

**PRINCIPALS' AND TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPALS'
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP**

Shonta M. Smith, B.S., M.A.

An Abstract Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate

School of Saint Louis University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Education

2007

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which principals and teachers perceive that principals use instructional management practices. Instructional management plays a major role in effective instructional leadership. If principals' and teachers' perceptions of instructional management are not congruent, it can confound the achievement of school goals. This confusion may stem from the various definitions of instructional leadership and what one believes instructional management looks like. As schools work harder to meet district and state standards, strong instructional management, as well as leadership, are essential. Instructional management focuses on instruction, evaluation, professional development, incentives and school improvement.

The population that was studied included 62 teachers and 64 principals from rural, suburban, and urban public schools in a Midwestern state. The study found that no significant difference existed among teachers and principals based on years of experience; however, results revealed a significant difference existed between teacher perceptions and principal perceptions of the extent to which principals demonstrated 10 instructional management practices. The

practices for which perceptual data were gathered were the following: frame the school goals, communicate the school goals, supervise and evaluate instruction, coordinate the curriculum, monitor student progress, protect instructional time, maintain high visibility, provide incentives for teachers, promote professional development, and provide incentives for learning.

The findings reported a significant difference between teachers' perceptions of principals' use of the 10 instructional management practices and principals' perceptions of principals' use of the 10 instructional management practices.

**PRINCIPALS' AND TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPALS'
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP**

Shonta M. Smith, B.S., M.A.

A Project Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate
School of Saint Louis University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Education

2007

© Copyright by
Shonta Michelle Smith
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
2007

COMMITTEE IN CHARGE OF CANDIDACY:

Assistant Professor Joyce A. Dana,
Chairperson and Advisor

Professor Michael Grady

Associate Professor William T. Rebore

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my mother Constance E. Smith. She laid the foundation for my educational growth. Through her I have soared. She is the wind beneath my wings and the rock I stand upon. I am forever grateful.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost I would like to give honor to God, because through him all things are possible. I would like to thank Dr. Joyce Dana, Chairperson and Advisor, for her support and guidance. I would also like to thank Dr. William Rebore and Dr. Michael Grady, members of my doctoral committee. Randle Smith Sr., and Lillian Henry: you are my rock. A very special thanks goes to Christina Morris; you are a shining star. Malcolm S. Townes, Theodore R. Love, Dr. Venessa Brown, Stacey Nichols, Carletta D. Washington, Lorna Turner, and Retaun Canon: I appreciate your diligence and hard work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 THE PROBLEM AND BACKGROUND OF THE RESEARCH.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Purpose of Study.....	10
Research Question.....	10
Interacting Variables.....	11
Hypothesis and Sub-Hypothesis.....	11
Hypothesis.....	11
Sub-Hypothesis.....	12
Limitations of the Research.....	12
Definitions of Terms.....	12
The Importance of this Study.....	14
CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	16
Introduction.....	16
Great Man Theory.....	17
Karnes' Conception of Leadership.....	18
Importance of Leadership for Principals.....	25
Trends in Schools.....	27
Productivity and Satisfaction.....	30
Culture and Productivity.....	31
Strategies and Techniques.....	33
School Leaders Guiding Standards.....	33
Empowering Teachers.....	35
Influencing Teachers.....	36
Principal's Instructional Leadership Behaviors..	37
The Principal as Instructional Leader.....	41
Seven Steps to Effective Instructional Leadership.....	42
Instructional Leadership Impact on Student Achievement.....	43
Defining Instructional Leadership.....	46
Knowledge and the Instructional Leader.....	47
Skills and the Instructional Leader.....	49
Instructional Management.....	51
Summary.....	54
CHAPTER III RESEARCH PROCEDURE.....	55
Research Description.....	55
Purpose Statement.....	55
Variables.....	56
Research Questions.....	56
Hypothesis.....	57
Sub-Hypotheses.....	57
Population Description.....	57

Sample.....	58
Procedure for Data Collection.....	58
Instrument.....	59
Validity and Reliability.....	59
Level of Measurement.....	59
Analysis of Data.....	60
CHAPTER IV DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS.....	61
Purpose of Study.....	61
Population Profile.....	61
Descriptive Statistics.....	64
Research Question.....	65
Hypothesis and Sub-Hypotheses.....	66
Hypothesis.....	66
Sub-Hypothesis 1.....	68
CHAPTER V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS.....	77
Summary.....	77
Conclusions.....	79
Recommendations.....	81
Appendix A.....	85
Appendix B.....	101
References.....	103
Vita Auctoris.....	109

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Instructional Leadership and Instructional Management52

Table 2: Frequencies and Percentages of Total Participants', Teachers', and Principals' Gender.61

Table 3: Frequency and Percentages of Total Participants', Teachers', and Principals' Ages62

Table 4: Frequency and Percentages of Total Participants', Teachers', and Principals' Ethnicity62

Table 5: Frequencies and Percentages of Total Participants', Teachers', and Principals' Location63

Table 6: Frequency and Percentages of Total Participants', Teachers', and Principals' Educational Background64

Table 7: Means and Standard Deviations on the 10 Principal Instructional Management Functions by Groups (Teachers/ Principals)65

Table 8: Differences Between Teacher Perception and Principal Perception of Principal Use of 10 Instructional Practices, Application of t-Test.67

Table 9: Means and Standard Deviations for Teachers' Perceptions of Principal Use of 10 Principal Instructional Management Practices by Years of Experience69

Table 10: Ten Univariate ANOVAs among Teachers on the 10 Principal Instructional Management Practices by Years of Experience (1 year vs. 2-4 years vs. 5-9 years vs. 10-15 years vs. More than 15 years)70

Table 11: Means and Standard Deviations for Principals on the 10 Principal Instructional Management Practices by Years of Experience73

Table 12: Ten Univariate ANOVAs among Principals on the 10 Principal Instructional Management Practices by Years of Experience (1 year vs. 2-4 years vs. 5-9 years vs. 10-15 years vs. More than 15 years)75

CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM AND BACKGROUND OF THE RESEARCH

Introduction

The school principal is the legal authority within the formal school structure and is responsible for providing an environment where competent teachers strive to meet each child's individual needs for a successful future (Stevens, 2001). Kelly, Thornton & Daugherty (2006) note that principals have the power, authority, and position to impact the climate of the school, but many lack the feedback to improve. If principals are highly skilled, they can develop feelings of trust, open communications, collegiality, and promote effective feedback (p. 23). Sergiovanni (2001) believes a principal's primary responsibility is to provide effective instructional and curricular leadership. However according to Marzano, Waters, and McNulty the concept of instructional leadership is not well defined (2005).

In a recent instructional leadership study by the MDRC - Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (2007) the term "instructional leadership" is widely used. Researchers have only begun to specify what good instructional leaders actually do. Nor has there been much study of how leaders' actions flow through a social and organizational system to

create learning opportunities for students. For example Smith and Andrews (1989) identify four roles performed by instructional leaders: resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence. Blasé and Blasé (1998) believe instructional leaders use instructional research to make decisions, establish coaching relationships among teachers, facilitate collaborative efforts among teachers, facilitate the study of teaching and learning, and use the principles of adult learning when dealing with teachers. Hallinger, Murphy, Weil, Mesa, and Mitman (1983) identify three dimensions of instructional leadership: defining the school mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive learning climate. With there being various definitions of instructional leadership, it is logical to conclude that there is a significant difference between principals' self perception of instructional leadership and teachers' perception of the principals' instructional leadership. For the purpose of this study, Hallingers et al.'s, concept of instructional leadership will be used as a basis for investigating effective instructional leadership.

The broad definition of instructional leadership is reflected in job descriptions of school principals. Three different school districts' job descriptions of school

principals in a large metropolitan area in the midwest were reviewed and instructional leadership is not defined and/or it is not mentioned in any of the three job descriptions. School district A describes the successful candidate having high expectations for all students, a collaborative leadership style, strong human relations and communications skills. School District B provides a list of key goals and job functions that the Principal is expected to perform in order to achieve the listed goals. School District C states the requirements are a respect for and desire to serve students, experience in implementing middle school level programs, and strong instructional leadership skills. Again, the concept and definition of instructional leadership varies.

In order for teachers and principals to share a common understanding of instructional leadership, it is necessary to begin by evaluating how leaders perceive themselves and how their employees perceive them. Perception must be recognized as being influenced by the conditioned leadership style that the respondents have and that they use to describe others' leadership. Transactional, visionary, instructional, facilitative, and transformational are different forms of leadership styles. Each leadership style has distinct characteristics. Transactional leaders use a

bargain basement approach. They offer followers specified external rewards and privileges in exchange for completion of duties and responsibilities outlined by their organization (Bass, 1985). Visionary leaders create an image and an idea of school culture. They use philosophies and policies that succinctly state the school's vision (Maccoby, 2003). Instructional leaders use strategies that are technical and symbolic (beliefs & values). Instructional leaders are good motivators who apply educational forces of conceptual knowledge, diagnose problems and evaluate procedures (McEwan, 2003). Facilitative leaders display behaviors that enhance the collective ability of a school (Lashway, 1995). Facilitative leaders solve problems and improve performance. Transformational leaders use their knowledge and skills and their perceptions of changes that are needed to work both inside and outside the organization. These skills are used to map new directions, to secure new resources, and to respond to the realities of a very unstable present and, at times, an unforeseeable future (Sergiovanni, 2001).

It appears in most instances if a principal subscribes to a transformational or instructional leadership style, he/she is perceived by teachers, students, parents, and the academic community as having a strong instructional

philosophy and supporting a school culture where students feel safe and have the ability to grow and teachers feel a lot of job satisfaction (Sergiovanni, 2001).

As principals exercise various forms of leadership, the perception of what they do may vary. How principals perceive themselves and how their teachers perceive them can be similar or totally different. These similarities and/or differences may stem from assumptions or misconceptions about instructional leadership. Studies of schools in the Midwest found that "teachers appear substantially more willing to participate in all areas of decision making if they perceive their relationship with their principal as more open collaborative, facilitative, and supportive" (Smylie, 1992, p. 63). On the other hand, teachers struggling with classroom management issues may perceive their principal as being nonchalant. They may avoid being involved because the principal has never offered to help or offer suggestions to assist them with classroom management issues.

The similarities and/or differences of perception of principals and teachers will ultimately affect the overall culture of the school. For schools to be effective, there must be effective instructional leadership that creates a responsive school culture (Wamer, 1993). As principals and

teachers work together to enhance the culture of the school, there is a strong need for instructional leadership to reflect common goals and objectives also held by those who deliver instruction to students. By having common goals and objectives, principals and teachers have consistency and congruency in their work with students.

As early as 1933, the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction of the National Education Association prepared a yearbook to formulate a set of guiding principles underlying the organization of effective instructional leadership. The yearbook identified some major problems with instructional leadership. For example, some of the problems in the area of conflicts arising in relationships involving the principal consisted of the following:

1. Principal believes in one method and teacher believes in another;
2. Principal believes in rigid adherence to the course of study, while teacher believes in making adaptations to pupil needs, or vice versa; and
3. Principal believes in maintaining rigid promotion standards, while teacher believes such standards should be flexible or vice versa. (National Education Association 1933, p. 29)

In addition, the yearbook addressed these problems suggesting that, to build morale, principals must sell their

idea to teachers and show teachers the importance of having a common philosophy.

Some of the same problems that were discussed in the National Education Association's 1933 study still exist today. The perceptions of teachers and principals about principals' instructional leadership vary. Although these perceptions may vary, the impact they have on schools is notable. If a principals' self perception is that he/she is an instructional leader and if that self-perception does not match the perception his/her teachers have about him/her, then there may be problems such as differences regarding the instructional program or regarding conditions for learning or regarding the overall goals and instructional outcomes. It is important that the perceptions of principals and teachers be closely aligned in order to work effectively together to meet common goals, common work ethics, embrace common objectives and reach common outcomes for students.

To enhance the operations of the school, it is essential that the behavior of both teachers and principals reflect sound practices of instructional leadership. Instructional management is one large part of instructional leadership. For example, a principal's instructional management includes, but is not limited to, the following: the ability to frame school goals, communicate school goals,

supervise and evaluate instruction, coordinate the curriculum, monitor student progress, protect instructional time, maintain high visibility, provide incentives for teachers, promote professional development, and provide incentives for learning (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985).

If principals display behaviors of instructional management on a consistent basis, the perceptions of principals and teachers should be more closely aligned.

In 1984 the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory conducted research that defined strong instructional leadership as:

1. Portraying learning as the most important reason for being in school; public speeches and writings emphasize the importance and value of high achievement.
2. Having a clear understanding of the school's mission and is able to state it in direct, concrete items. Instructional focus is established that unifies staff. The school leadership believes that all students can learn and that the school makes the difference between success and failure.
3. Apply teaching and learning principals; they know research, legitimize it, and foster its use in problem solving. Effective teaching practices are modeled for staff as appropriate.
4. Set expectations for curriculum quality through the use of standards and guidelines. Alignment is checked and improved; priorities are established within the curriculum; curriculum implementation monitored.

5. Establish and maintain a safe orderly school environment.

6. Check student progress frequently relying on explicit performance data. Results are made visible; progress standards are set and used as points of comparison; discrepancies are used to stimulate action.

7. Set up systems of incentives and rewards to encourage excellence in student and teacher performances; they act as figureheads in delivering awards and highlighting the importance of excellence. (pp. 4 & 5).

Of all the behaviors listed above, none is more critical to building excellence than knowledge of current research on teaching, learning, and leadership (Sergiovanni, 2001). Strong leaders exhibit a commitment to the improvement ethic and gaining competency is a lifelong journey.

In another study Hallinger and Murphy (1985) examined the instructional management behavior of school principals. The primary goal of that study was to describe the instructional management behaviors of principals in terms of specific job behaviors and practices.

This research project is a critical analysis of teachers' and principals' perceptions of principal's instructional management practices. This research project also provides teachers and principals with an analysis of behaviors to assist them with enhancing goals, instruction,

student progress, professional development, visibility, and providing incentives for teaching and learning. In addition, the results of this research project can be used to influence and expand continuous and comprehensive school improvement plans.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which teachers and principals perceive that principals demonstrate essential instructional management practices. As instructional managers and leaders, principals work to build productive school cultures. Principals who exercise effective instructional management also enhance the day-to-day operations of a school. As instructional managers, principals must provide students and teachers with information and opportunities to develop sound instructional practices. In addition, principals must build and maintain positive relationships with students, teachers, parents and community stakeholders.

Research Question

One major research question directed the collection of descriptive and inferential data. The major research question was: Were there differences between teachers' and

principals' ratings of principals' use of instructional management practices?

Interacting Variables

The independent variables were instructional management practices, as described by Hallinger and Murphy (1985). The practices are (1) framing the school goals, (2) communicating school goals, (3) supervising and evaluating instruction, (4) coordinating the curriculum, (5) monitoring student progress, (6) protecting instructional time, (7) maintaining high visibility, (8) providing incentives for teachers, (9) promoting professional development, and (10) providing incentives for learning. The dependent variables were both the principals' perceptions and the teachers' perceptions of the extent to which principals use instructional management practices.

Hypothesis and Sub-Hypothesis

Hypothesis

There is one main hypothesis for this research study, which is stated: There is a significant difference between teachers' perceptions and principals' perceptions of the extent to which principals use instructional management practices.

Sub-Hypothesis

There is one sub-hypothesis, which is stated as follows: There is a significant difference between teachers' perceptions of the extent to which principals use instructional management practices and principals' perceptions of the extent to which principals use instructional management practices, based on within group years of experience.

Limitations of the Research

There are various limitations to this study. The first limitation is that by surveying only principals and teachers in the state of Missouri, the study can only be generalized to a hypothetical population that looks like the sample used. Secondly, there will be a portion of respondents who do not complete the questionnaire. Finally, the teachers and principals who chose to participate in this study are responding based on their perceptions of principals' instructional management practices. Perceptions may be influenced by a number of factors that are not measured in this study.

Definitions of Terms

For the purpose of this research project, the following terms are defined:

Perception—The American Heritage College Dictionary

(1997) states:

Perception is (1) the process, act, or faculty of perceiving (2) the effect or product of perceiving (3) recognition and interpretation of sensory stimuli based chiefly on memory, the neurological processes by which such recognition and interpretation are effected (4) insight, intuition, or knowledge, gained by perceiving.

Leadership—The process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1993).

Instructional leadership—involves setting clear goals, allocating resources to instruction, managing the curriculum, monitoring lesson plans, and evaluating teachers. In short, instructional leadership is a collection of those actions that a principal takes, or delegates to others, to promote growth in student learning (Flath, 1989).

Instructional management—Hallinger and Murphy (1985)

note: the role of the principal can be subdivided into three general dimensions: defining the school mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive learning climate

School culture—According to Stolp (1994) culture is described by patterns of meaning that include norms, values, beliefs, ceremonies, rituals, traditions, and myths understood, maybe in varying degrees by members of the

community. Schein (1992) adds climate, mental models, philosophy as additional categories of culture.

The Importance of this Study

There are several reasons this study is important. The role of the principal continues to be a vital element to the improvement of schools. The responsibilities of the principal are shifting from operational management to instructional leadership. As this shift takes place, principals must have a better understanding of their roles. For example, The National Staff Development Council (NSDC) describes the additional focus that instructional leadership brings to the components of quality leadership: "Principals as instructional leaders, focus on helping teachers improve their classroom performance and make academic instruction their school's top priority" (National Staff Development Council, 2000, p. 3). As instructional leaders, principals spend lots of time in classrooms, analyze data, provide opportunities for teachers to share information and work with teachers to plan curriculum and instruction. This research project adds to the body of knowledge on perceptions regarding principals' use of instructional management practices. The knowledge can assist principals and teachers with identifying their perceptions of

instructional management and, perhaps, initiate conversations about what instructional management should look like. The specific focus of adding to the knowledge base about instructional management is the use of Hallinger's and Murphy's (1985) ten categories of instructional management, maintaining a focus on those ten categories.

As schools develop improvement plans, this study can be utilized to enhance working relationships with teachers and principals because they will have a better understanding of instructional management. In addition, the importance of this study shows why teachers' and principals' perception of instructional management should be closely aligned.

CHAPTER II

Review of Related Literature

Introduction

The aim of this literature review is to gain insight into current and historical literature regarding instructional management and instructional leadership. The specific focus of the research project is adding to the knowledge base about instructional management, which is a major part of instructional leadership. Consequently, not only the historical background of leadership, in general, needs to be reviewed, but also instructional leadership and the association of instructional management to school leadership needs to be explained.

A historical overview of leadership, its aspects and standards, strategies and techniques that promote instructional management and leadership are explored. The Great Man Theory provides the theoretical framework for how instructional leadership is defined. The conceptual framework is shaped by a review of Karnes Conception of leadership.

Other key models and approaches such as behaviors associated with effective leadership, bureaucratic theory, person's model, human relations and human resource models

are all explored in this review. Strategies and techniques that promote instructional leadership such as, The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium, Empowering Teachers, Influencing Teachers, Principals Instructional Leadership Behaviors, The Principal as Instructional Leaders, and the Seven Steps to Effective Instructional Leadership are discussed. Finally, Hallinger's and Murphy's Instructional Management Practices are discussed and, in part, similarities are identified between the Instructional Management Practices and Leadership Responsibilities (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005) of school leaders.

Great Man Theory

Frase and Hetzel (1990) stated that prior to 1960 it was once thought that great leaders were born, not trained and attracted to their role in life by a magical magnetism. This surrealistic notion was labeled the "Great Man" Theory of leadership. This theory was based on the comparative approach. The common denominator for distinction was inherited capabilities, which destined individuals to become great leaders. It was believed that the great leaders were endowed with unique capabilities that set them apart from the common masses. "The Great Man Theory leads to Trait Theory which is based on the assumption that there are

certain personality characteristics that can predict success in leadership positions" (Frase & Hetzel, 1990, p.12).

However, other theories would argue not all leaders are born but that some leaders develop certain characteristics that they have learned through their interactions.

Karnes' Conception of Leadership

Karnes (1947) asserts that leadership is a function of essential qualities such as: true social interest, intelligence, energy and courage to subordinate self or local interests to the good of the many. While admitting that there are certain weaknesses connected with the traits approach to leadership, Lynch (1950) suggests that a leader should be intelligent and imaginative; possess physical and nervous energy; be healthy; should be able to convince others; have a thorough knowledge of problems of the group; possess integrity, honest, uprightness, loyalty, unselfishness, sincerity, a sense of responsibility, and a well defined sense of justice and fairness; understand human nature; be persistent, patient, tenacious and tactful; be able to express himself clearly; that he should be self-confident and that he should possess personal magnetism.

Like Lynch, Harry Levinson (1980) suggests that the following traits of effective leaders are highly appropriate

to the school principal such as: the ability to take multiple forms of data and integrate the data to construct a global picture; the ability to tolerate chaos and operate in a fog-shrouded environment with the belief that the fog-shrouded environment will eventually lift; the ability to use effective judgment; the ability to demonstrate sensitivity; the ability to be involved with other members of the school community; the ability to communicate; the ability to adapt; the ability to develop a clear sense of vision; the ability to preserve; and the ability to be organized (pp. 6-8).

Essential leadership skills enable the principal to establish a working relationship that is conducive to the school culture. By utilizing these skills, the principal is able to develop an environment that is favorable to teaching and learning.

Roberts (1985) explains that collective action transforms leadership and empowers those who participate in the process. There is hope, there is optimism, and there is energy. In essence, transforming leadership facilitates the redefinition of a people's mission and vision, is a renewal of their commitment, and the restructuring of their systems for goal accomplishment. John Gardner (1990) concludes that the primary skill for contemporary leaders is to understand

the kind of world it is and have some acquaintance with the system other than their own with which they must work.

Gardner further states that to function in such a world, leaders need critical skills such as; agreement building, networking, and exercising non-jurisdictional power. Leaders must have skills in conflict resolution, mediation, compromise, and coalition building. Leaders must create or recreate the linkages needed to get things done and utilize power that gives them the ability to build consensus and teamwork and to translate others ideas into action.

The Human Relations Model, according to Sergiovanni, Burlingame, Coomb, & Thurston (1980) deal with the individuals' social needs by expressing the following:

1. People in our culture, teachers among them, share a common set of needs—to belong, to be liked, to be respected.
2. While teachers desire individual recognition, they more importantly want to feel useful to the school and to their own work group.
3. They tend to cooperate willingly and comply with school goals if these important needs are fulfilled.
4. The administrator's basic task is to make each teacher believe that he or she is useful and an important part of the team.

5. The administrator is willing to explain his or her decisions and to discuss subordinates objections in planning and in decision-making.

6. Within narrow limits, the faculty or individual teachers who make up the faculty should be allowed to exercise self-direction and self-control in carrying out plans.

7. Sharing information with teachers and involving them in school decision making will help satisfy their basic needs for belonging and for individual recognition.

8. Satisfying these needs will improve faculty morale and will reduce resistance to formal authority.

9. High faculty morale and reduced resistance to formal authority may lead to improved school performance. It will at least reduce friction and make the administrator's job easier. (pp. 58 & 59)

Sergovanni et al. go on to state that the Human Resources Model urges shared decision making, joint planning, common goals, increased responsibility and more autonomy by indicating the following: The administrator's basic task is to create an environment in which subordinates can contribute their full range of talents to the accomplishment of school goals. He or she works to uncover the creative resources of subordinates. The administrator allows and encourages teachers to participate in important as well as routine decisions. In fact, the more important a decision is to the school, the greater the administrator's efforts to

tap faculty resources. These capabilities represent untapped resources, which are presently being wasted. The administrator allows and encourages teachers to participate in important as well as routine decisions. In fact, the more important a decision is to the school, the greater the administrator's efforts to tap faculty resources.

Administrators work continually expand the areas over which teachers exercise self-direction and self-control as they develop and demonstrate greater insight and ability. The overall quality of decision making and performance will improve as administrators and teachers make use of the full range of experience, insight, and creative ability which exists in their schools. Teachers will exercise responsible self-direction and self-control in the accomplishment of worth while objectives that they understand and have helped established. Faculty satisfaction will increase as a by-product of improved performance and the opportunity to contribute creatively to this improvement. (Sergiovanni et al., 1980, pp. 57-58).

Leadership and management of schools can take on many forms. The Bureaucratic model would be the opposite of the Human Resource Model as impersonality and objectivity are suggested as management principles in dealing with workers such as teachers and students. Sergiovanni et al. (1980)

found that the German Sociologist Max Weber proposed a pure form of idealization of an organization, which he called bureaucracy. This idealization was in the form of a set of structural properties and characteristics such as hierarchy, division of work, rules, and procedures.

In the interest of efficiency, an organization should have a well defined hierarchy of authority, with jobs and offices defined with reference to jurisdiction and location, a division of work based on functional specialization; rights and responsibilities of workers, a system of procedures for dealing with categories of activities within areas of responsibility; relationships characterized by impersonality; and a reward structure based on technical competence. Bureaucracy remains a part of the image of most educational organizations, and it advocates work diligently to incorporate its principles of order and certainty (Sergiovanni et al., 1980, pp. 49 & 50).

Finding the balance of instructional leadership and management is a challenge for principals. Bolman and Deal (1991) describe the balance between leadership and management. Organizations which are over managed but under led eventually lose any sense of spirit or purpose. Poorly managed organizations with strong charismatic leaders may soar temporarily only to crash shortly thereafter. The

challenges of modern organizations require the objective perspective of the manager as well as the brilliant flashes of vision and commitment that wise leadership provides (Bolman & Deal, pp. xiii-xiv). They report that because schools have become very complex organizations, principals must move beyond occasional brilliant flashes to methods of continuous improvement (Bolman & Deal, p. 17).

The Person Model states that an ideal school is one characterized by highly motivated individuals from which they derive intrinsic satisfaction. These individuals are linked together into highly effective work groups. The work groups are characterized by commitment to common school objectives, by group loyalty, and by mutual support. The building blocks to organizational health are individuals and their needs and groups of individuals. Maintenance and nurturance of the human organization are important concerns of administrators who operate within the person model (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1979).

Regardless of the different styles of school management according to Hallinger in his article "Instructional leadership and the School Principal" the school principal has always been expected to perform a variety of roles. For example, Cuban (1988) identified the political, managerial and instructional roles as fundamental to the principalship.

He further concluded that "Principal effectiveness is attained by finding the correct balance among these roles for a given school context" (p. 2).

Importance of Leadership for Principals

In the early 1980s with the effective schools movement, principals moved to an instructional leadership role (Crow, Matthews, and McCleary, 1996). Instead of simply managing the operation of the school, principals were expected to inspire and influence students, teachers, and occasionally parents and community members to focus on the instructional environment. As instructional leaders, principals exercise leadership externally and internally.

Externally the principal works with the community, parents, and businesses. By working with these entities the principal recognizes leadership coming from the sources and attempts to influence them for the benefit of the school (Crow et al., 1996). As a relationship develops, the principal is able to build a partnership with all three entities making the entities stakeholders in the school community.

Internally, the leadership role of the principal includes the development of the leadership potential of teachers and students. As an instructional leader, the

principal works with internal stakeholders to enhance curriculum and instruction and the school culture. As the principal exercises instructional leadership, internal stakeholders (students, teachers, staff, etc.) play an active role in the educational process. This active role heightens the growth and development of all stakeholders involved. It amplifies the relationship by influencing collaboration and cooperation among the internal community.

Instructional leadership is leadership that is directly related to the process of instruction where teachers, learners, and the curriculum interact (Acheson & Smith, 1986, p. 3). Sergiovanni (2001) states instructional leaders must be knowledgeable about learning theory, effective instruction, curriculum - the power within the educational force. In addition, instructional leaders must be able to communicate and represent to students, teachers, and parents what is important and valuable in school. Instructional leaders must become a symbolic force. Finally, Sergiovanni (2001) affirms instructional leaders must be skilled in the actual construction of a culture that specifically defines what a given school is all about.

An instructional leader has a passion for great teaching and a vision for what schools should provide for children. The National Association of Elementary School

Principals (2001) established six standards of instructional leadership that are unequivocal and nonnegotiable in the focus on learning. They are:

1. Lead schools in a way that places student and adult learning at the center.
2. Set high expectations and standards for the academic and social development of all students and the performance of adults.
3. Demand content and instruction that ensure student achievement of agreed on academic standards.
4. Create a culture of continuous learning for adults tied to student learning and other school goals.
5. Use multiple sources of data as diagnostic tools to assess, identify, and apply instructional improvement.
6. Actively engage the community to create shared responsibility for student and school success. (pp. 6-7)

These six standards provide a very practical description of instructional leadership. In addition, the standards provide a framework for instructional leadership.

Trends in Schools

Sager (1992) reports that an increasing trend in schools where teachers and students report a culture conducive to school success is a transformational leader as

principal. He goes on to suggest that these principals consistently utilize identifiable strategies like:

- A clear and unified focus that empowers professionals to act as both individuals and members of the school.
- A common cultural perspective that enables teachers to view other schools through a similar lens.
- A constant push for improvement emphasizing the importance of the simultaneous application of pressure and support during educational change.

As principals put these strategies into practice, individuals from the outside must know what to look for when they walk into schools that exhibit these characteristics. There are at least eight factors that contribute to a school culture and determine its quality according to Howard, Howell, and Brainard (1987):

1. Continuous Academic and Social Growth. Each student is developing academically, socially, and physically in skills and knowledge. Faculty, too, are improving their skills with regard to their particular assignments and as cooperative members of the education team.

2. Respect. Students see themselves as persons of worth; their ideas are responded to. Teachers and

administrators feel the same way. School is a place where individuals have self-esteem, are considerate, and appreciate others. An atmosphere of mutual respect prevails.

3. Trust. Trust is having confidence that others can be counted on to do what they say they will do; they have integrity.

4. High morale. In a school with high morale, people feel good about what is happening. They are willing to perform assigned tasks; they are confident and cheerful. Self-discipline is the mode. A defeatist attitude does not exist.

5. Cohesiveness. This quality is manifested by a person's attraction to the school. It is often called school spirit or esprit de corps. People feel a sense of belonging to the school. They want to stay with it and exert their influence on it in collaboration with others.

6. Opportunities for Input. Not everyone can be involved in making the important decisions required in running a school's programs. But every person wants the opportunity to contribute ideas and know they have been considered. When people feel they have no voice, it diminishes their self-esteem and deprives the school of their influence.

7. School Renewal. The school is self-renewing; it is growing, developing, and changing.

8. Caring. Individuals in the school feel that some other person or persons are concerned about them. People are interested in each other. Teachers feel that the principal knows that the staff understands the pressures of the job and will help if they can.

In addition, these factors determine the success a school will have in achieving the goals of productivity and satisfaction.

Productivity and Satisfaction

The two paramount goals of school culture are productivity and satisfaction. According to Howard et al. (1987), the goal of productivity means that the school provides a wholesome, stimulating, and productive learning environment that is conducive to the academic and personal growth of students. Productivity includes such characteristics as achieving basic skills, developing an expanding knowledge base, and using inquiry and problem-solving processes. The goal of satisfaction means that the school provides a pleasant and satisfying environment within which young people can work. Satisfaction includes factors as a sense of personal worth, enjoying school, and success

from participation in worthwhile activities. A corollary of these two paramount goals for young people is providing a satisfying and productive environment for adults in the school community: teachers and other staff members, the principal and parents (Howard et al., p. 6).

Culture and Productivity

In the business world, evidence is accumulating to show the significant role culture plays in financial performance. Kotter and Heskett (1992) compared top performing firms with less successful ones in the same business environment. They found that those with strong cultures attuned to prevailing business conditions out performed their counterparts in several ways: revenue increased by an average of 682 percent compared to 166 percent; the workforce grew by 282 percent versus 36 percent; stock gained value by 901 percent contrasted with 74 percent, eclipsing that of 1 percent in less cohesive firms.

Collins and Porras (1997) found similar results in their study of visionary companies' places where cultural values infused all aspects of everyday practice. They compared these visionary companies with other top rated firms and with average performers. A look at the long term

financial performance of these three groups tells a dramatic story:

- Shareholders who in 1926, invested \$1.00 in the general stock market (average companies) would have accumulated \$415.00 in growth and dividends by now.
- Shareholders who invested the same dollar in a more select portfolio (above average companies) would have earned more than twice that amount \$955.00.
- Investors whose 1926 dollar was placed in visionary companies would today see a portfolio worth \$6,356.00. (Collins & Porras, 1997, p. 23-24)

In the business world, culture stands out as a strong predictor of financial results. This same culture performance link appears to apply to education. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, the research on effective schools consistently showed that these schools had a climate and ethos that was purposeful and conducive to learning (Levine & Lezotte, 1990). These were places where a clear mission focused on student learning was embedded in a culture that supported high expectations for all students. The studies provided vivid proof of the power of culture.

More recently, numerous studies of school change have identified the organizational culture as critical to the successful improvement of teaching and learning (Fullan, 1998; Rossman, Corbett, & Firestone, 1988). In study after

study, where the culture did not support and encourage reform, that improvement did not occur. In contrast, improvement efforts were likely in schools where positive professional cultures had norms, values, and beliefs that reinforced a strong educational mission. Culture was a key factor in determining whether improvement was possible.

Strategies and Techniques

School Leaders Guiding Standards

Foremost in the understanding of contemporary leadership is an understanding of the standards to which school principals are held. The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium's (ISLLC) Standards for School Leaders were developed under the direction of the Council of Chief State School Officers in 1996. The standards present a common core of knowledge, dispositions, and performances that leaders should be able to demonstrate. These standards reflect the importance and responsibility of effective school leaders. School principal preparatory programs organize graduate students' learning and development around the following standards:

Standard 1 - A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation,

implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

Standard 2 - A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Standard 3 - A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Standard 4 - A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

Standard 5 - A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical matter.

Standard 6 - A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal and cultural context. (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium [ISLLC], pp. 4 & 5)

The (ISLLC) standards reflect the significant role principals play in education. Furthermore, the standards confirm the relationship that principals should have with teachers, parents, and community members. In addition, the standards are predicated on the concept of access,

opportunity, and empowerment for all members of the school community (ISLLC, 1996).

Empowering Teachers

In a collegial, collaborative environment, principals consistently concentrate on enabling others to examine and redesign schools for improved learning, and teachers learn to share power and work as a team (Blasé & Blasé, 2001). Successful instructional leaders realize that increasing teacher access to decision making is essential to empowering teachers and that cooperative decision making is the foundation (Maeroff, 1988). As instructional leaders share the decision-making, it ensures quality instruction and significantly shapes the climate of the school (Wendel, Kigone, & Spurze, 1991). As instructional leaders, principals embrace the responsibility of providing a positive educational climate. Blasé and Blasé (2001) conducted a study on understanding the characteristics of shared governance principals that directly and indirectly contributed to teachers' sense of empowerment.

In summary, the study stated that teachers' sense of empowerment is enhanced by modeling, building, and persistently supporting an environment of trust among teachers, whom they consider professionals and experts; systematically structuring the school to encourage authentic collaboration by establishing readiness and common goals and by responding to the school's unique

characteristics; Supporting shared governance efforts by providing professional development and basic resources; Maintaining a focus on teaching and learning; Supporting teacher experimentation and innovation, granting professional autonomy, and viewing failure as an opportunity to learn; Modeling professional behavior, especially by exhibiting caring, optimism, honesty, friendliness, and enthusiasm; Encouraging risk taking and minimizing threat (or constraints on teacher freedom and growth); Praising teachers and using other symbolic rewards (e.g., valuing and respecting teachers); and Setting the stage for discussing and solving the Meta problems of a school through effective communication, openness and trust, action research, group participation in decision making, and effective procedural methods for solving problem. (Blasé & Blasé, p. 143)

Each of the principals described by teachers in their study used strategies identified with instructional leadership in varying degrees and teachers viewed this approach as making the major contribution to their sense of empowerment (Blasé & Blasé, 2001).

Influencing Teachers

Isherwood (1973) found that principals who demonstrated charisma, expertise, and human relations skills heightened teachers' loyalty to the principal and improved teacher satisfaction. Principals' use of persuasion was significantly related to the degree of consensus that teachers perceived in school (Muth, 1973). Mark Hanson (1976) discovered that in innovative schools, public praise by administrators resulted in desired modifications of

teacher behavior. Hanson also found that principals who described appropriate professional conduct positively influenced teachers. By influencing teachers principals that practice instructional leadership promote successful teaching.

Principal's Instructional Leadership Behaviors

Keefe and Jenkins (1984) stated that the National Association of Secondary School Principals' Handbook on Effective Instructional Leadership lists the following traits of a successful instructional leader: (1) they hold high expectations for teachers and staff; (2) they spend a major portion of their day in working with teachers and improving the instructional program; (3) they work in identifying and diagnosing instructional problems and (4) they are deeply involved in the school's "culture" and climate to influence it in positive ways.

Effective instructional leadership requires a very complex set of relationships between principals and their beliefs and the surrounding environment of the school. The principal's values and previous experience of the community and the institution in which the principal finds the school all must be taken into account. Sergiovanni (1984) discusses five leadership behaviors available to a principal:

technical, human, educational, symbolic, and cultural. Technical forces include being a good manager and applying good planning, organizing, coordinating, and controlling techniques to insure optimum effectiveness of the organization. This includes such things as good office management practices, good scheduling techniques, and appropriate use of goals and objectives. Human forces deal with human relation skills, implementing good motivational techniques, and building good morale within the organization. These skills become major contributors to the climate of the school.

Educational forces focus the conceptual knowledge of education of the practitioner on the daily operations of the educational enterprise. Skills include the ability to diagnose educational problems, carry out the functions of clinical supervision, evaluate educational programs, develop curriculum, implement staff development activities, and develop good individual educational programs for children. Symbolic forces are behaviors that symbolize to others those things, which the leader believes important and of value to the organization. It involves purposing which can be defined as that continuous stream of actions by an organization's formal, leadership which has the effect of inducing clarity,

consensus, and commitment regarding the organization's basic purposes.

Cultural forces deal with the cultural leader functioning as the high priest of the school. In this role the cultural leader seeks to strengthen the values and beliefs that make the school unique. The cultural force of leadership bonds students, parents, and teachers together as true believers in the school. This is done by sharing with others what the school most values, by orientation of new members of the group (students, staff, and parents) to the values and beliefs of the organization; by telling stories of past glories to reinforce these traditions; or simply by explaining the standard operating procedure that is expected to be used. As the principal develops a sound instructional organization, builds a positive instructional climate, and builds a functional school culture, all of these instructional leadership behaviors must be called upon in varying amounts, depending, of course, on the specific task.

Developing positive staff attitudes is an instructional leadership quality that enhances the school's organizational climate. Descriptors and suggestions for the enhancement of a strong organizational climate and culture within a staff include the development of feelings of collegiality, trust and confidence, and appreciation and recognition (Shafer &

King, 1985). Trust and confidence builds comradery. Teachers are highly respected professionals. They have confidence in themselves, and the principal trusts their judgment and respects them for the professionals that they are. The trust and confidence carries over into the community they serve. Tangible support is key. The principal as well as district office support staff functions as facilitators to teachers by providing them with the resources they need to teach effectively.

Professional development is a high priority and effort is made to insure that teachers have good opportunity for staff development through workshops, conferences, and study opportunities. Appreciation and recognition enhances relationships. Just as students need a reward system to encourage desired behavior, so do teachers. Looking for desired teacher behavior and rewarding it should be done regularly through both formal and informal channels. Feature articles in the school newspaper, teacher of the month, bulletin boards, PTA luncheons honoring certain teachers, and articles in the newspaper represent formal ways of rewarding outstanding teaching. Shafer and King (1985) state be careful, however, not to create petty jealousies among staff members by singling out only certain members for recognition. In addition Shafer and King (1985) state less

formal methods more frequently used may bring better results. The simple spontaneous comment for something well done or the note placed in the teachers mailbox with a positive statement about something the teacher has recently accomplished are two simple but effective techniques for expressing appreciation and recognition.

The Principal as Instructional Leader

Sally Zepeda (2003) implies that strong leadership promotes excellence and equity in education and entails projections, promoting, and holding steadfast to the vision; garnering and allocating resources; communicating progress; and supporting the people, programs, services, and activities implemented to achieve the school's vision. The rationale for leadership suggests that effective leadership is essential to the development and continuing improvement of any organization. An educational leader is needed to focus efforts on excellence and equity.

Zepeda (2003) goes on to say that quality teaching and knowledge about instruction should be a part of the vision for student achievement. Instructional leadership involves knowing what good teaching is and how good teaching leads to student learning. Building a vision for student success and instructional leadership is an ongoing reflective process,

and building the vision among the members of the school community is an iterative process that begins with the instructional leader looking within for the core values and beliefs that motivate her to act on these values and beliefs. The effective principal also looks to the school community to engage all stakeholders in developing the vision. The vision drives all actions and allocations of resources. Instructional leaders protect the vision, leading people toward the end goal (Zepeda, p. 13).

Seven Steps to Effective Instructional Leadership

In order to improve the teaching and learning process there are seven steps to effective instructional leadership according to McEwan (2003). They are as follows:

1. Establish, implement, and achieve academic standards.
2. Be an instructional resource for your staff.
3. Create a school culture and climate conducive to learning.
4. Communicate the vision and mission of your school.
5. Set high expectations for your staff and yourself.
6. Develop teacher leaders.
7. Develop and maintain positive relationships with students, staff and parents. (p. 15)

Each step gives the principal ways to make sure that effective teaching and learning is going on in the classroom. For example, to ensure that a consistent and coherent program is established school wide as well as in grade level and departmental goals take the following steps. Use test results, grade reports, attendance records, and other information to spot potential problems (McEwan, 2003). Develop and maintain collaborative relationships formed during the development and adoption of the shared vision (Mendez-Morse, 2001). Develop teacher leaders by providing training and staff development. Subscribe to journals and newspapers and read them. Utilizing these seven steps helps the principal create techniques that enhance instructional leadership.

Instructional Leadership Impact on Student Achievement

While the focus of this research project was not student achievement, it should be noted that effective instructional leadership is a primary key to student achievement. Kelly, Thornton and Daughtery (2006) report that effective leadership is possibly the most important single determinant of an effective learning environment (p. 17). According to Waters and Cameron (2007) in their report on "The Balanced Leadership Framework: Connecting Vision

With Action" over the past several years, Mid-continent research for Education and Learning (McREL) has completed multiple meta-analytic studies on the practice of effective schools, teachers, and principals. Their studies provide general guidance for what school leaders and teachers can do to increase student achievement (p. 1). Between 1998 and 2003, McREL conducted three major quantitative studies, using a meta-analysis, on the effects of classroom, school, and leadership practices on student achievement.

The three findings of main importance for this research project appeared in the first study; nine clusters of research-based instructional strategies used by classroom teachers were identified as having effects on student achievement (Marzano, 1998; Marzano, Gaddy & Dean, 2000). In their second study which looked at school leadership, they found a statistically significant correlation between school level leadership and student achievement of .25, which translates to a one standard deviation increase in principal leadership behavior corresponding with a 10 percentile point difference in student achievement on a norm referenced test. No longer is there a question about the effect of leadership on student achievement. Clearly, leadership makes a difference (Waters & Cameron, 2007, p. 3).

The second finding identified 21 leadership responsibilities with statistically significant correlations to student achievement and 66 practices or behaviors for fulfilling these responsibilities. With this finding, the concept of "instructional leadership" is no longer an abstraction or left only to theory (Waters & Cameron, 2007, p. 3).

The final finding of importance to this study was in spite of finding the average effect of student achievement correlated at .25, the study also found that not all strong leaders have a positive impact on student achievement. There were a number of studies in which principals were rated by teachers as strong leaders in schools with below average achievement (Waters & Cameron, 2007, p. 9).

Fullan (2002 as quoted in Kelly et al. (2006) points out that "Only principals who are equipped to handle a complex, rapidly changing environment can implement the reforms that lead to sustained improvement in student achievement" (p. 16). Indeed, principals must deal with the various levels of skills and abilities of their faculty and a continuity of divergent situations within today's complex school environment (Kelly et al., p. 17).

Bolman and Deal (1991) also report that the variables associated with improved student achievement have been a

focus of researchers for many years. Now, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) has significantly increased the pressure to improve student achievement. Waters, Marzano, and McNulty, 2004, reported that effective school leadership substantially boosts student achievement. School climate, leadership, and quality instruction are frequently associated with effective schools (p. 18).

Defining Instructional Leadership

More recently, the definition of instructional leadership has been expanded to include deeper involvement in the core business of schooling, which is teaching and learning. Attention has shifted from teaching to learning, and some have proposed the term "learning leader" over "instructional leader" (DuFour, 2006).

The National Association of Elementary School Principals (2001) defines instructional leadership as "leading learning communities". In learning communities, staff members meet on a regular basis to discuss their work, work together to problem solve, reflect on their jobs, and take responsibility for what students learn. They operate in networks of shared and complementary expertise rather than in hierarchies or in isolation. People in a learning community "own the problem" and become agents of its

solution. Instructional leaders also make adult learning a priority: set high expectations for performance; create a culture of continuous learning for adults and get the specific behaviors such as making suggestions, giving feedback, modeling effective instruction, soliciting opinions, supporting collaboration, providing professional development opportunities, and giving praise for effective teaching.

Knowledge and the Instructional Leader

Inherent in the concept of an instructional leader is the notion that learning should be given top priority while everything else revolves around the enhancement of learning, which undeniably is characteristic of any educational endeavour. Hence, to have credibility as an instructional leader, the principal should also be a practicing teacher. For example, in the United Kingdom, most principals spend an average of 20 percent of their time in a week teaching (Weindling, 1990).

Instructional leaders need to know what is going on in the classroom and to have an opportunity "to walk the factory floor." Many a time, principals are not in touch with what is going on at the classroom level and are unable to appreciate some of the problems teachers and students

encounter. Their tendency is to address instructional issues from the perspective of when they were teachers. Principals need to work closely with students, developing teaching techniques and methods as a means for understanding teacher perspectives and for establishing a base on which to make curricular decisions. Also, a teaching principal strengthens the belief that "the sole purpose of the school is to serve the educational needs of students" (Harden, 1988, p.88). Whitaker (1997) identified four skills essential for instructional leadership.

- First, they need to be a resource provider. It is not enough for principals to know the strengths and weaknesses of their faculty but also recognize that teachers desire to be acknowledged and appreciated for a job well done.

- Secondly, they need to be an instructional resource. Teachers count on their principals as resources of information on current trends and effective instructional practices. Instructional leaders are tuned-in to issues relating curriculum, effective pedagogical strategies and assessment.

- Thirdly, they need to be good communicators. Effective instructional leaders need to communicate

essential beliefs regarding learning such as the conviction that all children can learn and no child should be left behind.

- Finally, they need to create a visible presence.

Leading the instructional program of a school means a commitment to living and breathing a vision of success in teaching and learning. This includes focusing on learning objectives, modeling behaviors of learning, and designing programs and activities on instruction.

Skills and the Instructional Leader

Besides having knowledge in the core areas of education, the principal must possess certain skills to carry out the tasks of an instructional leader. These skills are interpersonal skills, planning skills, instructional observation skills, skills in research and skills in evaluation.

The task of being an instructional leader is both complex and multidimensional. If principals believe that growth in student learning is the primary goal of schooling, then it is a task worth learning. If a principal possesses essential knowledge and skills, he or she is likely to become an effective leader, sharing, facilitating, and guiding decisions about instructional improvement for the

betterment of students' education. The "dramatically different role" of the principal as an instructional leader is outlined by Brewer (2001) as

one that required focusing on instruction; building a community of learners; sharing decision making; sustaining the basic; leveraging time; supporting ongoing professional development for all staff members; redirecting resources to support a multifaceted school plan; and creating a climate of integrity, inquiry, and continuous improvement. (p.30)

Buffie (1989, p. 82) identified knowledge, skills, and context as vital components in the development of instructional leadership. As Buffie notes (pp. 82-85), knowledge is key to effective decision making. Knowledge is fundamental to the skill development necessary to carry out one's goals. Skills are needed to turn knowledge into action. Effective leaders recognize the role of knowledge and skills in the change process. Knowledge and skills are applied within the context of a set of beliefs or values. One's belief system is what serves as the foundation for decision-making.

By concentrating on teaching, the instructional leader of the past emphasized the inputs of the learning process. By concentrating on learning, today's school leaders shift both their own focus and that of the school community from inputs to outcomes and from intentions to results. Schools

need principal leadership as much as ever. But only those, who understand that the essence of their job is promoting student and teacher learning, will be able to provide that leadership. Schools need leadership from principals who focus on advancing student and staff learning. They need to ask, "To what extent are the students learning the intended outcomes of each course?" "What steps can I take to give both students and teachers the additional time and support they need to improve learning?" (DuFour, 2006, p. 2__).

Instructional Management

Instructional leadership has been the primary focus of most of the literature review, simply because research confirms the positive student outcomes that are related to instructional leadership responsibilities. There are a number of variables that can intervene in the potential effectiveness of instructional leaders; however, without instructional leadership, the educational outcomes for children may not be reached.

Instructional Management is a term that was frequently used in the transition between research identifying the importance of school leaders as managers and the more current research identifying the importance of school leaders as instructional leaders. Table 1 identifies the

characteristics of instructional management that are closely associated with Marzano, Waters, and McNulty's (2005) 21 principal responsibilities.

Table 1
Instructional Leadership and Instructional Management

Marzano, Waters & McNulty (2005)	Hallinger & Murphy (1985)
Affiliation-Recognizes and celebrates accomplishments and acknowledges failures	Provides incentives for teachers Provides incentives for student learning
Change Agent-Is willing to challenge and actively challenges the status quo	
Contingent Rewards-Recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments	Provides incentives for teachers and for student learning
Communication-Establishes strong lines of communication with and among teachers and students	
Culture-Fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation	
Discipline-Protects teachers from issues and influences that would detract from their teaching time or focus	Protects instructional time
Flexibility-Adapts his/her leadership behavior to the needs of the current situation and is comfortable with dissent	
Focus-Establishes clear goals and keeps those goals in the fore-front of the school's attention	Frames the school goals Communicates the school goals
Ideals/Beliefs-Communicates and operates from strong ideals and beliefs about schooling	
Input-Involves teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and Policies	
Intellectual stimulation-Ensures faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices and makes the discussion of these a regular aspect of the school's culture.	

Table 1
Continued

Marzano, Waters & McNulty (2005) Continued	Hallinger & Murphy (1985) Continued
Involvement in Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment-Is directly involved in the design and implementation of the curriculum, instruction, and assessment	Coordinates the curriculum
Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment-Is knowledgeable about current Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment	
Monitoring/Evaluating-Monitors the effectiveness of school practices and the impact on student learning	Supervise and Evaluate instruction Monitor student progress
Optimizer-Inspires and leads new and challenging innovations	
Order-Establishes a set of standard operating procedures and routines	
Outreach-Is an advocate and spokesperson for the schools to all stakeholders	
Relationships-Demonstrates an awareness of the personal aspects of teachers and staff	
Resources-Provides teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their jobs	Promotes professional development
Situational awareness-Is aware of the details and undercurrents in the running of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems	
Visibility-Has quality contact and interactions with teachers and students	Maintain high visibility

Because instructional management addresses ten factors and the factors are ones with which teachers are familiar, the research project measures the extent to which perceptions of teachers' and principals' perceptions differ regarding principals' instructional management practices.

The ten management practices are associated with at least nine of the 21 leadership responsibilities.

Summary

Principals' perception of their own instructional management and teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional management practices should be congruent. If the perceptions of instructional management is not similar, it may cause misunderstandings and misconceptions and it may prevent teachers and principals from achieving the essential learning and achievement goals for students. These misunderstandings and misconceptions may stem from the various concepts of instructional management identified by researchers such as Blasé and Blasé (1998, 1999, 2001), Smith and Andrews (1989), and Hallinger et al. (1983) to name a few. In order for schools to be effective it is important that teachers' and principals' perception of the principals' instructional management be the same. As Hallinger et. al. (1983) affirms, instructional management defines the school's mission, manages curriculum and instruction, and promotes a positive school climate.

CHAPTER III

Research Procedure

Research Description

Quantitative research methodologies were utilized. In this research project, descriptive statistics allowed the researcher to describe the sample and provide the data to compare perceptions of two groups, teachers and principals. Descriptive statistics were used to organize and analyze the data collected on the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this research project was to determine the extent to which principals and teachers perceive that principals use instructional management practices. Those practices were (1) frame the school goals, (2) communicate the school goals, (3) supervise and evaluate instruction, (4) coordinate the curriculum, (5) monitor student progress, (6) protect instructional time, (7) maintain high visibility, (8) provide incentives for teachers, (9) promote professional development, and (10) provide incentives for learning. As instructional managers, principals work to build productive school cultures. Principals who exercise

instructional management also enhance the day to day operations of a school.

Variables

The independent variables were the ten instructional management practices of instructional management. The practices were (1) frame the school goals, (2) communicate the school goals, (3) supervise and evaluate instruction, (4) coordinate the curriculum, (5) monitor student progress, (6) protect instructional time, (7) maintain high visibility, (8) provide incentives for teachers, (9) promote professional development, and (10) provide incentives for learning. The dependent variables were both the principals' perception and the teachers' perceptions of the principals' use of instructional management practices. The intervening independent variable is within group years of experience.

Research Questions

The following research question was addressed by collecting descriptive data for identifying mean scores and standard deviations: Are there differences between principals' ratings and teachers' ratings of principals' instructional management practices?

Hypothesis

There is one Hypothesis for the study. The Hypothesis is stated as follows:

There is a significant difference between principals' and teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional management practices.

Sub-Hypotheses

Sub-Hypothesis 1 stated: There is a significant difference between age groups of teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional management practices.

Sub-Hypothesis 2 stated: There is a significant difference between age groups of principals' perceptions of principals' instructional management practices.

Population Description

The populations studied were rural, suburban, and urban public school principals and teachers in the state of Missouri. There are approximately 2000 principals and 67,097 teachers in the state of Missouri. The principals and teachers work in public elementary, middle, and, high schools.

Sample

A random sample of 200 principals and 200 teachers was selected to participate in the study. This sample size was chosen based upon the number of principals and teachers in the state of Missouri. The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education School Core Data Office provided the researcher with a list of principals and teachers in the state of Missouri.

Procedure for Data Collection

The study utilized the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale published by Dr. Philip Hallinger. It was used to collect data from principals and teachers regarding perceptions of principals' instructional leadership. Each principal and teacher received an envelope via U.S. mail containing the questionnaire and a cover letter explaining the study's purpose, research procedures, and the efforts made to maintain confidentiality, and the fact that their participation was voluntary. In addition, the envelope contained a self-addressed envelope for the participants to return the completed questionnaire to the researcher. A second mailing was made when it was necessary.

When a questionnaire was received, it was coded and the data were entered on a data spread sheet for analysis.

Questionnaires were stored in a locked file cabinet in the office of the researcher.

Instrument

Validity and Reliability

The Principal's Instructional Management Rating Scale was tested for validity and reliability. To test the validity and reliability of the Principal's Instructional Management Rating Scale, five criteria were tested: content validity, reliability (Cronbach's alpha), validity (analysis of variance), construct validity (subscale intercorrelation), and construct validity (documentary support). Hallinger reported in the Instructional Management Rating Scale Resource Manual that content validity achieved a minimum average agreement of .80 among a group of raters and subscales achieved a reliability coefficient of at least .75 and the validity significance level was .05.

Level of Measurement

The Principal Instructional Management Rating scale uses an ordinal level of measurement (Likert scale). The Likert scale goes from 1 to 5. 1 represents almost never, 2 represents seldom, 3 represents sometimes, 4 represents frequently, and 5 represents almost always.

Analysis of Data

The Principal Instructional Management Rating scale (PIMRS) was used to gather data. The PIMRS consists of 50 behavior statements divided into 10 subscales, each of which measures a different instructional leadership variable (framing school goals, 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 providing incentives for learning). Each instructional leadership subscale in the PIMRS consists of 5 items. Each item is scored on a 1 to 5 scale (Almost Never to Almost Always), denoting the frequency with which the specific behavior is practiced. Descriptive statistics were utilized to explain profiles of respondents. Questionnaire data were entered and analyzed by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

Chapter IV

Data Analysis and Findings

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which principals and teachers perceive that principals demonstrate instructional management practices. Descriptive statistics were used to identify a population profile and answer the research question, and inferential statistics were used to test the Hypothesis and Sub-Hypotheses.

Population Profile

Tables 2 through 6 present the profile of the respondents to this research study, which includes teacher and principal gender, age range, ethnicity, location, and educational background.

Table 2
Frequencies and Percentages of Total Participants', Teachers', and Principals' Gender.

Variable	Category	Total #	Total %	Tea #	Tea %	Prin #	Prin %
		N = 126	100%	N = 62	49.3%	N = 64	50.7%
Gender	Male	49	39.2%	20	32.8%	29	45.3%
	Female	76	60.8%	41	67.2%	35	54.7%

Although a larger percent of the principals responded, in general, the respondent population was fairly well balanced between teachers and principals.

Table 3
*Frequency and Percentages of Total Participants', Teachers',
 and Principals' Ages*

Years	Total		Teachers		Principals	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
20-24	3	2.4	3	4.9	--	--
25-35	28	22.6	21	34.4	7	11.1
36-40	10	8.1	4	6.6	6	9.5
41-50	39	31.5	10	16.4	29	46.0
51-60	39	31.5	20	32.8	19	30.2
61 and Over	5	4.0	3	4.9	2	3.2

The random sample and ultimate voluntary participants were more numerous in the age ranges of 41-50 for both teacher and principals. In fact, a strong majority of the respondents were in the age brackets from 41 and over; specifically, 67% of the teachers were 41 years old or older and 79.4% of the principals were 41 years old or older. The population can be generalized as predominantly mature in age.

Table 4
*Frequency and Percentages of Total Participants', Teachers',
 and Principals' Ethnicity*

Ethnicity	Total		Teachers		Principals	
	#	Percent	#	Percent	#	Percent
African Americans	16	13.2	11	18.3	5	8.2
European Americans	63	52.1	31	51.7	32	52.5
Hispanic Americans	1	0.8	1	1.7	1	1.6
Multi-Ethnic	4	3.3	3	5.0	23	37.7
Other	37	30.6	14	23.3	5	8.2

In general, the population is representative of the ethnicity of Missouri teachers and principals, particularly in regard to the strong percent of European Americans who occupy those positions.

Table 5
Frequencies and Percentages of Total Participants', Teachers', and Principals' Location

Variable	Total #	Total %	Tea #	Tea %	Prin #	Prin %
Location	N=126		N = 62		N = 64	
Urban	23	18.5%	13	21.7%	10	15.6%
Suburb	52	41.9%	30	50.0%	22	34.4%
Rural	49	39.5%	17	28.3%	32	50.0%

Although the number of schools located in rural areas is larger than in either suburban or urban areas in Missouri; however, the number of teachers located in suburban and urban environments will be larger than the number in rural areas. Consequently, the locations of teachers are representative of the total population. Because every school requires a principal, the number of principals will mirror the number of schools, the largest number of which will be located in rural areas. The principal participants in this study also are representative in number of the state of Missouri.

Table 6
*Frequency and Percentages of Total Participants', Teachers',
 and Principals' Educational Background*

Educational Background	Total		Teachers		Principals	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Bachelors	3	2.5	3	4.9	--	--
Bachelors + some college hours	15	12.7	15	24.6	--	--
Masters	9	7.6	6	9.8	3	5.3
Masters + some college hours	75	63.6	37	60.7	38	66.7
Doctorate (Ed.D./Ph.D.)	15	12.7	--	--	15	26.3
Doctorate + some college hours	1	.8	--	--	1	1.8

In the state of Missouri, school principals must have a Masters Degree and certification in Educational Administration to be certificated as a school principal. All principal participants had a Masters Degree and 94.8% had earned a Masters Degree or beyond a Masters Degree. 28.1% had earned a Doctorate. Teachers are expected to have a Bachelors Degree in Education. 84.7% of the teachers had earned a Masters Degree or beyond a Masters Degree. 13.5% had earned a Doctorate.

Descriptive Statistics

This section will present the data that answer the research questions and provide the results of some basic inferential tests for the Hypothesis and Sub-Hypothesis.

Research Question

The research question was: Were there differences between teachers' ratings and principals' ratings of the principal's use of instructional management functions? To determine the differences, mean scores were identified for each instructional management practice for principals' responses and for teachers' responses. Table 7 presents those data.

Table 7
Means and Standard Deviations on the 10 Principal Instructional Management Functions by Groups (Teachers/Principals)

Functions	Teachers			Principals		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Frame the School Goals	62	3.90	0.89	64	4.46	0.58
Communicate the School Goals	61	3.75	0.90	64	4.02	0.55
Supervise and Evaluate Instruction	62	3.43	0.93	62	4.38	0.46
Coordinate the Curriculum	62	3.60	0.94	63	4.29	0.51
Monitor Student Progress	60	3.65	0.83	64	4.23	0.54
Protect Instructional Time	61	3.41	0.99	63	4.11	0.48
Maintain High Visibility	60	3.06	1.04	63	4.17	0.53
Provide Incentives for Teachers	59	3.10	1.14	62	3.99	0.59
Promote Professional Development	62	3.79	1.02	64	4.44	0.51
Provide Incentives for Learning	61	3.74	0.95	64	4.23	0.59

Teacher perceptions of the extent to which school principals used the 10 practices of instructional managers ranged from a low mean score of 3.06 (Maintain High Visibility) on a 5-point Likert scale to a high mean score

of 3.90 (Frame the School Goals). All 10 practices were rated lower by the teachers than they were by the principals. The principals rated principal use of the practices from a low mean score of 3.99 (Provide Incentives for Teachers) to a high mean score of 4.46 (Frame the School Goals).

Hypothesis and Sub-Hypotheses

Hypothesis

There is a significant difference between teachers' and principals' perceptions of the extent to which principals use instructional management practices.

Table 8 presents the results of inferential tests to identify whether or not there is a significant difference between teachers' and principals' perceptions.

Table 8
Differences Between Teacher Perception and Principal Perception of Principal Use of 10 Instructional Practices, Application of t-Test.

Sub-scores	<i>t</i>	df	Sig.
Frame the School Goals	-4.13	104.00	.001
Communicate the School Goals	-2.05	98.86	.043
Supervise and Evaluate Instruction	-7.24	89.59	.001
Coordinate the Curriculum	-5.06	94.35	.001
Monitor Student Progress	-4.55	99.74	.001
Protect Instructional Time	-5.03	85.90	.001
Maintain High Visibility	-7.47	86.77	.001
Provide Incentives for Teachers	-5.36	86.42	.001
Promote Professional Development	-4.49	89.00	.001
Provide Incentives for Learning	-3.42	98.81	.001

When a t-Test was applied to compare teacher perceptions of principals' use of the 10 instructional management functions with principal perceptions of principals' use of the 10 instructional management functions, there was a significant difference for all 10 functions. The significant difference for Communicate the School Goals was $p \leq .043$. The other nine functions—Frame the School Goals, Supervise and Evaluate Instruction, Coordinate the Curriculum, Monitor Student Progress, Protect Instructional Time, Maintain High Visibility, Provide Incentives for Teachers, Promote Professional Development, and Provide Incentives for Learning—experienced a strong

significant difference at ($p \leq .01$). Therefore, the hypothesis is rejected.

Sub-Hypothesis 1

There is a significant difference between teachers' perceptions of the extent to which principals use instructional management practices based on within group years of experience.

To determine if there was any significant difference in teacher perceptions of principals' use of the 10 instructional leadership practices, based on years of experience, means and standard deviations were computed as a beginning for analysis. Table 9 reports the means and standard deviations.

Table 9

Means and Standard Deviations for Teachers' Perceptions of Principal Use of 10 Principal Instructional Management Practices by Years of Experience

Years of Experience	1		2-4		5-9		10-15		15+	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Frame the School Goals	3.7	.42	4.24	.71	3.40	0.80	3.97	0.58	4.08	1.01
Communicate the School Goals	3.4	.28	4.13	.79	3.27	0.87	3.80	0.67	3.86	1.02
Supervise and Evaluate Instruction	3.2	.28	3.36	.73	3.12	1.03	3.35	1.04	3.67	0.87
Coordinate the Curriculum	3.7	.71	3.71	.81	3.23	0.98	3.40	1.01	3.81	0.91
Monitor Student Progress	3.2	.28	3.83	.75	3.37	0.86	3.62	0.84	3.85	0.81
Protect Instructional Time	2.8	.01	3.49	.76	3.38	1.09	3.03	1.32	3.64	0.88
Maintain High Visibility	3.4	.01	3.02	1.17	3.10	1.09	2.85	1.02	3.15	1.04
Provide Incentives for Teachers	3.3	.42	3.00	1.46	2.93	1.21	3.12	1.42	3.20	1.01
Promote Professional Development	3.5	.42	4.51	.54	3.55	1.01	3.43	1.33	3.85	1.01
Provide Incentives for Learning	3.9	.99	4.24	.92	3.37	1.23	3.63	0.89	3.75	0.88

Note. 1 year (n = 2), 2-4 years (n = 9), 5-9 years (n = 13), 10-15 years (n = 8) and More than 15 years (n = 26).

To determine whether there were significant differences between teachers within groups years of experience, univariate ANOVAs were applied. Table 10 identifies degrees of significance.

Table 10

Ten Univariate ANOVAs among Teachers on the 10 Principal Instructional Management Practices by Years of Experience (1 year vs. 2-4 years vs. 5-9 years vs. 10-15 years vs. More than 15 years)

Sub-Scores	F	Sig.	η^2	Power
Frame the School Goals	1.36 (0.81)	.263	0.10	0.39
Communicate the School Goals	1.30 (0.86)	.285	0.10	0.39
Supervise and Evaluate Instruction	0.75 (0.79)	.562	0.06	0.22
Coordinate the Curriculum	1.07 (0.87)	.380	0.08	0.31
Monitor Student Progress	1.08 (0.68)	.375	0.08	0.32
Protect Instructional Time	0.77 (1.03)	.552	0.06	0.23
Maintain High Visibility	0.23 (1.15)	.923	0.02	0.09
Provide Incentives for Teachers	0.21 (1.37)	.931	0.02	0.09
Promote Professional Development	1.59 (0.98)	.193	0.12	0.45
Provide Incentives for Learning	0.94 (0.90)	.447	0.07	0.28

Note. $df = 4, 48$. Numbers in parentheses represent mean square error.

There were no significant differences at the .05 level of significance in teacher perceptions based on within group years of experience.

To determine if there were any significant differences in principals' perceptions of principals' use of the 10 instructional management practices based on within group years of experience, the means and standard deviations were computed as a beginning for analysis. Table 11 presents the results.

To determine if significance existed within group years of experience for principals at the .05 level, univariate ANOVAs were applied and Table 12 reports the results.

There was a significant difference in principals' perceptions of the extent to which they use instructional management functions by years of experience for the Promote Professional Development management practice. The significance level was $p < .039$. The other 9 instructional management practices were not significant at the .05 level of significance.

Table 11

Means and Standard Deviations for Principals on the 10 Principal Instructional Management Practices by Years of Experience

Years of Experience Sub-Scores	1		2-4		5-9		10-15		15+	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Frame the School Goals	4.27	.50	4.50	.48	4.56	.55	4.26	.64	4.62	.75
Supervise and Evaluate Instruction	4.37	.65	4.28	.44	4.40	.44	4.27	.42	4.64	.43
Coordinate the Curriculum	4.08	.54	4.25	.51	4.30	.48	4.33	.62	4.34	.55
Monitor Student Progress	3.97	.86	4.13	.58	4.26	.42	4.17	.58	4.48	.34
Protect Instructional Time	4.10	.55	4.08	.40	4.03	.56	4.20	.51	4.32	.25
Maintain High Visibility	4.30	.43	4.13	.70	4.25	.44	4.00	.51	4.16	.56
Provide Incentives for Teachers	3.83	.51	3.80	.58	4.13	.55	4.00	.73	4.04	.61
Promote Professional Development	4.07	.59	4.60	.45	4.36	.51	4.47	.51	4.68	.34
Provide Incentives for Learning	4.13	.62	3.98	.64	4.23	.63	4.27	.52	4.42	.54

Note. 1 year (n = 6), 2-4 years (n = 12), 5-9 years (n = 20), 10-15 years (n = 14) and More than 15 years (n = 10).

Table 12

Ten Univariate ANOVAs among Principals on the 10 Principal Instructional Management Practices by Years of Experience (1 year vs. 2-4 years vs. 5-9 years vs. 10-15 years vs. More than 15 years)

Sub-Scores	F	Sig.	η^2	Power
Frame the School Goals	0.80 (0.37)	.529	0.06	0.24
Communicate the School Goals	1.31 (0.30)	.278	0.09	0.38
Supervise and Evaluate Instruction	1.27 (0.20)	.293	0.09	0.37
Coordinate the Curriculum	0.31 (0.27)	.870	0.02	0.11
Monitor Student Progress	0.84 (0.28)	.504	0.06	0.25
Protect Instructional Time	1.28 (0.22)	.290	0.09	0.37
Maintain High Visibility	0.76 (0.29)	.555	0.06	0.23
Provide Incentives for Teachers	0.45 (0.38)	.771	0.03	0.15
Promote Professional Development	2.72 (0.23)	.039	0.18	0.71
Provide Incentives for Learning	0.74 (0.35)	.568	0.06	0.22

Note. $df = 4, 51$. Numbers in parentheses represent mean square error.

Although there was not a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions by years of experience of the extent to which principals used instructional management practices and there was not a significant difference in the principals' perceptions by years of experience of the extent to which principals used 9 of the ten instructional

management practices, there was one instructional management practice that was significantly different, Promote Professional Development; hence, the sub-hypothesis is rejected.

Chapter V

Summary, Conclusions, Recommendations

Summary

The purpose of this research project was to determine the extent to which principals and teachers perceived that principals used instructional management practices.

Instructional management consists of many facets. According to Sergiovanni (2001), instructional leaders and managers must be knowledgeable about learning theory, effective instruction, and curriculum. In this research project, teachers' and principals' perceptions were assessed by using the Principals Instructional Management Rating Scale (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985) The following Research Question was answered with descriptive statistics and the Hypothesis and Sub-Hypotheses were tested inferentially.

The Research Question was: Are there differences between principals' ratings and teachers' ratings of principals' instructional leadership practices?

The Hypothesis tested was: There is a significant difference between principals' perceptions and teachers' perception of the principals' instructional management practices. Sub-Hypothesis 1 was: There is a significant difference between teachers' perceptions of principals'

instructional management practices based on within group years of experience. Sub-Hypothesis 2 was: There is a significant difference between principals' perceptions of principals' instructional management practices based on within group years of experience.

The Research Question was answered by using descriptive data, specifically mean scores and standard deviations. The Hypothesis was tested by identifying mean scores and standard deviations and then applying a t-Test to determine the extent to which the perceptions were different. The Sub-Hypotheses were tested by applying an Anova to test differences within groups' years of experience.

There were a total of 10 principal instructional management practices, which included the following:

- (1) frame the school goals,
- (2) communicate the school goals,
- (3) supervise and evaluate instruction,
- (4) coordinate the curriculum,
- (5) monitor student progress,
- (6) protect instructional time,
- (7) maintain high visibility,
- (8) provide incentives for teachers,
- (9) promote professional development and
- (10) provide incentives for learning.

The findings were the following. First, the mean scores that were reported for teachers' perceptions of principals' use of instructional management practices were considerably

lower than the mean score that principals' perceptions of principal use of instructional management practices were. Teacher perceptions' means ranged from 3.06 to 3.90 on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Principal perceptions' mean scores ranged from 3.99 to 4.46 on a 5-point Likert-type scale.

When a t-test was applied to test the Hypothesis, there was a significant difference between teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional management and principals' perceptions of principals' instructional management. There was not a significant difference when testing within group differences based on teachers' years of experience. There was only one instructional management practice for which there was a significant difference based on principals' perceptions of principals' instructional management practices and that was promoting professional development.

Conclusions

The descriptive data identifying the mean scores for teachers' perceptions and for principals' perceptions of the extent to which principals are perceived to use instructional management practices reveal the challenges of collecting and interpreting perceptual data. Because the principals were using self-perceptions rather than external

perceptions, it is expected that their self-ratings would be higher than those whom they supervise.

Because teachers are supervised by principals, their experiences with principals' supervision will have influenced the way they perceive the extent to which principals use instructional leadership practices.

Nonetheless, perceptual data can provide some insight to educational discussions that should occur between and among teachers and principals that relate to instruction in the classroom and instructional management practices used by leaders. Creating critical conversations between and among teachers and principals can be productive in developing a working relationship with purposes that are congruent and that support one another in the work of effectively instructing students and providing management support for effectively instructing students. When the two parties' practices are disparate, students do not receive the full, harmonious support for learning that they need.

Obviously, the significant difference that existed between teachers' perceptions and principals' perceptions points out a need to initiate an on-going discussion between school principals and their classroom teachers regarding effective service to the students from the school "team" where members speak with one voice and are united in

learning and growing together, working to refine and improve instructional practices that will benefit student performance and achievement.

Recommendations

The Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale is a questionnaire that can be utilized routinely by school districts to assess principals' instructional management practices and to carry on the discussion of any disparity of perception that exists within the school team. It is recommended that school principals initiate an effort to take this approach and create the essential dialogues that will improve their practices as a team and bring their perceptions closer into congruency with the perceptions of those with whom they work and lead.

Teachers, principals, school districts, and universities may use the findings of this research project to encourage further research into instructional management and instructional leadership and to encourage the development of congruent perceptions. It is recommended that principal preparatory programs encourage graduate students to pursue instructional management and instructional leadership research and add to the data already collected

regarding effective principal instructional management practices and teacher perceptions of such.

If a school team elects to explore their instructional management practices, a recommendation would be that they employ the Hallinger, et al. Principal Instructional Management instrument to initiate the dialogue. Teachers can utilize this instrument to enhance their understanding of instructional management practices. This research project's findings provide teachers with a base from which to discuss teacher perceptions of instructional management practices. Teachers can compare their self perceptions to the perceptions of other teachers and compare those perceptions to principals' perceptions. Rich dialogue can occur when teachers and principals conduct these discussions. The discussions can explore why the perceptions exist, and they also can focus the dialogue on effective instructional management practices with each practice providing personal value and worthwhileness for exploring the meaning and skills needed for themselves. These discussions, as well as internal consideration related to growth needs, may produce value-added experiences—even for those who are quite skilled in instructional delivery and instructional practices.

As principals tackle the No Child Left Behind Act and its demand for accountability, not only for teachers but

also for school leaders, they can utilize the data from this research project to assist with improving school climate and enhance professional development for teachers. School climate and professional development are two key components of a school's culture. The culture of a school dictates whether a school moves forward or remains stagnant. The finding related to differences in perceptions within groups based on principals' years of experience was that the difference existed related to professional development. The finding produces some insight to the value of participating in continual growth models, professional learning communities, and life-long learning.

School districts may use this research project's findings to contribute discussion and analysis when developing comprehensive school improvement plans. When developing school improvement plans, districts must have ownership from teachers as well as principals. This study provides districts with 10 areas of instructional management practices that can become foci for discussions, for professional development and for school improvement.

It is also recommended that a larger study involving participants from all 50 states be conducted for purposes of initiating the dialogue and, perhaps, having data that will

stimulate greater knowledge about what needs to be in existence for students to improve their performance.

Finally, it is recommended that selected sites enter the study as a longevity study and collect routine, annual data. The routine and continual process conducted over several years could confirm or deny the value of initiating discussion around the presence/absence of the instructional management practices and what the effects of on-going administration of the assessment might be for students, their teachers, and their principals.

Appendix A

Principal Instructional Management

Rating scale

Teacher form

Published by:

Dr. Philip Hallinger

7250 Golf Pointe Way

Sarasota, FL 34243

Leadingware.com

813-354-3543

philip@leadingware.com

All rights are reserved. This instrument may not be reproduced in whole or in part without the written permission of the publisher.

Teacher Form 2.0

Please complete the background data by placing an "x" in front of the appropriate response.

Age Range

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 20–25 | <input type="checkbox"/> 25–35 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 36–40 | <input type="checkbox"/> 41–50 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 51–60 | <input type="checkbox"/> 61 and over |

Gender

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Male | <input type="checkbox"/> Female |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Ethnicity

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> African American | <input type="checkbox"/> European |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic | <input type="checkbox"/> Multi-Ethnic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other | |

Educational Background

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor's Degree | <input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor's Degree + some additional college hours |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Master's Degree | <input type="checkbox"/> Master's Degree + some additional college hours |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Doctorate (Ed. D. or Ph. D.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Doctorate + some additional college hours |

Your School District

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Urban | <input type="checkbox"/> Rural |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Suburban | |

THE PRINCIPAL INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT

RATING SCALE

PART I: Please provide the following information about yourself:

(A) Years, at the end of this school year, that you have worked with the current principal:

___1 ___5-9 ___more than 15
 ___2-4 ___10-15

(B) Years experience as a teacher at the end of this school year:

___1 ___5-9 ___more than 15
 ___2-4 ___10-15

PART II: This questionnaire is designed to provide a profile of principal leadership. It consists of 50 behavioral statements that describe principal job practices and behaviors. You are asked to consider each question in terms of your observations of the principal's leadership over the past school year.

Read each statement carefully. Then circle the number that best fits the specific job behavior or practice of this principal during the past school year. For the response to each statement:

5 represents *Almost Always*
 4 represents *Frequently*
 3 represents *Sometimes*
 2 represents *Seldom*
 1 represents *Almost Never*

In some cases, these responses may seem awkward; use your judgment in selecting the most appropriate response to such questions. Please circle only one number per question. Try to answer every question.

Thank you.

To what extent does your principal . . . ?

ALMOST NEVER
ALMOST ALWAYS

I. FRAME THE SCHOOL GOALS

1. Develop a focused set of annual school-wide goals	1	2	3	4	5
2. Frame the school's goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them	1	2	3	4	5
3. Use needs assessment or other formal and informal methods to secure staff input on goal	1	2	3	4	5
4. Use data on student performance when developing the school's academic goals	1	2	3	4	5
5. Develop goals that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school	1	2	3	4	5

II. COMMUNICATE THE SCHOOL GOALS

6. Communicate the school's mission effectively to members of the school community	1	2	3	4	5
7. Discuss the school's academic goals with teachers at faculty meetings	1	2	3	4	5
8. Refer to the school's academic goals when making curricular decisions with teachers	1	2	3	4	5
9. 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)	1	2	3	4	5
10. Refer to the school's goals or mission in forums with students (e.g., in assemblies or discussions)	1	2	3	4	5

III. SUPERVISE & EVALUATE INSTRUCTION

11. Ensure that the classroom priorities of teachers are consistent with the goals and direction of the school	1	2	3	4	5
12. Review student work products when evaluating classroom instruction	1	2	3	4	5

NEVER ALWAYS	ALMOST ALMOST				
13. Conduct informal observations in classrooms on a regular basis (informal observations are unscheduled, last at least 5 minutes, and may or may not involve written feedback or a formal conference)	1	2	3	4	5
14. Point out specific strengths in teacher's instructional practices in post-observation feedback (e.g., in conferences or written evaluations)	1	2	3	4	5
15. Point out specific weaknesses in teacher instructional practices in post-observation feedback (e.g., in conferences or written evaluations)	1	2	3	4	5

IV. COORDINATE THE CURRICULUM

16. Make clear who is responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels (e.g., the principal, vice principal, or teacher-leaders)	1	2	3	4	5
17. Draw upon the results of school-wide testing when making curricular decisions	1	2	3	4	5
18. Monitor the classroom curriculum to see that it covers the school's curricular objectives	1	2	3	4	5
19. Assess the overlap between the school's curricular objectives and the school's achievement tests	1	2	3	4	5
20. Participate actively in the review of curricular materials	1	2	3	4	5

V. MONITOR STUDENT PROGRESS

21. Meet individually with teachers to discuss student progress	1	2	3	4	5
22. Discuss academic performance results with the faculty to identify curricular strengths and weaknesses	1	2	3	4	5
23. Use tests and other performance measure to assess progress toward school goals	1	2	3	4	5
24. Inform teachers of the school's performance results in written form (e.g., in a memo or newsletter)	1	2	3	4	5
25. Inform students of school's academic progress	1	2	3	4	5

ALMOST ALMOST
NEVER ALWAYS

VI. PROTECT INSTRUCTIONAL TIME

26. Limit interruptions of instructional time by public address announcements	1	2	3	4	5
27. Ensure that students are not called to the office during instructional time	1	2	3	4	5
28. Ensure that tardy and truant students suffer specific consequences for missing instructional time	1	2	3	4	5
29. Encourage teachers to use instructional time for teaching and practicing new skills and concepts	1	2	3	4	5
30. Limit the intrusion of extra- and co-curricular activities on instructional time	1	2	3	4	5

VII. MAINTAIN HIGH VISIBILITY

31. Take time to talk informally with students and teachers during recess and breaks	1	2	3	4	5
32. Visit classrooms to discuss school issues with teachers and students	1	2	3	4	5
33. Attend/participate in extra- and co-curricular activities	1	2	3	4	5
34. Cover classes for teachers until a late or substitute teacher arrives	1	2	3	4	5
35. Tutor students or provide direct instruction to classes	1	2	3	4	5

VIII. PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR TEACHERS

36. Reinforce superior performance by teachers in staff meetings, newsletters, and/or memos	1	2	3	4	5
37. Compliment teachers privately for their efforts or performance	1	2	3	4	5
38. Acknowledge teachers' exceptional performance by writing memos for their personnel files	1	2	3	4	5
39. Reward special efforts by teachers with opportunities for professional recognition	1	2	3	4	5
40. Create professional growth opportunities for teachers as a reward for special contributions to the school	1	2	3	4	5

ALMOST ALMOST
NEVER ALWAYS

IX. PROMOTE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

41. Ensure that inservice activities attended by staff are consistent with the school's goals	1	2	3	4	5
42. Actively support the use in the classroom of skills acquired during inservice training	1	2	3	4	5
43. Obtain the participation of the whole staff in Important inservice activities	1	2	3	4	5
44. Lead or attend teacher inservice activities concerned with instruction	1	2	3	4	5
45. Set aside time at faculty meetings for teachers to share ideas or information from inservice activities	1	2	3	4	5

IX. PROMOTE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

41. Ensure that inservice activities attended by staff are consistent with the school's goals	1	2	3	4	5
42. Actively support the use in the classroom of skills acquired during inservice training	1	2	3	4	5
43. Obtain the participation of the whole staff in Important inservice activities	1	2	3	4	5
44. Lead or attend teacher inservice activities concerned with instruction	1	2	3	4	5
45. Set aside time at faculty meetings for teachers to share ideas or information from inservice activities	1	2	3	4	5

X. PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR LEARNING

46. Recognize students who do superior work with formal rewards such as an honor roll or mention in the principal's newsletter	1	2	3	4	5
47. Use assemblies to honor students for academic accomplishments or for behavior or citizenship	1	2	3	4	5
48. Recognize superior student achievement or improvement by seeing in the office the students with their work	1	2	3	4	5
49. Contact parents to communicate improved or exemplary student performance or contributions	1	2	3	4	5
50. Support teachers actively in their recognition and/or reward of student contributions to and accomplishments in class	1	2	3	4	5

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Professor Dr. Philip Hallinger, author of the *Principal Instructional Management Rating Scal*(PIMRS), received his doctorate in Administration and Policy Analysis from Stanford University. He has worked as a teacher, administrator, and professor and as the director of several leadership development centers. He has been a consultant to education and healthcare organizations throughout the United States, Canada, Asia, and Australia. He is currently Professor and Executive Director of the College of Management, Mahidol University, in Thailand.

The *PIMRS* was developed with the cooperation of the Milpitas (California) Unified School District, Richard P. Mesa, Superintendent. As a research instrument, it meets professional standards of reliability and validity and has been used in over 150 studies of principal leadership in the United States, Canada, Australia, Europe, and Asia.

The scale is also used by school districts for evaluation and professional development purposes. It surpasses legal standards for use as a personnel evaluation instrument and has been recommended by researchers interested in professional development and district improvement (see, for example, Edwin Bridges, *Managing the Incompetent Teacher*, ERIC, 1984). Articles on the development and use of the *PIMRS* have appeared in *The Elementary School Journal*, *Administrators Notebook*, *NASSP Bulletin*, and *Educational Leadership*.

The *PIMRS* is copyrighted and may not be reproduced without the written permission of the author. Additional information on the development of the *PIMRS* and the rights to its use may be obtained from the publisher (see cover page).

PRINCIPAL INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT

RATING SCALE

Principal Form

Published by:

Dr. Philip Hallinger

7250 Golf Pointe Way

Sarasota, FL 34243

Leadingware.com

813-354-3543

philip@leadingware.com

All rights are reserved. This instrument may not be reproduced in whole or in part without the
written
permission of the publisher.

Principal Form 2.0

Please complete the background data by placing an "x" in front of the appropriate response.

Age Range

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 20–25 | <input type="checkbox"/> 25–35 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 36–40 | <input type="checkbox"/> 41–50 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 51–60 | <input type="checkbox"/> 61 and over |

Gender

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Male | <input type="checkbox"/> Female |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Ethnicity

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> African American | <input type="checkbox"/> European |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic | <input type="checkbox"/> Multi-Ethnic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other | |

Educational Background

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor's Degree | <input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor's Degree + some additional college hours |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Master's Degree | <input type="checkbox"/> Master's Degree + some additional college hours |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Doctorate (Ed. D. or Ph. D.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Doctorate + some additional college hours |

Your School District

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Urban | <input type="checkbox"/> Rural |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Suburban | |

THE PRINCIPAL INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT
RATING SCALE

PART I: Please provide the following information if instructed to do so by the person administering this instrument:

(A) Number of school years you have been principal at this school:

___1 ___5-9 ___more than 15
___2-4 ___10-15

(B) Years, at the end of this school year, that you have been a principal:

___1 ___5-9 ___more than 15
___2-4 ___10-15

PART II: This questionnaire is designed to provide a profile of your leadership. It consists of 50 behavioral statements that describe principal job practices and behaviors. You are asked to consider each question in terms of your leadership over the past school year.

Read each statement carefully. Then circle the number that best fits the specific job behavior or practice as you conducted it during the past school year. For the response to each statement:

5 represents *Almost Always*
4 represents *Frequently*
3 represents *Sometimes*
2 represents *Seldom*
1 represents *Almost Never*

In some cases, these responses may seem awkward; use your judgment in selecting the most appropriate response to such questions. Please circle only one number per question. Try to answer every question.

Thank you.

To what extent do you . . . ?

ALMOST NEVER
ALMOST ALWAYS

I. FRAME THE SCHOOL GOALS

1. Develop a focused set of annual school-wide goals	1	2	3	4	5
2. Frame the school's goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them	1	2	3	4	5
3. Use needs assessment or other formal and informal methods to secure staff input on goal	1	2	3	4	5
4. Use data on student performance when developing the school's academic goals	1	2	3	4	5
5. Develop goals that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school	1	2	3	4	5

II. COMMUNICATE THE SCHOOL GOALS

6. Communicate the school's mission effectively to members of the school community	1	2	3	4	5
7. Discuss the school's academic goals with teachers at faculty meetings	1	2	3	4	5
8. Refer to the school's academic goals when making Curricular decisions with teachers	1	2	3	4	5
9. 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)	1	2	3	4	5
10. Refer to the school's goals or mission in forums with students (e.g., in assemblies or discussions)	1	2	3	4	5

III. SUPERVISE & EVALUATE INSTRUCTION

11. Ensure that the classroom priorities of teachers are consistent with the goals and direction of the school	1	2	3	4	5
12. Review student work products when evaluating Classroom instruction	1	2	3	4	5

ALMOST ALMOST
NEVER ALWAYS

13. Conduct informal observations in classrooms on a regular basis (informal observations are unscheduled, last at least 5 minutes, and may or may not involve written feedback or a formal conference)	1	2	3	4	5
14. Point out specific strengths in teacher's instructional practices in post-observation feedback (e.g., in conferences or written evaluations)	1	2	3	4	5
15. Point out specific weaknesses in teacher instructional practices in post-observation feedback (e.g., in conferences or written evaluations)	1	2	3	4	5

IV. COORDINATE THE CURRICULUM

16. Make clear who is responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels (e.g., the principal, vice principal, or teacher-leaders)	1	2	3	4	5
17. Draw upon the results of school-wide testing when making curricular decisions	1	2	3	4	5
18. Monitor the classroom curriculum to see that it covers the school's curricular objectives	1	2	3	4	5
19. Assess the overlap between the school's curricular Objectives and the school's achievement tests	1	2	3	4	5
20. Participate actively in the review of curricular materials	1	2	3	4	5

V. MONITOR STUDENT PROGRESS

21. Meet individually with teachers to discuss student Progress	1	2	3	4	5
22. Discuss academic performance results with the faculty to identify curricular strengths and weaknesses	1	2	3	4	5
23. Use tests and other performance measure to assess progress toward school goals	1	2	3	4	5
24. Inform teachers of the school's performance results in written form (e.g., in a memo or newsletter)	1	2	3	4	5
25. Inform students of school's academic progress	1	2	3	4	5

ALMOST ALMOST
NEVER ALWAYS

VI. PROTECT INSTRUCTIONAL TIME

26. Limit interruptions of instructional time by public address announcements	1	2	3	4	5
27. Ensure that students are not called to the office during instructional time	1	2	3	4	5
28. Ensure that tardy and truant students suffer specific consequences for missing instructional time	1	2	3	4	5
29. Encourage teachers to use instructional time for teaching and practicing new skills and concepts	1	2	3	4	5
30. Limit the intrusion of extra- and co-curricular activities on instructional time	1	2	3	4	5

VII. MAINTAIN HIGH VISIBILITY

31. Take time to talk informally with students and teachers during recess and breaks	1	2	3	4	5
32. Visit classrooms to discuss school issues with teachers and students	1	2	3	4	5
33. Attend/participate in extra- and co-curricular activities	1	2	3	4	5
34. Cover classes for teachers until a late or substitute teacher arrives	1	2	3	4	5
35. Tutor students or provide direct instruction to classes	1	2	3	4	5

VIII. PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR TEACHERS

36. Reinforce superior performance by teachers in staff meetings, newsletters, and/or memos	1	2	3	4	5
37. Compliment teachers privately for their efforts or performance	1	2	3	4	5
38. Acknowledge teachers' exceptional performance by writing memos for their personnel files	1	2	3	4	5
39. Reward special efforts by teachers with opportunities for professional recognition	1	2	3	4	5
40. Create professional growth opportunities for teachers as a reward for special contributions to the school	1	2	3	4	5

ALMOST ALMOST
NEVER ALWAYS

IX. PROMOTE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

41. Ensure that inservice activities attended by staff are consistent with the school's goals	1	2	3	4	5
42. Actively support the use in the classroom of skills acquired during inservice training	1	2	3	4	5
43. Obtain the participation of the whole staff in Important inservice activities	1	2	3	4	5
44. Lead or attend teacher inservice activities concerned with instruction	1	2	3	4	5
45. Set aside time at faculty meetings for teachers to share ideas or information from inservice activities	1	2	3	4	5

IX. PROMOTE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

41. Ensure that inservice activities attended by staff are consistent with the school's goals	1	2	3	4	5
42. Actively support the use in the classroom of skills acquired during inservice training	1	2	3	4	5
43. Obtain the participation of the whole staff in Important inservice activities	1	2	3	4	5
44. Lead or attend teacher inservice activities concerned with instruction	1	2	3	4	5
45. Set aside time at faculty meetings for teachers to share ideas or information from inservice activities	1	2	3	4	5

X. PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR LEARNING

46. Recognize students who do superior work with formal rewards such as an honor roll or mention in the principal's newsletter	1	2	3	4	5
47. Use assemblies to honor students for academic accomplishments or for behavior or citizenship	1	2	3	4	5
48. Recognize superior student achievement or improvement by seeing in the office the students with their work	1	2	3	4	5
49. Contact parents to communicate improved or exemplary student performance or contributions	1	2	3	4	5
50. Support teachers actively in their recognition and/or reward of student contributions to and accomplishments in class	1	2	3	4	5

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Professor Dr. Philip Hallinger, author of the *Principal Instructional Management Rating Scal*(PIMRS), received his doctorate in Administration and Policy Analysis from Stanford University. He has worked as a teacher, administrator, and professor and as the director of several leadership development centers. He has been a consultant to education and healthcare organizations throughout the United States, Canada, Asia, and Australia. He is currently Professor and Executive Director of the College of Management, Mahidol University, in Thailand.

The *PIMRS* was developed with the cooperation of the Milpitas (California) Unified School District, Richard P. Mesa, Superintendent. As a research instrument, it meets professional standards of reliability and validity and has been used in over 150 studies of principal leadership in the United States, Canada, Australia, Europe, and Asia.

The scale is also used by school districts for evaluation and professional development purposes. It surpasses legal standards for use as a personnel evaluation instrument and has been recommended by researchers interested in professional development and district improvement (see, for example, Edwin Bridges, *Managing the Incompetent Teacher*, ERIC, 1984). Articles on the development and use of the *PIMRS* have appeared in *The Elementary School Journal*, *Administrators Notebook*, *NASSP Bulletin*, and *Educational Leadership*.

The *PIMRS* is copyrighted and may not be reproduced without the written permission of the author. Additional information on the development of the *PIMRS* and the rights to its use may be obtained from the publisher (see cover page).

APPENDIX B

PERMISSION TO USE PRINCIPAL INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT RATING

SCALE



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
Prof. Philip Hallinger
Philip.h@cmmu.net

March 7, 2005

Shonta M. Smith
5029 Maple Ave.
St. Louis, MO 63113

Dear Mr. Smith:

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

References

- Acheson, K., & Smith, S. C. (1986). *It is time for principals to share the responsibility for instructional leadership with others*. Eugene, OR: Oregon School Study Council, University of Oregon.
- American Heritage College Dictionary, 1997. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. (1998). *Handbook of instructional leadership: How really good principals promote teaching and learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. (1999). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: Teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(3), 349-380.
- Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. (2001). *Empowering teachers: What successful principals do*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1991). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Brewer, H. (2001). Ten steps to success. *Journal of Staff Development*, 22(1), 30-31.
- Buffie, E. G. (1989). The principal and leadership. In P.D.K. International (Ed.), *Readings on leadership in education* (pp. 79-88). Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Collins, J., & Porras, J. (1997). *Build to last: Successful habits of visionary companies*. New York: Harper Business.
- Crow, G., Matthews, L., & McCleary, L. (1996). *Leadership a relevant and realistic role for principals*. New York: Eye on Education.

- Cuban, L. (1988). *The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- DuFour, R. (2006). The learning-centered principal. Retrieved June 17, 2006, from <http://www.andrews.edu/~ggifford/EDAL520SU05/Leatning-center-Principal.htm>
- Flath, B. (1989). The principal as instructional leader. *ATA Magazine*, 69(3), 19-22, 47-49.
- Frase, L., & Hetzel, R. (1990). *School management by wandering around*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.
- Fullan, M. (1998). Leadership for the 21st Century: Breaking the bonds of dependency. *Educational Leadership* 18, 6-10.
- Gardner, J. (1990). *On leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *Elementary School Journal*, 86, (2), 217-243.
- Hallinger, P., Murphy, J., Weil, M., Mesa, R. P., & Mitman, A. (1983). Identifying the specific practices, behaviors for principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 67(463), 83-91.
- Hanson, M. (1976). Beyond the bureaucratic model: A study of power and autonomy in educational decision making. *Interchange*, 7(1), 27-38.
- Harden, 1988.
- Howard, E., Howell, B., & Brainard, E. (1987). *Handbook for conducting school climate improvement projects*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Education Foundation.
- Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. (1996). *Standards for School Leaders*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Isherwood, G. B. (1973). The principal and his authority: An empirical study. *High School Journal*, 56(6), 291-303.

- Karnes, H. S. (1947). *Managing your mind*. New York: MacMillan.
- Keefe, J., & Jenkins, J. (1984). *Instructional leaders handbook*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Kelly, R., Thornton, B., & Daugherty, R. (2006). Relationships between measures of leadership and school climate, *Education*, 126(1), 17-22.
- Kotter, J., & Heskett, J. (1992). *Corporate culture and performance*. New York: Free Press.
- Lashway, L. (1995). *Facilitative leadership*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management ERIC Digest 96.
- Levine D., & Lezotte, L. (1990). *Unusually effective schools: A review and analysis of research and practice*. Madison, WI: National Center for Effective Schools Research and Development.
- Levinson, H. (1980). Criteria for choosing chief executives. *Harvard Business Review*, 58(4), 113-120.
- Lynch, C. D. (1950). *Leading and managing men*. New York: Ronald Press.
- Maccoby, M. (2003). *The productive narcissist: The promise and peril of visionary leadership*. New York: Broadway Books.
- Maeroff, G. I. (1988). Blue print for empowering teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69(7), 473-477.
- Marzano, R. J. (1998). *A theory-based meta-analysis of research on instruction*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Marzano, R. J., Gaddy, B. B., & Dean, C. (2000). *What works in classroom instruction*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T. & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

- McEwan, E. (2003). *7 steps to effective instructional leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation MDRC. (2007). *Instructional Leadership Study*. Retrieved February 11, 2007 from http://www.mdrc.org/project_3_71.html.
- Mendez-Morse, S. (2001). *Leadership characteristics that facilitate school change*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- Muth, R. (1973). Teacher perceptions of power, conflict, and consensus. *Administrators' notebook*. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center.
- 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 Education Association Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction. (1933). *Effective Instructional Leadership*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- National Staff Development Council. (2000). *Learning to lead, leading to learn*. Oxford, OH: Author.
- Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. (1984). *Effective schooling practices: A research synthesis*. Portland, OR: Author.
- Roberts, N. (1985). Transforming leaders: A process of collective action, *Human Relations*, 38(11), 1023-1046.
- Rossmann, G. B., Corbett, H. D., & Firestone, W. A. (1988). *Change and effectiveness in schools*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Sager, 1992.
- Schein, 1992.
- Sergiovanni, J. T. (1984). Leadership and excellence in schools. *Educational Leadership*, 41, 33-37.

- Sergiovanni, J. T. (2001). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective*. Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sergiovanni, J. T., Burlingame, M., Coomb, F., & Thurston, W. P. (1980). *Educational governance and administration*. Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Sergiovanni, J. T., & Starratt, J. R. (1979). *Supervision: Human perspectives*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Shafer, J. & King M. (1985). Good seeds grow in strong cultures. *Educational Leadership* 42, 67-74.
- Smith, W. F., & Andrews, R. L. (1989). *Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Smylie, M. A. & Hart, A. W. (1999). School leadership for teacher learning and change: A human and social capital development perspective. In K. S. Louis and J. Murphy (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (2nd ed., pp. 421-441). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stevens, L. (2001). *An administrative handbook: A view from the elementary principal's desk*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Education.
- Stolp, S. (1994). *Leadership for school culture*. ERIC Educational Reports ERIC Digest 91.
- Wamer, 1993.
- Waters, T., & Cameron, G. (2007). *The balanced leadership: Framework connecting vision with action*. Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Waters, J. T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2004). Leadership that sparks learning. *Educational Leadership* 61, 48-52.
- Weindling, D. (1990). The secondary head teacher: New principals in the United Kingdom. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 74(526), 40-45.

Wendel, R. C., Kigone, A. M., & Spurze, C. W. (1991). Are administrators' personalities related to their job skills? *NASSP Bulletin*, 75(539), 14-20.

Whitaker, B. (1997). Instructional leadership and principal visibility. *Clearinghouse*, 70(3), 155-156.

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

Vita Auctoris

Shonta Michelle Smith graduated from Parkway Central Senior High School in June 1989. She received her undergraduate degree from Harris-Stowe State College in Elementary and Middle School Education in December 1994. Shonta began her graduate studies at the University of Missouri-St. Louis in August 1995 and graduated January 1998 with a Master of Education degree in Counseling. She began doctoral studies at Saint Louis University in August 2000.

Shonta has over 14 years of experience in the field of education. She has worked in elementary, middle, and high school settings. In 2005 and 2006 Shonta received the prestigious honor of being inducted into Who's Who Among American's Teachers. She was also inducted into the Cambridge Who's Who for the 2006 - 2007 school year. Shonta is currently the Principal of Ashland Elementary School in the St. Louis Public Schools, St. Louis, Missouri.