

Jessica Apgar McCord

Candidate

Special Education, Educational Specialties

Department

This dissertation is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication:

Approved by the Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Elizabeth Keefe, Chairperson

Dr. Susan Copeland

Dr. Donald Duran

Dr. Richard Meyer

Dr. Julia Scherba de Valenzuela

**EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND ITS IMPACT ON LIFE IN
SCHOOLS: A CRITICAL INTERPRETATION**

by

JESSICA APGAR MCCORD

B.S., Elementary Education, University of New Mexico, 2005

M.A., Special Education, University of New Mexico, 2008

DISSERTATION

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Special Education

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

July, 2013

UMI Number: 3601147

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

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



UMI 3601147

Published by ProQuest LLC (2013). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

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



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

DEDICATION

To the students, who need leaders who will look past the numbers and create a more just school for all.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge Dr. Elizabeth Keefe, my advisor and dissertation chair. Her constant support, guidance, and belief in my work inspired me to pursue my academic interests with immense dedication. Thank you for being my rock, my mentor, and my cheerleader.

To Dr. Rick Meyer, thank you for always pushing me to think harder. “I believe” you have offered more support than I ever could have hoped for. Thank you!

To Dr. Susan Copeland, Dr. Julia Scherba de Valenzuela, and Dr. Don Duran, our conversations will remain my favorite part of this process. There was nothing more exciting than being in a room with you all gathered together. I am honored that you were a part of my academic journey in a multitude of ways.

To my family for being so incredibly supportive. Thank you all for understanding as I locked myself away to finish this work.

To all of my friends, especially Lisa and Stephanie. I could never have done this without either of you. I love you both.

To my husband, Chris. Thank you for putting our lives on hold, and believing in me without hesitation. There are no words to express how much you mean to me,.

Finally, to my mom. You’ve dedicated your life to caring for everyone around you. Your grace, kindness, and selflessness are my reasons for striving to make the world around me a better place. If I can make half the difference that you do each day, I will have lived a life to be proud of. I love you, Momma.

**EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND LIFE IN SCHOOLS: A CRITICAL
INTERPRETATION**

by

Jessica Apgar McCord

B.S., Elementary Education, University of New Mexico, 2005

M.A., Special Education, University of New Mexico, 2008

Ph.D., Special Education, University of New Mexico, 2013

ABSTRACT

In this critical hermeneutical study, the historical and current literature was systematically investigated. The epistemological, methodological, and ideological issues in the theoretical history were analyzed to determine their impact on the development of educational leadership as a field of study. Two literature reviews were conducted to demonstrate how the field conceptualized its impact on life in schools. These literature reviews also allowed for a connection of the present state of the field to its historical foundation.

The current ideologies driving the field of educational leadership were examined within the epistemological and methodological foci of the literature. It was found that the ideological history of the field, based in scientific management and efficiency, has manifested itself in the current accountability polices and impacted what counts as knowledge in the research done in educational leadership.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	xv
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
Defining leadership.....	4
Instructional leadership	6
Distributed leadership	7
Transformational leadership.....	8
Educational leadership and the purpose of schools	9
Vision and leadership	10
Ideology.....	11
NCLB and ideology.....	12
Accountability ideology	16
Business ideology.....	18
Purpose of schools	22
How leaders communicate the purpose of schools.....	27
Organization	29
CHAPTER 2 THE STUDY	33
Theoretical Framework	34
Ontology, epistemology, and methodology	34
Critical hermeneutics.....	36
Applying critical hermeneutics to educational leadership	41
Methodology.....	45
Conceptualizing the study.....	46

Investigating theory	50
Formulating research questions and contemplating methods.....	53
Recognizing tensions	55
Critical reflection	56
An interpretive investigation.....	57
Questioning and application	58
Working around the hermeneutical circle	60
Methods.....	61
Data collection and analysis.....	62
Historical analysis.....	62
Literature reviews and analyses	66
First literature review.....	66
Second literature review.....	67
Analysis of reviews	68
Testing findings	69
Ideological analysis	70
Trustworthiness and credibility.....	70
Trustworthiness during the study	71
Trustworthiness after the study	73
Credibility and transferability	74
Positionality	75
Guidelines for interpretation.....	78
CHAPTER 3 HISTORY OF THEORY IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP	80

Child Labor and Public Schooling.....	80
The Science of Education.....	87
Traditional Theories of Educational Leadership.....	90
Illustrations of the traditional theories	93
The impact of traditional theories.....	94
Human Relations Movement.....	94
Human relations movement and educational leadership	97
Illustrations of the Human Relations Movement.....	98
Social Systems Theory	100
Social systems theory and educational leadership	103
Illustrations of social systems theory.....	104
Human Resources Movement.....	105
Human resources movement and educational leadership.....	111
Illustrations of the human resource movement.....	112
Critical and Postmodern Theories	114
Critical theory	114
Postmodern theories	115
Critical theory and postmodernism	116
Critical and postmodern theories and educational leadership	120
Illustrations of critical and postmodern thought in educational leadership.....	120
Summary.....	121
Analysis of the Historical Development of the Field.....	122

Traditional theories.....	122
Human relations movement	126
Social systems theories	128
Human resources movement.....	129
Critical theories.....	131
Postmodern theories	132
Summary.....	133
Chapter 4 A REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP AND LIFE IN SCHOOLS.....	135
Methods.....	136
Results.....	141
Leithwood and Jantzi (2005).....	141
Robinson et al, (2008).....	143
The meta-analysis	145
Principal effects on student achievement.....	148
Marks and Printy (2003).....	150
O'Donnell and White (2005).....	153
Jacobson et al. (2007).....	154
Chance and Segura (2009)	156
Finnigan and Stewart (2009)	157
Horng et al. (2010)	159
Louis et al. (2010).....	164
Grissom and Loeb (2011)	166

Sanzo et al. (2011)	168
Silva et al. (2011)	169
Principal effects on school culture.....	170
Pepper and Thomas (2002)	172
Youngs and King (2002).....	173
Kelley et al. (2005)	176
Eilers and Camacho (2007).....	177
McGhee and Lew (2007)	178
Twigg (2008)	179
Graczewski et al. (2009).....	181
Matsumura et al. (2009).....	183
Fancera and Bliss (2011)	185
Principal effects on teacher outcomes	186
Griffith (2004)	187
Hurren (2006).....	189
Youngs (2007).....	190
Wahlstrom and Louis (2008)	191
Vecchio et al. (2008)	193
Grissom (2011).....	194
May and Supovitz (2011).....	196
Walker and Slear (2011).....	199
Price (2012)	201
Principal effects on teacher well-being	202

Blase and Blase (2002)	203
Blase, Blase, and Du (2008)	205
Principal effects on parents and the community	209
Griffith (2001)	210
Gordon and Louis (2009).....	212
Principal effect on inclusive school outcomes	213
Riester et al. (2002).....	214
Ovando and Cavasos (2004)	215
Smith and Leonard (2005)	216
Masumoto and Brown-Welty (2009)	219
Theoharis (2010)	220
Brown et al. (2011)	221
Waldron, McLesky, and Redd (2011).....	222
Marx and Larson (2012)	223
Summary.....	225
CHAPTER 5 RE-VIEWING THE LITERATURE: AN HERMENEUTICAL ANALYSIS	
.....	227
Methods.....	228
Findings.....	234
Policy and reform issues.....	235
Classroom instruction	239
Special populations.....	242
Organizational health and school climate.....	243

Principals' choice of professional development.....	246
Teacher induction and retention	247
Teacher job satisfaction.....	250
Professional learning communities.....	251
Sharing leadership.....	252
Challenging school contexts.....	255
Focus on the principal.....	255
Principal as emerging theme.....	257
How Does Leadership Impact Life in Schools?Current State of the Field	258
Student outcomes.....	258
Teacher outcomes.....	263
School culture	267
Parents.....	271
Reflection.....	273
CHAPTER 6 METHODOLOGICAL DISCUSSION	275
Describing the Literature Reviews	275
Quantitative methods	277
Current quantitative research.....	278
Group comparison.....	284
Association between groups	285
Relationships between variables.....	285
Discussion of quantitative methods	287
Qualitative methods	288

Current qualitative research.....	291
Case studies.....	291
Grounded theory.....	294
Ethnography.....	296
Discussion of qualitative methods.....	299
Mixed methods.....	300
Current mixed methods research.....	301
Discussion of mixed methods research.....	303
Summary.....	304
CHAPTER 7 ANALYSIS OF METHODOLOGIES.....	305
Quantitative Analysis.....	308
Qualitative Analysis.....	312
Mixed Methods Analysis.....	317
Ideological Analysis of Methodologies in Educational Leadership.....	320
CHAPTER 8 LOOKING BACK AND FORGING AHEAD.....	327
Understanding the Past.....	332
Looking to the Future.....	334
APPENDICES.....	342
APPENDIX A DATA FROM FIRST LITERATURE REVIEW.....	343
APPENDIX B DATA FROM SECOND LITERATURE REVIEW.....	375
APPENDIX C REVIEW OF METHODOLOGIES.....	418
APPENDIX D STUDIES UTILIZING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA FROM STANDARDIZED TESTS.....	474

REFERENCES.....506

LIST OF TABLES

Table A1. Searches for Research Review	343
Table A2. Principal Effects on Student Achievement.....	349
Table A3. Principal Effects on School Culture.....	355
Table A4. Principal Effects on Teacher Outcomes.....	361
Table A5. Principal Effects on Teacher Well-Being	366
Table A6. Principals Effects on Parents and the Community.....	367
Table A7. Principal Effects on Inclusive School Outcomes	369
Table B1. New Searches for Second Research Review	375
Table B2. Re-search of Original Search Terms	378
Table B3. Policy and Reform Issues.....	382
Table B4. Classroom Instruction.....	390
Table B5. Special Populations	395
Table B6. Organizational Health and School Climate.....	396
Table B7. Principals' Choice of Professional Development	400
Table B8. Teacher Induction and Retention.....	401
Table B9. Teacher Job Satisfaction	406
Table B10. Professional Learning Communities.....	408
Table B11. Sharing Leadership.....	410
Table B12. The Role of the Principal in Challenging School Contexts	412
Table B13. Principals as Emergent Theme in Challenging School Contexts	415
Table C1. Studies that Employed Quantitative Methods	418
Table C2. Studies that Used Qualitative Case Study Methods.....	437

Table C3. Study that Utilized Qualitative Grounded Theory Methods 463

Table C4. Studies that Utilized Qualitative Auto-Ethnography 464

Table C5. Studies that Used Mixed Methods..... 466

Chapter 1

Introduction

“A mind that is adequately sensitive to the needs and occasions of the present actuality will have the liveliest of motives for interest in the background of the present, and will never have to hunt for a way back because it will never have lost connection” (Dewey, 1916/2009, p. 61).

Through this interpretive investigation of the field of educational leadership, my purpose is to investigate the research literature to determine how leadership impacts life in schools and to understand the ideological factors that drive research and knowledge creation. Through a critique of ideologies and an analysis of how they impact what we choose to know about leadership, I seek to emancipate the field from restricting epistemologies and methodologies. Emancipation must be clarified, and I use the term purposefully, to suggest that we are restricted and held captive by the beliefs and methodologies that have been dominant within the field of educational leadership. Leonardo (2003) suggested that “the problem of research into domination is not so much an issue of producing ‘better’ knowledge, but of liberating people from accepting their knowledge as natural and neutral” (p. 346). It is in this spirit of liberation that I undertake this investigation into educational leadership.

The process of emancipation and liberation must include a thorough investigation of the history of the field, with the purpose of understanding how it is we arrived at the present situation. This is the spirit of Dewey’s (1916/2009) call for an understanding of the “background of the present”, the past that has led us to our

current reality, and an important tenet of critical interpretive analysis. Without a connection to the past, it is impossible to learn from triumphs and trials to create and sustain real change. Through an understanding of this past, I will illuminate the issues that have taken deep hold of the system of education and shaped the field of educational leadership.

Although I place great emphasis in this investigation on the history of educational leadership, I do so with the purpose of clarifying the foundations upon which the prominent epistemologies and methodologies of the present have arrived in such esteemed regard. The examination of this history will allow a connection with the present, so that there is a greater understanding of the underlying beliefs that have restricted what is counted as knowledge and scientifically, research-based practice in this important field of study.

For this investigation to have an impact on the thoughts and choices involved in studying problems and devising solutions for leaders to implement in the schools, the purpose of schools is a critical discussion. English (2005) pointed out “the nature of what is unique to the educational enterprise and the purpose of schooling in the larger society have been eroded in the continuing discourse regarding economic productivity” (p. xi). I argue that what is studied and communicated in the literature reveals a stance on what is believed about the reason for schools’ existence, and this impacts the actions taken in schools that directly affect students and how they are conceptualized.

For example, The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB, 2002) contains colorful, passion-inducing rhetoric in its very title. Of course schools do not want to

leave children behind, the public had no choice but to be enamored with the sentiment in the title of this Act. When looking more closely, however, it can be argued that the only measure of 'not leaving children behind' is the standardized assessment of each child, which communicates to the public that children are beings that can be explained by a number on a page and, perhaps, a charted graph that shows how they compare to other children. Not only are children judged fit to be measured in this manner, schools are judged this way as well. A school is only as good as its Annual Yearly Progress (AYP), the aggregated scores of how their students perform on this one measure of performance throughout the entire 180 days of school. This system of standardization and measurement represents an economically driven ideology that has its roots in ideas of industry and productivity. English (2005) noted the impact of standardization when he said that "elaborate forms of standardization are advanced to eliminate all forms of variance that inhibit productivity" (p. xi).

I believe that the impact of ideologies communicated by NCLB (2002) on the day-to-day life of schools has been significant, and this policy is the most recent manifestation of the ideologies that have prevailed over the last century. Leonardo (2003), as he discussed the idea of school transformation in contrast to school reform by policy, said, that "this necessitates an ideological critique of the purpose of schools and how to conduct research in order to expose the contradictory conditions in which schools are embedded" (p. 347).

What is of pertinent interest in this study is the conceptualization of the impact that educational leadership has on the life in schools. Leadership at the level

of the school principal is the focus of this investigation because of the tremendous impact and interaction these site-based leaders have with their particular schools and communities. It has been noted that leadership is second only to classroom instruction in promoting the successful outcomes of students (e.g., Leithwood & Louis, 2012; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). Educational leadership takes place within the context of the school organization, and the internal and external forces that effect the school organization are complex (Foster, 1986; Hodgkinson, 1991). These forces include national policies, such as NCLB (2002), that guide action and direction in the daily activities of a leader and their school, and must be critically examined to determine their ideological impact.

Defining Leadership

To discuss the nature of educational leadership, it is important to have a common language from which to begin the conversation (Shoho, Merchant, & Lugg, 2011). My purpose is not to define leadership indefinitely, but to put forth key terms with meanings to provide a basis for further discussion. Throughout the literature on educational leadership, many terms are used to refer to leadership and leadership behaviors: administrator, manager, supervisor, and principal are the most commonly found terms within the literature in this investigation. I will use the terms synonymously, although many scholars in the field use each term purposefully to communicate particular meanings.

Definitions of leadership are plentiful, but the following definition forms the basis of most theories: Leadership is the act of influencing the actions of others to achieve desirable ends or goals of the organization (e.g., Burns, 1978; Hodgkinson,

1991; Krajewski, 1979; Marzano et al., 2005). I will write with the assumption that the style, actions, and beliefs of individual leaders influence how they assume these tasks, and the organizational beliefs and cultures shaped by wider societal factors have an impact on these roles as well (Foster, 1986; Hodgkinson, 1991; Sarason, 1990). While the definition put forth above constitutes what many in this field consider leadership to be, I subscribe to Foster's (1986) notion of leadership as a definition that should serve as a goal for school leaders, he stated that "leadership is not manipulating a group in order to achieve a present goal; rather, it is empowering individuals in order to evaluate what goals are important and what conditions are helpful" (p. 185-186). This definition will serve as something to strive for in the future of educational leadership and its studies. It is a definition I will show is in line with a democratic purpose of schooling, and it contradicts what much of the research communicates silently about the purpose of schools.

From these definitions and their complex nature, I believe that the research and literature within this field of study represent many differing views about the manner in which effective leadership is carried out and the goals it aspires to accomplish. The focus on school leadership, particularly, has never been more prominent. This is evidenced by the continuous publication of new studies, as well as leadership literature that all seem to claim the best advice for creating and sustaining an effective school (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). Indeed, I have found the literature in this area of education is continuously growing and expanding, but I will demonstrate how ideas from a century ago still shape the underlying structures and beliefs that drive our educational system and administration of schools. Further, I

will analyze the ways in which this foundation has impacted epistemological and methodological subscriptions and what is widely circulated as the most important knowledge we can uncover about leadership and schools.

In addition to the overarching definition of leadership, educational leadership as a field has often had a romance with adjectives (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). These adjectives have been utilized within the literature to describe types of leadership. Although some of these descriptive terms will be explained as they are encountered in the literature reviews, I have chosen three terms to include in this discussion of defining leadership because they represent foci that have had long-standing presence in the educational leadership literature.

Instructional leadership. This type of leadership has been present in the literature throughout the past century. In the early part of the 1900's the strong emphasis on the supervisory functions had an impact on the use of the term. The principal was meant to be the expert teacher, and guide the work of the teachers within schools (Brown, 2011). Early thought in the field, much aligned with business and management, put forth that effective supervision would lead to increased performance by the teachers (Brown, 2011; Hodgkinson, 1991; Tyack, 1974). Getzels et al. (1968) discussed that there was also an air of distrust that teachers would be able to do their jobs without the authoritative guidance of the principal in instructional manners. In Chapter Three, there will be many examples of instructional leadership within the theory developments of the field.

Instructional leadership has received a lot of attention in the contemporary literature, as will be discussed in the research reviews in Chapters Four and Five.

Louis (2009) noted that instructional leadership reappeared as a major focus in the 1980's with the effective schools movement. Within the policy context of NCLB (2002), instructional leadership has been conceptualized in many different ways, differing from supportive leadership for literacy to instructional management and curriculum focus. Overall, instructional leadership is a term used that denotes the ability of the principal to be involved in the instructional matters of the school, from managing curriculum, understanding instructional content, supervising instruction, providing modeling and feedback to teachers regarding instructional matters, and contributing to collaboration around student learning as part of a professional learning community (Dufour, Dufour, & Eaker, 2008).

Distributed leadership. This is also a prime focus within the leadership literature (Leithwood, Mascal, & Strauss, 2009). Although early literature put forth ideas about group work in schools, it was not until leadership was more widely defined as a function of specific situations with the ability to manifest itself in different individuals other than the principal that it gained more recognition in the literature (Leithwood et al., 2009). Distributed leadership has received a great deal of scrutiny because of its vague definitions and the questions about how to enact this type of leadership with common purpose and structure (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). The literature on professional learning communities and collaboration places an emphasis on the abilities of various people within the school participating in leadership functions and problem solving based on a common focus on student learning (DuFour et al., 2008). Within the school structure, distributed leadership can mostly be found in the organization of committees and focus groups organized

by grade levels, leadership teams, and teams with specific functions within the schools (Leithwood et al., 2009).

Transformational Leadership. Although this term was coined by Burns (1978), it has become a focal point in the contemporary educational leadership literature. There is yet another transformative leadership strand beginning to emerge, which seeks to distinguish itself from transformational leadership by questioning justice and democracy (Shields, 2010), and there are transformative leadership studies found in leadership for social justice strands of inquiry.

Transformational leaders can be characterized by three main functions as put forth by Leithwood and Jantzi (2005). They cited setting directions, helping people, and redesigning the organization as the most important transformational leadership behaviors (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). Transformational leadership is also characterized by inspiring vision toward a common purpose within a school, but there is less focus on the content of that vision within transformational leadership, which is in contrast to transformative leadership.

I agree with Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) that the field of educational leadership does not need another adjective to describe leadership. These three terms are not the only ways that leadership is characterized or described in the literature, but they do represent prominent topics in the research I reviewed. The reader will notice particular elements of these types of leadership within both the historical discussion and the current review of the literature. Although not a focus for my study, it is interesting to notice how each has progressed within the theory movements in the field.

Educational Leadership and the Purpose of Schools

The underlying beliefs that guide the adherence to epistemological and methodological traditions communicate an ontology, or worldview, about the purpose of schooling, and this is an important piece of my analysis. The widely accepted definition of leadership I have put forth includes the words “desirable ends or goals of the organization” (e.g., Burns, 1978). Thus, no discussion of the impact of leadership would be complete without a thorough investigation of what these end goals have been throughout the development of the field. Instead of goals, I will refer to the purpose of schools because I feel that this more wholly encompasses the meaning of the important work done in an educational organization. I will investigate the historical and ideological purposes of schooling that our system was built upon, including a discussion of what I believe a purpose of public schools should be based on principles of social justice and democracy as common beliefs that bind the American society together. I will also demonstrate how research literature communicates, intentionally or not, a purpose for schools.

School leaders have an important role to play in the communication of school purpose. They are the “keepers of the vision” and throughout the leadership literature it is noted that setting the vision for the school is one of the most important functions of leaders within schools (e.g., Dufour et al., 2008; Fullan, 2001, 2010; Leithwood et al., 2012; Marzano et al., 2005). What constitutes these visions is not widely discussed, suggesting that underlying ideologies must play a role in the process of creating and communicating a school vision. An analysis of these beliefs

as evidenced in the leadership literature may help to understand the visions that school leaders communicate.

Vision and leadership. The literature on school leadership is full of passionate calls for leaders to understand the importance of their own beliefs and values. What is left out of much of the conversation are the beliefs, values, and institutional norms that operate within schools on a silent basis, the underlying ideologies that drive the daily actions and leadership activities within a school, and the ideologies communicated by the literature and research that drives decision making and change. Although there are many scholarly examples of writing that addresses the specific underlying beliefs that guide actions within school systems (e.g., Apple & Weis, 1983; Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985; Foster, 1986; Hodgkinson, 1991; Kerdeman, 2004; Shaker & Heilman, 2004), much of the research done in educational leadership instead lists shaping school vision as an important behavior of effective school leaders and goes no further into what that entails (e.g., Bryk & Schneider, 2003; Camburn et al., 2010; Coldren & Spillane, 2007; Nettles & Herrington, 2007). Other literature cites vision creation and facilitation, describing in detail the ways in which to make this happen, but the content of the vision is elusive, or assumed to be created organically within the organization (Deal & Peterson, 2009; Dufour et al., 2008; Fullan, 2001, 2010; Leithwood & Louis, 2012). This elusiveness is important to note because it suggests underlying ideologies that operate on a “common sense” basis about what constitutes proper vision and direction for schools. Leonardo (2003) said that “common sense is a long process of naturalizing knowledge that is inherently historical and ideological” (p. 346).

Dufour et. al. (2008) put a great deal of emphasis on the role of vision creation as the apex of communicating a common purpose and driving all further action within the school. While I agree that vision should be contextualized within the school organization and created within the community of people that will be affected and hopefully inspired by this vision, I argue that without a thorough appraisal of the bigger picture and the underlying ideologies, the vision is lost in translation. There are powerful outside factors to consider, especially when putting the responsibility of creating, facilitating, and inspiring the vision of the school community squarely on the shoulder of the school leaders. The outside ideological pressures have an impact on the visions that are communicated and endorsed by school leaders. These factors must be examined in order for school leaders to see the bigger picture, to understand how their visions coincide with or challenge the status quo. Through recognizing the ideological forces at play, leaders can make more informed decisions about how they will inspire vision and communicate purpose within their schools.

Ideology. Ideology is a powerful force, because it becomes part of the “common sense” of a school, often goes unquestioned, yet guides all action and interaction. When speaking of ideology, I am talking about the systems of shared beliefs and values that become “givens” within a group of people or a society, by either internal, or most commonly in education, external forces. It is important to acknowledge the integrative function that ideology plays in society, as well as its repressive role. Leonardo (2003) argued that ideology serves an integrative function by justifying a way of being and allowing for coherence within society. The

integrative function of the education policy in America is to unite people around the purpose of providing an equitable, high quality education for all children and this function is essential to understanding how it has been so difficult to contend with. It is important to the further discussion of the historical and current state of educational leadership to first examine the current ideologies that are communicated through national policies in the United States and relate these ideologies to the purpose they communicate for schools. This discussion will serve as an important point of reference throughout this volume.

NCLB and Ideology. When NCLB (2002) was passed into law, some might have called it a great victory for the nation. As I have pointed out previously, it was difficult not to be supportive of something that claimed as its basis “leaving no child behind”. The law includes powerful provisions that have impacted public education across the country, for all students. Let me begin with stating what I believe are the positive aspects of this law, as I wish to give credit where credit is due and acknowledge the integrative function the resulting ideology has had in placing an emphasis on education for *all* students.

The provision that all data collected from state assessment systems will be disaggregated so as to place an emphasis on specific categories of students has been important to groups of marginalized students who have often not been included in widespread reforms for quality education (Diamond, 2012). For schools, districts, states, and the country to be able to see how children who are English Language Learners, students in ethnic minority groups, students who are economically disadvantaged, and students with disabilities shape up in accordance with their

peers is vitally important to painting a picture of the lack of equity being afforded to all students within the system. The provision of the law that puts forth that states must have growth measures in place for all subgroups of students allows resources to be utilized with the end goal of improving education for students who had often been overlooked. These are important landmarks that have affected historically marginalized groups of students in ways that brought them to the forefront as a priority for improving educational outcomes (Diamond, 2012).

The belief and commitment to educating all students equally and paying close attention and responding to inequities within the system are some of the more integrative ideological functions of this policy. Along with these integrative functions, this policy has also served a repressive function as well. NCLB (2002) mandated that states put in place a single accountability system utilizing an assessment for all students, (except for those with the most significant cognitive disabilities) that measured the proficiency of students in relation to the state's academic standards in reading and math. It left decisions to the states about both the academic standards and assessment instrument itself, and allowed states to set their own requirements for Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) within the guidelines of using statistically valid and reliable instruments and measuring progress primarily based on the state's academic assessments. They could set their own target for annual measurable objectives (AMO) as long as they kept in mind that all students were expected to meet proficiency by the year 2013-2014. Within the state accountability system, NCLB (2002) mandated that sanctions and rewards must be included that hold schools and districts accountable for student achievement based

on these measures. Well, here we are in 2013, and there are few, if any, schools that can claim to have made 100% proficiency in all sub-groups of students according to the state accountability systems, and it is doubtful that any will achieve this target either in the coming year or in the future.

In addition to these provisions, teachers are now required to be Highly Qualified (HQ), and although there are many avenues (some problematic) that teachers can take to achieve HQ status, there is an even stronger push for new teachers to gain certification through a plethora of multiple choice, standardized assessments to prove their ability to join the profession (Shaker & Heilman, 2004). It is certainly no question that highly qualified teachers should be in place within schools, but the use of the standardized testing, in addition to the further specialization of roles given to the teachers promotes a professionalism that breaks teachers into increasingly narrow areas of specialty and expertise. This is the hallmark of a bureaucratic, technocratic institution, where roles are so specified that they create a sort of factory where specific products (students), are molded by particular workers (specialized teachers), in the most efficient way possible.

The final provision of NCLB (2002) that I will mention in this discussion is the use of scientifically, research-based curriculum and practices in all schools. This includes curriculum that is used for intervention purposes for students with disabilities or students who need additional supports. It also ties administrative behavior to the use of research-based practices, and Lashley (2007) pointed out how NCLB has completely changed the landscape of educational leadership. This is

not surprising given the role of the principal as the one who sets the direction for schools; the direction has been set for them through the use of policy.

With the Obama administration, a new Blueprint for Reform (2010) has been put forth with the intention of revising and reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the original title of the federal education law before NCLB. While this revision has yet to take place, the federal Department of Education, in September of 2011, responded to the sanctions put forth by NCLB by offering states the opportunity to apply for waivers from sanctions. In a recent testimony to Congress, Secretary Arne Duncan said that the waivers are allowing states to use multiple measures of growth and gain, better serve at-risk students, provide support for principal and teacher effectiveness, and the flexibility to move forward with reform (Brenchley, 2013). What is important to note about these professed improvements due to the waiver system is that they are still tied to student achievement scores on state's standardized tests. Brenchley's (2013) blog outlined a beautiful graphic illustrating the long list of "multiple measures of growth and gain". Each addition to the flexibility waiver was a numerical measure, and included standardized items like AP tests, SAT/ACT scores, and additional testing areas on standards based assessments like science and social studies instead of just reading and math under NCLB (2002) (Brenchley, 2013). The support of principal and teacher effectiveness is often translated into policies that states are enacting that tie teacher and principal job performance to the same state standardized tests. No matter how you package it, it is perpetuating the same problems inherent in NCLB by just adding to the list and arguing that it is a step in the right direction.

What does this all mean for the current ideological situation?

Accountability ideology. The current ideologies that govern action in and around the schools I will characterize as the accountability and business ideologies. Accountability ideology, although given a giant boost by NCLB (2002), has been around for the past century, although cloaked in different language. As I will explicate in my discussion of the historical development of the field, the industrial-efficiency ideology of the early 20th century had much to contribute to the beliefs governing our schools and leaders today. English (2005) stated that “educational leadership’s problem has been and remains the fact that it has been run like a business and that the accountability models superimposed in educational settings reinforce and extend assumptions of business/industrial activities” (p. xi). The basis of this ideology is the belief that education is something that should be measured, tested, and quantified, and through this means it can be held accountable to and legitimized for the public (English, 2005; Habermas, 1989). Habermas (1989) described a legitimation crisis as what occurs when the public no longer believes in the necessity of an institution, therefore constituting the creation of a defense mechanism to legitimate the institution and quiet the voices of the public. Instrumental rationality is a concept that Habermas (1989) described as a way institutions overcome a legitimation crisis. Through the use of ideology and discursive manipulation, instrumental rationality becomes the accepted beliefs of the public, and all further action is directed at strengthening this rationality. This is the role of accountability ideology in defending the public school system.

The accountability ideology holds at its foundation the belief that the creation of standards that can be assessed through standardized tests are the best way to measure school quality, and the punitive repercussions based on the results of high stakes tests will force the schools to make changes and effectively improve (English, 2005; Fusarelli, Kowalski, & Petersen, 2011; Shaker & Heilman, 2004). The predictable consequences of such measures can be found by turning on the news or reading the newspaper. Some school districts and teachers are reported to be cheating on standardized tests in order to gain rewards and avoid punishment. This is a powerful consequence of the accountability ideology pervading the schools. In addition to these beliefs, both Fusarelli et al. (2011) and Shaker and Heilman (2004) discussed how the federal government's dictation of scientifically, research-based strategies, and the specified definition included in the law, places higher value on quantitative studies and effectively adheres the federal policy to the positivistic notion that the only information that is of significance is what can be measured in quantity, and this drives the administration, actions, and beliefs within schools.

These working mechanisms of the accountability ideology speak volumes about the purpose of schools and how children are viewed. Foster (2002) discussed the role of standards in this time of high stakes testing and put forth that

standards, then, can often be seen to have their origin in the drive to create school systems that produce effective workers who can compete ably in a global economy. Having productive workers is not a bad end in and of itself; however, when it drives out other valuable ends, it becomes much more problematic. And it does drive out other ends" (p. 180).

The purpose of schools in this system of beliefs is to standardize children, ultimately driving out the other “valuable ends” of a democratic education such as individuality, respect for differences, and social justice. Placing such a discrete emphasis on the high-stakes tests suggests that children should be filled with information, and that anything they cannot answer in the form of filling in a bubble sheet or in a short answer where they restate the question is not of value. Within this ideology, students are viewed in relation to the standards they must achieve. They are meant for input and retrieval, machine-like beings that must demonstrate the same knowledge, in the same way, in a standardized setting with their peers of the same age. That sounds like an awful lot of sameness to me, and it breeds a destruction of individuality, problem solving, value of diversity, and love of learning. As Dewey put it “imposing an alleged uniform general method upon everybody breeds mediocrity in all but the very exceptional” (p. 138).

Business ideology. The business ideology is not far removed from the ideology of accountability, in fact, I believe the two cannot exist separately. I will discuss them separately here, but in future references, I will utilize accountability ideology as a terms that encompasses both business and accountability. The business ideology plainly communicates that the world of education can learn a thing or two from the world of business (English, 2005). If businesses and corporations can increase efficiency and output from their workers, then education should be able to apply the same principles in order to reap similar rewards. Some have argued that the applicability of business ideals in education is not misplaced, but has been significantly misunderstood and misused (Boyd, 2004). Boyd (2004)

specifically noted the importance of leaders in schools being able to manage resources in a way to maximize the quality and opportunities provided to students, although the business ideology in practice tends to overemphasize the management of resources and generalize this concept to situations inappropriately. Lugg and Shoho (2006) discussed the current political climate in education and its emphasis on the managerial functions of administration to the detriment of actual leadership, particularly leadership for social justice. English (2005) differed from Boyd (2004) in this appraisal of the impact business has had on the field and suggested that “one of the problems of educational leadership has been that its mental models are no different than those used by leaders in the private sector” (p. xi).

The business ideology is nothing new, much like accountability ideology it has existed since the inception of the public schools. The inclusion of this ideology can be seen in reform movements, specifically in educational leadership, that tout the use of quality management, quality assurance measures, and data-driven management. More recently, and arguably of more significant impact, are the reforms intended to link administrator and teacher pay to the outcomes of standardized test scores in an attempt to bolster performance through the use of incentives and rewards.

Corporate leaders manage complex organizations, and through the use of quality management, incentives, punishment, and eliciting buy-in to the purposes of the organization, they have told many stories of inspirational change and success. The world of education, specifically within leadership, is seemingly in awe of the leaders of the business world. For my own administrative licensure, I cannot count

how many books I read that came from this genre, and had nothing to do with education in particular (e.g., Monroe, 2003; Hunter, 1998). While I found some value in the humanistic revelations of business leaders, I more often found myself wondering how I could make connections with people who made change for profit; the purpose of schools and the purpose of business seem to be quite at odds with each other in many more ways than they are similar (English, 2005; Lugg & Shoho, 2006).

It is important to note that the notion of meritocracy is deeply embedded in the business world (Bowles & Gintis, 1976/2011; Giroux, 2012). It is also driven by the capitalist ideas of the free market. Giroux (2012) called this “economic Darwinism”, and described it as the “survival of the fittest” (p. 23). These beliefs center on the fact that those who are the smartest, most able, will contribute more to society. Boyd (2004) argued that business ideals of quality for the lowest price have been shortened in education to a focus on the lowest price and a loss of the aspect of quality. Giroux (2012) emphasized this fact when talking about Arne Duncan’s Race to the Top initiative that he interpreted as “expanding efficiency at the expense of equity, prioritizes testing over critical pedagogical practices, endorses commercial rather than public values, accentuates competition as a form of social combat over cooperation and shared responsibilities, and endorses individual rights over support for the collective good” (p. 41). He went on to point out that the impact on leadership is the belief that the keys to reform are data systems and the ability to measure how people teach and learn effectively (Giroux, 2012, p. 41).

One way to conceptualize business ideology is to think of it in terms of a factory. If it is believed that education should be more like business, then teachers should maximize their product through the use of proven, research-based strategies, supervised by their administrators, that will allow schools to get more bang for their buck. Students are products, (raw materials), being molded, shaped, and created by the teachers, to then be put out into the market with the purpose of providing a return on the investment. The finished product of the student should produce a yield in the form of their productiveness as workers and their ability to continue the economic cycle that begun with the public's investment on their first day of school. The public pays for these students, so they should come out with economic value. There are numerous examples of this business/economic/capitalist ideology and how it has driven educational thought and reform within our schools (e.g., Apple & Weis, 1983; Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985; Bowles & Gintis, 1976/2011; Giroux, 2012). In this view, children are only as valuable as their demonstration of worth in the economy. Teachers are valuable in their ability to follow orders and make changes based on the efficiency of their methods. Giroux (2012) discussed the implications of current business ideology as deskilling teachers. Administrators, though still called leaders, assume the role of the manager, implementing the policies and procedures with great care in order to produce the best scores on the standardized tests thus providing a minimal level of education, decided upon by the standards in place, to the workforce.

Clearly this persistent ideology has not produced the effects that it would have hoped. Gladwell (2003), in his article for the *New Yorker*, stated in his

discussion on NCLB (2002) and the baggage that came with it, “if schools were factories, America would have solved the education problem a century ago” (p.31). Accountability and business ideologies are inextricably interwoven, and no matter what language they have been disguised in, they have pervaded our system and provided outcomes that should not be surprising if it is understood that by cloaking terms differently, real change is not possible.

When looking at these ideologies together, they communicate a purpose of schools that is quite different than the democratic ideal of American society, and this tension surfaces when examining closely the literature and research in educational leadership. Considering accountability and business, children are viewed as a means to an end. That end being either the demonstration of effective schools through a test score, or the ability to contribute to the world of business, material ventures, and economy. These views impact the epistemological beliefs about what knowledge is and how it can be investigated, interpreted, and communicated. Though their explanation is simple, the impact they have as silent partners within the literature in educational leadership is immense, and I will demonstrate this throughout my study.

Purpose of schools. Dewey (1902/2001) stated that:

The simple fact, however, is that education is the one thing in which the American people believe without reserve, and to which they are without reserve committed. Indeed, I sometimes think that the necessity of education is the only settled article in the shifting and confused social and moral creed of America (p. 390).

Ideologies, by their very existence, are masters at driving action without shouting their true purpose from the rooftops. It is with this in mind that I turn to a discussion of a purpose for education grounded in the democratic foundations of American society.

Democracy is the founding principle of this country, and although the rhetoric is used abundantly, the meaning of the concept gets lost in the silence of its assumed belief and meaning (Dewey, 1939/1989). English (2005) noted that “the problem of educational leadership is that it has been thoroughly saturated with the kind of thinking that has ignored social justice” (p. xi). Because of its rhetorical value, the debate of what constitutes a democratic, socially just education is often left by the way side (Shoho et al., 2011). I contend that now, more than ever, is an important time to rekindle the conversation about the true purpose of our schools, and I am not alone in this plea (e.g., Boyd, 2004; English, 2005; Foster, 2002; Giroux, 2012; Leonardo, 2003). When the principles of a democratic education are awakened for new debate and thought, I believe we will see just how far the current ideologies are from a democratic concept of education. As this discrepancy is revealed, a solution can begin to take shape in the form of critical inquiry that will illuminate and create a space for a democratic conversation with a renewed focus on the reason why schools are so important in our society.

It will come as no surprise that I have relied heavily on the works of Dewey in conceptualizing this conversation about democratic purposes of education. In fact, as I have scoured literature about democracy in education and leadership, I have found that most have this same reliance. Dewey’s conception of the potential of

democratic education is nothing short of insightful, inspirational, and full of hope. He also had a gift for communicating how education is a continuous process, and the simple but resonating fact that the true goal of education is to continue learning (Dewey, 1916/2009). One hundred years later, his words still ring as true as they did when he wrote them, and because of his respect for both science and the lived experience, I feel that he serves as an important cornerstone for much of the discussion in this volume. In this hermeneutic study I must make it clear that I do not wish to interpret his work as he meant it to be interpreted at the time of its publishing, but I do believe that interpreting his work in the present will serve to raise important issues and provide essential guidance for this analysis.

“A democratic society must, in consistency with its ideal, allow for intellectual freedom and the play of diverse gifts and interests in its educational measures” (Dewey, 1916/2009, p. 243). Skrtic (1991) further elaborated that “democracy *is* collaborative problem solving through reflective discourse within a community of interests” (p. 182, italics in original) and referred to Dewey when placing an emphasis on educational excellence and educational equity as the primary goals of a democratic education. Democracy embraces the concepts of active participation in life, including the desire and ability to contribute to the well-being of others, value diversity, attain individual fulfillment, and have choices that allow for a life of endless potential (Dewey, 1916/2009; Giroux, 2012; Skrtic, 1991). Karagiorgi (2011) discussed democracy in terms of extrinsic and intrinsic values. Democracy can manifest itself in a way that impacts the extrinsic value of a school by employing inclusive practices, for example, and democracy can also have an

intrinsic value that allows for a democratic nature to be the guiding force in the thoughts, beliefs, and actions of those within a school (Karagiorgi, 2011)

Social justice is an important concept that is closely tied to a conceptualization of democratic purposes for schools. Shoho et al. (2011) analyzed the historical roots of the concept and discussed the implications of social justice on educational leadership. They put forth that perhaps a focus on the guiding principles of social justice will be more important than a concrete definition in leading the thought and direction of educational leadership “there has been widespread consensus on the guiding principles associated with social justice, with those cited most often being equality, equity, fairness, acceptance of others, and inclusiveness” (Shoho et al., 2011, p. 47). These guiding principles serve as a strong grounding for a democratic purpose in educational leadership. Murphy (2002) called for a reculturing of the profession and argued that a synthesizing paradigm is needed that focuses on school improvement, social justice, and democratic community. Further, he put forth metaphors of moral steward, educator, and community builder to describe educational leaders, saying that “the persons wishing to affect society as schools leaders must be directed by a powerful portfolio of beliefs and values anchored in issues such as justice, community, and schools that function for all children and youth” (Murphy, 2002, p. 186).

A renewed focus on the democratic purpose of schools allows for a different conception of the child to take form. In this mindset, a child is valued for the individual they are, bringing with them to school all of their background, culture, experiences, and aspirations for the future. Children are seen as active participants

in their learning, and the focus on individuality makes standardization an unfavorable situation. In addition, a desire to work for the benefit of others, and a collaborative spirit is cultivated. Children are viewed as beings not to be shaped and molded, but guided down paths that emphasize their unique attributes in a way that contributes to the larger whole, the philosophical “greater good”.

A conception and true dedication to a purpose for schools that embraces democracy has the potential to have an enormous impact on the special populations of students who are served by the system. When this purpose is at the forefront, guiding all action and belief about schools, students with special needs are embraced for their individual strengths and challenges. Having students who are respected and included with their peers would be considered an exercise in the real world of democracy where all people are valued for what they can contribute to the community, and this can only be realized when they are welcomed and encouraged to have an active role. Children who are English Language Learners (ELLs), would be recognized and appreciated for the immense cultural diversity and rich experience they represent. Students who are at-risk for school failure based on their economic need, or other life factors would also realize their best attributes within the school. They would represent the populations upon which schools should place the most value, because it is through their success or failure that the school’s success or failure should be granted.

The whole premise of democratic education is equality and excellence (Dewey, 1916/2009; Foster, 2002; Giroux, 2012; Shaker & Heilman, 2004; Skrtic, 1991). If schools are failing to provide students who fall outside of the neat and tidy

category of those who would learn whether they attended school or not, then they are failing altogether. Schools are meant to be communities, as Foster (2002) called passionately for, that provide all children with the opportunity to be whatever they choose to be in life, and this is no easy task. A democratic purpose for schools would do more than change the funding for special programs, throwing money at special populations so it keeps up appearances of attempts for equality and excellence, it would integrate the specialness of programs into everyday school living so that all children are being provided the opportunities to express their individual strengths, while also understanding their contribution to the good of others around them.

A widespread reflection on the purpose of schools would make a change in the ways schools are measured essential. If the value of education lies not only in its function of guiding learning, but also in its ability to guide children to understand the value of the people and circumstances that surround them, it would necessitate an active, reflective conversation about how schools are studied, and what outcomes are most important. This will be a difficult conversation with many differing views and passionate feelings about how schools are “measured”, but it is these difficult conversations, with many voices, that will be valued in the democratic culture we hope for.

How leaders communicate the purpose of schools. To revisit my discussion on vision at this point is pertinent. Leaders are essential to the success of schools and the students they serve, as it has been noted, they are second only to classroom instruction in the impact they have on student learning (Leithwood and Louis, 2012; Marzano et al., 2005). They are the “keepers of the vision”, the people

who are charged with the responsibility of communicating what is important at their schools and setting the tone for creating a common purpose that drives all within the community to strive to meet the goals set forth (e.g., Dufour et. al., 2008; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). School leaders can choose to critique the status quo by challenging the current ideologies, with a consciousness of their long progression within and strong hold of the system, or they can choose to subscribe to and communicate weak visions that do nothing more than rationalize the current state of affairs and reproduce the same outcomes that have plagued our schools for a hundred years.

It is impossible to move forward without a great degree of understanding and reflection. It is this reflection, the self-reflection of the field of educational leadership that is imperative to recreating and recommitting to the democratic ideals that our students deserve. I conclude this discussion with a plea to reflect upon Dewey's (1916/2009) words about life and education, he stated that:

our net conclusion is that life is development, and that developing, growing, is life. Translated into its educational equivalents, that means (i) that the educational process has no end beyond itself; it is its own end; and that (ii) the educational process is one of continual reorganizing, reconstructing, transforming (p. 40).

It is my hope that through an accurate appraisal of the state of affairs in educational leadership, we can begin the educative process of reorganizing, reconstructing, and transforming that must take place first in the beliefs we hold about education, and next in the actions taken to reinvent schools that work for all children. This is the

ultimate task of educational leaders, and those within the field of educational leadership.

Organization

Two major questions guide my investigation. First, what are the epistemological, methodological, and ideological histories of educational leadership? Second, how have these histories shaped the focus of theory development and literature in educational leadership?

This dissertation is organized in an attempt to facilitate understanding and connections between the analyses I have conducted. Chapter Two is dedicated to the theoretical framework and methods I used to conduct this critical hermeneutical analysis of the research in the field of educational leadership. It serves as an important frame from which to understand how I carried out this study and ultimately arrived at a deeper understanding.

In Chapter Three, I describe the historical development of the field of educational leadership, and discuss the progression of theories and their epistemological and methodological influences. This understanding allows me to uncover and communicate the ideological foundations that have woven their way into the history of theory development in this field. Mills (2000) proposed that sociologists, and those who make their work the investigation of society, its structures, and institutions, have fallen into the trap of the Scientific Method which has inhibited their use of methodologies. Similarly, I will show how the history of research in the field of educational leadership has been shaped epistemologically by the Scientific Method, how this adherence to the Scientific Method has been driven

by ideologies, and how that has affected the contemporary predominance of certain epistemological beliefs and the use of methodology. Mills (2000) further stated that “methodology, in short, seems to determine the problems” (p. 57). English (2005) agreed when he stated that “what seems not to have occurred to many researchers is that the research methods they embrace define the nature of the problems they pursue as well as the outcomes they obtain” (p. xiii). An historical analysis and connection is imperative in order to understand the current system that is desperately trying to reform education and leadership through the use of a narrow definition of scientifically based research (NCLB, 2002). This scientifically based research communicates the epistemological and methodological histories of the field of educational leadership. Leonardo (2003) referred to history as “the primordial soup of ontological understanding. It precedes and intercedes every moment of reflection” (p. 332). In examining the philosophies of the historical and current realities of the field, I can help others to reflect on their understanding and open the conversation to allow for democratic dialogue and critique.

In Chapter Four, I put forth the findings of the first literature review I conducted for this study, and include a description of the research I initially found. The findings of each study are shared with the purpose of illuminating what the present research literature has to say about the impact of educational leadership on life in schools, and allows the reader to see how I conceptualized the first phase of my investigation into the life of schools and the impact of educational leadership.

As part of my interpretive method, I conducted a second literature review, and this I discuss in Chapter Five. The findings of this additional search are

illuminated to add depth to my initial analysis of the current state of the field. This layer of analysis also allowed me to practice reflexivity and examine ontological and epistemological beliefs that I had not thoroughly understood until this point in my study. My personal understanding was imperative to the following chapters in which I delve more deeply into the epistemological and methodological issues that communicate what is believed to be important about leadership in schools.

In Chapter Six, I discuss the prominent methodologies and talk about the paradigms each are commonly associated with, as well as the paradigms evident in the research I reviewed. This chapter will tie together the results of both literature reviews to present findings organized by methodology, and discuss strengths and limitations of the research reviewed. This section sets the foundation for the methodological, epistemological, and ideological analysis in the following chapter.

Chapter Seven represents the heart of this study, in which I discuss and analyze the epistemologies and methodologies found in both reviews of the current literature, and how they communicate both a purpose for schools, and what knowledge is important about school leadership. Although it is not always clearly stated, the use of methodologies is influenced by widespread ideological factors and is something that needs to be uncovered through the interpretation and analysis of methodology and purpose in education. With an understanding of the integrative and repressive functions of ideology, this chapter concludes with a critique of ideology and its impact on research in educational leadership.

Finally, in Chapter Eight, I discuss how the ideologies, history, and current state of affairs communicate what is held to be important about schools, and how

this has remained largely the same over the past century of schooling in the United States. I facilitate understanding of why the field is in its current state, and I put forth recommendations for future investigations that are supported by the results of my study. Through this discussion, I demonstrate the power of research literature and how it communicates what is important to know about schools and leadership. By bringing these issues to consciousness, it is my hope that a conversation will be fueled about the direction of our schools, and how the choices made by those in the field of educational leadership continue to steer the field down courses that lead to the same destination, without an awareness of the old, outdated map used to navigate new terrain.

As I speak to the leaders of education in our country, I hope to shed light on the deeply rooted beliefs that have guided our thoughts and actions, and help to make a difference in the essential change needed for educating our young and creating a strong system of education that can reflect upon itself often, make changes as needed, and continually reinvent itself in the best interests of the students it serves; I believe that would be something to be proud of and a fine legacy to leave to our next generations of educators and leaders.

Chapter 2

The Study

In this chapter, I describe my theoretical framework, the methodology that guides this study, and the methods I employed to conduct my investigation. The theoretical framework is the result of an intensive study of methods, and therefore my discussion of methodology is done in a narrative form so that readers can understand how I constructed the methods used for study and analysis. I discuss the methods I used as a result of the initial methodological investigation and address the standards for research in humanities-oriented research as outlined by the American Educational Research Association (AERA, 2009). I chose these standards to address the quality and rigor of my research because they serve to guide scholarly studies that rely heavily on interpretive and theoretical frameworks to conduct investigations into unrecognized problems within education research and practice.

In this chapter, I chose to discuss my theoretical framework, methodology, and methods under separate headings to promote understanding. My theoretical framework is the result of my study of methods (methodology). The methodological process was an integral piece to each chapter in this dissertation. It also represents an important function in my hermeneutical analysis, my deeper understanding and ability to extract theory to apply to methods. After I explain the thought processes that I used to arrive at methods for data collection and analysis, I discuss these particular methods in detail. The organization of this chapter should further assist

the reader to understand the literature I have chosen to guide this study, and how it shaped my analysis.

Theoretical Framework

This investigation will be framed within critical theories of education and methods of hermeneutic analysis (Gallagher, 1992), and will include pragmatic implications that attempt to fuse the horizons of methodologies in a way that will promote an understanding of their contributions and limitations. I seek to spur the conversation about the purpose of educational leadership and how self-reflection within a field of study can serve to initiate transformation with the hope of improvement. English (2002) stated, in reference to educational leadership, that “it is impossible for the field to be truly reflective about its own presuppositions. It is forever trapped within its own logic and definitions” (p. 126). Self-reflection requires insight into the methodological foci within the field and how this has shaped, and been shaped by, the values and aims that drive research and training for future leaders. Leonardo (2003), when he discussed Habermas’ hermeneutics, explained that the purpose is “to reinstate the importance of reflection over the interests tied to knowledge” (p. 341). It is through analysis and discussion that I hope to kindle the fire of reflection that is needed to begin to shift direction in educational leadership from a reliance upon deeply embedded ideologies to a conscious understanding and interrogation of the beliefs guiding research and practice in the field.

Ontology, epistemology, and methodology. The ontology, or worldview associated with critical theory is that people are nested within historical and

structural realities that are based on struggles for power (Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2011). With a slightly post-positivist view, I situate myself within critical theories with the acknowledgement that I believe there is a reality that is better than others, and I equate this with socially just outcomes for all served within our schools. The epistemological basis of critical theory is that research is driven by the study of social and historical structures and the belief that this study can change these structures to provide empowerment to those negatively impacted by the power within social and historical structures (Lincoln et al., 2011; Morrow & Brown, 1994). Methodology within critical theory tends to be of the dialogic and dialectical nature, where the focus is on methods that will allow for social transformation (Guba, 1990; Lincoln et al., 2011). I situate myself within a constructivist approach as well, acknowledging the philosophical belief that people construct their own understanding that is impacted by their personal frame of reference and interaction with others (Guba, 1990; Lincoln et al., 2011; Morrow & Brown, 1994). Where I differ from radical constructivist viewpoints is in my ontological belief that there is a socially just ideal that can be strived for, and this ideal is not relative to peoples' vantage points. Justice, freedom, and equality in education are ideals that should not be relative to particular social constructions, perhaps an adherence to relativity within these constructs could serve to reproduce further exclusion and rationalization for injustice. These concepts are examples of universal ideals that should never be rationalized based on a person's perceptions of them as relative to the concept. For example, a child in special education cannot be segregated from peers and provided few opportunities for interaction because it provides an

education that is relative to their perceived abilities. Children have the right to be educated with their non-disabled peers, to participate in their school community, and to receive a high quality education that is supported by educators (administrators, teachers, staff) in ways that respect their fundamental democratic right to be a part of their community. Equality of opportunity, freedom to realize independence and hope for the future, and justice in the form of action to allow these constructs to be realized must be universals that apply to all children.

My choice of theoretical framework also includes a pragmatist influence (Dewey, 1902/2001, 1939/1989; Foster, 1986; Rorty, 1982). Although many argue against pragmatism as a hodge-podge of beliefs that do not align ontologically and epistemologically (e.g., Willower, 1998), I employ pragmatics as a tool that allows for appreciation and understanding of differing ways to know (Dewey, 1939/1989; Foster, 1986). I use pragmatism as a way to ensure a deep understanding of the many paradigms and philosophies associated with research, which adds to my reflection about the ways that each can contribute to knowledge and transformation within the field of educational leadership.

Critical hermeneutics. Originating within the Greek language, 'hermeneutics' is translated as interpretation. Gallagher (1992) defined hermeneutics as the study of interpretation that when used within a critical framework can provide a way to reveal and explicate the underlying mechanisms of reproduction and hegemony within institutions. Hermeneutics allows the interpreter to work within the hermeneutical circle. This circle involves understanding how the texts we interpret have been shaped by context and

historical factors, while also maintaining an understanding of how these interpretations shape those who interpret and are impacted by them. Habermas (1989) discussed how interpretation allows for the “skillful use of language...to see what we can do to change ingrained schemata of interpretation, to learn (and teach others) to see things understood on the basis of tradition differently and to judge them anew” (p. 297). As humans, we are constantly interpreting our surroundings, but by employing hermeneutics I hope to bring to light the ways information is interpreted and place importance on this act as something we have agency in doing if we choose to acknowledge and actively participate in the act of understanding.

Interpreting the research and literature in the field of educational leadership is vitally important because it is through these texts that the scientifically, research-based evidence is found, and this knowledge guides the preparation and practice of leaders in education. Understanding the traditions, as Habermas (1989) explained them, is the historical piece of my analysis. Leonardo (2003) discussed the importance of history in understanding worldviews that guide thought and action, and placed this understanding as a key element in the reflection process of interpretation. It is not enough to merely accept traditions and history through either ignoring them or rationalizing them, they must be explicated in a way that brings them into the context of a new conversation, a conversation that provides the possibility of liberation and emancipation from unquestioned beliefs.

Gallagher (1992) discussed the four principles of critical hermeneutics as reproduction, hegemony, reflection, and application (p. 240). Deetz and Kersten (1983) described the three tasks of work in critical theory to be understanding,

critique, and education. In my research, the aim of this process is to inspire people to realize their agency and active participation in the process of making meaning in educational leadership, and to bring to consciousness possibilities for action.

The attention given to reproduction and hegemony are described as pre-critical interpretations because they involve the investigation of the problems that emerge from the interpretations of the research literature itself. In this critical hermeneutic study, these stages embody the historical traditions within the field of educational leadership and describe the way beliefs and norms have been rationalized through the literature. This initial understanding has the purpose of describing the social realities within an organization or field of study and the forces that form, deform, sustain, and change that reality. A clear understanding cannot be described without attention to the historical factors that have shaped thought within an institution or a field of study such as educational leadership. This understanding must also be described in terms of how the past has brought us to the present situation. In Habermas' (1989) hermeneutics, he emphasized the importance of historical explication as an essential facet of interpretation.

Reflection and application can involve critique and emancipation, or education. These connections are important to make in understanding how hermeneutics and critical theory can act or be used collectively to demonstrate understanding, set the foundation for critique, and allow for a thorough appraisal of the situation within educational leadership so as to have some educative value in making recommendations for change and growth. Critique is central to critical theory, analyzing both the historical and the present situations within a structure to

find the oppositional features of a problem that has not yet found a distinct voice. It is through this critique that issues of ideology, values, means, and ends are able to find a way to break through the noise of scientific inquiry to make a statement of their own that is recognized and open for discussion. "Ideology critique is a matter of social justice and this is ultimately the challenge of critical hermeneutics" (Leonardo, 2003, p. 343). Yet ideology critique is not enough, by bringing to consciousness the ways in which prominent ideologies have directed research and action, this will merit action taken to contemplate and create a different system of beliefs from which to guide study of educational leadership.

Education is the final piece of critical theory that I will address in my analysis. With a firm understanding and a coherent critique, offering suggestions and paths for improvement is essential. Many philosophies and theoretical methods have been criticized for their lack of putting forth solutions to the problems they concern themselves with (Gallagher, 1992). It is my promise to the reader that I will not make the same mistake. As my analysis takes me through a thorough investigation of this field, I know that only through educative action can my contribution make a true difference within this important field of study and practice. Dewey (1916/2009) put it so eloquently when he stated "it is that reconstruction or reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience, and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience" (p. 61-62). Thinking and knowledge will only be useful if they provide guidance toward a clear path for progress.

Although Gallagher (1992) and Habermas (1989) discussed the belief that critical hermeneutics ultimately seeks to move toward an ideologically neutral conversation, I must revise this construct within my theoretical framework. To neutralize would be to underplay its importance and the power it continues to exert even after it is made conscious. Instead of ideologically neutral terrain, I seek to name the ideologies at work within the educational leadership literature in order to bring them to a conscious conversation where their power is recognized, questioned, and contested in order to move toward a more ideal educational situation that embodies values, rights, and a more holistic conceptualization of the child.

Ideology is at work when contradictions are found between what is communicated as widely held beliefs and what is real in terms of the forces that shape the conversations and actions within an institution. Hegemony is closely related to ideology in that it operates behind the backs of the people it controls, utilizing shared, rationalized ideologies to exert power and influence over those who are unaware. Ideology and hegemony function together to retain power over systems of beliefs that guide thought and action, and this is my justification for focusing so heavily on the purposes of schooling. I argue that there must be a reason for the efforts made in examining and working with schools, and I do not wish to fall into the trap of reproducing ideologies that will continue to repress progress. A critical framework will allow me to move toward emancipatory, educative discussion. I have previously defined emancipation as freeing the reader from unquestioned beliefs about the way things are done in the field of educational

leadership, and I suggest that emancipation is necessary to move forward. Leonardo (2003) put forth that “an important purpose of critical hermeneutics is to expose myths or unquestioned assumptions that have long been held as self evident” (p. 345). By uncovering the hidden meanings within the most prominent ideologies of accountability and efficiency, their dominant influence can be deflated to allow for a space where a more “ideal speech situation”, as Habermas (1989) spoke of, can take place. This can be accomplished through naming ideological influences, and consciously acknowledging their power. In this situation, there are no hidden meanings because through interpretation they are made clear, and the conversation is freed from the unspoken, unrecognized, or purposefully ignored ideologies that dominate the literature in the field of educational leadership.

Applying Critical Hermeneutics to Educational Leadership. Through my analysis, I will show how certain scientific philosophies (ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies) have determined the use of methods in research within educational leadership and how this has in turn impacted the interpretation of results, moving around the hermeneutical circle to again impose its meanings on the further use of methods and interpretations. Critical hermeneutics will allow me to continually focus on the research questions guiding this study, and let me remind the reader that they are; What are the epistemological, methodological, and ideological histories of educational leadership? How have these histories shaped the focus of literature in educational leadership? Through the investigation of these questions in my analysis of leadership literature, I will be able to communicate what problems have been and are continuing to be investigated, continually asking; are these

problems that are pertinent to the improvement of our schools, or are they merely those that dominant scientific paradigms have dictated that we investigate, maintaining a narrow focus on what can be measured and never really understanding the real problems that are determining the grim fate of our educational system? Apple and Weis (1983) put forth that “because of a positivistic emphasis and an overreliance on statistical approaches, it [education research] has been unable to unravel the complexities of everyday interactions in schools” (p. 3). Similarly, Leonardo (2003) said that “to understand people suggests a mode of analysis that is different from explanations common to the natural sciences, something positivism unreflexively applies to the human and social sciences” (p. 332). Through this study, I aim to demonstrate how positivism has impacted thought within educational leadership. I will describe the methods used to analyze the educational leadership literature in the forthcoming Methods section.

The literature on educational leadership is fraught with claims that the leaders of our schools are the ‘keepers of the vision’, the transformational leaders who will create and sustain school reform and improvement (Dufour et al., 2008; Fullan, 2001, 2010). Considering both the integrative and repressive functions of ideology, it can easily be argued that leaders are the ‘keepers of the ideologies’. The linguistic use of research and literature to prepare our administrators and provide them with the ideas and knowledge they will need to lead schools is a hermeneutical, interpretive, phenomenon in and of itself. Language is ideology (Gallaher, 1992), and through the use of the language in textbooks, inspirational leadership literature, and other professional publications that guide their formal or

informal appraisal of the field, our future leaders are being assimilated into a culture that embraces the use of particular scientific paradigms that minimize the inherent problems in an institution that is built upon the foundation of ideologies that have been continuously rationalized and left unquestioned to the extent that they keep showing up, but perhaps with new catchphrases (Smith, 2001). This is yet another reason why critical hermeneutics is an appropriate framework for analysis; it seeks to uncover these hidden meanings through the depth of its interpretation (Habermas, 1989; Leonardo, 2003; Thompson, 1981).

To reiterate the importance of Dewey's (1916/2009) words, it is only through understanding the past that we can examine the present, and strive for progress in the future; the disconnect from the "background of the present" must not happen. To further reiterate this point, I refer to a popular quote that states "the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results". It is time to understand and reflect upon the underlying systems of beliefs that have guided our public schools and particularly the field of educational leadership so that there will no longer be the expectation of different results from doing the same things. If educational transformation, such as that Leonardo (2003) suggested, is going to happen in our country, it has to begin with self-realization and reflection upon what schools stand for, what their purpose is, and how we are going to use the knowledge of past triumphs and trials to help forge a new path of change and progress. It is time to directly acknowledge the beliefs that have been taken for granted and accepted because they have become so deeply engrained in the fabric of society that they are not brought to question anymore, or at least not as often or as

critically as they should be. Though I will demonstrate, through a discussion of the history of child labor and public schooling, that the view and treatment of children is better than it was a century ago, our children need a system that will reflect upon itself in order to realize the enormous impact schools have on the lives of children. Almost 25% of children are living in poverty, and schools that serve high-poverty populations and receive more stringent guidance from federal policy tied to funding demonstrate dismal proficiency rates across the United States (The Annie E. Casey Foundation, KIDS Count Data Center, datacenter.kidscount.org). These children depend upon a system that refuses to do what it rhetorically hopes to provide through education; continually learn and grow through an understanding of past experiences, embrace each day as an opportunity and use each minute to its fullest, and prepare for a future that encompasses a life of freedom, choice, and participation in democracy. Educational leadership as a field has an obligation to reflect upon what schools stand for and the processes and practices that will help children realize a better future. I argue that the first step in fulfilling this obligation is reflection and a resulting conscious awareness of history and how it has impacted the present.

I do not believe that the research in educational leadership has failed to provide knowledge and information about how to proceed toward a more democratic purpose for schooling. There is a wealth of knowledge that is available to build upon, and much important research has been done to illuminate the role of leaders in schools that can and should be used to improve leadership practice in school contexts. I do believe, however, that there is much to be questioned about

how the research and literature conceptualize schools and their purpose. With this in mind, I reiterate my pragmatic stance in terms of the conduct and use of research. In its most Deweyan sense, I acknowledge and respect the many ways in which reality can be known, and I believe that experience should be measured in ways that illuminate the human experience, be that quantitatively, qualitatively, or both. Each methodology has its unique strengths and contributions to the field of educational leadership, I wish to make very clear that I have a respect for the many methods utilized for investigating schools, but I will show how efforts have been misdirected for quite some time, which has resulted in a lot of research and very little progress (Foster, 2002; English, 2002, 2011).

Methodology

This is an account of my investigation into methods and methodologies that shaped this interpretive dissertation. Because it is theoretical and interpretive in nature, I have chosen to write this in a narrative form so that the reader can understand the thoughts, processes, influences, and reflections that impacted the creation of this study and the choice of theoretical frameworks just explained above. I will make reference to my analyses in this section, but a thorough discussion of the systematic procedures and the “how” of my methodology will be discussed in the Method section that follows the present discussion.

AERA outlined standards appropriate to humanities-oriented research in education, and through the following discussion, I will address the conceptualization standard (AERA, 2009) to establish my perspective as a researcher and to communicate how this study was conceptualized, including the scope and limits of

the inquiry. After this methodological discussion, I will turn my attention to methods and describe how I extracted theory to employ systematic procedures to conduct this study.

Conceptualizing the study. As part of my doctoral program in Special Education at the University of New Mexico, I was required to do a comprehensive examination. Before this could take place, I had to meet with my committee members to decide upon a focus for my comprehensive exams, which would then lead to a more precise idea for what would become my dissertation research. Little did I know that I had begun the research for my dissertation long before I met with my committee to talk to them about my growing interest in the field of educational leadership.

Concurrently with my doctoral program at UNM, I also took courses at another local university to obtain my educational administration license. I worked at a school where the principal had an enormous impact on the culture, practices, and well-being of the people within the school community, and I wished to have a deeper understanding of his preparation so that I could understand more clearly why he made decisions, behaved in particular ways, and the beliefs that guided what he did for students and teachers. For this reason, I chose to attend the same preparation program as he had, and this choice would also allow me to continue my doctoral coursework as planned without shifting my course of study in Special Education, Literacy, and Research Methods.

By the time I met with my committee to discuss the focus of my comprehensive exam, I completed this program, had an exceptional experience with

my field supervisor during my administrative internship, and decided that this was a field of study I certainly wanted to pursue. My interdisciplinary committee supported my interest wholeheartedly, suggested that I invite my administrative field supervisor to join the committee as a representative from Educational Leadership, and they ultimately crafted questions that would allow me to investigate this field that I had become so passionate about.

The overarching question for my comprehensive exam was, how does leadership impact life in schools? I spent six weeks of my summer engrossed in organizational and leadership literature, trying to find out as much as I could to respond to the questions for my comprehensive exam. I studied the historical development of the field, I reviewed the current research, the methodologies found in the current research, and I synthesized my findings. I will discuss this process in more detail in the following Methods section. To understand the methodologies I found within the literature at this point, I relied heavily upon texts that I read for research methods courses at the University (e.g., Cresswell, 2009; Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2006; Mayan, 2009; and Willig, 2008). I felt that I had done a thorough job of creating a picture of the field of educational leadership and how it conceptualized the relationship with life in schools. The end goal of completing my comprehensive exams was to help me narrow my focus, find a gap in the literature, and come up with my own research focus for a dissertation. This is, in fact, what happened, but it took a different form than I, or any of my committee members, initially thought it would.

I have been cursed/blessed with a “big picture” mentality that has caused me to have great anxiety throughout this process. I had many conversations with colleagues and mentors within public schools and at the university in attempts to narrow my focus through reflective conversation, and I continued to have a difficult time focusing on one specific problem. Even when I thought I was incredibly focused on an attainable research question, I was told that it was still not specific enough. My committee members have come to know me well over the course of my studies, and they recognized this attribute in me very clearly. As I presented the results of my comprehensive exam, and proposed questions for study, which I thought had been intricately narrowed to several choices for further research, I was shocked and elated at the response of my committee members.

It was suggested that I had already identified a gap in the literature, and that instead of a field-based research study, I should pursue a theoretical dissertation that would represent a second layer of analysis of the work I had done for my comprehensive exams. (This will be described in the forthcoming Methods section of this chapter). The questions that arose from the completion of my comprehensive exams were centered upon the use of quantitative methods to determine relationships between leadership and school variables. Collectively, my committee and I had a sense that there were methodological issues within the literature that biased the types of questions asked and the manner in which data was collected, analyzed, and results reported. My committee talked to me about problematizing the methodologies within the research, and helped to set me on a good path for beginning the work involved in a theoretical dissertation study.

Thus began my journey into philosophical and theoretical research. I immediately gained the support of a gracious and knowledgeable professor from UNM who was coincidentally teaching a course on theoretical research. He allowed me to spend office hours with him, asking broad questions and getting ideas for further reading. He additionally allowed me to audit his course and participate in the rich discussions that would take place over the course of the semester. It was through this investigation that I was able to understand hermeneutical inquiry, critical theory, and the philosophical underpinnings of research methodologies. Through the careful documentation of the conversations I had with this professor, the readings for his course, and my continued search into the reference pages of the works he assigned, I began to create resources that would serve as a basis for the conceptualization of this study. I had a careful focus on “problematizing methodologies” as I vigorously read works by Habermas (1989), Gallagher (1992), Morrow and Brown (1994), Weber (1946), and others, and I constantly searched for the link between my work and the theories they espoused. I knew that I was looking for methodologies and theories that would allow me to interpret my own work, (the comprehensive exams), and to serve as a framework through which to further investigate and interpret the research in the field of educational leadership. Through class conversations, deep reflections, and journaling, I began to see the intricate connections of philosophy, hermeneutics, pragmatism, and critical theory that would allow me to conduct the analysis in the following chapters of this dissertation. Seven handwritten notebooks served as my guides for keeping track of my own learning and understanding as I came to shape my theoretical framework

and more clearly conceptualize the work I would do. These same notebooks were vitally important as references while conducting my analyses, as I will discuss in the Methods section.

Investigating theory. Hermeneutics, or theories of interpretation, I immediately knew would be the appropriate framework from which to conduct this study, because I realized that I was essentially reinterpreting the work I had previously done, and working to continue analysis through the interpretations I would have as my own understanding was cultivated through investigation. I began to delve more deeply into this broad methodological literature by finding books referenced, looking up commonly cited works, and reading incessantly. Once I had gained a more comfortable understanding, I began to focus more specifically on the literature in educational leadership that could help to illuminate the way in which I could approach this investigation.

It was during this phase of my study that I began to have a full grasp of the scope of this work. I found numerous articles and books (e.g. Foster, 2005; English, 2002, 2011; Foster, 1986; Hodgkinson, 1991; Leonardo, 2003; Smith, 2001) that specifically related educational leadership research to epistemological and methodological issues. This is where I learned about competing paradigms within educational leadership, such as postmodernism and post-positivism. I studied the works of Culbertson (1988), Donmoyer (1999), Erickson (1977), Evers and Lakomski (1996a, 1996b), Gronn and Ribbins (1996), Gunter (2005), Murphy (2002), and Smith and Blase (1991) to determine the salient issues within the competing philosophies of educational leadership. This literature brought to light

the critical conversations that had taken place within this field of research and theory development, and the references to historical development, competing epistemologies and methodologies, and theoretical criticism of particular lines of thought in the field allowed me to begin positioning myself within the conversation. I saw that there was much debate within the field, and a lot of consensus about the role historical development had played in stagnating the field at many points, specifically paralleling arguments within social science research (i.e. the paradigm wars brought on by Kuhn (1996), qualitative vs. quantitative debate as evidenced in English, 2011; Lincoln et al., 2011). I will discuss my findings in relation to these works in Chapter Eight.

My grasp of this analytical framework was illuminated when I re-read Foster's (1986) *Promises and Paradigms*. My initial reading of his work had left me with many things to ponder, specifically the relationship between theory and practice, or praxis as he called for in his text (Foster, 1986) and how this could relate to methodological choices in educational leadership research. Nevertheless, my first appraisal of his work had a tremendous impact on the work I completed for my comprehensive exams. I was shocked and excited when I saw that I had missed so much of his analysis during my first reading. I had not considered his work to be an interpretation of the field of educational leadership that sought to problematize the differing theory developments in the field through an investigation of historical influences and explanation of the current (to his time period) manifestations of these historical influences. I understood parallel ideas between the work he had done and the work I had set out to do. When I saw references to Habermas, Weber,

Dewey, and hermeneutic theories this led me to believe I was extending the theoretical work he had done in publishing his volume. With this knowledge, I re-read several pieces that had informed my first appraisal of the field of educational leadership, and these close readings with a focus on interpretation represented my first conscious hermeneutic analysis.

I began to contemplate the principles of hermeneutics through my reading of other texts. These principles are distancing, questioning, application, and self-understanding (Gallagher, 1992). I will explain these concepts in more detail within my Method section, but here I will discuss the principle of questioning and how it guided my new interpretation of these texts as I contemplated the focus of my study before it was conceptualized. Gallagher (1992) said that “Interpretation is structured as a question” (p. 147), and the overarching question guiding my thought was; how do these texts help me to understand methodological problems that have occurred within and as a result of the historical development of the field? Additionally I thought about, what theories can guide me through a textual analysis of the research in this field to arrive at a deeper understanding of the problems with methodology? Through these more careful readings, guided by the preceding questions, my formal analyses began to take shape, which I will explain in detail in the Methods section following this methodological discussion.

As I reviewed the notebooks I had created from participating in my Theoretical Research class, the synthesizing theory was hermeneutics. My notes also highlighted the prevalence of ideology critique as central to theoretical research. A re-reading of Gallagher’s (1992) chapters on different approaches to hermeneutical

research in education led to me to revisit critical hermeneutics and begin conceptualizing how the problem of methodology in research could be investigated within the principles of this theoretical framework. I also referenced Thompson's (1981) critical hermeneutical study on the work on Ricoeur and Habermas to continue probing my knowledge of their contributions to philosophical work while paying attention to the way in which Thompson laid out his textual analysis of these philosophers. My initial understanding of Habermas' work led me to believe he was a hermeneutical theorist; when I realized his contributions to critical theory, I made the decision that critical hermeneutics was appropriate for my study. I have outlined this framework, and the ways it aligns with the purpose of my research in the preceding section of this chapter.

I corresponded with my dissertation committee chair and another member with a strong knowledge of critical theory, (though all of my committee members have wide knowledge of different theoretical perspectives), and a passion for questioning the current political climate of our education system. Along with my growing understanding of the theoretical framework I had chosen to problematize the methodologies in the research within educational leadership, these conversations helped me to pose initial questions that would guide my interpretation and analysis.

Formulating research questions and contemplating methods. When I officially began the work of analyses for this dissertation, I further clarified my theoretical framework by typing it out on the computer as a draft and being sure I understood the frames from which I was going to analyze my previous work,

utilizing the tenets of critical hermeneutics and incorporating pragmatics that I have previously explained at the beginning of this chapter. This framework, which relies upon the universal principles of hermeneutics (Gallagher, 1992), specific guiding tenets of critical hermeneutics (Gallagher, 1992; Thompson, 1981, 1990), and pragmatism (Dewey, 1916/2009, 1939/1989; Foster, 1986) was presented to my dissertation committee during my proposal meeting and through this meeting I was able to further clarify my use of these methods. They helped me to refine my questions, and suggested further elaboration on specific historical developments that would strengthen my historical analysis, thus providing a stronger foundation upon which to base the rest of my findings and analysis. With their approval, I began the work of analyzing the writing I had done for my comprehensive exam, and at this point it actually became my dissertation study.

As I continued to apply the principles of hermeneutics, I knew I would need particular methods to guide my analysis. I noticed the similarity between my approach to analyzing the data from my first literature review and naturalistic inquiry, which led me to investigate this paradigm through the writings of Lincoln and Guba (1985). At this point, I also came upon a study Thompson (1990) conducted in which he devoted a chapter to his methodology of interpretation. With tools to proceed with a critical, depth-hermeneutical approach that attends to social-historical analysis, formal analysis, and interpretation (Thompson, 1990), along with the tools I needed for the handling of the data (literature reviews), I was confident that my study of methods had equipped me with what I needed to conduct

this study. I will discuss these frameworks and the theory I extracted from their methodology to apply to my study in the forthcoming Method section.

Recognizing tensions. The hermeneutical principles of distancing, application, and self-reflection implored me to contemplate my circumstantial position in relation to the field of educational leadership. Distancing is described as the way in which the interpreter is positioned related to the work they will investigate (Gallagher, 1992). I had to establish the tension between my own presuppositions and the literature in educational leadership so as to allow for a space where I could objectify the methodologies by admitting the unfamiliarity I had with the methodological problems within the literature. The principle of application involves the relationship between distancing, being open to the possibilities of interpretation, and the practical application of such interpretations. The tensions must be identified through self-reflection and an understanding of the personal circumstances presupposing the interpretation (Gallagher, 1992). This led me to articulate my presuppositions and beliefs through an investigation of the ideologies that permeate our education system (e.g., English, 2002; Foster, 2002; Shaker & Heilman, 2004), the purpose of schools they communicate, and what I discussed in Chapter One to be a democratic purpose for schooling. The preparation for this writing came from careful readings of Dewey (1916/2009, 1939/1989), Hand (2006), and others who wrote about democracy specifically within education (i.e., Boyd, 2004; Dantley, 2010; Fusarelli, Kowalski & Petersen, 2011; Mawhinney, 2004; Mullen, 2008; Portelli & Simpson, 2007; Pryor, 2008; Shields, 2010; Simmonds, 2007; Tate, 2003; Woods, 2007). This explanation was important, because it

provided alignment with hermeneutical principles of distancing, anticipation of application, and self-understanding (Gallagher, 1992), as well as the social-historical analysis Thompson (1990) included in his methodological framework. The foundational purpose of the discussion of ideology and the purpose of schooling were ultimately an anchor from which to conduct all further analyses. Without a connection to the present situation, and an honest appraisal of my own beliefs, it would have been impossible to conduct a rigorous hermeneutical interpretation aligned with principles of interpretive analysis (Gallagher, 1992). An acknowledgement of the current ideologies and their discrepancy with a democratic purpose for schools was vitally important to the critical part of analysis, and the context of the social situation in which I conducted my study. Ideologies are at work when discrepancies are found, and I needed to demonstrate this for myself first, and also for my readers to establish the significance of my study.

Critical reflection. Remaining true to the principle of application (Gallagher, 1992), and Thompson's (1990) social-historical analysis, I then revisited the historical analysis I had completed for my comprehensive exams and included a more thorough discussion of the historical events that led to creation of the field of educational administration. The first question that guided this study was; what are the epistemological, methodological, and ideological histories of the field of educational leadership? Not only does this question directly interrogate the historical traditions of the field, Gallagher (1992) explained that in the process of critical reflection, tradition and its historical effect could be transformed. My interpretation needed to communicate a broader historical understanding of the

spirit of the times in which educational leadership as a field gained recognition, and how this development set the stage for professionalizing the field through scientific inquiry.

I revisited each theory development in the educational leadership and added information from the methodological and leadership literature that had continued to shape my understanding of this history. After I filled in the gaps from my initial documentation of the history, I then analyzed the literature and drew conclusions about the ideological, epistemological, and methodological factors at work within the historical development of the field, thus explicitly addressing my research question. This process called for a direct application of critical hermeneutical principles, which I will discuss in my Method section.

An interpretive investigation. Through conversation with the chair of my dissertation committee, we agreed that my initial search for literature during my comprehensive exams had shown bias toward quantitative methodologies through the specific use of the word *effects* in my search terms. We decided upon a plan of action that would allow me to demonstrate reflexivity in my research review methods and consciously eradicate the bias I had initially worked from by expanding *leadership effects* to *school leadership*, and I conducted a second review of the current literature. These processes constitute the formal analysis portion of Thompson's (1990) depth-hermeneutics. We discussed how conducting this second review of the literature would in fact be the results and findings of my study because they represented my own shift in understanding of epistemology and methodology, as well as an acknowledgment of the power of the positivist ideology and its impact

on my thinking before I had actively reflected upon it, as I was called upon to do within the hermeneutical principle of self-understanding. Data collection methods and summaries (findings) are discussed in Chapter Five, but I will explain my use of constant comparative analysis to arrive at the organization and grouping of the studies I reviewed in the following Method section.

After completion of this second review, I sought to create a picture of the landscape of methodologies utilized in the research, and again distanced myself from the research in order to objectify the focus of my interpretation. I accomplished this by locating the facts of the research purpose, design, conceptual frameworks, focus of study, methods, methodology, and findings, these categories were determined through a priori codes based on my knowledge of methodologies and methods. I layed out these elements in tables to guide summarization without imposing analysis. For the analysis of methodologies in Chapter Six, I spent time investigating each methodology and the associated paradigms, trying to understand more clearly the epistemological and ontological assumptions inherent within each methodology. As I gained a deeper understanding, I included an overview of each methodology before putting forth examples of each within a discussion of strengths and limitations inherent in each approach.

Questioning and application. With this base for understanding the philosophies of each methodology, and examples from the literature I reviewed, I then went on to conduct the epistemological, methodological, and ideological analysis of the research. This constituted a major portion of this critical hermeneutical analysis. The methods utilized in this analysis included the

arrangement of articles into tables that allowed me to look carefully at the outcomes, methods, and conceptual frameworks guiding studies. After being in close contact with the research reviewed, I was already beginning to see some important areas that needed further explanation and analysis, especially with regard to underlying ideologies. The construction of tables allowed me to identify studies that I needed to look at more closely to determine epistemological and methodological inconsistencies that ultimately communicated the accountability and business ideologies. This process allowed me to remain in close contact with the research, while also consulting many other sources on both qualitative and quantitative research that would help to guide my analysis. I also found myself revisiting my historical analysis to assist in explaining some of the practices I found to be incommensurate. A focus on the questions guiding my research was also something I had to continue to revisit as I wrote this analytical chapter to ensure I was remaining on the same path I set out on.

As I completed Chapter Eight I decided that the next part of my study would need to address the emancipatory and educative function of critical hermeneutic research, which is also what Thompson (1990) described as interpretation or re-interpretation. Through the use of critical interpretation, the purpose of this study was to bring underlying ideologies into consciousness so that they may be the focal point of a new conversation around the purpose of schools and the role of educational leadership. A careful review of all previously written material was undertaken, and I kept track of important points that were to be made in this section, being sure that my reasoning was sound and I had made warranted

assertions supported by the results of my investigation. It was at this time, as well, that I needed to go back and review all of my notebooks to ensure I was including the salient reflections I had written while immersed in the literature surrounding this study.

Working around the hermeneutical circle. Finally, I revisited the tenets of critical hermeneutics to ensure that my completed work encompassed each area I had set out to address. Reproduction, hegemony, reflection and application are tenets specific to critical hermeneutics and these complemented the universal principles of hermeneutic analysis, distancing, questioning, application, and self-understanding (Gallagher, 1992). The reproductive piece of this analysis was addressed through an understanding of the historical development of the field. Hegemonic influences were parsed out through the analysis of ideologies that guided the field's historical development. Included within these components was also the review of the literature, which allowed for a picture of the state of the field. I was conscious of my motivation to analyze during my summary of each article, so I made sure that I was focused on saving further critique for the spaces where critique was warranted. I wanted the reader to be able to see what the authors communicated about their studies, so as to form their own opinions without my critique. I was also aware that my summaries reflected yet another layer of interpretation that removed the reader from the authors who conducted the study. In this regard, I tried to reflect the findings of other authors as carefully as possible in these sections.

Reflection took place during my analysis of the methodologies, and my direct work on answering the research questions set forth at the beginning of my study. This process included a lot of additional reading into the philosophies of scientific, naturalistic, and critical inquiry. I also periodically checked in with my committee chair to be sure that the conclusions I drew were aligned with her understanding of the philosophies discussed herein as well.

The final component of my study needed to address the application, or emancipatory function of the knowledge I illuminated in this study. I carefully considered each critique I had made based on the evidence found in the studies, I was sure to think critically about both the strengths and weaknesses of the research methods. I also revisited some of the critical appraisals I had come across in the literature that demonstrated others' beliefs from competing paradigms. After an additional thorough reading of my work, including notes I took as I read, I put forth my implications for future research from the foundation of an understanding of the past and present.

Methods

Up to this point in this chapter, I have described my theoretical framework, and discussed the methodological processes that occurred throughout the conceptualization and completion of this study. At this point, I will describe the methods used to carry out my investigation. This study was not a linear process, so to aid in understanding, I have organized my methods categories into a discussion of (a) data collection and analysis within both the historical and literature review

phases of the study, (b) trustworthiness and credibility, and (c) guidelines for interpretation.

Data collection and analysis. In this section, I will attempt to describe the way in which I went about collecting information for the historical investigation included within this study, as well as the analysis of data collected from the literature reviews.

Historical analysis. The initial step in the collection of information for this study was the investigation into the history of theories in the field of educational leadership. I first conducted searches for literature on EBSCOHost, the online database of scholarly literature utilized by my university, with broad terms such as *history* and *educational leadership*. This method did not yield satisfactory results that I felt I could utilize to help me see the progression of ideas in the field, so upon the suggestion of a professor, I went to the library and looked for an encyclopedia or handbook of educational leadership. I located the SAGE Encyclopedia of Educational Leadership and Administration (English, 2011), which included two volumes of entries intended to provide snapshots of the pertinent issues in this field of study. I scanned the table of contents and found a sub-heading for theories. I visited each of these entries, and made photocopies being sure to include the reference pages to guide further reading.

While reading each entry, I paid close attention to the progression of ideas that was included in most discussions of particular theories. This allowed me to begin mapping out the progression of thought in the field by making a diagram in my historical notes journal. I also found/requested/ordered references from each

entry for further reading. As I completed this additional readings, I was able to add to my graphic, move theories around, and begin to categorize the progression of thought into movements that were salient in the literature. The movements I originally identified were the traditional movement, human relations movement, social systems theory movement, human resources movement, and critical and postmodern theories. When I had collected four or more references to each theory movement within the literature I read, I decided that these were the categories I would use to organize my discussion of the historical development of theory within the field. I made a point to also investigate organizational theory, so the literature I read to understand the history of development included interdisciplinary works not particularly related to education (e.g. Bass, 1981; Burns, 1978).

Concurrently with this investigation, I also searched educational journals from the digital database EBSCOHost. I conducted broad searches of educational leadership and focused on the years 1880-1980 to determine if the research I found would help to demonstrate the theories I had found in the history of the field. I kept these articles in a folder labeled "historical documents" on my computer. After I reviewed each article, I would decide if it illustrated a particular theory movement and move it into corresponding folders labeled "traditional theory", "human relations movement" etc. I also made notes in my historical notes journal to keep track of particular phrases that illustrated the conceptualization of leadership at the time.

In the initial write-up of the historical development of theory within the field for my comprehensive exams, I was interested in accurately portraying the

historical development with little commentary. When I revisited the historical piece for my dissertation study, I approached it from within my theoretical framework. The analysis of the historical development of the field fit within the social-historical analysis of Thompson's (1990) depth-hermeneutics. Attuning my thought with the additional tenets of reproduction and hegemony within critical hermeneutics (Gallagher, 1992; Thompson, 1981) and the overarching hermeneutical principle of distanciation through the explication of traditions and history (Gallagher, 1992), I refocused my interpretation of the work I had previously done and proceeded to re-read my historical section. While I read, I made notes in my historical notes journal and also made highlighted notes within the review function of my word-processor for every part where I noticed that epistemological or methodological interpretations were made. I additionally made notes of the places where I felt the tension of ideology between a democratic purpose for schools and the efficiency ideology that was present during the inception of the field by marking these places with color coded comments utilizing the notes function in my word processor. I wanted to trace this belief in efficiency, so making specific notes would help me trace any further adherence to this ideology and assist with my further analysis.

A second reading of the historical piece I had previously written allowed me to expand upon the theoretical developments in the field. The wide reading that I had done, as notated throughout this volume, helped me to further understand the history of the field and including these details was important to present an accurate appraisal of the development of the field. It was during this second reading that I was also able to understand how important the child labor and public schooling

movements set the stage for the development of educational leadership as a field, so I went back and included this discussion in a way that introduced the theory development within educational leadership.

Subsequent revisions of the historical piece of this study were done as I cross-checked references, and continued to keep notes about the history of the field I found in additional articles or books I read that were not necessarily focused on history, but included historical information that could help me fill in the gaps of my explanation. These notes were kept in my historical notes journal, and this journal was reviewed no less than once a week while I worked on this study to ensure I was including new supporting information in this history.

The analysis of the historical development of the field specifically addressed my first research question which was: what are the epistemological, methodological, and ideological histories of the field of educational leadership? This analysis was conducted by reading each theory movement in my historical section, referencing the methodological texts I had relied upon for this study, and reviewing the notes I had made in my journal and within the “review” function of my word-processor, which allowed me to see comments within the text and address them in my analysis. I specifically looked for language that denoted an adherence to particular epistemologies, methodologies, and ideologies. Words like efficiency, effects, and productivity, for example, focused my attention on the positivist ontology and objective epistemology, and I sought to look through my illustrations of each theory to support my analysis and show how each phase of theory was epistemologically, methodologically, and ideologically aligned. During this analysis, I also kept a

reflection journal that helped me to be aware of my own bias and sensitivity to the positivist ontology, and I triangulated my analysis through the use of peer debriefing with my professors, as well as constantly referencing methodological texts and articles pertaining to philosophical issues in educational leadership research (e.g., Foster, 1986; English, 2002, 2005, 2011; Young & Lopez, 2011). Both the explanation of history and the analysis can be found in Chapter Three.

Literature reviews and analyses. The methods used to collect the data, including criteria for inclusion and exclusion for this study are explained in detail in Chapters Four and Five. In this methods section, I will focus on my data analysis procedures.

First literature review. For the first review of the literature, I created tables that laid out the purpose of the study, the conceptual framework, participants/sites of study, independent and dependent variables, or foci of study, methodology, and findings. Each article was read through in its entirety, and as the elements listed above were found, they were input into the table. Once the table was completed, it was saved as a comprehensive file on my computer for later reference. I printed the tables and cut them out to allow for ease while I went through the categorization process.

I utilized constant comparative analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) to code the articles and decide upon categories. As I decided upon categories for the articles, I would compare each article with the last category and see where it appeared to fit. I did this for all articles for the first round of categorizing, and I constructed broad names for the categories. As Lincoln and Guba

(1985) put forth based on the work of Glaser and Strauss (1967), I stopped coding and wrote a memo, describing the rules for each category I had constructed. After these memos were constructed, I went through each article again, testing the properties I had come up with and making decisions about where the articles best fit. They were moved as necessary. I decided upon names for categories based on the outcomes investigated. This proved to be problematic with many studies because many were focused on organizational processes that included both teacher and student outcomes. I re-read articles to determine the main focus of particular studies based on variable constructions as well as what the authors discussed most fervently in their findings. When my categories were saturated with well-defined properties, I began the process of summarizing within each category. For the first review, I summarized each article independently, while subsumed within the category. This can be found in Chapter Four.

I then categorized the articles based on a priori methodology codes (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) of qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-methods. This categorization allowed me to discuss the methodologies used within the research and explain the strengths and weaknesses of each approach utilizing examples from the educational leadership literature.

Second literature review. For the second literature review, I followed the same initial steps as I had in the first review by creating tables with the pertinent information about each article. I then printed and cut out each article to allow for ease in categorization. The same constant comparative analysis techniques were employed. I named categories in this second review based upon themes that

emerged from the purpose of the study, conceptual frameworks, and findings. This represents a different categorical approach from my first review. I attempted to use language from the authors to construct categories that best encompassed the overall purpose of the study. It is interesting to note the different categories that emerged from this second literature review. Through my reflection and immersion in philosophical, political, and methodology texts, I could see that my thinking about categorizing this literature had changed. This is not something I can provide a procedure for, but I will discuss this importance in Chapter Five.

Analysis of reviews. To begin to address my second research question, I proceeded with the a priori methodological categorization of all articles found from both reviews. My second research question asked: how have the epistemological, methodological, and ideological histories of educational leadership shaped the focus of the research and literature? I chose to address the methodological piece of this analysis first, thus the choice of a priori methodological categories. The creation of these comprehensive methodological tables allowed me to revisit each article in the table and look for patterns in the focus of study and the methodologies used. This analysis can be found in Chapter Six.

After I had written about the methodological components found across all studies reviewed, I utilized methodological literature, in addition to notebooks from my theoretical research class and my methodological notes journal to assist in the epistemological and ideological analysis of the methodologies within the literature. These resources allowed me to question and challenge my own interpretations while I imposed my analysis on the research I had found. I searched for

counterarguments for statements I made about epistemological and ideological issues, and I included these counterarguments within the analysis in Chapter Six, and addressed them utilizing the research literature. The methodological notes journal I kept allowed me to keep track of any questions, additional references, and reflections I had in order to ensure a thoughtful appraisal of my second research question. I revisited these notebooks to ensure I had answered my own questions about these philosophical issues either through further contemplation or further reading. These reflective sessions helped me to be sure I was triangulating my analysis with the works of additional authors, methodologists, epistemologists, etc. and not making false claims that were incompatible with methodologies or paradigms. Chapter Seven underwent many re-interpretations (Thompson, 1990) as my continued immersion led to new insights.

Testing findings. My findings through the data analysis to this point led me to believe that my research questions had led to a much larger finding than could be found within the philosophical pieces I had addressed. I found myself more concerned with the ontology of the field, and this led to an additional categorization of data. What I found from the epistemological and methodological analysis was the emergent theme of the worldview of the field being aligned with a realist ontology aligned with positivism. The data had showed me that the manifestation of this ontology was an adherence to the use of student achievement data as the focus of epistemology. This led me to make suppositions about its use within the field, and I therefore constructed an a priori category of studies that used student achievement data and proceeded to construct an additional table. This construction led me to

revisit each article, looking again for evidence of reliance on student achievement data. This table was constructed and can be found in Appendix D.

The construction of this table allowed me to again analyze the research, looking for patterns in both the articles included in this table, and those that were excluded. I relied upon my notes in my research review journal to keep track of the conceptual framework, methodology, and findings of each study to further immerse myself in each study. The results of this analysis can be found also in Chapter Seven.

Ideological Analysis. This analysis represents the thought processes guided by adherence to my theoretical framework and methodology, as explained above. This was accomplished by conducting readings of the work I had previously written for this study, taking careful notes in my ideological analysis journal that represented places where I noted tensions between a democratic purpose for schools and the purpose of schools communicated by the research in educational leadership. The results of this analysis can be found at the end of Chapter Seven.

Trustworthiness and credibility. The work that I have done cannot easily be categorized into a line of inquiry. For this reason, I utilized many sources to be sure I was addressing indicators of quality research in my methods and methodology. Lincoln and Guba (1985), as well as Lincoln (1990) discussed the importance of trustworthiness in naturalistic inquiry. In this study, I did do what seemed “natural”, so for this purpose I am relying upon their indicators to discuss the trustworthiness and credibility of my method. Lincoln and Guba (1985) described trustworthiness as the ability of the inquirer to persuade both themselves and their audience that the findings of a study are worth paying attention to, and

they related trustworthiness criteria in naturalistic studies to internal and external validity, reliability, and objectivity criteria of conventional research (p. 290).

Trustworthiness during the study. I used field journals throughout the study. My theoretical research journal was created when I audited the course on the subject at my university. As I attended class sessions, met with the professor, and read incessantly, I kept the methodological focus of my study in mind. I labeled each meeting with my professor and kept notes of our conversation. After our meeting, I would return to my notes of the conversation and highlight important points, making additional notes about how this information would help to guide me to a theoretical framework. I focused particularly on theoretical methodology that had an emphasis on critique, ideology, and interpretation. I would also write additional questions to bring up during class sessions, and revisit my notebook after classes to see if my questions had been answered and write a response to myself.

My theoretical research journal was also a place that I kept notes from readings I conducted for class. After each reading, I would read my notes, again highlighting important information that would lead to further reading. Additionally, I searched the reference pages of all readings I did for the class and ordered books, articles, and other works cited to continue my inquiry into the topics. I kept all articles organized in a folder on my computer labeled “theoretical research”. I added articles to this folder that were pertinent to my understanding (e.g., Habermas, 1989; Gadamer, 1989; Leonardo, 2003). Additional articles that were cited were added to a folder entitled “theoretical framework” so I knew they would possibly serve as guidelines for the creation of the framework utilized for this study (e.g.,

Deetz & Keersten, 1983; Eisner, 1988). This theoretical research journal was further utilized during the analysis and write-up of my study to assist in the ideological, methodological, and epistemological analysis. I was able to use the highlighted portions of my notebook to ensure understanding and find resources that would assist me in explaining my analysis.

I kept a historical notes journal, a methodology notes journal, and several personal journals. I explained how I utilized the former two journals in the above sections. The personal journals served a reflexive purpose (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In these journals I would write each day after I had read or completed portions of this study. These entries captured my thoughts about theoretical issues, historical connections, and points for analysis. This is also where I began to shape my findings. A review of these journals at several points during each week of my work allowed me to begin making connections between the analyses I had done and play with findings. These personal journals also allowed me to keep track of my own personal experiences and biases that were uncovered during the course of the study, impacting decisions I made about the research process. For example, when I noted the bias I had found in my first review search terms, I wrote about this in my journal, looked through my methodological notes journal, and decided that I had, in fact shown bias based on my newfound understanding of the issues within paradigms due to my wide reading, notes, and reflection.

I mounted safeguards of triangulation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) throughout the study by ensuring communication with members of my dissertation committee.

Through both phone conversations and email communication, I was able to discuss

the historical points, theoretical framework, and data collection and analysis phases with people who had experience within both quantitative, qualitative, and theoretical research. These conversations also served as peer-debriefing (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) sessions where I could share portions of my writing and gain valuable feedback. Through journaling, contact with my committee members, and reading of current events in newspapers, I was able to constantly question the significance of this study and ensure validity through the connections I made with contemporary issues in the news. I would bookmark news stories, and later journal about them, and I also brought up these issues to committee members to see if they agreed upon the relevance of my study to contemporary issues about high stakes testing, leadership, and merit pay in the news.

Trustworthiness after the study. Lincoln and Guba (1985) put forth recommendations for assessing trustworthiness after the completion of a study. These recommendations included attention to truth value, applicability, consistency, and neutrality. The explained that truth value is the confidence in the truth of the findings. This was assessed by revisiting my tables, and searching through articles multiple times to ensure I was representing the studies I reviewed accurately. I conducted this assessment both during and after the completion of my data analysis. I assessed the applicability of my study through interdisciplinary reading. The methods and theoretical frameworks I utilized can be applied to other areas of study, especially within education. For example, a similar investigation into the history of teaching practices, with a current review of the literature, and an analysis of the methodological, epistemological, and ideological histories and contemporary

issues could be conducted utilizing the same theoretical framework and methods I have discussed in this study.

I assessed consistency with trepidation. The embedded thought processes that have comprised this study are difficult to replicate. I attempted to document carefully my thought processes and decision making points in this chapter to facilitate the replication of my study. The neutrality of this study was assessed throughout, and is documented in my personal reflection journals. These journals document my own misunderstandings, questions, and thoughts about the philosophies of science and served as anchoring points for me to continue expanding my knowledge and thinking with regard to this study.

Credibility and transferability. A strength of this study is the prolonged immersion in the literature within the field of educational leadership, theoretical literature, and interdisciplinary literature around organizational theories and related literature to leadership in general. Over the past 18 months, I have spent some part of each day immersed in the literature, taking notes, having conversations, and generally contemplating these issues. The data collection and analysis phases of this study were intense. I spent fourteen days, and at least eight hours of those days working on the first literature review, and I was in constant contact with the research literature, conducting all reading and analysis during that time. For the second phase of this study, I spent eight additional months with a minimum of five working days a week, and an additional minimum of six hours per day immersed in the theoretical literature and conducting my second analysis.

During this time of prolonged immersion with the literature, peer de-briefing occurred with my professors on at least a bi-weekly basis. I also conducted negative case analysis (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) by revising my interpretations of the philosophies of science until I arrived at my conclusion.

I assessed transferability through my reflections on the philosophy of science. I determined that the history of science as documented by other authors (e.g., Kuhn, 1996; Foster, 2002; Shaker & Heilman, 2004) has a profound effect on other areas of study, thus the interpretation and analysis I completed for this study would apply to other lines of inquiry. I also concluded through this reflection that my critique must continue to happen in other contexts of educational leadership to ensure that it is continually shaped by important processes within the education system, and not falling back into the same positivist thinking that has proliferated within the field. Constant reflection, interpretation, connection to the past, and critique are the only ways in which this can happen (Dewey, 1916/2009).

My final assessment of transferability is my audit trail. My journals, and further documentation in the form of organized folders on my computer to keep track of reading and research, the spreadsheets documenting my research review processes (as discussed in Chapters Four and Five), and the tables I created all serve as ways to document the transferability to other contexts.

Positionality. Although in my style of writing many inferences can be made about my position within this research, it is important that I make it explicit. I do not claim an objective approach to this study, but I have employed many methods to ensure I have been aware of my own presuppositions, misunderstandings, and

previous experiences. The processes of distancing and self-understanding, as I have described, have assisted me in keeping my own personal biases in mind and utilizing methods to ensure I was not just finding what I wanted to in the course of this study.

I have been an elementary classroom teacher, and I have worked as both a special and general education teacher. In the three schools where I have worked, I have been personally impacted by the beliefs, words, and actions of leaders at my school. I have also witnessed and been keenly aware of the impact these leaders have had on other teachers, students, and the community. I have had many negative experiences with school leaders, but I have also been fortunate enough to work with principals who truly emanate the principles of democracy, social justice, and community building that is needed to ensure more positive outcomes for students. I have experienced the accountability ideology, and I have worked with those who do not question it, and those who work tirelessly against it for the good of students.

I have completed the requirements for my administrative license, and I have stepped in the shoes of a school administrator while completing my internship for this certification program. I have experienced the difficulties that come from being in charge of an entire school, the problems that arise with time management, and personnel, and the joys of being able to collaborate with teachers after observing their classrooms. Although I have not been a principal, I have taken on many leadership roles within the schools where I have worked. I understand the day to day pressures and challenges from the perspective of both teachers and administrators.

As a researcher, I consider myself positioned within this field of educational leadership, and education in a more broad sense. After spending so much time enveloped in the educational leadership literature, it is impossible to feel like an “outsider”. I acknowledge the subjectivity that is inherent in my interpretation of the field, but I have discussed the methods I used to address the trustworthiness and credibility of my study. I subscribe to a critical realist ontology that the reality of justice, equality, and freedom should be an end realized for all people. I do believe that our realities are constructed around our own presuppositions and experiences, but this is no reason not to strive for a common understanding of these principles. Epistemologically, I believe that what counts as knowledge is anything that can be practically used to help realize more socially just, democratic ends for children in schools. Methodologically, I think that there are many ways of knowing, but researchers must be aware of the inherent biases in methodologies and consciously make choices about methodology with these biases in mind. I am positioned as a co-creator in this study. I gained understanding and contributed to the constructions through my own learning about the philosophical issues in the field. I was familiar with many researchers, (English, Foster) and relied heavily upon their work because I agreed with their reasoning and arguments. I also sought out opposition for their work (Willower, Donmoyer) to ensure I had an understanding of the multi-faceted nature of argument about deep philosophical issues like paradigms, epistemologies, and methodologies. I was constructed by this study as much as it was constructed by me. Through the use of interpretive and analytical methods, I have attempted to ensure this construction is one that others may see

value in, and could replicate for themselves as closely as is possible for this type of contemplative research.

Guidelines for interpretation. I discussed the guidelines for interpretation in my methodology section above, but I will describe them briefly here as well. The constant contact with the theoretical literature was essential to my interpretation and analysis. My journals served as places where I could grapple with the deep issues within the philosophies of science and keep a keen focus on the purpose of my study. I would often rewrite my research questions in the middle of reading to be sure that I was thinking about the focus of my study while reading and extracting the pertinent information. The methodological books (e.g. Guba, 1990; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Morrow & Brown, 1994; English, 2011; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011) I read were replete with post-it notes, highlights, and notes in the margin where I would describe how the information I read was related to the analytical focus of my study. The universal principles of hermeneutics (Gallagher, 1992), the tenets of critical hermeneutics (Gallagher, 1992; Habermas, 1989; Thompson, 1981, 1990), and the standards for humanities-oriented research (AERA, 2009) served as interpretive guidelines throughout this study. I had these works on hand easily, referenced them frequently, and continued to journal about my findings. The key to my interpretive process is the reliance on wide literature sources, and the constant use and review of my own journals to keep track of my own growth, development, and interpretive abilities.

Though this research process was far from a linear undertaking, I hope that my reader has a better understanding of how I went about this study so that

application of my theoretical framework, methodology, and methods may be possible.

Chapter 3

The History of Theory in Educational Leadership

Child Labor and Public Schooling

Educational leadership has been affected by many different movements and reforms in the history of the United States. Though education has been present in our society from the earliest days of colonization, it has taken many different forms and roles throughout the development of the country (Collins, 1979, Mintz, 2004). It is important to understand how public education became such a strong force, and how the development of education as a science spurred the realization of educational administration and leadership as a field. Illuminating these developments facilitates insight into the development of prominent theories and ideologies within education.

Child labor and education are very closely intertwined, and no discussion of the history of education would be complete without understanding how the two movements relate to each other (Bogotch, 2011; Hindman, 2002). From colonization up through the industrial boom in the US, children were seen very differently than they are today (Collins, 1979). Child labor and the welfare of children were issues that were not seen as problematic, and Hindman (2002) gave many examples of this characterization of children in his appraisal of the history of child labor in America. Children were viewed as a means of providing profits to families, especially families in poverty or enduring hardship (Mintz, 2004). According to both Puritan and Quaker religious beliefs, idleness was a sin, so with no other alternatives for the masses of children, work was a natural endeavor for them to take on (Hindman,

2002). Protestant work ethics also fell in line with views on working as a moral endeavor (Bogotch, 2011; Collins, 1979), so the dominant beliefs in America during this time period supported and encouraged the work of children. In fact, there were times in the 18th and 19th centuries that child un- or underemployment were viewed as problematic, and the focus of reform during these periods was to find ways to put children to work. These earlier reforms, to the contrary of solving the problem of child labor would later prove to be obstacles in the attempts to regulate the exploitation of children in industry (Hindman, 2002).

Some of the solutions to this problem of un- or underemployment were to create “spinning schools”, as some of the early manufactories were called (Hindman, 2002). These schools touted their educative purpose when recruiting young women to attend. As the Industrial Revolution took hold after the Civil War, the need for child labor was imperative to the growth and financial success of most industries (Abbott, 1908; Hindman, 2002). Abbott (1908) cited how this system of beliefs was “skillfully used by friends of industry who viewed children as instruments for developing natural resources” (p. 37). The abolition of slavery was also an important turning point for the labor market in America, and was considered “the biggest step toward creating a free labor market” (Hindman, 2002, p. 21). This free labor market exploited the cheap and abundant labor sources found in women and children to create dramatic financial gain for those who owned and operated businesses within the many growing industries of the time.

In the late 19th century, the United States was faced with millions of people immigrating to her shores (Collins, 1979). With the mass influx of unskilled labor,

the industries were provided with a steady stream of people to work in the mills, mines, textile and glass industries, to name a few of the most prominent industries in the country (Hindman, 2002). There were also many people who sought to make a profit by providing this highly demanded cheap labor, and many children were coaxed onto ships in Europe headed for America, which would then sell them off as hired labor when they reached their destination (Hindman, 2002). Along with these atrocities were the increasing issues associated with widows and orphans, especially in the urban centers of the country. Many lived in desperate poverty, but this problem could be solved by recruiting them to work in the industries, providing means for widowed women and their children to survive without the work of a husband or father (Hindman, 2002).

Agricultural work was predominantly seen as an honorable way of life during this time, and one that was justified to make use of children's work. The pioneers of the Midwest and western parts of the United States made their living off of farming, and this was often a family enterprise. The yeomanry way of life, as depicted by Hindman (2002), was something that had distinct educative value for children. The young of a family would join their parents and siblings in the fields, but would also be offered many learning experiences in these interactions. The learning that occurred in these settings was seen as preparation for their later life, and was characterized as a noble, honorable way of living (Hindman, 2002; Mintz, 2004).

Those that could not make a living on the farm, and felt the blow of poverty were recruited to mill towns that were created around the building of a mill. These towns sought entire families to come live in the town with the sole purpose of

working at the mill. Families often had to work for family wages, or on the conditions that they would have a certain number of family members committed to working in the mills (Hindman, 2002). While the mill owners talked of the great service they were doing to people living in rural poverty, the conditions were often deplorable, and the wages were skim (Hindman, 2002).

Some organizations sought to help with the specific problem of orphans by sending them off to wholesome families in the agricultural parts of the country (Mintz, 2004). Orphan trains would carry children from New York City into the more rural parts of America with the notion that they would have a chance to live a good life with a family who would adopt them and share with them the rich experiences associated with the farming life (Hindman, 2002). In many cases, this work was exploited, and the educative value was lost to the financial gain that came from having more children working and producing more output for these farms and other industries (Hindman, 2002).

During these times, schooling was not seen as a viable alternative to work (Hindman, 2002). The reasons for this were many. First, schools were not widely available in all states and territories until the early 20th century when all states in the union had written laws providing for state funded public schools (Bogotch, 2011). The trouble of getting children to the school location and the added issue of the school hours not matching the work hours of the parents provided more trouble than they were worth to a majority of families. In addition, schooling for all was just not highly valued in our country at the time due to a lack of a frame of reference, and the employers who drove the quality of life were more interested in the present

conditions than in the benefits that schooling could provide to them in the form of skilled labor in the future (Collins, 1979; Hindman, 2002).

Abbott (1908) put forth that child labor was viewed as a righteous institution by a majority of people before the Industrial Revolution so it carried over naturally into the factories of industry. It was not until the late 1800's and early 1900's that child labor was brought to the national spotlight as an abominable issue that must be resolved in order to realize the doctrine of democracy and freedom for all (Hindman, 2002). Until this point in history, children were seen as belongings, possessions that could earn a wage and contribute to the family's basic living and material needs. Hindman (2002) and Mintz (2003) described how children were seen as pests, criminals, and troublesome if they were not made to be useful through work, and their rights as humans were certainly not included in discussion.

Abbot (1908) said:

That so little interest was taken in the subject until the last two decades is due perhaps, to the fact that our social reform movement belongs to recent, if not contemporary history. A consciousness of our social sins today does not mean that they are of sudden growth but rather that public opinion has slowly become enlightened enough to take cognizance of them (p. 37).

Abbott (1908) eloquently illuminated the fact that while child labor was never something that *should* have happened, it certainly has its place in our history. The realization of this fact allowed for the realization of a remedy for an ill that should have been taken care of long ago.

Labor organizations in the late 19th century proved to be the first proponents of both child labor reform and public education (Collins, 1979; Hindman, 2002). Hindman (2002) explained how their propaganda included statements that equal education for all children was a democratic imperative. In addition to their humanitarian reasons for supporting reform, they also wished to protect adult workers from the competition of child workers that also negatively impacted wages for all workers (Collins, 1979; Hindman, 2002).

The creation of the National Child Labor Committee (NCLC) in 1904 was a step in the right direction and their work would serve to bring to the forefront the issues and working environments that children were faced with every day. Much of what is known about child labor in America was illuminated by this organization through studies they supported and implemented (Hindman, 2002). This committee also made it part of their efforts to push for national legislation that would regulate child labor, and these reforms would mirror the push for compensatory public schooling (Adler, 1914). Hindman stated that “success for both child labor and public education came hand in hand” (p. 58). After a series of defeats over many years, the impact of the child labor reform movement driven by the NCLC was realized by a restriction on the ages of child workers and the hours they could work (Hindman, 2002). Laws passed for compulsory schooling and the development of the public school system helped to pave the way for educational avenues that would provide alternatives to combat the notion of idle children.

A connection that is important to make in reviewing the history of child labor in our country is the strong relationship between industry, schooling, and children.

These areas of American life have been bound together in interest throughout the history of the past one hundred years; industry and business have dominated interests in our country since its inception. It is no surprise that the early materialistic, economically grounded ideologies, and the drive for profit continue to be in the forefront of our national interests, especially with regard to education.

Technological advances in the early 1900's found their use during this time of reform. Hindman (2002) discussed how it is unclear if technological advance spurred the decrease of child labor, or if the regulation of child labor was spurred by the increase of available technologies to do more efficient work than that of the unskilled workers. Either way, it is clear to me that during this time, the United States was enamored with scientific and technological progress, and it had an impact on the field of education and educational leadership in many important ways (Haas & Poynor, 2011).

The dominant interests of industry in America will serve as a lens through which to understand the significance of several important developments in education. First, as children moved out of industry into the schools, the schools faced the crisis of having a major influx of students of all ages and meeting their needs accordingly. The public wanted a legitimate reason for paying taxes to fund schools, and also for taking their children out of gainful employment for what was lauded as a more important alternative (Leavitt, 1914). Though schools had been in place in some form since colonization, and their compulsory nature was growing within states, (Collins, 1979; Tyack, 1974), they were just falling into the realm of widespread public interest. People wanted to know that public education was

-serving its purpose in educating their young. This was a time that was ripe for the standards and measures characteristic of science.

The Science of Education

During this time of unrest and uncertainty, people like Edward Thorndike gained prominence (Haas & Paynor, 2011; Lagemann, 1989). Though Thorndike began his career in psychology studying animal behavior, he quickly found a profession in the field of education in the early 1900's (Lagemann, 1989). In his career, Thorndike would have an immense influence on the development and focus of schools, through his behaviorist studies of human behavior and intelligence, creation of tests and textbooks, and use of quantitative methods to drive the field of knowledge creation within the science of education (Beatty, 1998; Haas & Paynor, 2011; Lagemann, 1989). Thorndike believed in the importance of experimentation within education, and while he did not believe there was any one theory of learning, he did believe that any theory was worth nothing unless it could be backed by quantitative results and data (Lagemann, 1989). His works came at an opportune time for the American public and greatly impacted those involved in administration and teaching in schools. America had a "romance with quantification" (Lagemann, 1989, p. 210), and Thorndike quickly became a celebrity within the realm of science in education and his methods of experimentation became the pinnacle of quality and efficiency in education (Haas & Paynor, 2011; Lagemann, 1989).

At the same time that Thorndike was creating his niche in education, Charles Judd began his journey as the head of the College of Education at the University of Chicago in 1909. He was to replace John Dewey in this position, and the direction he

would take the college was very different than his predecessor (Lagemann, 1989). Lagemann (1989) put forth that while Dewey and Judd both found that experimentation in education, as well as the science of education to be of utmost importance, their approaches could not have been more different. Dewey's Laboratory School focused on the participant-observer aspect of research, attempting to fuse theory and practice in a way that would allow the problems of the classroom to be investigated and acted upon as they occurred naturally in this setting (Dewey, 1916/2009). Dewey believed that all people involved in schooling were equal in their stake, and that administrators, teachers, and students alike were all first students of education (Lagemann, 1989). This bond and respect for what each person could bring to the environment of the school was a trademark of Dewey's educational philosophy. Lagemann (1989) discussed how Dewey also valued interdisciplinary study, inviting many professors from outside of education to take part in the advisory of the Laboratory School, thus creating relationships and a sense of community between the school and other institutions, including business.

Judd, on the other hand, believed in professionalizing education (Lagemann, 1989), and this is where the histories discussed above come full circle to understand their impact on educational administration and leadership. Judd believed that each person within the education system had a role to fulfill. Research should be carried out in a laboratory setting, and the researchers should be the ones who dictate the methods to the teachers, who then carry out the results of their scientific findings (Judd, 1925). In this regard, role specification spurred Judd's request to Franklin Bobbitt, who would establish specific courses in educational administration based

on the theory of scientific management (Haas & Paynor, 2011; Lagemann, 1989; Shoho et. al., 2011), which will be discussed in more detail in the next section of this chapter. This, along with other similar progressions in colleges and universities around the nation, is how educational administration as a field of study came to be.

The importance of the distinction of “the field” of educational leadership should not be underplayed (English, 2002). The very birth of educational administration as a course of study in the graduate schools was spurred by the deep admiration and insistence upon scientific study as the cure for the evils of the school system, and the legitimation of educational administration as a field (English, 2005). That the progression of the field of educational administration should be so heavily dependent upon positivistic, quantitative methods of inquiry in the present does not seem quite so mysterious or unfounded when considering how it came to exist; these are the mechanisms it has used to defend itself as a legitimate field (English, 2002; Haas & Paynor, 2011).

While Beatty (1998) put forth that the standardized tests and texts created by Thorndike and mass marketed in the 1920’s and beyond probably had the most lasting effects on schools and children, I suggest that it is this impact paired with the fact that the two major graduate schools of education were headed by Thorndike and Judd during this time (Lagemann, 1989), and through these avenues, the stage was clearly set for educational leadership and education as a whole to have a strict adherence to those methods deemed most scientific and therefore most worthy of attention to improve America’s schools.

Traditional Theories of Educational Leadership

Educational leadership has its roots in theories of organization. In the early part of the 20th century, Frederick Taylor put forth a theory of scientific management to help organizations, particularly industrial businesses, become more efficient (Callahan, 1962; Haas & Paynor, 2011). Taylor's theory was based on a notion of the leader as the manager who employed studies and scientific principles to arrive at organizational goals in the most standardized, efficient way possible (Bogotch, 2011; Callahan, 1962; Judd, 1925; Getzels, Lipham, & Campbell, 1968; Hodgkinson, 1991). With the use of Taylor's model, communication occurred from the top down with the manager assigning tasks and monitoring activity, while productivity was addressed from the bottom of the organization up (Barbour, 2006; Callahan, 1962; Foster, 1986; Getzels et al., 1968).

I have previously mentioned the impact of Charles Judd, the head of the College of Education at the University of Chicago during this time, and his solicitation of Franklin Bobbitt to create a syllabus and course structure to begin a program of education for future educational administrators (Haas & Paynor, 2011; Lagemann, 1989). Judd, with his background in psychology, was a huge proponent of increasing the scientific study of education and the principles of scientific management in particular (Judd, 1925). Lagemann (1989) discussed how Judd's own leadership style embraced these principles, as he believed in a strict division of labor between researchers, administrators, and teachers. He felt strongly that the researchers should dictate the methods of leadership and teaching within a school.

The collective influence of Judd and Bobbitt in the adoption and utilization of scientific management within educational administration was widespread.

In addition to these strong advocates of scientific management, Ellwood Cubberley, an influential superintendent who was also inspired by Taylor's work, came up with an Industrial Theory of Management for schools and set forth to apply these scientific principles to the area of educational administration (Barbour, 2006a). The application of these principles in education was characterized by tight controls on the daily work of subordinates, with the principal in the role of manager putting forth standardized methods and ways of teaching in an efficient manner (Barbour, 2006; Callahan, 1962; Getzels et al., 1968). In this model, uniformity and amount of product output were paramount to efficiently producing the desired outcomes of the organization.

It was also during this time that Weber's bureaucracy was conceptualized and gained an audience in the field of management and leadership (Brown, 2011; English & Steffy, 2011; Foster, 1986; Hodgkinson, 1991; Shapiro, 2006). Weber put forth that there is a hierarchical structure inherent within most organizations, and the way to maximize performance and efficiency is to use this structure to benefit organizational goals (Foster, 1986; Weber, 1946). Both the management and the communication strategies employed in this model occurred from the top of the organization to the bottom, and the leader was conceptualized as the manager of all affairs who used power and influence to control workers (Hodgkinson, 1991; Shapiro, 2006).

One important difference to note between the scientific management theory and bureaucracy is that, although they both conceive the system as being closed to the outside influences of society, Taylor focused on the micro-level of the organization, while bureaucracy was concerned with the macro-level of the organization (Foster, 1986; Hodgkinson, 1991). Taylor's theory implied that if the productivity of the individual worker can be impacted, then the efficiency goals of the organization would be met. Weber's theory postulated that maximizing the use of the hierarchical structures of the organization would produce and provide more efficient and effective outcomes for the organization (Brown, 2011; Foster, 1986; Hodgkinson, 1991; Tyack, 1974).

Tyack (1974) wrote of bureaucracy as the corporatization of schools, and discussed Franklin Bobbitt's influence in achieving this end in the administration of schools. Along with his syllabus and courses in educational administration at the University of Chicago (Lagemann, 1989), he put forth an organizational structure complete with tasks for school administrators that was replicated and adopted across the country as the new reform for the administration of public schools. Tyack (1974) further characterized this corporate model as a shift from mechanical, public bureaucracy to a professional bureaucracy dominated by school boards and superintendents. Schools today continue to be organized as professional bureaucracies, and this exemplifies the historical roots and creates ongoing tensions with emerging theories on educational leadership and school effectiveness (Foster, 1986; Hodgkinson, 1991; Sarason, 1990; Skrtic, 1991).

Illustrations of the Traditional Theories. I reviewed the historical literature to find illustrations of theory and gain a perspective of practitioners' viewpoints within the theory movements. I chose three articles that illustrate the mindset of administrators influenced by the traditional methods of management. Sargeant (1923) wrote an article about the school principal and the future. In his view, it was the principal's job alone to be in touch with teachers, students, and parents within the community to communicate his message. Sargeant also spoke about the managerial aspects of the position such as taking care of the people, the buildings, class sizes, and the community. These tasks were laid out in a way that assumed the principal was the only person capable of managing these tasks, and the ownership of the message communicated to stakeholders belonged to the principal. Emery (1930) also listed the practical duties of the principal, which were similar to the managerial tasks laid out by Sargeant. He referred to his teachers as subordinates and talked about his sole position in being a "goodwill ambassador" to the public (Emery, 1930, p. 393). Axtell (1931) put forth a list of 31 items that should comprise the duties of the principal. These duties were very administrative and managerial in nature, assuming the directed role of the principal as the only person who was in charge of all operations within a school and undoubtedly influenced by Bobbitt's focus on managerial tasks to yield efficiency (Getzels, Lipham, & Campbell, 1968).

These articles illustrated the very authoritarian views of their authors, making a clear distinction between the leader and the led, the principal and the teachers. These brief illustrations allow for a glimpse into the demeanor of the

dominant leadership style in schools at the time, and demonstrate the specialization of tasks and the idea that power belonged to the school leader. It was their job to manage subordinates to maximize school efficiency (Emery, 1930; Sargeant, 1923). They also illustrated the idea of the “successful men” of the time, as Tyack (1974) discussed in his history of American education. These men were thought to be professional, well-trained people who understood the reforms that were needed to centralize the schools and provide effective management to ensure productivity and obedience (Tyack, 1974).

The impact of traditional theories. The traditional theories of organization that dominated the early part of the century have left their mark on the field of educational leadership. Weber’s bureaucratic theory permeates the organization of our schools and has been accepted “because it works”, as noted by Hodgkinson (1991). It has become an implied concept because the bureaucratic system is so deeply engrained within our society, therefore further explorations and discussions of leadership theory have the underlying structure of bureaucracy at their core (Brown, 2011). The theories I describe further will be discussed with the understanding that the education system is organized with hierarchical features, and any attempt to study its structure involves an attempt to manipulate the inner workings of these structures that occur at many levels within the organization (Foster, 1986; Hodgkinson, 1991).

Human Relations Movement

After the rise of scientific management and bureaucracy theories, there was movement towards a focus on human relations (Brown, 2011; Getzels et al., 1968;

Hodgkinson, 1991; Maxcy, 1991; Tyack, 1974). The human relations movement was credited to Mary Parker Follett who, in 1924, argued against the scientific management theory as an effective way to work with such socially driven systems like schools (Barbour, 2006b; Maxcy, 1991), although she was not in the field of education (English, 2005). Her argument was solidified by Mayo's studies of the Hawthorne plants as described in most texts that include a history of educational leadership (Barbour, 2006b; Brown, 2011; Foster, 1986; Getzels et al., 1968; Hodgkinson, 1991; Maxcy, 1991). The Hawthorne studies were intended to support the theory of scientific management by demonstrating that workers could be manipulated by changing their environment (Barbour, 2006b). When the researchers found that the work conditions and the pay put in place by their managers had little to no effect on the worker's productivity, they postulated that it was instead the relationships they had with their co-workers as well as the attention they received from the researchers that accounted for a difference in levels of productivity (Barbour, 2006b; Foster, 1986). Their conclusions led to the identification that it was the perceived ability of the worker by their managers, as well as their social satisfaction with peers that led to greater productivity and job satisfaction. This supported Follett's theories of "dynamic, harmonious human relationships" (Barbour, 2006b, p. 25; Getzels et al., 1968) as the key to increased production in the workplace. Follett saw the workplace as a system of interrelated parts that should not be separated from each other, but grouped to maximize productivity and efficiency (Getzels et al., 1968). A great stress was put upon the

utilization of horizontal communication during this movement, especially between peers (Barbour, 2006b; Foster, 1986).

The idea that leadership interaction and attention influenced workers' productivity led to a shift in the focus of administrators: in the school this meant more of a focus on teachers, students, and communities (Foster, 1986). I believe the context in which this movement gained ground is important. The end of World War II gave rise to a renewed commitment and passion for democracy (Brown, 2011), and this theme added to the focus on the structures of human relationships within the school organization. The purpose of schooling had shifted to a renewed, impassioned focus on creating a democratically schooled society, which appeared to be in line with Dewey's (1916/2009) writing.

This more humanistic approach, however, did not value the work that was produced by communication among peers or think of this as a way to instigate innovation or improvement, it is important to understand the intentions in the use of language focused on democracy and cooperation during this time (Tyack, 1974). These relationships were merely structures that improved worker productivity and helped to run the machine of the workplace: attempts to curb unrest and promote conformity (Getzels et al., 1968; Tyack, 1974). The democratic values were to be taught to students, not enacted within the school institution between principal-teacher interactions or teacher-student interactions (Hodgkinson, 1991; Maxcy, 1991). While this movement signaled a shift in a better direction for workers, it did not signal a voice or acknowledgement of individual motivations or values held by the workers within the hierarchical structure of the organization (Tyack, 1974). I

suggest that the tension between spoken values of democracy, and the actual values of efficiency and control are apparent within this theory movement.

The human relations movement was an important change in thinking for educational institutions but there are notable deficiencies (Foster, 1986). These theories were transactional in nature and required a give and take relationship between the leader and the follower, or the principal and the teacher (Walker, 2002). Manipulation was used as the mechanism of leadership because the theories were based on the premise that human desires, actions, and feelings could be influenced through relationships with others in order to achieve the goals of the organization (Brown, 2011; Foster, 1986; Hodgkinson, 1991; Maxcy, 1991). While teachers may have felt more involved in cooperating and working in groups, they were often expected to arrive at conclusions that had already been pre-determined by their principals (Tyack, 1974).

Human relations movement and educational leadership. Mary Parker Follett understood that human organizations needed a more humanistic approach to management and administration (Barbour, 2006b; Foster, 1986; Getzels et al., 1968). By turning the focus away from individuals working toward the organizational goals, to focusing on a humanistic approach including social interaction as a means to accomplishing goals, she impacted the thinking of future theorists who would build upon this idea (Getzels et al., 1968). For educational leaders during this time, the themes were illustrated in the literature. The focus had shifted to group work and supervision with the end goal of motivating teachers through humanistic approaches such as giving them more attention and being an

approachable leader (Hodgkinson, 1991). The emphasis continued to be on the leader as the expert who held knowledge and gave the directions so that teachers were using approved, standardized methods of teaching in their classrooms.

Illustrations of the human relations movement. Power (1919) indicated a plan for supervision and spoke about the importance of laying out the plan in such a way that teachers would offer their approval and support. This was a direct example of the type of manipulative group work discussed by Tyack (1974). Power (1919) also discussed having group meetings of teachers and he suggested that this type of horizontal communication, characteristic of the human relations movement (Foster, 1986), would improve the instruction of the teachers.

In 1922, Gist and King surveyed teachers about their perceptions of administrators' role in the school. Their results indicated that teachers of the time subscribed to the structure of the human relations movement. According to the authors, they expected their administrators to be professional leaders, taking care of the day-to-day actions of the school and handling difficult situations with poise. These teachers also noted that they wished their administrator to be an expert teacher who modeled lessons and provided feedback to them about their own teaching (Gist & King, 1922). These statements provide support for Follett's theory of harmonious relationships that motivated workers to meet the goals of the school, supported by the positive relationship with their administrator (Getzels et al., 1968).

Perry (1925) suggested that teachers and principals had rights, and the rights of the teachers were only of interest when they involved the interest of the

student. Perry also noted that it was the right of teachers to have adequate supervision, and he suggested that teachers did not know how to do their job well without the knowledgeable supervisor interacting with them regularly to model lessons and give them direction.

Longshore (1926) wrote about the need for the principal to get things done through other people, again emphasizing the interactions with subordinates within the school, and echoing the definition that I discussed in Chapter One that forms the basis of many leadership theories (e.g., Burns, 1978). Woods (1938) argued that school management should be judged by student achievement, the end goal of the school organization, and he also suggested that if teachers participated in management, it would humanize the concept of administration. He went further and explained that if teachers worked together with their peers to solve problems and collect information that this would result in greater job satisfaction, even more so if the efforts were appreciated by the school administrator (Woods, 1938). In 1947, Lange and DeBernardis talked about how leadership was the same across contexts, but that good leadership was based on constructive human relationships. Jordan (1958) asserted that good schools are in the hands of the principal. He was critical of the group-study discussion techniques, but put forth that successful teaching came down to the relationship between the teacher and the principal (Jordan, 1958).

Each of these illustrations supported a greater understanding of how the human relations movement manifested itself in educational leadership. The leader was still the expert, taking on a decisive, managerial role, although emphasis was

placed upon relationships as the guiding factor that would lead them to reach the goals of the institution. The interactions were based upon the work done within the organization and were very straightforward. The relationships were taken at face value; if they existed, they would bolster the esteem of those involved and help achieve the directive goals set forth by administration (Tyack, 1974).

Social Systems Theory

The human relations movement gave way to the movement of a social science or social systems framework (Barbour, 2006b; Foster, 1986; Getzels et al., 1968). A prominent theorist within the social science movement was Chester I. Barnard, who proposed that authority within the organization must be delegated from the bottom up to have any real impact on the growth and development of the organization (Barnard, 1968; Hodgkinson, 1991). Barnard (1968) conceptualized the organization as a complex whole with interrelated parts and he put forth basic elements of an organization. Though influenced by the ideas of Follett, Barnard differed in his approach through a focus on the social behavior of the organization and a call to study this behavior to have a better representation of the phenomenon (Getzels et al., 1968). Barnard (1968) defined the concepts of effectiveness and efficiency, with efficiency meaning the attainment of cooperative purpose, adding that effectiveness was a personal endeavor, the attainment of individual motives and goals. Elaborating on this idea, he recognized the occurrence of both formal and informal features within an organization and noted their interdependence (Barnard, 1968; Getzels et al., 1968). The informal features consisted of individuals within the system that have contact, interactions, and groupings that impact their personal

knowledge, attitudes, emotions, and experiences (Getzels et al., 1968). The three elements he put forth as features of formal organization were communication, willingness to serve, and common purpose (Barnard, 1968; Foster, 1986; Getzels et al., 1968). In social systems theories the leader recognized the underlying interactions and regulated them so they became an asset to the overall goals of the institution; there was no formal organization without the informal (Getzels et al., 1968).

According to Foster (1986), Barnard also began the conversation about moral leadership and cooperation within an organization. This view of the organization as a complex system of interrelated parts was a very distinct shift from the early theories of scientific management and bureaucracy, and was most likely influenced by the work of Mary Parker Follett (Getzels et al., 1968). Although Barnard's theory contributed greatly to thinking about organizations as complex systems with human relationships and social behaviors as important components, he failed to address the power relationships and the political factors inherent when people have hierarchical roles in an organization designed to serve the society in which it is present (Foster, 1986). He also continued to subscribe to the idea of rationality within administrative theory: If an understanding could be reached about the contextual factors that impact leaders, this greater conceptualization would lead to absolute truths and ways to manage people and organizations (Getzels et al., 1968). His work perpetuated the previous theories that conceptualized organizations as closed systems, with little to no influence from the outside effects of society (Barbour, 2006a).

A key theory that arose within the social systems movement was McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y (Barbour, 2006a; Hodgkinson, 1991). According to Hodgkinson (1991), Theory X put forth the idea that people have an inherent desire to avoid work and must be motivated to work toward organizational goals through coercion, control, and threats of punishment. Theory X type people were posited to dislike responsibility and "strive for security and the direction of leaders to feel comfort and stability" (Hodgkinson, 1991, p. 71). Theory Y represented a more positive view of the worker. Theory Y suggested that people like to work because it is a natural state of being, and the key to motivation in achieving an organization's goals is commitment of the workers (Hodgkinson, 1991). According to this theory, commitment was best affirmed by rewards, and the rewards that people found most motivating were those that satisfied their ego and helped them attain self-actualization (Hodgkinson, 1991). Important in the description of Theory Y was the belief that creativity, ingenuity, and imagination are characteristics that all people possess, and it was the job of the leader to "spark the growth and realization of these characteristics to further the goals of the organization" (Hodgkinson, 1991, p. 72).

The theories discussed within the social sciences movement can be classified as closed system theories that saw the organization as an "organismic whole" (Goodlad, 1955, p. 2) which consisted of many complex interactions and relationships within the organization, its goals, and structures, but these interactions were not influenced by the outside world. These theories also belong to the rational school of thought where there are scientific ways to address behaviors

and clear cut answers can be formulated to intervene and find a way to lead and manage in the most productive and efficient way possible through the existing structures of the institution (Foster, 1986; Hodgkinson, 1991).

Social systems theory and educational leadership. The social systems theory again changed the approach and demeanor of leaders within the schools. Barnard's (1968) contribution of the three aspects of leadership: (a) a focus on communication, (b) willingness to serve, and (c) a common purpose, opened the door for future theories to include these elements within their framework. I describe these as closed system perspectives because the focus continued to be only upon what happened within the organization itself, with little regard for the outside factors (Hodgkinson, 1991). Foster (1986) discussed how theories in the social systems framework in the 1980's had evolved to an open systems perspective that considered the outside influences which impact a workers' motivation. The use of group work and common purpose to align the mission of the organization was an important contribution, and these theories sought to use relationships as a way to improve the organization and the attainment of goals, although some have argued that these team arrangements Barnard described were merely another way to manipulate people through control of the group (Foster, 1986). In the early social systems theories, the worker did not have an active role in shaping common purpose and participating in how it was communicated, and I argue that democratic purposes were the discursive tools used to align societal purpose through the mechanism of working in groups to achieve common goals (Brown, 2011; Maxcy, 1991).

Illustrations of social systems theory. Several notable pieces arose while reviewing the historical literature. In 1926, McSkimmon put forth the role of the principal as an interpreter. She claimed that the interpretation of students' test results, and reports to the school board were of utmost importance to the leader of the school. These points illustrate the absolute manager and expert leader from earlier theories. McSkimmon also illustrated the earlier human relations movement when she stated that helping teachers to improve their own practice would be the true test of a principal's leadership, supporting the presumption that the principal was the one to impart knowledge to the teacher, but also illustrating the common thread of instructional leadership that weaves its way through all theories in educational leadership. What was more progressive in this article was the discussion about respecting the teachers' time, and using relevant meetings to inspire, encourage growth, and solidify common interest (McSkimmon, 1926). I found that this article clearly illustrated an essential element of the social science movement because of its emphasis on coming together for a common purpose. The inspirational role of a leader is also an important element of transformational leadership, which is prominent in contemporary thought.

Herrick (1947) discussed how leadership was not the command over people, but the command over problems, demonstrating Barnard's (1968) theory of the leader and the workers coming together to meet the needs of the organization. Herrick also discussed the importance of accepting individual teachers, showing a desire for learning, leading group discussions and guiding group work, and the ability to develop and use both a personal and professional philosophy about life

and education. This movement away from the leader as the head of people because of their labeled position was an illustration of Barnard's (1968) notion of authority from the bottom-up, built from interaction and authority instead of from position (Foster, 1986; Hodgkinson, 1991).

Human Resources Movement

Burns (1978) conveyed theories of transactional and transformational leaders. Though some texts characterize transformational leadership in the realm of the human relations movement (Foster, 1986), I think it is clear that he had an understanding of the leader's role in the organization as an open system (Burns, 1978). An open system can be defined as an organization that interacts with the environment in which it is situated (Bastedo, 2006). For example, the school as an organization or institution does not merely exist, independent of external influences. It is constantly being enacted upon by societal, cultural, and political influences that affect the way it operates (Bastedo, 2006; Foster, 1986; Hodgkinson, 1991). With this open system in mind, Burns (1978) said that "leadership is the reciprocal process of mobilizing, by person with certain motives and values, various economic, political, and other resources, in a context of competition and conflict, in order to realize goals independently or mutually held by both leaders and followers" (p. 425). By recognizing the existence of economic, political, and other resources, I believe he implied an understanding about the nature of organizations as systems influenced by outside factors, and I put forth that his statement about independent or mutually held goals recognized the existence of people as separate entities from

the organization, interacting within the institution but also motivated by factors other than the goals of the organization they work within.

The process of exchanging services for the attainment of these goals, both collective and independent, is what Burns (1978) termed transactional leadership. The work that Burns (1978) did with transactional leadership I think was certainly influenced by the work of Getzels and Guba (1957), who examined the dialectic tension between the idiographic and nomothetic features of relations within an organization and examined the idiographic, nomothetic and transactional leadership styles. Idiographic was referred to as the individual traits and motivations of people within the organization while nomothetic referred to the properties of the group and the collective rules and motivation of the collective organization (Foster, 1986; Getzels & Guba, 1957; Hodgkinson, 1991). Getzels and Guba presented a framework, which outlined the tension between institutional roles and individual roles. The authors hypothesized how different leadership styles and approaches could be taken to achieve the same end goals of the institution (Getzels & Guba, 1957). Hodgkinson (1991) agreed that it was the responsibility of the leader to reconcile the tensions between the idiographic and nomothetic roles.

Transactional leadership was concerned with the values of means within the relationships of leaders and followers (Burns, 1978). Examples of the means Burns put forth are honesty, common purpose, honoring commitments, and fairness. The transactional nature of reconciling the nomothetic and idiographic realms involved an exchange between the leader and the followers (Hodgkinson, 1991). The followers brought their personality, needs, and dispositions to the group, and the

leaders could reconcile these individual properties by using nomothetic properties, the inherent role expectations and rules underlying the institutional culture, to manipulate the individual to work toward the end goals of the organization with greater effectiveness and efficiency (Burns, 1978; Getzels & Guba, 1957; Hodgkinson, 1991; Sackney & Mitchell, 2002). I suggest that the contributions Burns made to the field of educational leadership literature are immense, and though he discussed transactional leadership, his general theory of leadership encompassed both transactional leadership and transformational leadership (Burns, 1978) which will be revisited after a thorough discussion of the impact of transactional leadership on theories of administration.

There is a great amount of literature related to transactional leadership, and leadership frameworks. Situational theory, contingency theory, path-goal leadership theory, and resource dependency theory have come from the work of Getzels and Guba (1957) as well as Burns' (1978) assertions and descriptions of transactional leadership (Foster, 1986; Hodgkinson, 1991; Walker, 2002). Contingency theory was cited by Foster (1986) to be the most prominent approach to organizations within his time, and he went on to describe contingency theory as the means to move between bureaucratic and human relations type leadership behaviors to adjust to any situation. Getzels and Guba (1957) discussed how the leader should be able to choose a style that they felt would bring about the greatest efficiency and effectiveness for achieving the goals of the institution. Foster (1986) described transactional theory with a foundation in the traditional roots of organization theory and he argued that transactional theory viewed organizations as closed

systems without any regard for the environment, although in my opinion Burns' (1978) descriptions contradicted this view. I argue that Burns (1978) may have placed more emphasis on the organization as a contained system, but my interpretation of his writing is that he had a wider view of the organization within the influences of the environment.

Other theories closely related to contingency theory and the work of Burns (1978), Barnard (1968) and Getzels and Guba (1957) are situational theories. These theories focus on situational factors of the organization instead of leadership behaviors and interactions in isolation (Hodgkinson, 1991; Maxcy, 1991). Situational theories attempt to look at the features of an organization that impact leadership behavior. The variables investigated within situational theories are structural features of the organization, organizational climate, and the roles and characteristics of both the leaders and other people involved in the organization (Maxcy, 1991). Situational theories are based on the notion that a leader must perform dual functions. Earlier studies, such as the Ohio Leadership Studies cited by Bruner (2011), asserted that one function was consideration, in which the relationship behavior of the leader toward the followers is of importance. The second function was to initiate structure with a focus on the task behaviors and how their roles were defined or structured (Bruner, 2011; Foster, 1986). I contend that this theory built upon the work of Getzel and Guba (1957) because they focused on the choice between nomothetic, idiographic, and transactional leadership styles, while situational theories included attention to both nomothetic and idiographic elements with the idea that the exchanges were transactional in nature. Situational

leadership is based on the assumption that a leader must change their style to fit the context of the given situation.

Fiedler (as cited in Foster, 1986) added to this body of research by attempting to isolate leadership behaviors within different situational contexts. Many other researchers have added to this body of knowledge as well (Foster, 1986). Hersey and Blanchard came up with a leadership model based on the functions of the leader exhibiting task behavior, relationship behavior, and knowing the maturity level of subordinates to perform tasks and functions related to the organizational goals (Bruner, 2011; Foster, 1986, Maxcy, 1991). Hersey and Blanchard's work is supported by Burns' (1978) discussion of the role of leaders in moving followers through levels of need or stages of moral development.

Other works in the area of contingency and situational leadership theory include Vroom and Yetton's contingency model, and path-goal theory as cited in Bruner (2011), Foster (1986), Maxcy (1991), and Hodgkinson (1991). Foster (1986) described these theories and put forth that Vroom and Yetton's approach was characterized by the idea that leaders can make the best decision in a situation by determining the nature of the decision and utilizing the most appropriate style for a given situation. Path-goal theory is described as the way a leader helps subordinates achieve goals by guiding them to particular directions that lead to the end goals of the organization valued most by the workers (Foster, 1986).

Transformational leadership is a concept that has emerged many times in the literature (Barbour, 2011; Burns, 1978; Bruner, 2011; Foster, 1986; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Maxcy, 1991; Hodgkinson, 1991). Burns (1978) distinguished between

transactional and transformational leadership by clarifying that transformational leadership was concerned with end goals such as justice, fairness, equality, liberty, and freedom. He described the assessment of this type of leader when he said “the test of their leadership function is their contribution to change, measured by purpose drawn from collective motives and values” (Burns, 1978, p. 427).

Transformational leadership has been characterized as charismatic in nature (Fullan, 2001; Hodgkinson, 1991), with an emphasis on the belief that the leaders have the ability to change and motivate individuals, transforming them to eager participants in working toward the higher goals of the organization (Williams, Ricciardi & Blackburn, 2006). Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) defined transformational leadership as setting direction, helping people, and redesigning the organization, and they further explained how transactional and managerial functions have a purpose for the effective leader in different settings.

Some theorists, such as Herbert Simon (as cited in Foster, 1986) have been hesitant to discuss values and morals within educational leadership. This view of value-free leadership asserts that facts are above values and should be paramount when conceptualizing and testing theories of leadership (Foster, 1986). Burns (1978), Foster (1986), and Hodgkinson (1991) are notable examples of authors who understood and attempted to explain the value-laden nature of leadership.

Transformational leadership has evolved into a field of study where the focus is on the moral agency of the administrator, attempting to understand how the value system and morals of the person in charge can inspire and motivate followers (Fullan, 2001; Williams et al., 2006). Although transformational leadership came

into view within the human resources movement in leadership theory, it continues to be cited in literature and remains a focus of contemplation, theorizing, and research (Fullan, 2001; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Muhammad, 2009; Williams et al., 2006)

Human resources movement and educational leadership. The theories and ideas from the human resources movement attempted to look more closely at how relationships and dispositions of individuals interacted with the environment of the organization. Prominent differences from earlier theories are the open systems view of organizations as a part of the environment that influences individual and group norms and behaviors, as well as influencing the expectations and goals of the organization. I find that this is especially important for schools because they are constantly being enacted upon by forces outside of the institution. In fact, the meaning of an institution, according to Getzels and Guba (1957), cannot be removed from the wider society, which dictates and shapes its goals and purposes. Another notable difference within this theory movement is the more prominent mention and description of enacted democratic features within the organization (Foster, 1986). The historical structure of bureaucracy, the hierarchical structure, and its continued imposition as a nested feature of educational institutions has led to critical and postmodern fields of thought within educational leadership (Foster, 1986; Hodgkinson, 1991; Maxcy, 1991). After I offer a brief glimpse into illustrations of the human resource movement within the literature, I will focus the discussion on the contemporary theories that have surfaced in the field of educational leadership.

Illustrations of the human resource movement. Armstrong (1947), Gann (1947), and Ragan (1955) asserted the important role that schools must have in mirroring the democratic ideals of society. This clearly definitive open systems view of leadership was apparent in their calls for leaders to understand how schools must have and contribute to a vision for society (Armstrong, 1947). What was also common within these articles was a focus on the supervisory functions of the principals. Traces of this emphasis from the human relations and earlier traditional management theories that put forth the leader as the one conveying knowledge to the workers both individually and in group settings were evident (Armstrong, 1947; Gann, 1947; Ragan, 1955). I suggest that the supervisory emphasis is also a further illustration of the instructional leadership that has evolved in contemporary theory.

The writing of Paulsen (1958), Ramsey (1961), and Krajewski (1979) were a few illustrations of leadership styles more transactional in nature. Ramsey (1961) wrote of the dual nature of leadership with its formal and informal authority. He put forth that a principal as an instructional leader would not have to use his formal authority, which grounded his ideas in situational or contingent leadership theories. Similarly, Paulsen (1958) noted the importance of a leader to adapt to changing social situations, and he also spoke of the growth of the community as a part of the responsibility of the organization. This view exemplified the premises of situational and contingency theories by mentioning the choice of leadership style within the dynamic social environment of the school, and the open systems notion of community being impacted and changed by the organization (Krajewski, 1979; Paulsen, 1958).

Most prominent in the historical literature I reviewed are the airs of transformational leadership that rise through the words of many authors writing about the role of educational leaders. These articles strongly communicated the function of democracy and moral obligation to society within the school (Keliher, 1947; Koopman, 1947), illustrating the democratic emphasis attributed to the earlier human relations phase. What I believe makes them transformational in nature is the emphasis put on the role of the leader to motivate and inspire the democratic action of their followers (Burns, 1978). Koopman (1947) specifically put forth that the leader must have a demonstrable faith in the democratic process and feel a moral obligation to clear the way for democratic action with the institution, while Keliher (1947) used strong rhetoric claiming that leaders must embrace the democratic ideals of society and support teachers in growing and changing within the organization.

Heichberger (1975) and Goodlad (1955) wrote of change processes and considerations of the wider society. Goodlad (1955) described the schools' role within the larger societal context, and went on to note considerations that a principal must make to inspire and motivate the followers within the school. Heichberger (1975) put forth that effective leadership must come from a strong philosophical base with attention paid to the environment, and he further posited that dynamic leadership was essential to change and growth within the school. Though spanning generations of thought within educational leadership, these rhetorical clues allowed me to formulate a relationship between their views and the

theories of Getzels and Guba (1957), Burns (1978) and the work that followed their contributions to this field.

Critical and Postmodern Theories

I argue that what has been largely missing from the theoretical literature discussed thus far is a discussion and question of the power relationships and structures that were overwhelmingly accepted as the norm for educational organizations in the historical literature. Critical and postmodern theories are manifestations of critical disagreement with previous theories and epistemologies, but they have important distinctive features. These theories move into new directions, and also seek to question the implications of the inherent power relationships and structures within institutions that have produced conditions of ineffectiveness, doubt in purpose, and inequity in opportunities for those within the system of education from administrators to students (Brown, 2011; Foster, 1986; Hodgkinson, 1991; Maxcy, 1991).

Critical Theory. Though it only gained footing in the second half of the 20th century in educational leadership thought and research (Shoho et. al., 2011), examples of critical theory are found in the literature as early as 1923 (Barbour, 2011). Scholars in the Frankfurt School sought to adapt Marxism theories to the theoretical and political needs of the time (Barbour, 2011; Morrow & Brown, 1994). These philosophers were opposed to the notion of closed systems and absolute truths. They put forth that humans create their society and their history (Barbour, 2011). According to Barbour, they also argued that society should be full of free actors that have the ability to make their own choices and have their own individual

purposes driven by personal values and creativity. Barbour outlined the main principles of critical theory in educational administration to be “inclusion of several disciplines of the social sciences, a historical perspective, oppositional (dialectical) contradictions, using formal rationality to deny power classes of citizens, emancipation, and the elimination of social justice” (p. 154). Sarason (1990) described a critical stance on our education system when he stated that “because we have these institutions is no excuse to use them as we have, to continue to fly in the face of their intractability to improvement” (p. 149). Foster (1986) put forth that individuals have the power to recreate their organizations, but often do not realize that what is in place is not historically determined. He also discussed the role of the leader in demystifying and examining the structures in which leadership occurs. Indeed, critical theories have attempted to question and study these structures with the end goal of arriving at emancipatory knowledge (Shakeshaft, 2011; Young & Lopez, 2011).

Postmodern Theories. Lincoln et al. (2011) discussed postmodern thought and the participatory research paradigm. Postmodernism has been described as a set of beliefs that hold no version of reality to be better than another, and Denzin and Lincoln (2011) described postmodernism as an overarching field of thought that does not privilege any single authority, method, or paradigm (p. 16). English (2001) spoke of postmodernism as a critique of modernistic views of science (positivism), and has written extensively about this stance toward educational administration. This position has added to the thought within the educational leadership literature by rejecting positivist notions of science, and encouraging the

questioning of all knowledge within the field (English, 2001). I have found this field of thought is difficult to define, and is often associated with critical theories. A major principle of postmodernism is the rejection of metanarratives that govern thought and research without being questioned (Niesche, 2005). According to Foster (2002), the established narratives of social life constitute the reality that is constructed. A major criticism of postmodernity is its seemingly laissez-faire style that anything goes as long as it works (Willower, 1998). Postmodernism, as a contribution to the thought in educational leadership, I suggest is constituted by its questioning of what counts as absolute knowledge, and its acknowledgement of many ways of knowing. It reveals a critical stance toward anything claiming authority (Grogan, 2004), but runs into problems when confronted with its own distrust of metanarratives as postmodern thinkers attempt to make calls for change (Willower, 1998).

Critical theory and postmodernism. The move from an objective, fact-oriented, value-free science of administration towards a subjective focus on values and context is a mark of both critical and postmodern theories, although some would argue that postmodernism rejects theories of values (Willower, 1998). As I have reflected upon postmodernism and critical theory, I have contemplated the notion of narratives and ideology. I will discuss my own understanding of these concepts before I move forward with some of the important literature within this realm of theory development.

In my conception, I propose that some of the criticisms of postmodernism may be due to the dialectical nature of renaming ideas in an attempt to reframe the way they are conceived. For example, narratives are the stories that permeate

society, the big ideas that take hold and become part of our being and history (Niesche, 2005). Although it is more artful to refer to these systems of beliefs as narratives, I think that ideologies and narratives are different names for the same terms. Therefore, to get past the criticism of postmodernism as being against metanarratives but then attempting to put forth new, counter-narratives (Grogan, 2004), it could instead be thought of in terms of ideology. Postmodern thinkers are against the unquestioned ideologies (metanarratives) that dominate social life. I believe the intersection of narratives and ideology could give the opportunity for critiques of ideology to go past merely documenting the impact of unquestioned beliefs to proposing the counter-narratives spoken of within specific post-modern thought (Grogan, 2004).

Hodgkinson (1991) wrote extensively about the role of values within educational leadership and analyzed the major movements within previous theory focusing on this role throughout each movement. According to Hodgkinson (1991), there are five levels of values to consider within leadership in education. He stated that “the educational leader is caught up in a field of values in which he is forced to choose and act” (Hodgkinson, 1991, p. 43). His field of action consisted of: (a) individual values at the core followed by, (b) group culture that is characterized by informal organization purposes (c) the organizational culture with a focus on organizational purposes followed by (d) the sub-culture which is denoted by community purposes and finally encompassing all other values is (e) culture, which is described as the “social culture in space and time which is a function of geography and history and is expressed in those values represented by the German concept of

the spirit of the times” (Hodgkinson, 1991, p. 44). Both Foster (1986) and Hodgkinson (1991) argued for a renewed focus on the Aristotelian concept of praxis. This concept was essentially the idea that both values and facts can drive purposeful, meaningful, and moral decisions (Hodgkinson, 1991). The infiltration of focus on values within educational leadership paid close attention to the fact that schools are socially constructed entities that exist only because of society which consists of individuals who have individual, collective, and cultural values that drive the construction of organizations (Hodgkinson, 1991; Foster, 1986).

Several theories have their place within postmodern frameworks. I find that qualities of previous theories are found within each of these realms, as history has created the space for them to come into existence. Chaos theory is a mathematical notion that attempted to explain the chaotic happenings with certain mathematical and scientific fields of study (Blount, 2006). It is applicable to educational leadership because of the unpredictable nature of schools, and its contribution to postmodern thought is its move away from viewing systems as linear, predictable, and controllable (Blount, 2006). Complexity theory is closely related to chaos theory, but has had stronger impact on the field of educational leadership (Marion & McGee, 2006). Where chaos theory did not leave enough structure for an organization to carry on norms, histories, and memories, complexity theory did (Marion & McGee, 2006). Complexity theory realizes the inherent non-linear structures of organizations such as schools and employs a bottom-up, rather than top-down strategy for management and leading. Marion and McGee (2006) explained that complex systems are enhanced by agents that can stimulate creativity: they are

adaptive, and best suited for knowledge-producing organizations. Senge (2000) is a proponent of learning organizations and has written extensively about complex learning organizations for both the business industry and education. Fullan (2001) is another prominent thinker in this postmodern arena, and his work tends to focus on the leader as an agent of change within change processes in organizations like schools.

As the scope of educational leadership theory has widened, so too have the numerous labels and models. It would be impossible to list the various names and emergent theories from this field of thought in total, so I will focus on the most common aspects I have found while reviewing the literature.

Critical and postmodern thoughts are both encompassed by the questioning of knowledge within institutions, roles, social and political influences that create and impact organizations (Barbour, 2011; Brown, 2011; Foster, 1986; Hodgkinson, 1991; Maxcy, 1991). The understanding of how humans shape their own history and society, and a focus on the historical perspective of organizations are inherent within many of the critical views (Barbour, 2011). The focus on purpose, individual contribution to a mutually agreed upon goal, mission, or vision is also a trademark of critical thought, and could be considered the counter-narratives that Grogan (2004) wrote about. The belief that individuals come together within an organization that has the ability to change, grow, and self-renew based on its changing culture and dynamic societal demands and pressures is also common within these modes of thinking (Barbour, 2011; Bogotch, 2011; Foster, 1986; Fullan, year; Hodgkinson, 1991; Maxcy, 1991; Sarason, 1990; Senge, 2000).

Critical and postmodern theories and educational leadership. This shift in thinking represents leadership based in values, but no longer are they focused only on the values of the individual leader. Creating school culture to represent the differing views of those who occupy the institution is an essential part of integrating postmodern thought into the practice of leadership. The ability and motivation to question the previous theories and their applications have been promulgated by such authors as Foster (1986), Maxcy (1991), and Sarason (1990). These authors provided detailed accounts of the history and development of thought within this field of study, and it was their critical analysis of the emerging paradigms of critical and postmodern thought that called for a movement away from adopting a one best system approach to educational leadership (Tyack, 1974). Critical theory adds to contemporary thought on leadership by maintaining a focus on the historical construction of our current realities as well as questioning organizations, leadership practices and power, and focusing on the end goals of equity and justice for those who have been marginalized by the social constructions of our society (Foster, 1986). In my opinion, based on the literature, it is the hope of many contemporary authors and researchers that the focus continue to move toward more artistic, and moral imperatives that honor each being within the organization by valuing their truly shared purpose and creating systems that have the ability to sustain themselves by adapting to ever changing social situations (Foster, 1986; Fullan, 2001; Maxcy, 1991; Senge, 2000).

Illustrations of critical and postmodern thought in educational Leadership. There are many schools of thought within the critical field of research,

so I will choose to highlight those that are most prominent. A focus on critical theory through a feminist viewpoint has been a focus of theory and research as discussed by Shakeshaft (2011) when she suggested an agenda for 21st century leaders and researchers. Shakeshaft (2011) has been a prominent voice in feminist research in educational leadership and she seeks to understand and explain how the traditional modes of thought and organization have impacted the historical and present role of women in this field (Shakeshaft, 2011).

Other focus has been on the area of queer theory, investigating the inequities imposed upon members of homosexual communities and how it has impacted their role within educational leadership (Young & Lopez, 2011). Young and Lopez (2011) also describe Critical Race Theory (CRT) and how its purpose is to question and determine the underlying structures and relationships that have shaped the inequities in educational leadership for people of color.

There are many illustrations of critical and postmodern thought within the current literature that I have reviewed for this study. Their salient features will be the questioning of inherent power structures and beliefs that govern leadership.

Summary. The attempts to map the history of thought in the educational leadership are numerous (e.g., Foster, 1986; Getzels et al., 1968; Hodgkinson, 1991; Tyack, 1974). I find that most broad literature on the subject of educational leadership includes a brief history of organizational thought and the movements that have shaped this field of study and practice. Even within the texts of well-respected and often cited authors in this field, I have discovered disagreements within terminology and classification of some of the theories into their respective

movements. The manner in which I have organized these theory movements do not represent chronological, linear thought as I have tried to demonstrate in my discussion of their similarities and differences through illustrations of the historical literature. In this overview, I have attempted to put forth the most prominent theorists and thinkers particularly as they relate to educational leadership. Now, I will turn my attention to discussing the epistemologies and methodologies and how they are manifested within this history of theory development.

Analysis of the Historical Development of the Field

Traditional theories. The underlying beliefs that supported the infiltration of scientific management and bureaucracy are extremely important to note because of their lasting impact on this field of study (English, 2002, 2005; Foster, 2002; Skrtic, 1991). Scientific management was governed by the positivist epistemology (Callahan, 1962; English, 2002) that knowledge is made up of absolute truths, and “the discovery of invariant laws that determine the relations among observable empirical facts or objective structures outside consciousness” (Morrow & Brown, 1994). This view places science as an autonomous way to stand outside of the facts, observe occurrences in the world as they are, (one reality exists and can be observed), and claim a value-free stance that communicates only truth based on empirical data (English, 2005).

The ideological implications of this view are important to discuss because they form the foundation of an ontology by which society has been “cemented together” (Morrow & Brown, 1994, p. 63). Morrow and Brown (1994) stated “it is argued that dominant political and social interests shape the development of science

and technology, hence the “autonomy” of science is always problematic” (p. 63). They also put forth that “it is claimed that science and technology cannot be fully neutral with respect to human values because they inevitably mediate social relations” (Morrow & Brown, 1994, p. 63).

The adherence to positivist views in the creation of a field of educational leadership created a beginning point of “the field” itself (English, 2002). English (2002) discussed the impact of positivism and its excesses that have continued to guide research in educational administration, and he stated that “such excesses are more than traces. They are deeply imprinted in the minds and practices of those working in “the field” including the continuation of the most long-lasting concept of all, the idea that there is a singular, all encompassing totality called “the field”” (p. 121). English (2002) also put forth an interesting argument, which made me call into question my examination of “the field” of educational leadership, as well as my point of examination being the inception of science in education. English (2002) argued that there was a history of leadership before science, and the dismissal of the field of leadership before the point of scientificity is yet another manifestation of the stronghold of positivism. I admit that I have also been shaped by the society and education in which I have been assimilated, and as a result I have defined the field of educational leadership to begin when it was professionalized by the use of scientific inquiry. This is a notable weakness in my illumination of educational leadership, and one that I hope to remedy in the course of my career by delving more deeply into the true history of leadership before traditional science took over.

The science of education took over in the early 20th century, spurring the development of the field of educational leadership because it was a way to legitimate the profession. English (2002) noted this adherence to science as a defense mechanism that intended to serve as a way to refute and justify the actions within schools. Specifically for leadership, this meant that the study of leadership would be confined to observable behaviors and empirical observations, variables that could be manipulated to achieve greater efficiency, with outcomes being economically tied to items such as school budget and utilization of resources. Callahan (1962) noted that in the first decades of the field of educational leadership, doctoral dissertations overwhelmingly focused on scientifically measurable items such as fiscal and business administration, pupil personnel and personnel management, legal issues, and buildings and equipment (p. 202). English (2002) described the ideological impact well when he stated that “in their rush to become a science, early professors of educational administration swapped respectability and status for any possibility of understanding and/or teaching anything meaningful about leadership” (pp. 116-117).

With specific regard to the measurable aims of education as directed toward student outcomes, Callahan (1962) discussed how the early leaders in the science of education sought out businessmen to tell them what the standards of education should be, thus establishing a purpose for schools driven by an ideology of business. They knew they had to find something quantifiable to determine their efficiency, and they felt that men from the business world, the inheritors of their finished product, would be the best people to tell them what the outcomes should be. It is

Franklin Bobbitt who can be credited with the overwhelming infiltration of business aims in education, “Bobbitt went beyond merely suggesting that the business and industrial world enter the schools and set up standards: he made it their civic duty” (Callahan, 1962, p. 83).

From its very inception as a “field” of study, educational leadership has assimilated its students into a culture of science that has put emphasis on specific aspects of their role within a school. These points of emphases greatly impact the underlying beliefs about the purpose of school and the view of children. The principles communicated in traditional science say that anything that can be counted as knowledge must be measured and calculated; knowledge about the workings of a school is value-free, it is up to the researcher to merely allow the facts of nature (e.g., the school, the student) to make themselves known (Guba, 1990, p. 19). These facts can be calculated based upon their relation to the outcomes desired by the business world, which had set the standard for education (Callahan, 1962). Methods for educating students within a school can be employed by more knowledgeable others that have the hard data, strengthened by causal relationships that will allow for universal laws to be applied that will increase the efficiency of administrators, teachers and students (Thorndike, 1929). Educational administrators are those who can utilize the findings of science and apply them to their school sites in a way that standardizes all action and produces results. This is the realization of the factory mode of administration, where local context makes little difference, and scientific principles must be applied to the teaching and learning process in a uniform fashion. This takes the human nature out of education

and places it within a realm of realism that strips children and teachers of their individuality by focusing only on those matters that can be neatly, scientifically, empirically measured, with the utmost goal of prediction and control (Guba, 1990) based upon desired outcomes communicated by business standards (English, 2005; Foster, 2002).

Human relations movement. Although at first glance, it appeared that the underlying epistemologies within administration were changing because of a more humanistic focus on relations between workers and their superiors, I found there is ample evidence to suggest the opposite. A changing epistemology would have signaled a change in the beliefs about what can be known about schools and administration. This was not the case, however, because objectively measured outcomes were still the end goal of administration (e.g., McSkimmon, 1926). The language of efficiency and productivity continued to be in place during this time, and the relations between administrators and teachers was seen as a variable to be manipulated, not a contextual concept to be investigated (Brown, 2011; Getzels et al., 1969; Foster, 1986; Hodgkinson, 1991; Maxcy, 1991; Tyack, 1974). The ideological principles of positivist science were in place as evidenced by an examination of the measure of efficiency, the end goals of the organization. These measures speak volumes about the underlying beliefs governing thought and inquiry.

Thorndike (1929) said that “methods of teaching change by a process of variation and survival of the fittest variations in the sense of those most fit to win the commendation of teachers, supervisors, and other educational authorities” (p.

189). The very inclusion of the term “survival of the fittest” is very telling about the epistemology governing Thorndike’s mode of inquiry, as it suggests that the best way to teach all children will rise to the top. Thorndike discussed, in many articles during the 1920’s and 1930’s how important it was to continue refining modes of analysis to provide greater detail to supervisors and teachers that would allow them to have the greatest effect on the learner, as measured by the numerous standardized tests he and others had created (Beatty, 1998).

The human relations movement, although cloaked in the veil of democracy, viewed democratic teaching as another set of standardized content to be instilled in students. It was one more observable behavior for administrators to measure when evaluating their teachers, not a deeply held principle that enveloped the community and sought to impact the relations of people within the school (Foster, 1986; Hodgkinson, 1991; Maxcy, 1991; Tyack, 1974). Put another way, it was an example of the “if-then” positivist strategy of hypothesizing and testing causal relationships. If the administrator makes the teacher feel like a cooperative part of the school, then students will achieve to a higher degree because the teacher will more skillfully apply methods dictated and modeled by the principal. The end goals of the schools remained the same, the principle of consent for standardization of methods in the name of efficiency remained at the core. Terms like cooperation and democracy were merely smokescreens, utilized to soften the blow of the same efficiency and business ideologies that are synonymous with scientific management, a positivist ontology, and objective epistemology.

Social systems theories. Social systems theories had many important contributions in developing lines of thought in educational leadership. The emphasis on understanding that the dedication of the teachers was imperative to the realization of a common purpose, and the investigation of human behaviors that revealed components of human behavior to be of importance, were additions that signified a shift to more humanistic modes of thought. Barnard's (1968) aspects of leadership attempted to place more of an emphasis on the behaviors leaders could exhibit that fostered an environment where the staff would have increased dedication to the end goals of the school. Common purpose was emphasized, although it was still ideologically driven by business standards, and this was made evident by the lack of explanation, in addition to the lack of involvement by teachers, parents, and students in its development (Herrick, 1927; McSkimmon, 1926). This common purpose is the crux of the ideological impact, there was no question that the common purpose must be to achieve efficiency and turn out the desired product to those in business who needed the skilled, but not too skilled, labor that the schools provided (Bowles & Gintis, 1976/2011).

Getzels et. al. (1968) pointed out the positivistic, empirical epistemologies that continued to be the underlying feature of these theories. Theories in this movement focused on finding the truth about human behaviors with the goal of prediction and control in favor of the standards set forth. Foster (1986) pointed out that the continued view of the school as a closed system helped to silence the conversation about power and influence from outside societal factors that had a great impact on the workings of the school. This itself is a paradox, because the

standards set for the school came from the powerful, influential world of business and industry. The closed view treated schools as distinct entities where facts about leadership and teaching could be found, and when discovered could be universally applied to continue the goal of efficiency and productivity, as measured by student achievement on standardized types of assessment (Judd, 1925; McSkimmon, 1926; Thorndike, 1929).

The fact that the same ideologies continued to pervade the development of these theories meant that the methodologies were similarly impacted. Because of the fact that knowledge was decidedly objective, only certain ways of finding that information could be utilized, thus solidifying the use of methodologies that promoted the quantification of human behavior with a de-emphasis on values and meaning.

Human resources movement. The most notable difference in thought within the human resources movement is the idea of an organization as an open system that is influenced by outside factors. Burns (1978) discussed the importance of navigating the social, economical, and political influences that impact an institution, and within this movement are the first theories that actively acknowledge the role of external factors on the process of schools. Though not critical in nature, this acknowledgement changes the conceptualization of a school, and develops the ability to investigate what other factors impact life in schools.

Transactional leadership, as depicted by Burns (1978) conceived of common purpose as the means to an end in an organization. This is critically important to the ideological analysis of thought within this theory movement. Many educational

leadership theories, such as situational theory and contingency theory, worked under the framework of transactional leadership Burns (1978) put forth. When identifying common purpose as a means to an end, instead of an end itself, it communicates the idea that common purpose is merely a mechanism for achieving ideologically unquestioned goals within the education system. Within theories of transactional leadership the assumption is that schools are working toward ends that need no further discussion. The measurement of outcomes, as determined by the quantifiable data collected from schools, serve as the way to discover whether specific facets of transactional leadership theories are successful. Common purpose becomes merely a variable construction, and this will be illustrated within the current literature included in Chapters Four and Five.

I argue that transformational leadership has been one of the more important contributions from the human resources movement into educational leadership. Transformational leadership, discussed by Burns (1978), is characterized by a difference in the end goals of leadership, as opposed to the means used to achieve them. I will reiterate that the ends Burns (1978) put forth for transformational leadership were justice, fairness, equality, liberty, and freedom.

Epistemologically, these ends represent a shift away from value-free, quantifiable data into a realm more concerned with democratic principles as ends of themselves. In practice, the methodologies utilized to investigate transformational leadership are traditionally scientific, quasi-experimental studies utilizing variables to posit relationships between transformational leadership behavior and school outcomes (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). This represents a distinct ideological problem

in how to measure ends such as justice, fairness, equality, and freedom. If these ends are decided to be manifestations of student test scores and no other measure, the methodological choices reflect an objective epistemology. In fact, the methodological choices have communicated a different epistemology, or put another way, the choices made in deciding how to collect what data have communicated what counts as knowledge. The studies on transformational leadership have not been utilized as a methodological or epistemological way to study values in relation to leaders, and it was only through this analysis that I realized such an important distinction between the ends espoused by this theory, and the ends communicated methodologically in the studies conducted under the framework of transformational leadership. This will be explored in more detail in Chapter Seven.

Critical theories. Within the progression of theories in educational leadership, it is only within this paradigm that we find an actual shift in epistemology and methodology (Lincoln et al., 2011). Critical theories have at their center the purpose of illuminating ideological issues and problems of power, authority, and social repression (Morrow & Brown, 1994). Epistemologically, these theories question what counts as knowledge and seek to uncover the reasons why specific outcomes have traditionally been held above others, and under what conditions reproduction of dominating beliefs and systems have occurred. Critical theories also seek to uncover the power relations that dominate institutions within society, and specifically within leadership the focus is on the outcomes of historically marginalized groups to achieve socially just outcomes (Lincoln et al., 2011).

The confusion begins when looking at the ends investigated in these studies. What counts as scientific knowledge in the positivist view is quantifiable by outcomes such as scores on standardized tests. Surprisingly, many studies conducted under the framework of critical theories utilize student achievement scores as a measure of outcomes for the leaders they investigated, without questioning the inherent ideologies and power structures that are indicated by the presence of standardized testing at all. This is something that will be investigated in more detail in Chapters Six and Seven, after I have discussed the current literature in the field and am able to analyze the methodologies in terms of their epistemological beliefs.

Postmodern theories. Post-modern thought and critical theories differ in some important respects. Postmodern theories do not privilege any authority, method, or paradigm (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Ontologically, this represents a shift in thinking from realist ontology of positivistic science. The nature of reality is both subjective and objective, and based on participation and participative realities (Lincoln et al., 2011). Epistemologically, this represents a more holistic view and a critical subjectivity concerned with “how we know what we know and the knowledge’s consummating relations” (Lincoln et al., 2011, p. 103). Wanat (2006) discussed postmodernists in qualitative research as challenging the traditional thought that researchers can be objectively removed from the situation, instead favoring interpretivist approaches. Methodologically, this line of thought has contributed to more participatory ways of knowing and going about collecting and co-creating that knowledge. Because postmodern thought does not privilege any

method or authority over others, the problem at hand, and the primacy of the practical are what drive choices of method (Lincoln et al., 2011).

The contributions of critical and post-modern thought to studying underlying ideologies have been a prime focus on the end values of equity and justice, through the questioning of how we know what we know and the structures that impact this knowledge. Both critical and postmodern theories challenge the traditional views within the field of educational leadership (Wanat, 2006).

Summary. Through this discussion I have answered the first question driving this study; what are the epistemological, methodological, and ideological histories of educational leadership? This historical exploration served several purposes in this study. Thompson (1990) discussed the importance of historical analysis in a depth-hermeneutical study. Gallagher (1992) put forth the pre-critical principles of reproduction and hegemony as a way to describe the social reality of the field, and forces that have sustained the realities of the field. Although I have utilized critical inquiry to analyze the philosophical history of educational leadership, this historical analysis serves as a foundation from which to understand the current state of the field. I have discussed the ways in which beliefs and norms have been justified within the field, and how these underlying ideologies have impacted theory development.

In the following chapters, I will discuss the findings of my reviews of the current literature to give a clear picture of what the current state of inquiry is in the field. In Chapter Six, I will specifically discuss the methodological implications of the current literature in the field. I will analyze the epistemologies, methodologies, and

ideologies of the current literature in Chapter Seven before I attempt to synthesize all of these findings into some warranted implications for further development of the important field of educational leadership in Chapter Eight. These chapters will be devoted to answering the question; how have these histories shaped the focus of theory development and literature in educational leadership?

Chapter 4

A Review of the Research: The Relationship between Principal Leadership and Life in Schools

Scholars and practitioners alike are in search of ways to describe and explain the characteristics of effective leaders to determine how the perfect combination of qualities can positively impact school environments with predictability. With the passage of NCLB (2002) and the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA; 2004), there has never been greater pressure on school leaders to ensure student achievement gains through reform and improvement initiatives (Leithwood & Louis, 2012). The outside societal factors that drive the purpose of schooling are now firmly rooted in a context of accountability (NCLB, 2002; Ravitch, 2010). Society wants proof that our schools are fulfilling their purpose and without challenging the inherent technical rationality, the reliance upon student achievement data on standardized achievement tests has become the norm (Ravitch, 2010). I believe there is more to what happens inside schools than the achievement of students on a test taken in the spring, and my personal experience with teachers, pre-service teachers, university colleagues, and other professionals who work in the day-to-day contexts of schools tells me that I am far from alone in this belief. The purpose of this investigation is to find out how researchers in the field of educational leadership have conceptualized life in schools and what their findings are in relation to principal leadership behaviors.

This chapter represents the initial review of literature undertaken before the critical hermeneutical analysis, which caused me to rethink how I went about

looking for this literature. The second literature review will be discussed in Chapter Five.

Methods

This review of the research was designed to find out how principals affect life in schools as determined by outcomes of teachers, students, and families. After an in-depth review of the historical and major conceptual frameworks in the field of educational leadership, elements of life in schools were determined and search terms were constructed. From preliminary searches designed to gain a broad perspective of the breadth of the research literature, several keyword search terms were noted that were also used as a part of this search. Initial broad searches brought up results that were not narrow enough in scope to determine the purpose of the research in a systematic way, so more specific search terms were used, resulting in a greater number of searches conducted, as shown in Appendix A, Table A1. I felt that this method would allow me to specifically find the most relevant research related to the different outcomes of life in school.

In a broad search of the research literature, it is imperative to have clear inclusion and exclusion criteria to guide the selection of relevant research (Hart, 1998). For this review, the inclusion and exclusion criteria were created in an attempt to focus on the specific actions of principals that have a direct relationship with outcomes. Only articles that were from scholarly, peer-reviewed journals were included, and the articles could not be literature reviews or meta-analyses, although the most relevant of these are discussed first in my forthcoming results to present their most salient findings and contributions. The studies must have been published

between 2001 and 2012. The scope of the research in this field caused me to limit the years investigated, so the year 2001 was chosen because of the landmark legislation that was passed, NCLB (2002), which I believe had an effect on the focus and context of research studies. Studies must have had the principal as the primary focus of the study, or as an independent variable. Outcomes were very broadly defined, but a relationship between the principal's actions or leadership behaviors had to be investigated on an outcome for teachers, students, or families and could not serve as a moderating or mediating variable. There are many studies that include the discussion of principal behavior as a moderating or mediating variable and they are certainly relevant research to review and add much to our knowledge of how leadership impacts outcomes. For the purpose of this paper, however, investigating how the principal's behavior has been determined to directly relate to outcomes helped to narrow the results and provide a more precise focus for this review and discussion.

Because of the nature of organizations, and the organizational theories that underlie much of the conceptual framework of educational leadership, the context of the studies was important. For this reason, only studies that were conducted in the United States were chosen for review. It was essential to maintain a common societal context from which to frame this review so as not to confound the effects of national reforms, legislation, and policy matters that may affect the role of the principal. Studies also had to be conducted with public schools, in grades K through 12th, and in traditional education settings. For the purposes of this study, no online

schools or other alternative type settings were considered relevant for the review at this time.

Exclusion criteria for this review were very specific, because I found the nature of these studies to be incredibly complex in some instances. Studies that focused on district level administration, such as the superintendent, were excluded. Principal preparation programs, principal professional development, and the impact of experiences on principal's perceptions were not chosen for this review. These types of studies focused primarily on the principal outcomes instead of on the effect of the principal on school, teacher, and student outcomes and were not relevant to review at this time. Studies that focused on new teacher retention issues or beginning teacher retention issues were chosen with a great deal of care. The role of the principal in these studies had to be very clearly defined and also had to be a greater focus than other variables discussed to be included in this review.

Studies from the Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership were automatically excluded after it was determined that this publication creates scenarios for pre-service principals in preparation programs. Publications that were not readily available through the University of New Mexico library system were excluded due to time constraints, and this led to the exclusion of 11 possible studies from the publication ERS Spectrum published by Education Weekly. I was unable to obtain these titles and therefore unable to determine if they would further meet criteria for review.

Principal succession is a rapidly growing field of literature that focuses on the issues revolving around planning for principal retirement, turnover, and

promotion. The purpose of this review was to determine the behaviors of principals already in a position to impact life in schools, so studies that focused on succession issues were excluded.

There were many studies that sought to determine effective characteristics of principals in schools, but were not tied to outcomes. These studies were excluded because relationships could not be reasonably postulated through the exploration. A few studies focused on teachers' perceptions of effective leaders, and they were excluded if they did not also have outcomes related to the perceptions of effective leadership behaviors.

Finally, studies were excluded if their methodologies and theoretical frameworks were not thoroughly explained. Several studies had minimal write-ups and did not include a satisfactory description of the theories driving their investigation. If the authors did not provide this context, it was difficult to determine if the research was rigorous enough to espouse the results they claimed. Studies that did not display quality characteristics or indicators of their utilized methodology were excluded.

I conducted searches in relevant databases, as shown in Table 1, and terms were varied to try to account for the differences used in terminology within the field of educational leadership. I did not determine a limit for the number of articles to show up on a given search, so when terms were entered, I scanned all results and reviewed abstracts to determine initial relevancy. If I determined the articles to be possibly relevant, they were set aside for more careful review after all searches had

been conducted. At the conclusion of the searches for research, I scanned all articles set aside to determine if they met the inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Searches were conducted in the following databases: Academic Search Complete, Academic Search Premier, EconLit, Education Research Complete, Humanities International Complete, PsychArticles, PyscInfo, and Public Administration Abstracts. In choosing these databases, I tried to capture the interdisciplinary nature of leadership research. These databases were searched simultaneously with combinations of the following terms: *principal effectiveness, principal effect*, leadership effectiveness, leadership effect*, leadership style, student outcomes, student achievement, teacher morale, teacher attitude*, teacher, job satisfaction, teacher retention, teacher effectiveness, teacher emotions, teacher treatment, teacher experiences, teacher professional development, teacher professional learning, new teachers, student attitude, school environment, and school culture*. I then used these terms to search the ERIC database as well, as displayed in Table 1. In all, I found 161 articles that met initial criteria for relevancy. I then obtained these articles in full text to review more carefully and determine if they met criteria for inclusion. I ultimately found 40 articles that met the exclusion and inclusion criteria for this review. Each article was summarized in the construction of a table showing the results of my review. From this initial table, the articles were then categorized using constant comparative analysis as I discussed in Chapter Two. The remainder of this chapter will be devoted to summarizing the findings of the articles within the categories I constructed.

Results

Several literature reviews (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Robinson et al., 2008) and a commonly cited meta-analysis conducted by Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) have been done that shed light on the impact that principal behavior has on student achievement. Before I review the recent research in this area, I will discuss the literature reviews and meta-analysis to provide a deeper understanding of future progressions in the strands of research.

Leithwood and Jantzi (2005). The authors conducted a literature review of the research done on transformational leadership between 1996 and 2005. The authors found 32 studies for review that met their inclusion and exclusion criteria. For their search, they looked for any article that had been published from any country that had a specific focus on transformational leadership and its direct effects on student outcomes. The authors analyzed their articles with several different purposes in mind, and discussed (a) the impact of context on transformational leadership, (b) the moderating and mediating variables that influenced transformational leadership's impact on student outcomes, and (c) the direct influence of transformational leadership on student outcomes. Leithwood and Jantzi conceptualized transformational leadership as (a) setting direction, (b) helping people, (c) redesigning the organization, and (d) transactional and managerial roles.

The authors considered moderating variables for transformational leadership as anything impacted by this type of leadership that was not a student outcome. Several themes in my forthcoming review are considered by Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) as moderating or mediating variables to student outcomes. The

authors put forth five categories of moderating variables found in the studies they reviewed: (a) characteristics of leaders' colleagues, (b) characteristics of the leaders themselves, (c) characteristics of students, (d) organizational structures, and (e) processes. The same broad categories were used to define mediating variables and included all of the previously listed categories except for the characteristics of the leaders themselves (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005).

Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) found that the effects of transformational leadership were augmented by prior student achievement, family educational culture, organizational culture, shared school goals, and coherent plans and policies. The authors also found that there were no moderating effects for teachers' age, gender, and years teaching, and there were mixed results for the moderating effects of school size.

When they explored the mediating variables, Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) found that school culture was examined in the most studies within their review. Learning climate was also a focus for many studies, and the authors found there to be too little accumulated evidence to draw any specific conclusions about these outcomes. They discussed organizational commitment and the positive impact transformational leadership had on this as a mediating variable, and they also included a discussion of job satisfaction. They put forth, based on the studies they reviewed, that transformational leadership had a significant impact on job satisfaction. The authors also discussed: (a) changes in teacher practices, (b) planning and strategies for change, (c) decision-making processes, (d) pedagogical or instructional quality, (e) organizational learning and (f) collective teacher

efficacy. Leithwood and Jantzi did not discuss the results of these mediating factors, but I included them in this list because I found them to be frequently studied mediating variables, which I considered as outcomes for the purpose of my review. I think it is interesting that they have appeared frequently in the literature and I find that this demonstrates how researchers have further attempted to link these outcomes to leadership practices in the research I have reviewed.

Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) found that the results were in favor of concluding that transformational leadership had a positive impact on student achievement. The authors also briefly discussed the findings of student engagement as an outcome. They noted that student engagement was a strong predictor of student achievement, and in the studies they reviewed, transformational leadership had a significant positive relationship with student engagement.

Finally, the authors put forth the major findings in the transformational leadership literature. They found that the effects of transformational leadership on perceptions of organizational effectiveness were significant and large. They found that effects on objective, independent measures of organizational effectiveness were positive and significant, but had a small base of research on which to draw conclusions. They concluded that evidence of effect on student outcomes was limited, but positive (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005).

Robinson et al. (2008). This literature review was conducted with the purpose of identifying international research focused on the effects of different types of leadership on student outcomes. Although it included two studies that I will review in this paper (Griffith, 2004; Marks & Printy, 2003), I have chosen to keep

these articles in my discussion because of the different focus of the Robinson et al. review. The purpose of my review is to determine a broader scope of outcomes that are affected by leadership behavior. Marzano et al. (2005) and Robinson et al. (2008) conceptualized many of the direct outcomes I examined as moderating or mediating factors. With that in mind, I will briefly discuss the results of Robinson et al.'s review.

Overall, the authors found that instructional leadership had a greater impact on student achievement than transformational leadership (Robinson et al, 2008). They also found that high performing schools had a greater focus on teaching and learning, and that this focus was impacted by the leadership behaviors of their principals. The authors put forth five dimensions of leadership that they found had a significant impact on student outcomes as evidenced by the studies they reviewed. The first dimension they found was establishing goals and expectations that are focused on student learning and clearly communicated by leaders. They explained that goals provided a sense of purpose, and allowed teachers and staff to focus their attention and efforts to regulate their performance toward these goals. They also found that leaders in their studies used resources strategically (Robinson et al., 2008). This dimension focused on teaching and staffing resources, as well as providing instructional resources within the school. The third dimension they found was planning, coordinating, and evaluating teaching and the curriculum. Fourth, they discussed promoting and participating in teacher learning and development. The final dimension the authors described was ensuring an orderly and supportive environment.

Robinson et al. (2008) argued that transformational leadership may explain more about the relationships between leadership and staff than about the relationship between leadership and student learning. I noted that one of the studies included in my review, (Griffith, 2004), I included as an effect on teacher outcomes and this may support their claim. They also put forth that “if we are to learn more about how leadership supports teachers in improving student outcomes, we need to measure how leaders attempt to influence the teaching practices that matter” (Robinson et al., 2008, p. 669). This supports the organization of my own review as I attempt to look for a more inclusive definition of outcomes that impact life in schools instead of narrowly focusing on student achievement.

The meta-analysis. The meta-analysis conducted by Marzano et al. (2005) warrants discussion because of its prominence in the leadership literature. There are few studies published after 2005 that do not include a reference to this work. For this reason, I have chosen to include a brief discussion of their findings, but I also put forth some limitations and criticisms of this widely cited meta-analysis. I reviewed the reference list for this work to investigate possible overlap with studies identified for my review, and I found that Marzano et al. used 60 unpublished doctoral dissertations out of the 69 studies used for their analysis. Because unpublished doctoral dissertations are not subject to the same strict peer review process, this is a notable drawback to their findings. Robinson et al. (2008) also made this observation, and discussed the caution with which Marzano et al.’s results should be interpreted.

Marzano et al. (2005) reviewed studies from 1978-2001, and analyzed the correlation between general leadership behaviors and student achievement. They computed an average correlation of .25 between leadership behaviors and student achievement. Perhaps the most influential assertions Marzano et al. made were the 21 leadership behaviors they argued were supported by the evidence in their meta-analysis. These 21 behaviors have been cited and used in many studies published after their analysis, and for that reason I will list and briefly explain them before moving on to the present review.

The authors found that the leaders had an impact on student learning by

- demonstrating affirmation, or the ability of the principal to recognize and celebrate accomplishment and acknowledge failure;
- acting as change agent and being willing to challenge the inherent status of the school;
- using contingent rewards to acknowledge accomplishments;
- establishing lines of communication with teachers and students;
- paying attention to culture by fostering shared beliefs and a sense of community;
- demonstrating discipline by protecting teachers from issues that take away from their focus on teaching;
- showing flexibility and adapting to a given situation while being comfortable with dissent among staff;
- maintaining focus by establishing and keeping a focus on clear goals for the school;

- understanding personal and collective ideals and beliefs and how this drives decisions and communication;
- soliciting input from teachers about implementation of policies and important decisions;
- providing intellectual stimulation to ensure that teachers are current on their knowledge of theory and practice;
- being involved in curriculum, instruction, and assessment design, implementation, and practice, and demonstrating a strong knowledge base in these areas;
- monitoring and evaluating school effectiveness;
- leading new innovations through inspiring the school staff;
- giving attention to the order and the standard operating procedures and routines of the school;
- acting as an advocate and a spokesperson for the school;
- understanding the importance of relationships, and being aware of the personal aspects of teachers and staff;
- providing resources, both material and through professional development;
- using situational awareness to have a firm understanding of the issues happening within the school and using this informal knowledge to help address problems and challenges;
- being a visible member of the school community, fostering relationships and having contact with teachers and students (Marzano et al., 2005).

This exhaustive list has provided a framework for other research in distinguishing observable, measureable leadership behaviors that have been examined more closely in their relation to school outcomes. I believe these leadership behaviors and their relationship with student achievement comprised the influence of this meta-analysis. Now that I have discussed their findings, I will address the current research that has met my specific criteria for inclusion in this review.

Principal effects on student achievement. In earlier discussion, I argued that the purpose of schooling is the attainment of equitable learning opportunities and experiences. In this era of high stakes testing and accountability, that learning is measured by students' performance on standardized tests (NCLB, 2002). Regardless of the validity of such measures, I reason that they provide easily accessible information that is used in many ways to judge the effectiveness of a school, a principal, and its teachers. While the literature reviews and meta-analysis provided information that is helpful for examining the outcomes they considered moderators or mediators, the main variable of investigation was student achievement (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Marzano et al., 2005; Robinson et al., 2008).

The conceptual frameworks used in the studies discussed in this section have some striking similarities. Many of the studies cited instructional leadership (Grissom & Loeb, 2011; Louis, Dretzke, & Wahlstrom, 2010; Marks & Printy, 2003; O'Donnell & White, 2005), shared leadership (Louis et al., 2010; Marks & Printy, 2003), and transformational leadership (Chance & Segura, 2009; Finnigan & Stewart, 2009; Marks & Printy, 2003). In these studies, instructional leadership was

any type of behavior that is focused on curriculum, instruction, and assessment. The shared aspect of instructional leadership implied the close collaboration with teachers and school staff around these concepts. Transformational leadership was more broadly focused on the creation of a vision and the behaviors that inspired action and commitment to the goals of the school. It also implied a focus on the school culture and the behaviors of the principal that motivated teachers and staff to want to rise above the stated goals to achieve higher ends for their students (Burns, 1978).

Other theoretical frameworks that formed the base of the discussions in these articles were complexity theory (Chance & Segura, 2009; Jacobson, Brooks, Giles, Johnson, & Ylimaki, 2007), instructional management (Grissom & Loeb, 2011; Horng, Klasik, & Loeb, 2010; Silva, White & Yoshida, 2011), and accountability (Sanzo, Sherman, & Clayton, 2011). Complexity theory has a strong focus on the complex nature of organizations and the changes and reforms that impact the actions, beliefs, and working environment of the school (Marion & McGee, 2006). Instructional management has similar features of instructional leadership, but focuses on the tasks a principal can complete individually that may be focused on curriculum, instruction, and assessment (Grissom & Loeb, 2011). For example, these decisions may be the selection of curriculum and assessment tools and the subsequent scheduling of professional development for teachers to use these tools. Instructional management, therefore, does not imply the collaboration and creation of new meanings as a collective whole around the concepts of curriculum,

instruction, and assessment. Accountability frames the studies within the era of high stakes testing (NCLB, 2002).

Many of these theoretical frameworks have been discussed in greater detail earlier in this paper, but a synthesis of the theories as used in the articles reviewed provides a reference point from which I can articulate the findings of the studies. Detailed information about the participants can be found in the tables I will refer to in the following discussion, and an examination of the methods used and their limitations will take place in Chapter Six. The purpose of this section is to outline the variables measured and the findings of the studies reviewed. I will discuss the research with a focus on the effects of principals on student achievement in chronological order to describe the progression of ideas and theory development throughout the last 11 years.

Marks and Printy (2003). In this study, the authors investigated the relationship between transformational leadership and shared instructional leadership and continued this exploration into the effects of these types of leadership on school performance as measured by teachers' pedagogical quality and skill in assessing students. The conceptual frameworks driving their study were instructional leadership, shared instructional leadership and transformational leadership. An outline of the participants can be found in Table A2.

Data collection occurred through the use of surveys asking teachers about their instructional practices, professional activities, and perceptions of the school and the way it was organized. The researchers conducted site visits at each school, and conducted interviews with school staff and administrators as well. Marks and

Printy (2003) observed relevant meetings and collected documents for analysis during these site visits. The authors chose 144 teachers for more careful observation of their instruction and an analysis of their assessment skills.

Marks and Printy (2003) determined the dependent variable of pedagogical quality by the sum of teachers' scores on classroom instruction and assessment tasks. The authors measured student academic achievement by the students' performance on analysis, inter-disciplinary concepts, and elaborated written communication with the assessment the researchers used to calculate the teachers' skill in evaluating student work.

Case studies and qualitative analysis methods were used to determine the leadership style of the principal (Marks & Printy, 2003). The authors synthesized the interviews, observations, and documents into comprehensive case studies for the 24 principals who participated. To ensure validity of the case studies, the authors asked staff members at the schools to review and critique the drafts. Marks and Printy created a list of over 100 codes and case study data was then analyzed to create coding reports. Later, the authors converted codes into variables to complete their statistical analysis.

Marks and Printy (2003) constructed transformational leadership from the coding reports on two items, and from the teacher surveys on three items. The items from the coding reports were answered yes or no, and indicated whether there was intellectual leadership from the principal, and if the principal shared power with teachers. The three items from the teacher surveys were rated on a scale from low to high (1-3), and asked if the principal's behavior was supportive and encouraging,

if the principal was interested in innovation and new ideas, and if the principal influenced the restructuring process. The other independent variable of shared instructional leadership was constructed based on the coding report and the authors attempted to capture the degree of instructional leadership by the principal and the teacher, as well as the level of interaction around curriculum, instruction, and assessment between the principal and teachers.

Marks and Printy (2003) used a scatterplot analysis to determine the relationship between transformational and shared leadership. They then placed the schools on the quadrant that best represented the leadership present at their school. The authors used one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to compare means for the schools on their leadership ratings with the demographic, organizational, and performance characteristics based on the categorical designation of the school. The authors then used hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) to determine the effects of school leadership on the dependent variables of pedagogical quality and student achievement.

According to Marks and Printy (2003), nine schools fell within the low shared instructional leadership and low transformational leadership category. Data from their case studies indicated that schools in this category had instructional leadership from teachers, but not from administration and the school populations tended to be very poor with a high minority population and low achievement scores. The researchers used the term “integrated leadership” to describe the schools where transformational and shared instructional leadership were high based on their scatterplot analysis. They found that these schools were demographically

different than the low leadership schools, and had the highest achievement, were larger in size, and the students represented less minority enrollment. The authors offered no explanation for the differences in the school leadership types and school demographics.

Marks and Printy (2003) found that the pedagogical quality in integrated leadership schools was higher than in other schools. Similarly, they reported that the student achievement scores were higher in schools with integrated leadership as well. The authors put forth that this data indicated the positive effect of the shared work of administrators, teachers, and other staff focused on curriculum, instruction, and assessment as measured in their surveys and case study data. The authors postulated that the integration of leadership had a positive relationship with pedagogical quality and authentic academic achievement based on their data analysis. The authors noted the limitations in their purposeful sample of schools and discussed the need for replication with a random sample so the findings could be generalized to other settings.

O'Donnell and White (2005). The purpose of this study was similar to Marks & Printy (2003). O'Donnell & White wanted to determine the relationship between instructional leadership behaviors and student achievement within middle school settings. For a summary of the participants, see Table A2. The authors in this study used Hallinger's Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS; as cited in O'Donnell and White, 2005), to determine the frequency of instructional leadership behaviors demonstrated by the principals in their study. This measure focused on setting a school mission, managing the instructional program, and

promoting the school's learning climate. The measure of student achievement was determined by student performance on the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA).

O'Donnell and White (2005) performed multivariate regression analyses and found that principal or teacher ratings on the PIMRS (Hallinger; as cited in O'Donnell & White, 2005) did not have a significant effect on student achievement. The authors reported that zero-order Pearson correlations, however, did indicate a significant relationship between the teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership behaviors and student achievement. Although all three areas of instructional leadership as teachers perceived them had a positive relationship to both reading and math achievement, the authors found the strongest relationship with teachers' perception of promoting a school learning climate. The authors considered the principals' perceptions of their own instructional leadership behaviors in the statistical analysis, and no significant relationship was found with student achievement.

O'Donnell and White (2005) listed the important behaviors associated with instructional leadership and promoting a school learning environment because they considered these as the most significant findings from their study. The behaviors they listed were (a) protecting instructional time, (b) maintaining high visibility, (c) providing incentives to teachers, (d) promoting professional development, and (e) providing incentives for learning.

Jacobson et al. (2007). The approach to this qualitative study of school achievement was different than the studies investigated thus far. Jacobson et al.

explored the leadership behaviors of principals who had arrived at high poverty, low-performing schools and subsequently had student achievement gains after their arrival. A description of these schools can be found in Table A2. The authors framed their study within the theory of organizational complexity (Marion & McGee, 2006) and used a qualitative design to examine the behaviors of the principal that may have led to higher student achievement scores.

Jacobson et al. (2007) conducted interviews with the principals, teachers, and support staff to collect data. The authors also employed the use of focus groups with parents and students, and used a semi-structured interview protocol informed by the International Successful School Project. Evidence of student achievement was obtained from the New York State Education Department report cards and reports on school improvement and this data served as both an inclusion criteria for participating schools, and as the outcome investigated in this study (Jacobson et al., 2007).

Jacobson et al. (2007) found that common themes emerged among the three schools they investigated. All principals exhibited behaviors that set clear goals toward a common purpose with the focus being on meeting the needs of the students as a community. The authors discussed how the leaders demonstrated modeling and presence within the school. According to the authors, the principals' actions followed their deeply held beliefs about their mission and expectations for the school: These principals were highly visible and committed to their school community in a way that inspired the teachers and students to do their best work every day. The authors described how every decision made in the school had to

meet the requirements of simply being what was best for children in the school. Ensuring a safe environment and following through on words spoken were strong leadership themes within their case studies (Jacobson et al., 2007).

Chance and Segura (2009). Following the same case study design of the previous authors, Chance and Segura investigated a school that had developed a plan for school improvement and sustained its efforts. The focus of this study was the behavior of the principal and the role he played in this sustainability (Chance & Segura, 2009). The authors framed their study within theories of organizational development and transformational leadership. They chose Valley High School as the school for analysis because of sustained change evidenced by three consecutive years of growth on student achievement tests.

Chance and Segura (2009) interviewed administrators, teachers, parents, and students about their perspectives of (a) curriculum, (b) instruction, (c) decision making, (d) the change process, and (e) their role as stakeholders in these elements of the school. The authors reported findings of this study as themes that emerged from their interview data and analysis.

Chance and Segura (2009) found that there was a collaborative nature to the school setting that was impacted by the structures put in place by the principal. Time was referred to by the authors as the vehicle for collaboration and they described how the principal created common times for the teachers to come together and talk about students. In addition to time, Chance and Segura reported that the principal ensured that the collaboration was structured and focused so that teachers had an urgent purpose in student centered conversation that would lead to

the completion of goals and objectives established by the principal. Similarly noted by Jacobson et al. (2007), Chance and Segura also cited the importance of a common purpose and a shared vision for student achievement, and argued that this must be supported by the organizational management and instructional leadership of the principal to sustain positive growth in student outcomes.

Finnigan and Stewart (2009). The purpose of this study was to examine the leadership behaviors of principals in low-performing schools in Chicago that had been placed on probationary status. The authors used a similar measure of outcomes as previous studies reviewed (Chance & Segura, 2009; Jacobson et al., 2007). Framed by theories of school accountability and transformational leadership, the authors chose schools based on their rating as schools on probation, and examined the differences in leadership behaviors among schools that changed designations or remained static over the course of their study to try to determine the effect of specific behaviors on student achievement. The authors discussed school accountability policy theories and explained that if schools are given sanctions and support, they will redirect their efforts to improve (O'Day, as cited in Finnigan & Stewart, 2009).

Finnigan and Stewart (2009) conducted multiple interviews with (a) teachers, (b) principals, (c) assistant principals, (d) probation managers, (e) special education coordinators, (f) parents, and (g) Local School Council members. The authors also conducted focus groups to collect data. Finnigan and Stewart did classroom observations, and collected relevant documents to triangulate their data and provide a stronger foundation for their findings.

The authors found that in schools designated on probation that remained static in their designation and did not make improvements in their test scores, transformational leadership behaviors were not commonly found (Finnigan & Stewart, 2009). They noted some important differences between schools that moved off of probation or made improvements and schools that did not. Demographic and size differences were reported by the authors as possible factors in the improvement of the schools. The authors' main focus for this study was the behaviors of leaders at these schools. In schools that made improvements, the leadership behaviors found through their data collection and analysis closely resembled transformational leadership as defined in other literature (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005).

The authors classified leadership that occurred in improving schools into behaviors such as (a) setting direction, (b) developing people, (c) developing the organization, (d) managing the organization, and (e) distributing leadership. They found these behaviors were most prevalent in the two schools that moved off of probation quickly. When they compared these behaviors to those in schools that did not make improvement, or were making more modest improvement, the authors found important distinctions. The leaders in the lower performing schools were found to have a narrow focus on accountability targets, and employed many quick fixes that did not promote a culture of collaboration, student growth, and high expectations for the learning of all students (Finnigan and Stewart, 2009). Because of these remarkable differences in the behaviors of the principals, and the absence of transformational leadership in many of the schools they studied that did not

make improvement, the authors concluded that the transformational leadership of the principals in the two schools that moved off of probation must have been related to the growth and learning of the students.

Horng et al. (2010). This study represented a different component of principal leadership behavior on student achievement and the perceptions of teachers and parents on school effectiveness. Horng et al. studied what principals do, how they spent their time, and how variations in principals' actions were reflected in school outcomes as measured by (a) student achievement on state standardized tests which determined school rating by Florida's A+ rating system, (b) teachers' assessments of the school, (c) teacher satisfaction, and (d) parents' assessments of the school. The authors framed their study in the theory of instructional leadership and investigated the amount of time principals reportedly spent on various tasks that could be classified as instructional leadership or management. The participants of the study are described in more detail in Table A2, but it is important to note here that the authors spent time studying elementary, middle, and high school principals for this project.

Horng et al. (2010) used observation through shadowing to collect data about what tasks principals performed during the school day and what amount of time they spent in these tasks. There were six broad categories within which 43 separate tasks were coded: These categories were (a) administration, (b) organization management, (c) day-to-day instruction, (d) instructional program, (e) internal relations, and (f) external relations. Administrative tasks were items the authors described as

- scheduling;
- student services;
- disciplinary issues;
- Special Education requirements; and
- compliance or testing related tasks.

Organizational management, the authors defined as tasks that focused on

- budgetary issues;
- hiring of personnel;
- personnel concerns,
- networking with other principals;
- managing personal schedule;
- maintaining facilities; and
- developing and monitoring a safe school environment.

The authors considered day-to-day instruction activities as

- informally and formally coaching teachers to improve instruction;
- evaluating teachers;
- classroom observations;
- implementing professional development;
- using data to inform decision making; and
- teaching students.

Hornig et al. described instructional management as

- the development of an instructional program across the school;

- evaluating curriculum;
- using assessment results for program evaluation and development;
- planning professional development;
- releasing or counseling out teachers;
- planning or directing after school activities; and
- utilizing school meetings.

The authors cited internal relations as the interactions between the principal and school stakeholders such as teachers, students, parents, and other staff within the school. These interactions could be formal or informal and could occur anywhere within the school building itself. External relations included activities such as communicating with community members, raising funds, communicating to district with the intention of receiving resources, or utilizing communications with the district that were also initiated by the district (Horng et al., 2010).

Teacher satisfaction, teacher assessment of the school and parent assessment of the school was measured with the use of three surveys (Horng et al., 2010). The authors obtained the results of a district school climate survey for teachers, as well as a district school climate survey for parents. An additional survey was created and administered by the researchers for the teachers to complete. The authors ran analyses using the data from each of these instruments and the principals' use of time to determine if there were any relationships between what and where the principals' spent their time and school outcomes.

Horng et al. found that principals in their study spent a majority of their time on administrative tasks and appeared to devote the least amount of time to

instructional tasks in both the day-to-day instruction category and the instructional program category. A similar low trend was found for external relations as well. The authors investigated where principals spent their time, and they found that most of their time was spent in transition from one activity to the next. Of the principals observed, the authors found that more than half of their day was spent in their own office, with 40% of their time spent elsewhere on campus. Horng et al. reported that schools with higher ratings on the states' A+ rating system had leaders who spent more time on day-to-day instruction tasks. Another salient finding the authors put forth was that external relation tasks were more prevalent in A-rated schools.

After running statistical analyses with the principals' time use and student outcomes, Horng et al. (2010) discussed key findings. They found that time spent on organization management and day-to-day instruction activities were positively related to student achievement across several different types of statistical analyses. When controlling for students' past achievement, the authors found that only organizational management tasks had a significant relationship to student achievement and growth over time in student achievement.

Although this section is focused on a discussion of principal effects on student achievement outcomes, Horng et al. (2010) included an analysis of teacher satisfaction and both teacher and parent assessments of the school climate in relation to the principals' use of time. I will summarize these results briefly so they can be included in the discussion of relevant themes and strands forthcoming.

Horng et al. (2010) found that teachers' perceptions of the school environment were positively related to the organizational management tasks of the

principals. They found that time spent on instructional program and internal relations tasks were also positively associated with teachers' perceptions of a positive learning environment. According to the authors, parents' assessments of a positive learning environment reflected quite different results. In parents' perceptions, the time spent on day-to-day instruction tasks was negatively associated with a positive learning environment, as was the time spent on internal and external relations (Horng et al., 2010). The only significant relationship they found between a principals' use of time and parents' positive perception of school climate were organizational management tasks.

Horng et al. (2010) also investigated teacher satisfaction as a measurement of satisfaction with the school in which they were currently teaching, and their results found that time principals spent in internal relations activities was positively associated with this variable. Principals' time spent in instruction-related activities did not have a significant positive relationship with teacher satisfaction in their current school, but was found to have a marginally positive relationship with teachers' satisfaction in the teaching profession (Horng et al., 2010). The authors reported that time principals spent on external relations tasks was reported to have a negative relationship with teacher satisfaction both in the profession and at their current school.

Horng et al. (2010) demonstrated the complexity of a principals' schedule and shed light on the many tasks and the amount of time spent on these tasks for a sample of principals in different levels of school. Overall, the authors found that principals in elementary, middle, and high school actually spent their time quite

similarly across tasks. Their strongest finding was the relationship between time spent on organizational management and the perceptions of teachers, parents, and to some extent student achievement scores.

Louis et al. (2010). This study investigated three different school leader behaviors and their impact on teachers' work with each other, classroom practices, and student achievement. The authors chose theories of instructional leadership and shared leadership to frame their study. They also cited literature on organizational trust and teacher leadership within a professional community to inform their design.

Louis et al. (2010) surveyed teachers, as described in Table A2, both in 2005 and in 2008 to collect data for this research. Teachers' professional community was measured using items from the authors' survey to construct a solid variable for analysis. The authors reported that these survey items reflected the nature of teachers' relationships with each other. The shared leadership variable was constructed based on teachers' ratings of principals' behaviors that supported the sharing and distribution of leadership to teachers (Louis et al., 2010). They constructed the instructional leadership variable using sample items that asked about specific principal behaviors in this area on the teacher survey. The level of trust the teachers had in the principal was also a dependent variable that the authors constructed from survey items. The authors obtained student achievement data from state websites and used this data to calculate relationships at the building level.

Louis et al. (2010) used structural equation modeling to compute relationships between leadership and school outcomes. The authors found that professional community and trust in the principal were the only significant predictors of focused instruction within the school, and these variables also had a significant impact on student math achievement scores directly, although it was found more significant for elementary than secondary schools. The authors used a three-model approach to compute calculations that looked at leadership effects on student achievement. These calculations produced confounding results, which led the authors to then move to a path analysis utilizing the maximum likelihood method.

Louis et al. interpreted the findings to report that instructional leadership had a direct effect on professional community but direct effects on instruction were limited. Trust in the principal was found to have a limited effect on professional community, and an insignificant effect on student achievement (Louis et al., 2010). The authors also found that both shared and instructional leadership had important effects on other variables, but were indirectly related to student achievement. The strongest effects were found on professional community, and the authors hypothesized an indirect relationship between leadership and student achievement through professional community based on the idea that professional community leads to more focused instruction and therefore positively influences student outcomes. While they reported that their findings for direct effects of leadership on student achievement were insignificant, the relationships they found with other outcomes were strong enough to make recommendations for further researching

the components of professional community that have the greatest impact on student achievement and how leadership influences these variables.

Grissom and Loeb (2011). The purpose of this study was to determine how principal efficacy varies across tasks and to investigate the relationship between principal efficacy and school outcomes, primarily student achievement scores. The authors also wanted to determine the level of agreement between principals' reported effectiveness and their rating of effectiveness by assistant principals. Grissom and Loeb additionally investigated parent satisfaction with the school as a dependent variable. To frame their study, the authors focused on theories of instructional leadership and complexity theory to understand the context in which principals perform their tasks. They also discussed the importance of recognizing schools as bureaucracies and discussed the difficulties that arise in balancing instructional leadership and bureaucratic, manager type work.

The participants in this study were principals, assistant principals, teachers, and parents from a large district in Florida, and they are described more in Table A2. Grissom and Loeb (2011) gave the principals a 42-item task inventory on which to rate their effectiveness for each task. The same inventory was also given to assistant principals for later comparison of reported effectiveness (Grissom & Loeb, 2011). The authors broke these tasks were broken into five dimensions which were (a) instruction management, (b) internal relations, (c) organization management, (d) administration, and (e) external relations. These categories were also used in Horng et al. (2010). The authors used school-wide achievement data that was reported as the grade given based on Florida's A+ accountability system. They noted

that because of the imprecise nature of these grades, student growth on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test was also used for analysis as a dependent variable. Grissom and Loeb measured teacher satisfaction by a one-item survey asking teachers to rate how satisfied they were being a teacher in their school. They used an additional measure, which was obtained from a district created parent climate survey that asked parents to assign a grade to their child's school based on their perception of its effectiveness.

Grissom and Loeb (2011) first sought to distinguish patterns in task effectiveness and how they varied across school and leader characteristics. They found that across school contexts, principals tended to rate themselves high on all five dimensions. The authors reported that the agreement between the principals' self-ratings and the ratings of the assistant principals was low. Organization management emerged as a significantly related variable in many of their statistical analyses. The tasks involved in organization management are referred to in my discussion of Horng et al. (2010) and are defined the same by Grissom and Loeb (2011).

Grissom and Loeb (2011) used varimax rotation to score principal effectiveness along five dimensions that were uncorrelated by design. They also used a regression framework that allowed them to adjust for other characteristics of the school that might produce bias estimates within the data. The authors controlled for prior achievement when computing with student achievement scores to determine the performance gains, not performance at one point in time.

The authors found that organization management, as self-reported by the principals, and as reported by assistant principals, had a positive relationship with school performance as rated by (a) the A+ grading system, (b) student achievement, (c) teacher satisfaction, and (d) parents' rating of the school. Grissom and Loeb (2011) stressed that although these results favored more traditional notions of managing instead of leading, some factors within organization management were closely related to tasks defined as instructional management and they suggested that further investigation is needed to determine the types of integrated leadership, such as those investigated by Marks and Printy (2003), that will consistently lead to positive school and student outcomes.

Sanzo et al. (2011). The authors of this study examined the leadership practices of highly successful middle school principals and how they facilitated student achievement as measured by Annual Yearly Progress (AYP; NCLB, 2002). Sanzo et al. framed their study by discussing accountability literature and the policy context in which these schools operated. They also cited behaviors of effective principals as reported by Marzano et al. (2005). Sanzo et al. used the same four common core practices of leaders as cited by Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) to serve as the foundation for their exploration: (a) setting direction, (b) developing people, (c) redesigning the organization, and (d) managing the instructional program. I found that similar categories were also used by Finnigan & Stewart (2009) and Jacobson et al. (2007). Sanzo et al. determined that principals were successful if they met the following criteria: (a) they met the Commonwealth of Virginia accreditation standards; (b) the schools in which they worked met the federal NCLB accreditation

standards as measured by student achievement scores, graduation rates, and attendance rates; and (c) they had to have been a principal for at least three years (p. 35).

Sanzo et al. (2011) chose ten principals to interview for this study. The authors put forth that their sample represented a diverse set of school communities, locations, and enrollment sizes. The researchers transcribed and coded the interviews with principals to identify emergent themes using open coding, and constant comparison methods. The authors found that the most salient themes in their data were (a) sharing leadership, (b) facilitating professional development, (c) leading with an instructional orientation, and (d) acting openly and honestly. Based on the ratings of the schools according to AYP, the authors argued that these practices and behaviors allowed the leaders to provide their staff with a common vision and sustain academic growth in a climate of accountability.

Silva et al. (2011). The final study reviewed within this theme examined the direct effects of principal-student discussions on eighth graders' gains in reading achievement, and this study represents the only experimental quantitative research in my review. The framework for this study was based in the functions of instructional management, which was also a variable considered in the study conducted by Grissom and Loeb (2011), Horng et al. (2010), and Jacobson et al. (2007). Silva et al. reported that the participants for this study included both an experimental group and a control group of students, as well as one principal and two assistant principals that had contact with the students in the experimental group.

Silva et al. (2011) considered the independent variable in this study as the achievement based discussions that the principal would have with students in the experimental group. The authors used student outcomes as measured by achievement on the PSSA reading exam, and additional data was collected in the form of a student survey at the conclusion of the experiment.

The scores were plotted on a graph to determine the clustering and overall gains of students in both the control and the experimental group (Silva et al., 2011). In the control group, the authors found three outliers who made significantly higher gains and these three students were interviewed to determine the cause. They found that there were extenuating circumstances that caused these three students to make such large gains. The students in the experimental group did show growth as a result of meeting with the principal to set goals for academic achievement, according to the authors (Silva et al., 2011). The survey the authors administered after the experiment revealed that all students, except for one, self-reported that the discussions with the principal led to 'more' or 'a lot more' motivation to do well on the PSSA. The authors concluded that their research should encourage other studies in the area of principal-student relationships that may positively impact student achievement.

Principal effects on school culture. Given the historical development of theories more focused on the interactions within organizations that make it more effective, it is promising to find research literature that focuses on how leadership influences school culture and climate. As I researched the history of educational leadership, I found a shift in the emergent theories from managing within the

organization to the concept of a vision for changing and improving the organization. To accomplish this implies that a leader must have knowledge of the culture of the organization. Deal and Peterson (2009) described school culture as the unwritten rules, traditions, norms, and expectations that permeate its existence and interact with the beliefs and actions of the people within an organization. While much of school culture remains under the surface, described best as a feeling had when walking through the halls, there are some observable and measurable aspects that researchers have constructed in relation to school culture. Collaboration, professional development, collective vision and purpose, and collective teacher efficacy are aspects of school culture that I have found in my review of the literature. I believe these components relate to the unspoken rules, traditions, and beliefs that are held by members of the school. I also think that the existence of these components can help identify and transmit the unspoken culture of the school and transform it into interactions that shape behaviors. For this reason, I have included these components in the review of research focused on the relationship of leadership to school culture.

The theories and conceptual frameworks that guide the studies reviewed below are similar to those discussed within effects on student achievement. Transformational leadership frames several studies (Pepper & Thomas, 2002; Twigg, 2008), along with instructional leadership (Fancera & Bliss, 2011; Graczewski, Knudson, & Holtzman, 2009). Literacy leadership has not been previously discussed, but is used by McGhee and Lew (2007) to frame their study. This type of leadership is conceptualized as knowledge and action taken by the

principal with a focus on literacy quality, equity, and learning (McGhee & Lew, 2007). Situational leadership and its focus on adaptive behaviors and correct responses and actions for specific situations framed a study conducted by Kelley, Thornton, and Daughtery (2005). School capacity and the social systems context approach frame the other two studies included in this theme (Eilers & Camacho, 2007; Youngs & King, 2002). I will again arrange the articles in this theme in chronological order to notice patterns of theory and methodology used over time. The studies reviewed in this section are outlined in Table A3 with more detailed information about participants and summaries of methods, variables, and findings.

Pepper and Thomas (2002). This study sought to determine the relationship between leadership and school climate. This study was conducted as a qualitative auto-ethnography and data collection occurred through the use of personal journals belonging to one of the authors. The story of a principal who realized her authoritative leadership style was not having a positive impact on her school's climate documented her change and the change of the school as she adopted more transformational leadership qualities and behaviors (Pepper & Thomas, 2002).

The theme of this article focused on the principal reflecting upon her own previous behaviors and understanding that she needed to build trust at her school to develop the capacity for collaboration between herself and the teachers to focus on student learning and make the school a positive place to learn and grow for both students and teachers (Pepper & Thomas, 2002). The authors reported that the principal began her change by altering her approach to discipline referrals and

beginning to develop trusting relationships with the students so they knew she was interested in their problems and wanted them to take responsibility for their actions and move on. Building on the confidence and outcomes she attained as a result of these interactions, Pepper and Thomas described how the principal began to think about and formulate a plan for building these same relationships with the teachers.

Pepper and Thomas (2002) chronicled how this principal began to meet with teachers and collaborate with them about school decisions. Eventually a site-based management team made up of teachers and the principal was created, and the authors considered this an outcome that demonstrated the growth in school culture. Additional outcomes of her behavioral changes were a decrease in discipline referrals, and a decrease in teacher complaints, and the authors also cited a small (3%) increase in student achievement scores over the course of this transformation to a new style of leadership.

Youngs and King (2002). The authors explored how principal leadership builds school capacity through professional development. They chose seven elementary schools to participate in this study, and they framed their study within theories of organizational structure, and school capacity. The authors defined school capacity as “the combined knowledge, skills, and dispositions of individual teachers” (Youngs & King, 2002, p. 646). They put forth that the realization of school capacity can be found in the structure of a professional community, which was also discussed in Louis et al. (2010) and found to be a significant moderating variable between school leadership and student achievement.

Youngs and King (2002) conducted observations of professional development activities within each school, as well as interviews with district and professional development staff, teachers, and principals. They also used document analysis of relevant items. The authors discussed the details of principal leadership in the four schools they studied. Two schools, Lewis and Renfrew, had high rankings on principal leadership for professional development, Kintyre's leader demonstrated a great amount of change in these facilitative behaviors over the time of the study, and Falkirk was chosen because of its low ranking of principal leadership for professional development.

I will discuss the results of these schools describing the professional development initiatives and discussing the principal behaviors that supported professional learning. Youngs and King (2002) reported that the work at Lewis was focused on curriculum for math, reading, and world lab. This specific curriculum allowed the grade level teams to come together, in addition to a principal and team leader group, to collaborate and study the best ways to implement this curriculum (Youngs & King, 2002). According to the authors, the principal structured common planning time for teachers, arranged formal professional development, created additional half days for professional development, and fostered empowerment and collaboration with the teachers.

Renfrew's professional development was driven by grade level standards and benchmarks and essential questions that addressed equity in achievement and literacy (Youngs & King, 2002). The authors observed that this school had teacher inquiry groups, grade level teams, and institutes held throughout the year to foster

collaboration and learning. The authors noted similarities and found that the principal of Renfrew, like Lewis' principal, was focused on sustained, school-wide change. Youngs and King described how the Renfrew principal facilitated the institutes held during the school year, and also fostered teacher empowerment and leadership. The authors put forth that principals and teachers together focused on examining critical questions of equitable learning within this school.

Youngs and King (2002) described Kintyre as a Montessori school that implemented school-wide literacy training with the use of a district resource teacher for professional development. The authors reported that they also had grade level teams that collaborated with regard to professional development. The principal of this school worked collaboratively with the teachers, made arrangements for teachers to work with reading specialists, personally received training in Montessori practices and methods, and organized a school-wide retreat to help the staff come together with a common purpose (Youngs & King, 2002).

The researchers described Falkirk as a school that adopted the Accelerated Schools Model with cadres and a steering committee (Youngs & King, 2002). They stated that there was literacy training for all teachers, and a thematic, arts-integrated curriculum. Grade level teams were also implemented in this school, which was similar to the other schools in the study (Youngs & King, 2002). The authors reported that the principal's actions were focused on encouraging professional development opportunities, transferring teachers and hiring new staff to build commitment, and requiring regular grade level meetings for collaborative purpose.

Youngs and King (2002) put forth that the major themes in their findings revolved around principals being able to create and sustain structures that fostered collaboration and professional development through a common school-wide focus. This focus on shared experiences, they claimed, would help to keep professional development from being a fragmented, ineffective endeavor within the school. The authors stated the importance of a common school vision, as well as the importance of giving teachers a voice in the direction of their school through providing input on professional development initiatives. Youngs and King argued that connecting resources and building trust were also considered essential behaviors that principals must exhibit to build professional community within the school.

Kelley et al. (2005). The authors, through a frame of situational leadership, examined the relationship between the principal's preferred leadership style and school climate. They surveyed one principal and one teacher from 31 schools to determine the leadership style based on the Leader Behavior Analysis II (Blanchard, Hambleton, Zigarmi, & Forsyth; as cited in Kelley et al., 2005). This instrument asked the respondent to choose from four leadership styles to rate 20 different leadership scenarios. The scores were reported under the headings of leadership effectiveness and leadership flexibility (Kelley et al., 2005). School climate was measured using the Staff Development and School Climate Assessment Questionnaire (Zigarmi & Edeburn; as cited in Kelley et al., 2005) and the researchers administered this instrument to five teachers from each school. The authors conveyed that this questionnaire measured teachers' perceptions of

communication, innovativeness, advocacy, decision-making, evaluation, and attitudes toward staff development.

Kelley et al. (2005) analyzed data using Pearson product correlations. The authors found significantly positive relationships between all aspects of school climate and a high teachers' rating of leadership effectiveness. All six measures of school climate were found to be low if the rating of leadership effectiveness was low. Conversely, the authors found that if the rating of leadership flexibility was high, there was a negative relationship with school climate. The authors found statistically significant negative relationships with communication and advocacy. Kelley et al. reported that teachers who rated leadership flexibility low perceived their leaders as principals that shared information, listened to concerns, and supported teachers. A final important finding the authors reported was that principals' self-ratings of their leadership were not related to teachers' ratings of leadership style or to teachers' perceptions of school climate. This means that only the teachers' ratings of leadership style were related to school climate.

Eilers and Camacho (2007). The authors told a story about how a principal achieved a positive change in school culture, and attempted to outline the behaviors that led to the change. They framed their exploration in the social systems context approach. Their study focused on one elementary school, and data collection on leadership impact occurred through classroom observations, structured interviews, and focus groups with teachers and district staff. The authors collected data on school culture by surveying the staff about communities of practice, collaborative leadership, and evidence-based practice. They focused on these aspects of culture

because they were aligned with what the authors described as the unique strengths of the new principal at this school.

The authors discussed how the principal established a focus on building capacity for communities of practice, collaborative leadership, and evidence-based practice, and this resulted in the school being moved from an emergent rating on the survey of school culture to beyond the reported district average (Eilers & Camacho, 2007). The authors included a description of the corresponding growth in student achievement that coincided with the growth in school culture. They determined that the initiative of the principal to collaborate with district office staff and make connections to resources for the school staff made an impact on the level of culture change realized at this school. Eilers and Camacho reported that this combination of setting high expectations, collaborating with teachers, learning together with the staff, and connecting outside resources for professional development made a positive impact on school culture and student achievement.

McGhee and Lew (2007). The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions of teachers regarding principal support for and understanding of effective writing instruction and how this impacted principals' actions and the interventions adopted by the schools. McGhee and Lew framed their study within the theories of instructional leadership and leadership for literacy. The authors surveyed 169 teachers who attended a statewide writing conference and data from this survey was used for both independent and dependent measures. Literacy leadership was determined by the Principal's Support for Writing Instrument (McGhee, as cited in McGhee & Lew, 2007), which included a section on perceptions

of intervention action. This section was used as the outcome variable for the authors' statistical calculations.

McGhee and Lew (2007) performed many different types of statistical analyses to arrive at their conclusions, as shown in Table A3. Ultimately they found that principals' knowledge and beliefs as perceived by teachers had an impact on the literacy programs interventions used in their schools. The coding of the survey remarks yielded two important themes that the authors discussed: the influence of the principals and the focus on test scores.

The authors supported the first theme with examples that expressed the teachers' beliefs that strong leadership and support for literacy instruction were crucial to a school culture dedicated to equity and improvement in literacy skills for students. The second theme, a focus on test scores, illustrated a more negative tone, and the authors gave examples of teachers' comments that spoke of principals who made terrible impressions on their staff by focusing only on test scores as the end result of their teaching and intervention efforts.

Overall, McGhee and Lew found that the knowledge and beliefs of principals as perceived by their teachers played an important role in how they conceptualized the implementation of both literacy programs and interventions. The authors illustrated one component of school culture and how it can be influenced by principals.

Twigg (2008). This study was conducted to determine the effects of leadership on perceived organizational support, organization based self-esteem, and organizational citizenship behaviors. The authors also analyzed student

achievement data, but I included the study within the section on school culture related outcomes because it was not the main focus of the research. Twigg framed this study within the context of transformational leadership theory and included 31 principals and 363 teachers as participants. To measure transformational leadership, the MLQ Form 5X Short was used (Bass, Aviola, & Jung, as cited in Twigg, 2008). The author developed scales and administered them to teachers that measured perceptions of organizational support, and organization based self-esteem. A scale developed by Skarlicki and Latham (as cited in Twigg, 2008) was given to measure organizational citizenship behaviors. The author used student achievement data as measured by scores on state standardized tests.

The measure of transformational leadership given by Twigg (2008) asked teachers to rate their perceptions of principal behavior on items that are related to previous discussions of transformational leadership (e.g., Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). The author included items about organizational support in the survey that assessed teachers' perceptions of the level of care the organization exhibited for individual teachers and their personal goals and values. Organization based self-esteem consisted of items that determined teachers' perceptions of worth and value to the organization itself (Twigg, 2008). The author measured citizenship behaviors with items that asked about the teachers' behaviors during out of school functions and how they spoke of the organization to outsiders.

Twigg (2008) investigated numerous relationships in his use of statistical analysis. I will only discuss the findings that are related to the leadership impact on the dependent variables. The author employed hierarchical regressions, and

ultimately conducted structural equation models on a path analysis of the hypothesized model to test the relationships between variables. Twigg found that the weakest relationship was between leadership and citizenship behaviors. The strongest relationship was found between leadership and perceived support. After running several different structural equation models with different mediating variables, he put forth the strongest finding: he found that transformational leadership had the strongest relationship with perceived support, which then impacted either organization-based self-esteem or citizenship behavior. Citizenship behavior was found to have a positive, significant relationship with student achievement (Twigg, 2008).

Graczewski et al. (2009). The authors studied the approach of principals and leadership teams to determine if the principals fostered a clear and coherent vision for the schools' approach to professional development. The authors framed their study in theories of instructional leadership, and examined nine elementary schools in San Diego that were participating in site-based leadership reform. The researchers examined leadership behaviors through interviews with the principal and observations of principal leadership. They measured teachers' perceptions of professional development with a survey, observations of professional development, and interviews. The authors employed a mixed-methods design for their research.

Because the authors used both qualitative and quantitative data in their study, I will discuss their qualitative findings first, followed by a summary of their quantitative analysis. Graczewski et al. found that many principals talked about the importance of setting a school vision as a central component of their role as the

leader. They also found that principals in the case study schools not only coordinated and planned professional development, they were active participants alongside their staff. They discussed the importance that teachers placed on providing resources and support for professional development that was relevant and useful to their teaching practice.

Four leadership scales were used in analyzing and discussing teachers' perceptions of leadership style (Graczewski et al., 2009). These dimensions were (a) coherent, school-wide vision for instructional improvement; (b) focus on student learning and achievement; (c) follow-up and implementation support; and (d) leadership engagement in instructional improvement. The scales they developed to analyze and discuss teachers' perceptions of professional development were (a) coherent and relevant professional development, and (b) content and curriculum focused professional development. The authors found positive correlations between each of the four leadership dimensions and perceptions of a coherent and relevant professional development program. They put forth that the strongest predictor for coherence of professional development was the perception of a coherent school vision. The authors also found that there was a significant, positive correlation between the teachers' perceptions of leadership engagement in instructional improvement and a content and curriculum focused professional development program. These findings affirmed the authors' hypotheses and represented the only statistically significant relationships found in their analyses (Graczewski et al., 2009).

Matsumura et al. (2009). Although this study is more focused on a specific aspect of professional development, the participation in professional development activities and coaching opportunities fall into the realm of school culture because I believe the health of a school culture may predict teachers' participation in these kinds of activities within their school. Matsumura et al. investigated the role of the principal in teachers' participation in literacy coaching activities. Instructional leadership served as the theoretical frame within which this study was conducted. The authors reported that 29 schools, 15 principals, 11 coaches, and 106 teachers participated in this investigation, as shown in Table A3. The authors determined leadership roles and behaviors through interviews with principals and literacy coaches. Teachers' perceptions of the coaching activities and participation were measured using a pre- and post-survey on their work with the coach (Matsumura et al., 2009). The authors also collected information about the frequency of engagement with the coach as a measure of participation.

Matsumura et al. (2009) used a combination of qualitative, inductive methods to categorize their interview data, along with correlational analyses with their surveys to determine the impact of the principal on teachers' perceptions of and participation in literacy coaching activities. Qualitative software was used to analyze data through three steps including open coding with inductive analysis, axial coding, and then organizing codes into larger categories that represented dimensions of principal support.

According to Matsumura et al. (2009), they found significant positive relationships between principal support behaviors and teachers' participation in

working with the coach in grade level teams, and being observed by the coach teaching a reading lesson. The authors found that in schools where the principal trusted the coach to manage their own time and treated them as a valued professional, teachers participated more frequently in team meetings with the coaches. Teachers' participation in classroom observations done by the coach were positively related to the principal treating the coach as a valued professional, publicly endorsing the coach's literacy expertise, and actively participating in the Content Focused Coaching program (Matsumura et al., 2009). When the principals' view of the literacy coaches aligned with the Content Focused Coaching program, which meant that the principals understood the coaches were there to help improve capacity and instruction, not as an additional teacher or someone to handle administrative tasks, there was a positive relationship to the teachers' participation in having coaches observe their classroom teaching. The authors described the coaches' perceptions of behaviors that principals exhibited to support them in their work included actions such as (a) publicly endorsing the coach as a literacy expert, (b) publicly supporting the coaching program, and (c) explaining its relevance to their school improvement. The authors conveyed that coaches felt more effective when the principal encouraged teachers to work with them and treated them like a valued professional.

Matsumura et al. (2009) summarized their findings and supported their statistical analyses with qualitative results from interviews with the coaches and principals. They argued that their study provided evidence of the important role

principals play in creating a school culture that values coaching as an instructional improvement activity.

Fancera and Bliss (2011). The purpose of this study was to determine if instructional leadership functions positively affected collective teacher efficacy (CTE). The authors chose 53 high schools in New Jersey to study for this research, and the study was framed within the theories of instructional leadership and efficacy. Instructional leadership was measured using Hallinger's PIMRS (as cited in Fancera & Bliss, 2011). This scale included items that focused on the principals' role and involvement in matters considering curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices within the school at different levels and was also described and utilized by O'Donnell and White (2005) to determine the relationships of instructional leadership behavior and school climate. CTE was measured using a short version of Goddard's Collective Efficacy Scale (CES; as cited in Fancera & Bliss, 2011). The authors included an analysis with student achievement data, as described in Table A3.

According to Goddard (as cited in Fancera & Bliss, 2011), "CTE is dependent on the interaction of group competence, the ability of the faculty as a whole to effectively instruct students to learn, and teaching task analysis, or teacher perceptions of students" (p. 356). The PIMRS (Hallinger; as cited in Fancera & Bliss, 2011) measured 10 principal instructional leadership behaviors, some that have been described in previous studies (O'Donnell & White, 2005). For the purposes of understanding what relationships exist and had no predictive value, the ten behaviors measured by Hallinger's PIMRS were (a) framing the school goals, (b)

communicating the school goals, (c) supervising and evaluating instruction, (d) coordinating the curriculum, (e) monitoring student progress, (f) protecting instructional time, (g) maintaining high visibility, (h) providing incentives for teachers, (i) promoting professional development, and (j) providing incentives for learning (Fancera & Bliss, 2011).

After computing Pearson moment-correlation coefficients, Fancera and Bliss (2011) found that there was no significant relationship between any of the 10 instructional leadership behaviors and CTE. The authors put forth that CTE had a positive relationship with school achievement, however. They found that the leadership functions of (a) protecting instructional time, (b) supervising and evaluating instruction, and (c) monitoring student progress were related with several indicators they used to measure school achievement. O'Donnell and White (2005) similarly noted that the function of protecting instructional time was related to perceptions of a positive school climate. Fancera and Bliss found no other relationships with other instructional leadership behaviors and school achievement. They reported significant positive relationships between student demographic information and CTE, as well as student achievement. This may suggest, according to the authors, that student socioeconomic status is a greater predictor of CTE and student achievement than leadership behaviors, at least in the schools they studied.

Principal effects on teacher outcomes. In the search for research literature, I separated teacher outcomes into many different components to try to capture the way the field of educational leadership conceptualizes the impact of leadership on teachers. Undoubtedly, teachers are the people in the schools who

have the most direct interaction with student learning, so the focus on what allows them to be more effective, remain satisfied and motivated in their work, and feel valued and intrinsically rewarded for the effort they spend on improving their practice and continually striving to meet the needs of all students is of utmost importance (Robinson et al., 2008). Marzano et al. (2005) and other researchers have agreed the effects of leadership occur mostly through other variables, so it is in this section that we turn to one of the most influential variables for student learning (Leithwood & Louis, 2012; Marzano et al., 2005). The articles in this section are focused on teacher job satisfaction, motivation, retention, performance, and efficacy. They represent a broad array of individual outcomes with a relationship to leaders.

In addition to the previous theories and conceptual frameworks that have driven the studies reviewed, these articles represent theoretical illustrations in this discussion. Transactional leadership was a specific focus for one study reviewed (Vecchio, Justin, & Pearce, 2008). Grissom (2011) introduced the economic labor market model as a conceptual frame in his study. In this study, he used this theory to propose why teacher retention is so important to economic conditions and efficiency of schools in using and retaining resources (Grissom, 2011). Finally, there is also specific reference to human relations theory (Price, 2012). With this in mind to help guide the discussion, I have organized the articles in chronological order within these themes to follow any emergent patterns in methods or theories within the research, the studies are also outlined in Table A4.

Griffith (2004). The purpose of this study was to understand if components of transformational leadership impacted teacher job satisfaction, and if this then

impacted the turnover rate for teachers. The author was also interested in examining the relationship of transformational leadership, job satisfaction and the achievement gaps in schools. Framed in transformational leadership theory, 3,291 school staff, and 25,087 students from 117 different schools participated in this study (Griffith, 2004). The author administered surveys to the participants that measured three components of transformational leadership to be used as the independent variable: (a) charisma or inspiration, (b) individualized consideration, and (c) intellectual stimulation.

For the dependent variable of satisfaction, Griffith (2004) used three items on the survey that indicated the teachers' job satisfaction. The author determined staff turnover from archival records obtained from the district office that indicated teacher mobility and turnover. Organizational performance was determined by student achievement data and responses of students on survey items to which they indicated their gender, racial/ethnic background, and self-reported GPA to determine the achievement gap between minority and non-minority students (Griffith, 2004).

Griffith (2004) used structural equation modeling to investigate the effects of transformational leadership on school staff turnover and school performance. He investigated teacher satisfaction as a moderating factor between principal leadership and school staff turnover and school performance. The author also used HLM to investigate the cross-level effects of job satisfaction and principal leadership on achievement disparities between students who were in both minority and non-minority ethnic groups.

Griffith (2004) found that the three components of transformational leadership contributed equally to principal transformational leadership. He also reported that transformational leadership had a significant, positive relationship with staff job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was found to have a moderately significant, positive relationship with student achievement (Griffith, 2004). The author tested the direct effects of transformational leadership on school staff turnover and student achievement and did not find a direct relationship between these variables. He additionally found that principal transformational leadership had a strong, significant indirect effect on both staff turnover and student achievement through job satisfaction. Finally, the author determined from his data that schools with higher job satisfaction had a significant and positive relationship with a smaller achievement gap, and the gap narrowed when transformational leadership variables were added into the equation, meaning that schools with transformational leadership and high staff job satisfaction had smaller achievement gaps.

Hurren (2006). This study was conducted to investigate the relationship between principals' use of humor and teacher job satisfaction. The author framed his study within a discussion of organizational culture, climate, job stress, and satisfaction. The author reported that 650 teachers participated in this study: they were from elementary, middle, and secondary schools, as represented in Table A4. The dependent variable was the principals' use of humor as measured by the Principals' Frequency of Humor Questionnaire (Hurren, 2006). The author gave participants a definition of humor and asked them to rate the use of humor by their

principal in several different situations. The definition was “any message, verbal or nonverbal, that is communicated by the principal and evokes feelings of positive amusement by the participant” (Hurren, 2006, p. 379). The author measured teachers’ job satisfaction by Evan’s job satisfaction scale (as cited in Hurren, 2006).

Hurren (2006) used frequency distributions, means, and ANOVA to examine the responses to the humor questionnaire. Ultimately he found that ANOVA was an appropriate test to use and proceeded with data analysis. The author concluded that there were positive relationships between the principals’ frequency of humor use and teacher job satisfaction.

Youngs (2007). The purpose of this study was to examine how elementary principals’ beliefs and actions influenced the experience of new teachers. This study employed the theoretical framework of instructional leadership, and 12 principals along with 12 teachers participated in the study. Qualitative methods were used to conduct interviews with principals, beginning teachers, mentors and other educators within the schools. Observations of principals’ meetings with the new teachers, mentor-mentee meetings, and other induction activities were conducted by the researcher.

Youngs (2007) compiled field notes for each audiotaped interview and used this information to write case reports for each of the six schools that included information about the principals’ background, their beliefs and actions related to instructional leadership, induction, and teacher evaluation. These case reports also included information about the direct and indirect interactions and influences the principals had with the new teachers (Youngs, 2007). Youngs coded the data from

winter and spring to understand the nature of the principal leadership and the relationship to the new teacher experiences.

According to Youngs (2007), the principals' beliefs and actions did have an impact on (a) new teachers' experiences, (b) satisfaction with the job, (c) learning and growth, and (d) intention to stay teaching. Youngs further argued that through direct interactions and facilitating mentor-mentee relationships with other teachers, principals had a positive influence on the professional growth of a new teacher. The author reported that the background and beliefs of the principal regarding instructional leadership, induction, evaluation, and policy impacted the way they approached interactions and support for new teachers.

Wahlstrom and Louis (2008). This study was conducted to determine how teachers' instructional practices are affected by principal-teacher relationships. Shared leadership, organizational trust and efficacy theories served as the conceptual framework for this study (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). The authors surveyed 4,165 teachers about principal leadership behavior and classroom practices to construct the variables used for data analysis.

Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) described that teacher classroom practice consisted of three main themes, which indicated high loadings from survey items. Standard contemporary practice was broadly defined as discovery-centered teaching practices versus teacher-centered practices (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). The authors described the focused instruction variable and it included items that asked teachers about (a) the level of interruption in their classroom, (b) pace of instruction, and (c) strategies that allowed students to construct their own

knowledge. They defined flexible grouping practices by responses to items that queried the teachers' practices in (a) grouping students, (b) differentiating instruction, and (c) providing opportunities for cooperative learning.

Two variables represented principal leadership behavior (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). These variables were principal trust, which the authors measured by responses from the teachers about (a) the level of discussion with the principal about educational matters, (b) individual support from the principal to improve practice, and (c) development of a caring and trusting environment. Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) constructed the second variable, shared leadership, which was measured by teacher responses to items that asked about the level of influence teachers and grade level teams had on resources and decision making within the school.

Professional community (also discussed in Louis et al., 2010, Eilers & Camacho, 2007) was measured by four variables that consisted of (a) reflective dialogue, (b) collective responsibility, (c) de-privatized practice, and (d) shared norms that were constructed from responses about the level of involvement teachers had with each other around collaboration, reflection about teaching practices, and utilizing each other as resources for the common purpose of educating all students (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). The authors also measured individual efficacy from items that reflected the individuals' feelings of competence and effectiveness in their classroom.

Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) used stepwise linear regression models to analyze the variables. They found that the leadership variables had no significant

effect on contemporary classroom practice. The authors reported that both leadership variables had a significant positive effect on focused instruction. Wahlstrom and Louis conveyed that shared leadership was significant in both elementary and high school settings, while trust in principal leadership was significant in the middle school setting for focused instruction. Finally, the authors found that the leadership variables were insignificant predictors of flexible grouping practices in all settings.

Overall, Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) found that shared leadership and the trust in the principal were related to teachers' instructional practices, specifically focused instruction which was described by pace of instruction, combined with student discovery and teacher-guided instruction practices. The authors emphasized the finding that the variance in results across settings indicated shared leadership was more important in high school, while trust in the principal was more important in the middle school setting.

Vecchio et al. (2008). The authors examined the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and teacher performance and satisfaction. Vecchio et al. (2008) framed their study within theories of both transformational and transactional leadership. They chose 223 high school principals and 342 head department teachers of English and Math to participate in the study. In addition, the authors constructed 179 teacher-principal dyads from the data for analysis.

Vecchio et al. (2008) gave principals a survey that asked about their perception of teacher job performance. Teachers were given surveys that reflected

their perception of their principals' leadership style and included items that asked about (a) vision, (b) performance expectations, (c) intellectual stimulation, (d) participative goals, and (e) contingent rewards (Vecchio et al., 2008). The authors also had teachers answer three survey items about their level of job satisfaction.

The authors found the means, standard deviations, internal reliabilities, and inter-correlations of the variables to analyze their data and report their results (Vecchio et al., 2008). For the outcome of satisfaction, the authors found that data indicated transactional leadership added to the effects of transformational leadership on teacher satisfaction. Based on their results, the authors argued that transactional leadership behaviors may have more predictive value than previously assumed, and these findings were contrary to their first hypothesis. Vecchio et al. (2008) initially believed that transactional leadership behaviors would augment transformational leadership behaviors, but their data indicated that the reverse relationship was present. They also reported that their second hypothesis, that contingent rewards negatively moderated the relationship between transformational leadership and teacher satisfaction and performance, was confirmed by their data analysis.

Grissom (2011). The author studied the links between principal effectiveness and teacher satisfaction and turnover in school environments that were difficult to staff. The author explained the economic labor market model to help the reader understand the literature on teacher attrition and retention within the framework of teacher supply and demand. He discussed the cost-benefit framework and how schools that enroll large populations of disadvantaged students

could be conceptualized as imposing a cost on the teacher in the form of a poor working environment. Grissom posited that principal leadership behaviors can affect the job satisfaction of teachers working in this difficult to staff environments and sought to investigate this relationship.

Principal effectiveness was measured by teacher responses to the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and the Teacher Follow-up Survey (TFS) that were administered by the National Center for Education Statistics (Grissom, 2011). The author gave questionnaires to school and district leaders to obtain their perspective about organizational characteristics. The author reported that 30,690 teachers' surveys were analyzed for this study.

Grissom (2011) used teacher satisfaction and teacher turnover as the dependent variables in this investigation. Teacher satisfaction was measured by one item on the survey that asked the teacher to rate how satisfied they were working at their present school (Grissom, 2011). The author determined teacher turnover by the principals' response to the TFS-1, which asked the principals to designate whether teachers had remained in the school, transferred schools, or left the district.

Six statements on the SASS were used to construct principal effectiveness (Grissom, 2011). These statements related to teachers' perceptions of (a) the principal setting clear expectations, (b) the principal providing support and encouragement, (c) the principal recognizing staff for a job well done, (d) the principal supporting teachers with disciplinary issues, (e) the principal communicating school vision, and (f) feelings about the overall operation of the

school (Grissom, 2011). The author performed regression analysis to determine the relationship between the variables. Initially, he found that teachers were less satisfied in schools with higher minority and low-income populations. When Grissom added the variable for principal effectiveness, teacher satisfaction was positively impacted, and addition of other principal and school characteristics indicated that they had no effect on the positive relationship between principal effectiveness and teacher satisfaction. The author also reported results on the relationship between principal effectiveness and teacher turnover. He found that teacher turnover was negatively influenced by principal effectiveness, meaning that principals that were more effective predicted a lower probability of teacher turnover. Grissom further reported that principal effectiveness had a more positive effect in disadvantaged schools than in other environments, which indicated that the same principal in an average school may have no effect on satisfaction, but a good principal in a disadvantaged school may have a tremendous effect on teacher satisfaction and retention.

May and Supovitz (2011). The purpose of this study was to determine how much time principals reported spending on improving instruction, the scope and frequency of these interactions, and how this time was related to teachers' reported changes in instructional practices. Horng et al. (2010) also studied principals' use of time. The authors used instructional leadership theory as their conceptual framework. May and Supovitz reported that 51 schools from each level participated, as shown in Table A4. The independent variables the authors investigated were the time spent on instructional leadership and leadership behaviors. The authors

collected data on time as measured by a daily principal activity log. Instructional leadership behaviors were measured by the self-reported behaviors in the principal's log, as well as teacher responses to a school staff questionnaire the authors conducted for this study. Instructional change served as the dependent variable and was measured by 2 eight-item scales from the staff questionnaire administered to the teachers (May & Supovitz, 2011).

According to May and Supovitz (2011) principals reported how much time they spent on nine different leadership tasks in their daily principal logs. The authors reported these categories of tasks as (a) building operations, (b) finances and financial support for the school, (c) community or parent relations, (d) school district functions, (e) student affairs, (f) personnel issues, (g) planning/setting goals, (h) instructional leadership, and (i) principal professional growth. The authors also used the teachers' responses to instructional leadership questions on the survey to construct the leadership variable. The survey items asked about how often (a) teachers and principals discussed the teachers' instruction, (b) the principal observed the teacher instructing, (c) the teacher observed the principal instructing, (d) the principal provided feedback after an observation, and (e) the principal reviewed work completed by students (May & Supovitz, 2011).

May and Supovitz (2011) measured instructional change with survey items that asked about the changes in a teacher's reading and math instruction. Teachers were asked to rate how much their instruction had changed with regard to

- student assessment,
- student grouping,

- materials used,
 - topics covered,
 - teaching methods used,
 - the type of work students were asked to do,
 - the kinds of questions students were asked, and
 - understanding of the needs of individual students within the their classroom
- (May & Supovitz, 2011).

May and Supovitz (2011) used descriptive statistics and multilevel models to analyze and report their data. First, the authors reported that based on the daily logs, principals report spending only an average of 8% of their time on instructional leadership tasks. The range of time reported by principals was between 0% and 25% (May & Supovitz, 2011). The authors reported that a majority (68%) of teachers reported only have 'some' instructional leadership contact with their principals. The authors stated that 10% of teachers said they had no contact with their principals in an instructional leadership capacity, and 22% reported a high level of instructional leadership contact. May and Supovitz constructed a scatterplot of the reported contact with principals by school size and put forth that time reported in instructional leadership tasks appeared to be related to school size.

The authors found that as time in instructional leadership increased, there was not an increase in teachers' reported change in instructional practices (May & Supovitz, 2011). However, the authors did find a relationship between school-wide change in instructional practices in reading and time spent in instructional leadership.

Walker and Slear (2011). This study examined the impact of principal leadership behaviors on the efficacy of new and experienced middle school teachers. Theories of efficacy, instructional, and transformational leadership were used as the framework for this study (Walker & Slear, 2011). The authors had 366 teachers complete surveys for this study. Principal behaviors were measured by teacher responses to 11 different leadership behaviors (Walker & Slear, 2011). The authors measured teacher efficacy with the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES), the long form version of this instrument took into account the various experience levels of the teachers who responded (Walker & Slear, 2011).

Walker and Slear (2011) put together a list of 11 principal behaviors that they argued had been found to support teacher efficacy in past research. These eleven items were

- communication,
- consideration,
- discipline,
- empowering staff,
- flexibility,
- influence with supervisors,
- inspiring group purpose,
- modeling instructional expectations,
- monitoring and evaluating instruction,
- providing contingent rewards, and
- situational awareness (Walker & Slear, 2011).

Walker and Slear (2011) used stepwise linear regression to analyze the data for this study. When the data was analyzed not considering the level of teacher experience, the authors found that three principal behaviors had a statistically significant relationship with teacher efficacy. The behaviors that the authors found were positively associated with teacher efficacy were modeling instructional expectations and communication. Providing contingent rewards had a significant, negative effect on teacher efficacy (Walker & Slear, 2011). This negative relationship was reported by the authors to mean that contingent rewards were more important for teachers with lower reported efficacy, and less important for teachers who reported higher efficacy.

The authors also conducted analysis based on the level of experience of the teachers and principal behaviors (Walker & Slear, 2011). The authors reported that the data for the new teachers (0-3 years of experience) showed that modeling instructional expectations was the only significant predictor of efficacy. They conveyed that the efficacy of experienced teachers (4-7 years of experience) showed positive significant relationships with modeling instructional expectations and communication. Very experienced teachers (8-14 years of experience) were found to have their efficacy affected by communication, consideration, and modeling instructional expectations (Walker & Slear, 2011). For teachers who had extensive experience (more than 15 years), the authors reported that their efficacy was affected by the principals' behavior of inspiring group purpose. Walker and Slear (2011) concluded that based on these results, principals should focus on different

aspects of their leadership behavior to build the efficacy of teachers with different levels of experience.

Price (2012). This most recently published study in this section of my review was conducted to examine the direct effects of principals' attitudes on teacher outcomes. Price used organizational culture and human relations theory as a framework for her study. The author calculated 11,620 relationships between elementary principals and teachers using data from the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS).

Principals' attitude was a variable the author constructed from a combination of responses to items about (a) power sharing, (b) frequency of joint professional exchange with teachers, (c) principal satisfaction, (d) principal cohesion, and (e) principal commitment behavior (Price, 2012). The author also considered moderating variables on principal attitudes in analysis and included responses to items such as (a) principal autonomy from the district, (b) personal antecedents such as preparation experience, (c) previous experience as an assistant principal, and (d) mentoring experiences.

Teacher satisfaction, teacher perceptions of cohesion, and teacher commitment were considered the dependent variables because of their related impact on positive school climates (Price, 2012). The author constructed the scores for teacher satisfaction from responses to items about (a) principal communication, (b) recognition, (c) support, (d) class size, (e) salary, and (f) teaching in general. Price discussed teacher cohesion as a response to factors that unified staff perceptions about

- rule enforcement,
- school mission,
- cooperation and coordination, and
- feelings regarding the principal (Price, 2012).

Price (2012) used structural equation modeling to determine the effects of relationships on principal outcomes, but that is not a focus of this review so I focus the summary of this study on the calculations that looked at the principal as the independent variable. The author employed fixed effects linear regression modeling techniques to investigate principal-teacher relationships on teacher outcomes. The author found that principals' relationships with their staff greatly impacted teacher outcomes, positively affecting teacher satisfaction, cohesion, and commitment. Price also reported that individual principal attitudes did not have an effect on teacher attitudes.

Principal effects on teacher well-being. The studies discussed in this section could have been included within the above portion on teacher outcomes however they represent a different view of leadership that I felt was important to review as a separate discussion. These articles both use the frame of boss abuse theories to investigate the mistreatment of teachers and the effects this has on teacher well-being. The theories, as explained by the authors, describe how people in positions of power have the ability to abuse that power and mistreat subordinates in ways that impact their personal well-being (Blase & Blase, 2002; Blase, Blase, & Du, 2008). The authors who conducted these studies stated the noticeable lack of literature on the topic of abuse in educational leadership and

sought to begin a conversation about the occurrence of these types of behaviors and the lasting impacts mistreatment can have on teachers.

Blase and Blase (2002). The first study of its kind, the authors sought to discover how teachers defined abused by principals and how these behaviors affected them. The authors framed their study within boss abuse theories, and they used symbolic interactionism for data analysis. The authors reported that 50 teachers participated in this study, as summarized in Table A5.

Blase and Blase (2002) collected data through interviews with the teachers. Because of the sensitive nature of the topic being investigated, the authors reported that most interviews happened over the telephone to ensure anonymity. Principals' acts of abuse were of central concern, as was the teachers' perceived effects of the abuse, and these foci were the topic of the two open-ended questions that the researchers asked the teachers during their interview (Blase & Blase, 2002).

Blase and Blase conducted two to four interviews with each participant, and they constructed transcripts and detailed notes for each interview. The authors analyzed the data using grounded theory methods and each line was coded by hand. Personal documents from the teachers, as well as official documents from their schools were also collected to provide both deeper understanding of the phenomenon as well as provide a method to triangulate the data and produce more trustworthy results (Blase & Blase, 2002).

The authors classified their findings about principals' abusive behaviors by levels indicating their intensity (Blase & Blase, 2002). Indirect, or moderately aggressive, abuse the authors considered as (a) discounting teachers' thoughts,

needs, and feelings; (b) isolating and abandoning teachers; (c) withholding resources and denying approval, opportunities, and credit; (d) favoring select teachers, and (e) offensive personal conduct. The authors explained behaviors that were considered escalating in aggression as (a) spying, (b) sabotaging, (c) stealing, (d) destroying instructional aids, (e) making unreasonable demands, and (f) both public and private criticism. The most aggressive behaviors reported were (a) lying, (b) explosive behavior, (c) threats, (d) unwarranted reprimands, (e) unfair evaluations, (f) mistreating students, (g) forcing teachers out of their jobs, (h) preventing teachers from leaving or advancing, (i) sexual harassment, and (j) racism.

The researchers found that the reported effects of these behaviors were classified into five different categories. Early psychological and emotional responses included

- shock and disorientation,
- humiliation,
- loneliness,
- injured self-confidence and self-esteem,
- feelings of corruption and guilt (Blase & Blase, 2002).

Long-term psychological responses were also discovered in their analysis of interview data. These long-term responses were

- fear and anxiety,
- anger, and

- depression (Blase & Blase, 2002).

The authors also found that physical and physiological problems were reported.

Blasé and Blasé discovered that damaged schools, in the form of damaged relationships or classrooms, or impaired decision making were also reported by teachers who had been abused. Finally, the authors learned that some teachers considered leaving their job as a result of their mistreatment.

Blase, Blase, and Du (2008). The purpose of this study was to investigate how teachers perceived mistreatment by principals, how they coped with the mistreatment, and what they perceived to be the effects of the mistreatment (Blase, Blase, & Du, 2008). The authors also sought to determine if there were different perceptions of mistreatment and effects based on the demographic background of teachers. The authors reported that 172 teachers completed the survey offered at the website of the National Association for the Prevention of Teacher Abuse. The questionnaire was created by the researchers based on the data from their previous study (Blase & Blase, 2002).

The survey created by the Blase and Blase (2002), called the Principal Mistreatment/Abuse Inventory (PMAI), included a section on mistreatment that included measures of frequency, intensity and duration of abusive behaviors. They also included a section asking about the effects of the abuse on the victims' emotional, physical, and behavioral well-being. The authors included additional questions about the victims' coping methods, and finally they asked about teachers' perceptions of reasons behind the abuse. The authors were interested in demographic information that may have offered more information about the nature

and type of abuse experienced by teachers with different personal characteristics and backgrounds.

Blase, Blase, and Du (2008) reported their results using descriptive statistics. They found that 78.5% of teachers who responded reported at least moderate personal harm as the result of principal mistreatment. They also found that 75% reported at least moderate harm to their work. The authors reported that 58.1% of teachers responded that there was at least moderate harm caused to their families due to the mistreatment they experienced. 76.1% reported that their combined harm for personal, work, and family effects was at least moderate, and 45.3% rated their combined harm level as serious or extensive (Blase, Blase, & Du, 2008). The authors also stated that 42.5% of the respondents said that over 60% of their total life's harm came from the principals' abuse.

Blase, Blase, and Du (2008) reported the teachers' most frequently cited coping methods. They found that the top ten coping methods were to

- avoid the principal,
- talk with others for support and ideas,
- endure the principals' mistreatment,
- rationalize the principals' behavior,
- participate in relaxing activities,
- detach,
- assert oneself with the principal,
- look for good in the principal,
- report to a union official or association representative, or

- think positively and accept this as a part of the job (Blase, Blase, & Du, 2008).

The authors reported differences in preferred coping strategies by gender, age, and marital status. They found no differences in coping strategies when compared with levels of degrees, school level, or ethnic groups. 51.2% of respondents said that sometimes the mistreatment was so bad that they could not cope and 76.7% reported that they would leave their job as a result of this abuse.

The authors reported high percentages (over 60%) of detrimental effects of the abuse. These effects included

- stress,
- resentment,
- anger,
- insecurity,
- a sense of injustice and moral outrage,
- self-doubt,
- anxiety,
- a sense of powerlessness,
- maintenance of silence, and
- bitterness (Blase, Blase, & Du, 2008).

The authors stated that less frequently reported effects were the (a) use of alcohol, (b) worsened allergies or asthma, (c) smoking, (d) ulcers, (e) use of illegal drugs, and (f) post-traumatic stress disorder. The authors reported that 77.3% of

respondents indicated that their teaching had been undermined and affected by the mistreatment. These effects were further analyzed and broken down to note differences in gender, union contracts, age, and marital status. Again, no variation in effects was found due to level of degree, school levels, experience, or ethnicity.

50% of teachers who responded to the questionnaire reported that the frequency of the mistreatment was moderate, while 30.8% reported mild frequency, 12.2% reported high frequency, and 7% reported severe frequency (Blase, Blase, & Du, 2008). The authors reported that the intensity of harm was demonstrated by ten intensely harmful behaviors performed by the principal which were: (a) intimidation, (b) failure to recognize or give praise for work related achievements, (c) giving unwarranted reprimands, (d) making unreasonable demands, (e) favoring other teachers, (f) lying to the teacher or about the teacher, (g) nitpicking about time or micromanaged teachers, (h) using negative terms to label teachers and their behavior, and (i) unjustly criticizing teachers (Blasé, Blasé, & Du, 2008).

Finally, Blase, Blase, and Du (2008) put forth the teachers' responses about their perceptions of why principals engaged in abusive behaviors. They found that teachers believed mistreatment occurred because of (a) personal characteristics, (b) disagreement with their policies or actions and (c) advocating for the students. These were the most frequently found themes in the teachers' responses, but other reasons included (a) the teacher refusing to engage in unethical or immoral behavior, (b) filing a union grievance, (c) knowledge of administrative wrongdoing, and (c) not being one of the favorite teachers (Blase, Blase, & Du, 2008).

Principal effects on parents and the community. This was an outcome that was not readily found in my review of the research literature. Although I did not specifically search for parents as an outcome measure, the school environment, student, and school culture searches should have brought up results that indicated parents' involvement or perceptions if they existed. In studies that I have previously discussed, I have found aspects of parent perceptions that were included in data collection and analysis (e.g., Horng et al., 2010). Of the two studies that will be reviewed below, Gordon and Louis (2009) used student achievement as an outcome variable, and while I will report their results, the focus is on the perceptions of principals and the effect their openness to community involvement has on the school outcomes.

Following open systems theory, discussed earlier in this paper, Gordon and Louis (2009) theorized that parent and community involvement had an effect on the organizational structure of the school as well as student achievement. These stakeholders hold expectations of the school as an institution and through their larger role in society have important values and beliefs that shape the purpose of schooling (Foster, 1986; Hodgkinson, 1991; Sarason, 1990). I will discuss two studies that attempted to look at the effects of the principal on parental and community voice in the school.

These studies are framed within role theory, democratic leadership, and have a small focus on the power relationships that exist within organizations (Gordon & Louis, 2009; Griffith, 2001). Role theory examines the specific roles and behaviors associated with them that take place within organizations and social systems

(Lindle, 2006). Democratic leadership emphasizes the equal voice of constituents and those involved in and affected by the decisions and actions of an organization (Kramer, 2006). Power relationships are a central focus of critical theory, and attempt to make change through questioning their existence, why they occur, and who benefits from their presence (Barbour, 2011; Foster, 1986). Through these frames, I will discuss the following articles in chronological order, and an outline of their features can be found in Table A6.

Griffith (2001). The purpose of this study was to discover the types of principal behavior that were associated with high levels of parent involvement. 78 principals were surveyed, and 13,768 parents were surveyed as well. This study was framed within the conceptual frameworks of role theory and situational leadership theory (Griffith, 2001). The author used HLM to analyze the relationships between variables constructed from the two surveys.

Griffith (2001) measured parent involvement by responses to survey items that asked about (a) their participation in volunteering to help with activities at the school, (b) attending parent-teacher association meetings, (c) attending events for the students at the school, and (d) helping their children with homework and school projects. Parents were also asked to rate how the school does with regard to informing parents about educational progress, problems with their child, and school meetings and events (Griffith, 2001). The author additionally surveyed parents about the ways the school empowered them, and collected information about their socio-demographic background.

Griffith (2001) surveyed principals about their perceived behaviors and roles as the leaders of their schools. The roles they could choose from were created by the author from a review of the leadership literature and included (a) master teacher, (b) administrative agent, (c) gamesman or politician, (d) school manager, (e) maintenance manager, or (f) missionary. The principal could choose more than one role to describe their prominent behavior as the leader (Griffith, 2001). The author reported that a majority of principals chose the school manager as their primary role.

Griffith (2001) reported that the managerial role had a negative effect on parent involvement and parent perceptions of the school environment. The administrative agent role also was found to have a negative effect on parent perception of school climate, but a positive effect on attending PTA meetings (Griffith, 2001). The author stated that parents felt less empowered with a maintenance manager, and that the gamesman was associated with perceptions of a positive school climate, and feelings of empowerment among parents, although it was negatively associated with attendance to PTA meetings. The master teacher was also reported to have a positive relationship with parent empowerment, and the missionary role was related to higher attendance at PTA meetings (Griffith, 2001).

When analyzing the data with regard to free and reduced meal (FARM) status and English as a second language (ESOL) information, Griffith (2001) discussed the following results. The master teacher was found to have a greater effect on empowerment and involvement for parents in schools with higher FARM and ESOL status. The author also reported similar results for the missionary role, stating that

there was a relationship with parents' positive perceptions of school climate, and feelings of empowerment. The role of the gamesman was reported to have a negative effect in these schools on school climate, informing parents, and feelings of empowerment (Griffith, 2001).

Gordon and Louis (2009). This study sought to determine how leadership style affected principals' openness to community involvement, and if this in turn impacted student achievement. Because the authors focused on the mediating variable of community involvement and the principals' role in encouraging these behaviors, this study is discussed here instead of with effects on student achievement. The study was framed within critical theories illustrated by questions of power structures that could marginalize the voice of parents, and democratic leadership theories (Gordon & Louis, 2009). The authors surveyed 260 administrators in addition to 4,491 teachers.

Gordon and Louis (2009) constructed variables from the principal survey and found three main factors which were (a) principals' openness to community involvement, (b) district support for community and parent involvement, and (c) principals' perceptions of parent influence. The teacher survey gleaned factors of (a) principal/teacher shared leadership, (b) district and school leadership influence, (c) teachers' perceptions of parent influence, and (d) teacher influence (Gordon & Louis, 2009). The authors obtained student achievement data as measured by the performance on state standardized tests.

Gordon and Louis (2009) found that the leadership variables did not have a significant relationship with student achievement. Further, they found that schools

with more diversity of membership on their leadership teams had principals who are more open to community involvement, and they put forth that “principals personal behaviors and attitudes about community and parent influence are strongly related to community and parent involvement in school decisions” (Gordon & Louis, 2009, p. 21). Finally, in analyzing the relationships between shared leadership and student achievement, the authors found that shared leadership behaviors and teachers’ perceptions of parent involvement were positively related to student achievement. The authors suggested that this implied that principals and teachers could create structures of shared leadership that resulted in more parental involvement and positively impacted student achievement.

Principal effect on inclusive school outcomes. Inclusive school outcomes are what I define to mean equitable learning opportunities and a purposefully positive school culture for students who have been historically marginalized. This section includes a review of studies that focused on students with disabilities, students in minority groups, and creating a socially just school environment for all students.

New theories that have not been addressed in previous studies are used to frame some of the articles discussed in this section. Critical Race Theory (Marx & Larson, 2012), academic optimism (Brown, Benkovitz, Muttillio, & Urban, 2011), and leadership for social justice theories (Riester, Pursch, & Skrla, 2002; Theoharis, 2010) make their debut in this section. Critical Race Theory has been previously discussed in the historical discussion of this paper. Academic Optimism is the combination of collective efficacy, academic emphasis, and faculty trust (Brown et

al., 2011). The articles in this section will be discussed in chronological order, and a summary of their main features can be found in Table A7.

Riester et al. (2002). The purpose of this study was to investigate the role of highly successful elementary school principals in their work to influence a more socially just school. Riester et al. chose six elementary schools for their study. The role of the principal was the focus of their research and data was collected to determine this role through semi-structured interviews, observations, documents from the district and the school, as well as a reflexive journal kept by the researchers (Riester et al., 2002). The authors determined social justice outcomes by the qualitative data in addition to high rates of literacy and low rates of placement in special education for each school.

Riester et al. (2002) reported findings as themes that emerged from their qualitative data. The first theme they discussed was a democratic culture. The authors suggested principals' behaviors that demonstrated a commitment to success, created an environment of freedom, and empowered professional staff supported a democratic culture. The authors also found that the leaders adopted a prescriptive approach to literacy and success. They discussed the elements of this theme and determined that principals of these schools communicated a strong focus on literacy skills and emphasized active learning to attain literacy skills that would give students access to the world of opportunities around them (Riester et al., 2002). A third theme that the authors discussed was stubborn persistence. They described this as a "quest to educate every child" (Riester et al., 2002, p. 299). The authors argued that the principals they studied modeled their own actions after the

firm belief that every child can and will learn and be successful. Additionally, they reported that (a) establishing a strong vision, (b) using data to support and drive decisions, (c) empowering teachers through active problem solving, (d) providing time for teachers to collaborate and improve practice, and (e) moving out of the way so the school could prosper were all items the principals discussed as key elements in creating a school culture focused on social justice (Riester et al., 2002).

Ovando and Cavazos (2004). The authors wanted to determine how high school principals used student performance, goal development, shaping school culture, and instructional management to enhance the academic achievement of Hispanic students. This study was framed using a theory of instructional leadership (Ovando & Cavazos, 2004). To determine the principals' actions and behaviors, the authors conducted extensive interviews with principals and teachers at each of the two schools that participated in their study. See Table A7 for additional information about participants. The authors also conducted direct observations and document analysis. The authors used student achievement data to determine if the school was making academic growth, but the primary focus on the growth of Hispanic students qualifies its inclusion under the theme of inclusive schooling.

Ovando and Cavazos (2004) found that principals in both schools had a strong focus on student achievement that was evident in both their words and their actions as self-reported and reported by teachers. They reported that both principals used support for teachers as a way to enhance and build a positive school culture. Ovando and Cavazos also put forth that both principals used instructional management strategies like monitoring student performance and relying on their

leadership team to help implement instructional programs and ensure the intended academic outcomes. These relationships were enhanced by a shared philosophy about student learning and success (Ovando & Cavazos, 2004). Finally, the authors concluded that the similarities they noted in the principals' actions in these two schools allowed them to theorize about the effects of principals' specific actions on the inclusive school culture and the student academic achievement attained at both sites.

Smith and Leonard (2005). This study explored the role of the principal in balancing and reconciling the conflicting goals of school efficiency and school inclusion. Smith and Leonard used symbolic interactionism as the theoretical basis for this study. The authors chose four schools that were in the beginning stage of implementing full inclusion programs. Interviews were conducted with seven special education teachers, 14 general education teachers and three principals (Smith & Leonard, 2005). These participants were from either elementary or middle school, see Table A7 for a breakdown of this information. The authors explored the role of the principal as well as the perceptions and feelings about school inclusion.

Smith and Leonard (2005) used an interrelationship digraph they created to discuss their findings. Their data from general education teachers indicated that the primary system driver for inclusion was differences of students. They also suggested that the primary system outcome was teachers' personal woes. For special educators, the primary system driver seemed to be resources, with the outcome being consequences of inclusion, and positive outcomes for students were

not the primary system outcome but emerged as a strong theme (Smith & Leonard, 2005).

The specific data pertaining to principals was reported to have three major themes (Smith & Leonard, 2005). The authors reported these themes as leadership style, attitudes towards inclusion, and professional development commitment. The authors discussed the three different leadership styles of the principals in the schools they studied. One principal was found to have a very authoritarian style that was illustrated by central decision making processes, a focus on academic achievement driven by accountability policy, and required teacher meetings that were only collaborative on the surface and when the principal was present (Smith & Leonard, 2005). The authors described the second principal as kind and nice to work with, but wary of conflict. This principal was reported to make quick decisions without thinking about long term solutions (Smith & Leonard, 2005). The authors also put forth that this principal was very friendly but did not use these relationships to further develop a collaborative culture with the vision of school inclusion in mind.

The third principal the authors discussed was a more facilitative leader (Smith & Leonard, 2005). The authors confirmed that this principal had self-reported being a student-centered leader who always made decisions with the best interests of the students in mind. This third principal was also described as working closely with teachers to collaborate and problem solve, giving teachers a voice in school decisions and direction, and facilitating idea sharing to further the school mission of inclusion (Smith & Leonard, 2005).

Smith and Leonard (2005) talked about the leaders' attitudes toward inclusion and put forth that this was essential to the sustainability of inclusive practices in the schools they studied. The first two principals the authors discussed were reported to have an attitude described as waiting to see what happened with inclusion. The authors cited that they both made comments about waiting to see if the school accountability results would prove if inclusion had worked. With the third, facilitative style principal, the teachers reported feeling supported and characterized the school climate as a family, collectively keeping the best interests of the students in mind (Smith & Leonard, 2005). The authors also found that teachers felt the presence of the principal in the school throughout the day and that the words of the principal were closely related to the actions employed. They additionally noted that this principals' school had the best score on the school accountability report card after the first year of inclusion.

Finally, Smith and Leonard (2005) discussed the commitment of principals to professional development. The authors spoke about the differences between the three principals and their approach to professional development. Smith and Leonard described how the first principal was unsure of what types of professional development to offer based on inclusive practices. The second principal had reportedly provided specific professional development to the staff so they could have a better understanding of inclusion (Smith & Leonard, 2005). According to the authors, the third principal demonstrated the greatest commitment to professional development for building inclusive practices. They stated that this principal both attended and supported teachers in receiving professional development that was

meaningful and helped all teachers feel more confident in their abilities to teach all students. Overall, the authors concluded that a facilitative style was the most effective for leading inclusive reform.

Masumoto and Brown-Welty (2009). The purpose of this study was to investigate the contributions of leadership to student outcomes in high-performing, high-poverty schools. This study used the conceptual frameworks of transformational leadership, distributed or collaborative leadership, and instructional leadership. Three schools in California were chosen, as shown in Table A7, and the authors chose a multiple case study design to examine the leadership practices within these schools.

Masumoto and Brown-Welty (2009) reported findings for both individual schools and across case studies. For the purposes of this review, I will focus on their cross-case study results. The authors found that at all three schools, there was a prevalence of contemporary leadership practices with elements from transformational, distributed, and instructional leadership. They also found that there were many formal and informal mechanisms in place to link the school to the community with the purpose of enhancing student outcomes. The authors discussed several factors that contributed to school success that were present at all three schools: (a) a direct focus on instruction, (b) focus on standards and expectations, (c) strong teachers, and (d) many support systems for students with a variety of needs. They also felt it was important to note that all three schools were cited as being the center of the community, and the authors identified the leaders of these

schools as effective change agents. They argued that their strong leadership skills were directly linked to student outcomes (Masumoto & Brown-Welty, 2009).

Theoharis (2010). The author explored the aspects of school leadership that promoted social justice in schools. This study is situated within critical theory and theories of social justice. The author reported that six principals participated in the study, as shown in Table A7. The author used a positioned subject approach for this study and data was collected using qualitative methods of interviewing, field log observations, and document analysis. The principals provided evidence of their school change through the qualitative data and also by providing evidence of gains in student achievement (Theoharis, 2010).

Theoharis (2010) discussed the themes that arose from the data in this study. The first theme he discussed was disrupting injustice in the context of resistance. The author identified resistance stemming from within the school community and from district policies and practices. Within the school community, the author reported events such as teachers refusing to have students with disabilities in their classroom. The author also noted the English-as-a-second-language policies that promoted the removal of students from classrooms to receive services as sources of resistance. The principals in this study demonstrated creative problem solving and interpersonal skills to attempt to resolve these situations within their schools (Theoharis, 2010). Specifically, Theoharis described that these principals found ways to change the inherent school structures that promoted segregation. These leaders were also reported to work toward professionalizing their staff, who had not felt as if they had the skills and knowledge necessary to

work with all students and attain positive outcomes (Theoharis, 2010). The author put forth that the leaders worked to improve the school climate so it was more welcoming to the community and they built strong ties between the school and the community. He found that the leaders challenged low student achievement by setting high expectations and working to create a school culture that shared a common belief in the abilities of all students. The author cited the overarching theme of challenging historical and present day marginalization of groups, and concluded that the leaders he studied demonstrated their commitment to social justice through the actions and strategies they employed.

Brown et al. (2011). The authors explored the ways that schools of excellence were promoting and supporting both academic excellence and systemic equity for all students. The principal was the unit of analysis for this study framed in symbolic interactionism and academic optimism (Brown et al., 2011). The authors cited that 24 schools participated in this multiple case study: 12 schools were identified as small gap (SG) schools, and 12 schools were identified as large gap (LG) schools. These identifiers refer to the achievement gaps between minority and non-minority students, and are described in Table A7. The authors conducted interviews with parents, teachers, and principals. The outcome the authors measured was the schools' status in regard to achievement gaps and the relationship with leadership employed in the schools.

Brown et al. (2011) found from their quantitative equity analysis that the SG and LG schools did not vary in their student demographics. They also found that teacher characteristics were very similar in both types of schools. The greatest

differences between the schools were reported to be the achievement of at-risk students, which was found to be far higher in the SG schools than in the LG schools (Brown et al., 2011).

Brown et al. (2011) described how the principals of the SG schools differed in their practices. Brown et al. put forth that these principals set the stage by demonstrating a strong focus on academic achievement, closely monitoring teaching and learning by using instructional leadership practices to support teachers, and expecting excellence from all students. The authors concluded these behaviors indicated that principal actions and school level changes had the potential to impact the successful outcomes of all students.

Waldron, McLesky, and Redd (2011). The purpose of this study was to examine the role of the principal in developing an effective, inclusive school. Theories of change and transformational leadership served as the conceptual framework for this case study (Waldron et al., 2011). The authors chose an elementary school to participate that included students with disabilities in general education classrooms at well above the state average.

Waldron et al. (2011) put forth the major themes found in their data. The first theme they discussed was setting the direction for inclusive practices at the school. Next, the authors described how the principal redesigned the organization of the school to provide better structures for both educating students and fostering collaboration between teachers. The authors also talked about the importance of improving working conditions for school staff by creating a learning community, which additionally helped to solidify their common purpose. Next, they conveyed

the importance of providing high-quality instruction in all settings, with the support and collaboration of the principal. Finally, the authors suggested the importance of using data to drive decision-making. The principal put a system in place for the teachers to more effectively monitor and evaluate student progress, which allowed them to collaborate more effectively to problem solve ways of helping their students succeed (Waldron et al., 2011). The authors concluded that the behaviors of an effective leader found in their study were also found in the general education literature, and they argued that an effective leadership for inclusion is universal to educational leadership in general. I found that the themes they put forth in their findings are supported by the transformational leadership literature (Leithwood and Jantzi, 2005) and include aspects of Marzano et al.'s (2005) effective leadership behaviors.

Marx and Larson (2012). The final article discussed in this section investigated the changes a principal made in response to a previous research project that illuminated inequities within his school. The current study documented the changes and their impact on school climate for Latina/o students and families. The authors chose the conceptual framework of Critical Race Theory for their study. Marx and Larson reported that 825 students participated by completing a survey, and a combination of 26 teachers and principals were surveyed as well to provide data for their mixed methods study.

The survey administered was the same as the one given in a previous study conducted by Marx (as cited in Marx & Larson, 2012). The data from the previous study was used as a baseline measure to determine if the impressions of the

students and teachers had changed due to the actions of the principal. The authors described the student survey, which asked the respondents to rate (a) how welcome they felt at school, (b) if they fit in, (c) what their thoughts were about blending in to U.S. culture, (d) how important speaking English was, and (e) if they felt the school placed value on their home culture and language (Marx & Larson, 2012). The authors also asked the students to respond to an open-ended question about their perception of the impact race or ethnicity had on schooling.

The survey given to teachers and administrators asked them to rate questions asking about their perceptions of (a) Latina/o culture, (b) language, and (c) strengths and weaknesses of Latina/o students (Marx & Larson, 2012). The authors also included open-ended questions that revolved around the same themes.

Based on the Marx's initial findings (as cited in Marx & Larson, 2012), recommendations were given that served as the basis for this investigation. Marx and Larson (2012) reported that the principal's first priority was to reach out to Latina/o families. To do this, he hired a university student who spoke Spanish to call every parent before parent teacher conferences and open houses at the school to make them aware of the event (Marx & Larson, 2012). The authors also reported that the principal would have multiple translators available at events so the teachers and administrators could easily communicate with parents without having to wait for a single translator. According to Marx and Larson, the principal made a concerted effort to meet with families regarding student progress, and bridged the gap between misunderstandings to help Latina/o families participate in their child's education in a way they had not been able to before because of structural inequities.

Marx and Larson (2012) described how the principal also took on other reforms, such as hiring more English-as-a-second-language (ESL) teachers to use sheltered instruction techniques in the core classes of the high school. He brought teachers together to align the ESL standards with the English language arts standards, and encouraged teachers to team-teach classes so they could better meet the needs of their diverse learners (Marx & Larson, 2012).

These are a few reported examples of changes the principal made to address the recommendations from the previous study (Marx & Larson, 2012). The authors gave the same survey at the conclusion of the current investigation and the results indicated a positive change in the perceptions of the Latina/o students, as well as the perceptions of the teachers. The school also reported an increase on their state accountability measure for AYP (Marx & Larson, 2012). The researchers reported observations made that illustrated how students were more inclusive of each other in hallways and discussed hearing comments by teachers indicating pride and regard for their students. The authors concluded that while it was difficult to attribute these changes directly to the actions of the principal, the qualitative data indicated that the steps he took helped to create a more positive school climate for Latina/o students.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to put forth the results of the first research review I conducted, and to take a closer look at the variables and findings to gain a perspective about what aspects of life in school have been investigated in the educational leadership literature. The themes found were principal effects on (a)

student achievement, (b) school culture and climate, (c) teacher outcomes, (d) parent and community involvement, and (e) inclusive school outcomes.

Chapter 5

Re-Viewing the Literature: A Hermeneutical Analysis

A major part of this critical hermeneutical study is the re-examination of my initial methods in determining the current state of the field in educational leadership through my review of the current literature. To fully understand the ideological implications of the research, it is imperative that I reflect upon my initial thinking to determine what ideologies were at work when I began this study. As I reflected upon this process, and sought to understand the role my own previous beliefs and understandings had on my approach to understanding the impact of educational leadership on life in schools, I was incredibly surprised at my findings. This process, as detailed in my methods section, drew upon the entirety of my experience in conducting this study, and allowed me to reflect upon and question my own inherent beliefs that have been brought to the forefront and illuminated through this study. The critical piece at this juncture is to understand how, through critical hermeneutical analysis, I arrived at a broader view of issues that I had previously given myself credit for understanding more thoroughly. I believe that my experience in this study gives important insight into the thought processes of many who seek to understand the various outcomes of school life and how to further understand the relationships between factors, such as educational leadership, and their impact on life in schools. The purpose of this additional literature review was to challenge the presuppositions that impacted my initial literature review to be sure that I provide a clear picture of the state of the field in educational leadership and its relationship to life in schools.

Methods

When I sat down to undertake this second literature review, I found that my epistemological beliefs were constantly being questioned, and I had to maintain a major focus on what I counted as knowledge, especially with regard to school outcomes. I found myself constantly questioning the things that matter most in schools, and wracking my brain about how these outcomes can be measured, or communicated, in meaningful ways that are inclusive to a variety of research methodologies. I did not want to discount knowledge without consciously acknowledging the differing epistemologies inherent in the choice of methodology. I found that this reflection caused me to examine both the search terms employed in the first investigation, as well as the inclusion and exclusion criteria I used to determine the research reviewed.

In addition to this epistemological reflection, the literature I relied upon to conceptualize life in schools as an all-encompassing phenomenon led me to further reflect upon my inclusion and exclusion criteria, thinking more broadly about life in schools and how that is manifested in the research literature. While I sought to expand my thinking, I also knew that I would have to create some bounds so as to keep a focus on the actions of principals and how these behaviors impacted outcomes in schools.

For this second study, my initial task was to revise my search terms, aware of the positivistic bias my initial terms demonstrated. The first review consisted exclusively of terms such as *principal effect*, and *leadership effect*. I recognized that this would immediately bias my search toward more statistically driven research

that examines effects of principals as variable constructions. This was an important reflection, and one that made me extremely aware of my initial bias toward thinking about research in terms of variables, statistical measures, and the scientific method. This second search was conducted, as shown in detail in Appendix B, Table B1. I attempted to remove the bias in these search terms by changing *principal effect* and *leadership effect* to a broader term of *school leadership*. I searched these terms with the same combinations of outcomes used in the first review, as I felt that my outcome terms were broad enough to encompass the facets of school life that could be impacted by a principal.

My inclusion criteria remained much the same. I included studies from 2001-2013, which is especially relevant for the analysis of accountability ideologies, reflecting the passage of NCLB (2002). I continued to include studies only from the United States to reflect the focus of this specific policy within a common societal framework. Studies chosen had to be within the K through 12th grade system of traditional public schools. For the purpose of this study, online schools, charter schools, and other alternative settings were not included. Studies had to be focused on actions or perceived actions of principals and tied with a school-based outcome, which included studies focusing on teachers, students, families, and the status of the school as an organization. The final inclusion criteria represented a shift in my thinking, and a change from the initial review. It was important that I understood that the life in school can be represented by the overall organizational health and climate, and while I had previously included studies focused on school climate, I

needed to have a renewed focus on the role of the principal within the organization as an outcome of its own.

Another important change to my inclusion criteria was a difference in having the principal as the primary focus of the study, or as an independent variable. The new criteria included any study where principal behavior or action was found to have a relationship with an outcome. This was an important change because it recognized the importance of the inductive nature of many qualitative studies, and removed bias from studies that may have explored the broad nature of life in schools, seeking to allow themes and important aspects to arise from the data collected. This inclusion criteria also allowed me to include studies that looked at overall school climate, but included perceptions of leadership as component variables in these investigations. I suggest that this was an important expansion in my search of the literature.

I also changed my inclusion of articles that noted the principals' behaviors as moderating or mediating variables. If a principals' behavior was shown to have a relationship with any school outcome, even if it mediated or moderated the impact on a final outcome, such as student achievement, it was included in this review. I realized the importance of a principal's actions have been widely cited as having an indirect effect on student outcomes (e.g., Leithwood & Louis, 2012; Marzano et al., 2005), and I wanted to reflect this understanding in my inclusion of research in this review.

I also included studies that focused on new teacher retention issues, which is a difference from the initial review. After conceptualizing the importance of a school

community and how it welcomes and supports new members, I realized that this is an important opportunity principals have to impact the development of their school, and while I noted choosing them with a great deal of care in the first review, I had to expand my inclusion criteria beyond having a specific focus on the principal to allow for studies that illuminated the experiences of new teachers and found the principals' leadership behaviors as an important element.

Exclusion criteria continued to be very specific for this second review, as they were for the first. The nature of the literature in educational leadership can be very complex, so my exclusion criteria allowed me to keep bounds on the current study while not excluding research that helped to form an understanding of how leadership impacts life in schools. Studies that focused on district level administration or leadership were excluded from this review. Studies that focused only on principal preparation, principal professional development, and principal perceptions were excluded. I included articles that studied the actions of principals in professional development and their impact on perceptions of school change, such as teachers' perceptions of school effectiveness based on the choices principals made about participating in professional development. Principal perceptions that were not tied to perceptions of other participants were excluded because of the inability to determine actual outcomes of the school beyond the principals' own beliefs.

Studies from the Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership continued to be excluded because they provided case studies to utilize in pre-service preparation programs for administrators and did not utilize research methodology in the

explanation of these scenarios. Principal succession is a rapidly growing field of literature that focuses on the issues revolving around planning for principal retirement, turnover, and promotion. The purpose of this review was to determine the behaviors of principals already in a position to impact life in schools, so studies that focused on succession issues were excluded.

There were many studies that sought to determine effective characteristics of principals in schools, but were not tied to outcomes. These studies were excluded because relationships could not be reasonably postulated through the exploration. A few studies focused on teachers' perceptions of effective leaders, and they were excluded if they did not also have outcomes related to the perceptions of effective leadership behaviors. The purpose of the review was to determine effective leadership and what principals do to achieve specific outcomes in schools, so the broad definition of perceived effectiveness was not relevant for review at this time.

Some studies I found were replications of previous studies done utilizing the same data sets and research methodology. Studies were excluded if they did not add to the previous investigation, meaning, that if a group of authors published several reports of research findings, with minimal difference in their write-up or focus of analysis, only the most recent, or in some cases, the more broad study was included. This was a rare occurrence, but one worthy of noting.

Finally, studies were excluded if their methodologies and theoretical frameworks were not thoroughly explained. Several studies had minimal write-ups and did not include a satisfactory description of the theories driving their investigation. If the authors did not provide this context, it was difficult to determine

if the research was rigorous enough to espouse the results they claimed. Studies that did not display quality characteristics or indicators of their utilized methodology were excluded.

With these inclusion and exclusion criteria in mind, I conducted the second search as shown in Appendix B, Table B1. I revised my search criteria to account for my previous bias in only searching for *principal or leadership effect*, but I also re-searched the initial terms used for the first review, these results are shown in Table B2. I did not determine a limit for the number of studies to show up on a given search, so for every search, I reviewed the abstracts of the articles, setting aside new literature in corresponding folders for more careful review if they appeared to meet my new criteria. Because I had previously conducted this review, I only retrieved new articles that I had not set aside previously. To account for this, I went through each article that I had previously set aside in folders labeled on my computer, in addition to the new literature found from conducting new searches, to more carefully consider if they met criteria for inclusion in this review.

Both the new search terms and the previously used search terms were investigated using the following databases to reflect the interdisciplinary nature of research in educational leadership: Academic Search Complete, Academic Search Premier, EconLit, Education Research Complete, Humanities International Complete, PsychArticles, PsycInfo, Public Administration Abstracts, and Business Source Complete. The inclusion of Business Source Complete is the only change from the initial review. These databases were searched simultaneously for combinations of the following terms: *principal effectiveness, principal effect**,

leadership effectiveness, leadership effect, leadership style, student outcomes, student achievement, teacher morale, teacher attitude*, teacher, job satisfaction, teacher retention, teacher effectiveness, teacher emotions, teacher treatment, teacher experiences, teacher professional development, teacher professional learning, new teachers, student attitude, school environment, school culture, and school leadership.*

Tables B1 and B2 show the results of these searches, including the new searches with *school leadership*, and the re-examination of the previous terms as well. In addition, 2 articles were found using snowball techniques while searching references of relevant research.

In all, the initial 161 articles found in the first review were reexamined to determine if they met inclusion criteria, and an additional 81 articles from the second search were examined as well. I kept detailed notes on each article in a document on my computer that outlined the reasons why studies were excluded from this second review. Ultimately, an additional 51 articles were found that met criteria for this second round of review.

Findings

The articles included in this second review speak volumes about the bias of my initial literature review. Of the methods employed, 30 used qualitative methods, representing more than half of the literature for this review. An additional 2 articles utilized mixed methods, and the remaining 19 articles utilized quantitative methods. This distinct discrepancy allows me to reflect upon the fact that I was unconsciously excluding research from the qualitative methodology.

The articles I found represent a diverse array of methods, and an equally diverse focus on outcomes within schools. Tables B3-B13 show the thematic arrangement of this research, and include more detailed information about each article. The themes I found that helped me to categorize this research are (a) policy and reform issues, (b) classroom instruction, (c) special populations, (d) organizational health and school climate, (e) principals' choice of professional development, (f) teacher induction and retention, (g) teacher job satisfaction, (h) professional learning communities, (i) sharing leadership, (j) the role of the principal in challenging school contexts, and (k) the principal as an emergent theme in challenging school contexts. I will describe the research by synthesizing their findings within each theme.

Policy and reform issues. I found nine studies that focused specifically on navigating the high-stakes accountability context of NCLB (2002), see Table B3. Some studies focused on specific curriculum interventions in response to the need to raise standardized test scores in particular areas through curriculum reform (Coburn, 2005; Ylimaki, 2012; Stillman, 2011; Rinke & Valli, 2010; Coburn, 2001; Spillane et al., 2002). Other studies focused on the challenges of implementing reforms such as Response to Intervention (RtI; White, Polly, & Audette, 2012) or Class Size Reduction (CSR; Burch, Theoharis, & Rauscher, 2010) and the role of the principal in supporting or inhibiting change. One study examined the threat-rigid response of school staff in response to high-stakes accountability policies and the perceptions of principal leadership related to a higher degree of threat rigid responses (Daly, 2009).

What is immediately striking about these studies is that all but one (Daly, 2009) utilized only qualitative methods. Daly (2009) utilized a two phase mixed methods design, and the qualitative data collection and analysis was relied upon heavily to support the quantitative phase of his study. In all studies, sites were purposefully selected to represent locations that provided rich data to examine both the strengths and challenges of leaders who were working within a high-stakes accountability context. Though these studies alone represent exploratory data that is not generalizable to larger populations, taken as a collective whole they have many similar findings that increase the generalizability of their results, and more importantly, begin to create a picture of how accountability ideology has permeated and impacted schools, principals, and teachers.

Across studies, it was reported that principals' beliefs and actions surrounding curriculum policy directly impacted the perceptions, understanding, and change in classroom instruction of teachers (Burch et al., 2010; Coburn, 2005; Rinke & Valli, 2010; Stillman, 2011; Ylimaki, 2012). Ylimaki (2012) found that a principal who was able to challenge the underlying ideologies within curriculum reform by providing progressive, democratically oriented leadership was able to impact the opportunities for students to receive meaningful instruction that honored their experiences and the community in which they lived. Stillman (2011) also reported the importance of the principals' relationship to the community, and ability to grant teachers professional discretion while protecting them from district surveillance so they could make changes in response to individual student needs based on reading curriculum reform. Similarly, Coburn (2005) noted the importance

of principals' beliefs about reading instruction and how their approach to student and teacher learning either supported or inhibited their ability to respond to the needs of their students.

Several studies noted the principals' role in filtering policy messages from the district office (Coburn, 2005; Rinke & Valli, 2010; Stillman, 2011; Ylimaki, 2012). Coburn (2005) compared principals' approaches to teacher and student learning, and found a relationship between the focus of policy reform and the beliefs of the principals. She further elaborated, with evidence from teacher conversations and classroom practice, how the principals' choice of message impacted their professional development opportunities, the content of their instruction, as well as their approach to reading instruction. Rinke and Valli (2010) discussed the differing pressures principals felt and how they communicated their AYP status. This affected their choice of professional development activities, and ultimately teachers' ability to understand reform policies surrounding the use of specific writing interventions for their students (Rinke & Vallie, 2010). Ylimaki (2012) and Stillman (2011) compared the focus of principals on accountability and literacy reforms and how the differing views of principals, their feelings regarding teacher professionalism and decision making, and their relationship with the community either challenged or deeply committed them to reform policies that teachers were expected to adhere to.

Burch et al. (2010) and White et al. (2012) investigated the importance of the role of the principal when creating systems for school-wide change. White et al. (2012) reported that a principal's commitment to Rtl implementation directly affected teachers' perceptions of the reform, and the principals' unrelenting, but

supportive stance allowed teachers to arrive at a deeper understanding of the process while participating with their leader in implementation. Burch et al. (2010) documented the differing perspectives and actions of leaders who implemented the CSR model of reform. The different experiences and backgrounds of the principals led them to approach the challenges of CSR reform in differing ways (Burch et al., 2010). These differing approaches either created problem solving situations where they were able to support teachers through creating physical space for learning, tailoring professional development activities, and focusing on diverse learners, or they created an environment of resentment where teachers were forced to “sink or swim” as they navigated this new reform effort (Burch et al., 2010). The latter orientation was characterized by mostly lower achieving schools, and the authors attributed this status to the choices and actions of leadership regarding the reform effort (Burch et al., 2010).

All of these studies included measures to ensure the quality and validity of their research methods. Each study included a combination of interviews, site observations, and document analysis to triangulate their findings, and they provided ample evidence within their write-ups to support emergent themes.

Daly (2009) explored, through a mixed methods design, the perceptions of leadership, teachers’ trust and threat-rigid responses through the use of survey instruments. Daly (2009) was interested in the response to sanctions used as a policy lever through the enactment of NCLB (2002) and explained that “organizations and communities can experience a socially constructed sense of a perceived threat condition” (p. 173). He further explained that the response to this

perceived level of threat creates differing types of conditions within an organization, with the highest perceived threat resulting in rigid hierarchical systems, centralized decision making, and the limiting of divergent views. Daly (2009) defined leadership as building vision and setting direction, developing people, and redesigning the organization. With the dimensions of leadership measured in this study, Daly found a moderate to strong correlation between perceptions of leadership and threat-rigid responses. He specifically found that dimensions of empowerment and involvement had an independent effect on threat rigid responses of teachers, and he included supporting evidence from interviews to support this finding. He further reported that many teachers feel that they have a lack ability to provide professional judgment, and a mentality that focused on doing what they were told. Principals felt that leadership had a strong impact on threat-rigid responses, while the most important factor for teachers was trust (Daly, 2009).

Classroom instruction. Seven studies were found that focused primarily on the role of the principal in impacting classroom instruction, see Table B4. These studies represented explorations of teachers' sense of instructional competence (Printy, 2008), the impact of leadership behaviors on instructional practices and academic capacity to improve (Hallinger & Heck, 2011; Heck & Moriyama, 2010), what principals noticed about instruction in high achieving schools (Johnson, Uline, & Perez, 2011) and direct relationships between leadership behaviors and student achievement (Reardon, 2011; Williams, 2009). Zimmerman and Deckert-Pelton (2009) focused their study on the perceptions of leaders in the teacher evaluation process and its impacts on perceived instructional change.

These studies represent a variety of methods used, but four out of these six studies focused on student achievement data as an outcome of interest (Hallinger & Heck, 2011; Heck & Moriyama, 2010; Johnson et al., 2011; Reardon, 2011; Williams, 2009). The other studies utilized measures of teachers' perceived instructional competence, instructional measures, and academic capacity as outcomes (Hallinger & Heck, 2011; Printy, 2008; Zimmerman, 2003).

Reardon (2011) and Williams (2009) reported the findings of their studies, which focused on the perceptions of leadership behaviors and student achievement. Both studies utilized statistical analysis and quantitative methods to conduct the study and report findings. Reardon (2011) found that principals' self-reported leadership behaviors had a strong relationship with student achievement. The author found the strongest correlations between principals' reported focus on rigorous curriculum, performance accountability and student achievement (Reardon, 2011). Williams (2009) found that leadership behaviors as perceived by the teachers had no significant relationship with student achievement. Williams (2009) did report, however, that the teachers' perceptions of leadership had a relationship with school climate, but they found that school climate had a weak relationship with student achievement. It is interesting to note how the differing perspectives measured impacted the findings with regard to student achievement.

Hallinger and Heck (2011), Heck and Moriyama (2010), Johnson et al. (2011), and Printy (2008) all focused their studies on the impact principals have on instructional practices. Three of these studies utilized a quantitative method with varying statistical approaches to data analysis (Hallinger & Heck, 2011; Heck and

Moriyama, 2010; Printy, 2008) as shown in Table B4. Johnson et al. (2011) utilized a qualitative method for their study. Hallinger and Heck (2011), Heck and Moriyama (2010), and Johnson et al. (2011) found that principals' leadership behaviors that focused on student learning had a positive impact on instructional practices. Hallinger and Heck (2011) reported that as collaborative, learning centered leadership strengthened, the academic capacity of the school, which focused on standards and implementation, sustained action toward improvement, and the management and development of resources grew. This academic capacity, in turn, represented greater than average growth according to standardized testing results in math (Hallinger & Heck, 2011).

Heck and Moriyama (2010) specifically focused on leadership-for-learning behaviors and found that these behaviors were related to stronger views about the quality of instruction perceived by teachers and families on a survey instrument. They also found that these perceptions influenced added-year effects through the use of multi-level structural equation modeling and a regression discontinuity approach to data analysis. Johnson et al. (2010) found that principals who focused their noticing behaviors on student engagement, student learning, and student understanding during their visits to classrooms, supported a more positive classroom climate that focused on teachers' behaviors in each of the important areas of student outcome. The schools they investigated served diverse populations and ranked higher on district outcomes of student achievement, student attendance, and had all received National Excellence in Urban Education awards (Johnson et al., 2010).

Zimmerman and Deckert-Pelton (2003) focused their mixed methods survey study on the perceptions of teachers about principals in the teacher evaluation process. They found that teachers needed principals who were able to make time to have conversations about evaluations, provide constructive feedback about their instruction, and collaborate with teachers about methods to improve instructional practices. They also found that teachers placed importance on the knowledge of the principal about consistent evaluation practices, in addition to knowledge about instruction and content (Zimmerman and Deckert-Pelton, 2003).

Special populations. Only two studies found focused on the role of the principal and the relationship to outcomes for students with disabilities, see Table B5. Sindelar et al. (2006) investigated the reasons why a previously successful inclusive school was unable to sustain their inclusive practices. Slobodzian (2009) explored the specific factors that impacted the exclusion and inclusion of students who are deaf. Both studies used an inductive approach that did not initially focus on the role of the principal. Leadership emerged as a theme in these qualitative studies, and therefore they are included within this review.

Both studies found that the behaviors, beliefs, and visions communicated by the principals played a role in outcomes for students with disabilities (Sindelar et al., 2006; Slobodzian, 2009). Sindelar et al. (2006) found that with the hiring of a new principal, the priorities for inclusive practices shifted and no longer embraced the same ideals the staff had experienced with their previous leader. In addition, the principal responded more compliantly to district pressures, minimizing the importance of what was happening within the school community to increase

accountability through a focus on documentation and training for use of data. As a result, there was less support for the inclusion program, and the lack of commitment by the principal led to an increased confusion and decreased commitment from the staff, thereby resulting in a shift away from including students with disabilities in the general education classrooms (Sindelar et al., 2006).

Slobodzian (2009) focused specifically on the inclusion and exclusion of students who are deaf, and in the course of the qualitative, ethnographic study found that there was a strong disconnect between the voiced priorities of the principal and the actions taken within the school to support inclusive practices. Ultimately, the leadership was characterized as being absent, disconnected, and not involved in the activities of the school to the extent that supports needed by the teachers to serve students who are deaf did not exist and this contributed greatly to the exclusion of students (Slobodzian, 2009).

Organizational health and school climate. Five quantitative studies and one qualitative study were found that focused on aspects of organizational health and school climate, see Table B6 for a more complete description of each article. Williams, Persaud, and Turner (2008) conducted the only study that included a specific focus on the role of the principal. The other studies were included because the elements of organizational health and school climate included factors that were directly related to perceptions of leadership behavior and they included a discussion of the specific impacts of the leadership dimensions of the outcomes of interest (DiPaola & Guy, 2009; Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2002; McGuigan & Hoy, 2006; Rhodes, Stevens, & Hemmings, 2011; Stryon & Nyman, 2008). These studies

were originally excluded because of their wide focus on organizational health. As part of my method in conducting this second review, I had to expand my thinking about the role of principals within the complex organization of the school. The inclusion of these studies represents my direct acknowledgement of the embedded role principals have within the overall organizational structure of the school.

Hoy, Smith and Sweetland (2002) sought to create a measure of organizational climate by exploring its relationship with faculty trust. They found that collegial leadership behaviors had the strongest relationship with faculty trust in the principals. DiPaola and Guy (2009) similarly found that collegial leadership had a significant effect on perceptions of organizational justice. They additionally reported that the factor of trust in the principal had the strongest relationship with organizational justice (DiPaola & Guy, 2009). Both studies cited the behaviors associated with collegial leadership as open, supportive, friendly, considerate, where principals treat teachers as colleagues and set reasonable expectations (DiPaola & Guy, 2009; Hoy et al., 2006). The findings of these two studies complement each other nicely, both citing the importance of these behaviors and their relation to trust within the school climate.

McGuigan and Hoy (2006) investigated school structures that assisted in achieving academic optimism, and also explored the relationship between academic optimism and student achievement. They found that principal behaviors related to enabling bureaucracy were positively related to teachers' self-efficacy and the overall academic optimism of the school, which in turn had a positive effect on student achievement. Conversely, Styron and Nyman (2008) examined data related

to school health and climate, organizational structures, and instructional practices for high and low performing schools. They found that principals with lower directive behaviors were found in higher achieving schools. They also found that principals who were able to secure district office support were scored lower in higher achieving schools (Styron & Nyman, 2008). The findings of these studies confound each other, which is important to note. The behaviors that enable bureaucracy in middle schools have a positive effect on student achievement, while the more supportive, less directive and noncompliant driven behaviors of principals in elementary settings have a positive impact on climate and student achievement.

Williams et al. (2008) specifically focused on the performance of the principal as it related to school climate and student achievement. Their instrument specifically focused on perceptions of instructional planning, interpersonal skills, decision making skills, school and facilities, organizational planning, and teacher evaluation. They found that each leadership practice was positively correlated with school climate (Williams et al., 2008). They interestingly found that while school climate was inversely related to low achievement, and positively related to high achievement, there was no relationship with school climate and students who fell in between these two extremes. Williams et al. (2008) also found that principals who demonstrated interpersonal skills as perceived by teachers was positively related to students exceeding expectations, and inversely related to students' below expectations. Again, there was no conclusive relationship between this leadership behavior and students who met expectations. The authors suggested that leadership

performance may need to be examined more distinctly for its effects on various groups of students and their differing performance on achievement measures.

Rhodes, Stevens, and Cummings (2011) focused their qualitative study on examining a school culture that supported the Science, Technology, and Math Education (STEM) in a new high school. The authors reported that democratic leadership was an important component to ensure collaboration and utilize teachers as instructional leaders. They found that the school culture was built upon problem-solving as teams, and the principal valuing the opinions and expertise of staff within the school. Rhodes et al. (2011) additionally cited the importance of a common vision to guide staff through a new innovation such as STEM.

Principals' choice of professional development. Two quantitative studies, outline in Table B7, examined principals' professional development and its perceived impact on leadership performance and student performance (Hughes & Jones, 2010; Grissom & Harrington, 2010). These studies were included because they represented a focus on what principals do in terms of their own professional development and how this is related to school outcomes as perceived by teachers or perceived student achievement. They represent an interesting line of research that attempts to investigate how principals choose to spend their time as professional learners and the possible impacts this may have on school outcomes.

Hughes and Jones (2010) focused on ethical training for principals and elicited responses from principals through an online survey that asked them about their previous participation in ethical leadership training. They additionally asked the principals to report the gains or losses of their school according to student

achievement data. Based on principal reports, they found that there was a significant relationship between the principals' pre- and in-service training in ethics and the reported gains in student achievement. A notable drawback of this study is the fact that it is based solely on principal perception of student achievement. This would be something that should be investigated more thoroughly in future research.

Grissom and Harrington (2010) used survey data from both teachers and principals to investigate the teachers' perceptions of effective leadership and principals' choice of professional development. They also included a measure of school performance as indicated by the principals on their survey. The authors found that teachers' perceived lower levels of effectiveness for principals who participated in university coursework and formal principal networks. They postulated that the perceptions may be due to the time associated with these outside commitments and the attention that it takes away from their daily tasks (Grissom & Harrington, 2010). They additionally found that principals who participated in formal mentoring or coaching programs were perceived to be more effective leaders, and this was also related to principals' reported growth in school performance.

Teacher induction and retention. I had previously included only research that focused on the direct role of the principal in teacher induction and retention issues, because it is such a wide field of research. However, for this review I found that I was able to delineate between research that included specific discussion of the role of the principal within these processes, and that this literature was important to include in review because of what it adds to the knowledge of life in schools. New

teachers represent an opportunity to assimilate new members into the community, and the role of the principal in setting the vision, direction, and school climate is an important factor in this process, which will be noted in the articles reviewed.

Eight studies were found that pertained to teacher induction and retention and included elements addressing the role of the principal in this process (see Table B8). Five studies focused on teacher retention issues and outlined the differing ways principals' impacted teachers' perceptions of their working environment and intention to remain teaching in their current school (Brown & Wynn, 2009; Easley, 2008; Greenlee & Brown, 2009; Ladd, 2011; Wynn & Brown, 2008). The other studies focused on new teacher induction and mentoring programs and the important role of the principal in these processes (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010; Tillman, 2005; Youngs, Holdgreve-Resendez & Qian, 2011). Five studies relied upon qualitative methods (Brown & Wynn, 2009; Easley, 2008; Tillman, 2005; Wynn & Brown, 2008; Youngs et al., 2011), one utilized a mixed methods design (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010), and the other two utilized quantitative methods (Ladd, 2011; Greenlee & Brown, 2009).

The studies investigating new teacher induction programs had similar findings in regard to principal behavior that is conducive to a positive induction experience. Tillman (2005) discovered, through a qualitative study, that the principals' lack of communication about expectations for the new teacher regarding classroom instruction, and a lack of focus on communicating the school culture led to a negative experience and the teachers' negative perception of her own ability to improve her teaching practice. Youngs et al. (2011) conversely found that when

principals provided clear goals and expectations, as well as resources to help achieve these goals, the new teachers felt more successful.

Bickmore and Bickmore (2010) noted that the participants in their study cited personal needs, in contrast to the professional needs, of new teachers were an important responsibility of administration. They reported the perceptions that principals were viewed as the most important factor in building a positive school culture, and noted that a collegial leadership style affected the success of induction programs through personal interactions and supporting teacher autonomy (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010). Youngs et al. (2011) also found that supportive leadership that gave clear feedback and suggestions focused on instruction instead of behavior or classroom management, resulted in teachers' positive induction experience and efficacy.

Ladd (2011) conducted a study that confirmed the relationship between perceptions of leadership and teachers' intended and actual departures from schools. She found that there was a large and statistically significant relationship between leadership and teachers' intentions to stay. Brown and Wynn (2009) and Greenlee and Brown (2009) elaborated upon this relationship by offering specific behaviors that they found were related to teacher retention. They similarly found that principals who focused on providing resources, as well as building strong culture with shared values that inspire collective work toward educational excellence were strongly related to teachers' feelings about remaining in a particular school (Brown & Wynn, 2009; Greenlee & Brown, 2009).

Easley (2008) and Wynn and Brown (2008) reported similar findings from their studies that communicated the importance of shared, supportive leadership, and focusing on the right things as aspects that most greatly impacted teachers' perceptions of commitment to staying in their schools. It is clear from these studies that the role of the principal in teacher induction and retention is important and significant.

Teacher job satisfaction. This was a theme found in the previous review I conducted, but an additional three articles were found to include in this second review, see Table B9. The studies found for this second review are focused on the personally and professionally inviting behaviors of principals (Egley, 2003; Egley & Jones, 2005), and how principal background and school processes relate to teacher job satisfaction (Shen, Leslie, Spybrook, & Ma, 2012). These three studies all employed quantitative methods to study the phenomena of interest.

Egley (2003) and Egley and Jones (2005) investigated the personally and professionally inviting leadership behaviors of principals. They defined professionally inviting behaviors as those that (a) hold high expectations, (b) communicate expectations for high academic performance from students, (c) have a sense of mission and share with others, (d) facilitate policies and procedures which benefit staff, students, and teachers, (e) offer constructive feedback for improvement in a respectful way, and (f) creates a climate of improvement through collaboration and shared decision making (Egley & Jones, 2005, p. 17). Personally inviting behaviors were defined as (a) being polite to others, (b) demonstrating optimism, (c) caring about co-workers, (d) making an intentional effort to treat

others with trust and respect, and (e) taking time to talk with faculty and staff about their out-of-school activities (Egley & Jones, 2005, p. 17).

Both studies found that there were relationships between the personally and professionally inviting behaviors of principals and teacher job satisfaction (Egley, 2003; Egley & Jones, 2005). They also found that these behaviors were related to perceptions of a more positive school climate, and also student achievement scores. Politeness and caring were behaviors rated highly by teachers (Egley & Jones, 2005).

Shen et al. (2012) investigated principal background and school processes and their relationship to teacher job satisfaction. Principal background was defined as education and work experience, while school processes included items about administrative leadership (Shen et al., 2012), which I will discuss as the findings of interest for this review. The authors reported that working conditions and administrative support had a positive relationship with teacher job satisfaction, and that principals' prior experience as a department head correlated with lower teacher job satisfaction. Shen et al. (2012) reported further that principals' previous experience as an athletic coach or director correlated with higher teacher job satisfaction, but they noted that the effects were small. They concluded that school process variables had more of a relationship with teacher job satisfaction than principal background (Shen et al., 2012).

Professional learning communities. Professional learning communities (PLCs) are becoming a popular reform effort for schools to focus on data-driven decision-making through a collaborative process (Dufour et al., 2008). Many schools

are implementing these processes as a way to bring teachers together around central questions that will help to keep a focus on student achievement and improving instructional practice. These studies are organized in Table B10.

Three qualitative case studies were found that examined how professional learning communities (PLCs) developed within schools. One study (Hollingworth, 2012) specifically focused on the role of the principal in this process. Two studies employed broader aims for their initial research, and the principals' leadership emerged as a salient theme from their data (Hipp, Huffman, Pankake, & Olivier, 2008; Huggins, Scheurich, & Morgan, 2011).

Hipp et al. (2008) discussed how a focus on moral purpose was important for the elementary and middle school settings they studied. All three studies cited the importance of principals' creating collaborative structures through managing and respecting teachers' time, as well as demonstrating instructional leadership behaviors and providing resources such as time, data, and support were important in the successful implementation of PLCs (Hipp et al., 2008; Huggins et al., 2011; Hollingworth, 2012). Huggins et al. (2011) cited the use of pressure for public accountability as a means to motivate teachers to participate in PLCs. Huggins et al. (2011) was the only study that specifically mentioned a rise in student achievement scores as an outcome related to the implementation of the PLC structure and process.

Sharing leadership. Distributed leadership is a vein of research within educational leadership that has a wide span (e.g., Spillane & Healey, 2010). While I did not specifically search for distributed leadership practices because of the

breadth of the literature in this area and my focus on specific leadership behaviors of the principal, I did include studies that surfaced in my searches which included how the principal creates situations that are more conducive to shared, distributed leadership. Three qualitative studies emerged focused on specific aspects of sharing leadership within schools, see Table B11. Lambert (2006) investigated the relationship between high leadership capacity and improved student performance, professional cultures, and shared leadership dynamics. Wasonga and Murphy (2007) queried teachers about their perceptions of the dispositions necessary to co-create leadership in a school, and Park and Datnow (2009) investigated leadership practices that facilitated data-driven decision making and utilized distributed leadership. Though each study takes a different approach to shared leadership ventures, they each contribute to the literature in a way that helps to understand what principals can do to foster shared leadership and how this impacts the dynamics of their school.

Lambert (2006) identified the behaviors and characteristics of leadership across differing capacities. She defined high leadership capacity as that which includes skillful leaders in principals, teachers, students, and parents. She further elaborated that schools exhibiting high leadership capacity have a shared vision which results in program coherence, inquiry based use of information that informs decisions and practice, a culture of collaboration, involvement, and collective responsibility, reflective practice, and student achievement that is high or improving consistently (Lambert, 2006, p. 240). She reported that within the schools she studied, as leadership capacity grew, there was less dependence on the principal.

Principals' who exhibited more adaptable behaviors, and an ability to change roles as the school grew in its leadership capacity were able to facilitate this growth and sustain more distributed leadership practices which impacted student achievement.

Wasonga and Murphy (2007) asked teachers to write about their perceptions of dispositions necessary for principals to co-create leadership with their staff. They found a plethora of non-examples and ways in which the lack of dispositions in their schools negatively impacted shared leadership. They reported that principals should exhibit behaviors that invite collaboration, show active listening, consider cultural implications of the communities they serve, demonstrate egalitarianism as way of supporting staff to grow and learn, demonstrate patience, and trust and trustworthiness. Teachers expressed reservations about co-created leadership as a reality within the hierarchical organization of schools, but the authors recommended that these dispositions be cultivated in leaders so as to continuously work toward the ideal of shared leadership (Wasonga & Murphy, 2007).

Park and Datnow (2009) examined the leadership practices in schools that were implementing data-driven decision making practices and utilizing distributed leadership. They reported that principals' who were successful in implementing these reforms based on growth in student achievement scores were able to create a climate dedicated to continuous improvement. These principals built capacity through modeling and learning together with their staff. They distributed decision making to other staff members, and created a climate where best practices were shared through the use of knowledge brokering among teachers (Park & Datnow, 2009).

Challenging school contexts. The United States is replete with diverse populations, and schools mirror this diversity. Though schools serving diverse, minority populations with high levels of students who are economically disadvantaged are sites for research in many studies I have reviewed, the studies in this section are characterized by their specific focus on the school as a challenging context, and thus have been organized to reflect the focus of the researchers and their purposive sampling of schools with these demographic representations.

This final category of research that I will review is broken into two sub-categories. I found eight studies (see Table B12) that focused on the practices occurring within challenging school settings, with four of these studies focused specifically on the role of the principal, and four additional studies that found the principal as emerging theme from qualitative data (See Table B13). All but one study (Hough & Schmitt, 2011) employed the use of qualitative methods to conduct research in this area. I will discuss their findings as those with a focus on the principal, and those that found the principal as an emergent theme.

Focus on the principal. Out of the four studies focused on the principal in challenging contexts, two specifically investigated the relationship of the principals' leadership with the community. Johnson (2007) and Cooper (2009) explored the culturally responsive and equity-minded behaviors of school leaders and how these behaviors related to a stronger school community with outside involvement from parents and other community organizations. These authors reported similar findings from their qualitative case studies. Both studies found that principals spoke about the importance of creating a culturally responsive environment that invited

parents and community members to participate (Cooper, 2009; Johnson, 2007).

They also both found that there are disturbing gaps between the principals' actions and words, and noted that there was a lack of understanding needed to successfully create an environment where social justice and equity are realized in practice. They also found that there was little connection between home culture and school practice, although these were communicated by principals to be important factors in sustaining a school that responds to the needs of a diverse community of learners.

Hough and Schmitt (2011) and Ramahlo, Garcia, and Merchant (2010) focused on the impact of leadership in high poverty settings and the relationship between these behaviors and school outcomes. Hough and Schmitt (2011) investigated high poverty middle schools and the relationships between leadership, professional development, classroom management, school climate, student achievement, attendance and behavior referrals. They found that there was no significant relationship between school climate or leadership and student achievement in the schools they studied. This supports the findings of Williams (2008) and Twigg (2008), and confounds other studies that show leadership and climate have a positive impact on student achievement (e.g., McGuigan & Hoy, 2006; Pepper & Thomas, 2003). Hough and Schmitt (2011) reported that in schools where teachers perceived supportive leadership for professional development, there was a relationship between the implementation of a professional development reform and student achievement, higher attendance, and fewer behavior referrals.

Ramahlo et al. (2010) similarly examined schools with a high population of students who were economically disadvantaged (over 75%), through an exploratory

case study of two schools identified as academically acceptable in the state of Texas. The authors found that the principals of these two schools had restructured curriculum to meet the needs of their students, employed highly qualified personnel with a great deal of training, and they both emphasized creating and sustaining a positive school culture.

Principal as emerging theme. The studies highlighted in this section (see Table B13) sought to discover the elements that impacted schools serving challenging populations of students. These schools are characterized by rural, transient demographics (Howley, Howley, Camper & Perko, 2011), high numbers of Latino and Hispanic students (Jesse, Davis, & Pokorny, 2004; Pollard-Durodola, 2003), and schools in differing performance statuses in suburban contexts (Brown, Anfara, & Roney, 2004). All four studies utilized qualitative methods to illuminate the unique issues facing the schools identified for investigation, and within their data analysis, the principal emerged as an important component that either supported or inhibited school outcomes.

Brown et al. (2004) and Jesse et al. (2004) both found similar characteristics of principals who were effective for challenging contexts. The importance of instructional leadership, availability to the staff surrounding instructional matters, and presence on the campus and in classrooms was cited (Brown et al., 2004; Jesse et al., 2004; Pollard-Durodola; 2003). It was also reported that the coordination of resources and activities led to better outcomes for the schools in their investigations (Brown et al., 2004; Jesse et al., 2004). Setting clear goals for students that focused on more than test scores was discovered as an essential element to building a school

culture focused on high expectations and positive outcomes for students (Brown et al., 2004; Pollard-Durodola, 2003).

Howley et al. (2011) studied a unique school located on an island off of the northeastern mainland of the United States. This school qualified as a challenging context because of its constantly changing population, high teacher turnover, and challenging remote location. This school focused on Place-Based Education (PBE), and the authors reported that in this challenging context, the principal had to adapt to the changing dynamics of the school to focus on teacher involvement in decision making and problem solving. There was also a focus needed on providing resources to teachers to effectively implement PBE for the changing population of students and staff. Howley et al. (2011) further cited the importance of the principal in communicating with the community and being able to explain and justify the PBE approach used within the school.

How Does Leadership Impact Life in Schools? Current State of the Field

The initial question that preceded my seminal study focused on how the field of educational leadership conceptualized life in schools and the impact of the principal on these outcomes. This discussion is also closely related to a purpose for schools, and how the field defines life in schools through the outcomes studied in the research. This is an important component of my further analysis and allows me to synthesize the research reviewed in a way that communicates my interpretation of the state of the field and how it views life in schools.

Student outcomes. In the studies I reviewed, there were no direct relationships found between principal leadership and student achievement, so my

findings are in line with the literature reviews and meta-analysis I discussed earlier in this paper that cited leadership effects on student achievement as largely indirect (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Marzano et al., 2005; Robinson et al., 2008). There were many moderated or mediated relationships found between principal leadership and student achievement. Important mediating and moderating effects were found for school climate, organizational health, academic optimism, collective teacher efficacy, professional learning communities, and teacher job satisfaction. The principals' ability to impact student achievement was often studied through the use of these other constructs to mediate or moderate principal influence.

Organizational management behavior was the only leadership variable that was found to have a direct relationship with student achievement without the presence of a moderating or mediating variable (Grissom & Loeb, 2011). The measure used in this study for student achievement was the aggregated score that equated to the grade based on the states' A-F grading system. These scores were calculated by the state department of education using hierarchical linear modeling and value added measures (Grissom & Loeb, 2011). The behaviors the authors associated with organizational management are related to instructional management and leadership behaviors as well, and the authors suggested further research in the areas of instructional management and integrated leadership (Grissom & Loeb, 2011). Other studies I reviewed also found considerable relationships with organizational management behaviors and professional development, school improvement, and parents' perceptions of a positive school climate (Chance & Segura, 2009; Horng et al., 2010; Youngs & King, 2002).

Marks and Printy (2003) found a positive relationship between integrated leadership behaviors and quality pedagogy along with student achievement in their mixed methods study. Louis et al. (2010) similarly found that when instructional leadership, shared leadership, and trust in the principal were considered together they had a positive relationship with student achievement. Hallinger and Heck (2011) similarly found that as collaborative, learning centered leadership strengthened, so did the academic capacity of the school, which in turn showed a relationship with student achievement. Other authors found that teachers' perception of their leaders promoting a positive school climate, which was considered a function of transformational leadership, was related to student achievement scores as well (O'Donnell & White, 2005). Horng et al. (2010) found that schools with higher ratings according to state accountability scores had principals that spent more time on day-to-day instruction tasks than schools with lower ratings which had leaders who focused on administrative duties. Reardon (2011) found a direct relationship between principals' perceptions of their attention to rigorous curriculum, student achievement, and performance accountability were related to student achievement as well. These findings, when taken together, help to construct an understanding that although leadership has limited direct relationships with student achievement, it can make a difference when considered with other variables. I noticed that the various leadership styles and frequent reference to integrated leadership imply that there is not one style that will be effective in supporting student achievement in all contexts (Grissom & Loeb, 2011; Horng et al., 2010; Louis et al., 2010; Marks & Printy, 2003).

In studies that were conducted with schools that were already achieving at high levels according to their student achievement data, there were common themes that arose within their findings. Each study made reference to schools with leaders who focused on communicating a clear, common vision and creating structures that allowed teachers to collaborate about student data and instructional practices (Chance & Segura, 2009; Jacobson et al., 2007; Sanzo et al., 2011). Jacobson et al. (2007) added that principals who were visible in the community and able to reorganize the structural and cultural aspects of the schools were effective in impacting school improvement. Additionally, Finnigan and Stewart (2009) found that principals in schools that were not making progress as schools on probation because of low achievement scores did not display many transformational leadership behaviors such as placing emphasis on interactions with teachers, inspiring a strong focus on student learning, and nurturing community involvement. These findings again supported the argument that integrated leadership that should include elements of managing the organization, instructional, and transformational leadership should be present to create an environment where all students can learn.

Student achievement was also a focus for studies that I classified as being concerned with social justice. Social justice is a difficult concept to measure, and five of the eight studies focused on inclusion and social justice used student achievement measures to determine if socially just outcomes were present at the schools they studied. Riester et al. (2002) defined social justice as measured by high rates of literacy and low rates of special education placement within the six schools they studied. Waldron et al. (2011) also used student achievement data that indicated the

level of achievement and inclusion in general education. The findings of both studies supported the presence of transformational, instructional leadership with elements of instructional and organizational management (Riester et al., 2002; Waldron et al., 2011). These authors found that promoting a democratic culture and redesigning the structures and organization of the school, as well as demonstrating a strong focus on literacy and academic success while using data to drive decision making were important behaviors the leaders illustrated in their actions and appeared to have a positive relationship with their measures of social justice. Riester et al. (2002) discussed persistence in achieving goals, and I find that this is an important point to remember.

Theoharis (2010) also referenced a strong persistence in achieving and sustaining equity in his study. He cited that a prime function of leadership was to disrupt injustices within school structures that marginalized and segregated students. He suggested that a leader must constantly question the organization and structure of the school to create environments that remain focused on an equitable education with high expectations for all students (Theoharis, 2010). Brown et al., (2011) and Ovando and Cavazos (2004) similarly noted the presence of high expectations and reorganizing structures as responsibilities of a principal who worked to achieve a socially just school for students in schools with a high minority and high poverty population. The only difference I noted in the findings of the studies focused on social justice and those concerned with student achievement is the presence of a critical awareness of structures that impede equity and growth. Otherwise, the integrated leadership behaviors found in previous studies discussed

are present in these studies as well. Waldron et al. (2011) argued that their findings were no different than the findings for studies that were not focused on inclusive schools, and I agree that effective leadership practices can have a tremendous impact on any type of school.

There were few studies focused on student outcomes that did not include a measure of student achievement on standardized test scores. Johnson et al. (2011) conducted a study that investigated the noticing behaviors of principals in high achieving schools, and their findings are worthy to put forward. The principals they interviewed focused on classroom climate, which fostered student engagement, learning, and understanding (Johnson et al., 2011). While the purposive sampling included scores on standardized tests, it is important to note that their findings were focused on what principals looked for when they visited classrooms and I find that the inclusion of student engagement and understanding as positive additions to the literature that should be further investigated.

Slobodzian (2009) also focused on student outcomes that were not related to student achievement when he investigated the inclusion and exclusion of deaf children through a qualitative design.

Teacher outcomes. If leadership does not have a direct influence on student achievement, then other variables must be examined to determine just how leaders relate to the outcomes within their schools (Robinson et al., 2008). Leithwood and Louis (2012) claimed that they had not found a school making sustained growth and improvement without the presence of a talented leader. Many of the studies I

reviewed explored the relationship between principal behaviors and teacher outcomes.

Transformational leadership behaviors such as setting direction, helping people, and redesigning the organization (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005), and leadership for learning behaviors were found to have relationships with outcomes such as effective teaching practices (Heck & Moriyama, 2010; Louis et al., 2010; Printy, 2008; Zimmerman & Deckert-Pelton, 2003), organization based self-esteem (Twigg, 2008), and teacher satisfaction (Griffith, 2004; Grissom, 2011; Hurren, 2006).

Overall, principals who inspired teachers to work toward a common goal focused on student learning and high expectations, cultivated relationships of trust and supportive cooperation, and removed barriers to both teacher and student success through reorganizing structures to promote innovation impacted teachers' perceptions of work environment, commitment, and job satisfaction (Griffith, 2004; Grissom, 2011; Hurren, 2006; Louis et al., 2010; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2009; Walker & Slear, 2011).

Horng et al. (2010) discussed the relationship they found between the time principals spent in day-to-day instructional tasks and teacher satisfaction. Price (2012) noted how principal-teacher relationships as perceived by teachers had a positive relationship with satisfaction, cohesion, and commitment of teachers. She also noted that individual principal attitudes seemed to have no relationship with teacher attitudes (Price, 2012). Conversely, Youngs (2007) found that the beliefs and actions of principals impacted new teacher satisfaction, professional growth and their intention to stay teaching.

Numerous studies documented the impact of the principal on teacher induction and retention. Bickmore and Bickmore (2010) found that teachers perceived that principals contributed more to the personal needs of teachers than their professional needs, and elaborated that principals have a role in the teachers' self-perception of competence, autonomy, and feelings of respect. Tillman (2005) further elaborated that the lack of communication about school culture and expectations negatively affected the induction experience of a new teacher. Youngs et al. (2011) also put forth the importance of clear goals and providing resources to achieve these goals.

Finally, Blase and Blase (2002) as well as Blase, Blase, and Du (2008) studied the effects of principal mistreatment. They found that teachers who reported abuse described the ways in which this abuse impacted their personal and professional lives. Teachers who experienced abuse cited that they would leave their career based on the mistreatment by the principals, and they reported a myriad of other coping behaviors that impacted their work and satisfaction (Blase, Blase, & Du, 2008).

I suggest that the studies that focused on teacher efficacy and pedagogical quality have some interesting contributions. Walker and Slear (2011) found that modeling instructional expectations had a significant positive relationship with teacher efficacy for all teachers in their study except for those who had been teaching for more than fifteen years. May and Supovitz (2011) found that when the time in instructional leadership tasks increased, there was not an increase in the teachers' reported change in instructional practices, however their data indicated

that the more time a principal spent in instructional leadership tasks did have a positive relationship with the school-wide measure of change in instructional practices. Both studies suggested that a principal must be strategic in the use of instructional leadership strategies, knowing the teachers' history and background and spending time with teachers who will benefit from modeling and instructional leadership tasks to improve the overall willingness of teachers to examine and change their instructional practices. Wahlstrom and Louis (2009) found that shared, transformational, and instructional leadership had a positive relationship with focused instruction when considered together. They found specifically that in middle schools, the perceived trust in the principal had the strongest positive relationship to focused instruction reported by the teachers (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2009). I believe that continuing to build upon the previous research on the relationships between principal leadership and teacher efficacy and effectiveness could be an important focus for future research.

Other studies focused specifically on the role of principals in helping teachers to navigate high stakes accountability policies and reforms. Coburn (2001, 2005) found that principals played an important role in communicating, filtering, and helping teachers make sense of policy implementation. Coburn (2005) and Spillane et al. (2002) reported similar findings about the impact of principals' previous experiences and beliefs and how these shape their interpretation and facilitation of policy directives. Spillane et al. (2002) reported how principals used data to communicate with the staff in attempts to understand district level policy reform. Coburn (2005), Rinke and Valli (2010), Stillman (2011), and Ylimaki (2012)

documented how principals' understandings of literacy instruction, dispositions toward professional development, and personal choices impacted the way in which they interpreted policy and how this shaped their professional development practices and the instructional foci for teachers. These studies all have important contributions to make in understanding how principals impact policy implementation in schools. The personal beliefs and background knowledge of principals plays a key role in their own initial interpretation of policy and effects the way in which they make decisions about and communicate areas of focus for their staff (Stillman, 2011; Ylimaki, 2012).

It is clear from these findings that principal actions and beliefs have important relationships with a diverse array of teacher outcomes. Teacher outcomes that were further investigated to determine their relationship with student outcomes continued to be linked only to student achievement, which is something that I discuss further in my analysis in Chapters Six and Seven.

School culture. School culture has many different components. It has been described as an abstract concept, consisting of the feelings of people who work within and are impacted by an organization and the manner in which they approach their work and construct their goals (Deal & Peterson, 2009). The authors who attempted to measure school culture did so by conducting surveys, studying participation in professional development, interviewing principals, teachers, and parents, and observing the school setting. In my review of the research, I separated school culture and socially just outcomes into two separate categories to discuss findings. For this discussion, I will include socially just outcomes within the category

of school culture because I argue that building inclusive schools involves the creation of a school culture that embraces high expectations for all students and is driven by the vision and norms that dictate the behaviors and attitudes of the people within the school and community.

Hornig et al. (2010) found that organizational management behaviors were related to parents' positive perception of school climate. Youngs and King (2002) found that critical inquiry into equitable learning opportunities for students led to greater capacity within the school to meet the needs of all students. They also found when a principal took the staff on a schoolwide retreat, it fostered a common vision and built trust between the principal and the staff, which had a positive impact on their school culture (Youngs & King, 2002). Many studies cited the importance of the principal inspiring a common vision and holding high expectations for all students (Chance & Segura, 2009; Eilers & Camacho, 2007; Finnigan & Stewart, 2009; Graczewski et al., 2009; Grissom, 2011; Jacobson et al., 2009; Ovando & Cavazos, 2004; Riester et al., 2002; Smith & Leonard, 2005; Theoharis, 2010). Through different methodologies, these authors found that this was essential to building a culture that demonstrated a belief that positive change can occur and all students can learn.

What I find absent from these studies is the analysis of what a principal did to inspire this common vision. I made this observation when I discussed student outcomes as well. Even within the qualitative studies, there is little focus on the language used by the principal that looks also at the actions to demonstrate how this process unfolded within the school. This is something I noted throughout all of the

research I reviewed, the vagueness of action and the absence of discourse analysis. Many of the behaviors associated with an effective leader are grounded in communication, but I reviewed no studies that focused on analyzing the content of visions, their development, and the discourse of principals and teachers that either supported or challenged this process of collective vision and purpose. What I also find missing is a study that examines the difference in visions across schools and the effects of these visions on school outcomes. I found it was a widely cited feature of effective leaders, and I argue that it is important to examine vision more carefully to understand its relationship with individual and collective beliefs and actions.

Other studies investigated the impact of principal leadership on professional development and collective teacher efficacy. School vision was found to play a role in teachers' perceptions of coherent professional development (Graczewski et al., 2009). McGhee and Lew (2008) found that the perceptions of principal knowledge about literacy impacted teachers' perceptions of effective interventions used in their schools. Graczewski et al., (2009) found that perceptions of leadership engagement in instructional improvement had a positive relationship to content and curriculum focused professional development as perceived by the teachers. Matsumura and Brown-Welty (2009) similarly found that principals' support behaviors were related to teacher participation in literacy coaching activities. Numerous studies cited the importance of principal facilitation of and participation in professional development, describing instructional leadership behaviors as the key to positive school outcomes (Eilers & Camacho, 2007; Graczewski et al., 2009; Sanzo et al., 2011; Youngs & King, 2002).

Management behaviors were also noted to have an important role in supporting professional development and collaboration. Many studies cited the importance of creating structures that supported collaboration and allowed teachers to come together and talk about student data and instructional practices (Chance & Segura, 2009; Eilers & Camacho, 2007; Graczewski et al., 2009; Waldron et al., 2011; Youngs & King, 2002). Smith and Leonard (2005) argued that a facilitative leadership style was most important for inclusive school success, stating that the leader must create opportunities for teachers to come together and talk about students in a productive way, driven by school vision and not by test scores.

Fancera and Bliss (2011) studied collective teacher efficacy. They found that instructional leadership behaviors did not have a significant relationship with collective teacher efficacy, which contradicted the findings by May and Supovitz (2011) who stated that the time a principal spent in instructional leadership practices appeared to have a relationship with school-wide changes in instruction. The studies used different measures, and collective teacher efficacy is not directly comparable to change in instructional practices, however I suggest that the willingness and ability to change instructional practices is related to a teachers' efficacy and belief that they can reach all learners. Though it may not be a strong comparison, I felt that it was important to note the differing findings in these related areas, as both studies were looking at measures of instructional leadership as well.

When thinking about the collective findings in the research related to school culture and principal leadership, I found that transformational leadership behaviors of inspiring and building a common vision had a relationship with building school

cultures that focused on coherent professional development and collaboration. Transformational leadership behaviors were also important for building cultures that focused on equity and inclusion (e.g., Waldron et al., 2011) Instructional leadership played a role in understanding how a principal can support focused professional development that teachers perceived as coherent and useful (Graczewski et al., 2009), as well as how principal leadership related to participation in activities such as literacy coaching (Matsumura et al., 2009). Although Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) included management behaviors within their explanation of transformational leadership, I will discuss them separately. Creating structures, managing time, and ensuring that teachers had resources available were themes that I found to be salient in the findings related to school culture, and I consider these to be more management tasks because they require the principal to act on behalf of the staff instead of with them and these behaviors can be classified as more independent (Chance & Segura, 2009; Horng et al., 2010; Jacobson et al., 2007).

Parents. Studies including parent perceptions of school outcomes were not prevalent in the research I reviewed. Grissom and Loeb (2011) included a measure of parent satisfaction which included only one item that asked parents to give a letter grade to their child's school. Parents would undoubtedly give varying letter grades for different reasons and the authors did not explore this further (Grissom & Loeb, 2011) Horng et al. (2009) surveyed parents about their perceptions of a positive school climate and the relationship with the perception of how principals used their time. Organization management behaviors had the strongest positive

relationship with parents' perceptions of a positive school climate. Griffith (2001) similarly included a discussion of parents' perceptions of a positive school climate and the effective leader behaviors parents associated with this outcome. Parents' perceived the principal in the role of the gamesman, which is related to a politician type role, and the role of the missionary who connects and inspires people to work together, as the strongest relationship with perceived positive school climate. It was also found that diverse leadership teams that include members of parent organizations and community members had a relationship with community involvement (Gordon & Louis, 2009).

Johnson (2007) re-analyzed data from a previous study to specifically focus on the perceptions of parents whose children attended a school in a challenging demographic context serving a high minority and high poverty population. She found that principals worked hard to build community and bridge the gap between school and home by welcoming parents into their schools and encouraging participation. She also found that there were many critical elements of cultural responsiveness missing, and she noted the distance between home culture and school practices (Johnson, 2007). Similarly, Cooper (2009) and Ramahlo et al. (2010) included parent perceptions of leadership in challenging contexts. Cooper (2009) reported similar gaps in understanding the cultural work necessary to create a strong family connection with the school. Ramahlo et al. (2010) related their parent perceptions to support the practice of building a positive school culture as a means to close achievement gaps.

I argue that parents have an important role in the education of their children and this is often overlooked, which is evidenced by the lack of parental involvement in the studies I reviewed. This could be a particularly interesting topic to study in relation to school vision. If a school is the focal point of a community (Masumoto & Brown-Welty, 2009), then it would be interesting to study how parents and other community members have a voice in the direction setting and vision creation within a school and how this impacts their involvement, perceptions of school climate, and student outcomes.

Reflection

This second review of the research was undertaken as a part of my hermeneutical method. Gallagher (1992) cited the importance of reflection and self-understanding as pre-critical stages of a critical hermeneutical study. Through the process of re-examining my own methods in the initial study of the literature, revising the language I used to conduct searches, and further clarifying the purpose of my study as finding out as much as I could about how leadership impacts life in schools, I was able to accomplish several tasks.

First, I was able to realize the efforts of my deep reflection and examination of epistemological and methodological literature. I had to delve more deeply into the world of philosophy to have a greater understanding of the competing worldviews at work within research agendas. Through reflecting on these epistemological beliefs, I understood how my initial search of the literature biased studies that were found to have “effects” that are so commonly noted in the discourse of quantitative methodologies. In Chapter Six, I will describe the research in methodological

categories to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the differing approaches. I will thoroughly analyze the findings of both literature reviews in order to extricate the opposing ideological, epistemological and methodological issues at play within the research literature in educational leadership in Chapter Seven.

The second task accomplished by this additional literature review was to lay the effective groundwork for understanding of the phenomenon of leadership and life in schools. Although the literature reviewed continued to be bound by carefully chosen inclusion and exclusion criteria, it was important that I was sure that I carefully illuminated the state of the field as it relates to outcomes of life in school that include parents, teachers, students, and the school as a culture of itself.

In accomplishing these tasks of reflection and understanding, I have communicated a critical framework from which to conduct my analysis of the current state of the field. It is in this discussion that I will be able to make connections between the underlying ideologies related to the purpose of schools, and the epistemological and methodological issues that have been raised by my investigation of the research in educational leadership.

Chapter 6

Methodological Discussion

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the use of methodologies within the literature of both reviews so that the reader can begin to draw conclusions before I impose my analysis. This chapter is organized to facilitate an understanding of the prominent methodologies of quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-methods research. As I have reflected deeply about the delineation of these methodologies, I need to make clear that it is not my intention to move back into the “qualitative-quantitative wars” that have defined a great deal of methodological conversation. I will discuss the major philosophical underpinnings within each of these methodologies, I will discuss the current research and how it illustrates these methodologies within the field of educational leadership, and I will put forth short discussions that illuminate what I have found to be both strengths and weaknesses of these methodological choices. In Chapter Seven, I will turn to an analysis and direct focus on my second research question regarding how the ideological, epistemological, and methodological histories have impacted the current literature and focus of study. This chapter seeks to provide an additional layer of understanding and reflection before delving into the analysis.

Describing the Literature Reviews

When combining the results of the two literature reviews, a total of 91 articles were systematically reviewed. Although the reporting of the research findings differed between my two reviews, comparative information can be found in Appendix C where Tables C1-C5 show the distribution of all articles in both reviews

across methodology. In total, 44 articles utilized qualitative methods, with 30 of those being added from the second review. Three additional mixed methods studies were added from the second review, for a total of ten, and 18 additional quantitative studies were reviewed, for a total of 37 included in my reviews.

From this first glance at the distribution of research methods, it is important to analyze how my methods have contributed to this picture. The second review was an attempt to eliminate bias toward quantitative methods through more inclusive terminology used in my searches. After the initial process of searching, I went through and looked at all the studies I had found, including the studies set aside for review from the first literature searches I conducted. Although my reflection was an attempt to have a more neutral view of what I included as research, respecting and acknowledging the differing methodologies, it is possible that my keen awareness of biased criteria from the first search led me to inadvertently bias qualitative studies on this second review. It is surprising that the number of qualitative studies outnumbered the quantitative studies, but I will demonstrate through further analysis that the epistemological bases of each representation of methodology are not as different as one might expect, given their fundamental ontological differences. Denzin and Lincoln (2011) stated that “if paradigms are overarching philosophical systems, denoting particular ontologies, epistemologies, and methodologies, one cannot easily move from one to another” (p. 5). I suggest that research in educational leadership blurs the lines between these philosophies, and this raises important questions about how methodology is used within the field.

Before I begin that analysis, I will provide an overview of each methodology and discuss the methods used in the 91 studies reviewed, providing examples of each in my discussion. In Chapter Seven, I will turn my analysis to the question: How have the ideological, epistemological, and methodological histories of educational leadership shaped the current literature?

Quantitative methods. Quantitative research tends to be conducted within the positivist or post-positivist worldview (Creswell, 2009; Guba, 1990; Lincoln et al., 2011). Creswell (2009) described post-positivism as the paradigm guiding the use of the scientific method. In quantitative research, the investigator approaches the study with a theory or hypothesis and then subsequently gathers data to test or explore the hypotheses. The aim of quantitative research, then, is to determine possible causes of outcomes that may lead to the discovery of truths that are generalizable to larger populations, in other words, positivism seeks ultimately to predict and control (Creswell, 2009; Lincoln et al., 2011). Although post-positivism attempts to reconcile some of the inherent problems with positivism, it still adheres to realist ontological assumptions, which translate into an objectivist epistemology (Guba, 1990). Post-positivists recognize that the knowledge, beliefs, and experiences of the researcher play a role in the relationship between the observer and the observed, however, they still attempt to eradicate this bias by making it known and getting on with their objective research (Lincoln et al., 2011). Essentially, post-positivism says that in nature there are truths or realities that can be approximated through objectively studying nature and allowing the truths to reveal themselves. Through the use of methodological manipulation, the researcher

can account for their subjective bias, and attempt to return the facts to an objective truth (Guba, 1990; Lincoln et al., 2011). Epistemology also determines what counts as knowledge (Skrtic, 1991), and the post-positivist epistemology basically communicates that anything worth knowing can be measured, predicted, and communicated as probable laws that can be applied across situations. In education, this impacts the creation of knowledge through an adherence to studying schools in ways that can be measured. Beatty (1998) when discussing Thorndike's beliefs about science and education, commented that testing the results of teaching was vitally important and that without quantitative explication, theories of education held no ground. This is the ultimate philosophy behind positivist and post-positivist paradigms.

Current quantitative research. As shown in Appendix C, Table C1, there were 37 quantitative studies included in my reviews, and 36 studies were exploratory in nature. Exploratory research employs methods to determine relationships between variables and test or create hypotheses about these relationships. Only one study (Silva et al., 2011) employed experimental methods to test an intervention. The 36 exploratory studies utilized various theoretical frameworks and attempted to correlate variables using statistical models. The 37 quantitative studies all used a form of a survey to collect the data on their independent variables. One exception was found, Horng et al., 2010, used a combination of self-reporting, daily logs, and observations of the principal to attempt to eliminate the bias of self-reporting behavior.

Surveys as a method of data collection have both strengths and limitations that I will discuss. Creswell (2009) cited surveys as one of the most common methods of quantitative data collection in social sciences research. Creswell cited that the strengths of surveys are that they can be created by the authors based on evidence from previous studies, theories, or personal experiences and tailored to the research question being studied. Many surveys utilized in the studies I reviewed were previously created and tested by authors to determine their reliability and validity which increased the strength of the data they collected from their participants (e.g., Fancera & Bliss, 2011; Grissom, 2011; Kelley et al., 2005; O'Donnell & White, 2005; Twigg, 2008; Walker & Slear, 2011). See Table C1 for a description of the survey instruments and their creators. Besides the possibility of using previously tested survey instruments and increasing the reliability and validity of the data collected, surveys can be administered in many different ways. Surveys can be done without much expense, and can be mailed out to random samples quite easily.

The limitations of surveys are the lack of response, and the errors that are inherent with self-reported data. Because surveys only measure perceptions of the people who respond, it is possible that the reports are not accurate representations of the actual phenomenon (Creswell, 2009; Willig, 2008). Gronn and Ribbins (1996) further cited that “respondent survey approaches take for granted merely that preferred or normative leadership theories predominate in different national and cultural settings and progressively define their measures in keeping with that assumption” (p. 458). They were arguing that through socialization and assimilation

of leaders into the dominant discourses of preferred theories and models, it essentially ignores the question of how and why these preferred frameworks have come to exist and assumes they will continue to prevail because that is what is being studied.

Authors that chose to create their own surveys were sure to test the items with a group before using it for their study (e.g., Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). This was done to ensure reliability of the survey items, as well as construct validity, which allowed the researchers to make adjustments to the questions to be sure they represented relevant questions and perceptions (Creswell, 2009). Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) explained how their survey instrument was constructed by combining items from previously published surveys with their own ideas, and they described how they field tested the instrument with different groups of teachers prior to their study. They also discussed how they used this field-testing to change the wording of some of their questions so that the final instrument was easier to understand and complete (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008).

Exploratory factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, and principal factor analysis with varimax rotations were statistical means used to construct variables from survey responses (e.g., Gordon & Louis, 2009; Griffith, 2004; Grissom & Loeb, 2011; Twigg, 2008; Vecchio et al., 2008; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). The use of these methods to construct variables allowed the researchers to run analyses on items from the survey to determine which items loaded on particular variables, thus creating a more manageable number of variables that reflected the relationship between survey items, which were then used in other statistical analyses. Griffith

(2004) used confirmatory factor analysis to determine how well the individual survey respondents conformed to scales representing the three components of transformational leadership he created based on survey response items. This analysis was based on his first research question, which sought to determine if the behaviors of principals could be described in terms of the components of transformational leadership (Griffith, 2004). The author used the confirmatory factor analysis as a basis for the subsequent statistical analyses, which used the components of transformational leadership to hypothesize relationships between these specific behaviors and teacher job satisfaction and staff turnover. The findings of the analysis supported the use of these components in further analysis, but the author noted that an additional calculation using chi-squared methods was statistically significant which usually indicated a poor fit between components. This limitation should be noted, although Griffith (2004) justified the poor fit by stating that large samples usually result in a statistically significant chi-squared value, and he ultimately determined that the confirmatory factor analysis was enough to allow him to reliably use the component variables in further analysis. Griffith (2004) illustrated the use of confirmatory factor analysis as a tool to both confirm reliable variables and communicate possible limitations in the calculations so readers are able to understand the limitations in drawing conclusions from the data.

Sample sizes and sampling procedures are ways to determine the significance of findings from survey methods (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006). The survey methods represented in the quantitative research reviewed most commonly utilized stratified random sampling. This means that they used existing groups as

their participant population, but employed random sampling techniques within the existing groups to allow for greater validity in data collection and analysis (Gay et al., 2006).

Fancera and Bliss (2011) reported using convenience sampling of districts within a range that they considered convenient in terms of the proximity to their location. From their convenience sample, stratified random sampling occurred for the administration of their survey (Fancera & Bliss, 2011). These are important considerations because the degree of randomization has an impact on the generalizability of the results found, and this was commonly referred to within the authors' discussion of limitations of their study (Fancera & Bliss, 2011). Fancera and Bliss noted that the use of a convenience sample had probably over-represented schools within the middle range of socioeconomic status from that region in New Jersey, which had implications for the presentation of results. Indeed, their presentation of results included discussion about the meaning of the analysis for the specific sample of schools they studied, and the authors made no reference to a general population of high schools (Fancera & Bliss, 2011). Although these 35 studies make important contributions to the knowledge base of leadership factors that have a relationship to school outcomes, the nature of the research designs and methods employed in the quantitative studies are limited in their generalizability to other school populations because of their sampling techniques, and their descriptive or exploratory nature.

No cause and effect relationships can be determined by the quantitative studies in this review. This is an essential consideration because the research

methods and analyses used were all correlational in nature, with the exception of Silva et al. (2011). This means that although the variables constructed through survey items could be explored in terms of their relationship to other outcome variables determined either by student achievement or additional variable construction from survey items, the statistical methods implied relationships between these variables, but one could not be found to cause the other (Creswell, 2009; Gay et al., 2006). The methods of variable construction and the findings of relationships between variables could lead to further research that may come closer to causality, but the implications of the quantitative research are limited by their design in generalizing findings to other school populations. This discussion will be continued in the final synthesis of this review. For the present, I will continue discussion of the statistical measures used to determine relationships between variables and discuss their uses, strengths, and limitations within the studies reviewed.

Using Creswell's (2009) criteria for choosing statistical tests, I discuss the studies within the following categories: (a) group comparison, (b) association between groups, and (c) relationship between variables. Studies that asked questions about group comparison utilized t-tests, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and Mann-Whitney U tests. Research questions that were focused on the association between groups used the chi-square test, and other studies which asked questions about the relationship between variables used Pearson product moment correlation, multiple regression, or Spearman rank-order correlation.

Group comparison. The use of t-tests, ANOVA, and Mann-Whitney U tests indicated the comparison of groups in the studies reviewed. For some studies, these were the primary statistical methods employed (Blase et al., 2008; Hurren, 2006), while for others they were one part of their statistical analysis (Louis et al., 2010; O'Donnell & White, 2005; Twigg, 2008). The t-test is used to determine if the means of two groups are significantly different from one another (Gay et al., 2006). For example, Twigg (2008) utilized t-tests to determine how self-reports of transformational leadership behaviors from principals differed from the perceptions of teachers' ratings of the principal on the same measure. This led the researcher to a more informed use of variables for his hierarchical analysis (Twigg, 2008), thus demonstrating the usefulness of this type of statistical measure when considering the perceptions of two groups in constructing variables. Twigg's (2008) use of t-tests also demonstrated the weaknesses involved when administering self-report surveys to determine principal behavior. The inflated responses by the administrators could lead to inflated relationships when other statistical measures were employed with the constructed variables. I find that this is important to consider, however, the use of t-tests can assist in acknowledging or avoiding such inflated findings.

ANOVA was used by Blase et al. (2008), and Hurren (2006) to determine the effects of categories of behavior. For example, Blase et al. (2008) wanted to know if there were differential perceptions of harm by teachers with different genders, ethnic background, marital status, etc. By using ANOVA, they were able to compare the perceptions of teachers according to demographic groups. Hurren (2006)

utilized ANOVA to test the relationship between the outcomes and the different levels of frequency that teachers' reported principals' use of humor. This was an effective way to determine what frequency of humor had a relationship with teacher job satisfaction in different settings (Hurren, 2006). Griffith (2004) used ANOVA to justify his use of school aggregated responses on surveys in subsequent statistical analyses. He found that the scales employed showed adequate within-group agreement which would allow him to use school level data in his analysis of transformational leadership and job satisfaction which resulted in more generalizable relationships between variables than if he had used individual level data in his analysis (Griffith, 2004).

Association between groups. Griffith (2004) again represented the use of chi-squared tests to determine the appropriate use of variables in his further statistical analysis. He used the chi-squared method to analyze the association between group ratings of the transformational leadership components. In this study, Griffith (2004) determined that a statistically significant chi-squared value was based on the large sample size and continued to utilize the results of his confirmatory factor analysis of components of transformational leadership to calculate further results for his research questions.

Relationships between variables. The types of studies that investigated relationships between variables were characterized by their use of Pearson product moment correlation, structural equation modeling and multiple regression analyses (Creswell, 2009). The types of regression analyses present in the studies I reviewed included hierarchical linear modeling, stepwise linear regression modeling, fixed

effects linear regression modeling, and path analysis. These types of statistical models allowed the researchers to control for other variables that may have had an affect outcomes but were not the focus of the study. For example, student demographic information such as gender and socioeconomic status may be controlled in statistical analysis to allow for results that acknowledge their impact on outcomes but attempt to control for their effects so that more accurate results about the variables in question can be determined.

Louis et al. (2010) used a combination of stepwise regression analysis, and structural equation modeling with path analysis. They reported numerous relationships and correlations within their data that suggested the predictive value of teachers' trust in their principal and student achievement (Louis et al., 2010). The authors also discussed the limitations and additional questions raised by their data, citing the complexity of their results as a serious limitation, and put forth that further research based on their findings was needed (Louis et al., 2010). Horng et al. (2010) also used regression analyses with their data and they discussed the limitation of using numerous controls with a small sample size. They chose to control for student prior achievement to determine the relationship between the principals' use of time and student achievement change over time, while leaving out controls for principals' prior experience and school characteristics (Horng et al., 2010). This omission of controls to gain more concise data analysis could overlook the impact of school demographics on student achievement and therefore should have been considered in their discussion of limitations.

Discussion of quantitative methods. Overall, I found that the studies I reviewed employed complex data analysis that required a great deal of checking and additional research into the methods used to determine the validity of their results. It is clear to me that the use of statistics allows researchers to determine relationships between variables that illuminate interesting and important relationships with leadership behaviors, roles, and styles. The authors of the studies reviewed were very careful not to report their findings as cause and effect, but rather as relationships between variables and possible predictors of outcomes. I determine the main strength of statistical models to be their use in assisting to understand the relationship between specific leadership behaviors and quantifiable outcomes. Linking school processes and behaviors with outcomes of student learning can be a useful tool in discovering possibilities for improvement.

The limitations for statistical analyses lay in their complex nature and the possible misinterpretation that could occur because of multiple types of analysis employed, specifically illustrated in the studies I reviewed. The discussion of results must take limitations into consideration throughout the presentation of methods and analysis (e.g., Griffith, 2004) so the consumer has an opportunity to determine the validity of the results. An additional shortcoming of quantitative research was its reliance on large sets of data. When determining outcomes for schools, some studies relied upon district created surveys (e.g. Williams, 2009), which often did not ask in-depth questions about teaching or learning. Many studies also relied upon the widely available data on student achievement from standardized test scores and state accountability systems. While this was one data point that indicated student

achievement, there are other facets of student growth that I argue should be taken into consideration.

Qualitative methods. Qualitative research in educational leadership utilizes both traditional and interpretivist methods. Generally, the purpose of qualitative research is to understand the meanings that people construct in regard to human or social problems (Creswell, 2009; Guba, 1990; Willig, 2008), but qualitative research done in this field encompasses many competing theoretical perspectives (Wanat, 2006). Qualitative methodologies tend to be situated within social constructivist worldviews that place emphasis on the construction of reality by the individuals seeking to understand the world around them (Creswell, 2009; Willig, 2008). Guba (1990) discussed the important point that the use of qualitative methods by itself is not a call for a paradigm shift, and qualitative methods can be used in more post-positivist research to combat the imbalance between precision and richness, he further cautioned against the assumption that qualitative signals a constructivist paradigm. Similarly, Wanat (2006) put forth that the debate between the traditional and interpretivist methods of conducting qualitative research “leaves researchers faced with many choices, while the field is pulled in contradictory directions” (p. 834). This is a point that I will discuss further in Chapter Six.

Qualitative research can be situated within many different worldviews. In a constructivist paradigm, the worldview is relativist, acknowledging and studying the subjective nature of reality, and within this paradigm researchers use this subjective nature to investigate phenomena through inductive practices, allowing the data to drive the development of theory and to inform the research process

(Creswell, 2009; Guba, 1990; Lincoln, 1990; Willig, 2008). Advocacy or participatory worldviews, commonly associated with the framework of critical theory or postmodern theories (Guba, 1990; Lincoln et al., 2011), are also frequently conducted with qualitative research methods (Creswell, 2009). The worldview of critical theory places emphasis on research done to illuminate the oppression of historically marginalized groups or individuals within our society, such as students with special needs, minority groups, and women (Creswell, 2009; Murphy, 2002; Willig, 2008). Postmodern thought is characterized by the questioning of modern scientific thinking (positivism) and doesn't privilege any specific authority, method or paradigm (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011).

Because of the contested terrain in which qualitative methods are utilized and the disagreement about overarching standards for judging the quality of qualitative research, I will put forth what I found to be important considerations as I reviewed the literature. Willig (2008) put forth several considerations to be made when conducting qualitative research to ensure a rigorous study. To address the role of the researcher in the study, a discussion of reflexivity should be present in qualitative research studies. Considerations about (a) personal bias, (b) personal experiences that could alter the interpretation of observations and data analysis, and (c) the established position or relationship of the researcher with the participants should all be discussed so the audience can have a better understanding of how to interpret the findings of the study (Willig, 2008). It is also important to understand the theoretical perspective guiding the qualitative researcher, as this epistemology will affect the way in which data are analyzed (Wanat, 2006). Willig

discussed that if these elements are not addressed properly, their exemption could equate to limitations of the study. A limitation that is commonly noted about qualitative research is its lack of generalizability to other populations because of its purposeful sampling and in-depth investigation of a phenomenon with limited participants (Creswell, 2009; Willig, 2008). In my reflection on qualitative methods, I have found that the manner in which these methods are utilized within educational leadership literature is often lacking in a discussion of the philosophical perspectives guiding the researcher within the study. I will discuss this further in Chapter Six as well.

I suggest there are many strengths of qualitative research. These methods allow the researcher to explore relationships, interactions, and meanings associated with phenomenon in depth and analyze the data to construct theories about these relationships that could be used in different types of studies (Creswell, 2009; Willig, 2008). Lincoln (1990) discussed her expanding conception of qualitative research within a constructivist ontology, citing issues such as trustworthiness, and the axioms of naturalistic inquiry. She put forth that good qualitative research should include an investigation of multiple constructions of reality (Lincoln, 1990), and I will describe this shortcoming related to educational leadership research in my forthcoming analysis.

Qualitative studies can also serve the purpose of illuminating the results of other studies done that explored quantitative relationships, and provide a more in depth explanation of relationships between behaviors and outcomes. Qualitative research allows the researcher to use data within a study to drive the investigation

and change direction during the course of a study if the data provide reasoning to do so. Although it has been criticized in the past for not utilizing the scientific method, and there are differing criteria by which to judge its quality, most qualitative research is concerned with the rigor of studies and determined to present findings that will add to the body of knowledge in the researched field (Creswell, 2009; Lincoln, 1990; Willig, 2008).

Current Qualitative Research. Various types of qualitative methods were used in 44 studies I reviewed to investigate the phenomenon of leadership behavior and its impact on outcomes within the school. These studies are organized in Tables C2, C3, and C4. The methods used for qualitative research in the studies I reviewed are case studies (see Table C2), grounded theory (see Table C3), and several types of ethnography (see Table C4). Each of these approaches to qualitative research will be explored, and I will discuss the strengths and limitations of each approach using examples from the studies reviewed.

Case studies. A case study design was employed for 40 out of the 44 qualitative studies in my review, and these can be found categorized together in Table C2. According to Willig (2008), case studies are characterized by their focus on a specific case as the unit of analysis. Willig (2008) also explained that case studies situate a particular case within a context and analyze the context in which the case occurs using triangulation and multiple sources of data to ensure accuracy of the phenomenon in data analysis. She further classified case studies by their type: I determined based on her typology, the case studies reviewed in this paper are instrumental in nature (Willig, 2008). The instrumental label means that they are

investigated because they represent a larger problem within our schools as a system that needs to be investigated (Willig, 2008), and this was a characteristic of all case studies discussed in this review.

The methods by which cases were chosen illustrated this instrumental nature. For example, Theoharis (2010) chose schools that demonstrated socially just outcomes for the students as evidenced by reported gains in student achievement and data collected through interviews with teachers, principals, and school staff. His focus on socially just outcomes for schools represented a systemic problem that needed examination. Sanzo et al. (2011) demonstrated the instrumental nature of their study by choosing schools that met AYP status and they investigated the ways accountability policy framed principals' behaviors and decisions in working toward increased student achievement. When investigating the effects of principal behavior on new teacher experiences, Ovando and Cavazos (2004) chose schools with low dropout rates, high poverty demographics, and proficient standardized testing scores for a majority of the students within various subgroups to illuminate the importance of principal actions on the success of Hispanic students. These studies provided examples of the instrumental nature of the qualitative methods utilized in the research I reviewed.

The studies in Table C2 represent single case studies and multiple case studies. A single case study presents an opportunity to determine if a current theory is applicable to one setting (Willig, 2008). Multiple case studies, however, provide a chance to compare data across settings and allow for theory generation based on the findings across participants (Willig, 2008).

Many of the studies I reviewed utilized multiple cases for their study. Youngs (2007) studied twelve different principals from three diverse school districts and developed a theory based on findings from her study that postulated that principals could have a positive impact on the efficacy, professional growth, and intention to stay in the profession by having direct interactions with the new teachers grounded in instructional leadership behaviors. Finnigan and Stewart (2009) compared data from 10 schools on probationary status to postulate that in schools where components of transformational leadership were evident, schools made improvements and moved through probationary status more quickly than in schools where these behaviors were not observed or reported.

There is also a distinction between naturalistic and pragmatic case studies (Willig, 2008). Willig (2008) defined naturalistic case studies as research that begins without a hypothesis or an idea of what the researcher will find. Pragmatic case studies are more focused, beginning with a research question that guides the research process, although it is possible and probable that the question will change throughout the course of data collection and analysis (Willig, 2008). All case studies presented in this review were pragmatic. They began with a research question or a hypothesis about the way a phenomenon would present itself and demonstrated relationships with other occurrences within the case studied. The data collection and analysis was driven by theories that have contributed to the initial research question. Finnigan and Stewart (2009) used theories of transformational leadership to develop codes that were analyzed initially, leading to emerging codes from the data as well. Themes were checked and re-checked through both the lenses of

transformational leadership and the emergent codes from the data to ensure the validity of their results (Finnigan & Stewart, 2009).

Triangulation of data sources within case studies can serve as a means to present more rigorous findings, and the lack of triangulation can be an indicator of limitations from the process and findings of a qualitative study (Creswell, 2009; Willig, 2008). All qualitative studies included in this review made reference to their triangulation of data sources. Some studies utilized one primary method of data collection, such as interviews, and then subsequently used observations or document analysis as secondary sources used for triangulation during data analysis (e.g., Masumoto & Brown-Welty, 2009; Waldron et al., 2011; Youngs & King, 2002). Because of the importance of data triangulation and its role in the quality and rigor of a qualitative analysis, I excluded many case studies from my review because there was not sufficient rigor and explanation of data analysis and triangulation methods to support the findings of the studies.

Grounded theory. Only one study reviewed used a complete grounded theory approach to drive data collection and analysis, see Table C3. Grounded theory consists of several characteristics that make it different from other qualitative methods (Willig, 2008). Specifically, the use of constant-comparative analysis, theoretical sampling, and theoretical coding as strategies for data analysis emerge as important characteristics (Willig, 2008). The process of grounded theory research means that the researcher will be constantly working with the data until all possible themes have emerged and no new data needs to be collected, this is theory saturation and is arrived at through the use of constant-comparison, theoretical

sampling, and theoretical coding (Willig, 2008). Willig (2008) also explained that when no new themes emerge from the data, saturation has been reached and a final analysis and write up of the findings can be constructed using all elements of the grounded theory approach. Blase and Blase (2002) cited the use of grounded theory as both their driving theory and approach to the data collection and analysis.

Many other studies also employed components of grounded theory such as constant-comparison and category saturation. A component of grounded theory is that the data analysis drives further data collection and this process continues until no new themes emerge (Willig, 2008). The studies that employed techniques common to grounded theory I chose not to categorize as such because they did not use the findings to then go back and collect further data until they found no new emerging themes. For example, Jacobson et al. (2007) utilized grounded theory methods to cross-code their data after all interviews had been transcribed. They did not actually use the emergent themes to go back and investigate the phenomenon in more depth with subsequent interviews, observations, or document analysis. The cross-coded data was checked across sources and triangulated, but again, the revisiting and additional collection of data that constitutes grounded theory was not employed (Willig, 2008).

Blase and Blase (2002) was the only study that utilized grounded theory most thoroughly. They cited the primary use of symbolic interactionism to drive the design, collection, and analysis of their study. They used grounded theory techniques to constantly analyze their findings and they used emergent themes to go back and interview participants more thoroughly to fill in gaps and confirm or

question their emergent themes. They used no a priori codes, and all codes and themes came directly from the interviews and document analysis. The data collection phase took place over a period of two years and allowed the researchers to reach saturation with their grounded theory process (Blase & Blase, 2002).

Grounded theory studies have strengths and limitations that I will discuss. First, they allow for theory generation solely from the data or framed within other theoretical frameworks that allow themes to emerge from previous understandings of the field of study (Willig, 2008). Second, they provide an in depth examination of a phenomenon that continually revisits the data collection and analysis process until the researcher is satisfied that they have come close to understanding all they can about a given problem (Creswell, 2009; Willig, 2008). I believe the limitations of grounded theory are common reasons for only portions of it being utilized in other studies. I put forth that a true grounded theory study is an enormous undertaking that requires a great deal of time and perseverance by the researcher as well as a great deal of physical data collected and analyzed. The proximity of the researcher to the data will result in the most informative analysis, and this requires a high commitment of both time and energy on the part of the researcher (Willig, 2008). Willig (2008) also discussed how grounded theory reflects a high level of commitment required by the participants to ensure they are available for continuous data collection. These are all strengths and limitations that have also been noted by Creswell (2009).

Ethnography. Pepper and Thomas (2002), Slobodzian (2009), and Ylimaki (2012), as shown in Table C4, cited the use of ethnography in their methods. All

three studies discussed the embedded position of the researcher(s) in the research site, and the use of thick description and naturalistic inquiry to document their study and more thoroughly understand the culture of the schools in which they studied.

Pepper and Thomas (2002) conducted an auto-ethnography study that investigated the changing role of one of the researchers as she reflected on the school climate at her school and sought to adapt her leadership practices to make a positive impact on this climate. Auto-ethnography is characterized by the researcher studying their own actions within the context of a natural setting, in this case the school, over a prolonged period of time. Creswell (2009) stated that this type of research method is flexible and evolves based on the lived experience of the researcher.

Pepper and Thomas (2002) used personal journals as the method of data collection. Because it was an auto-ethnography, one of the researchers was both the ethnographer and the principal. The strength of this study was the researcher's ability to use personal, lived experience to illuminate her thought process as she noticed problems within her school and reflected upon ways she could adapt her own actions and decisions to create positive change. The limitations of this study are the same as the limitations for qualitative research in general with one notable exception. The researcher's self-reporting of her change process could lead to a great amount of bias in the presentation of findings. From one perspective, this study posed a very limited perception of the reality of the school and placed emphasis only on areas that the author found were the most important aspects of

school climate. Her perception of change and positive growth were singular and did not reflect the views of others who had been impacted by her actions and decisions. This study represented an up close view of the life and thoughts of a principal with ties to her perceptions of outcomes and change, and added to our descriptive knowledge by chronicling the thoughts, actions, and beliefs of one principal who sought to create change.

Slobodzian (2009) studied the inclusion and exclusion of students who are deaf, and the researcher spent an entire school year observing classrooms, special events, field trips, meetings, and enveloped herself in the community of the school. She utilized many sources of data, including reviewing student progress reports, report cards, student work samples, and school-wide mailings. Through this in-depth ethnographic analysis, she also utilized grounded theory as a way to analyze data (Slobodzian, 2009). The author ultimately was able to tell the story of the inclusionary and exclusionary practices within this unique school serving a high population of deaf students. She found that the principals' behaviors ultimately impacted the climate and culture of the school in a way that promoted the exclusion of students.

Ylimaki (2012) spent four years immediately following the passage of NCLB (2001) investigating four schools with the purpose of uncovering the impact of this legislation on school practices, curriculum and leadership. She similarly embedded herself within these communities and cited the use of intensive naturalistic observations, interviews, and document collection as means to collect data. The author outlined her methods of data collection and analysis very carefully, and this

combined with the depth of her study met the quality indicators for a longitudinal ethnographic study of this scope (Ylimaki, 2012).

Discussion of qualitative methods. There was some variety in the types of qualitative methods employed within the studies I reviewed, but most relied upon case study methods to conduct their inquiries. The inherent strengths of qualitative research lie in the richness of data presented and the illumination of specific experiences, which add to an understanding of educational leadership in practice and its impact on school life. Most qualitative studies utilized member checking to ensure that the authors' appraisal of reality was collaboratively constructed (Lincoln et al., 2011), indicating an acknowledgement of the constructed nature of reality.

Limitations of qualitative studies I reviewed are the epistemological questions that arise when looking at the many studies that utilized purposeful sampling of schools based on student achievement data. The use of this data communicates that what initially counts as knowledge about schools is their performance according to standardized testing. I see this as placing the constructivist, qualitative inquiry as secondary and demonstrating epistemological misalignment with the knowledge they seek to espouse from their study. I must, at this point, admit my own bias toward conceiving qualitative studies as aligned with either critical or constructivist worldviews. My knowledge of qualitative methods has been developed through these lenses, and it has taken a great deal of reflection and further investigation to understand the tensions within qualitative research.

Wanat (2006) described this tension in her appraisal of qualitative methods within

the field of educational leadership, so my feelings on this topic are corroborated. I feel that the lack of discussion of philosophical (epistemological, ontological) perspectives guiding the research is a notable problem within this field of study. It would be very helpful to know how the researcher feels about the nature of reality (ontology) and what is important to know (epistemology) in order to more clearly understand the purpose of the research and the nature of the findings. This lack of discussion will be addressed again in Chapter Six when I discuss the ideological implications, which this lack of discussion has caused.

Lincoln et al. (2011) and Lincoln (1990) discussed the importance of good qualitative research including multiple perspectives in the construction of reality around the phenomenon studied. This was a notable drawback to many of the studies I reviewed. In particular, there were studies that only relied on the perceptions of teachers (e.g. Easley, 2008; Printy, 2008), and there were also studies that included only the perceptions of principals along with purposive sampling procedures utilized to select a site for study (e.g., Hughes & Jones, 2010; Reardon, 2011). These studies represent a notable deficiency in the manner in which some of the research in educational leadership is conducted with qualitative methods. Studies that utilize only one perception run the probable risk of only illuminating one side of the story and silencing, or discounting others.

Mixed methods. Mixed methods were used in ten of the 91 studies I reviewed (see Table C5). These types of studies use both qualitative and quantitative methods to investigate a problem or hypothesis. Creswell (2009) put forth that mixed methods are situated within a pragmatic worldview in which the

researchers are willing to utilize any method in an attempt to find answers about a given issue. Mixed methods are often criticized because the quantitative and qualitative methods are driven by worldviews that are not in agreement with each other, and in fact contradict each other quite obviously according to Mayan (2009), and Lincoln (1990). Creswell (2009) attempted to reconcile these contradictions by placing mixed methods within the pragmatist worldview, giving researchers a common ground on which to conduct studies using both methodologies, and I am reminded that Guba (1990) cautioned against thinking that qualitative methods indicate a different worldview. Qualitative methods can be used within a positivist/post-positivist worldview which can situate what counts as knowledge in a more pragmatic view, placing primacy on the practical and not on the mode of data collection.

There are several different types of mixed method studies. Some studies rely more on the quantitative methods, using the qualitative methods to support their quantitative base (Creswell, 2009). Other studies use qualitative methods as the primary framework for their study and support this data analysis with quantitative data and analysis, and a third type of study uses both methodologies equally in their data collection and analysis (Creswell, 2009).

Current mixed methods research. An example of a study that relied more heavily on quantitative data collection and analysis with a complimentary qualitative approach was done by McGhee and Lew (2007). These authors used structural equation modeling, exploratory factor analysis, and several other statistical measures to demonstrate the relationship between the perceptions of

teachers regarding principal support for and understanding of effective writing instruction and the interventions employed in their schools (McGhee & Lew, 2007). The survey given to teachers who attended a statewide writing conference also included an open-ended question at the end. The authors discussed how they decided to use qualitative analysis because 75% of their respondents took the time to answer the open-ended portion of their survey (McGhee & Lew, 2007). The results of their qualitative analysis supported the quantitative data analysis by emphasizing the teachers' perceptions of strong leadership and content knowledge of the principal that was needed to implement effective writing interventions.

Marx and Larson (2012) used qualitative methods as the primary method in their study, complimenting the findings with descriptive statistics from a pre- and post-survey given to Latina/o students who participated in their study. The researchers conducted in-depth interviews with the principal to determine the actions taken in response to the pre-survey, and documented in a qualitative narrative the actions and changes employed in an attempt to create a positive school climate for minority students (Marx & Larson, 2012). The results of the post-survey were shared to emphasize that the changes employed by the principal resulted in a more positive school climate based on the responses of the students (Marx & Larson, 2012).

In their study that investigated the relationship between transformational and instructional leadership and school reform efforts, Marks and Printy (2003) used both qualitative and quantitative methods more equally to describe and interpret their findings. These authors used surveys to determine pedagogical

quality as their outcome variable. The independent variable of leadership behavior was constructed using inductive coding of interviews and observations to determine the factors involved in principal behavior that may have impacted pedagogical quality. Student achievement scores were also used in the quantitative analysis as dependent measures, and the authors put forth findings that utilized both types of data (Marks & Printy, 2003).

The limitations of mixed methods research extend from the theoretical disagreements to practical considerations. Marks and Printy (2003) employed hierarchical linear modeling techniques in their quantitative analysis, which meant that they needed to have a considerably large sample size to conduct their research. They also interviewed 25-30 teachers from each of the 24 schools for their qualitative data collection. To consider the effort required to perform both methods with quality and rigor, I postulate that this type of research must be very expensive and time-consuming to conduct well. The researchers also had to have a great deal of knowledge in both methodologies to ensure the quality of their study and the relationships that could be determined based on their results. The strengths of mixed methods are in the multiple views of the same phenomenon. If done well, the quantitative and qualitative data can bring to light new findings that may have gone unnoticed without the use of both methods.

Discussion of mixed methods research. The mixed methods research I reviewed represented a focus on many different types of outcomes. Only three utilized student achievement data in their quantitative analysis, or in their purposive sampling of schools. Most studies utilized a larger sample from which to

survey and construct their variables for analysis. Additional follow-up interviews or focus groups were used to assist in illuminating the quantitative findings. Some studies only utilized a survey instrument, from which they inductively and deductively coded open-ended responses and proceeded to explain both the themes that arose from the data and the frequency percentages of types of responses found (e.g. Zimmerman & Deckert-Pelton, 2003).

I put forth that the mixed methods used in these studies provide both quantitative and qualitative data that can assist in studying their phenomenon. I do see, however, that the epistemological notion of what counts as knowledge is heavily aligned with the notion of measurement and quantification, which is in line with a more positivist, realist ontology. The qualitative methods do not signal a constructivist approach in these studies, they merely serve to help explain the variables under investigation. I put forth that there is no inherent disagreement between the methods used, but the epistemological beliefs of the researcher should be made more apparent within the research presentation.

Summary. In this chapter, I have outlined the paradigmatic alignments common to methods used, and I have discussed strengths and limitations within each methodology. In the next Chapter, I turn my discussion to answer the question; how have the epistemological, methodological, and ideological histories shaped the focus of theory development and literature in educational leadership?

Chapter 7

Philosophical Analysis of Methodologies

The purpose of this chapter is to look more deeply into the use of methodologies to arrive at an understanding of the salient issues impacting research in the field of educational leadership.

I argue that the methodologies used above represent deeper epistemological and ideological issues within the research in the field. Mills (2000) stated that “methodology, in short, seems to determine the problems” (p. 56). Methodology is the study of methods and its purpose is to illuminate what the researcher is doing when they go about conducting their studies. Many textbooks on methodology break this realm into quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-methods. With a focus only on methodology, a neglect of the driving theoretical perspectives guiding this choice could cause the situation to become confused and muddled, as is the case with some of the current research in educational leadership.

Epistemology is the study of theories of knowledge, and it concerns the realm of philosophy that notes the relationship of the knower to the known (Guba, 1990) and includes discussion about what counts as knowledge (Skrtic, 1991). More broad than epistemology, ontology is the study of what is real, the nature of what can be known (Guba, 1990; Leonardo, 2003). A positivist or post-positivist ontology adheres to the nature of reality as “being out there”, as something that can be found as an absolute truth, or approximated as closely as possible (Lincoln et al., 2011). Although positivism has endured much criticism and has acknowledged both the inability of absolute truth to be known, as well as the impossibility of a completely

objective stance by the researcher, it has manifested into new terminologies such as logical empiricism or structural functionalism, and the basic beliefs of positivism are largely unchanged (Foster, 2002).

The realm that I have found lacking and contradictory in educational leadership research has been in the epistemological and ontological concepts. My initial focus on methodology led me to the conclusion that it is not this choice that is impeding what is known about leadership. The distribution of research across methodologies implies that there is a body of literature that reflects a myriad of approaches to gathering knowledge. There are many scholars that have problematized these issues more broadly, particularly Foster (1986, 2002) and English (2002, 2005, 2011). Their work helped me reflect upon these issues more deeply as I sought to warrant my claims through an analysis of the current state of research in the field.

There has been little attention paid to the epistemological beliefs that guide the choice of methods in the current research. The term methodology has been often confused with methods; whereas methodology outlines the theories guiding methods, often researchers pay more attention to merely outlining the way in which they went about their research with little attention paid to the theories guiding these choices. Without such a connection, the epistemology underlying the search for knowledge becomes assumed. I argue that this assumption and inattention to epistemology ultimately reifies ideological factors that control the process and product of research in educational leadership.

A paradigm is the construction of a set of beliefs that encompass the ontology, epistemology, and often the methodology within a particular field of study (Kuhn, 1996). Kuhn discussed the manner in which paradigms come to take hold of a particular discipline and cited that when research is written up without due attention to the underlying beliefs guiding research (i.e. epistemology, ontology), this is an indicator that a paradigm has been accepted within a field (Kuhn, 1996). Although conceptual frameworks, through the use of literature reviews, attempt to communicate the lens through which studies are conducted, they often make no mention of the underlying epistemological beliefs of the researcher or the theories they espouse to use to guide methodological choices. I found that this type of understanding had to be done mostly through inference. This lack of epistemological discussion communicates that there is a “common sense” or an ideology at work in educational leadership research. The nature of what counts as knowledge makes an incredible difference in the problems that are investigated and the manner in which these problems are investigated.

Kuhn (1996) put forth that “to be accepted as a paradigm, a theory must seem better than its competitors, but it need not, and in fact never does, explain all the facts with which it can be confronted” (p. 17). To illustrate how this affected the field of education and educational leadership, I turn to Lagemann (1989). She discussed the tension between two prominent figures at the beginning of the century, Edward Thorndike, and John Dewey. Thorndike’s theories were grounded in the behavioral sciences, with a strong focus on the Scientific Method and positivist ontology. John Dewey, an early social constructivist, emphasized the role

of experience in education, the use of science to solve problems in a continual method of building upon previous experiences, and honoring the joint venture of education through community. During this critical point in the history of public education, Lagemann (1989) argued that Thorndike's science won because it was considered more scientific. She further suggested that Dewey's theories were complicated and philosophical, and the public wanted efficiency. I have previously outlined how this general mode of thinking at the turn of the century impacted the creation of departments of educational leadership at major universities. As educational leadership struggled for acceptance as a respected field (Foster, 2002), the choice of paradigm at this critical juncture has remained a salient feature of all further thinking within this field of study.

Quantitative Analysis

Quantitative studies represent almost half of the research that I found on school leadership. These studies are more straightforward for me to analyze. They are in line with logical empiricism, an objective epistemology that positions the researcher as the collector of facts, and a positivist ontology that says the facts speak for themselves, they are variables that can be measured and calculated to determine relationships that will ultimately result in the prediction and control of specific phenomenon. For example, if variables of leadership behavior can be linked to teachers' job satisfaction, or student achievement, these behaviors can then be isolated to a point where they can be explicitly taught to leaders and if they employ these behaviors correctly, they will have a predictive relationship with outcomes of interest. What does this say about the way schools are viewed?

I have argued that the impact of scientific management, Thorndike's educational measurement, and a focus on efficiency have permeated the thinking within educational leadership. The ideologies that drive this mode of thinking are tied to the history of efficiency ideology that continue to be present in both the current accountability and business ideologies. These ideologies communicate that what matters about schools can be measured and quantified. The bottom line of student achievement, teacher performance, teacher job satisfaction, and school climate can all be quantifiably measured in a way that controls for contextual variables and attempts to isolate the predictive variables and their outcomes. I find that the purpose of schools communicated is that the school environment is an organization that can come under control given the right study of specific variables that influence the bottom line of student achievement. Schools are places that should rely on efficiency and productivity to turn out the product, otherwise known as the student. More specifically, leadership is a means to an end, and that end is widely accepted as student achievement measured by standardized test scores.

24 out of the 37 quantitative studies utilized student achievement data as a dependent variable. In Chapter Four, I mentioned that due to NCLB (2002), student achievement data is widely accessible to researchers, and this accessibility itself is a manifestation of positivist influence. By creating systems of data that allow the researcher to remain objectively removed from its collection, and making it easily available, it perpetuates the imposition of accountability ideology in educational leadership research. While the use of this type of data is aligned with the quantitative paradigm, our educational system as a whole is reifying the reliance

upon standardized measures of student achievement, and the continued “gold standard” of positivist science (e.g. Lincoln et al., 2011). Methodologically speaking, the imposition of the accountability ideology determines the questions that are asked by providing data that represents the bottom line; student achievement on high stakes tests.

Attempts to isolate specific variables, such as experience and levels of education, are done to further specify the types of people and the qualifications necessary for predicting specific outcomes. While these studies can help give insight into the specific qualifications and background experiences of leaders and teachers that can impact student outcomes, the ultimate focus on student achievement as the main indicator of control in the school environment is an illustration of the epistemological and methodological problem. What counts as knowledge, epistemology, is easily defined by the facts that researchers objectively collect, and the methodology utilized is in line with this belief. If facts can be collected, they can be measured and analyzed. Although there can be a dispute about the importance and utility of these types of studies, the methods employed represent alignment with positivist, scientific paradigms that have dominated much of the research in educational leadership.

An important manifestation of the accountability ideology is illustrated in the use quantitative studies in educational leadership. The ease with which student achievement data can be accessed as an outcome of interest represents an easy avenue from which to reify this ideology and minimize the study of other important student outcomes. However, there are studies that I reviewed that attempted to

think outside of the high-stakes testing box when it came to student outcomes. Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) constructed variables that included outcomes such as student grouping, differentiated instruction, opportunities for cooperative learning, etc. These authors demonstrated the importance of the principal in influencing these student outcomes through teachers' reported practices and in turn communicated that there is more to classroom instruction than a standardized achievement score. May and Supovitz (2011) similarly included a component in their leadership variable that included the perceptions of principals' time spent reviewing student work. They also queried teachers' perceptions of their instructional practices that included grouping students, questioning practices, classroom assessment practices and understanding student needs (May & Supovitz, 2011). These two studies represent important examples of how quantitative research does not have to ultimately be aligned with the accountability and business ideology.

There have been many scholars who have cited the persistent problem of positivist ontology as the commonly accepted framework in the field of educational leadership, although their arguments have used differing terms (e.g. technical-rationality, instrumental, means-end, logical positivism; Biesta & Miron, 2002; Young & Lopez, 2011). Young & Lopez (2011) noticed the prevalence of logical positivism and the overreliance on the ontological and epistemological nuances that come with it. They explained the relationship between the epistemological and methodological choices in educational leadership well when they said "there is a circular relationship between the tools of inquiry we use and our commonly

accepted ideas of what we know or need to know” (p. 235). Biesta and Miron (2002) talked about a shift from “leadership as control” as conceptualized in leadership and organizational literature, but dually noted the concurrent rise of tighter controls and more external control over schools as enacted through policy and reform. This is certainly the case within the United States with the passage of NCLB (2002), the sanctions that have come along with it, and the new waivers put in place to seemingly help schools maneuver around being punished directly for their test scores. Based on the evidence of my literature reviews and in agreement with these authors, I do not argue that there have been many attempts to break through this framework and diversify the field with the study of differing outcomes (e.g., May & Supovitz, 2011; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008), but I agree with Young and Lopez (2011) as they put forth that it is important to recognize the epistemological and ontological “baggage” of the field of educational leadership (p. 235). This baggage has a long and prominent history with ties to the continually reified accountability and business ideologies within American education.

Qualitative Analysis

This is where the analysis gets far more complicated. Qualitative methods, such as case studies, are usually associated with a qualitative methodology that is tied to a constructivist or critical ontology and a subjective epistemology. This subjective epistemology places the researcher as an active participant in the research process, with prior knowledge, experiences, and beliefs that impact both the collection of data and its analysis (Willig, 2008; Lincoln, 1990). The constructivist ontology emulates a worldview that sees reality as a socially

constructed entity, constituting fact only to those involved within a particular social construction.

Young and Lopez (2011) described epistemology as ways of seeing and knowing. I have found that there is a great deal of misalignment epistemologically within the qualitative methodologies in the research I reviewed. I must make a clarification in terms of methods and methodologies at this point. I have also found that a discussion of methodology and the theories driving data collection and analysis to be lacking. Many studies confuse methods with methodologies, and this results in the reader having to do high levels of inferencing to determine what paradigm the research is aligned with. A qualitative method does not necessarily indicate a constructivist, critical, or postmodern approach to the phenomenon being studied (Guba, 1990). I find that, in fact, there are multiple, competing paradigms at work in several of the studies I reviewed.

For example, Riester et al. (2002) utilized scores on standardized tests to determine schools that were effectively teaching students with disabilities, and they defined social justice as the demonstration of high rates of literacy (as determined by scores on standardized tests) and low levels of placement in restrictive special education settings. While I do not disagree with finding a way to measure the social justice capacity of a school, I do disagree with using one measure of academic achievement to determine the social justice outcomes of students with disabilities. Epistemologically, this is saying that what counts as knowledge about students can be quantified in a standardized manner, while the knowledge constructed around this quantification is left to the researcher and the principal. If this study were

aligned with a constructivist or critical paradigm, reality about the success of the students would be a joint venture with the school community and the researcher, but the student outcome has been predetermined and this reflects both an ontological and epistemological issue within research in educational leadership overall.

Essentially, most research done with student outcomes in mind utilizes the quantified scores of students on standardized tests. This epistemological adherence within the educational leadership literature communicates that, while there may be much knowledge to be constructed and critically examined within a school, the way to understand students is to assign them a number based on high stakes test scores. I believe this epistemological adherence despite the methods used within the leadership literature communicates clearly what the field believes about effective teaching and student learning.

There are many studies that represent a focus on outcomes other than student achievement on standardized test scores. I found that these studies are more in line with constructivist or critical paradigms that are seeking to illuminate the experiences of those being studied. Many studies focused on teacher retention or teacher induction experiences and made no reference to student outcomes (e.g., Brown & Wynn, 2009; Easley, 2008; Tillman, 2005; Wynn & Brown, 2008; Youngs, 2007; Youngs et al., 2011). These studies helped to explain the impact of the principal on teachers' work experiences and intention to remain in the profession. They relied on data collected from interviews, focus groups, reflective journals, and utilized member checking to ensure they were co-creating the reality of the people

involved in the study. These are important epistemological and methodological points to make, because they communicate the importance of what counts as knowledge about teacher retention issues, and place value on the experiences of teachers and principals in attempting to understand and make meaning of their experiences together within the school.

Other case studies focused on inclusive practices and put forth explanations of the principals' impact on inclusive practices. Smith and Leonard (2005), Sindelar et al., (2006), and Slobodzian (2009) all discussed how principals' impacted the inclusion or exclusion of students with special needs. These studies shed light on how disability is constructed within particular school settings and communicated that the perceptions of teachers and principals around the issue of inclusion is what counts as knowledge. They also placed emphasis methodologically on the reality of inclusion being constructed by those who work within the schools. There is promising future research that could be done along these same lines of inquiry.

Other studies focused more on the principals' role in making sense of policies, and these studies are more epistemologically sound than those focusing only on student achievement. Although the underlying accountability ideology is present, there are some studies that question this practice and serve the purpose of helping to explain the meaning attributed to persons within a school in an accountability context. Stillman (2006) is a notable example. Making no reference to student achievement scores, Stillman (2006) studied teachers' perceptions of barriers that impeded their ability to meet the needs of marginalized students, and discussed the important role of the principal in impacting these perceptions. Again,

epistemologically, this type of research communicates that it is the meanings of experiences that count as knowledge about this topic, and although it would be easy to inscribe student achievement scores into a study of this kind, the author communicated their epistemological beliefs clearly by excluding this data.

My purpose in discussing some specific examples is to articulate the epistemological and methodological issues in the qualitative research done in educational leadership. Qualitative methods do not indicate a qualitative methodology, either within a constructivist or critical paradigm. As Young and Lopez (2011) argued, there must be a better understanding of method, methodology, and epistemology. Researchers should pay close attention to what they believe counts as knowledge, and the theories guiding their choice of methods. Much of the misunderstanding within these philosophies comes from the underlying ideologies that guide research and knowledge creation. I make this argument not because I am a strict epistemologist or methodologist, but I believe that the inattention to these details within the educational leadership literature continue to reify current ideologies and leave the purpose of schools unquestioned. Even studies that focus on different outcomes, particularly those of teachers, have implications in this regard. Though the researchers may be studying the phenomenon of teacher job satisfaction, or elements of professional learning communities, they all lead to the same destination, the reason for schools existence, and the outcomes for students served by the school. All research done around schools must be with this end goal in mind, because that is, in fact, why they exist at all.

The research surrounding student outcomes is largely focused on their achievement on standardized tests. Taken as a whole, the research communicates that the only life in schools that meaning must be ascribed to is void of student perception or other authentic measures of assessing learning. The teachers, principals, and sometimes parents, have important constructions of reality to contribute to the school enterprise, but a student can be measured and quantified by what is held to be the “gold standard” of knowledge (Lincon et al., 2011). I believe the educational leadership literature communicates that the purpose of schools is to standardize children and produce results, and this is more clearly apparent when looking at qualitative research. Inherent in qualitative methods are the possibilities this methodology has for illuminating and challenging student outcomes. The lack of this questioning, and the inattention to the child as an outcome of interest beyond test scores represents one of my strongest criticisms of research in educational leadership.

Mixed Methods Analysis

I have already announced my feeling about pragmatism, and my belief that there are many ways of knowing that can and should be used within educational leadership research. I have found through studying the epistemological and methodological issues that it is far more about the worldview of the field than it is about these more specific philosophies. Mixed methods research has been both criticized and defended strongly (Lincoln, 1990; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003). I have previously discussed the main uses of and the challenges associated with mixed methods research. Some opponents say that qualitative and quantitative research

are simply not compatible (Lincoln, 1990), while others argue that qualitative does not serve as an indication of a paradigm shift, or a difference in ontology (Guba, 1990). I suggest that they can be quite complementary to each other, assisting in viewing a phenomenon from many perspectives. Quantitative research can also help to describe possible problems or issues to be further investigated, while the qualitative piece provides rich descriptions of events studied more in depth based on quantitative analysis. I see the epistemological issue as being more about the actual content of what knowledge is important rather than the actual manner in which data is collected.

The content of this epistemology, and it is a salient feature of the mixed methods studies in this review as well, is the focus on quantifiable outcomes related to standardized student achievement. Studies that focused on school or student outcomes used measures of standardized test scores or accountability ratings to determine the impact of leadership (Brown et al., 2011; Daly, 2009; Eilers & Camacho, 2007; Marks & Printy, 2003). There was one exception, and that was the study conducted by Marx and Larson (2012), they included a pre- and post- survey given to Latino/a students, which asked for their perceptions of school climate. They reported the survey results with descriptive statistics and the utilized qualitative data from interviews and observations to expand upon the findings from their survey. This type of work is greatly needed so that new ways of assessing school success and student outcomes are conceptualized. I do not see an epistemological or methodological problem with the use of both methods in their study. The authors sought to determine the perceptions of students about school climate, they analyzed

and reported quantitative findings from their survey and explored the responses in more detail by utilizing interpretive data from interviews and observations (Marx & Larson, 2012). What counted as knowledge was the lived experience of the students, and they used several means to explore and report that experience.

Other mixed methods studies focused only on teacher perceptions of professional development, or induction experiences. These studies were interested in looking at the perceptions of teachers through the use of surveys, but the authors found that utilizing qualitative data helped to support or refute their findings in a way that provided a more rigorous study. The practical ways that researchers utilized both methods within their respective theoretical framework do not represent any epistemological or methodological issues in my opinion. Several studies represented a sophisticated and thorough use of both methodologies, paying specific attention to quality indicators such as triangulation, member-checking, document analysis, and coding procedures (e.g. Marks & Printy, 2003), that showed respect and understanding of both methods.

There are similar issues within this research that I have criticized for the other methodologies as well. In conducting studies with qualitative, (and I would argue quantitative survey data as well), it provides for a more reliable study if more than one perspective is gleaned. There were several mixed methods studies that focused only on the perceptions of teachers, not querying the perceptions of leaders or other school stakeholders. Understanding how principals feel they impact professional development, for example, would be an important component to add

depth to the teacher perceptions (e.g. McGhee & Lew; Zimmerman & Deckert-Pelton, 2003)

Ideological Analysis of Methodologies in Educational Leadership

Young and Lopez (2011) shared my concern about the need for an expansion of the theoretical understandings we have about what we know and how we know. They argued that with this expansion, there must be a greater understanding between methods, methodology and epistemology (Young & Lopez, 2011, p. 236).

The ideological implications of accountability and business ideology that go hand in hand with national education policies are working to infiltrate the epistemological and methodological frameworks from which research in educational leadership is created. Of the studies I reviewed, 24 out of the 37 quantitative studies utilized student achievement scores on standardized tests in their analyses. The purpose of schools is ignored in the literature and reified in the inclusion of standardized testing across methodologies. The mechanisms from which these ideologies come, the policies themselves, are working tirelessly to eradicate the alternate philosophies that could impact what is known about schools and leadership in particular (e.g., Grogan, 2004; Lees, 2007, Niesche, 2005). Shaker and Heilman (2004) noted this point when they discussed the language in NCLB (2002) to include scientifically, research-based studies to drive reform and improvement of school practices. These guidelines, and the money that goes along with financing large-scale studies funded by the Department of Education, seek to keep the accountability and business ideologies alive through the dismissal, or downplay, of alternative epistemological and methodological research.

In the qualitative studies I reviewed, 18 of the 44 studies utilized student achievement data as a method of purposive sampling to determine sites for study. What this demonstrates is that in studies directly focused on student outcomes, there are few examples that do not include standardized student achievement scores. Studies focused on navigating policy help to strengthen my findings. Coburn (2005) discussed how principals' personal beliefs and knowledge about literacy shaped the choices they made about professional development and instructional practices. Many studies specifically documented the important role principals have in making decisions about policy implementation and how this impacts teacher responses, professional learning communities, and curriculum choices. These outcomes all have a common sense, ideological impact on what happens in the classrooms with students. If the studies directly focused on student outcomes only focus on student achievement scores, then has to be assumed that the rest of the field is investigating with this end goal in mind. In Appendix D, I have constructed a table that includes all 49 studies that utilized student achievement scores for the readers' appraisal.

Epistemologically, I have demonstrated that by and large, what counts as knowledge about students is achievement scores. This overarching worldview that quantifiable student achievement measures are the "gold standard" of information about schools is not compatible with the democratic purpose for schooling I put forth in Chapter One. I worry that the time it will take to refocus, retrain, and reflect upon our schools will leave many teachers with scrambling leaders, and many children behind. I find this to be extremely ironic.

English (2002) referenced Gadamer and said that “[i]n other words, *the field* contains its own ontology and any deviation is assigned to outcast status and less than “pure science””(p. 126; italics in original). Because epistemology is under the umbrella of ontology, I argue that epistemology and methodology are greatly impacted by this overarching belief system guided by ideology, regardless of the actual methods employed in the research. What we know and how we can know it have become engrained in the minds of researchers to the point where even when subjective epistemologies are utilized, they are still adhered to the ontological beliefs of positivism through their acceptance of student achievement scores as measures of effective schools and socially just outcomes for students.

Schools, the context in which educational leadership takes place, cannot be separated from the phenomenon of leadership. Leadership takes place within a complex organization, and the complexities of this relationship must not be forgotten. It is the epistemological beliefs about the purpose of schools that are dictated by the dominant ontology and are creating the inability to enact change within the field. English (2002) argued that the denotation of “the field” is a product of positivism in itself because it perpetuates the assumption that “it is the totality of all that is currently worth knowing” (p. 126). It is difficult for me, within this specific investigation of educational leadership, to keep my discourse focused on this field instead of making more broad reference to education as a whole. In fact, as I note this tension, I realize even more the stronghold that positivism has on the minds of those who wish to be a part of the problem solving process in realizing more successful outcomes for schools. The fact that I have chosen one particular

field of study to investigate does not mean that all that must or can be known about educational leadership will be found within its own self-contained literature.

Reflecting upon the tension that I feel as I write these words helps me to further communicate the ideologies at work that undermine both epistemology and methodology. The problems are much larger, and without challenging the accountability and business ideologies, allowing them to go unquestioned, the worldview of the field will remain as it is, which will not do justice to the practitioners in the field who are grappling with these ontological issues each day in their work.

Qualitative methodologies that are aligned with either critical or constructivist paradigms are epistemologically adhered to the positivist conception of schools. In fact, I argue that critical research in educational leadership is failing to realize its goal of emancipatory knowledge in the name of socially just outcomes. By only utilizing narrow views of student learning, this research is reifying the use of high stakes testing and communicating the same purpose for schools found in the more overtly positivist literature. By only questioning the inherent power structures of leadership, the field itself is largely ignoring the power relegated by policy and therefore accepting the ideological impact of accountability and business. Though many studies (see Table B3) address the implications of policies and how principals' help their staff to navigate policies, the policies themselves are left largely unquestioned, and this suggests acceptance of the status quo.

In falling into the trap of positivist science, educational leadership research has lost its ability to reflect upon itself. It has focused largely on leaders, and not

enough on leadership *for* something. By narrowly focusing on the behaviors of leaders as they relate to variables, however, research has communicated that the purpose of schools is to achieve high test scores. Constructivist and critical paradigms have perpetuated this purpose by not questioning the purpose of schools as achieving the bottom line, and utilizing standardized assessment scores to judge the quality, effectiveness, or justice enacted within schools. All paradigms communicate that it has become common sense to define schools by the numbers, and while constructivist and critical paradigms may shed light on the life that happens within schools, illuminating the lived experiences of new teachers, or students with diverse cultural backgrounds, the plethora of studies focused on student achievement scores continue to reify the bottom line ideology of accountability and business.

49 out of the 91 articles I reviewed utilized student achievement data either as dependent variables, as measures used for purposeful sampling, or as data to triangulate and further explain possible relationships found (see Table D1). This represents almost half of the research I found from the past thirteen years of study in educational leadership where relationships between leadership and life in schools were investigated.

The studies that did not utilize student achievement data were focused on teacher and community outcomes, such as teacher job satisfaction, teacher well-being, professional development, or school climate. The data representing student outcomes, those served in schools, were overwhelmingly focused only on a narrow measure of student test scores.

Several studies did attempt to look at student outcomes in a broader sense, and these were included in both quantitative and qualitative studies, as I discussed in the previous section. This communicates to me that there are researchers within various paradigms that are attempting to question the underlying ideologies of accountability and business. Quantifying students and outcomes is not inherently bad and can in fact communicate important knowledge about students, teachers, principals, and schools. It is the purpose for which this knowledge is created, the ideological implications of particular kinds of information that is more problematic.

To directly answer the question; how have the epistemological, methodological, and ideological histories of educational leadership impacted the literature and the focus of study, the answer is now clear, and I argue that I have offered much evidence to warrant my assertions. Epistemologically, what counts as knowledge about schools is largely based on what can be quantified, as it was at the inception of the field. The field itself is concerned with narrow representations of what schools exist for, therefore communicating that the purpose of schools is to teach students to perform well on standardized tests. This is significant because of the ideologically driven visions that leaders set forth for their schools. With broadly painted explanations of vision, the only conclusion I can draw is that the business and accountability ideologies drive the focus of setting a vision for schools, which again communicate its purpose.

Methodologically, leadership research encompasses a wide array of paradigms. This has not, however, resulted in a shift from the positivist paradigm, and a reliance on quantitative measures. Although many excellent qualitative

studies in critical paradigms have been conducted, none question the technical rationality inherent in the purpose of schools communicated through the practice of standardized testing. I have additionally noted that the literature does not question the inherent factory model of schooling found in graded levels of instruction. Leaders are the people who have the ability to restructure and reorganize schools, so the inattention to this factory mode of education is also unsettling.

The research literature in educational leadership communicates that the efficiency ideology that manifests itself in accountability and business is still alive and well today. It continues to permeate the literature through the unquestioned beliefs about the purpose of schools. Social justice is largely defined as the narrowing of achievement gaps according to these same accountability measures. Democratic leadership is still practiced within the framework of making decisions about teaching that align with data-driven decision making so common to the business world.

Though the manner in which studies are carried out on the surface represents progress and diversity in methodologies in this field of study, the underlying ontology and epistemology guiding what counts as knowledge about schools as a whole continues to undermine what we can really know about life in schools and how to provide excellent, equitable education to all students.

Chapter 8

Looking Back and Forging Ahead

Thus far, I have examined the historical development of the field of educational leadership and put forth answers to the questions about how the ideological, epistemological, and methodological histories have impacted the literature and the focus of research. The analysis I offered explored the differing epistemological, methodological and ideological issues, including both positive aspects and more challenging problems within this field of study. Ultimately, I must come back to the discussion of the purpose of schools I put forth in Chapter One, because it is with this in mind that I reiterate my strongest finding.

Though there were many different outcomes explored, it is the ever-strengthening ideologies of accountability and business that are undermining what we know about educational leadership and life in schools. Studies that focused on student outcomes were largely focused on student achievement scores, and did not question that this is what counts as knowledge about students. Some studies utilized other variables in their construction of teacher and student outcomes, some studies focused on completely different outcomes such as teachers' ability to navigate policy and reform, parent perceptions, principal professional development, school and organizational health and climate, teacher job satisfaction, and teacher retention. These studies represent important knowledge about the many facets of educational leadership.

This begs the question, however, what are schools for? Why do we need to know about these elements of a school organization, why do they matter? This

brings the discussion full circle to the purpose of schools. Although not communicated directly in all studies that focused on outcomes other than student achievement, these studies were still conducted in schools that live in the policy context of NCLB (2002). The reason all studies were carried out was to find components that could ultimately lead to a better outcome for students. I suggest the overarching problem is that we do not have a reliable or valid measure for student outcomes. I argue that student outcomes need to be conceptualized to include more than a score on a standardized achievement test.

Quantitative studies, which utilized student achievement scores, found relationships with variables that did not provide enough description to understand how these variables look in a school setting. For example, when setting direction and communicating purpose were found to be positively related to teacher job satisfaction, how would I know what setting direction and communicating purpose mean? These are not items I can go down the street to purchase at the corner store then casually apply them to my practice and expect that I will increase teacher job satisfaction. How do we describe components that make up a teachers' job satisfaction? Do teachers want to enjoy their students and see positive growth? Do they want to leave promptly at 3:30 every day and not have any work to take home? Do they want to have students who sit in little rows and fill in bubbles all day? There are many unexplained factors related to teacher job satisfaction. Linking this satisfaction with student achievement scores causes more questions to be raised. Does teacher job satisfaction relate to student achievement more when teachers like their leaders to give them a scripted curriculum to follow with little room for

creativity? What exactly are teachers satisfied with? Satisfaction is a term saturated with meaning, and although attempts to quantify it with survey data can give important information about patterns in responses and relationships with other variables, satisfaction is a term that is meant to be known and understood.

Similar issues can be noted when looking at school climate and organizational health. Are the components of school climate and organizational health impacted more positively when leaders have successfully acclimated teachers to the accountability ideology pervading our system? Do principals act as skilled rhetoricians, merely conjuring up buy-in to reforms that teachers must participate in? Is a more positive school climate impacted by a principal who “sets the direction” for achievement on standardized testing? There are so many contextual pieces that are missing from these important discussions that it is only in the piecing together of clues from other studies and lines of thought within the field of educational leadership that I can reach any conclusion about the state of the field.

The above examples illustrate a great deal of ambiguity in studies that do not outright claim a stance on the purpose of schools by including standardized test scores in their study. It has been demonstrated in enough studies in varying paradigms that leaders are the people responsible for setting the direction and communicating a vision and common purpose for their schools. When these transformational leadership behaviors are not the prime focus, the literature is replete with instructional leadership, which is directly tied to impacting teacher instruction in the classroom and supporting growth in practice. It is time to contemplate what this really means. When purpose is left out of the discussion, or is

ambiguously defined as ensuring the learning of all students, there is no specific focus on what that really means for teachers or for students. Because of the pervasiveness of NCLB (2002) and the accountability and business ideologies that have followed in the line of efficiency and industrial ideologies of the past, it can easily be postulated that unless otherwise specified, the visions, common purpose, and focus of school leaders is to ensure standardized achievement. This proliferates through all research in this field unless otherwise specified, because it is with a purpose of schools in mind that the research has any kind of validity or significance to be conducted in the first place.

Leaders are the keepers of the vision, and ultimately they are the keepers of the ideologies and the purpose of schools. It will only be through understanding the history and the present that true reflection can take place so that an ontological shift can happen within leadership in education. The purpose of my study has been to bring these issues into consciousness to provoke action.

The field itself has an overarching ontology that defines what is believed to be real about schools. This ontology communicates a very positivistic notion that the nature of reality in schools can be communicated as truth to anyone who will allow the facts to speak for themselves. NCLB (2002) communicates this ontology for education and educational leadership by negating the constructed reality and lived experiences of those within schools. The ontology communicated by NCLB (2002) adheres the field to the ultimate, final notion of an effective school according to their accountability rating. This is the reality that many have either chosen to live with, or been forced to accept because fighting against such a deeply engrained ideology is

an incredibly daunting task with the high possibility of unpleasant experiences both within the school and with the wider community. Fighting the reality of NCLB (2002) means that something else must be imagined to take its place. By illuminating how NCLB is just the most current manifestation of century old ideologies, I argue that without emancipating the field from the positivist ontology, the same bottom line of student learning will be the driving force in any new reauthorizations of law or policy.

Imagining a new way to conceptualize student learning and growth is incredibly difficult, especially for those who study schools. It is no wonder that Thorndike's clean, straightforward systems of crunching numbers and measuring students won over Dewey's more messy experience-oriented views of education. A truly democratic way of living and educating children is far from easy, and I do not pretend to have the answers. I can offer my interpretations of this field in the hope that others will want to continue this conversation and begin the difficult work of thinking outside the box that we have been stuck in for the past 100 years.

Though it may not be a scholarly reference, as a part of this hermeneutical study I reflected deeply about all of these issues for many waking, (and many sleeping) moments. As I tried to wind down for the evening, I caught a part of a movie in which the main character was devising a plan to find the lock for a key he had found. He came up with a strategy, assigning each person he needed to visit a number. He calculated carefully how long it would take him to visit each of these people and the probability of finding the lock for his key. As he carried out his investigation, he found that people did not like being numbers, they were more like

letters, and letters were a part of words, their words wanted to be made into stories, and stories must be shared. This may seem like a simplistic comparison, but it helped me to realize that if we define our educational system as merely a number, we are missing the stories of those within that ultimately give our profession the depth and importance it deserves. Whether quantitative or qualitative, if educational leadership continues to be defined by the bottom line of student achievement, we are no better off than we were 100 years ago. Teacher satisfaction, professional learning communities, understanding policy reform, etc., will all be limited by the overarching ideological purpose of schools as sites where children are measured and standardized unless that purpose is finally contemplated and brought open for democratic discussion.

Understanding the Past

I have found through this critical hermeneutical analysis that ultimately it is the ontology of the field that is restricting what we know and how we know. There are so many interesting and important studies that have been done, as illustrated in my literature reviews. It cannot be ignored, however, that the keepers of the vision, the people responsible for implementation of curriculum, acclimating of new teachers, among the long list of duties and responsibilities held by leaders that are demonstrated in this review, are not a part of a deeper conversation about why we do what we do. It is not I who undermines the work of these dedicated scholars, it is the powerful ideologies that have not been reflected upon within this field of research that I have brought into the open and questioned critically in order to realize their impact and truly understand what is known about educational

leadership. The conversation I have begun needs to be continued, or the field will undoubtedly continue to be defined by an adherence to the bottom line. It is the job of the leader to advocate for those they serve, their students, and teachers, and say that we refuse to define our schools by a standardized measure. It's time for something far more equitable and innovative.

The field of educational leadership has fought hard over the past century to establish itself as a legitimate field of study (English, 2002). From Taylor's scientific management and Thorndike's influence on the measurement of learning and aptitude, the field has been fraught with traditional positivistic views. I am aware that positivism, in its original form, is dead (Willower, 1998), but the philosophies of post-positivism are still in line with the traditional notion, with the exception of a few qualifying terms. Post-positivism realizes that all we can know is an approximation of the truth, but it still believes that the truth is "out there", although we are limited in our abilities as humans to ever reach the absolute truth. The pervading ideologies that have driven educational leadership have complimented this traditional ontology. They have communicated that the truth that is "out there" is an effective school, and this effective school should be measured through standardized means. All that happens within the school is the means to the end of effectiveness. Many paths can be taken to arrive at this end, in terms of the knowledge creation within the field, but the end itself remains the same. Grogan (2004) implied that there is a "new positivism" at work in the current leadership literature in education, but I argue that it has been there all along. All theory development in the field of educational leadership subscribed to positivist notions

until the advent of critical and postmodern theories. I have argued that in their application to educational leadership research, they have left unquestioned the topic that is the direct concern of leaders, and that is the direction and purpose of schools. Again, while I do not discount the important illuminations of the research I have reviewed, I am convinced that this lack of critical inquiry into purpose just reifies effectiveness through efficiency, and effectively dehumanizes students who can pass, and marginalizes all students who cannot be easily defined by a test score. Can any child or student really be defined by a test score? Is it morally right to structure their school lives around such measures? These are the questions that must be asked and contemplated by those responsible for preparation in education leadership, and leaders themselves. It must be asked by researchers who help to prepare and guide the actions and knowledge of those in practice.

Looking to the Future

At the beginning of this dissertation, I stated that I would not fall into the same trap as others who have conducted critical interpretive studies by failing to address what could be our future. I am a critical realist, and a constructivist. That is the crux of the pragmatism that I subscribe to. I do not believe that all reality is “relative”, but I do not believe that there is one absolute truth to be had about our schools. I believe there should be an overarching democratic ontology that values justice, equity, freedom, and excellence that should envelop the field of educational leadership. I believe that these are truths that should serve as goals to be realized in each of our schools. From a local, constructivist viewpoint, I believe that the ways in

which these truths will be realized in our schools should be the concern of those directly involved in specific settings, and should thus be the focus of leadership.

I argue that the first step within educational leadership be the critical interrogation of what schools exist for. Dewey (1916/2009) stated that “it may be said that the things which we take for granted without inquiry or reflection are just the things which determine our conscious thinking and decide our conclusions” (p. 15). The purpose of schools has been taken for granted and needs to be brought forth for contemplation. This is a conversation that should include many voices, from all who are involved in schools, and directly involves the consideration of a democratic purpose for schooling that I put forth in Chapter One.

Brooks and Kensler (2011) cited Merriam (1938) to put forth a system of assumptions fundamental to the practice of democracy. They cited that the essential dignity of each individual, that each individual is worthy of participation, progress made through consent rather than violence, and shared gains should be assumptions guiding the practice of democracy in school (Brooks & Kensler, 2011, p. 61). This has implications for leadership with regard to both teaching and learning. If these assumptions are applied to the practice of standardizing education, it will swiftly be noted that there are contradictions. This was my purpose in illuminating a democratic purpose for schools at the beginning of this dissertation, and continues to be my purpose in coming around the hermeneutical circle to again interpret how these factors influence democratic practice in schools.

The essential dignity of each student is denied when they are forced to demonstrate knowledge in only one way. Each individual as worthy for

participation is something that is embraced by the mandates requiring all students to participate in standardized testing, but the results of the accountability ideology have far-reaching effects on the inclusion and participation of historically marginalized groups in classrooms with their peers (Skrtic, 1991). Progress through consent is not taken into account, and the violence done through the use of sanctions directly extinguishes democratic principles. The consent given by those in the leadership community who choose to focus their studies on these measures is given through the work of ideology that has permeated the educational system. Sharing in gains is left for schools that are lucky enough to have populations of students that perform well on standardized tests, other types of learning and growth are often minimalized and disregarded. The work on democratic leadership in the field of educational administration must critically examine how the inner workings of the school are determining the success of such strategies. If democratic leadership is studied with the purpose of including all voices toward the common goal of high-stakes achievement instead of democratically driven purposes, can it really be considered democratic at all?

The creation of a space where each person's view can be heard and taken with equal weight is essential if we would like to see the "vision" so highly spoken of in educational leadership literature actually have some footing. I think there should be studies directed toward parents, students, teachers, administrators, business-people, and the general public asking their opinions about what our schools should stand for. I believe that a closer examination of what constitutes a democratic way of living should be conducted with the purpose of informing what is done in schools. I

then put forth that there should be an enormous amount of conversation with any who have ideas to offer about how these ideals and knowledge can be demonstrated.

I am reminded of Dewey's (1916/2009) discussion of preparation for the future when I think of the counter-argument defending standardized achievement. The purpose communicated by the Common Core State Standards is to prepare children for college and careers (National Governor's Association for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010). Dewey (1916/2009) intelligently argued against preparation for a future that is such a long way off, and said that "children proverbially live in the present; that is not only a fact not to be evaded, but it is an excellence" (p. 44). By ignoring the excellence inherent in attending to the present moment, the child is lost in a remote future. "It is impossible to overestimate the loss which results from the deflection of attention from the strategic point to a comparatively unproductive point. It fails most just where it thinks it is succeeding—in getting a preparation for the future" (Dewey, 1916/2009, p. 44-45). If the purpose of schooling is to prepare children for a future they have no present connection with, we are losing the value of the present educative moments which, when given due attention, I argue will serve the child's future better than forcing it upon them at every stage of their educational life. If the focus shifts to that of the present, education becomes an end in and of itself, and this will require more than a standardized achievement score to measure its worth.

The use of authentic assessments, rubrics, portfolios, and performance assessment are avenues that could have great promise for the new purpose of

schools. Perhaps students in New Mexico, who on standardized tests, often write about sailboats that they have never seen, would be better evaluated by their writing about the value they place on helping their classmates in solving problems. Perhaps there needs to be a focus on student growth, instead of standardized, norm-referenced scores. I wonder what would happen if we told the students what they were learning and why, and gave them options for demonstrating their knowledge and understanding of particular concepts. I am a strong advocate for teachers and students being held to high expectations for growth and learning, but I truly believe there are far better ways to do this than through high stakes tests.

I put forth that there needs to be a shift in our thinking about the use of research methodologies. Each offers important information about specific aspects of the complex life in schools. I argue that quantitative research should be conducted on a smaller scale, within local contexts where the information represents a point in time that can immediately become the topic of problem solving and action. This would require a shift in the purpose of quantitative research as applied to this setting. By illuminating the facts within a local context, however, the relevance of the information can be utilized in a way that bridges the popularly contested gap between theory and practice. I argue that the use of qualitative methods designed to adhere to a constructivist and critical paradigm should be widely conducted so as to illuminate the essence of leadership. I believe this type of research has the ability to explicate the issues facing leaders as a whole, and can focus on building knowledge of what it means to be a leader. Being a good leader is about understanding the life of a school and the factors that make it more just for all students. Explanation and

statistical measures will only ever pinpoint one moment in time and will never reveal the same knowledge that can come with reflection and consideration of context.

Currently, I see the same historical themes playing out in the present. Maxwell, as cited in Callahan (1962) said “our friends of the standard-test-scale-statistical theory...are still in the second stage of reform accomplishment-the stage in which they proclaim their theory as a panacea for all educational ills” (p. 123). Callahan (1962) went on to describe how Maxwell joked about professors employing the same statistical measures with their own college students. The same sentiment can be found in the current crisis our society is facing, diving headfirst into the black hole of standardized testing. Across the country, states are reforming their policies to indicate how teachers and principals will be compensated for the scores reflected on standardized tests. A recent editorial in my local newspaper expressed Maxwell’s sentiments almost identically. The columnist described the creation of the new tests aligned with the Common Core State Standards, and told the story of a group of legislators on the east coast who attempted the high school exam and had dismal passing rates. She concluded her article with the same plea, asking for lawmakers across the country to take the same tests they were so happy to attach to a teacher or principals’ worth. I similarly read an article claiming that “test scores are no panacea for teacher evaluation”. The time is ripe for these new conversations to take place, and those in educational leadership should have an important role in fostering and contributing to these conversations.

It is, in fact, becoming a common occurrence to find articles, blogs, and news stories all related to the unrest caused by this accountability and business ideology. People are beginning to understand as a whole just how invested we are in these narratives that drive our schools. Manifestations of these ideologies can be found in more sinister terms, as an entire district in Atlanta was recently found to have cheated on exams so as to increase their standing within the state's accountability system. This is not what our schools should stand for, but it will become increasingly worse unless the critical conversation begins about how to change it.

The future must include innovative thinking that breaks from traditions of the past, while still retaining the knowledge of the impact they have had, and consciously divorces researchers and leaders alike from the "ontology of the field". We have a choice to create a better reality for our schools, one that the research clearly demonstrates is impacted by the beliefs and actions of school leaders. This choice must begin with both scholars and leaders agreeing that people are more important than numbers, and although we can use many means to understand, this new ontology has to guide all further choice for real change to occur. It will require a deeper knowledge of the epistemological issues within research that communicate what counts as knowledge and how we will study that knowledge. It will require greater understanding within and around research paradigms, and a greater commitment to doing what is needed to guide the education of students who trust us with their futures.

Ultimately, the field of educational leadership must take a critical, reflective stance. I have set forth the history of the field, investigated the current literature,

and analyzed the components of ideology, epistemology, and methodology that are found within the literature. I have come to the conclusion that it is the overarching beliefs within the field that have created a lot of knowledge, but left common purpose to be ideologically driven. A reflection on the purpose of schools should serve as a frame from which to guide future discussion. I stated that my purpose was to emancipate the field from restricting ideologies, but as I finish writing I am reminded that in this democratic society, it is the responsibility that lies within to emancipate ourselves. Collectively, we must change our minds about what schools exist for, but the paradox lies in the individual choices that must be made to enter in to this conversation. I, for one, will never look at educational leadership or our schools through the same lens as before I undertook this study. I understand how the interpretations of the past have impacted my own interpretations, and have in turn interpreted me. I have come full circle in this hermeneutical analysis, and it has led me to a new place where I understand what needs to happen within this field in order to impart more equitable outcomes for the students I serve. I refuse to allow the ideologically driven “vision” for schools shape how I will teach, lead, and study this field. I choose to challenge accountability and business ideologies that are tearing down our system, and it will be my life’s work to help create better ways for realizing a democratic purpose for schools. I hope you will join me.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Data from First Literature Review

Table A1

Searches for Research Review

Databases Searched	Search Terms	Results	Relevant Articles	Limitations
Academic Search Complete,	“principal effectiveness” AND “student outcomes”	5	0	Scholarly peer-reviewed
Academic Search Premier, EconLit, Education Research Complete, Humanities International Complete, PsychArticles, PsychInfo, Public Administration Abstracts	“principal effect*” AND “student outcomes”	0	0	2001-2012
	“principal effect*” AND “student achievement”	2	2	
	“leadership effect*” AND “student outcomes”	24	3	
	“leadership effect*” AND “student achievement”	105	22	
	“principal effect*” AND “teacher morale”	2	0	
	“leadership effect*” AND “teacher morale”	4	0	
	“principal effect*” AND “teacher attitude*”	1	0	
	“leadership effect*” AND “teacher attitude*”	20	0	
	“principal effect*” AND “student attitude*”	0	0	
	“leadership effect*” AND “student attitude*”	26	0	
	“principal effect*” AND “school environment”	0	0	
	Changed to “school culture”			
	“leadership effect*” AND “school environment”	57	6	
	“leadership effect*” AND “school culture”	64	1	
	“leadership style” AND “school	63	4	

Databases Searched	Search Terms	Results	Relevant Articles	Limitations
	climate”			
	“leadership style” AND “school culture”	69	0	
	“principal” AND “school environment”	160	21	
	“principal effectiveness”	6	0	
	“Principal effect*” AND “school effectiveness”	0	0	
	“leadership effect*” AND “school effectiveness”	32	3	
	“principal effect*” AND “teacher effectiveness”	0	0	
	“leadership effect*” AND “teacher effectiveness”	15	1	
	“leadership effect*” AND “teacher” AND “job satisfaction”	36	3	
	“leadership effect*” AND “teacher” AND	9	0	
	“retention”			
	“leadership effect*” AND “teacher effectiveness”	15	0	
	leadership effect* AND teacher AND Emotions	9	1	
	leadership effect* AND Teacher AND Treatment	10	0	
	“leadership effect*” AND “Teacher attitudes”	34	0	
	“leadership effect*” AND “Teacher experiences”	0	0	
	“leadership effect*” AND “Teachers Professional Development”	33	0	

Databases Searched	Search Terms	Results	Relevant Articles	Limitations
	“leadership effect*” AND “Teachers professional learning”	2	0	
	“principal effect*” AND “teacher” AND “job satisfaction”	2	4	
	“principal effect*” AND “teacher” AND “retention”	1	0	
	“principal effect*” AND “teacher” AND “effectiveness”	4	4	
	“principal effect*” AND “teacher” AND “emotions”	0	0	
	“Principal effect*” AND “Teacher” AND “Treatment”	0	0	
	“Principal effect*” AND “Teacher” AND “Attitudes”	2	1	
	Principal effect* AND Teacher AND Experiences	25	2	
	Principal Effect* AND “Teachers Professional Development”	9	0	
	“principal effect*” AND Teachers Professional learning	1	0	
	Principal effect* AND New teachers	3	3	
ERIC	principal effectiveness AND student outcomes	0	0	Scholarly, peer
	“principal effect*” AND student outcomes	0	0	reviewed 2001-2012
	principal effect* AND student achievement	2	0	Education level
	leadership effect* AND student outcomes	0	0	specified: Early
	leadership effect* AND student	0	0	childhood

Databases Searched	Search Terms	Results	Relevant Articles	Limitations
	achievement			education,
	principal effect* AND teacher AND	0	0	Elementary
	job satisfaction			education,
	principal effect*AND teacher AND	0	0	Elementary
	retention			secondary
	principal effect*AND teacher AND	118	23	education,
	effectiveness			Grade 1-12,
	Added NOT "Foreign Countries" in			High schools,
	descriptors			Intermediate
	principal effect* AND teacher AND	0		Grades, Junior
	emotions			high schools,
	Principal effect* AND	3	0	kindergarten,
	Teacher AND			Middle
	Treatment			schools,
	Principal effect* AND	70	8	primary
	Teacher AND			education,
	Attitudes			secondary
	Principal effect* AND	13	1	education
	Teacher AND			NOT
	Experiences			descriptor:
				"Foreign
				Countries"
	Principal Effect* AND	46	2	
	Teachers AND			
	Professional Development			
	principal effect* AND	33	1	
	Teachers AND			
	Professional learning			
	leadership effect* AND teacher	12	1	
	AND job satisfaction			
	leadership effect*AND	17	1	
	Teacher AND			

Databases Searched	Search Terms	Results	Relevant Articles	Limitations
	retention			
	leadership effect* AND "teacher effectiveness"	147	4	
	leadership effect* AND teacher AND Emotions	2	0	
	leadership effect* AND Teacher AND Treatment	9	0	
	leadership effect* AND Teacher AND Attitudes	126	13	
	leadership effect* AND Teacher Experiences	28	0	
	leadership Effect* AND Teachers AND Professional Development	123	0	
	leadership effect* AND Teachers AND Professional learning	83	0	
	principal effect* AND teacher AND morale	0	0	
	leadership effect* AND teacher AND morale	3	1	
	principal effect* AND student attitude*	1	0	
	leadership effect* AND student attitude*	13	0	
	Principal effect* AND "school environment"	3	0	
	Principal effect* AND School culture	30	3	
	leadership effect* AND "school environment"	12	2	

Databases Searched	Search Terms	Results	Relevant Articles	Limitations
	leadership effect* AND "school culture"	61	9	
	leadership style AND school climate	7	3	
	leadership style AND school culture	9	0	
	Principal AND "school environment"	8	0	
	"principal effectiveness"	4	0	
	Principal effect* AND "school effectiveness"	19	3	
	leadership effect* AND "school effectiveness"	78	5	

Note. Quotation marks indicate their use in the search

Table A2

Principal Effects on Student Achievement

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Marks, H.M., & Printy, S.M. (2003)	To investigate the relationship between transformational leadership and shared instructional leadership and school restructuring. To determine the effect of transformational and shared instructional leadership on school performance.	Instructional Leadership Shared Leadership Transformational Leadership	24 schools 8 elementary, middle, and high schools	Leadership behavior Formal interview with principal and a principal surrogate (teacher or team) Observations of principals in meetings and around the school. Teacher interviews	Pedagogical quality determined by teacher survey about instructional practices, professional activities, and perceptions of school and its organization. Observation of governance and professional meetings Document analysis of student work samples and teacher assessment of this work. Student academic achievement. Standardized test scores	Mixed Methods Scatterplot analysis ANOVA Hierarchical Linear Modeling Coding of qualitative data	In the lowest achieving schools, principals were more likely to be authoritative and have central control. Transformational leadership did not imply instructional leadership. The presence of integrated leadership had a positive relationship with quality pedagogy and high student achievement.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
O'Donnell, R.J., & White, G.P. (2005)	To determine the relationship between	Instructional Leadership	325 middle level educators	Instructional leadership behaviors	Student Achievement	Quantitative Forward selection	Teachers' perceptions of their leaders promoting
	instructional leadership behaviors and student achievement.		75 principals 250 8 th grade English and math teachers	Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS, Hallinger, 1987)	measured by the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment	regression Pearson correlation T test techniques Multivariate regression analysis	positive school learning climate was positively related to student achievement scores.
Jacobson, S.I., Brooks, S., Giles, C., Johnson, L., & Ylimaki, R., (2007)	To investigate the leadership behaviors of principals who arrived at schools and subsequently had student achievement gains	Organizational complexity	3 high-poverty schools that showed increases in achievement after the arrival of a new principal 20% of teachers at each school 20% of support staff 3-5 parents from each school	Leadership behaviors Interviews with the principal, teachers, and support staff. Focus groups Parents, students Semi-structured interview protocol (International Successful School Principalship Project)	School Improvement NYSED reports cards and reports of school improvement Interviews Focus Groups Semi-structured interviews	Qualitative Case Study methodology Grounded theory	Principals who shared a clear vision for schools, reorganized structural and cultural aspects, and were visible in the community made positive improvements in their schools.
Chance, P.L., & Segura, S.N. (2009)	To investigate a school that had developed a plan for school	Organization Development	Valley High School	Leader behavior Interviews with administrators, teachers, parents,	Student Achievement Growth Sustained change	Qualitative Case Study	By putting in place structures for the teachers to collaborate and
	improvement and sustained its efforts.	Leadership	The school met criteria of purposefully developing a plan for improvement and had sustained	and students on their perspectives of curriculum, instruction, decision making, change	as evidenced by 3 consecutive years of high achieving growth on standardized	Semi-structured interviews Qualitative analysis which	monitoring adult behavior, the school was able to focus on student learning and achieve both

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
			the change.	process, and	tests	included coding to	collaboration and
			Purposeful sampling	stakeholder involvement.		categorize and look for patterns	student growth.
			Cross sections of teachers, students, and parents for interviews	Documents pertaining to school improvement process		Time-ordered matrix	
			At least: 1 teacher from each department 2 12 th grade students on student council 2 parents involved in booster clubs	Observations of various school events		Conceptually clustered matrix	
			Purposeful sampling			Constant-comparative analysis produced a cognitive map	
Finnigan, K.S., & Stewart, T.J. (2009)	To examine the leadership behaviors of principals in low-performing schools and how they impact school improvement.	Transformational Leadership Accountability Policy	10 low performing schools in Chicago that had been placed on probationary status 5 schools removed from probation 2 moved off	Leadership behaviors Interviews Focus groups Observed classroom	School Improvement Interviews Focus Groups Observations	Qualitative Case Study Coding using the basis of transformational leadership and data driven codes Analysis with a priori and	Transformational leadership behaviors were rare in these schools, but more elements of transformational leadership were present in schools that moved through probationary status than those who remained stagnant.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
			probation within 2 years 4 remained on probation 1 was removed and replaced on probation			emerging codes. Checking and rechecking themes	
			Teachers, principals, assistant principals, probation managers, external partners, Local School Council members, parents, special education coordinators				
Horng, E.L., Klasik, D., &	To investigate what it is	No discussion of theory	Purposeful sampling 65 principals 41 high schools	Principal's time spent on each of 43	Student achievement	Quantitative	The tasks that principals spent
Loeb, S. (2010)	principals do, how they spend their time, and how variations in principals' actions are reflected in school outcomes.		12 elementary 12 middle	tasks. Principals time in 5 locations End of day logs, and experience sampling methods paired with observations done by researchers to eliminate the bias of	data across multiple years School environment as measured by climate surveys of teachers and parents	Experience Sampling Methods Time Use Observations Descriptive Statistics Multi-variate statistical	their time on had an effect on different aspects of school outcomes.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Louis, K.S., Dretzke, B., & Wahlstrom, K., (2010)	To investigate three different school leader behaviors and their impact on teachers' work with each other, classroom practices, and student achievement.	Instructional Leadership Shared Leadership	4,491 teachers (2005-06) 3,900 teachers (2008)	self-reporting. Principal leadership Teacher completed survey	Trust in principal Improved Instruction Survey with a focus on trust and improved measure of focused instruction Student Achievement School level scores on AYP Grade level information from state data bases	framework Quantitative Longitudinal Paired sample t tests Hierarchical Linear Modeling Structural Equation Modeling	Instructional leadership, shared leadership, and trust in the principal were positively related to student achievement when considered together.
Grissom, J. & Loeb, S. (2011)	To determine how principal efficacy varies across tasks, and does principal task efficacy predict key school outcomes, including student achievement scores. Also investigated the comparison between principal's self-	Instructional Leadership	314 principals who were given the M-DCPS principal online survey	Principal Effectiveness Self-rated 42 job tasks on perceived effectiveness. Assistant principals also rated their principal on the same scale	Student Achievement School report card as reported by Florida administrative data which included letter grade and demographic information for the school Parent satisfaction	Quantitative Exploratory factor analysis Ordinary Least Squares	Organization Management was positively related to school performance, teacher satisfaction and parent's assessments of school performance. Correlations between the principals' self-evaluation and the AP evaluation were not high.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Sanzo, K.L., Sherman, W.H., & Clayton, J. (2011)	reported scores and assistant principals' assessment. To examine the leadership practices of highly successful middle school principals and how they facilitate student achievement.	Accountability	5 male principals 5 female principals (middle school)	Successful principals Criteria: Those who met the Commonwealth of Virginia accreditation standards, those whose school met the federal NCLB standards, and those who were in at least their third year as principal. Leadership behaviors as determined by: Interviews with principals	Schools meeting AYP status	Qualitative Open coding, constant comparison Category saturation Matrix development	Themes of practice found in the data were shared leadership, facilitating professional development, leading with an instructional orientation, and acting openly and honestly to impact student achievement.
Silva, J.P., White, G.P., & Yoshida, R.K. (2011)	To examine the direct effects of principal-student discussions on eighth grade students' gains in reading achievement.	Instructional Management Framework	20 students in experimental sample 21 students in control sample 1 principal and 2 assistant principals	Principal behavior Achievement based discussions with the principal	Student Achievement PSSA reading exam And a student survey administered after the experiment	Quantitative experimental design T test Descriptive statistics	Conversations with the principal had a positive relationship with the motivation and achievement gain of students.

Note. The bolded terms represent the focus or variable investigated in the study followed by a description of the data collection method.

Table A3

Principal Effects on School Culture

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measure	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Pepper, K., & Thomas, L.H. (2002)	To determine the effects of the leadership role on school climate.	Transformational Leadership	1 Principal	Change in Leadership behavior and beliefs as evidenced by: Personal journals	Change in School Climate as evidenced by: Personal journals	Qualitative Auto-ethnography	The principal achieved positive change as evidenced by a decrease in discipline referrals and teacher complaints, as well as increase in student test scores (3%) by changing from authoritative leadership style to transformative leadership style.
Youngs, P., & King, M.B. (2002)	To explore how principal leadership builds school capacity through professional development.	School Capacity Professional Development Principal Leadership	9 public elementary schools History of low student achievement Demonstrated progress over 3-5 years prior to study Progress attributed to professional development Site based management Received PD assistance from external	Principal behaviors Observations of professional development, interviews with district and professional development staff as well as teachers and principals. Document analysis	School capacity Observations of professional development, interviews with district and professional development staff as well as teachers and principals. Document analysis	Qualitative Summarization of field notes to address research questions Individual and cross-case analysis	Principals created and sustained high levels of capacity by establishing trust, creating structures that promote teacher learning, and connecting faculties to external expertise or helping them to do so internally.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
			agencies				
Kelley, R.C., Thornton, B., Daugherty, R. (2005)	To examine the relationship between the principal's preferred leadership style and school climate.	Situational Leadership	Purposeful sampling 31 Elementary schools 31 principals 155 teachers (5 from each school)	Leadership Style Leader Behavior Analysis II (1 principal and 1 teacher from each school)	School Climate Staff Development and School Climate Assessment Questionnaire	Quantitative Pearson product moment correlations	Teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness were positively related to school climate, and principals' flexibility was negatively related to school climate. Principals' and teachers' perceptions of effectiveness and flexibility were not in agreement.
Eilers, A.M., & Camacho, A. (2007)	To tell a story about how a principal can achieve school-level change.	Social Systems Context Approach	Whitman Elementary 3 years not meeting AYP K-5 350 students 90% Free and reduced lunch 49% ELL 10% Special Education 32 Classroom Teachers New principal	Principal behavior Classroom Observations of first, third and fifth grade teachers Observations of grade-level team meetings and staff meetings Observations of school and district administrative meetings Structured interviews, and focus groups with teachers, and	School culture Measured by a teacher survey about communities of practice, collaborative leadership and evidence-based practice Documents relating to professional development, district communication, and within school communication	Mixed Methods Case Study Case-Oriented methods Survey	The principal's focus on utilizing resources and creating a school culture that was focused on student success led to sustainable change.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
			due to AYP status	district staff	Student Achievement Scores Collected from district website		
					School conditions and teacher experience Collected from state and district website		
McGhee, M.W., & Lew, C. (2007)	To explore how the perceptions of teachers regarding principal support for and understanding of effective writing instruction impacted their actions and interventions	Instructional leadership Literacy Leadership	169 teachers who attended the statewide writing conference	Literacy Leadership Principal's Support for Writing Instrument given to teachers in a statewide writing conference	Intervention Action as determined by the PSWI	Mixed Methods Structural Equation Modeling Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS) Mann-Whitney U Test Exploratory Factor Analysis Qualitatively analyzed comments from the open ended section of the survey.	Leadership knowledge about literacy affected interventions employed in the schools of teachers surveyed.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Twigg, N. (2008)	To determine the effects of leadership on perceived organizational support, organization based self-esteem, organizational citizenship behaviors, and student achievement.	Transformational Leadership	31 principals 363 faculty	Transformational leadership measured by the MLQ Form 5X Short (Bass...)	Perceived organizational support measured by a 15 item scale Organization based self-esteem measured by 10 item scale Organizational citizenship behaviors measured by the Skarlicki and Latham (1996) scale Student Achievement	Quantitative Exploratory factor analysis Confirmatory factor analysis T tests Hierarchical linear modeling	Transformational leaders increased supportive behaviors because they fostered a covenantal relationship between administration and teachers. This style of leadership was inconsequential in affecting citizenship behaviors and student performance.
Graczewski, C., Knudson, J., & Holtzman, D.J. (2009)	Did the approach of the principal and the leadership team foster a clear and coherent vision for the school's approach to professional development?	Instructional Leadership	Case Study 9 SDCS Elementary Schools (San Diego) participating in site-based leadership reform Principal, Assistant principal, peer coaches, and at least 12 teachers from each school	Principal Instructional Leadership Interviews with principal and teachers Observations of principal leadership	Teacher perceptions of coherent and relevant professional development Teacher survey Observations of professional development Interviews with teachers	Mixed methods Case Studies Regression analysis	The survey data and the qualitative data both supported the positive relationship between the principal fostering and communicating a clear, coherent vision and the coherence and relevance of the professional development at the school.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
			Survey				
			49 Elementary schools in SDCS				
Matsumura, L.C., Sartoris, M., Bickel, D.D., & Garnier, H.E. (2009)	To investigate the role of the principal in teacher's participation in literacy coaching activities.	Instructional Leadership Coaching theories	29 schools 15 principals 11 coaches 106 teachers	Leadership behavior Interviews with principals and coaches	Participation in coaching activities Pre and post teacher survey on work with the coach Frequency of engagement with different coaching activities	Mixed Methods Longitudinal Inductive approach to categorize data Correlational analyses	Principals demonstrated support for coaches by giving them professional autonomy. Significant correlations were found between principal support and teacher participation in two coaching activities.
Fancera, S.F., & Bliss, J.R. (2011)	To determine the relationship between instructional leadership functions, socioeconomic status of students, and collective teacher efficacy.	Instructional Leadership Efficacy	53 New Jersey High Schools Had an 11 th grade Included on 2007 NJ School Report Card rated by SES (low to high)	Instructional Leadership Functions Measured by the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS, Hallinger, 1987) completed by teachers	Collective Teacher Efficacy Measured by short version of Collective Efficacy Scale Student Achievement Scores	Quantitative Descriptive statistics Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients (r)	None of the 10 Instructional Leadership functions positively influenced collective teacher efficacy. CTE was not a variable that mediated the principal's influence on student achievement.
			4 A schools 3 B schools 2 CD schools 10 DE schools 14 FG schools 8 GH schools 9 I schools 3 J schools		NJ High School Proficiency Assessment-Language Arts NJHS Proficiency Assessment-Math SAT Critical Reading	Path analysis Correlational Study	

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
			1,083 teachers		SAT Math SAT Writing		
			Convenience sampling		% of students in AP classes		

Note. The bolded terms represent the focus or variables investigated in the study followed by an explanation of data collection methods.

Table A4

Principal Effects on Teacher Outcomes

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Griffith, J. (2004)	Do components of transformational leadership impact job satisfaction and therefore turnover rate for teachers?	Transformational Leadership	3,291 school staff 25,087 students from 117 elementary schools Stratified random sampling	Transformational Leadership Behavior Three components of transformational leadership on the survey	Teacher job satisfaction Three survey items that indicated job satisfaction Staff turnover determined by archival records at district Organizational performance determined by student achievement data. Student survey responses	Quantitative Confirmatory factor analysis Chi-square test ANOVA Structural Equation Modeling Hierarchical linear modeling	Transformational leadership was directly related to job satisfaction, and indirectly related through this variable to school staff turnover and organizational performance.
Hurren, B.L. (2006)	To investigate the relationship between principals' use of humor and teacher job satisfaction.	Organizational culture Effective organizations	471 teachers returned survey 209 elementary 99 middle school 157 secondary 6 multiple level Stratified random sampling	Principals' Frequency of Humor Frequency of humor questionnaire	Teachers' job satisfaction Measured by survey scale	Quantitative Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)	Findings were that a principal's use of humor played a role in teacher job satisfaction.
Youngs, P. (2007)	To examine how elementary principals' beliefs and actions	Instructional Leadership	12 elementary principals 6 1 st year elementary	Principal beliefs and actions Interviews with	Teachers' experiences Interviews and	Qualitative Case reports of principals	Through direct interactions with new teachers, principals can affect

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
	influence new teachers' experiences.		teachers 6 2 nd year elementary teachers 12 mentor teachers 6 grade level colleagues of 2 nd year teachers From 3 varied districts in the same state, chosen because of variation in policies, student demographics, and induction practices. Purposeful sampling 4,165 teachers	principals, beginning teachers, mentors, and other educators Observations of principals' meetings with new teachers, mentor-mentee meetings, and other induction activities.	observations	Coding of case reports based on variables Triangulated with field notes	their sense of efficacy, professional growth, and intention to stay in teaching
Wahlstrom, & Louis (2008)	To determine how teachers' instructional practices are affected by principal-teacher relationships.	Shared leadership Organizational Trust Professional Community Efficacy		Principal leadership behavior as measured by the Teacher Survey	Classroom practices Teacher Self-Efficacy Personal Characteristics measured by the Teacher Survey	Quantitative Principal factor analysis with varimax rotations Stepwise linear regression models	The effects of principal leadership on instruction were relatively weak. Teachers' perceptions of principal leadership had a consistent effect on the degree to which a teacher engaged in focused instruction. Improving teachers

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Vecchio, R.P., Justin, J.E., & Pearce, C.L. (2008)	To examine the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and teacher performance and satisfaction.	Transformational Leadership Transactional Leadership	223 principals 342 head teachers (high school) 179 teacher-principal dyads	Leaders use of contingent personal reward Leaders performance expectations Leaders intellectual stimulation Leaders participative goals measured by three-item measures on vision, performance expectations, intellectual stimulation, participative goals, and contingent rewards.	Employee performance measured by a principal's rating on a three-item measure job satisfaction as measured by a three-item measure	Quantitative Confirmatory factor analysis Correlational statistics	trust in principals may have a more direct effect on classroom instruction. Transactional leadership behaviors may have more predictive value than previously assumed.
Grissom, J. (2011)	To examine the links between principal effectiveness and teacher turnover.	Economic Labor Market Model	30,690 teachers in 6,290 schools	Principal effectiveness Measured by responses on the Schools and Staffing Survey Teacher Questionnaire	Teacher satisfaction Teacher questionnaire with Likert scale responses Teacher turnover	Quantitative Summary statistics Descriptive statistics Regression analysis	Good principals have the potential to impact teacher turnover and job satisfaction.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
					Principal designation as retrieved from Teacher Follow-up Survey-1.	Ordinary least squares Linear probability model	
					Student Demographics Provided by SASS		
May, H., & Supovitz, J.A. (2011)	To determine how much time principals report spending on improving instruction, what the scope and frequency of these interactions are, how this time is related to teachers reported changes in instructional practices.	Instructional Leadership	51 schools 30 elementary 10 middle 8 high schools 3 alternative/special education	Time spent on instructional leadership Daily principal activity logs Instructional Leadership Self-reported by principal's daily logs Teacher report based on school-staff questionnaire	Instructional change 2 eight item scales from the teacher survey	Quantitative Multilevel Models Log-variance models Power of x models	Principals reported to spend only about 8% of their time in instructional leadership activities. Data suggested that the principal's activities were not strong predictors of school-wide change in instruction, but did have a positive relationship with change in individual teachers' change in instructional practice.
Walker, J., & Slear, S. (2011)	To examine the impact of principal leadership behaviors on the efficacy of new and experienced middle school	Efficacy Instructional Leadership Transformational Leadership	366 middle school teachers From districts with a variation in urban, rural, suburban districts	Principal behaviors measured by teacher responses to 11 principal behaviors	Teacher Efficacy measured by the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale	Quantitative Stepwise multiple linear regression model	Three principal behaviors seemed to influence teacher efficacy. These behaviors were modeling instructional expectations,

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
	teachers.		Variation in percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch Random sampling within district				communication, and providing contingent rewards. The first two are positive, and contingent rewards were negatively related. Different effects were found with teachers of varying levels of experience.
Price, H. (2012)	To examine the direct effects that principals' attitudes have on teacher outcomes.	Organizational Culture Human Relations Theory	11,620 relationships calculated between elementary principals and teachers from SASS	Role of the Principal Schools and Staffing Survey	Teachers' Attitudes	Quantitative Structural Equation modeling Fixed effects linear regression modeling	Principals' relationships with their staff improved teacher satisfaction, cohesion, and commitment.

Note. The bolded terms represent the focus or variables investigated in the study followed by a description of data collection methods.

Table A5

Principal Effects on Teacher Well-Being

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Blase, J. & Blase, J. (2002)	To discover how teachers define abuse by principals and how these behaviors affect them, if they do.	<p>“Boss Abuse” Theories</p> <p>Symbolic Interactionism</p> <p>Organizational Justice</p> <p>Psychological and Stress Literature</p>	<p>50 teachers</p> <p>5 male</p> <p>45 female</p> <p>Snowball sampling</p>	<p>Principal’s acts of abuse</p> <p>Interviews with teachers</p>	<p>Teacher mistreatment</p> <p>Interviews</p>	<p>Qualitative</p> <p>Grounded Theory</p> <p>Open-ended theoretical and methodological perspective to create a model constructed from the phenomenon under investigation</p>	<p>Teachers suffered varying levels of mistreatment from principals in the workplace that had varying degrees of effect on them psychologically and physically.</p>
Blase, J., Blase, J., & Du, F. (2008)	To investigate how teachers perceive mistreatment, cope with the mistreatment, and perceive the effects. What are the frequencies and intensities of the harm, and does the report of mistreatment vary with demographic backgrounds?	<p>“Boss Abuse” Theories</p> <p>Symbolic Interactionism</p> <p>Organizational Justice</p> <p>Psychological and Stress Literature</p>	<p>172 teachers from elementary, middle, and high school</p> <p>They were offered the survey at www.endteacherabuse.org</p>	<p>Principal’s acts of abuse and mistreatment</p> <p>Principal Mistreatment/Abuse Inventory (PMAI) 219 item online survey</p>	<p>Teacher mistreatment and effects</p> <p>Teacher demographic</p> <p>PMAI (effects section)</p>	<p>Quantitative</p> <p>Descriptive statistics</p> <p>Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)</p> <p>Scheffe tests</p>	<p>Teachers suffered greatly because of mistreatment by their principal and it had a variety of effects from anger to wanting to leave their career altogether.</p>

Note. The bolded terms represent the focus or variables investigated in the study followed by a description of data collection methods.

Table A6

Principal Effects on Parents and the Community

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Griffith, J. (2001)	To discover what types of principal behaviors are associated with high levels of parent involvement.	Role Theory Situational Theory	82 schools 78 principals 13,768 parents Systematic Sampling	Leadership behavior Principal survey that indicated sets of behaviors or roles they commonly showed.	Parent perception of involvement Parent survey on parent involvement, perception of school climate, school informing parents, school empowering parents and demographic information	Quantitative Hierarchical linear modeling	Several significant relationships between principal roles and parents' reported involvement were found.
Gordon, M.F., & Louis, K.S. (2009)	To determine how leadership style affects principals' openness to community involvement and if this is related to student achievement.	Critical/ Postmodern Theories (power relationships) Democratic Leadership	260 Administrators 157 principals 103 vice principals 4,491 teachers	Principal's openness to community involvement District support for community and parent involvement Perceptions of parent influence Principal survey Principal/Teacher Shared Leadership	Student achievement Student performance on statewide standardized assessments	Quantitative Principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation Stepwise linear regression Correlational Study	Leadership variables, (openness to community involvement, perceptions of parent influence, district support) did not influence student achievement. Principal personal behaviors and attitudes about parent involvement and community participation influenced the level

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
				District and School Leadership Influence			of parent involvement in school decisions.
				Teachers' perceptions of parent influence			
				Teacher influence	Teacher survey		

Note. The bolded terms represent the focus or variable investigated in the study followed by a description of the data collection method.

Table A7

Principal Effects on Inclusive School Outcomes

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Riester, A.F., Pursch, V., & Skrla, L. (2002)	To investigate the role of highly successful elementary school principals in their work to influence a more socially just school.	Leadership for social justice	6 public elementary schools in Texas 70% of students from low-income homes Schools achieved "recognized" or "exemplary" status by the state Special education identification rates were below 14.2% and passing rates on state tests was above 59.8% for these students	Role of the principal Open-ended questions during semi-structured interviews with the principals. Observations District and school document analysis Researcher reflexive journals	Social Justice demonstrated by high rates of literacy and low rates of special education placement.	Qualitative Inductive data analysis Member checking Reflective conversations Peer de-briefing	Principals promoted a positive democratic culture, they adopted a prescriptive approach to literacy and academic success, and demonstrated stubborn persistence in achieving their goals.
Ovando, M.N., & Cavazos, M. (2004)	To determine how high school principals use student performance goal development, shaping school culture, and instructional	Instructional Leadership	Purposeful sampling 2 High Schools 80% of all students in each subgroup must pass state tests Attendance 94% or higher	Leadership behavior Extensive interviews with principals and teachers Direct observations Document analysis	Student Achievement Measured by state standardized testing	Qualitative Multiple Case Study Transcript, document, field note analysis, coding,	Principals in these high performing schools used goal development to keep a focus on student achievement. These principals also used support of teachers

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
	management to enhance the academic success of Hispanic students.		Dropout rate of 3.5% or lower for all students and each subgroup Total enrollment of over 1,500 with 80% or more Hispanic 2 principals, 10 ten teachers Member of site based decision team, 2 parents			categorizing based on research questions Triangulation Cross-checks Peer de-briefing	to influence school culture. Principals used instructional management techniques such as monitoring student performance, and relying on a leadership team to impact change.
Smith, R., & Leonard, P. (2005)	To explore the role of the principal in balancing and reconciling conflicting goals of school efficiency and school inclusion as one part of three more broad organizational goals.	Symbolic Interactionism	Purposeful sampling 4 schools that were each in the beginning stage of developing full inclusion programs 2 Elementary 2 Middle 3 Title I Purposeful sampling 7 Special Education teachers	Role of the principal and leadership style Interviews, focus groups, participatory observations, documents, and records.	Feelings about inclusion Interviews, focus groups, participatory observations, documents, and records.	Qualitative Blumer-Mead Model of Symbolic Interactionism Interactive Qualitative Analysis Brainstorming Affinity Diagram Interrelationship Digraph Individual Interviews	Principals should be the facilitators of a collaborative vision to realize the full potential of an inclusive culture. This facilitation required strong organizational skills and required them to be experts at allocating human and physical resources to maximize the effectiveness of

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Masumoto, M., & Brown-Welty, S. (2009)	To investigate the contributions of leadership on student outcomes in high-performing, high-poverty schools.	Transformational Leadership Distributed or Collaborative leadership Instructional leadership	14 general education teachers Three principals (1 elementary, 2 middle school) 3 high schools in California 35% or more receiving free and reduced lunch or eligible for Title I funding Had met AYP for all subgroups Academic performance above the state average Graduation rates above average for 5 recent years Lower than average 4 year drop out rates Current principal for more than 1 year. Purposeful sampling 6 principals	Leadership behavior Interviews Document review Content analysis Observation	School Climate/Culture Interviews Document review Content analysis Observation	Participatory Interviews Document and Records Analysis Qualitative Multiple case study approach Complex Cross-Case Comparative Analysis Constant Comparison Triangulation	inclusive practice. In all three schools, strong contemporary leadership was prevalent, and multiple formal and informal linkages were made between school and community, as well as common contributors to school success such as clear focus on instruction, standards, and expectations, strong teachers, and multiple support systems for students with various needs. Principals used
Theoharis, G. (2010)	To explore the aspects of school leadership that	Critical Theory Social Justice	2 elementary 2 middle school	Leadership behaviors	Socially Just School	Qualitative Positioned subject approach	strategies to disrupt injustice in the areas

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
	promote social justice and are linked to the outcome of a more just school.		2 high school Principals had to: Lead a public school Demonstrate a belief in social justice Demonstrate advocacy behaviors Provide evidence to show social just outcomes in their school	Interviews with principals and school staff, detailed field log observations, document analysis, Group interview with all principals	School outcomes as evidenced by interviews, field log, observations, document analysis, and reported gains in achievement.	Constant-comparison Data triangulation	of school structures that marginalized and segregated students, de-professionalized teaching staff, disconnected with the community, low-income families, and families of color, and disparate and low student achievement.
Brown, K.M., Benkovitz, J., Muttillio, A.J., & Urban, T. (2011)	How are schools of excellence promoting and supporting both academic excellence and systemic equity for all students?	Academic Optimism (Academic Emphasis and Collective Efficacy, Faculty Trust)	Purposeful and snowball sampling 24 schools 12 schools with large achievement gaps of more than 15% between white and minority students (LG) 12 schools with small achievement gaps of less than 15% between white and minority	Principal behavior Interviews with parents, teachers, principals, with the principal as the unit of analysis	Systemic Equity "Honor Schools of Excellence" awards set these schools apart as well as equity audit demographic information.	Mixed Methods Quantitative data to categorize schools as SG or LG Template Analysis Interpretive Zone A priori and iterative category development	Principals in SG schools had a focus on recognizing, encouraging, and celebrating academic achievement, closely monitoring teaching and learning by offering instructional feedback and support, and expecting excellence from each and every student.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
			students (SG)				
			Purposeful sampling				
			5 participants from 8 LG and 8 SG schools (80 interviews)				
			Principal Assistant Principal 2 teachers 1 parent				
Waldron, N.L., McLesky, J., & Redd, L. (2011)	To examine the role of the principal in developing an effective, inclusive school.	Transformational Leadership Change Theories	Random sampling Creekside Elementary Principal 480 students 50% high poverty 16% Special education Critical Case Sampling	Transformational leadership Interviews with principal, teachers, observing in classrooms, analyzing documents.	Successful Inclusion Student Accountability Data that indicate level of achievement and inclusion	Qualitative Case Study Four-step analytic process Triangulation and prolonged engagement	Five important themes emerged that were setting the direction, redesigning the organization, improving working conditions, providing high-quality instruction in all settings, and use data to drive
Marx, S., & Larson, L.L. (2012)	To investigate the changes a principal made in response to a previous research	Critical Race Theory	Secondary School 825 surveys to students	Change in leadership behaviors Surveys completed	School Climate Survey on impressions of latino/a students.	Mixed Methods Qualitative narrative	decision making. By taking positive action to include minority students and change school culture, a positive

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
	project that positively impacted school climate for latino/a students and families.		26 teacher/administrator surveys	by teachers, administrators, students	Survey to students on impressions of school climate	Comparison of survey results pre and post	outcome for school climate can be realized.

Note. The bolded terms represent the focus or variables investigated in the study followed by a description of the data collection methods.

Appendix B

Data from Second Literature Review

Table B1

New Searches for 2nd Research Review

Databases Searched	Search Terms	Results	Relevant
Academic Search	"school leadership"	43	6
Complete, Academic Search Premier, EconLit, Education Research Complete, Humanities International Complete, PsychArticles, PyscInfo, Public Administration Abstracts, and Business Source Complete	"school leadership"	52	13
	"student achievement"		
	Narrowed geography to only United states and any states within the US		
	"school leadership"	10	3
	"teacher morale"		
	"school leadership"	2	0
	"teacher attitude"		
	"school leadership"	0	0
	"student attitude"		
	"school leadership"	14	3
	"school environment"		

Databases Searched	Search Terms	Results	Relevant
	“school leadership”	15	1
	“School culture”		
	Refined to US and states within US		
	“school leadership”	17	1
	“school climate”		
	Refined to US and States within US		
	“school leadership”	8	3
	“school effectiveness”		
	Refined to US and states within		
	“school leadership”	42	3
	“teacher” “job satisfaction”		
	“school leadership”	38	7
	“school leadership”	10	1
	“teacher” “emotions”		
	“school leadership”	3	0
	“teacher” “treatment”		
	“school leadership”	31	0
	“teacher effectiveness”		
	“school leadership”	2	1
	“teacher experiences”		
	“school leadership”	19	3
	“teacher” “professional development”		
	“school leadership”	46	0

Databases Searched	Search Terms	Results	Relevant
	“teacher professional learning”		
	“school leadership” “new teachers”	19	0
	“school leadership” “parents”	19	3

Table B2

Re-Search of Original Search Terms

Databases Searched	Search Terms	First Review Results	Relevant Articles Found	Second Review Results	New Relevant
Academic Search Complete, Academic Search Premier, EconLit, Education Research Complete, Humanities International Complete, PsychArticles, PyscInfo, Public Administration Abstracts, and Business Source Complete	"principal effectiveness"	0	0	0	0
	"student outcomes"				
	"principal effect*"	1	1	7	0
	"student outcomes"				
	"principal effect*"	5	3	39	4
	"student achievement"				
	"leadership effect*"	27	3	28	0
	"student outcomes"				
	"leadership effect*"	123	27	196	4
	"student achievement"			Refined to US 26	
	"principal effect*"	0		0	0
	"teacher morale"				
	"leadership effect*"	3	1	2	0
	"teacher morale"				
	"principal effect*"	3	1	1	0
	"teacher attitude*"				
	"leadership effect*"	24	0	24	0
	"teacher attitude*"				
	"principal effect*"	0	0	0	0
	"student attitude*"				
	"leadership effect*"	38	0	31	0

Databases Searched	Search Terms	First Review Results	Relevant Articles Found	Second Review Results	New Relevant
	"student attitude*"				
	"principal effect*"	0	0	0	0
	"school environment"				
	Changed to "school culture"				
	"leadership effect*"	68	6	81	2
	"school environment"				
	"leadership effect*"	78	2	87	1
	"school culture"				
	"leadership style"	80	5	90	2
	"school climate"				
	"leadership style"	81	0	95	0
	"school culture"				
	"principal" "school environment"	276	37	545	5
				Refined to US	
				34	
	"principal effectiveness"	13	0	9	1
	"Principal effect*"	3	0	2	0
	"school effectiveness"				
	"leadership effect*"	47	4	35	0
	"school effectiveness"				
	"leadership effect*"	19	1	17	1
	"teacher effectiveness"				
	"principal effect*"	23	9	2	0
	"teacher" "job satisfaction"				
	"principal effect*"	6	0	1	0
	"teacher"				
	"retention"				
	"principal effect*"	122	10	5	1

Databases Searched	Search Terms	First Review Results	Relevant Articles Found	Second Review Results	New Relevant
	"teacher"				
	"effectiveness"				
	"principal effect*"	1	0	0	0
	"teacher"				
	emotions				
	Principal effect	2	0	0	0
	Teacher				
	Treatment				
	Principal effect*	56	3	41	2
	Teacher				
	Attitudes				
	Principal effect*	34	2	34	0
	Teacher				
	Experiences				
	Principal Effect*	0	0	24	0
	Teachers				
	Professional				
	Development				
	"principal effect*"	1	0	1	0
	Teachers				
	Professional				
	learning				
	Principal effect*	12	4	9	0
	New teachers				
	"leadership effect*"	32	4	42	0
	"teacher" "job				
	satisfaction"				
	"leadership effect*"	13	0	23	0
	"teacher"				
	"retention"				
	"leadership effect*"	16	0	18	0
	"teacher"				
	"effectiveness"				
	"leadership effect*"	5	1	0	0
	"teacher"				
	Emotions				
	leadership effect	11	0	0	0

Databases Searched	Search Terms	First Review Results	Relevant Articles Found	Second Review Results	New Relevant
	Teacher Treatment leadership effect*	22	0	0	0
	Teacher Attitudes leadership effect*	0	0	0	0
	Teacher Experiences leadership Effect*	31	0	32	0
	Teachers Professional Development "leadership effect*"	2	0	4	0
	Teachers Professional learning				

Table B3

Policy and Reform Issues

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Coburn, C.E. (2001)	To explore the connection between actions by the principal and teacher leaders and the nature and content of teachers' sensemaking.	Institutional Theory Sense-Making Theory	Urban school in California involved in ongoing effort to improve reading instruction.	Principal actions related to teacher sensemaking as evidenced by: Observations of relevant meetings and professional development Semi-structured interviews with teachers, resource personnel, and principal Document collection of relevant items	Teacher sensemaking as evidenced by: Observations of relevant meetings and professional development Semi-structured interviews with teachers, resource personnel and principal Document collection of relevant items	Qualitative Case Study Sustained observation In-depth interviewing Document analysis Initial codes used to identify emergent themes NUDIST qualitative data analysis software Inductive codes through iterative coding Immersion in research site, systematic sampling of occasions, efforts to explore countervailing	The conditions surrounding teacher conversation had an impact on the depth of their engagement and understanding. Specifically, the principal influenced where sensemaking happened, what messages were filtered and communicated to teachers regarding policies, active participation in understanding, and structuring collaboration in formal settings. These influences shaped the focus of teachers' understanding of new reform policies, and the decisions made by the principal around communication and professional development had a relationship with the instructional practices of teachers in their classrooms.

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
						evidence, systematic coding of data, sharing findings with key informants and including their insights in analysis	
Spillane, J.P., Diamond, J.B., Burch, P., Hallett, T., Jita, L., & Zoltners, J. (2002)	To investigate how principals make sense of and mediate district accountability policy.	Sense-making frame Institutional theories Political context	3 schools in Chicago Had varying measures on aspects of improvement in student achievement, poverty level, and school improvement (academic press, professional community, instructional leadership, and academic productivity)	Principal role in shaping understanding of accountability policy as evidenced by: Interviews with teachers in 2 nd and 5 th grade Interviews with principals Observations of grade-level meetings, faculty meetings, school improvement planning meetings, professional development workshops, supervisions of teaching practice, homeroom conversations,	Teachers' perceptions and understanding of accountability policy as evidenced by: Interviews with teachers in 2 nd and 5 th grade Interviews with principals Observations of grade-level meetings, faculty meetings, school improvement planning meetings, professional development workshops, supervisions of teaching practice, homeroom conversations, lunchroom	Qualitative Observations Semi-Structured interviews Video-tapes of leadership practices NUDIST qualitative data software	The authors reported that one principal utilized standardized achievement data to communicate meaningfully with his staff and help them understand the relevance of district level reform policies. The principals' reputation and ability in "number crunching" served as a means for his staff to understand the importance of student data. A second principal struggled within the context of her newly appointed principalship, and with legitimacy of authority. Principal beliefs, and teacher beliefs impacted the way teachers understood and worked through accountability policy. The third principal was reported to legitimize accountability policy and facilitate understanding through boosting teacher morale, providing support and instructional leadership, and utilizing pressures to improve instruction.

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Coburn, C.E. (2005)	To investigate the role of school leaders in making sense of new reading policies.	Cognitive approach to policy implementation Leaders as content experts Leaders as agents of change	2 urban elementary schools in California Serve diverse populations with over 60% free and reduced lunch status	lunchroom conversations Principals' impact on teachers' interpretation and enactment of policy as evidenced by: Interviews and observations Repeated, semi-structured interviews with teachers, principals, and support personnel Observations of professional development, faculty meetings, grade-level meetings, and informal interactions between principals and teachers.	conversations Teachers' perceptions of policy and enactment based on: Data from interviews and observations Teachers change in classroom practice as evidenced by: Interviews and observations	Qualitative Embedded, cross case design Initial codes identified emergent themes Used NUD*IST data analysis software Inductive creation of coding through iterative coding Constant comparison analysis Triangulation and quality checks through intensive immersion at site, explorations of countervailing evidence, systematic coding of data, and sharing	The author found that principals' knowledge and beliefs about reading instruction impacted the ways they filtered and communicated policy messages, constructed meaning with teachers around policy messages, and the resources and professional development they provided. Principals also provided an interpretive frame for teachers, which influenced their thoughts and understandings of reading policy, and ultimately their classroom instruction.

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Daly, A.J. (2009)	To examine the threat-rigid responses of school staff in response to NCLB and the role principals played in mitigating these responses.	Sanction as a Policy Lever Threat-Rigid Response Trust Balanced Leadership	252 teachers in eight schools in Year 2 Program Improvement (PI) schools (4 elementary, 4 middle) 201 teachers in 6 schools not under any PI status (3 elementary, 3 middle) 53 site administrators (principals, assistant principals)	Leadership measured by a 47 item leadership scale Interviews with principals Trust as measured by a 27 item Trust Scale Focus groups with teachers	Threat-rigid responses as measured by a 20 item Threat Rigidity Scale	findings with key informants, with the use of their feedback to inform final analysis. Two-Phase Mixed Methods Design Phase 1-Cross sectional survey approach ANOVA Multiple linear regression models Phase 2- Qualitative focus groups and interviews used to supplement initial findings Constant comparative analysis Check and recheck of emergent themes Qualitative	The author found moderate to strong correlations between all factors within the Leadership Scale and threat rigid responses. He put forth that leadership had a significant negative correlation with threat-rigidity, and a positive correlation with trust. Specifically, empowerment and involvement were facets of leadership behavior that had independent impacts on threat-rigid responses, and this was further supported by the focus group and interview data.
Burch, P., Theoharis,	To uncover patterns in	Importance of Principal	9 high poverty schools	Principal Role in implementing	Student Achievement as	Qualitative	The authors found that principals had varying approaches to CSR

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
G., Rauscher, E. (2010)	principal perceptions, decisions and actions related to Class Size Reduction (CSR) as a reform measure. To investigate teacher experiences and views related to principal actions and the CSR reform.	to Instructional Change The Role of Sense-Making in Policy Implementation	Participating in the Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) program in Wisconsin for 4 years 3 rural, 2 semiurban, and 4 urban schools 3 high achieving, 3 rapidly improving, and 3 low achieving schools	CSR as evidenced by: Interviews with principals and teachers. 8 half day observations in 3 different classrooms within each school. (39 teachers observed in 27 classrooms)	measured by: 3 high-achieving schools as measured by 75% proficiency on reading and math standardized tests for 4 years. 3 rapidly improving schools that showed growth of 25% or more over past 3-4 years. 3 low achieving schools that consistently had below 60% proficiency. Implementation of CSR Practices as evidenced by: Interview data Observations Artifacts collected were lesson plans, written principal-teacher communication, assessment instruments and	Development of coding categories based on theoretical literature Thematic analysis	which was related to their achievement profile. Principals who maximized the use of space through creative problem solving, integrated inclusive services through smaller class sizes, and provided proactive staff development on CSR issues sustained achievement gains of their students within the context of reform.

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Rinke, C., & Valli, L. (2010)	To understand the delivery of school based professional development in a high stakes accountability context.	High-Stake Accountability Professional Development School Context	3 schools serving large numbers of low-income students with high numbers of English Language Learners Focus on 4 th and 5 th grade Schools were at varying degrees of risk for meeting 2004-2005 AYP status	Principals' role in mediating high stakes accountability policy as evidenced by: Interviews with principals, math and reading specialists, staff development teachers, ESL teachers, Special Educators, Observations at grade-level, professional development, school improvement, and who staff meetings. Artifact Collection of professional development materials, lesson plans, student worksheets, and school policies	staff development plans. Teachers' opportunity to learn from professional development activities as evidenced by: Data collection and analysis	Qualitative Case Study Coding using NVivo Within-case analyses Cross-case analyses	The authors found that the school principals' dispositions towards professional development played a key role in the participation and implementation of professional development at their school site and was related to student achievement.
Stillman, J. (2011)	To examine the factors that impacted equity-minded teachers in	Equity-Minded Teachers	3 elementary teachers (equity-minded, highly qualified, with a	Leadership factors impacting teacher	Teachers' perceptions of accountability reforms as	Qualitative Multiple Case Study Design	The author found that a variety of principal behaviors mediated teachers' perceptions of reform policies. Three different

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
	navigating accountability-driven language arts reforms, and specific barriers that impeded teachers' ability to meet the needs of marginalized students.	School Change Social Learning and Activity Theories	Bilingual Cross-Cultural, Language, and Academic Development credential) California	perception of accountability reforms as evidenced by: Interviews Document collection	evidenced by: Interviews and classroom observations	Constant comparative method Triangulation through focused observations, member checking, and participant-observer role	leadership styles and dedication to different ideals impacted the teachers in drastically different ways, leading the author to conclude that leadership behaviors, actions, and beliefs had an impact on how teachers navigated reform policies.
White, R.B., Polly, D., & Audette, R.H. (2012)	To investigate the critical features and contextual issues related to the implementation of Response to Intervention.	Response to Intervention	15 participants (School leadership team (principal, 2 assistant principals, speech therapist, school psychologist, guidance counselor, 2 special education teachers, 2 general education teachers) 5 participants from district office) Elementary School in North Carolina Students in	Principal role in implementation as evidenced by: Unstructured interviews with all participants	RTI Implementation School as evidenced by: School's request to be the pilot site for the district	Qualitative Descriptive Case Study Design Unstructured interviews Open-coding of interview transcripts Inter-rater reliability conducted through coding meetings Time-ordered matrix of themes Member checks	The principal focused on obtaining buy-in through the introduction of this new reform effort and made it clear this was a part of the school's mission to reach all learners. The principal and assistant principals monitored student data weekly to provide support and keep abreast of issues arising with students. The principal was committed, and a community of trust and respect was in place before the implementation of this reform, and this led to a smoother transition. The principal communicated a deep belief in the reform and allowed teachers to take the lead but remained involved in the entire process.

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Ylimaki , R.M. (2012)	To examine how recent political shifts affected the meaning of curriculum leadership in schools.	Cultural Political Movements and Reform Curriculum Theories Instructional Leadership Distributed Leadership Instructional Leadership for Social Justice Critical Theory	grade 3-5 performing below state average on reading, and near state average in math 955 students K-5 4 principals identified as being aware of current politics related to curriculum 2 men (1 white and 1 African American) 2 women (1 white and 1 African American) Schools represented urban, suburban and rural communities	Leadership Identities and Practices Observed and interviewed principals, teachers, students, and parents over a 4-year period Observations of classrooms and curriculum meetings Document collection of curriculum maps, school board meetings, community meetings, newspaper articles	Curriculum Focus Study began immediately after the passage of NCLB with a focus on how this policy context impacted leadership in schools.	Critical Ethnographic Study Thick descriptions Intensive naturalistic observations Participant member checking throughout process Reconstructive analysis Semi-structured interviews	The author found that principals negotiated new identities that she categorized as 'new professional' or 'critical curriculum leadership'. She found that through these differing identities, principals chose areas of focus in their schools that impacted the curriculum and delivery of instruction as well as teacher and student morale. The author also noted that although there were two competing identities within the schools, all four made improvements to a proficient status by the end of the four years of the study.

Table B4

Classroom Instruction

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Zimmerman, S., & Deckert-Pelton, M. (2003)	To investigate teachers' perceptions of principals in the teacher evaluation process.	Teacher Evaluation Human Relations Theory Democratic Leadership	86 students in the Educational Leadership program at University of West Florida All taught in K-12	Principal role in evaluations as evidenced by: Responses to the Professional Appraisal Systems Survey	Teacher Evaluation as evidenced by: Responses to the Professional Appraisal Systems Survey	Mixed Methods Survey Constant Comparison Analysis Thematic coding Hypothesis creation based on data Frequency Percentages	The authors found that teachers wanted principals' to set aside time for interaction around evaluation to provide constructive feedback to inform their teaching practices. Levels of this interaction varied among respondents, but impacted their classroom instructional practices. The teachers expressed concerns about the consistency of evaluation measures in their schools and within their district. Teachers viewed their principals as important collaborators in improving their classroom practice and noted that commitment to evaluation was important. They also commented on the importance of principals' knowledge of instructional practice and evaluative skill as indicators of effective leadership tied to their ability to use the evaluation process to improve teaching practices.
Printy, S.M. (2008)	To investigate the influence of high school principals on the nature of science and math teachers' participation in a community of	Communities of Practice	2,718 teachers in 420 high schools	Principal leadership as measured by: Responses to the National Educational Longitudinal	Communities of practice as measured by: Responses indicating mutual engagement, joint enterprise, and	Hierarchical Linear Modeling	The author found that principals contributed to the participation of teachers in communities of practice, but had little influence on their perceptions of pedagogical competence. It was also found that the principal had little effect on the teachers' choice of pedagogical

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
	practice.			Study of 1988 (National Center for Education Statistics, 1994)	shared repertoire Teachers' sense of their instructional competence and reported use of standards-based instructional practices		practices.
Williams, E. (2009)	To examine the relationships between teachers perceptions of school leadership and student achievement.	High-Stakes Accountability Effective principals Social Systems Theory	82 schools in a Georgia School District	Principal Leadership as measured by: A district created survey distributed to teachers	Student achievement as measured by: Scores of 4 th graders on the state standardized assessment in reading Student Behavior Referrals Student demographic information	Pearson product moment correlations Factor analysis Stepwise multiple regression analysis Structural equation model	The author concluded that leadership behaviors as perceived by the teachers are not related to student achievement, but they found a strong relationship between teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional leadership skills and school climate. The author determined there was more relationship between student demographics and student behavior referrals than perceptions of leadership behaviors.
Heck, R. H., & Moriyama, K. (2010)	To examine relationships among elementary schools contexts, leadership, instructional practices, and added-year outcomes.	Educational Effectiveness Research (EER) Leadership for Learning	25,173 4 th and 5 th grade students from a western US state in 198 different schools 4,152 teachers 7,948 parents	Collaborative Leadership as evidenced by: Department of Education survey items reflecting school instructional practices from teachers,	School Climate Student Achievement as measured by: Math and reading scores from state standardized tests Student age, SES, gender, and ELL status data	Multi-level Structural Equation Modeling Regression Discontinuity Approach	The authors found a significant relationship between principal leadership for learning behaviors and the facilitation of school improvement through building instructional practices in the schools. They found that stronger perceptions about leadership for learning were positively related to stronger views about the quality of instructional practices which

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Hallinger, P., & Heck, R.H. (2011)	To examine the relationships between leadership, academic improvement capacity, and student achievement.	Collaborative Leadership School Improvement Literature	Random sample of 193 elementary schools 13,391 3 rd graders were followed over 3 year period	parents, and students Teacher responses to Collaborative leadership questions on DOE survey Collaborative, Learning-Directed Leadership as measured by: A sub-scale of items reflecting teacher perceptions of school improvement, school governance, and resource management and development	School improvement for academic capacity as measured by: Subscale items that indicated emphasis on standards and implementation, focused and sustained action on improvement, quality of student support, professional capacity of the school, school communication, stakeholder involvement, and student safety and well-being. Student achievement as measured by: Performance on the math portion of the	Quantitative Non-experimental, post hoc, longitudinal design Multi-level latent change analysis	influenced added-year effects. The authors found that as collaborative, learning directed leadership strengthened, so did the academic capacity, and this also represented greater than average growth according to the math standardized test scores.

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Johnson, J.F., Uline, C.L., & Perez, L.G. (2011)	To examine what expert principals noticed about classroom instruction in high achieving urban schools.	Instructional Leadership Noticing	14 principals from schools that received the National Excellence in Urban Education Award from 2008-2010 9 elementary, 2 middle, and 3 high schools	Principal Noticing Behaviors as evidenced by: Interviews of principals	state standardized assessment. High achieving schools that as indicated by: High population of minority students Schools where students who were English Language Learners or students with disabilities achieved at least 75% of the proficiency rate for the rest of the population Large percentage of students (over 50%) qualified for free/reduced lunch programs Attendance rates over 92%, graduation rates over 70%	Qualitative Interview Study Coding to identify themes Triangulated with conversation amongst researchers and data from site visit	Principals in these schools consistently mentioned a focus on student engagement, student learning, and student understanding. Classroom climate, and the extent to which teacher behavior influenced student engagement and understanding were of prime importance.
Reardon, R.M. (2011)	This study examined the relationships between principals' perceptions of their learning-centered leadership and	Instructional Leadership Learning-centered Leadership	31 elementary principals from a large school district in Virginia	Principal learning centered leadership as measured by: Principal self-perception measured on the	Student achievement as evidenced by: State standardized reading assessments	Hierarchical multiple linear regression analyses	The author reported a direct relationship between principals' perceptions of their attention to rigorous curriculum and student achievement on reading tests in grade 3. The leadership characteristics of attention to rigorous curriculum and performance accountability were

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
	student achievement on standardized tests.			VAL-ED instrument			significantly related to performance on testing in grades 4 and 5.

Table B5

Special Populations

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Sindelar, P.T., Shearer, D.K., Yendol-Hoppey, D., Liebert, T.W. (2006)	To examine the reasons for the unsustainability of inclusive school reform in a previously successful middle school.	Sustainability	Socrates Middle School	Principal role in inclusive practices as evidenced by: Perceptions of factors impacting inclusion as documented in interviews with principals and teachers	Inclusive reform efforts as documented by: Interviews, site observations, and document analysis	Qualitative Case Study Rewriting, coding, and constant comparative analysis Member check of themes	The authors reported that a change in leadership priorities and a lack of commitment or knowledge of inclusive practices were factors that led to the breakdown of previously successful inclusive practices within this school.
Slobodzian, J.T. (2009)	To explore the factors that impacted the exclusion and inclusion of students who are deaf.	Symbolic Interactionism	20 non-deaf students 2 deaf students 1 General education teacher 1 resource teacher Support personnel	Leadership Impact as determined by: Observations and interviews	Inclusion/Exclusion of students who are deaf as evidenced by: Observations and interviews	Qualitative Ethnography Comparative research design	The author reported a strong disconnect between the vision communicated by the principal and the supportive behaviors that would help make this vision a reality. The leadership was noted as absent, disconnected, and not involved in the activities of the school and this impacted the preparation, ability, and instructional capacity of teachers serving students who are deaf.

Table B6

Organizational Health and School Climate

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Hoy, W.K., Smith, P.A., & Sweetland, S.R. (2002)	To create and test a measure of organizational climate and its relationship with faculty trust.	Organizational Health Organizational Climate	97 high schools in Ohio	Leadership behaviors in: Organizational Climate Index which measured aspects of environmental press, collegial leadership, teacher professionalism, and academic press.	Faculty Trust as measured by: Faculty Trust Survey	Quantitative Correlational analysis Multiple regression analysis	The authors found that collegial leadership behaviors had the strongest relationship with faculty trust in the principal.
McGuigan, L., & Hoy, W.K. (2006)	To investigate the school structures that assisted in achieving academic optimism.	Academic Optimism	40 Elementary schools in Ohio	Leadership behaviors as measured by: Enabling school bureaucracy, as measured by the Enabling School Structure Form (ESS) (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000)	Academic emphasis, comprised of: Collective efficacy, faculty trust in students and parents Academic optimism as measured by: responses to a subscale of the Organizational Health Inventory, a short version of the collective efficacy scale	Quantitative Principal Axis Factor Analysis Multiple regression used to test hypothesized path model	The authors found that principals' enabling bureaucracy behaviors positively impacted teachers' collective efficacy and academic optimism. Academic optimism, in turn, had a positive effect on student achievement.

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
					(Goddard et al., 2000), and a short version of the Omnibus Trust Scale (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003)		
					School Achievement as measured by proficiency on state standardized assessments		
					Student achievement as evidenced by:	Quantitative	
					Designation of high performing and low performing schools as measured by state standardized assessments	Comparative Analysis	
					Measures included questions identifying principal behavior as supportive behavior, directive behavior, and restrictive behavior.	Multivariate analysis of variance	
					Organizational	Follow up analysis of variance	
Styron, R.A., & Nyman, T.R. (2008)	To examine the differences in school health and climate, organizational structures, and instructional practices between high performing and low performing middle schools.	School Climate Organizational Structures Instructional Practices	283 teachers (171 from high performing, 112 from low performing middle schools)	Principal influence as measured by: Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire for Middle Schools Measures included questions identifying principal behavior as supportive behavior, directive behavior, and restrictive behavior. Organizational	Student achievement as evidenced by: Designation of high performing and low performing schools as measured by state standardized assessments	Quantitative Comparative Analysis Multivariate analysis of variance Follow up analysis of variance	The authors found that there were lower directive principal behaviors in high-achieving middle schools. They also found that principal influence, the ability to gain support from district office, was scored lower in high achieving schools.

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Williams, E., Persaud, G., & Turner, T. (2008)	To explore the relationships between teachers' perceptions of leadership performance, school climate, and student achievement.	Social Systems Theory	81 schools in Georgia	Health Inventory for Middle Schools described institutional integrity, collegial leadership, principal influence, resource support, teacher affiliation, and academic emphasis. Principal leadership as measured by: Teacher responses on Instructional planning, interpersonal skills, decision making skills, school facilities and organizational planning, teacher evaluation	School climate as measured by: Teachers' perceptions on a survey Student achievement as measured by: 4 th grade scores on state standardized assessments of reading.	Quantitative Pearson correlational analysis	The authors reported that each leadership task was positively correlated with school climate. The authors found that school climate was inversely related to low achievement, and positively related to high achievement but had no impact on students who met expectations. They found that principal interpersonal task was positively related to students exceeding expectations, and inversely related to students below expectations.
DiPaola, M. & Guy, S. (2009)	To determine if organizational justice had a relationship with social processes in the educational arena.	Theories of Justice Collegial Leadership Organizational Climate	36 high schools in a mid-Atlantic state 1,218 surveys completed by professional staff members	Leadership as a factor in: School climate factors (collegial leadership, teacher professionalism, academic press, and community	Organizational Justice measured by: The Organizational Justice Scale (Hoy & Tarter, 2004)	Quantitative Multiple regression analyses	The authors found that only collegial leadership had a significant effect on organizational justice. Additionally, they found that the strongest relationship in trust factors was found between the trust in the principal and organizational justice.

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Rhodes, V., Stevens, D., & Hemmings, A. (2011)	To present a narrative account of how a school culture supporting STEM education developed in a new high school.	School Culture	The principal, and teacher Staff who participated in Faculty Writing Group	engagement) as measured by the School Climate Index Trust as measured by: The Omnibus T-Scale Principal actions as evidenced by: Documents created during the Faculty Writing Group	School culture as documented by: Perceptions notated during the Faculty Writing Group	Qualitative First-hand narrative Multiple voices-principal and teacher	The authors reported that through the use of democratic leadership practices that valued teacher teams, teachers were empowered as instructional leaders and policy makers. A strong school culture was created through joint problem solving and collaborative team-building efforts that helped them forge a common vision.

Table B7

Principals' Choice of Professional Development

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Grissom, J.A., & Harrington, J.R. (2010)	To examine teachers' perceptions' of principal performance as related to the professional development activities they chose to participate in.	Principal Professional Development	37,960 teachers in 7,410 schools	Choice of Principal Professional Development as evidenced by: Principal responses to professional development questions on the SASS Administrator Questionnaire	Teachers' Perceptions of Leader Effectiveness as evidenced by: Teacher responses as related to how the school is run on the SASS Teacher Questionnaire School Performance as measured by: Principal response to the measure of school performance on the SASS.	Quantitative Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression Instrumental Variables (IV)	The authors found that principals who participated in university course work and formal principal networks were rated lower in effectiveness as perceived by teachers and as indicated by school performance. They found that principals who participated in formal mentoring or coaching programs were rated higher in effectiveness as perceived by teachers, and as indicated by school performance.
Hughes, C., & Jones, D. (2010)	To examine the relationship between ethical training for elementary school principals and student performance.	Ethical Leadership Ethics/Morals Values/Judgments	Convenience sampling 111 principals in southern US state	Principal's Ethical Leadership training as measured by: A 29 item online survey	Student achievement as measured by: Principals' reporting of student achievement gains or losses on survey	Quantitative Chi-Square Test	The authors found that there was a significant relationship between the principals' pre- and in-service ethics training and their reported gains in student achievement.

Table B8

Teacher Induction and Retention

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Tillman, L.C. (2005)	To examine leadership practices and teacher mentoring in an urban school context.	Teacher Mentoring Principal as Mentor Transformational Leadership	1 st year, African American teacher Mentor Principal	Principal Role in Mentoring as evidenced by: Individual Interviews Group interviews Reflective Journals on mentoring, teacher competence, teacher and principal expectations, leadership practice, and racial, cultural, and class issues in the urban school context.	Teacher perceptions of mentoring experience as evidenced by: Individual interviews Group Interviews Reflective journals	Qualitative Culturally congruent qualitative research methods Analysis with pre-determined and emergent themes Member checks with participants	The author found that the principal's lack of communication about expectations and school culture negatively affected the new teachers' feelings about her ability to improve her teaching practice.
Easley, J. (2008)	To identify and explore factors and conditions of moral leadership that affected teacher retention for Alternative	Moral Leadership Teacher Efficacy	11 fellows of the Mercy College New Teacher Residency Program (NTRP)	Moral leadership behaviors as evidenced by: Focus group with 11	Teacher Retention as evidenced by: Fellows indicated a strong desire to remain in teaching	Qualitative Constant comparative analysis Thematic	The author found that the ARC teachers described moral leadership behaviors of respect for teachers, supportive relationships through dialogue, and focusing on the right things as themes that emerged from

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
	Route Certification teachers.			fellows	profession	analysis	their data and impacted the teachers' decisions to remain in the profession.
Wynn, S.R., & Brown, K.M. (2008)	To investigate what beginning teachers valued in a school leader.	New Teacher Induction and Mentoring Professional Learning Communities	12 schools (8 elementary, 2 middle, 2 high schools) 61 beginning teachers	Responses to questions about the classroom-based, building level, district level, and personal factors that define what the authors classify as "an environment of fulfillment" Leadership behaviors as evidenced by: Interviews with new teachers	Teacher Retention as measured by: Purposive sampling of schools with the lowest attrition rates in this district.	Qualitative Case Studies Semi-Structured interviews Constant Comparative analysis Triangulation of interview data, the presentation of verbatim quotes, the creation of an audit trail, and member checks were	The authors reported that beginning teachers valued collaboration, supportive conditions, supportive and shared leadership, shared norms and values, and de-privatization of practice all facilitated by their school leader.

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis used.	Findings
Brown, K.M., & Wynn, S.R. (2009)	To understand the leadership styles of twelve principals who led schools with low attrition and transfer rates.	Teacher Shortage Literature Teacher Turnover Literature Instructional Leadership	12 schools (8 elementary, 2 middle, 2 high schools) with the lowest attrition and transfer rates of beginning teachers.	Leadership styles of principals as evidenced by: Semi-structured interviews with 12 principals	Teacher Attrition and Transfer rates as evidenced by: Attrition and transfer rates between 0%-10% for elementary, 0%-20% middle, and 0%-15% for high school which represented a lower than average rate for the district (42%).	Qualitative Semi-Structured Interviews Constant Comparative Analysis Triangulation of interview notes, presentation of verbatim quotes, an audit trail, and member checks.	The authors reported that finding teachers who shared the same values with the school community, providing supports and needed resources, and being flexible and adaptable to the needs of the teachers affected retention rates.
Greenlee, B., & Brown, J.J. (2009)	To investigate the leadership behaviors and incentives that were most effective in the retention of teachers in challenging schools.	Teacher Attrition	Convenience Sampling 97 teachers (77 female, 20 male; 56 elementary, 23 middle, 13 high schools, and 3 vocational or alternative schools) enrolled in the Educational Leadership program at the University of South Florida	Principal leadership behaviors as evidenced by: Survey exploring teacher perceptions of principal leadership behaviors.	Teacher retention as evidenced by: Survey exploring teacher perceptions of principal leadership behaviors that would create an environment where they would want to stay.	Quantitative Frequency percentages	The authors found that teachers wanted to stay in a challenging school if they were offered incentives like bonuses, or the autonomy and resources to create strong curriculum innovations. They also found that principals who created a strong culture, and enhanced staff's desire and willingness to focus energy on achieving educational excellence were main factors in teachers' willingness to stay in challenging schools.

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Bickmore, D.J., & Bickmore, S.T. (2010)	To examine the effectiveness of two middle school induction programs through the perceptions of teachers, mentor teachers, and principals	Teacher Induction Literature School Climate	27 teachers, 16 mentors, and 2 principals representing two middle schools similar in demographic composition	Leaders' role in induction program as evidenced by: Responses on survey items Interviews with principals, mentors, and teachers	Teacher induction experience as evidenced by: Teacher surveys given to inductees and mentors that outlined their feelings about the induction program	Mixed Methods ANOVA (survey items) Qualitative coded and themes based on chain of concepts Member checking with most participants	The authors reported that participants felt that administrators contributed most to the personal needs of new teachers, specifically competence, autonomy, and respect needs. Administrators were viewed as the most influential in developing and maintaining a positive school climate. The authors also found that new and experienced teachers held a positive view of school leadership that was collegial in nature and provided positive working conditions to support school climate, thus affecting the success of the induction programs through individual interactions, and supporting teacher autonomy. For teachers at all three levels (elementary, middle, and high school) school leadership had a large and statistically significant relationship with teachers' intentions to remain in a school. She found that teachers are more likely to leave schools where the perception of leadership is poor.
Ladd, H.F. (2011)	To examine the relationships between teachers' perceptions of the working environment and their intended and actual departures from schools.	Teacher turnover Teacher Work Environments Transformational Leadership	Teachers in North Carolina	Principals' role in working environment as evidenced by: Survey responses on statewide instrument measuring teacher perceptions of working environment.	Teacher Retention and Attrition as evidenced by: Survey responses on statewide instrument measuring perceptions of intent to remain in teaching. Data on teachers actual departures from schools	Quantitative Exploratory factor analysis Full linear probability models	
Youngs, P., Holdgreve-	To examine how instructional	Instructional Program	7 elementary general	Principals' role in	New teacher induction	Qualitative Case Study	The authors found that principals who were very involved in the

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Resendez, R.T., & Qian, H. (2011)	program coherence impacted new teachers' induction experiences.	Coherence	education teachers in Michigan	instructional program coherence as evidenced by: Interviews with teachers	experience as evidenced by: Interviews with teachers	Semi-structured and Structured Interviews nVivo07 used to code based on induction literature	instructional aspects of literacy instruction were supportive and provided important feedback to enhance the learning of new teachers. Teachers struggled when they were provided unclear feedback, or suggestions focused only on classroom management and behavior instead of instructional issues. Principals also impacted the quality of new teacher experiences by providing clear goals and resources for achieving those goals.

Table B9

Teacher Job Satisfaction

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Egley, R. (2003)	This study explored the relationships between professionally and personally inviting leadership behaviors of principals on teacher job satisfaction, principal effectiveness, principal as agent of school improvement, principal's invitational quotient, and the computed accreditation performance index of the school district.	Invitational Educational Theory Effective Schools Research	283 high school teachers in Mississippi who returned surveys	Professionally and personally inviting leadership behaviors as evidenced by: Teacher responses to the Leadership Survey Instrument (Asbill, 1994)	Teacher Job Satisfaction Principal effectiveness Principal as agent of school improvement all measured by: Teacher responses to Leadership Survey Instrument (Asbill, 1994) Accreditation Performance Index of School as measured by: Student achievement scores	Quantitative Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient analysis	The author found that a statistically significant relationship existed between teachers' perceptions of principals' personal and professional inviting leadership behaviors and each of the variables in their hypothesis that address the 5 areas of focus in the purpose of the study.
Egley, R. J. & Jones, B.D. (2005)	To examine the relationship between principals' perceived personally and professionally inviting leadership behaviors and teacher job	Invitational Leadership	708 teachers (3 rd , 4 th , 5 th grade) from 30 school districts in Florida	Personally and Professionally Inviting Leadership Behaviors as evidenced by: 12 item questionnaire that addressed	Teacher rating of job satisfaction Teacher rating of school climate all measured by: Teacher responses to 12 item questionnaire	Quantitative Descriptive Statistics t-tests ANOVA	The authors put forth that teachers reported that principals demonstrated high levels of personally and professionally inviting behaviors that were correlated with their job satisfaction, perception of school climate, and rating based on standardized test scores of students.

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
	satisfaction, school climate, and accountability status of schools			teacher perceptions of principals' personally and professionally inviting leadership behaviors.	School grade given based on: FCAT standardized testing scores.		
Shen, J., Leslie, J.M., Spybrook, J.K., & Ma, X. (2012)	To determine how principal background and school processes were related to teacher job satisfaction	Teacher Job Satisfaction School Context School Process	7,670 principals 40,770 teachers	Principal Background as measured by: The Public School Principal Questionnaire portion of the SASS. School processes as measured by: The Public School Questionnaire portion of the SASS	Teacher Job Satisfaction as measured by: The Public School Teacher Questionnaire portion of the SASS	Quantitative Two-level hierarchical linear model	The authors found that principals' tenure at a particular school site showed a positive relationship with teacher job satisfaction. Conversely, the principals' experience as a department head previous to principal appointment showed a negative relationship with teacher job satisfaction. The authors also found that school processes related to administrative support had significantly positive, small effects on teacher job satisfaction.

Table B10

Professional Learning Communities

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Hipp, K.K., Huffman, J.B., Pankake, A.M., & Olivier, D.F. (2008)	The purpose was to document the ongoing development of two schools in becoming professional learning communities and the effects of meaningful collaboration on teacher learning.	Professional Learning Communities Change Theories	Two schools who were advanced in their development as professional learning communities (1 elementary, high student achievement on state standardized tests, 1 middle school with growth as measured by state standardized tests)	50 interviews with teachers, principals, assistant principals, support staff, and parents. Leadership Capacity School Survey (Lambert, 2003)	Principal Role in PLC as evidenced by: Progress toward implementation of Professional Learning Communities documented by: Staff responses to Professional Learning Community Assessment (Olivier et al., 2003); Revised School Culture Elements Questionnaire (Olivier, 2001); Teacher Efficacy Beliefs Scale-Collective Efficacy (Olivier, 2001); Leadership Capacity School Survey (Lambert, 2003)	Qualitative Case Stories of schools moving toward sustainable, improved practices.	The authors found that a focus on moral purpose, teamwork and shared responsibility, a collaborative and professional culture, and inclusive leadership were themes that arose between these two improving schools which provided illustrations of what principals can do to achieve sustainable PLCs.
Huggins, K.S., Scheurich, J.J., & Morgan, J.R. (2011)	To explore how a professional learning community was utilized as a reform effort to increase student achievement in	Organizational Learning Professional Learning Communities	1 Urban high school in the southwest of US	Principal Role in PLC Observations of PLC meetings and classroom teaching Document	Implementation of PLC as evidenced by: School personnel's desire to change and improve the outcomes of	Qualitative Case Study Constant comparative analysis Trustworthine	The authors reported that the principals' instructional leadership and involvement in instructional processes, the implementation of structures that also increased pressure for teachers to administer specific lesson cycles, offering support

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
	math.			collection Individual interviews with 9 participants (3 leaders, 6 teachers)	students' achievement on standardized tests. Administration's dedication to reform. Student achievement data from standardized tests in math	ss addressed through prolonged engagement, thick description, use of an audit trail, and peer debriefing	through the structures of PLCs and specifically by the principal, increasing both individual and public accountability, and increasing collaboration impacted the school's ability to implement PLCs in a manner that improved teacher and student learning. The author noted the increase in student achievement scores after the implementation of this reform effort.
Hollingworth, L. (2012)	To determine the role of the principal in supporting professional learning communities and the use of formative assessments.	Professional Learning Communities Assessment for Learning	A Midwestern high school	Principal Role in PLC Interviews with principals, teachers Artifacts from meetings Student classroom assessments Analysis of leadership behaviors within this data	School Implementation of PLCS called Building Leadership Teams as evidenced by: Interview data from teachers, principals, artifacts from meetings, and assessment data were analyzed. Observations of team meetings and classroom instruction and assessment Faculty wide survey regarding openness to systems change	Qualitative Case Study Triangulation of multiple sources of data	The author found that the principal of this school which was conscious of and choosing change processes related to PLCs cited instructional leadership behaviors, providing resources, creating schedules to honor teachers' time, and creating excitement and dedication to learning initiatives as reasons for sustained professional learning communities and learning with regard to formative assessments.

Table B11

Sharing Leadership

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Lambert, L. (2006)	To examine the relationships between high leadership capacity and improved student performance, professional cultures, and shared leadership dynamics.	Leadership Capacity	15 schools (11 elementary, 1 middle, 3 high schools) School principals, directors of initiatives, external coaches	High Leadership Capacity as evidenced by: A set of open-ended questions inviting participants to describe the leadership capacities of their schools Two extensive conversations about leadership capacity	Student performance improvement as measured by: Performance evaluation and acting in response to anticipated student changes.	Qualitative Case Studies Open-ended question responses Interviews Member checking with participants	The author reported that as leadership capacity grew within each school, there was less dependence on the principal. The principals roles changed as they moved through transitional phases of leadership capacity as a school, and this adaptability allowed the school to create and sustain more distributed leadership
Wasonga, T.A., & Murphy, J.F. (2007)	To investigate teachers' perceptions about the practice of dispositions necessary for co-creating leadership	Co-Creating Leadership	21 teachers identified as aspiring school leaders	Co-Creating Leadership behaviors as evidenced by: Written responses to questions about the dispositions necessary for co-creating leadership	Successful Co-Created Leadership as evidenced by: Written responses to questions regarding examples of successful and negative experiences with co-creating leadership	Qualitative Inductive and deductive qualitative research methods Used literature to drive theory-driven evaluation of responses	The authors found that teachers reported an absence of patience, trust, trustworthiness, and active listening, which had a negative impact on school outcomes as perceived by the teachers. Participants noted the importance of all co-creating leadership dispositions identified by the authors, but gave salient examples of how the absence of these dispositions negatively affected co-created leadership in schools.
Park, V., & Datnow, A.	To examine the leadership	Distributed Leadership	6 elementary schools, 1	Distributed Leadership	Student achievement as	Qualitative	The authors found that leaders and leadership practices

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
(2009)	practices in schools implementing data-driven-decision making utilizing distributed leadership.		middle school, 1 high school	<p>Behaviors as evidenced by:</p> <p>Interviews with superintendent, assistant superintendent, principal, assistant principal, and a minimum of 5 teachers.</p> <p>Informal observations of school, classroom, and relevant meetings</p> <p>Document analysis</p>	<p>evidenced by:</p> <p>Status as recognized nationally for utilizing data-driven decision making and evidence of student growth as measured by standardized testing</p>	<p>Multi-Site Case Studies</p> <p>Iterative coding and development of case reports</p> <p>Cross site analysis</p>	centered upon creating a climate dedicated to continuous improvement, building capacity through modeling and learning, distributing decision making practices, and distributing best practices through knowledge brokering.

Table B12

The Role of the Principal in Challenging Contexts

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Johnson, L. (2007)	To examine the culturally responsive behaviors of principals in challenging schools.	Culturally Responsive School Leadership	3 schools from the International Successful School Principalship Project (ISSPP)	Culturally responsive principal behavior as evidenced by: Re-analysis of interviews with principals, teachers, staff, and parents Re-analysis of Observations and document collection	Parent perceptions of principals' leadership as evidenced by: Renalysis of interviews with parents	Qualitative Case Study Re-analysis through lens of culturally responsive leadership	The author found that principals worked to create a trusting environment in their schools that welcomed parents and community members. These principals also held high expectations for all students. There were critical pieces missing, such as a connection between home culture and school practices.
Cooper, C.W. (2009)	To consider how educational leaders promoted equity-oriented reform that strengthened demographically changing school communities	Transformative Leadership for Social Justice Cultural Work	2 schools in central North Carolina	Leadership Behavior as evidenced by: 36 semi-structured interviews (22 with educators and staff, 14 with parents) 10 ethnographic observations (parent-teacher group meetings, cultural festivals, faculty and leadership meetings)	Equity-Oriented Reform as evidenced by: Document collection (schools' student population, school-family policies, relationships with local church and civic agencies).	Comparative Case Study Iterative process to identify themes Triangulation of multiple data sources Member checks with participants.	The author found that principals bridged cultural divides by making culturally responsive decisions that connected the community with the schools. She also found that there were some disturbing gaps in principals' understanding of the cultural work required to create an environment where social justice and equity are realized.

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Ramahlo, E.M., Garza, E., & Merchant, B. (2010)	To examine principals who sustained high levels of achievement in challenging contexts.	Instructional Leadership	2 principals, 11 teachers, 12 parents, and 11 students representing 2 schools in an urban city Texas High concentration of Hispanic students	Leadership Behaviors as evidenced by: Fact-Finding Questionnaire One-on-one interviews Group interviews	Closing Achievement Gap as evidenced by: Schools identified as Academically Acceptable or above as noted by achievement on standardized testing Schools had more than 75% identified as economically disadvantaged Principals identified as successful leaders by their professional peers	Qualitative Exploratory case study design	The authors found that principals demonstrated strong leadership with high expectations for student achieved through restructured curriculum design, employment of qualified and trained personnel, and an emphasis on sustaining a positive school culture.
Hough, D.L., & Schmitt, V.L. (2011)	To examine the relationships between leadership, professional development, classroom management, climate, student achievement, attendance, and behavior in high poverty middle schools.	School Climate Balanced Leadership	30 high poverty schools where teachers had completed Developmental Design professional development training. 900 teachers surveyed	Leadership Behaviors derived from: School Climate and Leadership Index	School Climate, Professional Development: Surveys completed by teachers which measured: implementation and comfort with Developmental Design, including a follow up measure; School Climate and Leadership Index	Quantitative Bivariate correlations Multivariate analysis of covariance	The authors found that there was no statistically significant direct relationship between school climate or leadership and student achievement. They found that school climate had a marginally significant relationship with student behavior referrals and academic achievement. Schools where leadership was perceived as being supportive of the DD implementation saw positive relationships between this implementation and student

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
					<p>Student Attendance as measured by: School attendance records</p> <p>School behavior/ discipline records</p> <p>Student academic achievement on state standardized testing</p>		achievement, higher attendance, and fewer behavior referrals.

Table B13

Principals as Emergent Theme in Challenging Contexts

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Pollard-Durodola, S. (2003)	To examine the characteristics of a school that was supported by research on effective schools for at-risk students	School Effectiveness	Wesley Elementary in Houston, TX	Principal Role in School Effectiveness as evidenced by: Interviews and biographical information from the principal, three teachers, and an educational consultant. Self-reflections from working at school	Effective School as evidenced by: Purposive sampling and Data collection of artifacts to gain knowledge of the outside view of the school. Personal knowledge of school effectiveness Documentation of student growth on state mandated assessments	Qualitative Case Study Triangulation of data Member checks by participants	The author reported that the principal at this school was known for his instructional leadership practices which included a presence on campus and in classrooms, his ability to mobilize people to help make positive change in student outcomes, his constant focus on student progress, and his ability to take risks.
Brown, K.M., Anfara, V.A., & Roney, K. (2004)	To determine plausible explanations for the difference in student achievement between high performing suburban middle schools and low performing suburban middle schools.	Middle Level Theories Social Systems Theory Organizational Climate/ Organizational Health	12 middle schools in Philadelphia, PA (6 high performing, 6 low performing)	Leader Behaviors as evidenced by: Semi-structured interviews with 2 teachers from each school)	Student achievement as measured by: High performing achievement as documented by the state standardized tests Low performing achievement as documented by the state standardized	Qualitative multi-site case study Data analyzed through the framework of organizational health Triangulation of interviews, verbatim quotes, use of	The authors reported that both schools perceived collegial, democratic leadership from their principals. Principals in HPS were reported to be collaborators in improving instruction, while LPS reported their principals' lack of time and availability for help with instructional matters. Principals' expectations at HPS were clearly articulated, focused on a bigger picture of improvement, while LPS principals were more focused on

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
					tests	multiple researchers and coders, and audit trails.	test results. Principals in LPS schools were found to provide less resources, but positively focused on more professional development. HPS principals were reported to provide more resources, but professional development was not highlighted.
Jesse, D., Davis, A., & Pokorny, N. (2004)	To examine the characteristics of high achieving middle schools that served Latino students in poverty.	Effective schools Effective Schools for Latino students	9 middle schools in Texas who were in the top 25% in terms of serving Latino students	Leader Behaviors as evidenced by: Interviews with principals and teachers Document analysis	Student Achievement as evidenced by: Schools with consistently high averages on the state standardized testing	Qualitative Case Study Coded based on ratings of school effectiveness from effective schools checklist, and variables scored by raters	The authors found that these high achieving schools had principals with differing leadership styles. What was common amongst the schools were leaders who coordinated activities of students and teachers toward focused goals, and leaders who supported a climate of mutual respect.
Howley, A., Howley, M. Camper, C., & Perko, H. (2011)	To explore the conditions that supported and constrained place-based education in an isolated rural community.	Place-Based Education Environmental Education Community Survival	Island Community School located on a northeastern US island with 340 residents	Leadership Behavior as evidenced by: Interviews (staff and students) Observations of site, classrooms, informal gatherings Document analysis	Sustained Place Based Education as evidenced by: School sites where PBE was a central focus Nominations by professional peers	Qualitative Case Studies Analyzed to allow for emergent themes related to research questions Triangulation of data through revisiting of	The principal described his attempt to change the school culture and adopt PBE through behaviors such as being responsive to teachers' ideas and solutions to problems, identifying and supporting teacher leaders who were experts in PBE, providing resources to programs to help move school in the right direction, and being willing and able to explain and justify the school program to community members.

Author(s)	Purpose of the Study	Conceptual Framework	Participants/ Study Site	Independent Measures	Outcomes Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
						field notes, interview transcripts, and evidence to support themes.	

Appendix C

Review of Methodologies

Table C1

Studies that Employed Quantitative Methods

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Quantitative Methods	Findings
Griffith, J. (2001)	To discover what types of principal behaviors are associated with high levels of parent involvement.	Role Theory Situational Theory	82 schools 78 principals 13,768 parents Systematic Sampling	Leadership behavior Principal survey that indicated sets of behaviors or roles they commonly showed.	Parent perception of involvement Parent survey on parent involvement, perception of school climate, school informing parents, school empowering parents and demographic information	Quantitative Hierarchical linear modeling	Several significant relationships between principal roles and parents' reported involvement were found.
Hoy, W.K., Smith, P.A., & Sweetland, S.R. (2002)	To create and test a measure of organizational climate and its relationship with faculty trust.	Organizational Health Organizational Climate	97 high schools in Ohio	Leadership Behavior within: Organizational Climate Index which measured aspects of environmental press, collegial leadership, teacher professionalism, and academic press.	Faculty Trust as measured by: Faculty Trust Survey	Quantitative Correlational analysis Multiple regression analysis	The authors found that collegial leadership behaviors had the strongest relationship with faculty trust in the principal.
Egley, R. (2003)	This study explored the relationships between professionally and personally	Invitational Educational Theory Effective Schools Research	283 high school teachers in Mississippi who returned	Professionally and personally inviting leadership behaviors as evidenced by:	Teacher Job Satisfaction Principal effectiveness	Quantitative Pearson product-moment correlation	The author found that a statistically significant relationship existed between teachers' perceptions of principals' personal and professional inviting

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Quantitative Methods	Findings
	inviting leadership behaviors of principals on teacher job satisfaction, principal effectiveness, principal as agent of school improvement, principal's invitational quotient, and the computed accreditation performance index of the school district.		surveys	Teacher responses to the Leadership Survey Instrument (Asbill, 1994)	Principal as agent of school improvement all measured by: Teacher responses to the Leadership Survey Instrument (Asbill, 1994) Accreditation Performance Index of School as measured by student achievement scores	coefficient analysis	leadership behaviors and each of the variables in their hypothesis that address the 5 areas of focus in the purpose of the study.
Griffith, J. (2004)	Do components of transformational leadership impact job satisfaction and therefore turnover rate for teachers?	Transformational Leadership	3,291 school staff 25,087 students from 117 elementary schools Stratified random sampling	Transformational Leadership Behavior Three components of transformational leadership on the survey	Teacher job satisfaction Three survey items that indicated job satisfaction Staff turnover determined by archival records at district Organizational performance determined by student achievement data. Student survey responses	Quantitative Confirmatory factor analysis Chi-square test ANOVA Structural Equation Modeling Hierarchical linear modeling Quantitative	Transformational leadership was directly related to job satisfaction, and indirectly related through this variable to school staff turnover and organizational performance.
Egley, R. J. & Jones, B.D.	To examine the relationship	Invitational Leadership	708 teachers (3 rd , 4 th , 5 th)	Personally and Professionally	Teacher rating of job satisfaction	Quantitative	The authors put forth that teachers reported that

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Quantitative Methods	Findings
(2005)	between principals' perceived personally and professionally inviting leadership behaviors and teacher job satisfaction, school climate, and accountability status of schools		grade) from 30 school districts in Florida	Inviting Leadership Behaviors as evidenced by: 12 item questionnaire that addressed teacher perceptions of principals' personally and professionally inviting leadership behaviors.	Teacher rating of school climate all measured by: Teacher responses to 12 item questionnaire School grade given based on: FCAT standardized testing scores.	Descriptive Statistics t-tests ANOVA	principals demonstrated high levels of personally and professionally inviting behaviors that were correlated with their job satisfaction, perception of school climate, and rating based on standardized test scores of students.
Kelley, R.C., Thornton, B., Daugherty, R. (2005)	To examine the relationship between the principal's preferred leadership style and school climate.	Situational Leadership	31 Elementary schools 31 principals 155 teachers (5 from each school)	Leadership Style Leader Behavior Analysis II (1 principal and 1 teacher from each school)	School Climate Staff Development and School Climate Assessment Questionnaire	Quantitative Pearson product moment correlations	Teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness were positively related to school climate, and principals' flexibility was negatively related to school climate. Principals' and teachers' perceptions of effectiveness and flexibility were not in agreement.
O'Donnell, R.J., & White, G.P. (2005)	To determine the relationship between instructional leadership behaviors and student achievement.	Instructional Leadership	325 middle level educators 75 principals 250 8 th grade English and math teachers	Instructional leadership behaviors Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS, Hallinger, 1987)	Student Achievement measured by the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment	Quantitative Forward selection regression Pearson correlation T test techniques Multivariate regression	Teachers' perceptions of their leaders promoting positive school learning climate was positively related to student achievement scores.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Quantitative Methods	Findings
Hurren, B.L. (2006)	To investigate the relationship between principals' use of humor and teacher job satisfaction.	Organizational culture Effective organizations	471 teachers returned survey 209 elementary 99 middle school 157 secondary 6 multiple level Stratified random sampling	Principals' Frequency of Humor Frequency of humor questionnaire	Teachers' job satisfaction Measured by survey scale	analysis Quantitative Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)	Findings were that a principal's use of humor played a role in teacher job satisfaction.
McGuigan, L., & Hoy, W.K. (2006)	To investigate the school structures that assisted in achieving academic optimism.	Academic Optimism	40 Elementary schools in Ohio	Leadership role as evidenced by: Enabling school bureaucracy, as measured by the Enabling School Structure Form (ESS) (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000)	Academic emphasis comprised of collective efficacy, faculty trust in students and parents Academic optimism as measured by: Responses to a subscale of the Organizational Health Inventory, a short version of the collective efficacy scale (Goddard et al., 2000), and a short version of the	Quantitative Principal Axis Factor Analysis Multiple regression used to test hypothesized path model	The authors found that principals' enabling bureaucracy behaviors positively impacted teachers' collective efficacy and academic optimism. Academic optimism, in turn, had a positive effect on student achievement.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Quantitative Methods	Findings
Blase, J., Blase, J., & Du, F. (2008)	To investigate how teachers perceive mistreatment, cope with the mistreatment, and perceive the effects. What are the frequencies and intensities of the harm, and does the report of mistreatment vary with demographic backgrounds?	<p>"Boss Abuse" Theories</p> <p>Symbolic Interactionism</p> <p>Organizational Justice</p> <p>Psychological and Stress Literature</p>	<p>172 teachers from elementary, middle, and high school</p> <p>They were offered the survey at www.endtecherabuse.org</p>	<p>Principal's acts of abuse and mistreatment</p> <p>Principal Mistreatment/Abuse Inventory (PMAI) 219 item online survey</p>	<p>Omnibus Trust Scale (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003)</p> <p>School Achievement as measured by proficiency on state standardized assessments</p> <p>Teacher mistreatment and effects</p> <p>Teacher demographic</p> <p>PMAI (effects section)</p>	<p>Quantitative</p> <p>Descriptive statistics</p> <p>Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)</p> <p>Scheffe tests</p>	Teachers suffered greatly because of mistreatment by their principal and it had a variety of effects from anger to wanting to leave their career altogether.
Printy, S.M. (2008)	To investigate the influence of high school principals on the nature of science and math teachers' participation in a community of practice.	Communities of Practice	2,718 teachers in 420 high schools	<p>Principal leadership as measured by:</p> <p>Responses to the National Educational Longitudinal Study of 1988 (National Center for Education Statistics,</p>	<p>Communities of practice as measured by:</p> <p>Responses indicating mutual engagement, joint enterprise, and shared repertoire</p> <p>Teachers' sense of</p>	<p>Hierarchical Linear Modeling</p>	The author found that principals contributed to the participation of teachers in communities of practice, but had little influence on their perceptions of pedagogical competence. It was also found that the principal had little effect on the teachers' choice of pedagogical practices.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Quantitative Methods	Findings
				1994)	their instructional competence and reported use of standards-based instructional practices		
Styron, R.A., & Nyman, T.R. (2008)	To examine the differences in school health and climate, organizational structures, and instructional practices between high performing and low performing middle schools.	School Climate Organizational Structures Instructional Practices	283 teachers (171 from high performing, 112 from low performing middle schools)	Principal Role in: Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire for Middle Schools Measures included identifying principal behavior as supportive behavior, directive behavior, and restrictive behavior. Organizational Health Inventory for Middle Schools describes institutional integrity, collegial leadership, principal influence, resource support, teacher affiliation, and academic emphasis.	Student achievement as evidenced by: Designation of high performing and low performing schools as measured by state standardized assessments	Quantitative Comparative Analysis Multivariate analysis of variance Follow up analysis of variance	The authors found that there were lower directive principal behaviors in high-achieving middle schools. They also found that principal influence, the ability to gain support from district office, was scored lower in high achieving schools.
Twigg, N. (2008)	To determine the effects of leadership on perceived organizational support,	Transformational Leadership	31 principals 363 faculty	Transformational leadership measured by the MLQ Form 5X Short (Bass...)	Perceived organizational support measured by a 15 item scale Organization	Quantitative Exploratory factor analysis Confirmatory	Transformational leaders increased supportive behaviors because they fostered a covenantal relationship between administration and teachers.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Quantitative Methods	Findings
	organization based self-esteem, organizational citizenship behaviors, and student achievement.				based self-esteem measured by 10 item scale Organizational citizenship behaviors measured by the Skarlicki and Latham (1996) scale Student Achievement Employee performance	factor analysis T tests Hierarchical linear modeling	This style of leadership was inconsequential in affecting citizenship behaviors and student performance.
Vecchio, R.P., Justin, J.E., & Pearce, C.L. (2008)	To examine the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and teacher performance and satisfaction.	Transformational Leadership Transactional Leadership	223 principals 342 head teachers (high school) 179 teacher-principal dyads	Leaders use of contingent personal reward Leaders performance expectations Leaders intellectual stimulation Leaders participative goals measured by three-item measures on vision, performance expectations, intellectual stimulation, participative goals, and contingent rewards.	measured by a principal's rating on a three-item measure job satisfaction as measured by a three-item measure	Quantitative Confirmatory factor analysis Correlational statistics	Transactional leadership behaviors may have more predictive value than previously assumed.
Wahlstrom, & Louis (2008)	To determine how teachers' instructional practices are affected by principal-teacher	Shared leadership Organizational Trust Professional Community Efficacy	4,165 teachers	Principal leadership behavior as measured by the Teacher Survey	Classroom practices Teacher Self-Efficacy	Quantitative Principal factor analysis with varimax rotations	The effects of principal leadership on instruction were relatively weak. Teachers' perceptions of principal leadership had a consistent effect on the

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Quantitative Methods	Findings
	relationships.				Personal Characteristics measured by the Teacher Survey	Stepwise linear regression models	degree to which a teacher engaged in focused instruction. Improving teachers trust in principals may have a more direct effect on classroom instruction.
Williams, E., Persaud, G., & Turner, T. (2008)	To explore the relationships between teachers' perceptions of leadership performance, school climate, and student achievement.	Social Systems Theory	81 schools in Georgia	Principal leadership as measured by: Teacher responses on instructional planning, interpersonal skills, decision making skills, school facilities and organizational planning, teacher evaluation	School climate as measured by: Teachers' perceptions on a survey Student achievement as measured by: 4 th grade scores on state standardized assessments of reading.	Quantitative Pearson correlational analysis	The authors reported that each leadership task was positively correlated with school climate. The authors found that school climate was inversely related to low achievement, and positively related to high achievement but had no impact on students who met expectations. They found that principal interpersonal task was positively related to students exceeding expectations, and inversely related to students below expectations.
DiPaola, M. & Guy, S. (2009)	To determine if organizational justice had a relationship with social processes in the educational arena.	Theories of Justice Collegial Leadership Organizational Climate	36 high schools in a mid-Atlantic state 1,218 surveys completed by professional staff members	Leadership factors related to: School climate factors (collegial leadership, teacher professionalism, academic press, and community engagement) as measured by the School Climate Index	Organizational Justice measured by: The Organizational Justice Scale (Hoy & Tarter, 2004)	Quantitative Multiple regression analyses	The authors found that only collegial leadership had a significant effect on organizational justice. Additionally, they found that the strongest relationship in trust factors was between the trust in the principal and organizational justice.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Quantitative Methods	Findings
Gordon, M.F., & Louis, K.S. (2009)	To determine how leadership style affects principals' openness to community involvement and if this is related to student achievement.	Critical/ Postmodern Theories (power relationships) Democratic Leadership	260 Administrators 157 principals 103 vice principals 4,491 teachers	Trust as measured by: The Omnibus T-Scale Principal's openness to community involvement District support for community and parent involvement Perceptions of parent influence Principal survey Principal/Teacher Shared Leadership District and School Leadership Influence Teachers' perceptions of parent influence Teacher influence Teacher survey	Student achievement Student performance on statewide standardized assessments	Quantitative Principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation Stepwise linear regression Correlational Study	Leadership variables, (openness to community involvement, perceptions of parent influence, district support) did not influence student achievement. Principal personal behaviors and attitudes about parent involvement and community participation influenced the level of parent involvement in school decisions.
Greenlee, B., & Brown, J.J. (2009)	To investigate the leadership behaviors and incentives that were most effective in the retention of	Teacher Attrition	Convenience Sampling 97 teachers (77 female, 20 male; 56 elementary,	Principal leadership behaviors as evidenced by: Survey exploring teacher perceptions	Teacher retention as evidenced by: Survey exploring teacher perceptions of principal leadership	Quantitative Frequency percentages	The authors found that teachers wanted to stay in a challenging school if they were offered incentives like bonuses, or the autonomy and resources to create strong curriculum

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Quantitative Methods	Findings
	teachers in challenging schools.		23 middle, 13 high schools, and 3 vocational or alternative schools) enrolled in the Educational Leadership program at the University of South Florida	of principal leadership behaviors.	behaviors that would create an environment where they would want to stay.		innovations. They also found that principals who created a strong culture, and enhanced staff's desire and willingness to focus energy on achieving educational excellence were main factors in teachers' willingness to stay in challenging schools.
Williams, E. (2009)	To examine the relationships between teachers perceptions of school leadership and student achievement.	High-Stakes Accountability Effective principals Social Systems Theory	82 schools in a Georgia School District	Principal Leadership as measured by: A district created survey distributed to teachers	Student achievement as measured by: Scores of 4 th graders on the state standardized assessment in reading	Pearson product moment correlations Factor analysis Stepwise multiple regression analysis Structural equation model	The author concluded that leadership behaviors as perceived by the teachers are not related to student achievement, but they did find a strong relationship between teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional leadership skills and school climate. The author determined there was more relationship between student demographics and student behavior referrals than perceptions of leadership behaviors.
Grissom, J.A., & Harrington, J.R. (2010)	To examine teachers' perceptions' of principal performance as related to the	Principal Professional Development	37,960 teachers in 7,410 schools	Choice of Principal Professional Development as evidenced by: Principal responses	Teachers' Perceptions of Leader Effectiveness as evidenced by:	Quantitative Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression	The authors found that principals who participated in university course work and formal principal networks were rated lower in effectiveness as perceived

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Quantitative Methods	Findings
	professional development activities they chose to participate in.			to professional development questions on the SASS Administrator Questionnaire	Teacher responses as related to how the school is run on the SASS Teacher Questionnaire	Instrumental Variables (IV)	by teachers and as indicated by school performance. They found that principals who participated in formal mentoring or coaching programs were rated higher in effectiveness as perceived by teachers, and as indicated by school performance.
Heck, R. H., & Moriyama, K. (2010)	To examine relationships among elementary school contexts, leadership, instructional practices, and added-year outcomes.	Educational Effectiveness Research (EER) Leadership for Learning	25,173 4 th and 5 th grade students from a western US state in 198 different schools 4,152 teachers 7,948 parents	Leadership behaviors as evidenced by: Department of Education survey items reflecting school instructional practices from teachers, parents, and students Teacher responses to Collaborative leadership questions on DOE survey	School Performance as measured by: Principal response to the measure of school performance on the SASS. Student Achievement as evidenced by: Math and reading scores from state standardized tests Student age, SES, gender, and ELL status data	Multi-level Structural Equation Modeling Regression Discontinuity Approach	The authors found a significant relationship between principal leadership for learning behaviors and the facilitation of school improvement through building instructional practices in the schools. They found that stronger perceptions about leadership for learning were positively related to stronger views about the quality of instructional practices, which influenced added-year effects.
Hornig, E.L., Klasik, D., & Loeb, S. (2010)	To investigate what it is principals do, how they spend their time, and how variations in principals' actions	No discussion of theory	65 principals 41 high schools 12 elementary 12 middle	Principal's time spent on each of 43 tasks. Principals time in 5 locations End of day logs, and experience	Student achievement data across multiple years School environment	Quantitative Experience Sampling Methods Time Use	The tasks that principals spent their time on had an effect on different aspects of school outcomes.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Quantitative Methods	Findings
	are reflected in school outcomes.			sampling methods paired with observations done by researchers to eliminate the bias of self-reporting.	as measured by climate surveys of teachers and parents	Observations Descriptive Statistics Multi-variate statistical framework Quantitative	
Hughes, C., & Jones, D. (2010)	To examine the relationship between ethical training for elementary school principals and student performance.	Ethical Leadership Ethics/Morals Values/Judgments	Convenience sampling 111 principals in southern US state	Principal's Ethical Leadership training as measured by: A 29 item online survey	Student achievement as measured by: Principals' reporting of student achievement gains or losses on survey	Chi-Square Test	The authors found that there was a significant relationship between the principals' pre- and in-service ethics training and their reported gains in student achievement.
Louis, K.S., Dretzke, B., & Wahlstrom, K., (2010)	To investigate three different school leader behaviors and their impact on teachers' work with each other, classroom practices, and student achievement.	Instructional Leadership Shared Leadership	4,491 teachers (2005-06) 3,900 teachers (2008)	Principal leadership Teacher completed survey	Trust in principal Improved Instruction Survey with a focus on trust and improved measure of focused instruction Student Achievement School level scores on AYP Grade level information from state data bases	Quantitative Longitudinal Paired sample t tests Hierarchical Linear Modeling Structural Equation Modeling	Instructional leadership, shared leadership, and trust in the principal were positively related to student achievement when considered together.
Fancera, S.F., & Bliss, J.R. (2011)	To determine the relationship between instructional	Instructional Leadership Efficacy	53 New Jersey High Schools	Instructional Leadership Functions Measured by the	Collective Teacher Efficacy Measured by short version of Collective	Quantitative Descriptive statistics	None of the 10 Instructional Leadership functions positively influenced collective teacher efficacy.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Quantitative Methods	Findings
	leadership functions, socioeconomic status of students, and collective teacher efficacy.		Had an 11 th grade Included on 2007 NJ School Report Card rated by SES (low to high) 4 A schools 3 B schools 2 CD schools 10 DE schools 14 FG schools 8 GH schools 9 I schools 3 J schools 1,083 teachers Convenience sampling	Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS, Hallinger, n.d.) completed by teachers Socioeconomic Status ENROLL data on free and reduced lunches	Efficacy Scale Student Achievement Scores NJ High School Proficiency Assessment- Language Arts NJHS Proficiency Assessment-Math SAT Critical Reading SAT Math SAT Writing % of students in AP classes	Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients (r) Path analysis Correlational Study	CTE was not a variable that mediated the principal's influence on student achievement.
Grissom, J. (2011)	To examine the links between principal effectiveness and teacher turnover.	Economic Labor Market Model	30,690 teachers in 6,290 schools	Principal effectiveness Measured by responses on the Schools and Staffing Survey Teacher Questionnaire	Teacher satisfaction Teacher questionnaire with Likert scale responses Teacher turnover Principal designation as retrieved from Teacher Follow-up	Quantitative Summary statistics Descriptive statistics Regression analysis Ordinary least	Good principals have the potential to impact teacher turnover and job satisfaction.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Quantitative Methods	Findings
					Survey-1.	squares	
					Student Demographics Provided by SASS	Linear probability model	
Grissom, J. & Loeb, S. (2011)	To determine how principal efficacy varies across tasks, and does principal task efficacy predict key school outcomes, including student achievement scores. Also investigated the comparison between principal's self-reported scores and assistant principals' assessment.	Instructional Leadership	314 principals who were given the M-DCPS principal online survey	Principal Effectiveness Self-rated 42 job tasks on perceived effectiveness. Assistant principals also rated their principal on the same scale	Student Achievement School report card as reported by Florida administrative data which included letter grade and demographic information for the school Parent satisfaction reported by M-DCPS provided parent survey information.	Quantitative Exploratory factor analysis Ordinary Least Squares	Organization Management was positively related to school performance, teacher satisfaction and parent's assessments of school performance. Correlations between the principals' self-evaluation and the AP evaluation were not high.
Hallinger, P., & Heck, R.H. (2011)	To examine the relationships between leadership, academic improvement capacity, and student achievement.	Collaborative Leadership School Improvement Literature	Random sample of 193 elementary schools 13,391 3 rd graders were followed over 3 year period	Collaborative, Learning-Directed Leadership as measured by: A sub-scale of items reflecting teacher perceptions of school improvement, school governance, and resource management and	School improvement for academic capacity as measured by: Subscale items that indicated emphasis on standards and implementation, focused and sustained action on improvement, quality of student	Non-experimental, post hoc, longitudinal design Multi-level latent change analysis	The authors found that as collaborate, learning directed leadership strengthened, so did the academic capacity, and this also represented greater than average growth according to the math standardized test scores.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Quantitative Methods	Findings
				development	support, professional capacity of the school, school communication, stakeholder involvement, and student safety and well-being.		
					Student achievement as measured by: Performance on the math portion of the state standardized assessment.		
Hough, D.L., & Schmitt, V.L. (2011)	To examine the relationships between leadership, professional development, classroom management, climate, student achievement, attendance, and behavior in high poverty middle schools.	School Climate Balanced Leadership	30 high poverty schools where teachers had completed Developmental Design professional development training. 900 teachers surveyed	Leadership Behaviors derived from: School Climate and Leadership Index	School Climate, Professional Development: Surveys completed by teachers which measured: implementation and comfort with Developmental Design, including a follow up measure; School Climate and Leadership Index Student Attendance as measured by: School attendance records	Quantitative Bivariate correlations Multivariate analysis of covariance	The authors found that there was no statistically significant direct relationship between school climate or leadership and student achievement. They found that school climate had a marginally significant relationship with student behavior referrals and academic achievement. Schools where leadership was perceived as being supportive of the DD implementation saw positive relationships between this implementation and student achievement, higher attendance, and fewer behavior referrals.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Quantitative Methods	Findings
Ladd, H.F. (2011)	To examine the relationships between teachers' perceptions of the working environment and their intended and actual departures from schools.	Teacher turnover Teacher Work Environments Transformational Leadership	Teachers in North Carolina	Principals' role in working environment as evidenced by: Survey responses on statewide instrument measuring teacher perceptions of working environment.	School behavior /discipline records Student academic achievement on state standardized testing Teacher Retention and Attrition as evidenced by: Survey responses on statewide instrument measuring perceptions of intent to remain in teaching. Data on teachers actual departures from schools	Quantitative Exploratory factor analysis Full linear probability models	For teachers at all three levels (elementary, middle, and high school) school leadership had a large and statistically significant relationship with teachers' intentions to remain in a school. She found that teachers are more likely to leave schools where the perception of leadership is poor.
May, H., & Supovitz, J.A. (2011)	To determine how much time principals report spending on improving instruction, what the scope and frequency of these interactions are, how this time is related to teachers reported changes in instructional practices.	Instructional Leadership	51 schools 30 elementary 10 middle 8 high schools 3 alternative/special education	Time spent on instructional leadership Daily principal activity logs Instructional Leadership Self-reported by principal's daily logs Teacher report based on school-staff questionnaire	Instructional change 2 eight item scales from the teacher survey	Quantitative Multilevel Models Log-variance models Power of x models	Principals reported to spend only about 8% of their time in instructional leadership activities. Data suggested that the principal's activities were not strong predictors of school-wide change in instruction, but did have a positive relationship with change in individual teachers' change in instructional practice.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Quantitative Methods	Findings
Reardon, R.M. (2011)	This study examined the relationships between principals' perceptions of their learning-centered leadership and student achievement on standardized tests.	Instructional Leadership Learning-centered Leadership	31 elementary principals from a large school district in Virginia	Principal learning centered leadership as measured by: Principal self-perception measured on the VAL-ED instrument	Student achievement as evidenced by: State standardized reading assessments	Hierarchical multiple linear regression analyses	The author reported a direct relationship between principals' perceptions of their attention to rigorous curriculum and student achievement on reading tests in grade 3. The leadership characteristics of attention to rigorous curriculum and performance accountability were significantly related to performance on testing in grades 4 and 5.
Silva, J.P., White, G.P., & Yoshida, R.K. (2011)	To examine the direct effects of principal-student discussions on eighth grade students' gains in reading achievement.	Instructional Management Framework	20 students in experimental sample 21 students in control sample 1 principal and 2 assistant principals	Principal behavior Achievement based discussions with the principal	Student Achievement PSSA reading exam And a student survey administered after the experiment	Quantitative experimental design T test Descriptive statistics	Conversations with the principal had a positive relationship with the motivation and achievement gain of students.
Walker, J., & Slear, S. (2011)	To examine the impact of principal leadership behaviors on the efficacy of new and experienced middle school teachers.	Efficacy Instructional Leadership Transformational Leadership	366 middle school teachers From districts with a variation in urban, rural, suburban districts Variation in percentage of students	Principal behaviors measured by teacher responses to 11 principal behaviors	Teacher Efficacy measured by the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale	Quantitative Stepwise multiple linear regression model	Three principal behaviors seemed to influence teacher efficacy. These behaviors were modeling instructional expectations, communication, and providing contingent rewards. The first two are positive, and contingent rewards were negatively related. Different effects were found with teachers of varying levels of experience.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Quantitative Methods	Findings
			receiving free and reduced lunch				
			Random sampling within district				
Price, H. (2012)	To examine the direct effects that principals' attitudes have on teacher outcomes.	Organizational Culture Human Relations Theory	11,620 relationships calculated between elementary principals and teachers from SASS	Role of the Principal Schools and Staffing Survey	Teachers' Attitudes	Quantitative Structural Equation modeling Fixed effects linear regression modeling Quantitative	Principals' relationships with their staff improved teacher satisfaction, cohesion, and commitment.
Shen, J., Leslie, J.M., Spybrook, J.K., & Ma, X. (2012)	To determine how principal background and school processes were related to teacher job satisfaction	Teacher Job Satisfaction School Context School Process	7,670 principals 40,770 teachers	Principal Background as measured by: The Public School Principal Questionnaire portion of the SASS. School processes as measured by the Public School Questionnaire portion of the SASS	Teacher Job Satisfaction as measured by: The Public School Teacher Questionnaire portion of the SASS	Quantitative Two-level hierarchical linear model	The authors found that principals' tenure at a particular school site showed a positive relationship with teacher job satisfaction. Conversely, the principals' experience as a department head previous to principal appointment showed a negative relationship with teacher job satisfaction. The authors also found that school processes related to administrative support had significantly positive, small effects on teacher job satisfaction.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Quantitative Methods	Findings
---------	---------	----------------------	--------------	-----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------

Note. The bolded terms represent the independent and dependent variables followed by a description of data collection methods.

Table C2

Studies that Used Qualitative Case Study Methods

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
Coburn, C.E. (2001)	To explore the connection between actions by the principal and teacher leaders and the nature and content of teachers' sensemaking.	Institutional Theory Sense-Making Theory	Urban school in California involved in ongoing effort to improve reading instruction.	Principal actions related to teacher sensemaking as evidenced by: Observations of relevant meetings and professional development Semi-structured interviews with teachers, resource personnel, and principal Document collection of relevant items	Teacher sensemaking as evidenced by: Observations of relevant meetings and professional development Semi-structured interviews with teachers, resource personnel and principal Document collection of relevant items	Qualitative Case Study Sustained observation In-depth interviewing Document analysis Initial codes used to identify emergent themes NUDIST qualitative data analysis software Inductive codes through iterative coding Immersion in research site, systematic sampling of occasions, efforts to explore countervailing evidence, systematic coding	The conditions surrounding teacher conversation had an impact on the depth of their engagement and understanding. Specifically, the principal influenced where sensemaking happened, what messages were filtered and communicated to teachers regarding policies, active participation in understanding, and structuring collaboration in formal settings. These influences shaped the focus of teachers' understanding of new reform policies, and the decisions made by the principal around communication and professional development had a relationship with the instructional practices of teachers in their classrooms.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
Riester, A.F., Pursch, V., & Skrla, L. (2002)	To investigate the role of highly successful elementary school principals in their work to influence a more socially just school.	Leadership for social justice	6 public elementary schools in Texas 70% of students from low-income homes Schools achieved "recognized" or "exemplary" status by the state Special education identification rates were below 14.2% and passing rates on state tests was above 59.8% for these students Purposeful sampling	Role of the principal Open-ended questions during semi-structured interviews with the principals. Observations District and school document analysis Researcher reflexive journals	Social Justice demonstrated by high rates of literacy and low rates of special education placement.	of data, sharing findings with key informants and including their insights in analysis Qualitative Inductive data analysis Member checking Reflective conversations Peer de-briefing	Principals promoted a positive democratic culture, they adopted a prescriptive approach to literacy and academic success, and demonstrated stubborn persistence in achieving their goals.
Spillane, J.P., Diamond, J.B., Burch, P., Hallett, T.,	To investigate how principals make sense of and mediate	Sensemaking frame Institutional	3 schools in Chicago Had varying	Principal role in shaping understanding of accountability	Teachers' perceptions and understanding of accountability	Qualitative Observations	The authors reported that one principal utilized standardized achievement data to communicate

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
Jita, L., & Zoltners, J. (2002)	district accountability policy.	theories Political context	measures on aspects of improvement in student achievement, poverty level, and school improvement (academic press, professional community, instructional leadership, and academic productivity)	policy as evidenced by: Interviews with teachers in 2 nd and 5 th grade Interviews with principals Observations of grade-level meetings, faculty meetings, school improvement planning meetings, professional development workshops, supervisions of teaching practice, homeroom conversations, lunchroom conversations	policy as evidenced by: Interviews with teachers in 2 nd and 5 th grade Interviews with principals Observations of grade-level meetings, faculty meetings, school improvement planning meetings, professional development workshops, supervisions of teaching practice, homeroom conversations, lunchroom conversations	Semi-Structured interviews Video-tapes of leadership practices NUDIST qualitative data software	meaningfully with his staff and help them understand the relevance of district level reform policies. The principals' reputation and ability in "number crunching" served as a means for his staff to understand the importance of student data. A second principal struggled within the context of her newly appointed principalship,,and with legitimacy of authority. Principal beliefs, and teacher beliefs impacted the way teachers understood and worked through accountability policy. The third principal was reported to legitimize accountability policy and facilitate understanding through boosting teacher morale, providing support and instructional leadership, and utilizing pressures to improve instruction.
Youngs, P., & King, M.B. (2002)	To explore how principal leadership builds school capacity through professional development.	School Capacity Professional Development Principal Leadership	9 public elementary schools History of low student achievement	Principal behaviors Observations of professional development, interviews with	School capacity Observations of professional development, interviews with district and	Qualitative Summarization of field notes to address research questions	Principals created and sustained high levels of capacity by establishing trust, creating structures that promote teacher learning, and connecting faculties to external

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
			Demonstrated progress over 3-5 years prior to study Progress attributed to professional development Site based management Received PD assistance from external agencies	district and professional development staff as well as teachers and principals. Document analysis	professional development staff as well as teachers and principals. Document analysis	Individual and cross-case analysis	expertise or helping them to do so internally.
Pollard-Durodola, S. (2003)	To examine the characteristics of a school that were supported by research on effective schools for at-risk students	School Effectiveness	Purposeful sampling Wesley Elementary in Houston, TX	Principal Role in School Effectiveness as evidenced by: Interviews and biographical information from the principal, three teachers, and an educational consultant. Self-reflections from working at school	Effective School as evidenced by: Purposive sampling and Data collection of artifacts to gain knowledge of the outside view of the school. Personal knowledge of school effectiveness	Qualitative Case Study Triangulation of data Member checks by participants	The author reported that the principal at this school was known for his instructional leadership practices which included a presence on campus and in classrooms, his ability to mobilize people to help make positive change in student outcomes, his constant focus on student progress, and his ability to take risks.
Brown, K.M., Anfara, V.A., & Roney, K. (2004)	To determine plausible explanations for the difference in student achievement	Middle Level Theories Social Systems Theory	12 middle schools in Philadelphia, PA (6 high performing, 6 low	Leader Behaviors as evidenced by: Semi-structured interviews with 2 teachers from each	Student achievement as measured by: High performing achievement as	Qualitative multi-site case study Data analyzed through the framework of	The authors reported that both schools perceived collegial, democratic leadership from their principals. Principals in HPS were reported to be

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
	between high performing suburban middle schools and low performing suburban middle schools.	Organizational Climate/ Organizational Health	performing)	school)	documented by the state standardized tests Low performing achievement as documented by the state standardized tests	organizational health Triangulation of interviews, verbatim quotes, use of multiple researchers and coders, and audit trails.	collaborators in improving instruction, while LPS reported their principals' lack of time and availability for help with instructional matters. Principals' expectations at HPS were clearly articulated, focused on a bigger picture of improvement, while LPS principals were more focused on test results. Principals in LPS schools were found to provide less resources, but positively focused on more professional development. HPS principals were reported to provide more resources, but professional development was not highlighted.
Jesse, D., Davis, A., & Pokorny, N. (2004)	To examine the characteristics of high achieving middle schools that served Latino students in poverty.	Effective schools Effective Schools for Latino students	9 middle schools in Texas who were in the top 25% in terms of serving Latino students	Leader Behaviors as evidenced by: Interviews with principals and teachers Document analysis	Student Achievement as evidenced by: Schools with consistently high averages on the state standardized testing	Qualitative Case Study Coded based on ratings of school effectiveness from effective schools checklist, and variables scored by raters	The authors found that these high achieving schools had principals with differing leadership styles. What was common amongst the schools were leaders who coordinated activities of students and teachers toward focused goals, and leaders who supported a climate of mutual respect.
Ovando, M.N., & Cavazos, M. (2004)	To determine how high school principals use	Instructional Leadership	2 High Schools 80% of all	Leadership behavior	Student Achievement	Qualitative Multiple Case	Principals in these high performing schools used goal development to keep

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
	student performance goal development, shaping school culture, and instructional management to enhance the academic success of Hispanic students.		students in each subgroup must pass state tests Attendance 94% or higher Dropout rate of 3.5% or lower for all students and each subgroup Total enrollment of over 1,500 with 80% or more Hispanic 2 principals, 10 ten teachers Member of site based decision team, 2 parents	Extensive interviews with principals and teachers Direct observations Document analysis	Measured by state standardized testing	Study Transcript, document, field note analysis, coding, categorizing based on research questions Triangulation Cross-checks Peer de-briefing	a focus on student achievement. These principals also used support of teachers to influence school culture. Principals used instructional management techniques such as monitoring student performance, and relying on a leadership team to impact change.
Coburn, C.E. (2005)	To investigate the role of school leaders in making sense of new reading policies.	Cognitive approach to policy implementation Leaders as content experts Leaders as	Purposeful sampling 2 urban elementary schools in California Serve diverse populations with over 60% free and reduced lunch	Principals' impact on teachers' interpretation and enactment of policy as evidenced by: Interviews and observations	Teachers' perceptions of policy and enactment based on: Data from interviews and observations Teachers change	Qualitative Embedded, cross case design Initial codes identified emergent themes Used NUD*IST	The author found that principals' knowledge and beliefs about reading instruction impacted the ways they filtered and communicated policy messages, constructed meaning with teachers around policy messages, and the resources and

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
	organizational goals.		Purposeful sampling 7 Special Education teachers 14 general education teachers Three principals (1 elementary, 2 middle school)			Brainstorming Affinity Diagram Interrelationship Digraph Individual Interviews Participatory Interviews Document and Records Analysis	effectiveness of inclusive practice.
Tillman, L.C. (2005)	To examine leadership practices and teacher mentoring in an urban school context.	Teacher Mentoring Principal as Mentor Transformational Leadership	1 st year, African American teacher Mentor Principal	Principal Role in Mentoring as evidenced by: Individual Interviews Group interviews Reflective Journals on mentoring, teacher competence, teacher and principal expectations, leadership practice, and racial, cultural, and class issues in the urban school context.	Teacher perceptions of mentoring experience as evidenced by: Individual interviews Group Interviews Reflective journals	Qualitative Culturally congruent qualitative research methods Analysis with pre-determined and emergent themes Member checks with participants	The author found that the principal's lack of communication about expectations and school culture negatively affected the new teachers' feelings about her ability to improve her teaching practice.
Lambert, L. (2006)	To examine the relationships between high leadership capacity and	Leadership Capacity	15 schools (11 elementary, 1 middle, 3 high schools)	High Leadership Capacity as evidenced by: A set of open-ended	Student performance improvement as measured by:	Qualitative Case Studies Open-ended question	The author reported that as leadership capacity grew within each school, there was less dependence on the

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
	improved student performance, professional cultures, and shared leadership dynamics.		School principals, directors of initiatives, external coaches	questions inviting participants to describe the leadership capacities of their schools Two extensive conversations about leadership capacity	Performance evaluation and acting in response to anticipated student changes.	responses Interviews Member checking with participants	principal. The principals roles changed as they moved through transitional phases of leadership capacity as a school, and this adaptability allowed the school to create and sustain more distributed leadership
Sindelar, P.T., Shearer, D.K., Yendol-Hoppey, D., Liebert, T.W. (2006)	To examine the reasons for unsustainability of inclusive school reform in a previously successful middle school.	Sustainability	Socrates Middle School	Leadership impact on inclusive practices as evidenced by: Perceptions of factors impacting inclusion as documented in interviews with principals and teachers	Inclusive reform efforts as documented by interviews, site observations, and document analysis	Qualitative Case Study Rewriting, coding, and constant comparative analysis Member check of themes	The authors reported that a change in leadership priorities and a lack of commitment or knowledge of inclusive practices was one factor that led to the breakdown of previously successful inclusive practices within this school.
Easley, J. (2008)	To identify and explore factors and conditions of moral leadership that affected teacher retention for Alternative Route Certification teachers.	Moral Leadership Teacher Efficacy	11 fellows of the Mercy College New Teacher Residency Program (NTRP)	Moral leadership behaviors as evidenced by: Focus group with 11 fellows Responses to questions about the classroom-based, building level, district level, and personal factors that define what the authors classifies as “an environment of	Teacher Retention as evidenced by: Fellows indicated a strong desire to remain in teaching profession	Qualitative Constant comparative analysis Thematic analysis	The author found that the ARC teachers described moral leadership behaviors of respect for teachers, supportive relationships through dialogue, and focusing on the right things as themes that emerged from their data and impacted the teachers’ decisions to remain in the profession.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
Jacobson, S.I., Brooks, S., Giles, C., Johnson, L., & Ylimaki, R., (2007)	To investigate the leadership behaviors of principals who arrived at schools and subsequently had student achievement gains	Organizational complexity	3 high-poverty schools that showed increases in achievement after the arrival of a new principal 20% of teachers at each school 20% of support staff 3-5 parents from each school	fulfillment" Leadership behaviors Interviews with the principal, teachers, and support staff. Focus groups Parents, students Semi-structured interview protocol (International Successful School Principalship Project)	School Improvement NYSED reports cards and reports of school improvement Interviews Focus Groups Semi-structured interviews	Qualitative Case Study methodology Grounded theory	Principals who shared a clear vision for schools, reorganized structural and cultural aspects, and were visible in the community made positive improvements in their schools.
Johnson, L. (2007)	To examine the culturally responsive behaviors of principals in challenging schools.	Culturally Responsive School Leadership	3 schools from the International Successful School Principalship Project (ISSPP)	Culturally responsive principal behavior as evidenced by: Re-analysis of interviews with principals, teachers, staff, and parents Re-analysis of Observations and document collection	Parent perceptions of principals' leadership as evidenced by: Renalysis of interviews with parents	Qualitative Case Study Re-analysis through lens of culturally responsive leadership	The author found that principals worked to create a trusting environment in their schools that welcomed parents and community members. These principals also held high expectations for all students. There were critical pieces missing, such as a connection between home culture and school practices. The authors found that teachers reported an absence of patience, trust, trustworthiness, and active listening, which had
Wasonga, T.A., & Murphy, J.F. (2007)	To investigate teachers' perceptions about the practice of dispositions	Co-Creating Leadership	21 teachers identified as aspiring school leaders	Co-Creating Leadership behaviors as evidenced by:	Successful Co-Created Leadership as evidenced by:	Qualitative Inductive and deductive qualitative	

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
	necessary for co-creating leadership			Written responses to questions about the dispositions necessary for co-creating leadership	Written responses to questions regarding examples of successful and negative experiences with co-creating leadership	research methods Used literature to drive theory-driven evaluation of responses	a negative impact on school outcomes as perceived by the teachers. Participants noted the importance of all co-creating leadership dispositions identified by the authors, but gave salient examples of how the absence of these dispositions negatively affected co-created leadership in schools.
Youngs, P. (2007)	To examine how elementary principals' beliefs and actions influence new teachers' experiences.	Instructional Leadership	12 elementary principals 6 1 st year elementary teachers 6 2 nd year elementary teachers 12 mentor teachers 6 grade level colleagues of 2 nd year teachers From 3 varied districts in the same state, chosen because of variation in policies, student demographics, and induction practices.	Principal beliefs and actions Interviews with principals, beginning teachers, mentors, and other educators Observations of principals' meetings with new teachers, mentor-mentee meetings, and other induction activities.	Teachers' experiences Interviews and observations	Qualitative Case reports of principals Coding of case reports based on variables Triangulated with field notes	Through direct interactions with new teachers, principals can affect their sense of efficacy, professional growth, and intention to stay in teaching

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
Hipp, K.K., Huffman, J.B., Pankake, A.M., & Olivier, D.F. (2008)	The purpose was to document the ongoing development of two schools in becoming professional learning communities and the effects of meaningful collaboration on teacher learning.	Professional Learning Communities Change Theories	Purposeful sampling Two schools who were advanced in their development as professional learning communities (1 elementary, 1 middle)	Principal Role in PLC as evidenced by: 50 interviews with teachers, principals, assistant principals, support staff, and parents. Leadership Capacity School Survey (Lambert, 2003)	Progress toward implementation of Professional Learning Communities documented by: Staff responses to Professional Learning Community Assessment (Olivier et al., 2003); Revised School Culture Elements Questionnaire (Olivier, 2001); Teacher Efficacy Beliefs Scale-Collective Efficacy (Olivier, 2001); Leadership Capacity School Survey (Lambert, 2003)	Qualitative Case Stories of schools moving toward sustainable, improved practices.	The authors found that a focus on moral purpose, teamwork and shared responsibility, a collaborative and professional culture, and inclusive leadership were themes that arose between these two improving schools which provided illustrations of what principals can do to achieve sustainable PLCs.
Wynn, S.R., & Brown, K.M. (2008)	To investigate what beginning teachers valued in a school leader.	New Teacher Induction and Mentoring Professional Learning Communities	12 schools (8 elementary, 2 middle, 2 high schools) 61 beginning teachers	Leadership behaviors as evidenced by: Interviews with new teachers	Teacher Retention as measured by: Purposive sampling of schools with the lowest attrition rates in this district.	Qualitative Case Studies Semi-Structured interviews Constant Comparative analysis	The authors reported that beginning teachers valued collaboration, supportive conditions, supportive and shared leadership, shared norms and values, and de-privatization of practice all facilitated by their school leader.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
Brown, K.M., & Wynn, S.R. (2009)	To understand the leadership styles of twelve principals who led schools with low attrition and transfer rates.	Teacher Shortage Literature Teacher Turnover Literature Instructional Leadership	12 schools (8 elementary, 2 middle, 2 high schools) with the lowest attrition and transfer rates of beginning teachers.	Leadership styles of principals as evidenced by: Semi-structured interviews with 12 principals	Teacher Attrition and Transfer rates as evidenced by: Attrition and transfer rates between 0%-10% for elementary, 0%-20% middle, and 0%-15% for high school which represented a lower than average rate for the district (42%).	Triangulation of interview data, the presentation of verbatim quotes, the creation of an audit trail, and member checks were used. Qualitative Semi-Structured Interviews Constant Comparative Analysis Triangulation of interview notes, presentation of verbatim quotes, an audit trail, and member checks.	The authors reported that finding teachers who shared the same values with the school community, providing supports and needed resources, and being flexible and adaptable to the needs of the teachers affected retention rates.
Chance, P.L., & Segura, S.N. (2009)	To investigate a school that had developed a plan for school improvement and sustained its efforts.	Organization Development Transformational Leadership	Valley High School The school met criteria of purposefully developing a plan for improvement and had sustained the change.	Leader behavior Interviews with administrators, teachers, parents, and students on their perspectives of curriculum, instruction, decision making, change process, and stakeholder involvement.	Student Achievement Growth Sustained change as evidenced by 3 consecutive years of high achieving growth on standardized tests	Qualitative Case Study Semi-structured interviews Qualitative analysis which included coding to categorize and look for patterns	By putting in place structures for the teachers to collaborate and monitoring adult behavior, the school was able to focus on student learning and achieve both collaboration and student growth.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
			Purposeful sampling	Documents pertaining to school improvement process		Time-ordered matrix	
			Cross sections of teachers, students, and parents for interviews	Observations of various school events		Conceptually clustered matrix	
			At least: 1 teacher from each department 2 12 th grade students on student council 2 parents involved in booster clubs			Constant-comparative analysis produced a cognitive map	
Cooper, C.W. (2009)	To consider how educational leaders promoted equity-oriented reform that strengthens demographically changing school communities	Transformative Leadership for Social Justice Cultural Work	Purposeful sampling 2 schools in central North Carolina	Leadership Behavior as evidenced by: 36 semi-structured interviews (22 with educators and staff, 14 with parents) 10 ethnographic observations (parent-teacher group meetings, cultural festivals, faculty and leadership meetings)	Equity-Oriented Reform as evidenced by: Document collection (schools' student population, school-family policies, relationships with local church and civic agencies). Member checks with participants.	Comparative Case Study Iterative process to identify themes Triangulation of multiple data sources	The author found that principals bridged cultural divides by making culturally responsive decisions that connected the community with the schools. She also found that there were some disturbing gaps in principals' understanding of the cultural work required to create an environment where social justice and equity are realized.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
Finnigan, K.S., & Stewart, T.J. (2009)	To examine the leadership behaviors of principals in low-performing schools and how they impact school improvement.	Transformational Leadership Accountability Policy	10 low performing schools in Chicago that had been placed on probationary status 5 schools removed from probation 2 moved off probation within 2 years 4 remained on probation 1 was removed and replaced on probation Teachers, principals, assistant principals, probation managers, external partners, Local School Council members, parents, special education coordinators Purposeful sampling	Leadership behaviors Interviews Focus groups Observed classroom Collected relevant documents	School Improvement Interviews Focus Groups Observations Document Collection Schools movement through the probationary status	Qualitative Case Study Coding using the basis of transformational leadership and data driven codes Analysis with a priori and emerging codes. Checking and rechecking themes	Transformational leadership behaviors were rare in these schools, but more elements of transformational leadership were present in schools that moved through probationary status than those who remained stagnant.
Masumoto,	To investigate the	Transformation	3 high schools	Leadership	School	Qualitative	In all three schools, strong

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
M., & Brown-Welty, S. (2009)	contributions of leadership on student outcomes in high-performing, high-poverty schools.	al Leadership Distributed or Collaborative leadership Instructional leadership	in California 35% or more receiving free and reduced lunch or eligible for Title I funding Had met AYP for all subgroups Academic performance above the state average Graduation rates above average for 5 recent years Lower than average 4 year drop out rates Current principal for more than 1 year. Purposeful sampling 6 elementary schools, 1 middle school, 1 high school	behavior Interviews Document review Content analysis Observation	Climate/Culture Interviews Document review Content analysis Observation	Multiple case study approach Complex Cross-Case Comparative Analysis Constant Comparison Triangulation	contemporary leadership was prevalent, and multiple formal and informal linkages were made between school and community, as well as common contributors to school success such as clear focus on instruction, standards, and expectations, strong teachers, and multiple support systems for students with various needs.
Park, V., & Datnow, A. (2009)	To examine the leadership practices in schools implementing data-driven-decision making utilizing distributed	Distributed Leadership		Distributed Leadership Behaviors as evidenced by: Interviews with superintendent, assistant superintendent,	Student achievement as evidenced by: Status as recognized nationally for utilizing data-driven decision	Qualitative Multi-Site Case Studies Iterative coding and development of case reports	The authors found that leaders and leadership practices centered upon creating a climate dedicated to continuous improvement, building capacity through modeling and learning, distributing decision

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
	leadership.			principal, assistant principal, and a minimum of 5 teachers. Informal observations of school, classroom, and relevant meetings	making and evidence of student growth as measured by standardized testing	Cross site analysis	making practices, and distributing best practices through knowledge brokering.
Burch, P., Theoharis, G., Rauscher, E. (2010)	To uncover patterns in principal perceptions, decisions and actions related to Class Size Reduction (CSR) as a reform measure. To investigate teacher experiences and views related to principal actions and the CSR reform.	Importance of Principal to Instructional Change The Role of Sense-Making in Policy Implementation	9 high poverty schools Participating in the Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) program in Wisconsin for 4 years 3 rural, 2 semiurban, and 4 urban schools 3 high achieving, 3 rapidly improving, and 3 low achieving schools	Document analysis Principal Role in implementing CSR as evidenced by: Interviews with principals and teachers. 8 half day observations in 3 different classrooms within each school. (39 teachers observed in 27 classrooms)	Student Achievement as measured by: 3 high-achieving schools as measured by 75% proficiency on reading and math standardized tests for 4 years. 3 rapidly improving schools that showed growth of 25% or more over past 3-4 years. 3 low achieving schools that consistently had below 60% proficiency. Implementation of	Qualitative Development of coding categories based on theoretical literature Thematic analysis	The authors found that principals had varying approaches to CSR which was related to their achievement profile. Principals who maximized the use of space through creative problem solving, integrated inclusive services through smaller class sizes, and provided proactive staff development on CSR issues sustained achievement gains of their students within the context of reform.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
Ramahlo, E.M., Garza, E., & Merchant, B. (2010)	To examine principals who sustained high levels of achievement in challenging contexts.	Instructional Leadership	2 principals, 11 teachers, 12 parents, and 11 students representing 2 schools in an urban city Texas High concentration of Hispanic students	Leadership Behaviors as evidenced by: Fact-Finding Questionnaire One-on-one interviews Group interviews	CSR Practices as evidenced by: Interview data Observations Artifacts collected were lesson plans, written principal-teacher communication, assessment instruments and staff development plans. Closing Achievement Gap as evidenced by: Schools identified as Academically Acceptable or above as noted by achievement on standardized testing Schools had more than 75% identified as economically disadvantaged Principals identified as successful leaders by their	Qualitative Exploratory case study design	The authors found that principals demonstrated strong leadership with high expectations for student achieved through restructured curriculum design, employment of qualified and trained personnel, and an emphasis on sustaining a positive school culture.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
Rinke, C., & Valli, L. (2010)	To understand the delivery of school based professional development in a high stakes accountability context.	High-Stake Accountability Professional Development School Context	3 schools serving large numbers of low-income students with high numbers of English Language Learners Focus on 4 th and 5 th grade Schools were at varying degrees of risk for meeting 2004-2005 AYP status	Principals' role in mediating high stakes accountability policy as evidenced by: Interviews with principals, math and reading specialists, staff development teachers, ESL teachers, Special Educators, Observations at grade-level, professional development, school improvement, and who staff meetings. Artifact Collection of professional development materials, lesson plans, student worksheets, and school policies	professional peers Teachers' opportunity to learn from professional development activities as evidenced by: Data collection and analysis	Qualitative Case Study Coding using NVivo Within-case analyses Cross-case analyses	The authors found that the school principals' dispositions towards professional development played a key role in the participation and implementation of professional development at their school site and was related to student achievement.
Theoharis, G. (2010)	To explore the aspects of school leadership that promote social justice and are linked to the outcome of a more just school.	Critical Theory Social Justice	6 principals 2 elementary 2 middle school 2 high school Principals had to:	Leadership behaviors Interviews with principals and school staff, detailed field log observations,	Socially Just School School outcomes as evidenced by interviews, field log, observations, document analysis,	Qualitative Positioned subject approach Constant-comparison	Principals used strategies to disrupt injustice in the areas of school structures that marginalized and segregated students, de-professionalized teaching staff, disconnected with the community, low-

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
			Lead a public school Demonstrate a belief in social justice Demonstrate advocacy behaviors Provide evidence to show social just outcomes in their school	document analysis, Group interview with all principals	and reported gains in achievement.	Data triangulation	income families, and families of color, and disparate and low student achievement.
Howley, A., Howley, M., Camper, C., & Perko, H. (2011)	To explore the conditions that supported and constrained place-based education in an isolated rural community.	Place-Based Education Environmental Education Community Survival	Purposeful and snowball sampling Island Community School located on a northeastern US island with 340 residents	Leadership Behavior as evidenced by: Interviews (staff and students) Observations of site, classrooms, informal gatherings Document analysis	Sustained Place Based Education as evidenced by: School sites where PBE was a central focus Nominations by professional peers	Qualitative Case Studies Analyzed to allow for emergent themes related to research questions Triangulation of data through revisiting of field notes, interview transcripts, and evidence to support themes.	The principal described his attempt to change the school culture and adopt PBE through behaviors such as being responsive to teachers' ideas and solutions to problems, identifying and supporting teacher leaders who were experts in PBE, providing resources to programs to help move school in the right direction, and being willing and able to explain and justify the school program to community members.
Huggins, K.S., Scheurich, J.J., & Morgan,	To explore how a professional learning	Organizational Learning	1 Urban high school in the southwest of	Principal Role in PLC:	Implementation of PLC as evidenced by:	Qualitative Case Study	The authors reported that the principals' instructional leadership

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
J.R. (2011)	community was utilized as a reform effort to increase student achievement in math.	Professional Learning Communities	US	Observations of PLC meetings and classroom teaching Document collection Individual interviews with 9 participants (3 leaders, 6 teachers)	School personnel's desire to change and improve the outcomes of students' achievement on standardized tests. Administration's dedication to reform. Student achievement data from standardized tests in math	Constant comparative analysis Trustworthiness addressed through prolonged engagement, thick description, use of an audit trail, and peer debriefing	and involvement in instructional processes, the implementation of structures that also increased pressure for teachers to administer specific lesson cycles, offering support through the structures of PLCs and specifically by the principal, increasing both individual and public accountability, and increasing collaboration impacted the school's ability to implement PLCs in a manner that improved teacher and student learning. The author noted the increase in student achievement scores after the implementation of this reform effort.
Johnson, J.F., Uline, C.L., & Perez, L.G. (2011)	To examine what expert principals noticed about classroom instruction in high achieving urban schools.	Instructional Leadership Noticing	14 principals from schools that received the National Excellence in Urban Education Award from 2008-2010 9 elementary, 2 middle, and 3 high schools	Principal Noticing Behaviors as evidenced by: Interviews of principals	Student Achievement and School factors as evidenced by: High populations of minority students Schools where students who were English Language Learners or students with	Qualitative Interview Study Coding to identify themes Triangulated with conversation amongst researchers and data from site visit	Principals in these schools consistently mentioned a focus on student engagement, student learning, and student understanding. Classroom climate, and the extent to which teacher behavior influenced student engagement and understanding were of prime importance.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
Rhodes, V., Stevens, D., & Hemmings, A. (2011)	To present a narrative account of how a school culture supporting STEM education developed in a new high school.	School Culture	The principal, and teacher Staff who participated in Faculty Writing Group	Principal actions as evidenced by: Documents created during the Faculty Writing Group	disabilities achieved at least 75% of the proficiency rate for the rest of the population Large percentage of students (over 50%) qualified for free/reduced lunch programs Attendance rates over 92%, graduation rates over 70%	Qualitative First-hand narrative Multiple voices-principal and teacher	The authors reported that through the use of democratic leadership practices that valued teacher teams, teachers were empowered as instructional leaders and policy makers. A strong school culture was created through joint problem solving and collaborative team-building efforts that helped them forge a common vision.
Sanzo, K.L., Sherman, W.H., & Clayton, J. (2011)	To examine the leadership practices of highly successful middle school principals and how they facilitate student	Accountability	5 male principals 5 female principals (middle school)	Successful principals Criteria: Those who met the Commonwealth of Virginia accreditation	Schools meeting AYP status	Qualitative Open coding, constant comparison Category	Themes of practice found in the data were shared leadership, facilitating professional development, leading with an instructional orientation, and acting openly and

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
	achievement.			standards, those whose school met the federal NCLB standards, and those who were in at least their third year as principal. Leadership behaviors as determined by: Interviews with principals		saturation Matrix development	honestly to impact student achievement.
Stillman, J. (2011)	To examine the factors that impacted equity-minded teachers in navigating accountability-driven language arts reforms, and specific barriers that impeded teachers' ability to meet the needs of marginalized students.	Equity-Minded Teachers School Change Social Learning and Activity Theories	3 elementary teachers (equity-minded, highly qualified, with a Bilingual Cross-Cultural, Language, and Academic Development credential) California	Leadership factors impacting teacher perception of accountability reforms as evidenced by: Interviews Document collection	Teachers' perceptions of accountability reforms as evidenced by: Interviews and classroom observations	Qualitative Multiple Case Study Design Constant comparative method Triangulation through focused observations, member checking, and participant-observer role	The author found that a variety of principal behaviors mediated teachers' perceptions of reform policies. Three different leadership styles and dedication to different ideals impacted the teachers in drastically different ways, leading the author to conclude that leadership behaviors, actions, and beliefs had an impact on how teachers' navigated reform policies.
Waldron, N.L., McLesky, J., & Redd, L. (2011)	To examine the role of the principal in developing an effective, inclusive school.	Transformational Leadership Change Theories	Creekside Elementary Principal 480 students 50% high poverty 16% Special	Transformational leadership Interviews with principal, teachers, observing in classrooms, analyzing documents.	Successful Inclusion Student Accountability Data that indicate level of achievement and inclusion	Qualitative Case Study Four-step analytic process Triangulation and prolonged	Five important themes emerged that were setting the direction, redesigning the organization, improving working conditions, providing high-quality instruction in all settings, and use data to drive decision making.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
			education			engagement	
Youngs, P., Holdgreve-Resendez, R.T., & Qian, H. (2011)	To examine how instructional program coherence impacted new teachers' induction experiences.	Instructional Program Coherence	Critical Case Sampling 7 elementary general education teachers in Michigan	Principals' role in instructional program coherence as evidenced by: Interviews with teachers	New teacher induction experience as evidenced by: Interviews with teachers	Qualitative Case Study Semi-structured and Structured Interviews nVivo07 used to code based on induction literature	The authors found that principals who were very involved in the instructional aspects of literacy instruction were supportive and provided important feedback to enhance the learning of new teachers. Teachers struggled when they were provided unclear feedback, or suggestions focused only on classroom management and behavior instead of instructional issues. Principals also impacted the quality of new teacher experiences by providing clear goals and resources for achieving those goals. The author found that the principal of this school which was conscious of and choosing change processes related to PLCs cited instructional leadership behaviors, providing resources, creating schedules to honor teachers' time, and creating excitement and dedication to learning initiatives as reasons for
Hollingworth, L. (2012)	To determine the role of the principal in supporting professional learning communities and the use of formative assessments.	Professional Learning Communities Assessment for Learning	A Midwestern high school	Principal Role in PLC Interviews with principals, teachers Artifacts from meetings Student classroom assessments Analysis of	School implementation of PLCs called Building Leadership Teams as evidenced by: Interview data from teachers, principals, artifacts from meetings, and assessment data were analyzed.	Qualitative Case Study Triangulation of multiple sources of data	

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
				leadership behaviors within this data	Observations of team meetings and classroom instruction and assessment Faculty wide survey regarding openness to systems change		sustained professional learning communities and learning with regard to formative assessments.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
White, R.B., Polly, D., & Audette, R.H. (2012)	To investigate the critical features and contextual issues related to the implementation of Response to Intervention.	Response to Intervention	15 participants (School leadership team (principal, 2 assistant principals, speech therapist, school psychologist, guidance counselor, 2 special education teachers, 2 general education teachers) 5 participants from district office) Elementary School in North Carolina 955 students K-5	Principal role in implementation as evidenced by: Unstructured interviews with all participants	RTI Implementation as evidenced by: School's request to be the pilot site for the district	Qualitative Descriptive Case Study Design Unstructured interviews Open-coding of interview transcripts Inter-rater reliability conducted through coding meetings Time-ordered matrix of themes Member checks	The principal focused on obtaining buy-in through the introduction of this new reform effort and made it clear this was a part of the school's mission to reach all learners. The principal and assistant principals monitored student data weekly to provide support and keep abreast of issues arising with students. The principal was committed, and a community of trust and respect was in place before the implementation of the reform, and this led to a smoother transition. The principal communicated a deep belief in this reform and allowed teachers to take the lead but remained involved in the entire process.

Note. The bolded terms represent the phenomenon investigated in the studies followed by a description of the data collection methods.

Table C3

Study that Utilized Qualitative Grounded Theory Method

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Data Analysis Methods	Findings
Blase, J. & Blase, J. (2002)	To discover how teachers define abuse by principals and how these behaviors affect them, if they do.	<p>"Boss Abuse" Theories</p> <p>Symbolic Interactionism</p> <p>Organizational Justice</p> <p>Psychological and Stress Literature</p>	<p>50 teachers</p> <p>5 male</p> <p>45 female</p> <p>Snowball sampling</p>	<p>Principal's acts of abuse</p> <p>Interviews with teachers</p>	<p>Teacher mistreatment</p> <p>Interviews</p>	<p>Qualitative</p> <p>Grounded Theory</p> <p>Open-ended theoretical and methodological perspective to create a model constructed from the phenomenon under investigation</p>	<p>Teachers suffered varying levels of mistreatment from principals in the workplace that had varying degrees of effect on them psychologically and physically.</p>

Note. The bolded terms represent the phenomena investigated in the study followed by a description of data collection methods.

Table C4

Study that Utilized Qualitative Auto-Ethnography

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Methods Used	Findings
Pepper, K., & Thomas, L.H. (2002)	To determine the effects of the leadership role on school climate.	Transformational Leadership	1 Principal	Leadership behaviors as evidenced by: Personal journals	School climate change as evidenced by: Personal journals	Qualitative Auto-ethnography	The principal achieved positive change as evidenced by a decrease in discipline referrals and teacher complaints, as well as increase in student test scores (3%) by changing from authoritative leadership style to transformative leadership style.
Slobodzian, J.T. (2009)	To explore the factors that impacted the exclusion and inclusion of students who are deaf.	Symbolic Interactionism	20 non-deaf students 2 deaf students 1 General education teacher 1 resource teacher Support personnel	Leadership Impact as determined by: Observations and interviews	Inclusion/Exclusion of students who are deaf as evidenced by: Observations and interviews	Qualitative Ethnography Comparative research design	The author reported a strong disconnect between the vision communicated by the principal and the supportive behaviors that would help make this vision a reality. The leadership was noted as absent, disconnected, and not involved in the activities of the school and this impacted the preparation, ability, and instructional capacity of teachers serving students who are deaf.
Ylimaki, R.M. (2012)	To examine how recent political shifts affected the meaning of	Cultural Political Movements and Reform	4 principals identified as being aware of current politics	Leadership Identities and Practices	Curriculum Focus Study begun immediately after the	Critical Ethnographic Study	The author found that principals negotiated new identities that she categorized as 'new

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Phenomenon Investigated	Outcomes of Interest	Qualitative Methods Used	Findings
	curriculum leadership in schools.	Curriculum Theories	related to curriculum	Observed and interviewed principals, teachers, students, and parents over a 4-year period	passage of NCLB with a focus on how this policy context impacted leadership in schools.	Thick descriptions	professional' or 'critical curriculum leadership'. She found that through these differing identities, principals chose areas of focus in their schools that impacted the curriculum and delivery of instruction as well as teacher and student morale. The author also noted that although there were two competing identities within the schools, all four made improvements to a proficient status by the end of the four years of the study.
		Instructional Leadership	2 men (1 white and 1 African America)	Observations of classrooms and curriculum meetings		Intensive naturalistic observations	
		Distributed Leadership	2 women (1 white and 1 African American)	Document collection of curriculum maps, school board meetings, community meetings, newspaper articles		Participant member checking throughout process	
		Instructional Leadership for Social Justice	represented urban, suburban and rural communities			Reconstructive analysis	
		Critical Theory				Semi-structured interviews	

Note. The bolded terms represent the phenomena investigated in the study followed by a description of data collection methods.

Table C5

Studies that Used Mixed Methods

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measure	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Marks, H.M., & Printy, S.M. (2003)	To investigate the relationship between transformational leadership and shared instructional leadership and school restructuring. To determine the effect of transformational and shared instructional leadership on school performance.	Instructional Leadership Shared Instructional Leadership Transformational Leadership	24 schools 8 elementary, middle, and high schools	Leadership behavior Formal interview with principal and a principal surrogate (teacher or team) Observations of principals in meetings and around the school. Teacher interviews	Pedagogical quality determined by teacher survey about instructional practices, professional activities, and perceptions of school and its organization. Observation of governance and professional meetings Document analysis of student work samples and teacher assessment of this work. Student academic achievement. Standardized test scores	Mixed Methods Scatterplot analysis ANOVA Hierarchical Linear Modeling Coding of qualitative data	In the lowest achieving schools, principals were more likely to be authoritative and have central control. Transformational leadership did not imply instructional leadership. The presence of integrated leadership had a positive relationship with quality pedagogy and high student achievement.
Zimmerman, S., & Deckert-Pelton, M. (2003)	To investigate teachers' perceptions of principals in the teacher evaluation process.	Teacher Evaluation Human Relations Theory	86 students in the Educational Leadership program at University of West Florida	Principal role in evaluations as evidenced by: Responses to the Professional Appraisal Systems	Teacher Evaluation as evidenced by: Responses to the Professional Appraisal Systems	Mixed Methods Survey Constant Comparison	The authors found that teachers wanted principals' to set aside time for interaction around evaluation to provide constructive feedback to inform their

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measure	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
		Democratic Leadership	All taught in k-12	Survey	Survey	Analysis Thematic coding Hypothesis creation based on data Frequency Percentages	teaching practices. Levels of this interaction varied among respondents, but impacted their classroom instructional practices. The teachers expressed concerns about the consistency of evaluation measures in their schools and within their district. Teachers viewed their principals as important collaborators in improving their classroom practice and noted that commitment to evaluation was important. They also commented on the importance of principals' knowledge in both instructional practice and evaluative skill as indicators of effective leadership tied to their ability to use the evaluation process to improve teaching practices.
Eilers, A.M., & Camacho, A. (2007)	To tell a story about how a principal can achieve school-level change.	Social Systems Context Approach	Whitman Elementary 3 years not meeting AYP K-5 350 students	Principal behavior Classroom Observations of first, third and fifth grade teachers Observations of grade-level team	School culture Measured by a teacher survey about communities of practice, collaborative leadership and evidence-based	Mixed Methods Case Study Case-Oriented methods	The principal's focus on utilizing resources and creating a school culture that was focused on student success led to sustainable change.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measure	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
			90% Free and reduced lunch 49% ELL 10% Special Education 32 Classroom Teachers New principal due to AYP status	meetings and staff meetings Observations of school and district administrative meetings Structured interviews, and focus groups with teachers, and district staff	practice Documents relating to professional development, district communication, and within school communication Student Achievement Scores Collected from district website School conditions and teacher experience Collected from state and district website Intervention Action	Survey	
McGhee, M.W., & Lew, C. (2007)	To explore how the perceptions of teachers regarding principal support for and understanding of effective writing instruction impacted their actions and interventions	Instructional leadership Literacy Leadership	169 teachers who attended the statewide writing conference	Literacy Leadership Principal's Support for Writing Instrument given to teachers in a statewide writing conference	as determined by the PSWI	Mixed Methods Structural Equation Modeling Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS) Mann-Whitney U Test	Leadership knowledge about literacy affected interventions employed in the schools of teachers surveyed.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measure	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Daly, A.J. (2009)	To examine the threat-rigid responses of school staff in response to NCLB and the role principals played in mitigating these responses.	Sanction as a Policy Lever Threat-Rigid Response Trust Balanced Leadership	252 teachers in eight schools in Year 2 Program Improvement (PI) schools (4 elementary, 4 middle) 201 teachers in 6 schools not under any PI status (3 elementary, 3 middle) 53 site administrators (principals, assistant principals)	Leadership measured by a 47 item leadership scale Interviews with principals Trust as measured by a 27 item Trust Scale Focus groups with teachers	Threat-rigid responses as measured by a 20 item Threat Rigidity Scale	Exploratory Factor Analysis Qualitatively analyzed comments from the open ended section of the survey. Two-Phase Mixed Methods Design Phase 1-Cross sectional survey approach ANOVA Multiple linear regression models Phase 2- Qualitative focus groups and interviews used to supplement initial findings Constant	The author found moderate to strong correlations between all factors within the Leadership Scale and threat rigid responses. He put forth that leadership has a significant negative correlation with threat-rigidity, and a positive correlation with trust. Specifically, empowerment and involvement were facets of leadership behavior that had independent impacts on threat-rigid responses, and this was further supported by the focus group and interview data.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measure	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Graczewski, C., Knudson, J., & Holtzman, D.J. (2009)	Did the approach of the principal and the leadership team foster a clear and coherent vision for the school's approach to professional development?	Instructional Leadership	Case Study 9 SDCS Elementary Schools (San Diego) participating in site-based leadership reform Principal, Assistant principal, peer coaches, and at least 12 teachers from each school Survey 49 Elementary schools in SDCS	Principal Instructional Leadership Interviews with principal and teachers Observations of principal leadership	Teacher perceptions of coherent and relevant professional development Teacher survey Observations of professional development Interviews with teachers	comparative analysis Check and recheck of emergent themes Mixed methods Case Studies Regression analysis	The survey data and the qualitative data both supported the positive relationship between the principal fostering and communicating a clear, coherent vision and the coherence and relevance of the professional development at the school.
Matsumura, L.C., Sartoris, M., Bickel, D.D., & Garnier, H.E. (2009)	To investigate the role of the principal in teacher's participation in literacy coaching activities.	Instructional Leadership Coaching theories	29 schools 15 principals 11 coaches 106 teachers	Leadership behavior Interviews with principals and coaches	Participation in coaching activities Pre and post teacher survey on work with the coach Frequency of	Mixed Methods Longitudinal Inductive approach to	Principals demonstrated support for coaches by giving them professional autonomy. Significant correlations were found between principal support and teacher participation

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measure	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
					engagement with different coaching activities	categorize data Correlational analyses	in two coaching activities.
Bickmore, D.J., & Bickmore, S.T. (2010)	To examine the effectiveness of two middle school induction programs through the perceptions of teachers, mentor teachers, and principals	Teacher Induction Literature School Climate	27 teachers, 16 mentors, and 2 principals representing two middle schools similar in demographic composition	Leaders' role in induction program as evidenced by: Responses on survey items Interviews with principals, mentors, and teachers	Teacher induction experience as evidenced by: Teacher surveys given to inductees and mentors that outlined their feelings about the induction program	Mixed Methods ANOVA (survey items) Qualitative coded and themes based on chain of concepts Member checking with most participants	The authors reported that participants felt that administrators contributed most to the personal needs of new teachers, specifically competence, autonomy, and respect needs. Administrators were viewed as the most influential in developing and maintaining a positive school climate. The authors also found that new and experienced teachers held a positive view of school leadership that was collegial in nature and provided positive working conditions to support school climate, thus affecting the success of the induction programs through individual interactions, and supporting teacher autonomy. Principals in SG schools had a focus on
Brown, K.M., Benkovitz, J.,	How are schools of excellence	Academic Optimism	24 schools	Principal behavior	Systemic Equity "Honor Schools of	Mixed Methods	Principals in SG schools had a focus on

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measure	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Muttillio, A.J., & Urban, T. (2011)	promoting and supporting both academic excellence and systemic equity for all students?	(Academic Emphasis and Collective Efficacy, Faculty Trust)	12 schools with large achievement gaps of more than 15% between white and minority students (LG) 12 schools with small achievement gaps of less than 15% between white and minority students (SG) Purposeful sampling 5 participants from 8 LG and 8 SG schools (80 interviews) Principal Assistant Principal 2 teachers 1 parent	Interviews with parents, teachers, principals, with the principal as the unit of analysis	Excellence” awards set these schools apart as well as equity audit demographic information.	Quantitative data to categorize schools as SG or LG Template Analysis Interpretive Zone A priori and iterative category development	recognizing, encouraging, and celebrating academic achievement, closely monitoring teaching and learning by offering instructional feedback and support, and expecting excellence from each and every student.
Marx, S., & Larson, L.L. (2012)	To investigate the changes a principal made in response to a previous research	Critical Race Theory	Random sampling Secondary School 825 surveys to students	Change in leadership behaviors Surveys completed	School Climate Survey on impressions of latino/a students.	Mixed Methods Qualitative narrative	By taking positive action to include minority students and change school culture, a positive outcome for school

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measure	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
	project that positively impacted school climate for latino/a students and families.		26 teacher/administrator surveys	by teachers, administrators, students	Survey to students on impressions of school climate	Comparison of survey results pre and post	climate can be realized.

Note. The bolded terms represent the variables or focus investigated in the study followed by a description of the data collection methods.

Appendix D

Studies utilizing student achievement data from standardized tests

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Pepper, K., & Thomas, L.H. (2002)	To determine the effects of the leadership role on school climate.	Transformational Leadership	1 Principal	Leadership behaviors as evidenced by: Personal journals	School climate change and student achievement as evidenced by: Personal journals	Auto-ethnography	As evidenced by a decrease in discipline referrals and teacher complaints, as well as increase in student test scores (3%) by changing from authoritative leadership style to transformative leadership style.
Riester, A.F., Pursch, V., & Skrla, L. (2002)	To investigate the role of highly successful elementary school principals in their work to influence a more socially just school.	Leadership for social justice	6 public elementary schools in Texas 70% of students from low-income homes Schools achieved "recognized" or "exemplary" status by the state Special education identification rates were below 14.2% and passing rates on state tests was above 59.8% for these students Purposeful	Role of the principal Open-ended questions during semi-structured interviews with the principals. Observations District and school document analysis Researcher reflexive journals	Social Justice demonstrated by high rates of literacy and low rates of special education placement.	Inductive data analysis Member checking	Principals promoted a positive democratic culture, they adopted a prescriptive approach to literacy and academic success, and demonstrated stubborn persistence in achieving their goals.

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
			sampling				
Spillane, J.P., Diamond, J.B., Burch, P., Hallett, T., Jita, L., & Zoltners, J. (2002)	To investigate how principals make sense of and mediate district accountability policy.	Sensemaking frame Institutional theories Political context	3 schools in Chicago Had varying measures on aspects of improvement in student achievement, poverty level, and school improvement (academic press, professional community, instructional leadership, and academic productivity)	Principal role in shaping understanding of accountability policy as evidenced by: Interviews with teachers in 2 nd and 5 th grade Interviews with principals Observations of grade-level meetings, faculty meetings, school improvement planning meetings, professional development workshops, supervisions of teaching practice, homeroom conversations, lunchroom conversations	Teachers' perceptions and understanding of accountability policy as evidenced by: Interviews with teachers in 2 nd and 5 th grade Interviews with principals Observations of grade-level meetings, faculty meetings, school improvement planning meetings, professional development workshops, supervisions of teaching practice, homeroom conversations, lunchroom conversations	Qualitative Observations Semi-Structured interviews Video-tapes of leadership practices NUDIST qualitative data software	The authors reported that one principal utilized standardized achievement data to communicate meaningfully with his staff and help them understand the relevance of district level reform policies. The principals' reputation and ability in "number crunching" served as a means for his staff to understand the importance of student data. A second principal struggled within the context of her newly appointed principalship, and with legitimacy of authority. Principal beliefs, and teacher beliefs impacted the way teachers understood and worked through accountability policy. The third principal was reported to legitimize accountability policy and facilitate understanding through boosting teacher morale, providing support and instructional leadership, and utilizing pressures to improve instruction.
Youngs, P., & King, M.B. (2002)	To explore how principal leadership builds school capacity through	School Capacity Professional Development Principal Leadership	9 public elementary schools Large	Observations of professional development, interviews with district and	Observations of professional development, interviews with district and	Qualitative methods	Principals can create and sustain high levels of capacity by establishing trust, creating structures that promote teacher learning, and connecting faculties

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
	professional development.		populations of low income students with histories of low achievement Shown improvement in student achievement over past 3-5 years Progress attributed to professional development Site-based management Received PD support from outside agencies	professional development staff as well as teachers and principals. Document analysis	professional development staff as well as teachers and principals. Document analysis		to external expertise or helping them to do so internally.
Egley, R. (2003)	This study explored the relationships between professionally and personally inviting leadership behaviors of principals on teacher job satisfaction, principal effectiveness,	Invitational Educational Theory Effective Schools Research	283 high school teachers in Mississippi who returned surveys	Professionally and personally inviting leadership behaviors as evidenced by: Teacher responses to the Leadership Survey Instrument (Asbill, 1994)	Teacher Job Satisfaction Principal effectiveness Principal as agent of school improvement all measured by: Teacher responses to the Leadership	Quantitative Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient analysis	The author found that a statistically significant relationship existed between teachers' perceptions of principals' personal and professional inviting leadership behaviors and each of the variables in their hypothesis that address the 5 areas of focus in the purpose of the study.

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
	principal as agent of school improvement, principal's invitational quotient, and the computed accreditation performance index of the school district.				Survey Instrument (Asbill, 1994)		
Marks, H.M., & Printy, S.M. (2003)	To investigate the relationship between transformational leadership and shared instructional leadership and school restructuring. To determine the effect of transformational and shared instructional leadership on school performance.	Instructional Leadership Shared Instructional Leadership Transformational Leadership	24 schools 8 elementary, middle, and high schools	Leadership behavior Formal interview with principal and a principal surrogate (teacher or team) Observations of principals in meetings and around the school. Teacher interviews	Pedagogical quality determined by teacher survey about instructional practices, professional activities, and perceptions of school and its organization. Observation of governance and professional meetings Document analysis of student work samples and teacher assessment of this work.	Mixed Methods Scatterplot analysis ANOVA Linear Modeling Coding of qualitative data	In the lowest achieving schools, principals were more likely to be authoritative and have central control. Transformational leadership does not imply instructional leadership. The presence of integrated leadership had a positive relationship with quality pedagogy and high student achievement.
					Accreditation Performance Index of School as measured by student achievement scores Student academic achievement. Standardized test scores		

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Pollard-Durodola, S. (2003)	To examine the characteristics of a school that were supported by research on effective schools for at-risk students	School Effectiveness	Wesley Elementary in Houston, TX	Principal Role in School Effectiveness as evidenced by: Interviews and biographical information from the principal, three teachers, and an educational consultant. Self-reflections from working at school	Effective School as evidenced by: Purposive sampling and Data collection of artifacts to gain knowledge of the outside view of the school. Personal knowledge of school effectiveness Documentation of student growth on state mandated assessments	Qualitative Case Study Triangulation of data Member checks by participants	The author reported that the principal at this school was known for his instructional leadership practices which included a presence on campus and in classrooms, his ability to mobilize people to help make positive change in student outcomes, his constant focus on student progress, and his ability to take risks.
Brown, K.M., Anfara, V.A., & Roney, K. (2004)	To determine plausible explanations for the difference in student achievement between high performing suburban middle schools and low performing suburban middle schools.	Middle Level Theories Social Systems Theory Organizational Climate/ Organizational Health	12 middle schools in Philadelphia, PA (6 high performing, 6 low performing)	Leader Behaviors as evidenced by: Semi-structured interviews with 2 teachers from each school)	Student achievement as measured by: High performing achievement as documented by the state standardized tests Low performing achievement as documented by the state standardized tests	Qualitative multi-site case study Data analyzed through the framework of organizational health Triangulation of interviews, verbatim quotes, use of multiple researchers and coders, and audit	The authors reported that both schools perceived collegial, democratic leadership from their principals. Principals in HPS were reported to be collaborators in improving instruction, while LPS reported their principals' lack of time and availability for help with instructional matters. Principals' expectations at HPS were clearly articulated, focused on a bigger picture of improvement, while LPS principals were more focused on test results. Principals in LPS schools were found to provide less resources, but positively focused on more professional

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Griffith, J. (2004)	Do components of transformational leadership impact job satisfaction and therefore turnover rate for teachers?	Transformational Leadership	3,291 school staff 25,087 students from 117 elementary schools	Transformational Leadership Behavior Three components of transformational leadership on the survey	Teacher job satisfaction Three survey items that indicated job satisfaction Staff turnover determined by archival records at district Organizational performance determined by student achievement data. Student survey responses	Structural Equation Modeling Hierarchical linear modeling	development. HPS principals were reported to provide more resources, but professional development was not highlighted. Transformational leadership was directly related to job satisfaction, and indirectly related through this variable to school staff turnover and organizational performance.
Jesse, D., Davis, A., & Pokorny, N. (2004)	To examine the characteristics of high achieving middle schools that served Latino students in poverty.	Effective schools Effective Schools for Latino students	9 middle schools in Texas who were in the top 25% in terms of serving Latino students	Leader Behaviors as evidenced by: Interviews with principals and teachers Document analysis	Student Achievement as evidenced by: Schools with consistently high averages on the state standardized testing	Qualitative Case Study Coded based on ratings of school effectiveness from effective schools checklist, and variables scored by raters Multiple Case Study	The authors found that these high achieving schools had principals with differing leadership styles. What was common amongst the schools were leaders who coordinated activities of students and teachers toward focused goals, and leaders who supported a climate of mutual respect.
Ovando, M.N., & Cavazos,	To determine how high school principals use	Instructional Leadership	2 High Schools 80% of all	Leadership behavior	Student Achievement	Multiple Case Study	Principals in these high performing schools used goal development to keep a focus on

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
M. (2004)	student performance goal development, shaping school culture, and instructional management to enhance the academic success of Hispanic students.		students in each subgroup must pass state tests Attendance 94% or higher Dropout rate of 3.5% or lower for all students and each subgroup Total enrollment of over 1,500 with 80% or more Hispanic 2 principals, 10 ten teachers Member of site based decision team, 2 parents Purposeful sampling 708 teachers (3 rd , 4 th , 5 th grade) from 30 school districts in Florida	Extensive interviews with principals and teachers Direct observations Document analysis	Measured by state standardized testing	Transcript, document, field note analysis, coding, categorizing based on research questions	student achievement. These principals also used support of teachers to influence school culture. Principals also used instructional management techniques such as monitoring student performance, and relying on a leadership team .
Egley, R. J. & Jones, B.D. (2005)	To examine the relationship between principals' perceived personally and professionally inviting leadership behaviors and teacher job	Invitational Leadership		Personally and Professionally Inviting Leadership Behaviors as evidenced by: 12 item questionnaire that addressed	Teacher rating of job satisfaction Teacher rating of school climate School grade given based on: FCAT standardized	Quantitative Descriptive Statistics t-tests ANOVA	The authors put forth that teachers reported that principals demonstrated high levels of personally and professionally inviting behaviors that were correlated with their job satisfaction, perception of school climate, and rating based on standardized test scores of students.

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
	satisfaction, school climate, and accountability status of schools			teacher perceptions of principals' personally and professionally inviting leadership behaviors.	testing scores.		
O'Donnell, R.J., & White, G.P. (2005)	To determine the relationship between instructional leadership behaviors and student achievement.	Instructional Leadership	325 middle level educators 75 principals 250 8 th grade English and math teachers	Instructional leadership behaviors Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS, Hallinger, n.d.)	Student Achievement measured by the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment	Multivariate regression analysis	Teachers' perceptions of their leaders promoting positive school learning climate was positively related to student achievement scores.
McGuigan, L., & Hoy, W.K. (2006)	To investigate the school structures that assisted in achieving academic optimism.	Academic Optimism	40 Elementary schools in Ohio	Principals' role in: Enabling school bureaucracy, as measured by the Enabling School Structure Form (ESS) (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000)	Academic emphasis comprised of: Collective efficacy, faculty trust in students and parents Academic optimism as measured by: Responses to a subscale of the Organizational Health Inventory, a short version of the collective efficacy scale	Quantitative Principal Axis Factor Analysis Multiple regression used to test hypothesized path model	The authors found that principals' enabling bureaucracy behaviors positively impacted teachers' collective efficacy and academic optimism. Academic optimism, in turn, had a positive effect on student achievement.

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Eilers, A.M., & Camacho, A. (2007)	To tell a story about how a principal can achieve school-level change.	Social Systems Context Approach	Whitman Elementary	<p>Principal behavior</p> <p>Classroom Observations of first, third and fifth grade teachers</p> <p>Observations of grade-level team meetings and staff meetings</p> <p>Observations of school and district administrative meetings</p> <p>Structured interviews, and focus groups with teachers, and district staff</p>	<p>(Goddard et al., 2000), and a short version of the Omnibus Trust Scale (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003)</p> <p>School Achievement as measured by proficiency on state standardized assessments</p> <p>School culture Measured by a survey about communities of practice, collaborative leadership and evidence-based practice</p> <p>Documents relating to professional development, district communication, and within school communication</p> <p>Student Achievement Scores Collected from district website</p>	Mixed Methods Case Study Case-Oriented methods Survey	By utilizing resources, staying focused on creating a school culture that was focused on

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Jacobson, S.I., Brooks, S., Giles, C., Johnson, L., & Ylimaki, R., (2007)	To investigate the leadership behaviors of principals who arrived at schools and subsequently had student achievement gains	Organizational complexity	3 high-poverty schools that showed increases in achievement after the arrival of a new principal 20% of teachers at each school 20% of support staff 3-5 parents from each school	Leadership behaviors Interviews with the principal, teachers, and support staff. Focus groups Parents, students Semi-structured interview protocol (International Successful School Principalship Project)	School conditions and teacher experience Collected from state and district website School Improvement NYSED reports cards and reports of school improvement Interviews Focus Groups Semi-structured interviews	Grounded theory	Principals who share a clear vision for schools, reorganize structural and cultural aspects, and are visible in the community can make positive improvements in their schools.
Hipp, K.K., Huffman, J.B., Pankake, A.M., & Olivier, D.F. (2008)	The purpose was to document the ongoing development of two schools in becoming professional learning communities and the effects of meaningful collaboration on teacher learning.	Professional Learning Communities Change Theories	Two schools who were advanced in their development as professional learning communities (1 elementary, high student achievement on state standardized tests, 1 middle	Principal Role in PLC as evidenced by: 50 interviews with teachers, principals, assistant principals, support staff, and parents. Leadership Capacity School	Progress toward implementation of Professional Learning Communities documented by: Staff responses to Professional Learning Community Assessment (Olivier et al., 2003); Revised	Qualitative Case Stories of schools moving toward sustainable, improved practices.	The authors found that a focus on moral purpose, teamwork and shared responsibility, a collaborative and professional culture, and inclusive leadership were themes that arose between these two improving schools which provided illustrations of what principals can do to achieve sustainable PLCs.

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
			school with growth as measured by state standardized tests)	Survey (Lambert, 2003)	School Culture Elements Questionnaire (Olivier, 2001); Teacher Efficacy Beliefs Scale-Collective Efficacy (Olivier, 2001); Leadership Capacity School Survey (Lambert, 2003)		
Styron, R.A., & Nyman, T.R. (2008)	To examine the differences in school health and climate, organizational structures, and instructional practices between high performing and low performing middle schools.	School Climate Organizational Structures Instructional Practices	283 teachers (171 from high performing, 112 from low performing middle schools)	Principals' role in: Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire for Middle Schools Measures included questions identifying principal behavior as supportive behavior, directive behavior, and restrictive behavior. Organizational Health Inventory for Middle Schools describes institutional	Student achievement as evidenced by: Designation of high performing and low performing schools as measured by state standardized assessments	Quantitative Comparative Analysis Multivariate analysis of variance Follow up analysis of variance	The authors found that there were lower directive principal behaviors in high-achieving middle schools. They also found that principal influence, the ability to gain support from district office, was scored lower in high achieving schools.

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Twigg, N. (2008)	To determine the effects of leadership on perceived organizational support, organization based self-esteem, organizational citizenship behaviors, and student achievement.	Transformational Leadership	31 principals 363 faculty	integrity, collegial leadership, principal influence, resource support, teacher affiliation, and academic emphasis. Transformational leadership as measured by the MLQ Form 5X Short	Perceived organizational support as measured by a 15 item scale Organization based self-esteem as measured by 10 item scale Organizational citizenship behaviors as measured by the Skarlicki and Latham (1996) scale Student Achievement	Statistical models	Transformational leaders increase supportive behavior because they foster a covenantal relationship between administration and teachers. This style of leadership was inconsequential in affecting citizenship behaviors and student performance.
Williams, E., Persaud, G., & Turner, T. (2008)	To explore the relationships between teachers' perceptions of leadership performance, school climate, and student achievement.	Social Systems Theory	81 schools in Georgia	Principal leadership as measured by: Teacher responses on Instructional planning, interpersonal skills, decision making skills, school facilities	School climate as measured by: Teachers' perceptions on a survey Student achievement as measured by: 4 th grade scores on	Quantitative Pearson correlational analysis	The authors reported that each leadership task was positively correlated with school climate. The authors found that school climate was inversely related to low achievement, and positively related to high achievement but had no impact on students who met expectations. They found that principal interpersonal task was positively related to students exceeding expectations, and

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Chance, P.L., & Segura, S.N. (2009)	To investigate a school that had developed a plan for school improvement and sustained its efforts.	Organization Development Transformational Leadership	Valley High School The school met criteria of purposefully developing a plan for improvement and had sustained the change. Purposeful sampling Cross sections of teachers, students, and parents for interviews At least: 1 teacher from each department 2 12 th grade students on student council 2 parents involved in booster clubs Purposeful	and organizational planning, teacher evaluation Leader behavior Interviews with administrators, teachers, parents, and students on their perspectives of curriculum, instruction, decision making, change process, and stakeholder involvement. Documents pertaining to school improvement process Observations of various school events	state standardized assessments of reading. Student Achievement Growth Sustained change as evidenced by 3 consecutive years of high achieving growth on standardized tests	Case Study Semi-structured interviews Qualitative analysis which included coding to categorize and look for patterns Time-ordered matrix Conceptually clustered matrix Constant-comparative analysis produced a cognitive map	inversely related to students below expectations. By putting in place structures for the teachers to collaborate and monitoring adult behavior, the school was able to focus on student learning and achieve both collaboration and student growth.

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
			sampling				
Daly, A.J. (2009)	To examine the threat-rigid responses of school staff in response to NCLB and the role principals played in mitigating these responses.	Sanction as a Policy Lever Threat-Rigid Response Trust Balanced Leadership	252 teachers in eight schools in Year 2 Program Improvement (PI) schools (4 elementary, 4 middle) 201 teachers in 6 schools not under any PI status (3 elementary, 3 middle) 53 site administrators (principals, assistant principals)	Leadership measured by a 47 item leadership scale Interviews with principals Trust as measured by a 27 item Trust Scale Focus groups with teachers	Threat-rigid responses as measured by a 20 item Threat Rigidity Scale	Two-Phase Mixed Methods Design Phase 1-Cross sectional survey approach ANOVA Multiple linear regression models Phase 2- Qualitative focus groups and interviews used to supplement initial findings Constant comparative analysis Check and recheck of emergent themes Case Study	The author found moderate to strong correlations between all factors within the Leadership Scale and threat rigid responses. He put forth that leadership had a significant negative correlation with threat-rigidity, and a positive correlation with trust. Specifically, empowerment and involvement were facets of leadership behavior that had independent impacts on threat-rigid responses, and this was further supported by the focus group and interview data.
Finnigan, K.S., & Stewart,	To examine the leadership behaviors of	Transformational Leadership	10 low performing schools in	Leadership behaviors	School Improvement		Transformational leadership behaviors were rare in these schools, but more elements of

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
T.J. (2009)	principals in low-performing schools and how they impact school improvement.	Accountability Policy	Chicago that had been placed on probationary status 5 schools removed from probation 2 moved off probation within 2 years 4 remained on probation 1 was removed and replaced on probation Teachers, principals, assistant principals, probation managers, external partners, Local School Council members, parents, special education coordinators	Interviews Focus groups Observed classroom Collected relevant documents	Interviews Focus Groups Observations Document Collection Schools movement through the probationary status	Coding using the basis of transformational leadership and data driven codes	transformational leadership were present in schools that moved through probationary status than those who remained stagnant.
Gordon, M.F., & Louis, K.S. (2009)	To determine how leadership style affects principals' openness to	Critical/Postmodern Theories (power relationships)	260 Administrators 157 principals	Principal's openness to community involvement	Student achievement Student	Stepwise linear regression	Leadership variables, (openness to community involvement, perceptions of parent influence, district support) do not influence

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
	community involvement and if this is related to student achievement.	Democratic Leadership	103 vice principals 4,491 teachers	District support for community and parent involvement Perceptions of parent influence Principal survey Principal/Teacher Shared Leadership District and School Leadership Influence Teachers' perceptions of parent influence Teacher influence	performance on statewide standardized assessments		student achievement. Principal personal behaviors and attitudes about parent involvement and community participation influence the level of parent involvement in school decisions.
Masumoto, M., & Brown-Welty, S. (2009)	To investigate the contributions of leadership on student outcomes in high-performing, high-poverty schools.	Transformational Leadership Distributed or Collaborative leadership Instructional leadership	3 high schools in California 35% or more receiving free and reduced lunch or eligible for Title I funding Had met AYP	Teacher survey Leadership behavior Interviews Document review Content analysis Observation	School Climate/Culture Interviews Document review Content analysis Observation	Multiple case study approach Complex Cross-Case Comparative Analysis Constant	In all three schools, strong contemporary leadership was prevalent, and multiple formal and informal linkages were made between school and community, as well as common contributors to school success such as clear focus on instruction, standards, and expectations, strong teachers, and multiple support

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
			for all subgroups Academic performance above the state average Graduation rates above average for 5 recent years Lower than average 4 year drop out rates Current principal for more than 1 year.			Comparison Triangulation	systems for students with various needs.
Park, V., & Datnow, A. (2009)	To examine the leadership practices in schools implementing data-driven decision making utilizing distributed leadership.	Distributed Leadership	Purposeful sampling 6 elementary schools, 1 middle school, 1 high school	Distributed Leadership Behaviors as evidenced by: Interviews with superintendent, assistant superintendent, principal, assistant principal, and a minimum of 5 teachers. Informal observations of school, classroom,	Student achievement as evidenced by: Status as recognized nationally for utilizing data-driven decision making and evidence of student growth as measured by standardized testing	Qualitative Multi-Site Case Studies Iterative coding and development of case reports Cross site analysis	The authors found that leaders and leadership practices centered upon creating a climate dedicated to continuous improvement, building capacity through modeling and learning, distributing decision making practices, and distributing best practices through knowledge brokering.

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
				and relevant meetings			
Williams, E. (2009)	To examine the relationships between teachers perceptions of school leadership and student achievement.	High-Stakes Accountability Effective principals Social Systems Theory	82 schools in a Georgia School District	Document analysis Principal Leadership as measured by: A district created survey distributed to teachers	Student achievement as measured by: Scores of 4 th graders on the state standardized assessment in reading Student Behavior Referrals Student demographic information	Pearson product moment correlations Factor analysis Stepwise multiple regression analysis Structural equation model	The author concluded that leadership behaviors as perceived by the teachers are not related to student achievement, but found a strong relationship between teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional leadership skills and school climate. The author determined there was more relationship between student demographics and student behavior referrals than perceptions of leadership behaviors.
Burch, P., Theoharis, G., Rauscher, E. (2010)	To uncover patterns in principal perceptions, decisions and actions related to Class Size Reduction (CSR) as a reform measure. To investigate teacher experiences and views related to principal actions and the CSR reform.	Importance of Principal to Instructional Change The Role of Sense-Making in Policy Implementation	9 high poverty schools Participating in the Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) program in Wisconsin for 4 years 3 rural, 2 semiurban, and 4 urban schools	Principal Role in implementing CSR as evidenced by: Interviews with principals and teachers. 8 half day observations in 3 different classrooms within each school. (39 teachers observed in 27	School Climate Student Achievement as measured by: 3 high-achieving schools as measured by 75% proficiency on reading and math standardized tests for 4 years. 3 rapidly improving schools that showed growth of 25% or	Qualitative Development of coding categories based on theoretical literature Thematic analysis	The authors found that principals had varying approaches to CSR which was related to their achievement profile. Principals who maximized the use of space through creative problem solving, integrated inclusive services through smaller class sizes, and provided proactive staff development on CSR issues sustained achievement gains of their students within the context of reform.

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
			3 high achieving, 3 rapidly improving, and 3 low achieving schools	classrooms)	more over past 3-4 years. 3 low achieving schools that consistently had below 60% proficiency. Implementation of CSR Practices as evidenced by: Interview data Observations Artifacts collected were lesson plans, written principal-teacher communication, assessment instruments and staff development plans.		
Grissom, J.A., & Harrington, J.R. (2010)	To examine teachers' perceptions' of principal performance as related to the professional development activities they chose to participate in.	Principal Professional Development	37,960 teachers in 7,410 schools	Choice of Principal Professional Development as evidenced by: Principal responses to professional development questions on the SASS	Teachers' Perceptions of Leader Effectiveness as evidenced by: Teacher responses as related to how the school is run on the SASS Teacher Questionnaire	Quantitative Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression Instrumental Variables (IV)	The authors found that principals who participated in university course work and formal principal networks were rated lower in effectiveness as perceived by teachers and as indicated by school performance. They found that principals who participated in formal mentoring or coaching programs were rated higher in effectiveness as perceived by teachers, and as indicated by

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
				Administrator Questionnaire	School Performance as measured by: Principal response to the measure of school performance on the SASS.		school performance.
Heck, R. H., & Moriyama, K. (2010)	To examine relationships among elementary school contexts, leadership, instructional practices, and added-year outcomes.	Educational Effectiveness Research (EER) Leadership for Learning	25,173 4 th and 5 th grade students from a western US state in 198 different schools 4,152 teachers 7,948 parents	Leadership behaviors as evidenced by: Department of Education survey items reflecting school instructional practices from teachers, parents, and students Teacher responses to Collaborative leadership questions on DOE survey	Student achievement as evidenced by: Math and reading scores from state standardized tests Student age, SES, gender, and ELL status data	Multi-level Structural Equation Modeling Regression Discontinuity Approach	The authors found a significant relationship between principal leadership for learning behaviors and the facilitation of school improvement through building instructional practices in the schools. They found that stronger perceptions about leadership for learning were positively related to stronger views about the quality of instructional practices, which influenced added-year effects.
Hornig, E.L., Klasik, D., & Loeb, S. (2010)	To investigate what it is principals do, how they spend their time, and how variations in principals' actions are reflected in school outcomes.	No discussion of theory	65 principals 41 high schools 12 elementary 12 middle	Principal's time spent on each of 43 tasks. Principals time in 5 locations End of day logs, and experience sampling methods paired	Student achievement data across multiple years School environment	Experience Sampling Methods Time Use Observations Multi-variate statistical	Principals spent most of their time on administrative tasks, and appeared to spend the least amount of time on instructional tasks. They spend most of their time in their office or the main office, and a small percentage of time in classrooms. Schools with the lowest rating according to the

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
				with observations done by researchers to eliminate the bias of self-reporting.	as measured by climate surveys of teachers and parents	framework	state accountability system had principals who spent the most time on administrative tasks. Schools with higher grades had principals who spent more time on day-to-day instruction tasks. Principals time spent on organizational management was positively related to teacher assessments of the school. Internal relations activities were positively related to teacher satisfaction, and organization management is positively related to parents' assessments of the school.
Hughes, C., & Jones, D. (2010)	To examine the relationship between ethical training for elementary school principals and student performance.	Ethical Leadership Ethics/Morals Values/Judgments	Convenience sampling 111 principals in southern US state	Principal's Ethical Leadership training as measured by: A 29 item online survey	Student achievement as measured by: Principals' reporting of student achievement gains or losses on survey	Quantitative Chi-Square Test	The authors found that there was a significant relationship between the principals' pre- and in-service ethics training and their reported gains in student achievement.
Louis, K.S., Dretzke, B., & Wahlstrom, K., (2010)	To investigate three different school leader behaviors and their impact on teachers' work with each other, classroom practices, and student achievement.	Instructional Leadership Shared Leadership	4,491 teachers (2005-06) 3,900 teachers (2008)	Principal leadership Teacher completed survey	Trust in principal Improved Instruction Survey with a focus on trust and improved measure of focused instruction Student Achievement School level scores	Structural Equation Modeling	Instructional leadership, shared leadership, and trust in the principal are positively related to student achievement when considered together.

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Ramahlo, E.M., Garza, E., & Merchant, B. (2010)	To examine principals who sustained high levels of achievement in challenging contexts.	Instructional Leadership	2 principals, 11 teachers, 12 parents, and 11 students representing 2 schools in an urban city Texas High concentration of Hispanic students	Leadership Behaviors as evidenced by: Fact-Finding Questionnaire One-on-one interviews Group interviews	on AYP Grade level information from state data bases Closing Achievement Gap as evidenced by: Schools identified as Academically Acceptable or above as noted by achievement on standardized testing Schools had more than 75% identified as economically disadvantaged Principals identified as successful leaders by their professional peers	Qualitative Exploratory case study design	The authors found that principals demonstrated strong leadership with high expectations for student achieved through restructured curriculum design, employment of qualified and trained personnel, and an emphasis on sustaining a positive school culture.
Rinke, C., & Valli, L. (2010)	To understand the delivery of school based professional development in a high stakes accountability context.	High-Stake Accountability Professional Development School Context	3 schools serving large numbers of low-income students with high numbers of English Language Learners Focus on 4 th	Principals' role in mediating high stakes accountability policy as evidenced by: Interviews with principals, math and reading specialists, staff	Teachers' opportunity to learn from professional development activities as evidenced by: Data collection and analysis	Qualitative Case Study Coding using NVivo Within-case analyses Cross-case	The authors found that the school principals' dispositions towards professional development played a key role in the participation and implementation of professional development at their school site and was related to student achievement.

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
			and 5 th grade Schools were at varying degrees of risk for meeting 2004-2005 AYP status	development teachers, ESL teachers, Special Educators, Observations at grade-level, professional development, school improvement, and who staff meetings. Artifact Collection of professional development materials, lesson plans, student worksheets, and school policies		analyses	
Brown, K.M., Benkovitz, J., Muttillio, A.J., & Urban, T. (2011)	How are schools of excellence promoting and supporting both academic excellence and systemic equity for all students?	Academic Optimism (Academic Emphasis and Collective Efficacy, Faculty Trust)	24 schools 12 schools with large achievement gaps of more than 15% between white and minority students (LG) 12 schools with small achievement gaps of less than 15% between white	Principal behavior Interviews with parents, teachers, principals, with the principal as the unit of analysis	LG and SG schools "Honor Schools of Excellence" awards set these schools apart as well as equity audit demographic information.	Mixed Methods Quantitative data to categorize schools as SG or LG Template Analysis Interpretive Zone A priori and iterative	Principals in SG schools had a focus on recognizing, encouraging, and celebrating academic achievement, closely monitoring teaching and learning by offering instructional feedback and support, and expecting excellence from each and every student.

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
			and minority students (SG)			category development	
			Purposeful sampling				
			5 participants from 8 LG and 8 SG schools (80 interviews)				
			Principal Assistant Principal 2 teachers 1 parent				
			Random sampling				
Fancera, S.F., & Bliss, J.R. (2011)	To determine the relationship between instructional leadership functions, socioeconomic status of students, and collective teacher efficacy.	Instructional Leadership Efficacy	53 New Jersey High Schools Had an 11 th grade Included on 2007 NJ School Report Card rated by SES (low to high)	Instructional Leadership Functions Measured by the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS, Hallinger, n.d.) completed by teachers Socioeconomic Status ENROLL data on free and reduced lunches	Collective Teacher Efficacy Measured by short version of Collective Efficacy Scale Student Achievement Scores NJ High School Proficiency Assessment- Language Arts NJHS Proficiency Assessment-Math SAT Critical Reading	Descriptive statistics Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients (r) Path analysis	None of the 10 Instructional Leadership functions positively influenced collective teacher efficacy. CTE is not a variable that can mediate the principal's influence on student achievement.

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Grissom, J. & Loeb, S. (2011)	To determine how principal efficacy varies across tasks, and does principal task efficacy predict key school outcomes, including student achievement scores. Also investigated the comparison between principal's self-reported scores and assistant principals' assessment.	Instructional Leadership	1,083 teachers Convenience sampling 314 principals who were given the M-DCPS principal online survey	Principal Effectiveness Self-rated 42 job tasks on perceived effectiveness. Assistant principals also rated their principal on the same scale	SAT Math SAT Writing % of students in AP classes Student Achievement School report card as reported by Florida administrative data which included letter grade and demographic information for the school Parent satisfaction reported by M-DCPS provided parent survey information.	Exploratory factor analysis Ordinary Least Squares	*No important differences were noted in the self-reported data of elementary, middle, and high schools Organization Management is positively related to school performance, teacher satisfaction and parent's assessments of school performance. Correlations between the principals self-evaluation and the AP evaluation are not high.
Hallinger, P., & Heck, R.H. (2011)	To examine the relationships between leadership, academic improvement capacity, and student achievement.	Collaborative Leadership School Improvement Literature	Random sample of 193 elementary schools 13,391 3 rd graders were followed over 3 year period	Collaborative, Learning-Directed Leadership as measured by: A sub-scale of items reflecting teacher perceptions of school	School improvement for academic capacity as measured by: Subscale items that indicate emphasis on standards and implementation, focused and	Quantitative Non-experimental, post hoc, longitudinal design Multi-level latent change analysis	The authors found that as collaborative, learning directed leadership strengthened, so did the academic capacity, and this also represented greater than average growth according to the math standardized test scores.

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
				improvement, school governance, and resource management and development	sustained action on improvement, quality of student support, professional capacity of the school, school communication, stakeholder involvement, and student safety and well-being.		
					Student achievement as measured by: Performance on the math portion of the state standardized assessment.		
Hough, D.L., & Schmitt, V.L. (2011)	To examine the relationships between leadership, professional development, classroom management, climate, student achievement, attendance, and behavior in high poverty middle schools.	School Climate Balanced Leadership	30 high poverty schools where teachers had completed Developmental Design professional development training. 900 teachers surveyed	Leadership Behaviors derived from: School Climate and Leadership Index	School Climate, Professional Development: Surveys completed by teachers which measured: implementation and comfort with Developmental Design, including a follow up measure; School Climate and Leadership Index	Quantitative Bivariate correlations Multivariate analysis of covariance	The authors found that there was no statistically significant direct relationship between school climate or leadership and student achievement. They found that school climate had a marginally significant relationship with student behavior referrals and academic achievement. Schools where leadership was perceived as being supportive of the DD implementation saw positive relationships between this implementation and student achievement, higher attendance, and fewer behavior referrals.

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Huggins, K.S., Scheurich, J.J., & Morgan, J.R. (2011)	To explore how a professional learning community was utilized as a reform effort to increase student achievement in math.	Organizational Learning Professional Learning Communities	1 Urban high school in the southwest of US	Principal Role in PLC: Observations of PLC meetings and classroom teaching Document collection Individual interviews with 9 participants (3 leaders, 6 teachers)	Attendance as measured by: School attendance records School behavior/discipline records Student academic achievement on state standardized testing Implementation of PLC as evidenced by: School personnel's desire to change and improve the outcomes of students' achievement on standardized tests. Administration's dedication to reform. Student achievement data from standardized tests in math Student achievement as evidenced by: High populations of minority	Qualitative Case Study Constant comparative analysis Trustworthiness addressed through prolonged engagement, thick description, use of an audit trail, and peer debriefing Qualitative Interview Study Coding to	The authors reported that the principals' instructional leadership and involvement in instructional processes, the implementation of structures that also increased pressure for teachers to administer specific lesson cycles, offering support through the structures of PLCs and specifically by the principal, increasing both individual and public accountability, and increasing collaboration impacted the school's ability to implement PLCs in a manner that improved teacher and student learning. The author noted the increase in student achievement scores after the implementation of this reform effort. Principals in these schools consistently mentioned a focus on student engagement, student learning, and student understanding. Classroom climate, and the extent to which
Johnson, J.F., Uline, C.L., & Perez, L.G. (2011)	To examine what expert principals noticed about classroom instruction in high achieving urban	Instructional Leadership Noticing	14 principals from schools that received the National Excellence in Urban	Principals' expert noticing behaviors as evidenced by: Interviews of principals			

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
	schools.		Education Award from 2008-2010 9 elementary, 2 middle, and 3 high schools		students Schools where students who were English Language Learners or students with disabilities achieved at least 75% of the proficiency rate for the rest of the population Large percentage of students (over 50%) qualified for free/reduced lunch programs Attendance rates over 92%, graduation rates over 70%	identify themes Triangulated with conversation amongst researchers and data from site visit	teacher behavior influenced student engagement and understanding were of prime importance.
Reardon, R.M. (2011)	This study examined the relationships between principals' perceptions of their learning-centered leadership and student achievement on standardized tests.	Instructional Leadership Learning-centered Leadership	31 elementary principals from a large school district in Virginia	Principal learning centered leadership as measured by: Principal self-perception measured on the VAL-ED instrument	Student achievement as evidenced by: State standardized reading assessments	Hierarchical multiple linear regression analyses	The author reported a direct relationship between principals' perceptions of their attention to rigorous curriculum and student achievement on reading tests in grade 3. The leadership characteristics of attention to rigorous curriculum and performance accountability were significantly related to performance on testing in grades 4 and 5.
Sanzo, K.L., Sherman,	To examine the leadership	Accountability	5 male principals	Successful principals	Schools meeting AYP status	Qualitative methodology	Themes of practice found in the data were shared leadership,

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
W.H., & Clayton, J. (2011)	practices of highly successful middle school principals and how they facilitate student achievement.		5 female principals (middle school)	Criteria: Those who met the Commonwealth of Virginia accreditation standards, those whose school met the federal NCLB standards, and those who were in at least their third year as principal. Leadership behaviors as determined by: Interviews with principals			facilitating professional development, leading with an instructional orientation, and acting openly and honestly.
Silva, J.P., White, G.P., & Yoshida, R.K. (2011)	To examine the direct effects of principal-student discussions on eighth grade students' gains in reading achievement.	Instructional Management Framework	20 students in experimental sample 21 students in control sample 1 principal and 2 assistant principals	Principal behavior Achievement based discussions with the principal	Student Achievement PSSA reading exam And a student survey administered after the experiment	T test Descriptive statistics	Conversations with the principal had a positive relationship with the motivation and achievement gain of students.
Waldron, N.L., McLesky, J., & Redd, L. (2011)	To examine the role of the principal in developing an effective, inclusive school.	Transformational Leadership Change Theories	Creekside Elementary Principal 480 students 50% high poverty 16% Special education	Transformational leadership Interviews with principal, teachers, observing in classrooms, analyzing documents.	Successful Inclusion Student Accountability Data that indicate level of achievement and inclusion	Case Study Four-step analytic process	Five important themes emerged that were setting the direction, redesigning the organization, improving working conditions, providing high-quality instruction in all settings, and use data to drive decision making.

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
Finnigan, K.S. (2012)	To allow greater understanding of the transformational leadership practices that influence teacher motivation and belief that they can make a positive impact on their students.	Transformational Leadership	Critical Case Sampling 3 low performing elementary schools in Chicago's School Probation Study 2 schools moved off probation in first 5 years 1 that remained on probation for more than 5 years	Transformational Leadership Interviews with teachers are primary source Interviews with principals and external partners are secondary source	School improvement Interviews Probationary status	Coding scheme based upon related literature and emerging analytical areas	Teachers felt that the instructional leadership provided by their principal was an important aspect of their growth. Effective management and trust were also found to be important themes. Teachers felt motivated to continue trying new methods because of the support provided by the principal.
White, R.B., Polly, D., & Audette, R.H. (2012)	To investigate the critical features and contextual issues related to the implementation of Response to Intervention.	Response to Intervention	Purposeful sampling 15 participants School leadership team (principal, 2 assistant principals, speech therapist, school psychologist, guidance counselor, 2 special education	Principal role in implementation as evidenced by: Unstructured interviews with all participants	RTI Implementation as evidenced by: School's request to be the pilot site for the district	Qualitative Descriptive Case Study Design Unstructured interviews Open-coding of interview transcripts Inter-rater reliability	The principal focused on obtaining buy-in through the introduction of this new reform effort and made it clear this was a part of the school's mission to reach all learners. The principal and assistant principals monitored student data weekly to provide support and keep abreast of issues arising with students. The principal was committed, and a community of trust and respect was in place before the implementation of the

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
			teachers, 2 general education teachers) 5 participants from district office Elementary School in North Carolina Students in grade 3-5 performing below state average on reading, and near state average in math 955 students K-5			conducted through coding meetings Time-ordered matrix of themes Member checks	reform, and this led to a smoother transition. The principal communicated a deep belief in this reform and allowed teachers to take the lead but remained involved in the entire process.
Ylimaki , R.M. (2012)	To examine how recent political shifts affected the meaning of curriculum leadership in schools.	Cultural Political Movements and Reform Curriculum Theories Instructional Leadership Distributed Leadership	4 principals identified as being aware of current politics related to curriculum 2 men (1 white and 1 African America) 2 women (1 white and 1 African	Leadership Identities and Practices Observed and interviewed principals, teachers, students, and parents over a 4-year period Observations of	Curriculum Focus Study begun immediately after the passage of NCLB with a focus on how this policy context impacted leadership in schools.	Critical Ethnographic Study Thick descriptions Intensive naturalistic observations Participant member	The author found that principals negotiated new identities that she categorized as 'new professional' or 'critical curriculum leadership'. She found that through these differing identities, principals chose areas of focus in their schools that impacted the curriculum and delivery of instruction as well as teacher and student morale. The author also noted that although there were two competing

Author(s)	Purpose of Study	Conceptual Frameworks	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcomes of Interest	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
		Instructional Leadership for Social Justice Critical Theory	American) Schools represented urban, suburban and rural communities	classrooms and curriculum meetings Document collection of curriculum maps, school board meetings, community meetings, newspaper articles		checking throughout process Reconstructive analysis Semi-structured interviews	identities within the schools, all four made improvements to a proficient status by the end of the four years of the study.

References

- Abbott, E. (1908). A study of the early history of child labor in America. *Journal of Sociology*, 14(1), 15-37.
- Adler, F. (1914). The child labor movement: A movement in the interests of civilization. *The Child Labor Bulletin*, 3(1), 8-10.
- American Educational Research Association. (2009). Standards for reporting on humanities-oriented research in AERA publications. *Educational Researcher*, 38(6), 481-486.
- Apple, M.W., & Weis, L. (1983). *Ideology & practice in schooling*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H.A. (1985). *Education under siege*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey Publishers, Inc.
- Axtell, P.H. (1931). Thirty-two points for elementary principals. *Journal of Education*, 113(13), 349.
- Barbour, J.D. (2006a). Management theories. In F. English (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 635-639). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Barbour, J.D. (2006b) Theories of administration. In F. English (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 23-27). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Barbour, J.D. (2011). Critical policy/practice arenas predicting 21st century conflict. In F. English (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of educational leadership* (2nd ed., pp. 153-175). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Barnard, C.I. (1968). *The functions of the executive* (30th anniversary ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bastedo, M.N. (2006). Open systems theory. In F. English (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration* (p.711). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Bass, B.M. (1981). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Beatty, B. (1998). From laws of learning to a science of values: Efficiency and morality in Thorndike's educational psychology. *American Psychologist*, 53(10), 1145-1152.

Berger, P.L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York, NY: Open Road Integrated Media.

Biesta, G.J.J., & Miron, L.F. (2002). The new discourses on educational leadership: An introduction. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 21, 101-107.

Bickmore, D.L., & Bickmore, S.T. (2010). A multi-faceted approach to teacher induction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 1006-1014.
doi:10.1016/j.tate.2009.10.043.

Blount, J.M. (2006). Chaos theory. In F. English (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 112-113). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2002). The dark side of leadership: Teacher perspectives of principal mistreatment. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(5), 671-727. doi:10.1177/0013161X02239643

Blase, J., Blase, J., & Du, F. (2008). The mistreated teacher: a national study. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(3), 263-301.

doi:10.1108/09578230810869257

Blueprint for Reform (2010)

Bogotch, I.E. (2011). A history of public school leadership: The first century 1837-1942. In F. English (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of educational leadership* (2nd ed., pp.3-26). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976/2011). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.

Boyd, W.L. (2004). Are education and efficiency antithetical? Education for democracy vs the "cult of efficiency". *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(2), 160-173. doi:10.1108/09578230410525586

Brenchley, C. (2013, February 7). Duncan to Congress: Giving states flexibility is working [Web blog post]. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/blog/2013/02/duncan-to-congress-giving-states-flexibility-is-working/>

Brooks, J.S., & Kensler, L.A.W. (2011). Distributed leadership and democratic community, in F. English (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of educational leadership* (2nd ed., pp.55-66). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Brown, K.M. (2011). Pivotal points: History, development, and promise of the principalship. In F. English (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of educational leadership* (2nd ed., pp.81-108). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Brown, K.M., Anfara, V.A., & Roney, K. (2004). Student achievement in high performing, suburban middle schools and low performing, urban middle schools: Plausible explanations for the differences. *Education and Urban Society*, 36(4), 428-456. Doi: 10.1177/0013124504263339.
- Brown, K.M., Benkovitz, J., Muttillio, A.J., & Urban, T. (2011). Leading schools of excellence and equity: Documenting effective strategies in closing achievement gaps. *Teachers College Record*, 113(1), 57-96.
- Brown, K.M., & Wynn, S.R. (2009). Finding, supporting, and keeping: The role of the principal in teacher retention issues. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 8, 37-63.
- Bruner, D.Y. (2006) Situational leadership. In F. English (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 573-574). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Bryk, A.S., & Schneider, B. (2003). Trust in schools: A core resource for reform. *Educational leadership*, 60(6), 40-44.
- Burch, P., Theoharis, G., & Rauscher, E. (2010). Class size reduction in practice: Investigating the influence of the elementary school principal. *Educational Policy*, 24(2), 330-358. doi:10.1177/0895904808330168.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Open Road Integrated Media.
- Callahan, R.E. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

- Camburn, E.M., Huff, J.T., Goldring, E.B., & May, H. (2010). Assessing the validity of an annual survey for measuring principal leadership practice. *The Elementary School Journal*, 111(2), 314-335.
- Chance, P.L., & Segura, S.N. (2009). A rural high school's collaborative approach to school improvement. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 24(5), 1-12.
Retrieved from <http://jrre.psu.edu/articles/24-5.pdf>
- Coburn, C.E. (2001). Collective sense-making about reading: How teachers mediate reading policy in their professional communities. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 23(2), 145-170.
- Coburn, C.E. (2005). Shaping teacher sensemaking: School leaders and the enactment of reading policy. *Educational Policy*, 19(3), 476-509.
doi:10.1177/0895904805276143.
- Coldren, A.F., & Spillane, J.P. (2007). Making connections to teaching practice: The role of boundary practices in instructional leadership. *Educational Policy*, 21(2), 369-396. doi:10.1177/0895904805284121
- Collins, R. (1979) The rise of the credential system. In R. Collins (Ed.) *The credential society: An historical sociology of education and stratification* (pp. 90- 130). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Cooper, C.W. (2009). Performing cultural work in demographically changing schools: Implications for expanding transformative leadership frameworks. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(5), 694-724. doi: 10.1177/0013161X09341639.

- Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Culbertson, J.A. (1988). A century's quest for a knowledge base. In N.J. Boyan (Ed.) *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 3-26). New York, NY: Longman.
- Daly, A.J. (2009). Rigid response in an age of accountability: The potential of leadership and trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(2), 168-216. doi:10.1177/0013161X08330499.
- Dantley, M.E. (2010). Successful leadership in urban schools: Principals and critical spirituality, a new approach to reform. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 79(3), 214-219.
- Deal, T.E., & Peterson, K.D. (2009). *Shaping school culture: Pitfalls, paradoxes, and promises* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Deetz, S.A., & Kersten, A. (1983). Critical models of interpretive research. In L. Putnam & M.E. Pacanowsky, *Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach* (pp. 147-172). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (2011). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 1-20). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Dewey, J. (1902/1966). *The child and the curriculum*. [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.com>.

Dewey, J. (1916/2009). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.com>.

Dewey, J. (1927/2012). *The public and its problems*. [Kindle Edition]. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.com>.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. [Kindle edition]. New York, NY: Touchstone Publishers. Retrieved from www.amazon.com.

Dewey, J. (1939/1989). *Freedom and culture*. New York, NY: Prometheus Publishers.

Diamond, J.B. (2012). Accountability policy, school organization, and classroom practice: Partial recoupling and educational opportunity. *Education and Urban Society*, 44(2), 151-182. doi:10.1177/0013124511431569.

DiPaola, M., & Guy, S. (2009). The impact of organizational justice on climate and trust in high schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 19, 382-405.

Donmoyer, R. (1999). The continuing quest for a knowledge base: 1976-1998. In J. Murphy, & K. Seashore-Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration*, (pp. 25-43). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

DuFour, R., DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (2008). *Revisiting professional learning communities at work: New insights for improving schools* (Institute ed.). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Easley, J. (2008). Moral school building leadership: Investigating a praxis for alternative route teacher retention. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(1), 25-38. Doi: 10.1108/09578230810849790.

- Egley, R. (2003). Invitational leadership: Does it make a difference? *Journal of Invitational Theory and Practice*, 9, 57-70.
- Egley, R.J., & Jones, B.D. (2005) Principals' inviting leadership behaviors in a time of test-based accountability. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 3(1), 13-24.
- Eilers, A.M., & Camacho, A. (2008). School culture change in the making: Leadership factors that matter. *Urban Education*, 42(6), 616-637.
doi:10.1177/0042085907304906
- Eisner, E.W. (1988). The primacy of experience and the politics of method. *Educational Researcher*, 17(5), 15-20.
- Emery, J.N. (1930). Selling the school to the public. *Journal of Education*, 112(16), 392-395.
- English, F. (2001). What paradigm shift? An interrogation of Kuhn's idea of normalcy in the research practice of educational administration. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 4(1), 29-38.
- English, F.W. (2002). The point of scientificity: The fall of the epistemological dominoes, and the end of the field of educational administration. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 21, 109-136.
- English, F.W. (2005). Introduction: A metadiscursive perspective on the landscape of leadership in the 21st century. In F.W. English (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of educational leadership*, (pp. ix-xvi). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- English, F.W. (2011). Introduction: Educational leadership at century's beginning-A continuing search for the philosopher's stone. In F.W. English (Ed.), *The SAGE*

handbook of educational leadership (2nd ed., pp.vii-xiii). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

English, F.W., & Steffy, B.E. (2011). Curriculum leadership: The administrative survival skill in a test-driven culture and a competitive educational marketplace. In F. English (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of educational leadership* (2nd ed., pp. 289-308). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Erickson, D.A. (1977). An overdue paradigm shift in educational administration, or, how can we get that idiot off the freeway? In L.L. Cunningham (Ed). *Educational administration: The developing decades* (pp. 114-143). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Evers, C.W., & Lakomski, G. (1996a). Postpositivist conceptions of science in educational administration: An introduction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(3), 341-343.

Evers, C.W., & Lakomski, G. (1996b). Science in educational administration: A postpositivist conception. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(3), 379-402.

Fancera, S.F., & Bliss, J.R. (2011). Instructional leadership influence on collective teacher efficacy to improve school achievement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 10(3), 349-370. doi:10.1080/15700763.2011.585537

Finnigan, K.S., & Stewart, T.J. (2009). Leading change under pressure: An examination of principal leadership in low-performing schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 19, 586-618.

- Foster, W. (1986). *Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration*. New York, NY: Prometheus Publishers.
- Foster, W.P. (2002). The decline of the local: A challenge to educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(2), 176-191.
doi:10.1177/0013161X03260360.
- Fullan, M. (2010) *All Systems Go*. [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.com>.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Fusarelli, L.D., Kowalski, T.J., & Peterson, G.J. (2011). Distributive leadership, civic engagement, and deliberative democracy as vehicles for school improvement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 10, 43-62.
doi:10.1080/15700760903342392
- Gallagher, H. A. (2004). Vaughn Elementary's innovative teacher evaluation system: Are teacher evaluation scores related to growth in student achievement? *Peabody Journal of Education*, 79(4), 79-107.
- Gallagher, S. (1992). *Hermeneutics and education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Gann, E. (1947). Self-development through good guidance. *Educational Leadership*, 4(4), 249-273.
- Gay, L.R., Mills, G.E., & Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Getzels, J.W., & Guba, E.G. (1957). Social behavior and the administrative process.

The School Review, 65(4), 423-441.

Getzels, J.W., Lipham, J.M., & Campbell, R.F. (1968). *Educational administration as a*

social process: Theory, research, practice. New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishers.

Gist, A.S., & King, W.A. (1922). The efficiency of the principalship from the

standpoint of a teacher. *The Elementary School Journal*, 23(2), 120-126.

Gladwell, M. (2003). Comment: Making the grade. *New Yorker*, 79(26), 31-34.

Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Aldine Transaction.

Goodlad, J.I. (1955). The individual school and its principal: Key setting and key

person. *Educational Leadership*, 13(1), 2-6.

Gordon, M.F., & Louis, K.S. (2009). Linking parent and community involvement with

student achievement: Comparing principal and teacher perceptions of stakeholder influence. *American Journal of Education*, 116, 1-31.

Graczewski, C., Knudson, J., & Holtzman, D.J. (2009). Instructional leadership in

practice: What does it look like, and what influence does it have? *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 14, 72-96.

doi:10.1080/10824660802715460

Greenlee, B., & Brown, J.J. (2009). Retaining teachers in challenging schools.

Education, 130(1), 96-109.

Griffith, J. (2001). Principal leadership of parent involvement. *Journal of Educational*

Administration, 39(2), 162-186. doi:10.1108/09578230110386287

- Griffith, J. (2004). Relation of principal transformational leadership to school staff job satisfaction, staff turnover, and school performance. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(3), 333-356.
doi:10.1108/09578230410534667
- Grissom, J.A. (2011). Can good principals keep teachers in disadvantaged schools? Linking principal effectiveness to teacher satisfaction and turnover in hard-to-staff environments. *Teachers College Record*, 113(11), 2552-2585.
- Grissom, J.A., & Harrington, J.R. (2010). Investing in administrator efficacy: An examination of professional development as a tool for enhancing principal effectiveness. *American Journal of Education*, 116, 583-612.
- Grissom, J.A., & Loeb, S. (2011). Triangulating principal effectiveness: How perspectives of parents, teachers, and assistant principals identify the central importance of managerial skills. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(5), 1091-1123. doi:10.3102/0002831211402663
- Grogan, M. (2004). Keeping a critical, postmodern eye on educational leadership in the United States: In appreciation of Bill Foster. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(2), 222-239. doi:10.1177/0013161X03261237
- Gronn, P., & Ribbins, P. (1996). Leaders in context: Postpositivist approaches to understanding educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(3), 452-473.
- Guba, E.G. (1990). The alternative paradigm dialog. In E.G. Guba (Ed.), *The paradigm dialog*, (pp.17-27). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Gunter, H.M. (2005). Conceptualizing research in educational leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 33(2), 165-180. doi:10.1177/1741143205051051.
- Haas, E., & Poynor, L. (2011). Issues of teaching and learning. In F.W. English (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of educational leadership* (2nd ed., pp. 334-352). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Habermas, J. (1989). On hermeneutics' claim to universality. In K. Mueller-Vollmer (Ed.), *The hermeneutics reader: Texts of the German tradition from the Enlightenment to the present* (pp.293-319). New York: Continuum.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R.H. (2011). Exploring the journey of school improvement: Classifying and analyzing patterns of change in school improvement processes and learning outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 22(1), 1-27. doi:10.1080/09243453.2010.536322.
- Hand, D. (2006). *Models of democracy*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
- Hart, C. (1998). *Doing a literature review: Releasing the social science research imagination*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Heck, R.H., & Moriyama, K. (2010). Examining relationships among elementary schools' contexts, leadership, instructional practices, and added-year outcomes: a regression discontinuity approach. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 21(4), 377-408.
- Herrick, V.E. (1947). The principal looks at himself. *Educational Leadership*, 4(7), 442-448.
- Hindman, H. (2002). *Child labor: An American history*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

- Hipp, K.K., Huffman, J.B., Pankake, A.M., & Olivier, D.F. (2008). Sustaining professional learning communities: Case studies. *Journal of Educational Change, 9*, 173-195. doi:10.1007/s10833-007-9060-8.
- Hodgkinson, C. (1991). *Educational Leadership: The moral art*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Hornig, E.L., Klasik, D., & Loeb, S. (2010). Principal's time use and school effectiveness. *American Journal of Education, 116*, 491-523.
- Hollingworth, L. (2012). Why leadership matters: Empowering teachers to implement formative assessment. *Journal of Educational Administration, 50*(3), 365-379. doi:10.1108/09578231211223356.
- Hough, D.L., & Schmitt, V.L. (2011). An ex post facto examination of relationships among the developmental designs professional development model/classroom management approach, school leadership, climate, student achievement, attendance, and behavior in high poverty middle grades schools. *Middle Grades Research Journal, 6*(3), 163-175.
- Howley, A., Howley, M., Camper, C., & Perko, H. (2011). Place-based education at Island Community School. *The Journal of Environmental Education, 42*(4), 216-236. doi:10.1080/00958964.2011.556682.
- Hoy, W.K., Smith, P.A., & Sweetland, S.R. (2002). The development of the organizational climate index for high schools: Its measure and relationship to faculty trust. *The High School Journal, 86*(2), 38-49.
- Huggins, K.S., Scheurich, J.J., Morgan, J.R. (2011). Professional learning communities as a leadership strategy to drive math success in an urban high school

serving diverse, low-income students: A case study. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 16, 67-88. doi:10.1080/10824669.2011.560525.

Hughes, C., & Jones, D. (2010). A relationship among public school leadership, ethics, and student achievement. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal*, 27(2), 50-73.

Hunter, J.C. (1998). *The Servant: A Simple Story about the true Essence of Leadership*.

Hurren, B.L. (2006). The effects of principals' humor on teachers' job satisfaction. *Educational Studies*, 32(4), 373-385. doi:10.1080/03055690600850321

Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004. 20 U.S.C. 1400 (2004).

Jacob, B.A., & Lefgren, L. (2008). Can principals identify effective teachers? Evidence on subjective performance evaluation in education, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 26(1), 101-136.

Jacobson, S.L., Brooks, S., Giles, C., Johnson, L., & Ylimaki, R. (2007). Successful leadership in three high-poverty urban elementary schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 6, 291-317. doi:10.1080/15700760701431553

Jesse, D., Davis, A., & Pokorny, N. (2004). High-achieving middle schools for Latino students in poverty. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 9(1), 23-45.

Johnson, J.F., Uline, C.L., & Perez, L.G. (2011). Expert noticing and principals of high-performing urban schools. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 16(2), 122-136. doi:10.1080/10824669.2011.559903.

- Johnson, L. (2007). Rethinking successful school leadership in challenging U.S. schools: Culturally responsive practices in school-community relationships. *ISEA*, 35(3), 49-57.
- Judd, C.H. (1925). Psychology as a basis of educational methods. *The Elementary School Journal*, 25(2), 102-112.
- Karagiorgi, Y. (2011). On democracy and leadership: From rhetoric to reality. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice*, 14(3), 369-384. doi:10.1080/13603124.2010.496872.
- Keliher, A.V. (1947). No monopoly on leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 4(4), 214-217.
- Kelley, R.C., Thornton, B., & Daugherty, R. (2005). Relationships between measures of leadership and school climate. *Education*, 126(1), 17-25.
- Kerdeman, D. (2004). Extending Gadamer's corrective: *No Child Left Behind* and hermeneutic conversation. *Philosophy of Education Yearbook*, 150-153.
- Koopman, M.O. (1947). Democratic climate for education. *Educational Leadership*, 4(4), 239-244.
- Kramer, B.H. (2006). Democracy, democratic education, and administration. In F. English (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 276-279). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Kuhn, T.S. (1996). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. [Kindle Edition]. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press. Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.com>.

- Ladd, H.F. (2011). Teachers' perceptions of their working conditions: How predictive of planned and actual teacher movement? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 33(2), 235-261. doi:10.3102/0162373711398128.
- Lagemann, E.C. (1989). The plural worlds of educational research. *History of Education Quarterly*, 29(2), 185-214.
- Lambert, L. (2006). Lasting leadership: A study of high leadership capacity schools. *The Educational Forum*, 70, 238-254.
- Lange, P., & DeBernardis, A. (1947). Successful leadership must be constructive. *Educational Leadership*, 4(4), 234-238.
- Lashley, C. (2007). Principal leadership for special education: An ethical framework. *Exceptionality*, 15(3), 177-187.
- Leavitt, F.M. (1914). The cooperation of the schools in reducing child labor. *The Child Labor Bulletin*, 3(1), 141-147.
- Lees, P.J. (2007). Beyond positivism: Embracing complexity for social and educational change. *English Teaching: Practice & Critique*, 6(3), 48-60.
- Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2005). A review of transformational school leadership research 1996-2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4, 177-199.
doi:10.1080/15700760500244769
- Leithwood, K. & Louis, K.S. (2012). *Linking leadership to student learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Leithwood, K., Mascall, B., & Strauss, T. (2009). New perspectives on an old idea: A short history of the old idea. In K. Leithwood, B. Mascall., & T. Strauss (Eds.),

Distributed leadership according to the evidence (pp. 1-14). New York, NY: Routledge.

Leonardo, Z. (2003). Interpretation and the problem of domination: Paul Ricoeur's hermeneutics. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 22, 329-350.

Lincoln, Y.S. (1990). The making of a constructivist: A remembrance of transformations past. In E.G. Guba (Ed.), *The paradigm dialog* (pp.46-66). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Retrieved from <http://www.openlibrary.org>.

Lincoln, Y.S., Lynham, S.A., & Guba, E.G. (2011). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences, revisited. In N.K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.) *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 97-128). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lindle, J. (2006). Role theory. In F. English (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration* (p. 885). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Longshore, W.T. (1926). The elementary school principalship. *Journal of Education*, 104(23), 597-598.

Louis, K.S., Dretzke, B., & Wahlstrom, K. (2010). How does leadership affect student achievement? Results from a national US survey. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 21(3), 315-336. doi:10.1080/09243453.2010.486586

Lugg, C.A., & Shoho, A.R. (2006). Dare public school administrators build a new social order? Social justice and the possibly perilous politics of educational

leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44(3), 196-208.

doi:10.1108/09578230610664805

Marion, R., & McGee, P. (2006). Complex theory of leadership. In F. English (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration* (pp.562-565).

California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Marks, H.M., & Printy, S.M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance; An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), 370-397. doi:10.1177/0013161X03253412

Marx, S., & Larson, L.L. (2012). Taking off the color-blind glasses: Recognizing and supporting Latina/o students in a predominately white school. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(2), 259-303. doi:10.1177/0013161X11421923

Marzano, R.J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B.A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: McREL.

Masumoto, M., & Brown-Welty, S. (2009). Case study of leadership practices and school-community interrelationships in high-performing, high-poverty, rural California high schools. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 24(1), 1-18.

Matsumura, L.C., Sartoris, M., Bickel, D.D., & Garnier, H.E. (2009). Leadership for literacy coaching: The principal's role in launching a new coaching program. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(5), 655-693.

doi:10.1177/03161X09347341

Mawhinney, H.B. (2004). Deliberative democracy in imagined communities: How the power geometry of globalization shapes local leadership praxis.

Educational Administration Quarterly, 40(2), 192-221.

doi:10.1177/0013161x03261173

Maxcy, S.J. (1991). *Educational leadership: A critical pragmatic perspective*. New York, NY: Bergin & Garvey.

Maxcy, S.J. (2003). Pragmatic threads in mixed methods research in the social sciences: The search for multiple modes of inquiry and the end of the philosophy of formalism. In A. Tashakkori, & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *The handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (pp. 51-90). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

May, H., & Supovitz, J.A. (2011). The scope of principal efforts to improve instruction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(2), 332-352.

doi:10.1177/0013161X10383411

Mayan, M.J. (2008). *Essentials of Qualitative Inquiry*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

McGhee, M.W., & Lew, C. (2007). Leadership and writing: How principals' knowledge, beliefs, and interventions affect writing instruction in elementary and secondary schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(3), 358-380.

doi:10.1177/0013161X06297202

McGuigan, L., & Hoy, W.K. (2006). Principal leadership: Creating a culture of academic optimism to improve achievement for all students. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 5, 203-229. doi:10.1080/15700760600805816.

McSkimmon, M. (1926). The high calling of the principal. *Journal of Education*, 103(12), 321-323.

- Mills, C.W. (2000). *The sociological imagination* (40th anniversary ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1959).
- Mintz, S. (2004). *Huck's raft: A history of American childhood*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard College.
- Monroe, L. (2003). *The Monroe doctrine: An ABC guide to what great bosses do*. [Kindle Edition]. Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.com>.
- Morrow, R., & Brown, D. (1994). *Critical theory and methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Mullen, C.A. (2008) Democratically accountable leader/ship: A social justice perspective of educational quality and practice. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 137-153.
- Murphy, J. (2002). Reculturing the profession of educational leadership: New blueprints. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 176-191. doi: 10.1177/0013161X02382004
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common Core State Standards*. Washington, DC: Authors.
- Nettles, S.M., & Herrington, C. (2007). Revisiting the importance of the direct effects of school leadership on student achievement: The implications for school improvement policy. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 82(4), 724-736.
- Niesche, R. (2005). Disengaging leadership: Educational administration and management as a field of scientific knowledge. In *Researching Identity*,

Diversity, & Education (pp. 20-35). Post-pressed (c/o eContent Management Pty. Ltd.).

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U. S. C. 70 § 6301 *et seq.* (2002).

O'Donnell, R.J., & White, G.P. (2005). Within the accountability era: Principals' instructional leadership behaviors and student achievement. *NASSP Bulletin*, 89(645), 56-71. doi:10.1177/019263650508964505

Ovando, M.N., & Cavazos, M. (2004). Principals' instructional leadership in successful Hispanic majority high schools. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 2(3), 7-24.

Park, V., & Datnow, A. (2009). Co-constructing distributed leadership: district and school connections in data-driven decision-making. *School Leadership and Management*, 29(5), 477-494. Doi: 10.1080/13632430903162541.

Pepper, K., & Thomas, L.H. (2002). Making a change: The effects of the leadership role on school climate. *Learning Environments Research*, 5, 155-166.

Perry, A.C. (1925). Justice in high places. *Journal of Education*, 101(15), 414-416.

Pollard-Durodula, S. (2003). Wesley Elementary: A beacon of hope for at-risk students. *Education and Urban Society*, 36(1), 94-117. Doi: 10.1177/0013124503256942.

Portelli, J.P., & Simpson, D.J. (2007). Critical democracy and leadership issues: Philosophical responses to the neoliberal agenda. *Journal of Thought*, 42(1/2), 3-7.

Power, L. (1919). A plan for supervision of instruction by principals of elementary schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 19(6), 408-418.

- Price, H.E. (2012). Principal-teacher interactions: How affective relationships shape principal and teacher attitudes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(1), 39-85. doi:10.1177/0013161X11417126
- Printy, S.M. (2008). Leadership for teacher learning: A community of practice perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(2), 187-226. Doi: 10.1177/0013161X07312958.
- Pryor, C.R. (2008). Dilemmas of democratic thought for educational leadership: Considerations of social justice scholarship. *Teacher Development*, 12(4), 279-288. doi:10.1080/13664530802579835.
- Ramahlo, E.M., Garza, E., & Merchant, B. (2010). Successful school leadership in socioeconomically challenging contexts: School principals creating and sustaining successful school improvement. *ISEA*, 35(3), 35-56.
- Ravitch, D. (2010). *The death and life of the great American school system: How testing and choice are undermining education*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Reardon, R.M. (2011). Elementary school principals' learning-centered leadership and educational outcomes: Implications for principals' professional development. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 10, 63-83. doi:10.1080/15700760903511798.
- Rhodes, V., Stevens, D., & Hemmings, A. (2011). Creating positive culture in a new urban high school. *The High School Journal*, 94(3), 82-94.
- Riester, A.F., Pursch, V., & Skrla, L. (2002). Principals for social justice: Leaders of school success for children from low-income homes. *Journal of School Leadership*, 12(3), 281-304.

- Rinke, C., & Valli, L. (2010). Making adequate yearly progress: Teacher learning in school-based accountability contexts. *Teachers College Record*, 112(3), 645-684.
- Robinson, V.M.J., Lloyd, C.A., & Rowe, K.J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635-674.
- Rorty, R. (1982). *Consequences of pragmatism*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sackney, L., & Mitchell, C. (2002). Postmodern expressions of educational leadership. In K. Leithwood & P. Hallinger (Eds.), *Second international handbook of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 881-914). Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Sanzo, K.L., Sherman, W.H., & Clayton, J. (2011). Leadership practices of successful middle school principals. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(1), 31-45.
doi:10.1108/09578231111102045
- Sarason, S.B. (1990). *The predictable failure of educational reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Sargeant, I.G. (1923). The school principal and the future. *Journal of Education*, 97, 719.
- Seashore-Louis, K.R. (2009). Leadership and change in schools: personal reflections over the last 30 years. *Journal of Educational Change*, 10, 129-140.
doi:10.1007/s10833-009-9111-4

- Senge, P. (2000). *Schools that learn: A fifth discipline fieldbook for educators, parents, and everyone who cares about education*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Shaker, P., & Heilman, E.E. (2004). The new common sense of education: Advocacy research versus academic authority. *Teachers College Record*, 106(7), 1444-1470.
- Shakeshaft, C. (2011). Wild patience: Women in school administration. In F. English (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of educational leadership* (2nd ed., pp. 210-222). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Shapiro, A. (2006). Social dimensions of leadership. In F. English (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 574-580). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Shen, J., Leslie, J.M., Spybrook, J.K., & Ma, X. (2012). Are principal background and school processes related to teacher job satisfaction? A multilevel study using schools and staffing survey 2003-04. *American Educational Research Journal*, 49(2), 200-230. Doi: 10.3102/0002831211419949.
- Shields, C.M. (2010). Transformative leadership: Working for equity in diverse contexts. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(4), 558-589. doi: 10.1177/0013161X10375609.
- Shoho, A.R., Merchant, B.M., & Lugg, C.A. (2011). Social justice: Seeking a common language. In F. English (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of educational leadership* (2nd ed., pp. 36-54). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Silva, J.P., White, G.P., & Yoshida, R.K. (2011). The direct effects of principal-student discussions on eighth grade students' gains in reading achievement: An

experimental study. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(5), 772-793.

doi:10.1177/0013161X11404219

Simmonds, M.R. (2007). Critical vulnerability: An imperative approach to educational leadership. *Journal of Thought*, 42(1/2), 79-97.

Sindelar, P.T., Shearer, D.K., Yendol-Hoppey, D., & Liebert, T.W. (2006). The sustainability of inclusive school reform. *Exceptional Children*, 72(3), 317-331.

Skrtic, T.M. (1991). The special education paradox: Equity as the way to excellence. *Harvard Educational Review*, 61(2), 148-206.

Slobodzian, J.T. (2009). The devil is in the details: Issues of exclusion in an inclusive educational environment. *Ethnography and Education*, 4(2), 181-195.

doi:10.1080/17457820902972804.

Smith, R., & Leonard, P. (2005). Collaboration for inclusion: Practitioner perspectives. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 38, 269-279.

doi:10.1080/10665680500299650

Smith, P.R. (2001). Educational administration: An interpretive art. *Education and Society*, 19(2), 97-107.

Smith, J.K., & Blase, J. (1991). From empiricism to hermeneutics: Educational leadership as a practical and moral activity. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 29(1), 6-21.

Spillane, J.P., Diamond, J.B., Burch, P., Hallett, T., Jita, L., & Zoltners, J. (2002).

Managing in the middle: School leaders and the enactment of accountability policy. *Educational Policy*, 16(5), 731-762. doi:10.1177/089590402237311.

- Spillane, J.P., & Healey, K. (2010). Conceptualizing school leadership and management from a distributed perspective: An exploration of some study operations and measures. *The Elementary School Journal*, 111(2), 253-281.
- Stillman, J. (2011). Teacher learning in an era of high-stakes accountability: Productive tension and critical professional practice. *Teachers College Record*, 113(1), 133-180.
- Styron, R.A., & Nyman, T.R. (2008). Key characteristics of middle school performance. *Research in Middle Level Education Online*, 31(5), 1-17.
- Tate, T.F. (2003). Servant leadership for schools and youth programs. *Reclaiming children and youth*, 12(1), 33-39.
- Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2003). Major issues and controversies in the use of mixed methods in the social and behavioral sciences. In A. Tashakkori, & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *The handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (pp. 3-50). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Theoharis, G. (2010). Disrupting injustice: Principals narrate the strategies they use to improve their schools and advance social justice. *Teachers College Record*, 112(1), 331-373.
- Thompson, J.B. (1981). *Critical hermeneutics: A study in the thought of Paul Ricoeur and Jurgen Habermas*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, J.B. (1991). *Ideology and modern culture*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Thorndike, E.L. (1929). The need of fundamental analysis of methods of teaching. *The Elementary School Journal*, 30(3), 189-191.

- Thornton, B. (2006). Systems theory/thinking. In F. English (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration* (pp.987-988). California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Tillman, L.C. (2005). Mentoring new teachers: Implications for leadership practice in an urban school. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41(4), 609-629. doi:10.1177/0013161X04274272.
- Twigg, N.W. (2008). Educational leadership: The effects of perceived support, organization-based self-esteem, and citizenship behaviors on student performance. *Journal of School Leadership*, 18(3), 256-277.
- Tyack, D.B. (1974). *The one best system: A history of American urban education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vecchio, R.P., Justin, J.E., & Pearce, C.L. (2008). The utility of transactional and transformational leadership for predicting performance and satisfaction within a path-goal theory framework. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 81, 71-82. doi:10.1348/096317907X202482
- Wahlstrom, K.L., & Louis, K.S. (2008). How teachers experience principal leadership: The roles of professional community, trust, efficacy, and shared responsibility. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 458-495. doi:10.1177/0013161X08321502
- Waldron, N.L., McLesky, J., & Redd, L. (2011). Setting the direction: The role of the principal in developing an effective, inclusive school. *Journal of Special Education Leadership*, 24(2), 51-60.

- Walker, D. (2002). Constructivist leadership: Standards, equity, and learning— weaving whole cloth from multiple strands. In L. Lambert et al. (Eds.), *The constructivist leader* (2nd ed., pp.1-33). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Walker, J., & Slear, S. (2011). The impact of principal leadership behaviors on the efficacy of new and experienced middle school teachers. *NASSP Bulletin*, 95(1), 46-64. doi:10.1177/0192636511406530
- Wanat, C.L. (2006). Qualitative research, history, theories, issues. In F.W. English (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration* (pp.831-835). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Wasonga, T.A., & Murphy, J.F. (2007). Co-creating leadership dispositions. *ISEA*, 35(2), 20-32.
- Weber, M. (1946). The bureaucratic machine. In Gerth, H., & Mills, C.W. (Eds.), *From Max Weber*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- White, R.B., Polly, D., & Audette, R.H. (2012). A case analysis of an elementary school's implementation of Response to Intervention. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 26, 73-90. doi:10.1080/02568543.2011.632067.
- Williams, E. (2009). Evaluation of a school systems plan to utilize teachers' perceptions of principal leadership to improve student achievement. *Challenge*, 15(1), 15-32.
- Williams, E., Persaud, G., & Turner, T. (2008). Planning for principal evaluation: Effects on school climate and achievement. *Educational Planning*, 17(3), 1-11.

- Williams, F.K., Ricciardi, D., & Blackbourn, R. (2006). Theories of leadership. In F. English (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration* (pp.586-591). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Willig, C. (2008). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology: Adventures in theory and method* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Open University Press.
- Willower, D.J. (1998). Fighting the fog: A criticism of postmodernism. *Journal of School Leadership, 8*, 448-463.
- Woods, R.C. (1938). Teacher participation in school management. *Education, 58*(10), 627-630.
- Woods, P.A. (2007). Authenticity in the bureau-enterprise culture: The struggle for authentic meaning. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 35*(2), 295-320. doi:10.1177/1741143207075395.
- Wynn, S.R., & Brown, K.M. (2008). Principal leadership and professional learning communities: What beginning teachers value. *International Journal of Educational Reform, 17*(1), 37-63.
- Ylimaki, R.M. (2012). Curriculum leadership in a conservative era. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 48*(2), 304-346. doi:10.1177/0013161X11427393.
- Young, M.D. & Lopez, G.R. (2011). The nature of inquiry in educational leadership. In F. English (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of educational leadership* (2nd ed., pp. 233-254). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Youngs, P. (2007). How elementary principals' beliefs and actions influence new teachers' experiences. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(1), 101-137. doi:10.1177/0013161X06293629

Youngs, P., Holdgreve-Resendez, R.T., & Qian, H. (2011). The role of instructional program coherence in beginning elementary teachers' induction experiences.

The Elementary School Journal, 111(3), 455-476.

Youngs, P., & King, M.B. (2002). Principal leadership for professional development to build school capacity. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(5), 643-670.

doi:10.1177/0013161X02239642

Zimmerman, S., & Deckert-Pelton, M. (2003). Evaluating the evaluators: Teachers' perceptions of the principal's role in professional evaluation. *NASSP Bulletin*,

87(636), 28-37. Doi: 10.1177/019263650308763604.