Joyce B. Castle
Brock University

Teacher Education and Leadership for Change: Exploring Faculty Perspectives

Given the call for newer forms of leadership in schools, teacher educators have a central role to play in promoting, modeling, and critiquing leadership for change. This study explored the thinking of a group of teacher educators in one Canadian context to gain some insight into their views of educational leadership and the extent to which these promote or constrain leadership for change. Findings revealed some diversity in faculty views about leadership, but also illustrated that traditional views remain deeply embedded in teacher educators' thinking.

Les revendications visant de nouvelles formes de direction au sein des écoles assignent aux enseignants un rôle central dans la favorisation, le modelage et la critique de nouvelles orientations en leadership. Cette étude s'est penchée sur les idées d'un groupe de formateurs d'enseignants œuvrant dans un contexte canadien dans le but d'en ressortir un aperçu de leurs avis du leadership pédagogique et de déterminer dans quelle mesure ces points de vue font avancent ou limitent l'évolution des nouvelles formes de direction. Il en ressort une certaine diversité d'opinions au sujet du leadership. Les résultats indiquent également que les idées des formateurs d'enseignants demeurent fortement empreints de points de vue traditionnels.

What does it mean to be an educational leader in an age of societal change and ever-increasing demands on teachers and administrators alike to demonstrate effectiveness? The question seems especially warranted at this time because the uncertainty associated with the educational reform movement of the past two decades continues to generate problems and questions that beg to be transformed into courses of action.

The notion of leadership itself, especially in the educational arena, has continued to generate much study. Over the last decade, some have argued for expanded conceptualizations of leadership housed in terms such as transformational leadership (Leithwood, 1992), moral leadership (Sergiovanni, 1992), and relational leadership (Regan & Brooks, 1995). Others have stressed that the concept of leadership cannot be considered in isolation from specific variables such as context (Owen, 1992), culture (Bryant, 1998), or gender (Schmuck, 1996). Still others have maintained that leadership is a perception and that the focus of inquiry should shift from leadership to followership (Meindl, 1995) and stewardship (Block, 1993). Taken together, such notions frame an understanding of how leadership in school settings has come to be viewed differently.

Joyce Castle is an associate professor in the Faculty of Education where she teaches preservice, continuing studies, and graduate-level courses. Her teaching and research interests are in literacy development, collaborative cultures, women's issues, and personal professional development in relation to the emergence of leadership.

In his analysis of the newer context for school leadership, Fullan (1996) identifies the current trends affecting leadership in schools and calls clearly for "leadership for change" (p. 701). Fullan's premise is that the new context requires new work of leaders, work that would have them "immerse themselves in real situations of reform and begin to craft their own theories of change, constantly testing them against new situations and against grounded accounts of others' experiences" (p. 710). In short, Fullan calls for leaders with a new mindset for change.

Change in education occurs slowly, however, leading me to suggest that leadership for change in schools is not likely to become common practice quickly. I also suggest that there is little likelihood that leadership for change will become common practice if faculties of education do not take an active role in promoting, modeling, and critiquing notions of leadership at every level from preservice through graduate studies. Because education faculties are largely responsible for preparing teachers and administrators, they play an active role in building initial views of leadership and promoting frameworks for action.

Yet little is known about teacher educators' ideologies and behaviors in relation to leadership. Only a small body of work has focused on education faculty members' thinking about leadership (see American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education's RATE V study, 1991; Bowen, 1995; Thiessen & Howey, 1998). This article addresses this gap by reporting selected findings from a study that explored teacher educators' thinking about educational leadership. Duke (1996) contends that "how people think about and make sense of leadership is a promising new direction in leadership studies" (p. 870). I set out to explore the thinking of a group of teacher educators, all working in the same faculty during this same era of change, in order to gain some insight into their views about educational leadership and the extent to which they promote or limit leadership for change. I report here on these educators' views as they relate specifically to leadership in schools.

School Leadership: The New Context
According to Bennis and Nanus (1997), over 350 definitions of leadership have emerged over the past 30 years. Clearly there are multiple interpretations of the nature of leadership. One reason for the disparity is that the study of leadership crosses a wide range of stakeholders from sociologists to political scientists to business and management theorists to educators. Gronn (1999) maintains that the flow of influential ideas has traditionally been *to* education *from* elsewhere rather than the reverse; "schools, universities and colleges have rarely stimulated the production of theories of leadership and administration which are unique to them" (p. 1). Yet in recent times people in education have indeed made significant contributions to the literature, especially in relation to defining the new context for school leadership.

The new context has emerged as a consequence of trends and changes both in society at large and in the education system itself. A decade ago Elmore (1990) identified the three main dimensions of the reform movement affecting school leadership: (a) changes in how teaching and learning were thought to occur in schools; (b) changes in the work situations of educators; and (c) changes in the distribution of power between schools and clients. More recent-

ly Murphy (1995) specified how the nature of schooling had changed and identified the key alterations affecting the infrastructure of schooling: (a) the acceptance of a constructivist view of learning in place of a behaviorist view; (b) the marketization of public education; and (c) the portrayal of schools as communities of co-workers rather than hierarchical establishments. In a more detailed analysis of the shifting environment accompanying the reform movement, Fullan (1996) focused on the broader social context and specified the eight changes he saw as continuing to affect school leadership well into the new century: (a) a trend toward self-managing schools; (b) new forms of school-community governance; (c) reduced dependence on outside bureaucracy; (d) new centralist roles by government; (e) broader standards of teacher professionalism; (f) expansion of information technology; (g) a focus on new student expectations; and (h) new multiracial, gender politics.

Taken together, these trends noted in the literature have contributed to changing the context in which schools operate and leadership is expected to function. Caldwell (1993) referred to the scope and pace of the change occurring in the 1990s as "nothing short of breathtaking" (p. 165) and argued that the accompanying restructuring would continue to affect every aspect of education from administration to teacher training. In a study that explored the specific changes happening in schools where restructuring was occurring, Newmann (1993) found four distinct themes. These included major changes in: (a) the learning experiences of the students; (b) the professional lives of the teachers; (c) the governance and management of the schools; and (d) how schools were held accountable. Taken together, these confirmed that changes were occurring and that these changes did relate to the trends noted in the literature.

The shift in thinking about schooling brought into question the longstanding patterns of relationships in schools. Traditionally, leadership in schools rested with the principal, the person vested with formal power to administer the site, manage the operation, and oversee instruction. Yet the reform movement and subsequent restructuring questioned this traditional power base, leaving principals struggling to change their roles as new rules and responsibilities were thrust on them, all calling for readjustments of personal and political power (Bredson, 1995). The major shift occurring in this new context has been the replacement of the *leadership by one* concept with the *group-centered leadership* concept. More people have begun to accept the notion that educational leadership may not be the sole responsibility of the principal, but rather may be the province of many who work outside the ranks of administration (Playko, 1992). The principal in this new context is called on to attend more to individual and group needs, to act as consultant and resource person, to model desired behaviors, to encourage self-monitoring, to create a supportive environment, to build collaborative communities, and most of all to give up total control. As a consequence of the shifts in principals' roles, teachers' roles and work are also coming to be viewed differently as they suddenly become part of the group-centered leadership. With a new emphasis on shared decision-making, site-based management, and collaborative communities, leadership is no longer simply the exclusive domain of the principal, but rather a power to be shared throughout the school.

In the new context, then, traditional patterns of relationships are altered such that traditional distinctions between principal and teacher become blurred. The development of human resources takes on a new level of importance in this context, and the goal becomes one of developing a professional community in which many leaders function together. This reflects the shift in thinking from viewing schools as organizations to viewing them as communities (Lieberman, 1995). In the literature on educational change, this concept of school community expands to that of learning community. Lambert, Collay, Dietz, Kent, and Richert (1996) stress that fundamental to this concept of learning community is the notion that all participants are interdependent and connected in their learning. By structure, then, learning communities conform to the principle of distributed leadership within a collaborative framework. Although some suggest that such leadership calls on relational skills and capacities most associated with women's ways of knowing and being (Regan & Brooks, 1995; Schmuck & Runkel, 1994), the broader message in the new context is that all school leaders are responsible for supporting collective learning (O'Neil, 1995).

Leadership for change, then, calls for a different kind of school leader. The trend is away from the individual *great man* approach that focuses on leaders and their capacities and actions to a focus on leadership as shared capacity and attributed status. In this age when conventional boundaries are disappearing, the challenge of leading calls for a new paradigm that promotes movement beyond the walls of tradition. The question of concern in this article is whether teacher educators are reflecting the challenges of this new paradigm. Reported here is the thinking of one group of teacher educators about school leadership and the notion of leadership for change.

Context of the Study

Participants

The faculty of education in this study is housed in a mid-sized Canadian university that offers degree programs at undergraduate and graduate levels. The preservice program has a four-year concurrent program and a one-year post-degree program, both of which provide a Bachelor of Education degree and teacher certification. The graduate program mainly serves practicing teachers who are studying part time for a Master of Education degree. The continuing studies program serves teachers who are pursuing upgrading courses part time. Neither preservice nor inservice departments have a specific leadership program, but the graduate program has an educational administration strand, with about a third of the students registered in this stream.

Although numerous instructors work full and part time across the three programs, this inquiry focused on the views of 12 individuals who taken together represent the mix of sex, age, rank, education, and role across the faculty. There were six men and six women in the group, all ranging in age from 35 to 65, with the average age being 48. Six of the group were responsible for teaching in the preservice department, four were from graduate studies, and the remaining two were allied most closely with continuing studies. Ten in the group had a doctoral degree and held tenured positions from assistant to full professor levels, and the remaining two had master's degrees and held contract positions having retired from positions in the school system. The

number of years at this faculty differed across the group and ranged from two to 25 years. Four of the most experienced in the group had prior administrative experience as either department chairs or school principals, and two were currently in titled leadership positions in the university.

Data Collection and Analysis
The data source of concern for the purpose of this article was an oral interview conducted with each participant. The format was semistructured, with open-ended questions followed by probing. All interviews lasted approximately 90 minutes and were tape-recorded and transcribed. The questions were as follows:

1. Name an individual(s) you consider to be an exemplary leader(s) in education. Why?
2. What are the key characteristics of a leader in education?
3. What is the main role of a leader in education?
4. Has leadership as a concept changed in recent years? If so, how? If not, why is this the case?
5. In a school setting, who is (are) the leader(s)? Why? What specific behaviors illustrate leadership in schools?

Initially, the transcription from each interview was given to each participant as a member check to ensure that their recorded comments represented their thinking. In some cases this resulted in changes in wording or in deletions or additions to specific responses. Following this an assistant and I read all transcriptions independently, first to determine what concepts surfaced, then to categorize these, and then to identify emerging themes. Each participant then received a written summary of the findings and was asked to reflect and comment on the appropriateness of the interpretations in the light of his or her own point of view. Again, this resulted in some further clarification and some shifts in interpretation as well as changes in wording. Finally, I revisited the data, this time using the literature on leadership as my framework to reconceptualize these teacher educators' views. My analysis and discussion of the findings are addressed below.

Findings
This section summarizes the 12 teacher educators' views about educational leadership. These views are presented in the three separate categories that emerged: characteristics of leaders, roles of leaders, and actions of leaders in school settings. The major themes emerging in each category are presented here, with direct quotes used to illustrate the thinking of individuals.

Characteristics of Educational Leaders
In this category the findings relate to these 12 educators' views of who and what constitute exemplary leadership. Owen (1992) maintains that there are many sources of ambiguity related to who leads and what leadership entails, but that one major source is rooted in the relation of leadership to position. It was this connection of leadership to position that emerged in these educators' responses. When asked to name exemplary leaders, all but one in the group named individuals in titled positions such as dean, superintendent, or principal. Emphasized across the group was how knowledgeable their selected leaders were, how effectively they interacted with others, and how powerful

their influence was. As well, each of the selected individuals was described as having influence that reached across a broad range of communities and resulted in observable change.

Beyond naming and describing individual leaders, these 12 educators also identified characteristics of great leaders in general. This is in keeping with one trend in the literature of characterizing leadership by focusing on those personal traits deemed to make one a leader. Initially, a range of traits emerged in the responses, with each of the following identified at least once by at least one educator: articulate, knowledgeable, influential, confident, innovative, inspirational, encouraging, visible, collaborative, organized, decisive, task-oriented, empowering, sensitive, caring, political, and risk-taker. Beyond this, however, one additional trait was named by all 12 in the group: vision. So although there was discrepancy across the group in the characteristics attributed to leaders, vision emerged as the common trait. As one participant stated,

> Certainly great leaders have vision, and to have that vision they must have a clear understanding, a historical perspective I guess, of what has come before, but also of where we are at now, and of where we should be going.

Closely related to this was another finding that revealed that the group saw leaders not only as having vision, but also as relating it to others. Yet their talk about relational capacity revealed clear differences in the group's views. One subgroup held that good leaders develop their own vision and influence others to come on board, either by personal magnetism alone or by direct challenge. The second subgroup focused on a leader's ability to work alongside others, empower them, and create the vision together. Two responses illustrate the differing views:

> [As leader] you look at your operation and see what is working, what should be maintained, and what should be improved … And then you make the changes or you move toward the changes that need to be made … At the same time you work to encourage and motivate people in that direction.

> You're not there as a leader to pull people to another level or push them in your direction, but to support growth in individuals and organizations. So the leader is really a facilitator who helps bring out the best in people and moves them in a shared or common direction that he or she has helped define by some form of collaborative engagement.

When these differing views of relational capacity were considered in relation to the group's earlier list of leadership traits, the individual traits then emerged as reflective of one or other of these images: a leader who pulls or pushes others in the direction of his or her vision, or a leader who works alongside others in the direction of a common vision.

Roles of Educational Leaders
These 12 educators not only described the characteristics of educational leaders, but also identified their roles. When comparing their talk about roles with their earlier list of characteristics, however, some distinct differences, as well as some inconsistencies, were found in their thinking.

The importance of managerial aspects of leadership emerged as most striking in their talk about roles. In their earlier talk about leadership traits, the

ability to maintain and manage an operation had not been noted as a key trait, but 11 of the 12 educators now stressed that "keeping things going smoothly" was a key role of a leader.

Yet although management emerged as imperative, this group also stressed that it was only one of two key roles for educational leaders. When talking about the other role, however, three distinct subgroups emerged. The first held that the other role of a leader was to make decisions and move things forward.

> I think a leader is there to keep things going … that's the drudgery part but it's a very necessary part. But once you get that, the leader has to move people ahead … you have to be able to make a decision … I think that a leader weighs the options, collects the information, makes a decision and stands by the decision.

The second subgroup held that although it was essential for leaders to manage, this should be done only for the purpose of creating a secure environment that would allow the leader to work alongside others, empowering them to carry out their work:

> We think of leadership as "vision building" and "grand ideas" … but if that's the only place where we put the emphasis, then we're losing sight of the day-to-day "getting the job done." It's every bit as important that leaders manage and organize and provide environments where we can all do our work—that's the main point—allow the rest of us to do our work. This is a "servant" kind of leadership and different from the "great man" kind of leadership we've been seduced into over the years.

The third subgroup differed again from the others, maintaining that one could not identify just what a leader should always set out to do because leadership roles were situational. This emerged as a contingency view that argued that different contexts and different times dictated different leadership roles:

> What's called for at one time isn't necessarily what's called for at another. That's why a person who's successful at one moment in an organization's development is not necessarily effective as a leader at another time … The leadership role is situational.

Probing was used here to urge these educators to connect this contingency notion of leadership to what was called for in this Canadian context in these current changing times. Two responses illustrate the diversity of views:

> A leader's role depends on whether the organization calls for innovation or whether it calls for a kind of maintenance role … In today's climate we need stability—the leader has to be empathetic, to be caring, to just let things rest.

> Leadership in good times is pretty easy—it's more just management than anything. Leadership in hard times is really trying to keep people focused and together and to get them moving again in a new direction. Education is in hard times now—we need to move, be innovative.

Taken together, the responses of the 12 faculty members highlighted varying conceptualizations of leadership and its roles. As well, differences emerged in this group's level of awareness of changing notions of leadership in education. When each was asked if leadership was different now than in the past, a range of views emerged. The three statements below reflect the range of views, but taken together, they might not reflect actual differences in position as much

as a lack of clarity between what is ideal and what is actual practice in school leadership:

> Oh sure, the notion of leadership had changed greatly. I know the literature though, and am influenced by that. I know all about "technical leaders" and "problem solvers" and "transformational leaders" and so on. Good leaders now, in these times, need to be transformative leaders—that's what schools need.

> I think [school leadership] is certainly more complex than it used to be. It's also much more collaborative—decisions aren't made in isolation now … In education now there's parental involvement and imposed curricular changes and amalgamation of boards and so on. So leadership has started to be viewed differently … But it's so hard to know if leadership has changed in actual practice.

> I really don't think notions about leadership have changed a lot … We now talk about transformational leadership and moral leadership and all those kinds of things that have always been important, but just haven't had the press till now … But when I look at practice, I don't see much of that happening … A hierarchical assumption's built into the way we work in organizations, and this includes schools, and I don't think we've been able to move out of that.

Actions of Leaders in Schools

Whereas the above sections report findings related to the group's views on traits and roles of educational leaders, this section deals with their views on leaders' behaviors and actions, another means of characterizing leadership.

When asked to connect their notions of leadership to what goes on in schools, these 12 educators' views fell at different points on a continuum. Their differing views on just who in a school is viewed as a leader emerged first. At one end of the continuum were two in the group who quickly stated that leadership activities in schools are associated with principals.

> In schools, the principal is the leader—there's no doubt about that. That's how it's seen in the eyes of the students, that's how it's seen in the eyes of the community, that's how it's seen in the eyes of the teachers. That's also how it's seen externally.

At the opposite end of the continuum were two others who emphasized a different construction of school leader. They held that in their experiences, principals were mere managers, and that the actual leaders in schools were teachers, those creating change.

> They're experimenting and testing things out in their classrooms. And they're identifying their practice according to theoretical perspectives they've sought out. They're quite articulate about why they do what they do and why they have the kinds of classrooms they do. They're rational, thoughtful decision-makers. And they're so willing to share this—there's an incredible energy to share their vision.

The remaining eight in the group formed the third subgroup on the continuum. This group identified different forms of leadership, distinguishing between *perceived* versus *actual, designated* versus *nondesignated*, and *formal* versus *informal* leadership. The perspective expressed was that designated leadership rested with one or two individuals in a school, but that leadership behavior

could be demonstrated by anyone in a school community. Changing times, they claimed, dictated changing roles and changing behaviors in schools.

> I see principals assuming more of a management role and less of a curriculum leader role ... And with site-based management principals have a lot more responsibility for school level decisions ... So leadership in the school now has to be shared more—it's moving away from the autocratic style where the principal made all decisions ... Lots of people are involved now, most especially teachers.

The other important finding in this section emerged when these educators were asked to expand on this notion of shared leadership in schools. It proved difficult for them to operationalize their views about distributed leadership; instead they offered descriptions of activities that reflected traditional views of power and privilege positions. When talking about teacher leadership, for example, these teacher educators quickly qualified the notion by specifying its limitations:

> There aren't many teacher leaders in schools—they're rare. The potential for leadership is there because the job, teaching, is really a leadership job. But if you want to have them take the lead—for example, you want them to do action research—well, it's the principal who has to say, "This is valued, I'll support you." So then the principal has the leader role by supporting and encouraging the staff.

When such examples of school practice were compared with earlier talk in the group, important discrepancies surfaced. Although most in the group had initially espoused that shared purpose and collaborative community were necessary parts of effective leadership in schools, and that all members of the community can be leaders at particular times, they then had great difficulty providing specific examples of leadership that illustrated this shared capacity. When talking in concrete terms about what happens in schools, it appears that their espoused views collided with deeply entrenched structures.

Observations and Reflections

Because the findings in any study highlight only specified slices of a phenomenon, the voices of the 12 educators in this study cannot do justice to the larger reality of teacher education across a range of contexts that differ in organization, politics, and culture. Despite these limitations, I would argue that there is something to be learned from the views of these 12 teacher educators, all of whom were involved daily in living one aspect of teacher education in changing times. I highlight here selected observations and discuss these in relation to the larger issue of whether and how teacher education and leadership for change are complementary terms. As well, I reflect on the implications that arise from the findings and suggest some possible courses for consideration in faculties of education.

Observations

Clearly the educators in this study were not of one mind in their views about school leadership. This was not an unexpected finding given that "there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are people who have attempted to describe the concept" (Owen, 1992). Yet some distinct findings

emerged in this study, and some aspects related to the thinking of these 12 teacher educators warrant further consideration.

It is worth noting first that clear patterns in their thinking about what constituted exemplary educational leadership surfaced initially in this group's talk. I was struck overall by the absence in this group's talk of any reference to the phenomenon of educational leadership as something that might be separate from leadership in general. Maxcy (1991) argues this stance, claiming that "educational leadership is a unique form of leadership ... owing to the fact that educational leaders engage in discourse/practice that is instructional" (p. 195). Key to this view is the operative notion of leadership as teaching. Yet although these 12 worked as teacher educators, none referred to the notion of educational leadership as a phenomenon that focused on teaching or pedagogy. I was struck as well by how readily these educators borrowed from other fields, most notably management and organizational theory, and that this readiness to adopt notions of leadership from outside fields appeared to confirm Gronn's (1999) notion that the flow of ideas about leadership is largely *to* education *from* elsewhere.

To me this adherence to views from other fields appeared first in the group's descriptions of the traits of leaders. All identified vision as the key characteristic of a leader. This could be a result of socialization and of prior training related to vision and mission statements. Nevertheless, vision-driven leadership has been a major component of organizational leadership theory, and these educators' responses supported this organizational view that visionary leaders are needed to set directions, be change agents, and to coach (Nanus, 1992). These educators seemed unaware of increasing critiques of this notion. As Senge (1990) points out:

> Our traditional views of leaders—as special people who set the direction, make key decisions, and energize the troops—are deeply rooted in an individualistic and nonsystemic world view. Especially in the West, leaders are *heroes*—great men (and occasionally women) who "rise to the fore" in times of crises ... So long as such myths prevail, they reinforce a focus on short-term events and charismatic heroes rather than on systemic forces and collective learning. At its heart, the traditional view of leadership is based on assumptions of people's powerlessness, their lack of personal vision and inability to master the forces of change, deficits which can be remedied only by a few great leaders. (p. 340)

None of the educators in this study made reference either to such views as Senge's or to other ways of replacing a visionary notion. Senge's view portrays leaders in three ways: as designers of learning processes that allow others to develop their mastery; as stewards who listen and absorb others' visions too; and as teachers who help others develop their understandings. Although reference to some aspects of these traits did emerge in the talk of some educators in this group, there was no mention that these should replace vision, or even that vision was a limited concept for educational leadership in this age. Fullan (1996) says that creating or having a vision is not bad or even unimportant, but that it needs to be put in perspective and viewed as subordinate to the more sophisticated process required for times of change.

I also observed that a reliance on views from other fields emerged in these educators' talk of roles for educational leaders. This group identified managing

the organization and building relationships as the two key roles. As Beare, Caldwell, and Millikan (1997) note, these are also traditional views from organizational behavior fields:

> Research has consistently revealed that importance of two "dimensions" in describing the behavior of leaders. These behaviors reflect a concern for accomplishing the tasks of the organization and a concern for relationships among people in the organization. (p. 27)

It is not that other less traditional views of leadership roles were foreign to this group of educators. Several individuals, for example, argued for contingency theories that refine conceptions of leaders' roles by pointing to contextual variables and how these call for different roles. This supported Levin's (1992) view that "leadership cannot be regarded as something immutable, divorced from the circumstances of any particular organization" (p. 5). Others in the group went further to espouse an interpretive position that points to leadership as a construction in the mind of the perceiver. From this perspective, "leadership reflects the structures of meaning of the perceiver and the culture and times in which the perceiver lives" (Owen, 1992, p. 268), making leadership roles concepts that are perceptual as well as contextual. Yet concepts such as designated leadership or distributed leadership are not role capacities, and when trying to operationalize these this group had difficulty moving beyond traditional role interpretations that view leaders as managing an organization, creating a vision, and relating to others.

What struck me most in this group's talk was just how difficult it was for them to describe specific examples of leadership behaviors in schools that reflected any of the newer concepts they described. When talking of school leadership, several had espoused newer views as noted above, but when describing actual practices in schools, the activities they described did not reflect the newer thinking. For example, several in the group had discussed school leadership within a framework of school communities of learners and leaders, but when they attempted to provide examples of what constitutes leadership in schools, the specific scenarios they offered failed to illustrate that *teacher as leader* was equal to *principal as leader*. So despite their talk about shared leadership, these teacher educators were not able to provide concrete examples that illustrated such concepts and not other more traditional notions reflecting privilege and power positions. In the school practices that were described, the principal still emerged as the power figure who could or could not choose to empower the teachers. None of the teacher educators made reference to leadership behaviors such as those outlined by Lambert and her colleagues (Lambert, 1998; Lambert et al., 1996) who describe "constructivist leaders" and ways of linking learning and leading. Instead the talk of the educators in this study confirmed Sergiovanni's (1994) view:

> It is easier to feel comfortable with the idea that schools should become communities of learners than that they should become communities of leaders. Learning together makes sense, but leading together defies some of the laws of leadership that we have come to accept. (p. 169)

It might be the case that these educators responded as they did because of surrounding contextual issues. Although they may have been aware of newer

theories and models, they might also have been aware of the disconnection between the literature and the realities of educational restructuring in Canada. The problem might be that of *what could be* versus *what is.* Perhaps these educators were merely reporting what they actually saw in schools as opposed to what they might like to see. Because the group had difficulty operationalizing their views does not mean that they are necessarily averse to change or opposed to newer conceptualizations. It does suggest, however, that leadership for the new context is not clearly understood, even among those who are preparing the leaders for the new context. Clearly, then, although the literature alludes to "a transformation in the nature as well as the style of leadership thought appropriate for school leaders" (Dimmock, 1996, p. 150), teacher educators do not appear readily able to provide examples of in-school leadership behaviors that reflect this transformation.

Suggestions for Action

There is a growing realization that leadership, reform in teacher education, and reform in education itself must all be closely linked (Hargreaves & Fullan, 1998). I suggest early in this article that if leadership for change is to become common practice in schools, those teaching in education programs need to take up the task of promoting, modeling, and critiquing newer notions of leadership. Yet the findings from this study suggest that teacher educators tend overall to hold to more traditional views of leadership. I suggest now that this finding can serve as fodder for thought and possible future action in faculties of education, and I offer the following suggestions geared toward creating more informed practice.

For one, teacher educators would be wise to look inward and explore their own beliefs and practices to determine whether and how their own understanding of leadership promotes or constrains change and newer views. This calls for a willingness to challenge existing assumptions and abandon the old for the new when necessary. Gosetti and Rusch (1995) hold that, "As educators, our understanding of how to learn, teach, and practice leadership is determined by the assumptions and values embedded within the dominant leadership culture" (p. 14), and that until we come to recognize these embedded notions and examine them through different lenses, they continue to shape our reality.

Toward this end, I suggest that teacher educators might come to understand themselves better and develop newer notions more readily if they worked collaboratively in their specific faculty contexts to develop common understandings of the larger role of teacher educators. This calls for education faculty to think more in terms of what they are aiming for in their program and of how their collective views and actions affect the final outcome, both short and long term. The views of those in preservice, continuing studies, and graduate programs need to be visited collaboratively, for faculty members can hold different perspectives on the purposes and ends of each program.

Crucial at this point would be open discussion among faculty about the entire notion of educational change itself and the entire question of leadership for change to what end. Voicing different perspectives on these topics could be most beneficial and could permit the emergence of new understandings among the faculty about the nature and kind of change that might be needed in their

specific context. Although leadership for change might be desirable on its own, it is also a problematic issue, and specific faculty contexts might suggest (or not) the need for specific changes in that faculty.

If faculty members do opt to create change geared toward promoting whole new mindsets related to educational leadership, I suggest that they think in concrete terms about how their program can build in students the leadership needed in the new context. Bennis (1994) holds that educational leaders in the new century need both managerial skills and a range of character traits that include vision, passion, integrity, trust, curiosity, and daring. If the character traits are present, Bennis claims, the teacher education program can develop the managerial skills. But others such as Fullan (1996) and Senge (1990) present a different scenario. They advocate alliance to emerging views that are more balanced and action-based and deal with real paradoxes of change. From this perspective, education programs must focus on problem-based examples that would contribute to the emerging theory. Whatever strategies a faculty agrees on for use would then differ depending on whether the students are at preservice, inservice, or graduate levels, and on whether they are preparing for leadership as teachers or administrators. The sort of information that can be included and modeled in education programs is provided by Hale (1998), who offers specific examples of strategies for teacher and principal use, and by Lambert (1998), who lists specific actions to build what she calls "leadership capacity." Faculty would also be wise to develop new curriculum in collaboration with educational administration scholars and to work regularly with educators in school systems to ensure that a multitude of viewpoints and perspectives are considered in program development.

Finally, as part of a faculty's ongoing development, I suggest that it would be helpful to engage in research aimed at expanding an understanding of this phenomenon of leadership for change. The range of views found in this study underscores the need for other studies like this with different groups of educators in different cultures and subcultures to determine what views and actions emerge across contexts and what contextual issues affect teacher educators' thinking.

Taken together, the suggestions presented here are geared toward helping teacher educators arrive at a better understanding of their own and their colleagues' thinking about leadership. This in turn will, I hope, prove helpful in the preparation and delivery of teacher education programs that will help resolve the ambivalence about educational leadership.

References

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1991). *Teaching teachers: Facts and figures (RATE V)*. Washington, DC: AACTE. (ERIC Document Retrieval Service No. ED 342 772)

Beare, H., Caldwell, B., & Millikan, R. (1997). Dimensions of leadership. In M. Crawford, L. Kydd, & C. Riches (Eds.), *Leadership and teams in educational management* (pp. 24-39). Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.

Bennis, W. (1994). *On becoming a leader*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1997). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper and Row.

Block, P. (1993). *Stewardship: Choosing service over self-interest*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Bowen, L. (Ed.). (1995). *The wizards of odds: Leadership journeys of education deans*. Washington, DC: AACTE.

Bredson, P.V. (1995). Role change for principals in restructured schools: Implications for teacher preparation and teacher work. In M.J. O'Hair & S.J. Odell (Eds.), *Educating teachers for leadership and change* (pp. 25-45). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Bryant, M. (1998). Cross-cultural understandings of leadership. *Educational Management and Administration, 26*(1), 7-20.

Caldwell, B.J. (1993). The changing role of the school principal: A review of developments in Australia and New Zealand. In C. Dimmock (Ed.), *School-based management and school effectiveness* (pp. 165-184). London: Routledge.

Dimmock, C. (1996). Dilemmas for school leaders and administrators in restructuring. In K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger, & A. Hart (Eds.), *International handbook of educational leadership and administration—Part 1* (pp. 135-170). London: Kluwer.

Duke, D.L. (1996). Perception, prescription, and the future of school leadership. In K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger, & A. Hart (Eds.), *International handbook of educational leadership and administration—Part 2* (pp. 841-872). London: Kluwer.

Elmore, R.F. (1990). *Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M. (1996). Leadership for change. In K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger, & A. Hart (Eds.), *International handbook of educational leadership and administration—Part 2* (pp. 701-722). London: Kluwer.

Gosetti, P.P., & Rusch, E. (1995). Reexamining educational leadership: Challenging assumptions. In D. Dunlop & P.A. Schmuck (Eds.), *Women leading in education* (pp. 11-35). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Gronn, P. (1999). *The making of educational leaders.* London: Cassell.

Hale, R.P. (1998). Developing teacher leaders. *Kappa Delta Phi Record, 34*(3), 110-111.

Hargreaves A., & Fullan, M. (1998). *What's worth fighting for out there?* New York: Teachers College Press.

Lambert, L. (1998). *Building leadership capacity in schools.* Alexandria, VA: ASSCD.

Lambert, L., Collay, M., Dietz, M.E., Kent, K., & Richert, A.E. (1996). *Who will save our schools? Teachers as constructivist leaders.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Lieberman, A. (1995). *The work of restructuring schools: Building from the ground up.* Albany, NY: Teachers College Press.

Leithwood, K. (1992). The move toward transformational leadership. *Educational Leadership, 49*(5), 8-12.

Levin, B. (1992). Coping with a changing world. In E. Miklos & E. Ratsoy (Eds.), *Educational leadership: Challenge and change* (pp. 41-62). Edmonton, AB: Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta.

Maxcy, S.J. (1991). *Educational leadership: A critical pragmatic perspective.* New York: Bergin and Garvey.

Meindl, J.R. (1995). The romance of leadership as a follower-centric theory: A social constructionist approach. *Leadership Quarterly, 6*, 329-34.

Murphy, J. (1995). Changing role of the teacher. In M.J. O'Hair & S.J. Odell, *Educating teachers for leadership and change* (pp. 311-323). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

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

Newmann, F.M. (1993). Beyond common sense in educational restructuring: The issues of content and linkage. *Educational Researcher, 22*(2), 4-13, 22.

O'Neil, J. (1995). On schools as learning organizations: A conversation with Peter Senge. *Educational Leadership, 52*(7), 20-23.

Owen, S. (1992). An interpretive approach to leadership: Developing a theme from a case-study. In E. Miklos & E. Ratsoy (Eds.), *Educational leadership: Challenge and change* (pp. 259-284). Edmonton, AB: Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta.

Playko, M.A. (1992). Educational leadership outside the school administrator's door. *Teaching Education, 5*(1), 81-90.

Regan, H.B., & Brooks, G.H. (1995). *Out of women's experience—Creating relational leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Schmuck, P.A. (1996). Women's place in educational administration: Past, present and future. In K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger, & A. Hart (Eds.), *The international handbook of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 337-367). London: Kluwer.

Schmuck, P., & Runkel, P. (1994). *Handbook of organization development for schools and colleges.* Chicago, IL: Waveland.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1992). *Moral leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1994). *Building community in schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York: Doubleday.

Thiessen, D., & Howey, K. (Eds.). (1998). *Agents, provocateurs: Reform-minded leaders for schools of education*. Washington, DC: AACTE.