9-5-2013

Educational Leadership and its Impact on Life in Schools: A Critical Interpretation

Jessica Apgar McCord

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

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

CHAPTER 5 RE-VIEWING THE LITERATURE: AN HERMENEUTICAL ANALYSIS

LIST OF TABLES

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, Mascall, & 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 that 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 distanciation, 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 Riceour 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 distanciation,

application, and self-reflection implored me to contemplate my circumstantial

position in relation to the field of educational leadership. Distanciation 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 distanciation, being open to the possibilities of

interpretation, and the practical application of such intepretations. 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 distanciation, 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, distanciation, 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 looks 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 distanciation 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-constructor 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 Hodginkson

(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; Brunner, 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 & Blackbourn, 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 en 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.

Horng 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. The 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, Aviolo, & 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, Muttillo, & 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 Cavasos (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 & Cavasos, 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 Cavasos (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 Cavasos 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 & Cavasos, 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, PyscInfo, 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 RtI 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 Cavasos (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.

Horng 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 & Cavasos,

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

outnumbers 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 Cavasos (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, Academic Search Premier, EconLit, Education Research Complete, Humanities International Complete, PsychArticles, PsychInfo, Public Administration Abstracts	"principal effectiveness" AND "student outcomes"	5	0	Scholarly peer-reviewed 2001-2012
	"principal effect*" AND "student outcomes"	0	0	
	"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 "retention"	9	0	
	"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 job satisfaction	0	0	Elementary education,
	principal effect*AND teacher AND retention	0	0	Elementary secondary
	principal effect*AND teacher AND effectiveness Added NOT "Foreign Countries" in descriptors	118	23	education, Grade 1-12, High schools, Intermediate
	principal effect* AND teacher AND emotions	0		Grades, Junior high schools,
	Principal effect* AND Teacher AND Treatment	3	0	kindergarten, Middle schools,
	Principal effect* AND Teacher AND Attitudes	70	8	primary education, secondary
	Principal effect* AND Teacher AND Experiences	13	1	education NOT descriptor: "Foreign Countries"
	Principal Effect* AND Teachers AND Professional Development	46	2	
	principal effect* AND Teachers AND Professional learning	33	1	
	leadership effect* AND teacher AND job satisfaction	12	1	
	leadership effect*AND Teacher AND	17	1	

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 Instructional Leaderhip 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 behaviors and student achievement.	Instructional Leadership	325 middle level educators 75 principals 250 8th 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 analysis	Teachers' perceptions of their leaders promoting 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 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	**Leader behavior** Interviews with administrators, teachers, parents, and students on their perspectives of curriculum, instruction, decision making, change	**Student Achievement Growth** Sustained change as evidenced by 3 consecutive years of high achieving growth on standardized	Qualitative Case Study Semi-structured interviews Qualitative analysis which	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

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 12th grade students on student council 2 parents involved in booster clubs	Observations of various school events		Conceptually clustered matrix Constant-comparative analysis produced a cognitive map	
			Purposeful sampling				
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 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	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., & 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	Purposeful sampling 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 with observations done by researchers to eliminate the bias of	**Student achievement** data across multiple years **School environment** as measured by climate surveys of teachers and parents	Quantitative Experience Sampling Methods Time Use Observations Descriptive Statistics Multi-variate statistical	The tasks that principals spent 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
				self-reporting.		framework	
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.
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
	reported scores and assistant principals' assessment.				reported by M-DCPS provided parent survey information.		
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 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 11th 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	**Instructional Leadership** **Functions** Measured by the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS, Hallinger, 1987) 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	Quantitative Descriptive statistics Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients (r) Path analysis Correlational Study	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.

Authors	Purpose	Conceptual Framework	Participants	Independent Measures	Outcome Investigated	Methods/Data Analysis	Findings
			1,083 teachers		SAT Math		
					SAT Writing		
			Convenience		% of students in		
			sampling		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 1st 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 2nd year elementary teachers 12 mentor teachers 6 grade level colleagues of 2nd year teachers From 3 varied districts in the same state, chosen because of variation in policies, student demographics, and induction practices. Purposeful sampling	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	4,165 teachers	**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
							trust in principals may have a more direct effect on classroom instruction. Transactional leadership behaviors may have more predictive value than previously assumed.
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	
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. **Student Demographics** Provided by SASS	Ordinary least squares Linear probability model	
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/speci al 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 Mulitlevel 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.	"Boss Abuse" Theories Symbolic Interactionism Organizational Justice Psychological and Stress Literature	50 teachers 5 male 45 female Snowball sampling	**Principal's acts of abuse** Interviews with teachers	**Teacher mistreatment** Interviews	Qualitative Grounded Theory Open-ended theoretical and methodological perspective to create a model constructed from the phenomenon under investigation	Teachers suffered varying levels of mistreatment from principals in the workplace that had varying degrees of effect on them psychologically and physically.
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?	"Boss Abuse" Theories Symbolic Interactionism Organizational Justice Psychological and Stress Literature	172 teachers from elementary, middle, and high school They were offered the survey at www.endteacherabuse.org	**Principal's acts of abuse and mistreatment** Principal Mistreatment/Abuse Inventory (PMAI) 219 item online survey	**Teacher mistreatment and effects** **Teacher demographic** PMAI (effects section)	Quantitative Descriptive statistics Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Scheffe tests	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.

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			of parent involvement in
				Leadership			school decisions.
				Influence			
				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 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.	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	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 Purposeful sampling			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	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
			14 general education teachers Three principals (1 elementary, 2 middle school)			Participatory Interviews Document and Records Analysis	inclusive practice.
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 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	**Leadership behavior** Interviews Document review Content analysis Observation	**School Climate/Culture** Interviews Document review Content analysis Observation	Qualitative Multiple case study approach Complex Cross-Case Comparative Analysis Constant Comparison Triangulation	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.
Theoharis, G. (2010)	To explore the aspects of school leadership that	Critical Theory Social Justice	6 principals 2 elementary 2 middle school	**Leadership** **behaviors**	**Socially Just** **School**	Qualitative Positioned subject approach	Principals used 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 Purposeful and snowball sampling	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., Muttillo, 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 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 decision making.
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	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 Complete, Academic Search Premier, EconLit, Education Research Complete, Humanities International Complete, PsychArticles, PyscInfo, Public Administration Abstracts, and Business Source Complete	"school leadership" "student outcomes"	43	6
	"school leadership" "student achievement" Narrowed geography to only United states and any states within the US	52	13
	"school leadership" "teacher morale"	10	3
	"school leadership" "teacher attitude"	2	0
	"school leadership" "student attitude"	0	0
	"school leadership" "school environment"	14	3

Databases Searched	Search Terms	Results	Relevant
	"school leadership" "School culture" Refined to US and states within US	15	1
	"school leadership" "school climate" Refined to US and States within US	17	1
	"school leadership" "school effectiveness" Refined to US and states within	8	3
	"school leadership" "teacher" "job satisfaction"	42	3
	"school leadership"	38	7
	"school leadership" "teacher" "emotions"	10	1
	"school leadership" "teacher" "treatment"	3	0
	"school leadership" "teacher effectiveness"	31	0
	"school leadership" "teacher experiences"	2	1
	"school leadership" "teacher" "professional development"	19	3
	"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" "student outcomes"	0	0	0	0
	"principal effect*" "student outcomes"	1	1	7	0
	"principal effect*" "student achievement"	5	3	39	4
	"leadership effect*" "student outcomes"	27	3	28	0
	"leadership effect*" "student achievement"	123	27	196 Refined to US 26	4
	"principal effect*" "teacher morale"	0		0	0
	"leadership effect*" "teacher morale"	3	1	2	0
	"principal effect*" "teacher attitude*"	3	1	1	0
	"leadership effect*" "teacher attitude*"	24	0	24	0
	"principal effect*" "student attitude*"	0	0	0	0
	"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*" "school environment" Changed to "school culture"	0	0	0	0
	"leadership effect*" "school environment"	68	6	81	2
	"leadership effect*" "school culture"	78	2	87	1
	"leadership style" "school climate"	80	5	90	2
	"leadership style" "school culture"	81	0	95	0
	"principal" "school environment"	276	37	545 Refined to US 34	5
	"principal effectiveness"	13	0	9	1
	"Principal effect*" "school effectiveness"	3	0	2	0
	"leadership effect*" "school effectiveness"	47	4	35	0
	"leadership effect*" "teacher effectiveness"	19	1	17	1
	"principal effect*" "teacher" "job satisfaction"	23	9	2	0
	"principal effect*" "teacher" "retention"	6	0	1	0
	"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*" "teacher" "job satisfaction"	32	4	42	0
	"leadership effect*" "teacher" "retention"	13	0	23	0
	"leadership effect*" "teacher" "effectiveness"	16	0	18	0
	"leadership effect*" "teacher" Emotions	5	1	0	0
	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* Teacher Attitudes	22	0	0	0
	leadership effect* Teacher Experiences	0	0	0	0
	leadership Effect* Teachers Professional Development	31	0	32	0
	"leadership effect*" Teachers Professional learning	2	0	4	0

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 2nd and 5th 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 2nd and 5th 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
				lunchroom conversations	conversations		
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	**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.	**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
						findings with key informants, with the use of their feedback to inform final analysis.	
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	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
					staff development plans.		
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 4th and 5th 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	**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
			grade 3-5 performing below state average on reading, and near state average in math 955 students K-5				
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	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 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 4th graders on the state standardized assessment in reading **Student Behavior Referrals** **Student demographic information** **School Climate**	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 4th and 5th 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,	**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
				parents, and students			influenced added-year effects.
				Teacher responses to Collaborative leadership questions on DOE survey			
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 3rd 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 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	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
					state standardized assessment.		
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	**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		
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
				Health Inventory for Middle Schools described institutional integrity, collegial leadership, principal influence, resource support, teacher affiliation, and academic emphasis.			
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: 4th 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
				engagement) as measured by the School Climate Index			
				Trust as measured by:			
				The Omnibus T-Scale			
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	**Principal actions** as evidenced by:	**School culture** as documented by:	Qualitative	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.
			Staff who participated in Faculty Writing Group	Documents created during the Faculty Writing Group	Perceptions notated during the Faculty Writing Group	First-hand narrative	
						Multiple voices-principal and teacher	

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	1st 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 Responses to questions about the classroom-based, building level, district level, and personal factors that define what the authors classifies as "an environment of fulfillment"	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	**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	Findings
						used.	
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.
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	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.
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 (3rd, 4th, 5th 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)	**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.
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	**Behaviors** as evidenced by: Interviews with superintendent, assistant superintendent, principal, assistant principal, and a minimum of 5 teachers. Informal observations of school, classroom, and relevant meetings Document analysis	evidenced by: Status as recognized nationally for utilizing data-driven decision making and evidence of student growth as measured by standardized testing	Multi-Site Case Studies Iterative coding and development of case reports Cross site analysis	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: Renalaysis 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 concentratio n 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 Development al 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 beings 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
							achievement, higher attendance, and fewer behavior referrals.
					Student Attendance as measured by: School attendance records		
					School behavior/ discipline records		
					Student academic achievement on state standardized testing		

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	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 (3rd, 4th, 5th	**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 8th 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
						analysis	
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. |
| 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
					Omnibus Trust Scale (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003) **School Achievement** as measured by proficiency on state standardized assessments		
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?	"Boss Abuse" Theories Symbolic Interactionism Organizational Justice Psychological and Stress Literature	172 teachers from elementary, middle, and high school They were offered the survey at www.endteacherabuse.org	**Principal's acts of abuse and mistreatment** Principal Mistreatment/Abuse Inventory (PMAI) 219 item online survey	**Teacher mistreatment and effects** **Teacher demographic** PMAI (effects section)	Quantitative Descriptive statistics Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Scheffe tests	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	**Principal leadership** as measured by: Responses to the National Educational Longitudinal Study of 1988 (National Center for Education Statistics,	**Communities of practice** as measured by: Responses indicating mutual engagement, joint enterprise, and shared repertoire **Teachers' sense of**	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 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 questions 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**	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.	**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	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: 4th 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 4th 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 **School Performance** as measured by: Principal response to the measure of school performance on the SASS.	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 4th and 5th 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.
Horng, 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	
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 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 11th 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 3rd 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 beings 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
					School behavior/discipline records		
					Student academic achievement on state standardized testing		
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	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 Mulitlevel 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	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
						of data, sharing findings with key informants and including their insights in analysis	
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.	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 2nd and 5th 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 2nd and 5th 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 Purposeful sampling	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 implementatio n Leaders as content experts Leaders as	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
		agents of change	status	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.	**in classroom practice** as evidenced by: Interviews and observations	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 findings with key informants, with the use of their feedback to inform final analysis.	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.
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	Symbolic Interactionism	4 schools that were each in the beginning stage of developing full inclusion programs 2 Elementary 2 Middle 3 Title I	**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	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

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	1st 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
				fulfillment"			
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.
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.
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	The authors found that teachers reported an absence of patience, trust, trustworthiness, and active listening, which had

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 1st year elementary teachers 6 2nd year elementary teachers 12 mentor teachers 6 grade level colleagues of 2nd 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
						Triangulation of interview data, the presentation of verbatim quotes, the creation of an audit trail, and member checks were used.	
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.
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 Cross sections of teachers, students, and parents for interviews At least: 1 teacher from each department 2 12th grade students on student council 2 parents involved in booster clubs	Documents pertaining to school improvement process Observations of various school events		Time-ordered matrix Conceptually clustered matrix 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	**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	6 elementary schools, 1 middle school, 1 high school	**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 Document analysis	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	**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
					CSR Practices as evidenced by: Interview data Observations Artifacts collected were lesson plans, written principal-teacher communication, assessment instruments and staff development plans.		
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	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 4th and 5th 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 anlaysis	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 2elementary 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
					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%		
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	**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.
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.	Transformation al 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	
			Critical Case Sampling 7 elementary general education teachers in MIchigan				
Youngs, P., Holdgreve-Resendez, R.T., & Qian, H. (2011)	To examine how instructional program coherence impacted new teachers' induction experiences.	Instructional Program Coherence		**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.
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	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

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.	"Boss Abuse" Theories Symbolic Interactionism Organizational Justice Psychological and Stress Literature	50 teachers 5 male 45 female Snowball sampling	**Principal's acts of abuse** Interviews with teachers	**Teacher mistreatment** Interviews	Qualitative Grounded Theory Open-ended theoretical and methodological perspective to create a model constructed from the phenomenon under investigation	Teachers suffered varying levels of mistreatment from principals in the workplace that had varying degrees of effect on them psychologically and physically.

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 Instructional Leadership Distributed Leadership Instructional Leadership for Social Justice Critical Theory	related to curriculum 2 men (1 white and 1 African America) 2 women (1 white and 1 African American) Schools represented urban, suburban and rural communities	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	passage of NCLB with a focus on how this policy context impacted leadership in schools.	Thick descriptions Intensive naturalistic observations Participant member checking throughout process Reconstructive analysis Semi-structured interviews	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.

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 Leaderhip 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	meetings and staff meetings Observations of school and district administrative meetings	practice Documents relating to professional development, district communication, and within school communication	Survey	
			32 Classroom Teachers	Structured interviews, and focus groups with teachers, and district staff	**Student Achievement** Scores Collected from district website		
			New principal due to AYP status				
					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	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
						Exploratory Factor Analysis	
						Qualitatively analyzed comments from the open ended section of the survey.	
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 | 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
						comparative analysis	
						Check and recheck of emergent themes	
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	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	in two coaching activities.
						Correlational analyses	
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.
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
Muttillo, 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 Random sampling	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	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 succss, 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 2nd and 5th 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 2nd and 5th 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)\n\n**Accreditation Performance Index** of School as measured by student achievement scores		
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 Leaderhip Transformational Leadership	24 schools 8 elementary, middle, and high schools	**Leadership behavior**\n\nFormal interview with principal and a principal surrogate (teacher or team) Observations of principals in meetings and around the school. Teacher interviews	**Pedagogical quality**\n\ndetermined 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.\n\n**Student academic achievement.** Standardized test scores	Mixed Methods\n\nScatterplot analysis ANOVA Hierarchical Linear Modeling\n\nCoding 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.

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
						trails.	development. HPS principals were reported to provide more resources, but professional development was not highlighted.
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	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	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	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	708 teachers (3rd, 4th, 5th 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** **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 8th 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
					(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		
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	**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 district staff	**School culture** Measured by a survey about communities of practice, collaborative leadership and evidence-based practice Documents relating to professional development, district communication, and within school communication **Student Achievement** Scores Collected from district website	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
					School conditions and teacher experience Collected from state and district website		
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	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
				integrity, collegial leadership, principal influence, resource support, teacher affiliation, and academic emphasis.			
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 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: 4th 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
				and organizational planning, teacher evaluation	state standardized assessments of reading.		inversely related to students below expectations.
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 12th grade students on student council 2 parents involved in booster clubs Purposeful	**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	**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	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	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**	Case Study	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 Purposeful sampling	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** Teacher survey	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	**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.
			Purposeful sampling				
Park, V., & Datnow, A. (2009)	To examine the leadership practices in schools implementing data-driven-decision making utilizing distributed leadership.	Distributed Leadership	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 Document analysis			
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 4th graders on the state standardized assessment in reading **Student Behavior** Referrals **Student demographic** information **School Climate**	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	**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 4th and 5th 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.
Horng, 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
					on AYP Grade level information from state data bases		
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. |
| 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 4th | **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 anlaysis | 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 5th 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., Muttillo, 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				
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	Random sampling 53 New Jersey High Schools Had an 11th 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	**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
			1,083 teachers Convenience sampling		SAT Math SAT Writing % of students in AP classes		
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.	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 3rd 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 **Student**	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 beings 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
					Attendance as measured by: School attendance records		
					School behavior/ discipline records		
					Student academic achievement on state standardized testing		
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)	**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	Qualitative Case Study Constant comparative analysis Trustworthiness addressed through prolonged engagement, thick description, use of an audit trail, and peer debriefing	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.
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	**Student achievement** as evidenced by: High populations of minority	Qualitative Interview Study Coding to	Principals in these schools consistently mentioned a focus on student engagement, student learning, and student understanding. Classroom climate, and the extent to which

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 middles

    schools: Plausible explanations for the differences. *Education and Urban

    Society, 36*(4), 428-456. Doi: 10.1177/0013124504263339.

Brown, K.M., Benkovitz, J., Muttillo, 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). *Revisitng 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). Curriclum 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). Postpositivst 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.

Horng, 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., & Cavasos, 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 evalutation:

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.