (3.64)	.79	.004*
		LA/LP (4.50)	HA/LP (3.64)	.86	.001*
	2	No statistical significance			
	3	HA/HP (4.35)	HA/LP (3.64)	.62	.022*
		LA/LP (4.41)	HA/LP (3.73)	.62	.008*
	4	No statistical significance			
	5	HA/HP (4.57)	HA/LP (4.09)	.48	.029*
		LA/LP (4.65)	HA/LP (4.09)	.56	.008*
Comm. School Goals	6	HA/HP (4.31)	HA/LP (3.40)	.91	.003*
		LA/HP (4.00)	HA/LP (3.40)	.60	.049*
		LA/LP (4.00)	HA/LP (3.40)	.60	.049*
	7	No statistical significance			
	8	No statistical significance			
	9	HA/HP (3.55)	HA/LP (2.60)	.95	.032*
		LA/HP (3.66)	HA/LP (2.90)	1.06	.019*
	10	LA/HP (3.71)	HA/LP (2.90)	.81	.038*
Supervise Evaluate Instruction	11	LA/HP (4.51)	HA/LP (4.00)	.51	.028*
	12	LA/HP (4.51	HA/LP (4.00)	.51	.028*
	13	No statistical significance			
	14	LA/LP (4.77)	LA/LP (4.54)	.23	.041*
	14	No statistical significance			

*.05 significance level

Table 39 continued

Domain	Question	Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Diff.	Sig.
Coordinate Curriculum	16	HA/HP (4.35)	HA/LP (3.93)	.56	.031*
	17	No statistical significance			
	18	No statistical significance			
	19	No statistical significance			
	20	No statistical significance			
Monitor Student Progress	21	No statistical significance			
	22	No statistical significance			
	23	LA/LP (4.25)	HA/LP (3.87)	.53	.026*
	24	No statistical significance			
	25	No statistical significance			
Protect Instructional Time	26	No statistical significance			
	27	No statistical significance			
	28	HA/HP (4.67)	LA/HP (4.45)	.38	.031*
	29	HA/HP (4.79)	HA/LP (4.36)	.43	.045*
	30	HA/HP (4.46)	HA/LP (3.91)	.55	.039*
High Visibility	31	HA/HP (4.69)	HA/LP (4.00)	.69	.009*
		LA/HP (4.69)	HA/LP (4.00)	.69	.009*
		LA/LP (4.53)	HA/LP (4.00)	.53	.022*
	32	No statistical significance			
	33	No statistical significance			
	34	LA/LP (3.97)	HA/LP (2.91)	.96	.020*
	35	No statistical significance			
Incentives For Teachers	36	No statistical significance			
	37	No statistical significance			
	38	No statistical significance			
	39	No statistical significance			
	40	No statistical significance			

*.05 significance level

Table 39 continued

Domain	Question	Quadrant (M)	Quadrant (M)	Diff.	Sig.
Promoting Professional Development	41	HA/HP (4.66)	HA/LP (4.00)	.66	.010*
		LA/HP (4.59)	HA/LP (4.00)	.59	.026*
		LA/LP (4.48)	HA/LP (4.00)	.48	.047*
	42	No statistical significance			
	43	No statistical significance			
	44	No statistical significance			
	45	HA/HP (3.95)	HA/LP (3.18)	.77	.045*
Incentives For Learning	46	No statistical significance			
	47	No statistical significance			
	48	No statistical significance			
	49	HA/HP (3.76)	LA/HP (3.11)	.65	.017*
			HA/LP (3.00)	.76	.039*
	50	LA/LP (4.47)	HA/LP (4.00)	.47	.043*

*.05 significance level

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Public education is currently facing high accountability standards for student achievement. With these increased standards comes a major paradigm shift for the principalship, a move from management to a focus on student learning. For the first time under the No Child Left Behind Act 0f 2001, principals whose schools fail to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) may be removed.

U.S. Department of Labor studies show that more than 40% of principals are nearing retirement and 42% of school districts report a shortage of highly qualified candidates to fill these positions (Savoye, 2001). While the government has legislated the expectation of a highly qualified teacher in every classroom, it has failed to establish the same expectation for principals (Ellison and Hayes, 2006), whose major role is to provide the focus and support system for student learning (Fullan, Hill, & Crevola, 2006). The purpose of this study was to determine if differences in instructional leadership behavior exist between principals of high-achieving, high-performing, low-achieving, and low-performing schools.

This study was framed around three research questions. These questions were designed to examine possible relationships between instructional leadership behavior, student achievement, and student academic growth.

1. Do principals of high-achieving high schools perform a different set of instructional behaviors than principals of low-achieving high schools?

2. Do principals of high-performing high schools perform a different set of instructional behaviors than principals of low-performing high schools?

3. Do differences in instructional leadership behaviors exist among principals of (a) high-achieving, high-performing schools; (b) high-achieving, low-performing schools; (c) low-achieving high-performing schools; and (d) low-achieving, low-performing schools?

Design Summary

This study was designed to examine the differences between principal instructional behavior compared to student academic achievement and performance. The population of this study consisted of 251 Tennessee high school principals. These principals were surveyed using the PIMRS that measured their perceptions of the frequency in which they implemented specified instructional leadership behaviors within their schools.

Summary of Findings

Based on responses from the Principal Instructional Management Rating Survey and subsequent analysis of the data, the following are the major findings of this study:

1. No significant differences were found in instructional leadership behavior between principals of high-achieving and low-achieving schools.

2. No significant difference was found in instructional leadership behavior between principals of high-performing and low-performing schools.

3. When achievement and performance data were combined, statistical significant differences were found in four domains of instructional leadership: framing school goals, protecting instructional time, maintaining high visibility, and promoting professional development.

Conclusions

Principals of high-achieving, low-performing schools engage in different behaviors than do principals of other schools. Principals of these schools frame goals less frequently than do principals of other schools. In addition, staffs in these schools

have less input into goal development and less frequently understand goals that are developed. Principals in high-achieving, low-performing schools less frequently display goals in highly visible places and less frequently communicate goals to the school community.

Initially, these findings were surprising to the researcher due to the mandated school improvement process enacted by the State Board of Education in 1995 and the yearly academic and value-added data generated by state testing and reflected in the Tennessee Report Card. Principals are held accountable for the performance of the school (Tennessee School Improvement Planning Process, A Blueprint for Continuous Improvement, 1999) and they are expected to have a thorough understanding of and to follow the school improvement process (Tennessee State Board of Education Rule 0520-1-3-03 (16), 1995).

Upon further review, these findings may support previous research on the school improvement process on the high school level (Wright, 2002). This study found that high school principals did not overwhelmingly accept the school improvement process nor did they completely understand it. Understanding the process of change is crucial if principals are expected to lead school improvement efforts (Fullan, 2001).

The most interesting finding for the researcher was the difference in principal behavior in the area of framing and communicating goals. Principals of high-achieving, high- performing and principals of low-achieving, high-performing schools more frequently developed a set of annual goals than principals in schools within the other quadrants. They used needs assessments and other data to develop these goals, but more

importantly, these were goals that were easily understood by teachers within the school. Initially this finding was somewhat surprising because of the mandated school improvement process enacted by the State Board of Education in 1995. As part of this plan schools are required to set goals, objectives, and strategies for achievement. Principals are held accountable for the performance of the school (Tennessee School Improvement Planning Process, A Blueprint for Continuous Improvement, 1999) and are expected to have a thorough understanding of and to follow the school improvement process (Tennessee State Board of Education Rule 0520-1-3-03 (16), 1995).

Principals also cited a lack of training as an impediment to successful implementation. This was especially true of those principals from schools in rural areas, which describes most of Tennessee's local school systems. While training opportunities are provided, they are most commonly held in the large metropolitan areas, which may prohibit many principals from the rural areas from attending due to the expense of travel or the lack of administrative support staff at the school that would enable these principals to attend (Wright). Goal setting has been shown have a positive correlation to student achievement (Marzano et al., 2005). An assumption that may be made from this finding is that if principals in the lower performing quadrants more effectively set and used annual goals to guide to guide academic focus, they could more effectively meet the state mandate for school improvement and as well as increase student academic performance.

Principals of high-achieving, low-performing schools less frequently protected instructional time and were less visible than principals of other schools. Both of these behaviors were cited as best practice behaviors associated with strong instructional leaders (Glanz, 2006c). Principals in these schools less frequently talked to teachers and

students during break time and they less frequently covered classes for teachers than other principals did. According to Whitaker & Turner (1997), the most important part of a school is what occurs in its halls and classrooms and maintaining high visibility in those venues is what affords principals a true sense of the school. In their 1998 study Blasé and Blasé found that high principal visibility in classrooms had positive impact on teacher motivation and morale; however, in order to perform these visits successfully, principals should be familiar with student achievement data and correlating school goals, have conversations with teachers about how to improve student learning, and to provide the staff development to make this happen.

Principals of high-achieving, low-performing schools less frequently promoted staff development than principals of other schools. The in-service in these schools was less frequently aligned with school goals and these principals less frequently set aside time in faculty meetings to share information from in-service activities. Promoting quality staff development is an integral part of instructional leadership (DuFour, 1991) and is viewed by teachers as evidence that the principal is the school's instructional leader (Smith & Andrews, 1990). According to DuFour (2004), quality staff development demonstrates both a commitment to achieving the school's goals but also increases the staff's capacity for goal achievement.

While each of these has been shown to have positive correlation to student achievement (Marzano et al., 2005), they should not be viewed in isolation, but rather when incorporated as a whole, helps promote a climate for student achievement (Hallinger & Murphy, 1987) and can lead to major systemic change within a school (Marzano et al.).

While not included as part of the research questions, the demographic data of this study revealed that the least experienced principals are leading the lower performing high schools. While the majority of principals within the state have 10 years or less experience, all of the principal respondents in the high-achieving, low-performing quadrant had ten years or less experience. Three characteristics are thought to influence instructional leadership behavior: Experience, gender, and training are all thought to influence instructional leadership behavior (Hausman, Crow, & Sperry, 2000). Few college programs offer courses focusing specifically on instructional leadership skills, but instead train for more managerial functions (Ginsberg, 1988). Lack of experience, combined with the academic complexity associated with secondary schools (Hallinger & Murphy, 1987b), could also be a factor for principals of high-achieving, low-performing schools who may be dealing with communities and staffs who are content with the status quo as these schools do reflect high academic achievement. According to Fullan (2005), success for schools depends on the ability of leaders who are able to develop other leaders. With the experience demographic skewed toward inexperience, this may be a more difficult goal to achieve. To be effective instructional leaders principals, principals must be able to "walk the talk". They must provide more than lip service to instructional leadership, they must take specific actions to demonstrate their commitment to instruction and to academic improvement (Glanz, 2006).

Implications

The findings of this study has implications for high school principals if they are to meet the standards set by the Tennessee academic accountability system which has merged with the mandates imposed by No Child Left Behind. Tennessee is one of two

states approved in 2006 by the U.S. Department of Education to use the value-added growth model to measure AYP. By 2013-2014 100% of students are expected to be proficient or advanced on NCLB mandated tests. Based on academic achievement and growth data generated from these tests, all Tennessee schools are required to submit school improvement plans aimed at reaching the 2013-2014 NCLB goals (Tennessee State Board of Education Rule 0520-1-3-03 (16), 1995).

If principals in lower-performing schools are to have a chance at attaining NCLB and Tennessee goals, they must develop the instructional leadership behaviors shown to have a positive correlation to high student achievement and they must be able to implement these behaviors frequently and effectively within their schools. These principals must be identified and provided with the professional development required to become effective instructional leaders.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, two recommendations are made. The first is to provide focused, sustained staff development in the four domains where significant differences were found, especially those principals whose schools were in the high-achieving, low-performing quadrant. Since Tennessee principals are mandated to earn 28 hours of state staff development credit (TASL) every two years, effective July 1, 2006, specific training in the identified instructional leadership domains should be provided for principals of schools in the lower performing quadrants. These school leaders could be grouped with leaders of higher-performing schools, allowing them to work together for a sustained period of time (Fullan, 2005). This is viewed as crucial by the researcher given the limited tenure of the respondents within this study.

A second recommendation is for further research. Since the survey instrument used in this study focused on frequency of behavior and did not focus on process and since the respondents to the survey instrument self-assessed, a case study of schools within each quadrant should be conducted. Other means of gathering data such as surveys of staff members, principal interviews, and shadowing principals, especially those in high-achieving, high-performing schools such be incorporated. These data would better explain the process successful principals use within their schools. These findings could then be used to develop a model that other principals could replicate.

Further research should also be conducted using additional demographic data. While principals were asked to state how many years experience they had as principals, they were not asked how many years they had served as the principal of the school to which they were assigned during the time of this study. Examining differences in years in a specific school might reveal differences in the frequency in which principals implemented instructional leadership behaviors.

REFERENCES

Alig-Mielcarek, J. & Hoy, W. (2005). *A theoretical and empirical analysis of the nature, meaning, and influence of instructional leadership*. Ohio State University.

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

Arnn, J. & Mangieri, J. (1988). Effective leadership for effective schools: A survey of principal attitudes. *NASSP Bulletin*, 72 (505), 1-7.

Austin, G.R. (1979). Effective Schools and the Search for Effectiveness. *Educational Leadership*, 37 (1), 10-14.

Avila, L. (1990). Just what is instructional leadership anyway? *NASSP Bulletin*, 74 (255), 53-56.

Barth, R. (1988). Principals, teachers, and school leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69 (9), 639-642.

Behar-Horenstein, L. & Ornstein, A. (1999). Curriculum, instruction, and supervision. in A. Ornstein & L. Behar-Horenstein (Eds.), *Contemporary Issues in Curriculum.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bennett, K. S. (1988). What about me? . . . Reflection from a first-year principal. *NASSP Bulletin*, 72 (509), 132-134.

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: Strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper and Row.

Blackman, M.C. & Fenwick, L.T.(2000). The principalship. *Education Week*, 29 March.

Blasé, J. & Blasé, J. (1988). *Handbook of instructional leadership: How really good principals promote teaching and learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Blegan, M. B. & Kennedy, C. (2000). Principals and teachers, leading together. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84 (616), 1-6.

Blombe, A. C. & James, M. E. (1985). The principal as instructional leader: An evolving role. *NASSP Bulletin*, 69 (481), 48-54.

Blum, R.E., Butler, J.A. & Olson, N. L. (1987). Leadership for excellence: Research-based training for principals. *Educational Leadership*, 45 (1), 25-29.

Blumberg, A. & Greenfield, W. (1986). *The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bossert, S. Dwyer, D., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 18 (3), 34-64.

Boyan, N. (1988). *Handbook of research in educational administration.* New York: Longman.

Brandt, R. (1989). On teacher empowerment: A conversation with Ann Lieberman. *Educational Leadership*, 46 (8), 22-26.

Bridges, E. (1982). Research on the school administrator: The state-of-the-art, 1967-1980. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18 (3), 12-33.

Bridges, E. (1984). *Managing the incompetent teacher.* Eugene.OR: Eric Clearinghouse.

Brookover, W. & Lezotte, L. (1979). Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement. East Lansing MI: Michigan State University.

Brookover, W., Schweitzer, J., Schneider J., Beady, C., Flood, P., & Wisenbaker, J. (1978). Elementary school climate and school achievement. *American Educational Research Journal,* 15 (2), 301-318.

Browder, L. (1994). Exploring the meaning of teacher empowerment. *Instructional Journal of Educational Reform*, 4 (2), 137-153.

Buchen, I. (2002). Overcoming obstacles to instructional leadership. *Principal.* 81 (5), 42-45.

Buckner, K. & McDowelle, J. (2000). Developing teacher leaders: Providing encouragement, opportunities, and support. *NASSP Bulletin,* 84 (616), 35-41.

Bulach, C. (2001). A 4-step process for identifying and reshaping school culture. *Principal Leadership,* 1 (8), 48-51.

Carney, I. (2003). Improving student achievement with a walk-through process. Presentation at Tennessee Staff Development Council Southeastern Regional Institute, October 20-21, Gatlinburg, Tennessee.

Childs-Bowen, D., Moller, G. & Scrivner, J. (2000). Principals: leaders of leaders. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84 (616), 1-6.

Chirichello, M. (2001). Collective leadership: Sharing the principalship. *Principal,* 81 (1) 46-50.

Chiste, R. L. (1989). What does empowerment really mean? *NASSP Bulletin*, 73 (513), 83-84.

Cohen, E., Miller, R., Bredo, A. & Duckworth, K. (1977). Principal role and teacher morale under varying organizational conditions. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching.

Cooley, V. & Shen, J. (2003). School accountability and professional job responsibilities: A perspective from secondary principals. *NASSP Bulletin,* 87 (634), 10-25.

Cotton, K. (2003). *Principals and student achievement: What research says.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum.

Council of Chief State School Officers (1996). *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards for School Leaders*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Cross, C. & Rice, R. (2000). The role of the principal as instructional leader in a standards driven curriculum. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84 (620), 61-65.

Cuban, L. (1988). *The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Cunard, R. (1990). Sharing instructional leadership: A view to strengthening the principal's position. *NASSP Bulletin*, 74 (525), 30-34.

Danielson, Charlotte. (2006). *Teacher leadership that strengthens professional practice.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

David, G. (1989). *Restructuring in progress: Lessons from pioneering districts.* Washington, D.C.: National Governor's Association.

Davidson-Taylor, C.M. (2002). Is instruction working? Students have the answer. *Principal Leadership*, 3 (2), 30-34.

Deal, T. & Celloti, L. (1980). How much influence do (and can) administrators have on classrooms? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 61, 471-473.

Deal, T. & Peterson, K. (1999). *Shaping school culture: The heart of leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

DeBevoise, W. (1984). Synthesis of research on the principal as instructional leader. *Educational Leadership*, 41 (5), 14-20.

Dietrich, A. & Bailey, E. (1996). School climate: Common-sense solutions to complicated problems. *NASSP Bulletin*, 80 (576), 16-25.

Doggett, M. (1987). Staff development: Eight leadership behaviors for principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 71 (497), 1-10.

Donmoyer, R. (1985). Cognitive anthropology and research on effective principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 22, 31-57.

Donmoyer, R. & Wagstaff, J. (1990). Principals can be effective managers and instructional leaders. *NASSP Bulletin*, 74 (525), 20-29.

Downey, C.J., Steffey, B.E., English, F.W., Frase, L.E., & Poston, W.K., Jr. (2004). *The three- minute walkthrough: changing school supervisory practice one teacher at a time*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

DuFour, R (1991). *The principal as staff developer*, Dennis Sparks, (ed.). Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service.

DuFour, R. (2002). The learning centered principal. *Educational Leadership*. 12-15.

DuFour, R. (2004). The best staff development is in the workplace, not in a workshop. *Journal of Staff Development,* 25 (2), 63-64.

DuFour, R. & Burnette, B. (2002). Pull out negativity by the roots. *Journal of Staff Development*, 23 (3), 27-30.

DuFour, R. & Eaker, R. (1992). *Creating the new american school: A principal's guide to school improvement*. Bloomington, Indiana: National Education Service.

DuFour, R. & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work.* Bloomington, Indiana: National Educational Service.

Dwyer, D., Lee, G., Rowan, B., & Bossert, S. (1983). *Five principals in action: Perspectives on instructional management.* San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37 (1), 15-27.

Ellison, J. & Hayes, C. (2006). *Effective school leadership: Developing principals through cognitive coaching.* Norwich, CT: Christopher Gordon.

Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a new structure for leadership.* Washington, D.C.: Albert Shanker Institute.

Elmore, R. (2005). What (so-called) low performing schools can teach (so-called) high performing cchools. *Harvard Education Letter*, September/October.

Evans, L. & Teddlie, C. (1995). Facilitating change in schools: Is there one best style? *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 6 (1), 1-22.

Fink, E. & Resnick, L. (2001). Developing principals as instructional leaders. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82 (8), 598-606.

Fiore, D.J. (2001). *Creating connections for better schools: How leaders enhance school culture.* Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Firestone, W. & Herriott, R. (1982). Prescriptions for effective elementary schools don't fit secondary schools. *Educational Leadership*, 82 (40), 51-53.

Foriska, T. (1994). The principal as instructional leader: Teaming with teachers for student success. *Schools in the Middle*, 3 (3), 31-34.

Freiberg, J. (1998). Measuring school climate: Let me count the ways. *Educational Leadership*, 56 (1), 22-26.

Fullan, M. (1992). Visions that blind. *Educational Leadership*, 49 (5), 19-20.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M. (2005). *Leadership and sustainability.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Fullan, M., Hill, P. & Crevola, C. (2006). *Breakthrough.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Gabriel. J.G. (2005). *How to thrive as a teacher leader.* Alexandria, VA: Association Supervision and Curriculum.

Gersten, R. & Carnine, D. (1981). Administrative and supervisory support functions for the implementation of effective educational programs for low income students. Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon.

Ginsberg, M. & Murphy, D. (2002). How Walkthroughs Open Doors. *Educational Leadership*, 59 (8), 34-36.

Ginsberg, R. (1988). Worthy goal, unlikely reality: The principal as instructional leader. *NASSP Bulletin*, 72 (507), 76-82.

Glanz, J. (2006a). *Collaborative Leadership*. Thousand, Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

(2006b). *Cultural Leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

(2006c). *Instructional Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Glatthorn, A. & Newberg, N. (1984). A team approach to instructional leadership. *Educational Leadership*,41 (5), 60-63.

Goldberg, M. (2001). *Lessons from exceptional school leaders.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Grogan, M. & Andrews, R. (2002). Defining preparation and professional development for the future. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38 (2), 233-236.

Hall, R. (2001). Unpublished walkthrough document. Available from Bay Region IV School Support Center, Alameda County of Education, 313 W. Winston Avenue, Hayward California, 94544; 510-670-4170.

Hallinger, P. (1983). *Assessing the Instructional Management of Principals.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Hallinger, P. (1989). Developing instructional leadership teams in high schools. Paper Presented at the International Congress for School Effectiveness, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, January.

Hallinger, P. (2003). A review of two decades of research on the principalship using the principal instructional management rating scale. Bangkok, Thailand: Mahidol University.

Hallinger, P. & Heck, R. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of the empirical research, 1980-1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 32 (1), 5-44.

Hallinger, P. & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary Journal*, 86 (2), 217-241.

Hallinger, P. & Murphy, J. (1987a). Assessing and developing instructional leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 45 (1), 54-61.

Hallinger, P. & Murphy, J. (1987b). Instructional leadership in the school context. *Instructional Leadership: Concepts, Issues, and Controversies, William Greenfield (ed)*. Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Hansen, J. & Childs, J. (1998). Creating a school where people like to be. *Educational Leadership,* 56 (1), 14-17.

Hausman,C., Crow, G. & Sperry, D. (2000). Portrait of the ideal principal: Context and self. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84 (617), 5-25.

Herman, J. (1990). Action plans to make your vision a reality. *NASSP Bulletin*, 74 (523), 14-17.

Hershberg, T. (2005). Value-added assessment and systemic reform: A response to the challenge of human capital development. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87 (4), 276-283.

Hoeh, J. (1973). Feeling guilty about not being an instructional leader? Don't. *NASSP Bulletin*, 57 (376), 1-7.

Hoerr, T. (1996). Collegiality: A new way to define instructional leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77 (5), 380-381.

Hoover, J. (2002). A dozen ways to raise students' test performance. *Principal*, 81 (3), 17-18.

Hord, S.M. (1997). *Professional Learning Communities: Communities of Continuous Inquiry and Improvement*. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Hord, S. ed. (2004). *Learning together. leading together: Changing schools through professional learning communities*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Howell, B. (1981). Profile of the Principalship. *Educational Leadership*, 39 (3), 33-36.

Hoy, A. & Hoy, W. (2006). *Instructional leadership: A research-based guide to learning in schools.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Hoy, W. & Forsyth, P. (1986). Effective supervision: Theory in practice. New York: Random House.

Hoy, W. & Miskel, C. (2001). *Education administration: Theory, research, and Practice* (6th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Hurley, J.C. (2001). The principalship, less is more. *Education Week.* 20 (37), 37.

Jones, P. (1987). *The relationship between principal behavior and student achievement in secondary schools.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Palo, Alto, CA.

Kanpol, B. (1990). Empowerment: the instructional and cultural aspects for teachers and principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 74 (528), 104-107.

Kennedy, C. (2002). The principalship, too much for one person. *Principal*, 82 (1), 28-31.

Kmetz, J. & Willower, D. (1982). Elementary school principals' work behavior. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18 (4), 62-78.

Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B.Z. (2002). *The Leadership Challenge.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Krug, S. (1993). Leadership craft and the crafting of school leaders. Phi Delta Kappan, 73 (3), 240-252.

Lambert, L. (1998). Building school culture: An open letter to principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 72 (506), 54-62.

Lashway, L. (2000). Who's in charge? The accountability challenge. *Principal Leadership,* 81 (3), 9-13.

Lashway, Larry (2002). The accountability challenge. *Principal*, 81 (3), 14-16.

Latham, G. & Waxley, K. (1981). *Increasing productivity through performance appraisal.* Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.

Lieberman, A. (1988). Teachers and principals: Turf, tensions, and new tasks. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69 (9), 648-653.

Levine, D. V. &Lezotte, L.W. (1990). Unusually effective schools: A review and analysis of research and practice. Madison, WI: National Center for Effective Schools Research and Development.

Lewellen, J. (1990). Effective leadership development. *NASSP Bulletin,* 74 (524), 6-13.

Lipham, J. & Hoeh, J. (1974). *The Principalship: Foundations and Functions.* New York: Harper and Row.

Lipham, J., Rankin, R. & Hoeh, J. (1885). *The Principalship: concepts, competencies, and cases.* New York, NY: Longman.

Little, J. & Bird, T. (1987). Instructional leadership, "close to the classroom" in secondary schools in *Instructional Leadership: Concepts, Issues, And Controversies*, William Greenfield, (ed). Newton, Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.

Locke, E & Latham, G. (1984). *Goal setting: A motivational technique that works.* Englwood, Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Lyons, V. E. & Shealtham, H. (1988). Comparing effective schools: What are the common components? *NASSP Bulletin,* 72 (152), 64-67.

Maeroff, G. (1988). The empowerment of teachers: Overcoming the crisis of confidence. New York: Teachers College Press.

Marriott, Donna (2001). Managing school culture. *Principal*, 81 (1),75-77.

Marks, H. & Printy, S. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39 (3), 370-397.

Marshall, K. (2003). Recovering from HSPS (hyperactive superficial principal syndrome): A progress report. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84 (9), 701-709.

Marzano, R. (2005). What works in schools. Presentation at the Tennessee Staff Development Council Southeast Regional Conference, October 17-18, Gatlinburg, TN.

Marzano, R., Waters, T. & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Matthew, L.J., & Crow, G.M. (2003). *Being and becoming a principal: Role conceptions for contemporary assistant principals and principals.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Mazzarella, J. (1976). *The principal's role in instructional planning.* Arlington, VA: NAESP

McEwan, E. (1998). *Seven steps to effective instructional leadership.* Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.

Meadows, B.J. & Saltzman, M. (2002). Shared decision-making: An uneasy collaboration. *Principal*, 81 (4), 41-48.

Mitchell. D. & Kerchner, C.T. (1983). Collective bargaining and teacher policy in *Handbook of Teaching and Policy*, edited by L.S. Schulmann and G. Sykes. New York: Logman.

Mitchell, D. & Tucker, S. (1992). Leadership as a way of thinking. *Educational Leadership,* 49 (5), 30-35.

Murphy, J. (1988). The unheroic side of leadership: Notes from the swamp. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69 (6), 54-659.

Murphy, J. (1990). Principal instructional leadership. In L.S. Lotto and P.W. Thurston (Eds.), *Advances in educational administration*: *Changing perspectives in the school.* Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Murphy, J. (2002). How the ISLLC standards are reshaping the principalship. *Principal*, 81 (2), 22-26.

Murphy, J. (2005). *Connecting teacher leadership and school improvement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

NAESP, NASSP & ERS (2000). *The Principal, keystone of a high-achieving high school: Attracting and keeping the leaders we need*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Nanus, B. (1992). *Visionary leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

National Association of Elementary School Principals (2001). *Leading learning communities: Standards for what principals should know and be able to do.* Alexandria, VA: Author.

National Association of Secondary School Principals (2001). NASSP Background. (online) available: www.principals.org./about_us/02-01/html. Office.

National Staff Development Council, (2001). *Learning to lead, leading to learn: improving school quality through principal development.* Oxford, OH: author.

Neufield, J. & Freeman, D. (1992). Teachers' perceptions on the principal's role in facilitating teacher improvement within the ASU-Tempe PDS. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Arizona Educational Research Organization, Phoenix, AZ.

Niece, R. (1983). The principal as instructional leader: Past influences and current resources. *NASSP Bulletin*, 77 (553), 12-18.

O'Neill. J.& Conzumas, A. (2006). *The power of smart goals.* Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

Ovard, G. (1990). Leadership: maintaining vision in a complex arena. *NASSP Bulletin*, 74 (523), 1-4.

Owens, R. (2004). *Organizational behavior in education: Adaptive leadership and school reform.* Boston, MA: Pearson Learning.

Pasi, R.(2001). A climate for achievement. *Principal Leadership*, 2 (4), 17-20.

Payne, D. & Wolfson, T. (2000). Teacher professional development: The principal's critical role. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84 (618), 13-21.

Peel, H., Wallace, C., Buckner, K. Wrenn, S., & Evans, R. (1998). Improving leadership preparation programs through a school, university, and professional organization partnership. *NASSP Bulletin,* 82 (602), 28-34.

Picucci, Ali C., Brownson, A., Kahlert, R.& Sobel, A. (2002). Shaping school culture. *Principal Leadership*, 3 (4), 38-41.

Pellicier, L., Anderson, L., Keefe, J., Kelley, E., & McCleary, L. (1990). *High school leaders and their schools.* Reston, VA: NASSP.

Peters, T. & Waterman, R. (1982). *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best Run Companies.* New York: Harper and Row.

Peterson, K. (2002). Positive or negative. *Journal of Staff Development*, 23 (3), 10-15.

Purkey, S. & Smith, M. (1982). Too soon to cheer? Synthesis of research on effective schools. *Educational Leadership*, 40, 64-69.

Quinn, T. (2002). Redefining leadership in the standards era. *Principal*, 82 (1), 16-20.

Rallis, S.(1998). Room at the top: Conditions for effective school leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69 (9), 643-647.

Rallis S.F. and Highsmith, M.C. (1986). The myth of the great principal. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 68 (4), 300-304.

Reeves, D. (2006). *The learning leader: How to focus school improvement for better results.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Richardson, J. (2001). Seeing through new eyes. *Tools for Schools.* National Staff Development Council, October/November, 1-7.

Ripley, D. (1997). Current tensions in the principalship: Finding an appropriate balance. *NASSP Bulletin*, 81(589), 55-65.

Rist, M.C. (1990). Teacher empowerment and teacher union. *Education Digest*, 55 (6), 7-9.

Rogus, J. (1988). Instructional leadership: An informal approach. *NASSP Bulletin,* 72 (510), 17-22.

Rogus, J. (1990). Developing a vision statement: Some considerations for principals. *NASSP Bulletin,* 74 (523), 6-12.

Rose, M. (1991). *Perceptions of selected principals in South Carolina concerning their instructional management behaviors.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, the University of Southern Mississippi.

Rosson, L. (1990). *The principalship: Dimensions in instructional leadership.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Roy, P. (2005). The power of culture. *Results.* National Staff Development Council, April, p.3.

Rushcamp, S. & Roehler, L. R. (1992). Characteristics supporting change in a professional development school. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 43 (1), 19-27.

Ryan, M. (2002). Making every minute count. *Principal Leadership*, 3 (3), 14-16.

Sagor, Richard D. (1992). Three Principals Who Make A Difference. *Educational Leadership*. 49 (5), 13-18.

Saphier, J. & King, M. (1985). Good seeds grow in strong cultures. *Educational Leadership*. 42 (6), 67-74.

Savoye, C. (2001). Fewer step forward to be principals. *Christian Science Monitor*, October 2.

Schiff, T. (2002). Principals ready for reform: A comprehensive approach. *Principal Leadership,* 2 (5), 21-26.

Schlechty, P. (1991). *Schools for the twenty-first century.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schmidt, L. (2003). Getting smarter about supervising instruction. *Principal.* 82 (4), 24-28.

Schmoker, M. (1999). *Results: the key to continuous school improvement* (2nd Ed). Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Doubleday.

Senge, P., Ross, R., Smith, B. Roberts, C. & Kleiner, A. (1994). *The fifth discipline fieldbook, Strategies and tools for building a learning organization.* New York: Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. (1984). Leadership and excellence in schooling. *Educational Leadership*, 41 (5), 4-13.

Sergiovanni, T. (1992). Why we should seek substitutes for leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 49 (5), 41-45

Sergiovanni, T. (2005). *Strengthening the heartbeat: leading and learning together in schools.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. & Starrett, R. (1998). *Supervision: A redefinition*, (6th ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.

Shelland, E. (2003). Defining the principalship. *Principal,* 82 (4), 56-60.

Sheppard, B. (1982). The transformational nature of instructional leadership. *Education Administration Quarterly,* 18 (3), 325-343.

Skiptunas, C. (1990). *Secondary principal leadership and school climate.* Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY.

Smith, W. & Andrews R. (1989). *Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference.* Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.

Southern Regional Education Board (1998). *Getting results: A fresh look at school accountability*. Atlanta, Georgia: Author.

Spady, W. & Schwahn, C. (2001). Leading when everyone goes back to zero. *Principal Leadership*, 2 (4), 10-16.

Stevens, L. (2001). *An administrative handbook: A view from the elementary principal's desk*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Stronge, J. (1993). Defining the principalship: Instructional leader or middle manager. *NASSP Bulletin*, 77 (553), 1-7.

Supovitz, J. (2000). Manage less, lead more. *Principal Leadership*, 1 (3), 14-19.

Tarasiena, P. (1993). *Assessing instructional leadership behavior of secondary school principals in Thailand.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Peabody College for teachers of Vanderbilt University Nashville, TN.

Taylor, R. (2002). Shaping the culture of school communities. *Principal Leadership*, 3 (4), 43-45.

Trimble, S. (2003). Between reform and improvement in the classroom. *Principal Leadership*, 4 (1), 39-43.

Walker, J. (1990). The skills of exemplary principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 74 (524), 48-55.

Waters, T., Marzano, R., & McNulty, B. (2002). *Balanced leadership:* What *30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Regional Education Laboratory.

Waters, T., Marzano, R., & McNulty, B. (2004). Leadership that sparks learning. *Educational Leadership*, 61 (7), 48-51.

Weber, J. (1971). *Inner city children can be taught to read: Four successful schools.* Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education.

Weber, J. (1996). Leading the instructional program. in S. Smith and P. Piele (eds), *School Leadership.* (352-278). Clearinghouse of Educational Management: Eugene, OR.

Welch, F., Lindsay, S., & Halfacre, J. (2001). Quality principals: Questions to consider. *Principal Leadership,* 1 (6), 56-59.

Whitaker, B. (1997). Instructional leadership and principal visibility. *The ClearingHouse.* January/February, 155-156.

Whitaker, T. & Turner, E. (2000). What is your priority? *NASSP Bulletin*, 84 (617) 16-21.

Wright, D. (2002). *Secondary school principals' perceptions and understandings of the Tennessee school improvement planning process.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.

Young, P. G. (2004). You have to go to school- *You're the principal: 101 tips to make it better for your students, your staff, and yourself.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Zepeda, S. (2003). *The principal as instructional leader.* Larchmont, New York: Eye on Education.

Zepeda, S. (2004). *Instructional leadership for school improvement.* Larchmont, New York: Eye on Education.

Zepeda, S., Mayers, R.S., & Benson, (2003). *The call to teacher leadership.* Larchmont, New York: Eye on Education.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PERMISSION TO USE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

College of Management- Mahidol University
SCB Park Plaza, Tower II West
Rachadapisek Rd, Chatujak
Bangkok, 10900
66(02)937-5656

Office of the Executive
Director Philip
Hallinger
Professor
Philip.h@cm
mu.net

August 20, 2005

Denise Johnson
Graduate Student
U. of Tennessee - Knoxville

Dear Ms. Johnson:

As copyright holder and publisher, you have my permission as publisher to use the *Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS)* in your doctoral research study. In using the scale, you may make unlimited copies of any of the three forms of the PIMRS.

Please note the following conditions of use:

1. This authorization extends only to the use of the PIMRS for research purposes, not for general school district use of the instrument for evaluation or staff development purposes;

2. The user agrees to send a soft copy of the completed study to the publisher upon completion of the research.

Please be advised that a *separate permission to publish* letter, needed by UMI for publication of the instrument in your dissertation, will be sent after the publisher receives a soft copy of the completed study.

Sincerely,

Professor Philip
Hallinger Executive
Director College of
Management

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER TO PRINCIPALS

January 18, 2006

Dear Principal:

I am an administrator with the Knox County School system. As part of my doctoral program at the University of Tennessee Knoxville, I am conducting research on instructional leadership. The purpose of this research is to identify specific instructional leadership behaviors of high school principals through your responses on the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale.

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw at any time without penalty and without the loss of any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw before data collection is completed, your data will be destroyed. No names or names of schools will be identified in this study. The Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale does have an identification number. This is so I can determine which surveys have been returned. It should take approximately twenty minutes to complete the enclosed survey. Please fill it out and return it to me in the self-addressed, stamped envelope by January 31.

If you have any questions about the study or the procedures, you may contact me during the day at 865-594-1737 or during the evening at 865-970-2373 or through email at iohnsondl5@kl2tn.net. If you have questions concerning your rights as a participant, you may contact the Compliance Section at the University of Tennessee Knoxville at 865-974-3466. Thank you for your time and assistance. You input is invaluable to this project.

Sincerely,

Denise M. Johnson
Knox County Schools

5874 8322 .10
04/04/07 US HFGroup

VITA

Denise Minton Johnson was born July 20, 1949 in Tuscaloosa, Alabama. She attended public schools in Knoxville, Tennessee, where she graduated from South High School in 1967. After receiving the Bachelor of Science Degree in 1970 from the University of Tennessee Knoxville, she began teaching in the Knox County School system. She completed her Master of Science Degree at the University of Tennessee Knoxville in 1992 and assumed an administrative position as a Social Studies Specialist in 1999, having previously served as a consulting teacher beginning in 1994. The Doctoral Degree from the University of Tennessee Knoxville was granted in December, 2006. She presently serves as the Social Studies Supervisor for Knox County Schools in Knoxville, Tennessee.