Indiana University of Pennsylvania Knowledge Repository @ IUP

Theses and Dissertations (All)

8-7-2008

Preparing Future Leaders: Principals' Perceptions of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards and Knowledge Indicators

Mark A. Gross Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Follow this and additional works at: http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd

Recommended Citation

Gross, Mark A., "Preparing Future Leaders: Principals' Perceptions of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards and Knowledge Indicators" (2008). *Theses and Dissertations (All)*. 724. http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd/724

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Knowledge Repository @ IUP. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (All) by an authorized administrator of Knowledge Repository @ IUP. For more information, please contact cclouser@iup.edu, sara.parme@iup.edu.

PREPARING FUTURE LEADERS: PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE INTERSTATE SCHOOL LEADERS LICENSURE CONSORTIUM STANDARDS AND KNOWLEDGE INDICATORS

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

Mark A. Gross

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

August 2008

Indiana University of Pennsylvania The School of Graduate Studies and Research Department of Professional Studies in Education

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Mark A. Gross

Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Education

Robert E. Millward, Ed.D. Professor of Education, Advisor

Cathy C. Kaufman, Ph.D. Professor of Education

Wenfan Yan, Ph.D. Professor of Education

ACCEPTED

Michele S. Schwietz, Ph.D. Assistant Dean for Research The School of Graduate Studies and Research Title: Preparing Future Leaders: Principals' Perceptions of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards and Knowledge Indicators

Author: Mark A. Gross

Dissertation Committee Members: Dr. Robert E. Millward Dissertation Committee Members: Dr. Cathy C. Kaufman Dr. Wenfan Yan

Recent high-stakes accountability movements in education have significantly changed the role of the school principal. As the incongruence between principal preparation programs and successful principalships becomes more apparent, it is imperative that principal preparation programs evolve to meet the complex needs of today's principalship and prepare leaders for tomorrow's schools. This dissertation study explored the standards-based changes in principal preparation programs in Pennsylvania and gathered perceptions of practicing administrators to assist in understanding whether these new changes in preparation and licensure have adequately addressed the preparation issues that have gained so much notoriety over the past decade.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my wife, Kelly, and my children, Alex and Alison, for serving as the motivation behind the writing of this dissertation. You are my inspiration and will continue to be the motivation behind all that I do in life. Thank you for the continuous love, support, and encouragement you provide on a daily basis and that you provided while I was working toward the completion of my doctoral degree. I love each of you dearly and look forward to the many special days that lie ahead of us as a family.

In addition, I would also like to thank my mom and dad, my brothers, Mike and Gary, and my sister, Michelle, for the love, support, and encouragement they have given me over the years. I hope and pray we have many special days that we will spend together in the future.

I want to sincerely thank my committee chairperson, Dr. Robert Millward, for the support, advice, and insight he provided during the writing of this dissertation. I would also like to acknowledge the assistance provided by committee members, Dr. Cathy Kaufman and Dr. Wenfan Yan, whose individual and collective support and guidance has been greatly helpful and appreciated. In addition, I want to acknowledge the fine work of Indiana University of Pennsylvania's Research Laboratory, especially Matt Puz, for the many hours spent assisting me with the data collection and analysis.

Lastly, I would like to thank the members of my co-hort for their friendship over the past several years. The laughter we shared and the support you provided will always be remembered.

iv

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1	THE PROBLEM	1
	Statement of the Research Problem The Evolution of Administrator Training:	1
	Historical Analysis	3
	Purpose of the Study	9
	Research Questions	9
	Significance of the Problem	9
	Definition of Terms	11
2	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	13
	The Evolution of Principal Roles	13
	Instructional Leadership: Leading versus Managing	14
	Transformational Leadership	22
	Principal Leadership Strategies	27
	The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium's	
	Standards for School Leaders	32
	The Future of Principal Preparation	37
	Problem-Based Learning	37
	Cohorts	. 38
	Collaborative Partnerships	. 38
	Field Experiences	. 38
	Technology	39
	Summary	. 39
3	PROCEDURES	41
	Introduction	41
	Research Questions	43
	Sample Population	43
	Instrumentation and the Pilot Study	44
	Validity and Reliability of the Survey Instrument	46
	Development of the Final Survey	48
	The Formal Study and Data Analysis	49
	The Formal Survey Matrix	50

v

Chapter

4	DATA AND ANALYSIS	54
	Introduction	54
	Demographic Variables	55
	Respondents to Survey	56
	Age of Pennsylvania Principals	57
	Gender of Pennsylvania Principals	57
	Ethnicity of Pennsylvania Principals	58
	School Level of Pennsylvania Principals	59
	Principals by School Location	60
	Experience Level of Pennsylvania	
	Principals	60
	Principals by Preparation Program	62
	Principals by College or University	62
	Research Questions and Data Analysis	65
	Research Question One	66
	Research Ouestion Two	73
	Research Question Three	82
5	SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS,	
C	RECOMMENDATIONS	130
	Summary	130
	Findings.	133
	Importance of the Interstate School	
	Leaders Licensure Consortium	
	Standards and Knowledge Indicators	133
	Preparation Levels of Pennsylvania	100
	Principals	134
	Demographic Factors and the	101
	Impact upon Perceived Importance and	
	Prenaration	135
	Summary of Findings	137
	Conclusions	138
	Recommendations for Programs and Practitioners	1/1
	Recommendations for Future Study	1/12
	Final Summary	144
	Final Summary	144
REFERENCES		145
APPENDICES		156
	Appendix A – Survey	157

LIST OF TABLES

T	Fable		Page
	1	Respondents to Survey	56
	2	Age Pennsylvania Principals	57
	3	Gender of Pennsylvania Principals	58
	4	Ethnicity of Pennsylvania Principals	58
	5	School Level of Pennsylvania Principals	59
	6	Principals by School Location	60
	7	Experience Level of Pennsylvania Principals	61
	8	Principals by Preparation Program	62
	9	Principals by College or University	63
	10	Perceived Importance of Standard 1	66
	11	Perceived Importance of Standard 2	67
	12	Perceived Importance of Standard 3	68
	13	Perceived Importance of Standard 4	69
	14	Perceived Importance of Standard 5	70
	15	Perceived Importance of Standard 6	71
	16	Summary of Perceived Importance	72
	17	Perceived Preparation of Standard 1	74
	18	Perceived Preparation of Standard 2	75
	19	Perceived Preparation of Standard 3	76
	20	Perceived Preparation of Standard 4	77
	21	Perceived Preparation of Standard 5	78

Table	ļ
-------	---

22	Perceived Preparation of Standard 6	79
23	Summary of Perceived Preparation	80
24	Comparison of the Standards as a Whole	81
25	Gender: Standard 1	83
26	Gender: Standard 2	85
27	Gender: Standard 3	86
28	Gender: Standard 4	87
29	Gender: Standard 5	89
30	Gender: Standard 6	90
31	Age: Standard 1	91
32	Age: Standard 2	91
33	Age: Standard 3	92
34	Age: Standard 4	93
35	Age: Standard 5	94
36	Age: Standard 6	96
37	School Level: Standard 1	99
38	School Level: Standard 2	99
39	School Level: Standard 3	100
40	School Level: Standard 4	101
41	School Level: Standard 5	102
42	School Level: Standard 6	102
43	School Size: Standard 1	103

Table	e
-------	---

44	School Size: Standard 2	104
45	School Size: Standard 3	105
46	School Size: Standard 4	106
47	School Size: Standard 5	106
48	School Size: Standard 6	107
49	Experience: Standard 1	109
50	Experience: Standard 2	111
51	Experience: Standard 3	112
52	Experience: Standard 4	115
53	Experience: Standard 5	117
54	Experience: Standard 6	119
55	School Attended: Standard 1	122
56	School Attended: Standard 2	123
57	School Attended: Standard 3	124
58	School Attended: Standard 4	125
59	School Attended: Standard 5	126
60	School Attended: Standard 6	128

CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Research Problem

The preparation of public school administrators is at a critical juncture. Despite recent signs of change, administrative preparation programs remain under attack for being too theoretical or insufficiently rigorous (Hallinger & Bridges, 1997). Some researchers such as Art Levine have concluded that most university-based preparation programs for administrators range in quality from "inadequate to appalling" (Archer, 2005). A recent Public Agenda survey found that 69% of principals and 80% of superintendents believed typical leadership programs "are out of touch with the realities of what it takes to run today's school district" (Farkas, Johnson, Duffett, & Foleno, 2001). Over 85% of both groups believed overhauling preparation programs would help improve leadership. State and local education systems are being asked to abandon the century-old model of the principal as middle manager directly responsible for every aspect of school operations and performance (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2000). New models of the principalship call for a greater emphasis on instructional leadership strategies. Murphy (1990) recommends principals spend more time on curriculum, teaching, and learning and less time on management tasks. Milstein (1999) proposed that there is a need for preparation programs to research a relationship between leadership preparation and subsequent administrative performance.

The problem of preparing principals in today's climate may lie in that instructors are typically oriented toward research centered in discrete academic disciplines, whereas school leaders are more interested in practical solutions to problems that cut across

disciplinary boundaries. Preparation programs frequently develop *managers* with a custodial mentality rather than *leaders* who can take their institutions into a radically transformed future (Hallinger & Bridges, 1997). However, several recent trends promise better alignment between preparation programs and schools, including the development of standards for administrator preparation, closer links between universities and K-12 schools, and new instructional methods. With the inception of *No Child Left Behind*, the new nationwide "accountability movement," and the identified shortage of educational administrators (Newsome, 2001) the need for highly effective preparation programs is essential.

The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) organized by the Council of Chief School Officers, was formed for the purpose of developing model standards and assessments for school leaders. ISLLC's primary constituency is the state education agencies responsible for administrator licensing. It includes representatives of state agencies/departments of education and professional standards boards, with considerable participation by professional associates. Many states, including Pennsylvania, have embraced the six standards that the ISLLC have developed and required them to be taught to future school leaders in an attempt to revitalize principal preparation programs and create much greater relevancy to those in leadership positions. Joseph Murphy (2000), a major catalyst behind the ISLLC standards, believes that the standards should be the core of productive leadership preparation.

Have the changes that have taken place in Pennsylvania regarding the preparation and licensure of school principals made an impact upon their perceived job-readiness? This quantitative study explored the standards-based changes recently made in

Pennsylvania principal preparation programs and gathered perceptions of practicing school principals to assist in understanding whether these new changes in preparation and licensure have adequately addressed the preparation issues that have gained so much notoriety over the past decade.

The Evolution of Administrator Training: Historical Analysis

Viewed historically, preparation programs provide insights into evolving beliefs about school leadership. Murphy (1998) traced the development of principal training in the United States from the 19th century to the present. He identified several distinctive periods of principal preparation dominated by particular paradigms. Each of these periods of relative stability was followed by an "era of ferment" in which old ideas were challenged and gradually replaced by new perspectives:

In the earliest period (1820-1899), educational administration was not recognized as a distinct profession. In this "ideological era," school leaders were simply learned authorities whose insights into the truth provided guidance to teachers, students, and the public. Little training was required during this era.

The second period (1900-1946) saw the establishment of formal leadership programs, most of which emphasized technical skills, with a strong flavoring of business efficiency. In this "prescriptive era," professors (most of whom were former school superintendents) attempted to prepare candidates for the principalship as it existed, not as it might be.

The third period (1947-1985) was the "scientific era," in which theoretical ideas from the social sciences began to take precedence. Simultaneously, the makeup of faculty changed, with the old practice-oriented generalists being replaced by discipline-

focused specialists with little practical experience and a strong focus on rigorous theory and research. With enough objective data, they believed, school leadership could be reshaped in a rational way.

The current "dialectic" period (1986-present) has been characterized by highly critical evaluations of administrator preparation programs and persistent efforts to transform the profession. In particular, there has been better communication among the diverse groups interested in the preparation of school leaders, and a notable effort to define rigorous standards for the profession. Programs to prepare educational administrators were limited prior to the 1900s. Many school leaders learned on the job and focused on the day-to-day operations of the school (Sharpe & Walter, 1997).

Early American schools had principal teachers who were elected, but the position has now evolved toward greater attention to administrative and leadership matters. There was a time when school principals were expected simply to manage schools; as long as discipline and order were the primary focus, job responsibilities were satisfied. Beck and Murphy (1993) indicated that schools were originally very receptive to the bureaucratic ideology. Principals were expected to develop and define a rigid hierarchy of authority, and lean heavily on the use of general rules to control the behaviors of others in the organization. During this time, they were expected to be managers as opposed to leaders. Early programs preparing educational administrators emphasized school finance, business methods, organization of schools, and school budgets with a smaller emphasis on curriculum and instructional methodology (Sharpe & Walter, 1997). Principals were the people who moved students from grade to grade at an orderly pace while policies were decided at higher levels of the bureaucracy. The Interstate School Leaders

Licensure Consortium (1996) indicated that the change probably started as early as the 1960s when the federal government began to focus on school curriculum, but most certainly with the publication of *A Nation at Risk* in the early 1980s, which greatly heightened the perception that schools needed to improve. During the 1970s, external factors began exerting a heavy influence on administration of schools (Ohman, 2000). There was a strong emphasis on accountability which would indicate that the efforts of an instructor, department, or institution were actually moving toward a desired end. This included measurement and documenting progress toward the specific goals (Ohman, 2000). Sergiovanni (1999) indicated that during this time, administrators needed to consider themselves as integral members of the community and that civic leadership was an expectation of school officials. Democratic ideals emerged and became a very strong component of managing schools. A Nation at Risk (1983) signed by President H. W. Bush began placing pressure on administrators to increase student success through increased accountability. Since the release of the 1987 report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, Leaders for America's Schools, considerable attention has been devoted to finding ways to improve the quality of leadership in our schools and educational systems (Murphy, Yff, & Shipman, 2000). Murphy (1989) felt that the reform movement, although beneficial in some aspects, had little impact upon the preparation programs for administrators.

The *No Child Left Behind Act* signed by President George W. Bush in 2002, called for annual testing in math and reading for every student in grades third-eighth, sanctions for schools that fail to meet the standards, and issued requirements for placing highly qualified teachers in all classrooms by 2006. Schools had finally evolved to the

point they were being held accountable for student learning. Most importantly, school leaders were expected to change from the managers of the past to the instructional leaders of the present, ensuring that all children will learn (Spoehr, 2004).

Also during this new era of accountability, observers have called for dramatic transformations of curriculum and instruction in administrator preparation programs. Typical recommendations include the use of adult learning principles; reflective activities; coherent, integrated curricula; mentoring; cohorts; authentic assessment; and added opportunities for clinical learning (John Daresh 1997). Some universities are beginning to move in this direction. For example, the Danforth Foundation has worked with a number of universities to provide programs that stress reflection, collaboration, and active problem solving. After a careful review of these new programs and the subsequent experience of their graduates, Leithwood, Menzies, Jantzi, and Leithwood (1995) concluded the evidence was "unequivocal:" preparation programs with these characteristics make a significant difference in leader success.

These many historic changes and the evolution of principal roles served as the catalyst in requiring preparation programs to address the complexity of the principal's position through the implementation of the ISLLC standards. In the last decade, the profession has moved toward the development of explicit *standards* centered on performance in school settings. Initially, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration identified 21 key proficiencies for principals, and the National Association of Elementary School Principals provided its own set of essential competencies. Most recently, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium began work in 1994 to develop standards for school leaders that are closely linked to the goal of

improved student learning and presented in a language that relates to the "new age" principal. These standards were finalized in 1996 and infused into preparation programs throughout the nation. The ISLLC standards have already incorporated tests that are required for licensure in many states. In addition to the assessment for licensure, many states have incorporated the standards into their training programs for administrators. As the ISLLC criteria become more widely accepted, they will undoubtedly be incorporated as guiding principles in many more preparation programs.

In the new reform environment, action by universities is not the only pathway to transforming leadership preparation. States continue to have considerable power in determining the certification requirements necessary for their future leaders. States can require standards-based certification and assessment in order to fully license their practitioners. The Southern Regional Education Board (2002), which has undertaken a major effort to support the improvement of leadership preparation in 16 states, has identified key state actions that can reshape leadership preparation. The steps include infusion of performance-based standards into preparation programs, integration of wellplanned clinical experiences with coursework, and tiered certification systems in which the second-level certificate requires evidence of successful on-the-job performance. Over the past several decades, the field of school administration has experienced turmoil as it has struggled to grow out of its adolescence. A great deal of energy has been invested in coming to grips with the question of what ideas should shape school administration. In the recent past, this has been seen in the form of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium's Standards for School Leaders.

John Norton (2002) noted that standards-based redesign is too often "a paper-andpencil game that requires players to match course titles and content with the adopted higher standards." English (2006) argues that the quest for a "knowledge base" in educational administration, resulting in the construction of standards, has created an unexpected downside leading to "deprofessionalization" of the profession. He indicates that the standardization of preparation programs tied to a knowledge base is, in essence, "anti-change" and "anti-democratic." Some researchers indicate, to be most effective, the new standards should lead to a fundamental rethinking of content, delivery, and assessment. Districts can work with university programs to identify promising candidates, host meaningful internship experiences, and provide advice on program content and delivery. In addition, practitioners can serve as mentors and adjunct instructors. Some large districts have negotiated tailor-made practice-based certification programs with universities (Keller, 2000). However, collaborative efforts take time and commitment. Personnel at universities and K-12 schools are quite different in how they operate and how they think (Norton, 2002). Successful partnerships require motivated participants with the authority to get things done, and the ability to clearly articulate their needs and expectations.

As with traditional programs, there is little evidence that connects preparation practices to principals' on-the-job performance or to student achievement (Archer, Bushweller, & Viadero, 2004). The new standards do not detail how they are linked to student performance, a critical element of today's responsibilities of a school leader. The ISLLC standards remain silent about principals' interaction with students, something that has concerned many individuals currently reviewing the standards. Although the ISLLC

seems to offer better descriptions of legal and ethical standards as well as guidance on building community internally and externally to the school, they are silent about principals' interactions with students (Clark, Stalion, & Young, 2004). Some researchers believe that the crucial missing link in reform efforts is research that would begin to make those connections between preparation practices and the achievement of students (Browne-Ferrigno, Barnett, & Muth, 2002).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to collect and analyze the perceptions of practicing Pennsylvania school principals regarding the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium's standards for school leaders as they relate to preparation and practice.

Research Questions

- 1. Which ISLLC standards and knowledge indicators are viewed as most important to practicing Pennsylvania school principals?
- 2. To what extent have the ISLLC standards and knowledge indicators been addressed in the preparation of Pennsylvania Principals?
- 3. What demographic factors have the most significant impact upon principals' perceptions of the ISLLC standards and knowledge indicators as they relate to preparation and practice?

Significance of the Problem

Standards alone, as discussed earlier, are probably not enough to reshape leadership programs. Extensive research suggests that many principals lack the time and preparation to successfully satisfy the roles they are required to fulfill (Farkas, et al.,

2001). "The organizational context in which they work and the set of skills, beliefs, and expectations that they bring to their role" function as roadblocks to effective instructional leadership" (Murphy, 1990, p. 181). Standards-based reform, distributed leadership, and an increased emphasis on student outcomes are issues for which most principals are simply not prepared (Elmore, 2000). It is time for preparation programs to change to the ever-increasing needs of the principal.

Principals have been trained and certified as administrators through programs that are largely irrelevant to, and grossly inadequate for, the work responsibilities found in the school principalship (Doud & Keller, 1998). Unquestionably, the need exists to rethink, redefine, and restructure the principalship and the preparation for the position (IEL, 2000). Rethinking and restructuring the principalship, as well as aligning principal preparation programs to adequately meet the day-to-day demands of the principal, requires a working knowledge of the current practices of today's principals. Murphy believes that, before sound conclusions can be drawn about the nature and future of preparation programs, reformers must possess three things: a comprehensive understanding of the history of preparation; a thorough grasp of the strengths and weaknesses of current programs; and, a clear vision of the future of education, school and leadership (Murphy, cited in Lumsden, 1993).

Facing new roles and challenges, principals require new preparation and should be guided into their positions by highly competent, professional, and ethical mentors. The Interstate Leaders Licensure Consortium (1996) indicated that a *Public Agenda* survey found that 69% of principals and 80% of superintendents believed that school leadership programs are out of touch with the realities of what it takes to run today's

school systems. More than 85% of both groups believed that overhauling preparation programs would help improve leadership. A survey conducted in Virginia revealed that only 44% of principals reported that their graduate education had been valuable to their preparation as principals (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001).

The high stakes accountability movement will make a profound impact upon nearly every aspect of education. Probably no individual has experienced the impact of the accountability movement more directly than the public school principal. No role has changed more dramatically (report of the Task Force to Evaluate and Redesign Preparation Programs, 2003). For this reason, it is imperative that principal preparation programs adequately address the needs of today and the changing needs of tomorrow. In Pennsylvania, the implementation of the ISLLC standards into preparation programs for school leaders is an effort to provide much needed change, rigor, and relevancy to the preparation programs for future school leaders. Has the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards for School Leaders made an impact upon the perceptions of secondary principals currently practicing in Pennsylvania? This study will attempt to answer this question.

Definition of Terms

ISLLC Standards. Standards developed by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium that encompass areas necessary for instructional leadership.

Knowledge Indicators. The knowledge-base required to assure successful and comprehensive understanding and implementation of the six standards for school leaders.

Principal Preparation Program. Administrative training program for aspiring principals that ultimately leads to certification.

Principalship. Essential performances of a school principal.

Principal. A building-level administrator in a school district.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The Evolution of Principal Roles

Since the inception of public education in America, educators have struggled with defining the role of the principal. The primary role and expectation of a school leader has continuously changed between management, instruction, and moral development causing confusion within the public school system itself (Green, 2000; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2000). Principals were originally trained to be "bureaucratic executives" followed 10 years later by "humanistic facilitators" and then "instructional leaders" (Beck & Murphy, 1993). Beck and Murphy (1993) cited that schools were persistently receptive to the bureaucratic ideology. They developed a clearly defined and rigid hierarchy of authority and leaned heavily on the use of general rules to control the behaviors of others in the organization. Surveys persistently find that principals feel torn between the instructional leadership, that almost everyone agrees should be the top priority, and the daily management chores that are almost impossible to ignore; often, the managerial responsibilities seem to take precedence (Cooley & Shen, 2003). In the past decade, the growth of standards-based accountability has only intensified the debate on principal roles. The Institute for Educational Leadership (2000), after citing a long list of the principal's traditional managerial responsibilities, indicated that principals today must also serve as leaders for student learning. Murphy (2000) defined school leadership in terms of three metaphors: moral steward, educator, and community builder. They must know academic content and pedagogical techniques. They must work with teachers to strengthen skills. They must collect, analyze, and use data in ways that fuel excellence.

They must rally students, teachers, parents, local health, and family service agencies, youth development groups, local businesses and other community residents, and partners around the common goal of raising student performance. And they must have the leadership skills and knowledge to exercise the autonomy and authority to pursue these strategies. In addition to the evolving roles of principals, schools themselves continue to change. There is some evidence that schools are becoming networks rather than hierarchies, requiring administrators to create communities both inside and outside of the school setting (Haughey, 2006). Principal knowledge management is now evident both in the regulated activities of the school and the informal communities supporting the dynamic structure of the school. More than ever, principals are expected to be much more than the bureaucratic executives of the past.

Instructional Leadership:

Leading versus Managing

The varying roles of the instructional leader, manager, democratic leader, change agent, and moral developer are enmeshed in history (Murphy, 2003). In order to adequately address the major needs of principal preparation programs, it is essential that an understanding of the principal's role in today's educational system is understood. The most frequently mentioned leadership styles in the research are *instructional leadership* and *transformational leadership* (Leithwood, et al., 2000). In addition, the next most frequently mentioned concepts were moral leadership, managerial leadership, and cultural leadership. Beck and Murphy (1993) described the complexity of today's school leader as:

A professional person being torn apart on the one hand by his intense interest and desire to lead in instruction and learning and on the other hand by his responsibility to keep school through the proper administration and management of people and things as expected by the public. (p. 125)

The new emphasis on "principal as leader" may have added a whole new dimension to the traditional distinction between the dual roles of "principal as educator" and "principal as administrator." Leadership must be earned, even after appointment to a managerial position. Leadership is not a position in the organization, but an active, influencing force (Boyer, 1983). The role of the principal, across the nation, is continuing to evolve due to many social, political, and economic factors. The principal's job is becoming increasingly complex therefore preparation programs must adequately address the various leadership roles that future principals will play in the ever-changing educational arena.

A major leadership challenge that is faced by building principals today is the dilemma of "managing versus leading" (Day, 2000). Although all principals want to become good leaders, it is very common for daily management functions to take over an administrator's day-to-day activities. The accountability movement that has taken the nation by storm has required building-level administrators to balance managerial and leadership tasks--something that sounds simple, but is becoming increasingly more difficult. There are four main components embedded in creating and sustaining a culture for learning and growth. These include the school culture, the instructional program and curriculum development, student learning, and professional staff development. To learn well, students need access to high-quality instruction, quality teachers, a well-crafted

curriculum, and the positive effects of a strong school leader (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). Central to developing a positive culture that promotes learning is trust formed through opportunities to share what is important, respect for the values that are common and diverse, and appreciation for the role each plays within the organization and its structure. An instructional leader is aware of opportunities to foster a climate of learning through the management of schedules, logistics, discipline, policies within the building, and management and leadership tasks. As administrators work with teachers who instruct diverse students, they must be aware of multiple ways of analyzing various facets of the work of teachers, from planning to instruction, activities and assessment of student learning (Hackman, Schmitt-Oliver, & Tracy, 2002).

Research indicates that effective leaders create effective schools. A true "leader" in today's public schools is one who has the ability to maintain a delicate balance between managerial and leadership tasks. Although knowledge is limited on what types of leaders are needed, there are a number of assumptions about leadership. In educational organizations there is an assumption that leaders of educational change should be both leaders and managers. Principals in today's environment are expected to fill both the managerial and leadership voids in the school. Manasse (1986) emphasizes that both leadership and management are currently expected from the same individual.

If one has had the opportunity to serve as a principal in today's public school, or the opportunity to observe their daily activities, it would be evident that the position is very much "reactive" in nature. An effective principal has the ability to keep the school running smoothly by resolving various issues throughout the typical school day (management tasks) while also leading the stakeholders in a common direction to

enhance student performance and learning (leadership tasks). Unfortunately, management responsibilities of principals are often the tasks of focus, while leadership tasks get very little attention. Principals must maintain their ability to take on both reactive and proactive roles within the school. As the role of today's principal continues to evolve, maintaining a fine balance between management tasks and leadership tasks is essential for any principal to survive and lead effective organizations. Due to this dilemma, there is an outcry for preparation programs to provide much less emphasis on management and more emphasis on instructional leadership to provide a much better framework for leadership programs (Barnett, 2004).

Research and leadership theory suggests that effective schools are the result of effective leaders. The central theme of the research is that those who find themselves supervising people in an organization should be both good managers and good leaders. As Duttweiler and Hord (1987) stated:

The research shows that in addition to being accomplished administrators who develop and implement sound policies, procedures, and practices, effective administrators are also leaders who shape the school's culture by creating and articulating a vision, winning support for it, and inspiring others to attain it. (p. 65)

Effective leaders are those individuals who demonstrate the ability to manage the day-to-day building concerns, while also infusing strategies that allow teachers, students, parents, and administrators to maintain their focus on a shared vision. These individuals typically demonstrate competencies and personality traits that are conducive to leadership. Effective school leaders have discovered ways to effectively integrate

leadership into their schools by implementing strategies that directly impact and promote teaching and learning. A dynamic principal has the ability to positively affect teachers and students. Principals in today's schools are expected to fill the role of inspirational leader, human resource developer, and change agent (Williamson, 1995). These individuals are those who work to create open, honest, and sincere relationships with all members of the school community (Sergiovanni, 1994). Principals that can find a delicate balance between the management tasks of the school and the leadership tasks of the school create environments that focus on the social and educational welfare of students. Such schools are possible because they bring out the best in teachers.

Although management tasks can easily absorb all of a building principal's time, energy, and focus, the goal of today's principal should be to maintain the balance between managing and leading. Principals who implement strategies in their building to encourage teacher growth and professionalism, while demonstrating strategies, behaviors, attitudes, and clear goals have a direct impact upon classroom instruction and overall school success. The "pressure to manage" and the "responsibility to lead" is a leadership challenge that all administrators face. Awareness of this challenge, and the implementation of simple strategies, can make a big difference in the overall effectiveness of today's school leader. Preparation programs must teach aspiring principals how to delicately identify, organize, and prioritize management and leadership tasks.

"Managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing" (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 21). Burns (1978) describes managers as "transactors" and leaders as "transformers." Managers concern themselves with the technical aspects

of the organization (Ubben & Hughes, 1987). The skills of a manager facilitate the work of an organization because they ensure that what is done is in accord with the organization's rules and regulations. The skills of a leader ensure that the work of the organization is what it needs to be while identifying the overall goals of the organization. They initiate the development of a vision of what their organization is about. "Management controls, arranges, does things right; leadership unleashes energy, sets the vision so we do the right thing" (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 21).

Current literature acknowledges a shift in the roles and responsibilities that demand the time of today's principal. It also reflects a consensus of concern over the failure of principal training to keep pace with today's diverse society and the changing expectations of school leaders (Fenwick, 2000). Once viewed as simply a school manager, the principal remains the point person on facilities oversight. The responsibilities gradually have increased, and the principal has become accountable for instructional improvement, staff development, curriculum design, development and implementation of site-based decision-making plans, and complex discipline and school safety issues (Ferrandino, 2000). A typical school principal spends 60-plus hours per week on administrative duties, which excludes student programs and special events (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 2001). Round table discussions with area administrators consistently demonstrate that school leaders believe that instructional leadership is a priority, and yet it is the area that is often neglected. Most administrators admit that there should be more time devoted to curriculum and spent in the classroom with teachers (Murphy, 1989).

Besides being asked to take on responsibilities that they never had to deal with in the past, principals now are held accountable for the successful achievement of students. Across the nation, today's schools feed, counsel, provide physical and mental health services, and protect students while they educate and instruct (*The Principal Shortage*, 2000). Principals must be experts on current education law and policy, and they must act as coordinators for social services and fundraisers. Their roles have evolved to include public relations consultant, security officer, technology expert, and diplomat; fulfilling these roles adequately is necessary to ensure that schools function coherently and smoothly every day (Farkas, et al., 2001). Above all, today's principals must focus on student learning: instructional programs, curricular and pedagogical issues, and models of assessment.

Many questions about the role of today's leader have laid the foundation for a new surge of research that recently has begun to examine and define the parameters of effective educational leadership (Farkas, et al., 2001). Such questions also are important in determining the future of the principalship and principal training. Answers to these questions must take into account the changes in principal responsibilities and roles that have been occurring during the last several decades. Current and future principals will have to understand how to deal with an ever-widening scope of issues, including diversity, emerging research findings on brain functioning, technology, community relations, and competition from charter schools (Ferrandino, 2001).

Michael Copland (2001) found that expectations of the principalship have mushroomed over the past 20 years. Some observers have suggested that the job may have become impossible for all but a few "superleaders" (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran,

2003). Principals are identified as the key reform agents and are held mercilessly accountable for various components of the school. When the concept of instructional leadership emerged in the early 1980s, the rules changed for school administrators. Long judged by their ability to manage school operations with businesslike efficiency, principals were now charged with a specifically academic mission. Study after study seemed to show that high-achieving schools had principals who boldly led the academic program, set goals, examined curriculum, evaluated teachers, and assessed results.

Today, prevailing views of leadership suggest that the principal's role should not be to direct others but to create a school culture in which decisions are made collaboratively. It is recommended that, in order to overcome the broad spectrum of responsibilities, principals learn to distribute leadership among the organization in order to meet managerial and leadership responsibilities effectively. This type of leadership requires the creation of power through others, not over them (Conley & Goldman, 1994).

Murphy and Datnow (2003) found that successful principals in comprehensive school reform build "dense leadership organizations" by sharpening their own collaborative skills, developing teacher leadership, finding resources to support the growth of professional community, giving teachers the confidence to grow, and managing the leadership agenda systemically. What Murphy and Datnow call "dense leadership" is more commonly known as "distributed leadership." While the term is sometimes used to describe a kind of job sharing in which the principal's current duties are parceled out to other administrators or teachers, it more typically views leadership as inherently a social activity woven into the threads of the organization. By virtue of their strategic position, principals must not only carry out their own assigned duties, but must

develop leadership capacity in teachers and others who are not necessarily accustomed to thinking and acting as leaders. Timperley (2005) points out that the idea of leadership as distributed across multiple people and situations has proven to be a more useful framework for understanding the realities of schools and how they might be improved.

Ten years ago, principals were asked to become "instructional leaders," exercising firm control by setting goals, maintaining discipline, and evaluating results. Today they are encouraged to be "facilitative leaders" by building teams, creating networks, and "governing from the center." As the role of the principal continues to evolve, it is evident that a principal must find ways to involve others in the decision-making process in order to meet the many demands of the position.

Transformational Leadership

Over the past two decades, debate over the most suitable leadership role for principals has been dominated by two conceptual models: *instructional leadership* and *transformational leadership*. The leadership literature of the 1970s and 1980s, with its focus on effective leaders, revisited the idea of personal traits as determinants of leadership abilities. It primarily contributed to understanding the impact of personal characteristics and individual behaviors of effective leaders and their role in making organizations successful. The studies differentiated between leaders and managers and introduced a new leadership characteristic--vision--and explored its importance. Along with having vision, effective leaders are said to facilitate the development of a shared vision and value the human resources of their organizations. In addition to these insights on leadership, a new theory emerged--*transformational leadership*.

Transformational leadership refers to the process whereby an individual engages with others and creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the follower. Philip Hallinger (2003) believes that these two conceptual models are in direct response to the changing needs of schools in the context of global educational reforms. According to Burns (1978), transformational leadership refers to the process whereby an individual engaged with others creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the follower. According to Schermerhorn (1996), the special qualities of transformational leaders include vision, charisma, symbolism, empowerment, intellectual stimulation, and integrity. A transformational leader is one who inspires trust, confidence, admiration, and loyalty from his or her followers. Today's principal and the programs responsible for their preparation must take into account that the expectations of a principal today are much different than in the past. The goal of preparation programs should be to facilitate the development of transformational leaders that are typically seen as visionaries and catalysts of organizational change (Campbell & Denhart, 2006). Studies show that incorporating shared leadership, shared vision, collective learning, supportive conditions, and shared personal practice within the professional learning community is important for student success and school improvement (Huffman, 2001). It is critical to understand that the emergence of a strong, shared vision based on collective values provides for the foundation for informed leadership, staff commitment, student success, and sustained school growth. The principals of tomorrow will need to be effective in creating this type of connection with all of his/her constituents in order to fulfill the demands of the position.

Vision is a major component of transformational leadership research. Successful leaders are able to collectively create, and ultimately sustain, a common vision for the organization. The vision serves as the focus for the organization and all that it entails. "All leaders have the capacity to create a compelling vision, one that takes people to a new place and the ability to translate that vision into reality" (Bennis, 1990, p. 46). Current leadership literature frequently characterizes the leader as the vision holder, the keeper of the dream, or the person who has a vision of the organization's purpose. In *Leadership is an Art* (1989), De Pree asserts that "the first responsibility of a leader is to define reality" (p. 9). Bennis (1990) writes that leaders "manage the dream." Vision is the collective goal(s) that keeps the organization moving together. Vision is a characteristic of leaders that allows them to attain true followers and work toward common outcomes in the organization.

Effective transformational leaders focus their school organization on a vision that embodies best practices in teaching and learning. These school leaders inspire others to reach for ambitious goals and in doing so create change (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). It is one thing to have a vision as an individual but something quite different to be able to share it. "Some studies indicate that it is the presence of this personal vision on the part of a leader, shared with members of the organization, that may differentiate true leaders from mere managers" (Manasse, 1986, p. 151). This style of leadership embraces building a school vision, establishing goals, providing intellectual stimulation, offering individualized support, modeling best practices and important organizational values, demonstrating high performance expectations, creating a productive school environment, and developing structures that foster participation in school decisions (Leithwood, et al.,

2000). A leader's vision needs to be shared by those who will be involved in the realization of the vision. Murphy (1988) applied shared vision to previous studies of policy makers and policy implementation; he found that those studies identified gaps between policy development and its implementation and concluded that this gap also applies to current discussions of vision. He stressed the need for the development of a shared vision in order for an organization and its leader to be effective. "It is rare to see a clearly defined vision articulated by a leader at the top of the hierarchy and then installed by followers" (Murphy, 1988, p. 656). Whether the vision of an organization is developed collaboratively or initiated by the leader and agreed to by the followers, it becomes the common ground, the shared vision that compels all involved. "Vision comes alive only when it is shared" (Westley & Mintzberg, 1989, p. 21). Visionary leadership combined with shared and collaborative strategies provide support for faculty to invest time and effort needed to create the school vision (Huffman, 2001). Transactional and transformational leaders are those who are willing to make effectual change within the organization. High profile changes are often associated with leaders who are charismatic. These leaders draw excellent people to them, create a vision, and establish the loyalty and commitment to see successful reform (Hargraves & Fink, 2000). It is a compilation of procedures and activities that, if guided by vision and dominated by commitment to the education of individual students, leads to more effective learning. Innovation includes skills in communication, partnerships, and trust building on the part of the school leader (Houston, 1998).

Bass and Steidlmeier (1998) state that leaders are authentically transformational when they increase awareness of what is right, good, and important, when they help to

elevate organizational needs for achievement, when they foster moral maturity, and when they move members beyond their own self-interests for the good of the whole. Transformational leaders exhibit exemplary moral, ethical, and humanistic traits. They must have strong convictions and be a firm believer in the direction the school is moving and yet be aware of personal values, beliefs, and desires (Sergiovanni, 1996). They create organizations that value the human element of individuals. They go beyond the development of a common vision; they value the human resources of their organizations. The cultural life in school is a constructed reality which includes values, symbols, beliefs, and ideals of parents, students, teachers, and others conceived as a group or community (Sergiovanni, 1984). Attention to the emotions is becoming increasingly more important to today's leaders. A central component of transformational leadership is the idea of "emotional intelligence." Emotional management seems to be a technical endeavor, born of modernity, set for standardization, and something that should be objective and measurable in today's leaders (Hartley, 2004). An environment is evident that promotes individual contributions to the organization's work. Transformational leaders develop and maintain collaborative relationships formed during the development and adoption of the shared vision. They form teams, support team efforts, develop the skills groups and individuals need, and provide the necessary resources, both human and material, to fulfill the shared vision that transformational leaders share with their followers. True leaders must maintain respectful communication and relationships with subordinates in order to attain the shared vision and build a climate conducive to the goals of the organization. Successful schools have a strong culture aligned with a clear vision of excellence in learning and an appreciation of the diversity within a society. Weak cultures result in
weak schools characterized by a lack of understanding of what is to be accomplished and a lack of effort toward common goals along with a lack of understanding or appreciation for the society (Sergiovanni, 1984).

Principal Leadership Strategies

Although today's leaders are expected to exhibit transformational leadership strategies, they basically have three strategies they must utilize in order to run their schools effectively: Hierarchical, Transformational, and Facilitative Strategies. Each has important advantages; each has significant limitations. Together, they offer a versatile set of options in meeting the needs of the principal's position and typically relate directly to the leadership style of the individual leader.

Historically, schools have been run as bureaucracies, emphasizing authority and accountability. Hierarchical strategies rely on a top-down approach in which leaders use rational analysis to determine the best course of action and then assert their formal authority to carry it out. Deal and Peterson (1994) refer to this as "technical leadership," in which the principal acts as planner, resource allocator, coordinator, supervisor, disseminator of information, and analyst. Hierarchical strategies provide a straightforward, widely accepted way of managing organizations. Deal and Peterson also point out that hierarchy tends to diminish creativity and commitment, turning the employee-school relationship into a purely economic transaction, often referred to as "transactional leadership."

Transformational strategies, as discussed earlier, rely on persuasion, idealism, and intellectual excitement, motivating employees through values, symbols, and shared vision. Principals shape school culture by listening carefully for the goals and aspirations

within the organization. Leithwood (1993) adds that transformational leaders foster the acceptance of group goals; convey high performance expectations; create intellectual excitement; and offer appropriate models through their own behavior. Transformational strategies have the capacity to motivate and inspire followers, especially when the organization faces major change. They provide a sense of purpose and meaning that can unite people in a common cause. Transformational strategies are difficult, since they require highly developed intellectual skills. It must be understood that an exciting, emotionally satisfying workplace does not automatically result in the achievement of organizational goals (Deal & Peterson, 1994). Transformational strategies, utilized by transformational leaders, are very effective in leading an organization and are the preferred strategies by today's researchers. Transformational leaders not only make an impact upon the organization, but transform the individuals within it.

Conley and Goldman (1994) promote the idea of "facilitative leadership, allowing for behaviors that enhance the collective ability of a school to adapt, solve problems, and improve overall performance." This is accomplished by actively engaging employees in the decision-making process; the leader's role is not to solve problems personally but to see that problems are solved. Like transformational leadership, facilitative strategies invite followers to commit effort and psychic energy to the common cause. Transformational leaders sometime operate in a top-down manner (Blase, Anderson, & Dungan, 1995); facilitative strategies offer teachers a daily partnership in bringing the vision to life. The leader works in the background, not at the center of the stage. Conley and Goldman (1994) say principals act in a facilitative manner when they overcome resource constraints; build teams; provide feedback, coordination, and conflict

management; create communication networks; practice collaborative politics; and model the school's vision. Facilitation creates a collaborative, change-oriented environment in which teachers can develop leadership skills by pursuing common goals, producing a democratic workplace that embodies the highest American ideals. Advocates of this view believe the principal can exercise instructional leadership by presiding over a team of staff members who do have instructional expertise (Hess, 2003). In order to provide such an environment, the role of the principal is to employ techniques that foster teamwork and mutual appreciation between principal and staff.

New research indicates that true collaboration in schools can exist, only if the principal has the ability to build "resonance" among the constituents of the school, that is a reservoir of positivity that frees the best in people, priming a good feeling in those that they lead (Goleman, McKee, & Boyatzis, 2002). Effective leaders utilize their "emotional intelligence," their ability to build meaningful relationships as a means of leading individuals in a common direction. A principal must possess the ability to build relationships with those they lead in order to truly utilize the collaborative and facilitative strategies. Blase and Kirby (2000) emphasized that effective principals are dynamic individuals who work to create open, honest, and sincere relationships with their teachers. Without the ability to manage relationships, the ability to be a transformational or facilitative leader is almost impossible.

Although much of the current literature seems to advocate transformational and facilitative approaches, the limited research evidence does not permit strong conclusions about which strategy is better able to meet the needs of today's administrator. It is recommended that effective principals use multiple strategies. Deal and Peterson (1994)

argue that effective principals must be well-organized managers and artistic, passionate leaders. Robert Starratt (1995) says principals must wear two hats--leader and administrator, in other words, the responsibility to manage and lead. As leaders, principals nurture the vision that expresses the school's core values; as administrators (or managers), they develop the structures and policies that institutionalize the vision.

Sergiovanni (1994) suggests that organizations, like people, exist at different developmental levels. A school that has traditionally operated with strong top-down decision-making may not be ready to jump into a full-blown facilitative environment. By instituting a variety of strategies, the leader can more effectively create a balance within their organization. Running a school does not seem to require all-or-nothing strategic choices. Effective leadership is multidimensional. A variety of strategies must be employed to meet the various demands placed upon the principal.

As indicated earlier, the demands on the principalship have increased over the past several decades. Effective principals are those who involve all stakeholders in the decision-making process. Over time, the hierarchical approach has evolved into an approach that requires collaboration and facilitation. This new approach to the principal position can assist in creating a fine balance between the ability to both manage and lead an organization.

Managerial duties for building-level administrators continue to grow, especially in the new "accountability movement." The bureaucratic management tasks often take time away from principals in their attempt to be instructional leaders. Although desirous of being instructional leaders, the demands placed upon a principal's time makes it much more difficult. Given the existing demands placed upon a principal's time, much of the

current literature focuses on new ways to allocate the workload. Research suggests that in order to find the balance between management functions and leadership functions, effective principals develop leadership teams, utilize internal resources, and delegate responsibility among the hierarchy of the organization. While doing this, continuous feedback and communication exists between the principal and the individuals in the organization. This communication is crucial in assuring the shared vision of all of the stakeholders is continuously in-focus.

Two major themes have been presented. First, the principal's role is increasingly being defined in terms of *instructional* and *transformational leadership*; concepts that surfaced decades ago but have very different meaning today. The instructional leader of the past was presented as an efficient, task-oriented, top-down manager who was focused on curriculum rather than buildings and budgets, a far cry from the traditional bureaucratic manager. At present, the ideal *instructional* and *transformational* leader is portrayed as a democratic, community-minded leader who builds consensus around a vision rooted in agreed-upon standards for student learning, with a commitment to be accountable for results.

The responsibility of principal preparation programs is to train principals in a manner that takes into account all necessary components of effective schools research. The principal's role has evolved over time and it is expected that principal training programs continue to evolve in order to address the complexity of today's principalship. Although it is almost certain to predict that preparation programs cannot adequately prepare principals for everything, it is important to assure that future principals receive well-rounded training that encompasses research-based methodology based on a good

theoretical framework. It is hoped by many the ISLLC standards prove to be the solid foundation to assure this transformation.

The Interstate School Leaders Licensure

Consortium's Standards for School Leaders The ISLLC Standards document states:

The intent of the document is to stimulate vigorous thought and dialogue about quality educational leadership among stakeholders in the area of school administration. A second intent is to provide raw material that will help stakeholders across the education landscape (e.g., state agencies, professional associations, institutions of higher education) enhance the quality of educational leadership throughout the nation's schools. Our work is offered, therefore, with these two goals in mind. (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium, 1996, p. 1)

Perhaps the implementation of these standards will finally prove to be the mechanism responsible for positive change in the preparation of future school leaders.

There are a variety of principal preparation program methodologies currently being used nationally, however many states have chosen to base their program's requirements on the ISLLC's Standards for School Leaders, regardless of the model of delivery. The ISLLC sought to stabilize the ever-changing administrative role with the development of six national standards for school leaders in 1996. Within these standards, knowledge indicators, dispositions (attitudes), and performances were specifically defined for each of the six standards. Murphy (2000) believed that these indicators, dispositions, and performances were the essence of what administrators needed to have in

order to be effective. The ISLLC organized by the Council of Chief School Officers, was formed for the purpose of developing model standards and assessments for school leaders. ISLLC's primary constituency is the state education agencies responsible for administrator licensing. It includes representatives of state agencies/departments of education and professional standards boards, with considerable participation by professional associates.

Murphy (2002), found the major force behind the standards listed six underlying beliefs for their purpose:

- 1. Standards are anchored on value ends or outcomes rather than functions and tasks.
- 2. They privilege student learning and demand success for all youngsters.
- They shift the center of gravity in school leadership from management and administration to learning and school improvement.
- They underscore the collaborative nature of school-based leadership, stressing the importance of access, opportunity, and empowerment for teachers, parents, and all members of the school community.
- 5. They establish an integrated and coherent framework for action.
 Instead of the usual laundry list of everything that a principal might do, they present a tightly focused set of ideas that help refocus the principalship on learner-centered leadership.
- 6. They are designed to shape and direct action of those who are in a position to do the heavy lifting and reshaping of the principalship. (p. 22)

In addition to raising quality within the profession, the Consortium's hope was that the development of model standards will spark necessary change in several ways. First, ISLLC member states, like Pennsylvania, believe the standards will provide useful information for decision-making within each state on a wide array of topics, such as program development and review, licensure, and advanced certification. Second, it is expected that the creation of common standards will promote collaboration among the states, either collectively or in smaller groupings, on topics of mutual interest, such as reciprocity of licensure and candidate assessment. The ISLLC standards have been in use since 1996 by many states.

The ISLLC standards call on school leaders to develop and articulate a vision of learning, advocate and sustain a school culture conducive to student learning and growth, ensure the management of a safe and effective learning environment, collaborate with families and community members, act with integrity and fairness, and understand and influence the larger political and legal context in which they work. (Murphy, Yff, & Shipman, 2000, p. 24-25)

Clearly, the ISLLC standards were designed to eliminate confusion and increase conformity among leadership organizations, especially administrative preparation programs (Green, 2001). Murphy (1992) believed that one of the most serious problems prior to the standards was that the current knowledge base in educational leadership was the fact that it did not reflect the realities of the workplace and did not provide the kind of experiences practitioners felt they needed.

Literature on the value of standards at all educational levels is mixed, indicating both support and criticism for their use among practicing administrators, professors, and

educators. Some suggest that the ISLLC standards face the imminent possibility of extinction (Leithwood & Steinbach, 2002) or becoming a predictable pattern of failed reform efforts (Bogotch, 2002). Murphy (2002) has countered the critics by stating, "The standards are exactly what they claim to be--what practitioners and researchers have told us are critical aspects of effective leadership" (p. 41). Schmoker and Marzano (1999) indicated that these clear standards are a pillar of higher learning and they are the "infrastructure" for school improvement. Giroux (1992), a critic of the standards, referred to them as "a weapon that ignores how schools can serve populations of students that differ vastly with respect to cultural diversity, academic and economic resources, and classroom opportunities" (p. 10). Fenwick English (2000) criticizes Murphy claiming that the standards are a limiting factor and will create a system of status-quo, not allowing for individual character and strength. Bogotch (2002) echoes this sentiment in his argument against the standards-based reform proposed by the ISSLLC and Murphy. Although criticized by some educational professionals, Murphy (2000) justifies the standards as a tool that will unify the profession by ensuring that all within the profession receive similar training, testing, and have the same expectations for the position. Only time will tell whether these standards will truly create the outcome for which they were intended.

The ISLLC Standards are as follows:

Standard 1. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

Standard 2. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. Standard 3. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. Standard 4. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members,

responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

Standard 5. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner. Standard 6. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

The full standards are defined by a combination of knowledge, disposition, and performance indicators.

The Future of Principal Preparation

Some researchers feel University instructors are typically oriented toward theory and research, where school leaders are more interested in practical solutions to problems that cut across various disciplines. Due to this phenomenon, preparation programs have tended to develop *managers* with a custodial mentality rather than *leaders* who can take their institutions into a radically transformed future (Hallinger & Bridges, 1997). However, the recent trends described earlier promise better alignment between preparation programs and schools, including the development of standards for administrator preparation, closer links between universities and K-12 schools, and new instructional methods. With the inception of *No Child Left Behind*, the new nationwide "accountability movement," and the identified shortage of educational administrators (Newsome, 2001) the need for highly effective preparation programs is essential. The infusion of the ISLLC's standards are hoped to be the driving force behind the necessary changes of preparation programs well into the future.

In addition to traditional programming, a number of new approaches have also surfaced that may support the necessary structure and pedagogy of future preparation programs, with or without the controversial standards:

Problem-Based Learning

This approach centers learning on professional problems, so that students develop and bring a variety of resources (such as research, data, and prior experiences) to the clarification and resolution of professional problems (Bridges & Hallinger, 1993). Proponents of Problem-Based Learning argue that in addition to gaining mastery or

problem-finding, students attain other essential leadership skills such as teamwork, product development, and most importantly, problem solving (Hart & Pounder, 1999).

Cohorts

The use of cohort groups has become increasingly popular. A 1995 study by the Center for the Study of Preparation Programs found that half of the units used cohorts at the Master's level and 80% used them at the doctoral level (McCarthy, 1999). A number of studies have documented strengths of cohorts. Advantages include the development of stronger social and interpersonal relationships, increased contact with family members, better integration into the university, clearer program structure, and course sequencing, higher program completion rates, greater cohesiveness, and the development of professional networks (Barnett, Basom, Yerkes, & Norris, 2000; Scribner & Donaldson, 2001).

Collaborative Partnerships

Partnerships between preparation programs and external resources are often considered central to the development of effective preparation programs. A series of articles in the *Journal of School Leadership* (November, 1999) described the challenges, opportunities, and obstacles to establishing partnerships as a way to redesign preparation programs for educational leadership.

Field Experiences

Researchers suggest that field experiences should provide core learning experiences in programs to enable future leaders to observe, participate in, and dissect important cognitive processes associated with identifying and addressing problems in the

leadership and management of organizations. Many programs use field experience to apply what is learned in the classroom, rather than using class work that occurs in the field (Hallinger, Leithwood, & Murphy, 1993)

Technology

Technology, or on-line learning, is something that has slowly been infused into some preparation programs. A number of efforts are currently underway to develop better use of technology in program delivery and program content. Hancock (1990) emphasized the importance of technology and the importance of computer-literate administrators. She emphasized a need for some type of technology implementation into all administrator preparation programs, as they are expected to be the instructional leader of their respective school. Some preparation programs have integrated the use of technology and online learning into their program for aspiring administrators. This trend will continue with the evolution of technology as a viable instructional and data management tool.

Summary

The role of the principal and theories relating to effective leaders, have changed over time. Principal preparation programs must continue to adapt to the expectations of the "new age principal" by infusing a variety of strategies and techniques in order to fulfill the complexity of the principalship. Traditional methodology must be replaced by methodology that can infuse a variety of learning activities for aspiring principals in order to maximize their readiness into the administrative arena. Identified voids in principal preparation programs can be filled through an increased understanding of the

needs of tomorrow's principals, an understanding of the evolution of the principalship, and an increased effort in providing methodology that maximizes effectiveness. The ISLLC's Standards for School Leaders aims to make the necessary revisions to preparation programs that enhances their effectiveness and impacts the practitioners that are ultimately derived from them.

CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES

Introduction

The state of principal preparation programs has been the subject of much controversy over the past several decades and especially in today's standards-based accountability movement. As discussed in the previous chapter, the cry for reform has been heard across the nation, with many states and universities feeling compelled to change the way they prepare school leaders. This study explored the standards-based changes in principal preparation programs, and gathered perceptions of practicing principals to assist in understanding whether these new changes in preparation and licensure have adequately addressed the preparation issues that have gained so much notoriety over the past decade.

The ISLLC organized by the Council of Chief School Officers, was formed for the purpose of developing model standards and assessments for school leaders. The ISLLC's primary constituency is the state education agencies responsible for administrator licensing. It includes representatives of state agencies/departments of education and professional standards boards, with considerable participation by professional associates.

In addition to the creation of the new standards, six of the ISLLC states also joined together to fund the development of an innovative performance assessment designed for licensure of school principals. The District of Columbia, Illinois, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, and North Carolina all contributed funds to this effort. Educational Testing Service (ETS), the development contractor, also contributed funds.

Delegates from these states sat on the ISLLC Development Team. The development team met periodically throughout the assessment development process to oversee and discuss the work, which was managed by ETS.

The content of the assessment is based on the standards developed by ISLLC members and on a national job analysis. The standards are based on:

- A thorough analysis of what is known about effective educational leadership at the school and district levels.
- A comprehensive examination of the best thinking about the types of leadership that will be required for tomorrow's schools.
- Syntheses of the thoughtful work on administrator standards developed by various national organizations, professional associations, and reform commissions.
- In-depth discussions of leadership and administrative standards by leaders within each of the 24 states involved in the ISLLC.

Many of the states involved in the development of the School Leaders Licensure Assessment had previously developed state-specific administrator standards. To devise material for a common assessment, these individual sets of indicators were blended into the six ISLLC Standards.

It is evident that the new standards are designed to capture what is essential about the role of school leaders. They are also intended to help transform the profession of educational administration and the roles of school administrators. Although many good things can be said of the new licensing standards, many questions still remain. Since Pennsylvania has recently joined the ranks of states adopting the ISLLC standards and

licensing requirements, a study is necessary to determine the perceived adequacy of these standards in relation to the preparation needs and job responsibilities of Pennsylvania's school principals.

Research Questions

- 1. Which ISLLC standards and knowledge indicators are viewed as most important to practicing Pennsylvania school principals?
- 2. To what extent have the ISLLC standards and knowledge indicators been addressed in the preparation of Pennsylvania principals?
- 3. What demographic factors have the most significant impact upon principals' perceptions of the ISLLC standards and knowledge indicators as they relate to preparation and practice?

Sample Population

The sample population for the formal study was limited to practicing school principals and assistant principals in the state of Pennsylvania. A simple random sample will be drawn from this population. The Pennsylvania Department of Education's (PDE) Education Names and Addresses (ENA) database will be utilized in order to attain the names and addresses of all principals within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. All necessary confidentiality agreements were in place prior to the distribution or use of any information obtained from either PDE or the Principals' Association. The purpose of this selection method was to assure that a true representative sample of the target population was secured for the study. By drawing from a larger population, simple random

population was adequate in making accurate assumptions based on the data generalized to the total population.

Instrumentation and the Pilot Study

This research utilized an original survey designed to gather "perceptions" of practicing school administrators regarding the ISLLC standards and their knowledge indicators. "Survey research typically employs questionnaires and interviews in order to determine opinions, attitudes, preferences, and perceptions of persons of interest to the researcher" (Borg & Gall, 1979). Therefore, based on the review of literature and previous studies regarding principal preparation and the ISLLC standards, an original survey was created. Although other studies explained in Chapters 1 and 2 have been conducted regarding principal preparation programs, it was determined that an original survey was necessary in order to adequately explore the needed focus of this study. Many studies have been conducted prior to the implementation of the ISLLC standards and assessment, but few have been conducted that focus on the impact of these changes. Due to this gap in the research, it was believed that this study would answer more questions regarding the state of principal preparation in Pennsylvania, and the impact these new standards have had upon practicing school administrators.

In order to create the necessary survey instrument, a careful review of the ISLLC standards, especially the knowledge indicators, was conducted in order to frame questions that adequately addressed the formulated research questions. It quickly became apparent that under each standard, there were very different types of knowledge indicators that served as the basis for the standards. The knowledge indicators were those subjects that the creators of the standards felt were necessary for practitioners to be

knowledgeable about in order to be successful in meeting the standards for success. It was important that all of these "knowledge indicators" be represented in the survey instrument. It was also very important that questions be designed regarding their perceived "importance" and to gather principals' perceptions of how they were emphasized in their preparation programs.

After designing the necessary demographic questions, survey items on the original instrument were directly connected to the research questions and specific ISLLC standards and their knowledge indicators. The pilot instrument consisted of a section of demographic data consisting of 8 questions and another section consisting of 83 Likert-response questions directly related to the research questions and the ISLLC standards, specifically their "knowledge indicators." The survey was designed to capture the demographic make-up of the sample population while also assuring the six standards and their knowledge indicators were thoroughly represented in the questions. Each knowledge indicator was used in the "importance" section of the survey as well as the "preparation" section of the survey in order to create meaningful inferences and correlations for future use in the formal study. Section one was developed to gather demographic data, while section two of the survey instrument was developed in order to assess the perceived importance and preparation level(s) of principals regarding the specific knowledge indicators that serve as the basis for the ISLLC standards.

For the purposes of this study, a Likert-scale (values of 1-4) was created to serve as the measurement of principal perceptions regarding preparation and the ISLLC standards.

A scale is a series of gradations that describes something. The most typical format for a scaled item is following a question or statement with a scale of potential response. In a true Likert scale the statement includes a value or positive or negative direction, and the subject indicates agreement or disagreement with the statement. (McMillan, 2004)

The Likert-scale in this study will be designed with a range of 1 (negative attitude) to 4 (positive attitude) for analysis purposes. The two sections of the questionnaire were comprised of independent and dependent variables (demographic data and Likert-scale) to provide for more varied information and responses from the sample population in order to gain a more thorough understanding of the issues presented. In addition, the survey design for the formal study, using a sample population, will assist in making accurate generalizations and inferences relative to the total population. The benefits of this type of data collection procedure include speed of data collection as well as economy of design (Creswell, 1994). A survey was the preferred method of data collection for this study because the population to be studied is representative of a population existing beyond local reach.

Validity and Reliability of the Survey Instrument

Content validity of the survey was established in several ways. First, a small panel of administrators working in the Somerset Area School District was presented the initial draft of the survey for the specific purpose of gaining necessary feedback regarding its usability and ease of administration. Most importantly, this panel assisted in determining that the survey accurately represented the ISLLC knowledge indicators and that the questions were readable, understandable, and reasonable. After gaining the

necessary feedback, the survey instrument continued to be designed utilizing this feedback until it was completed and formally piloted using a convenience sample in the summer of 2007. Piloting of the original survey was necessary to address issues related to ambiguity and semantics, while also establishing the necessary validity and reliability for the survey instrument. The pilot population for this study consisted of a convenience sample of twenty principals currently working in public schools across Appalachia Intermediate Unit 8 in Pennsylvania. Practicing school principals were chosen as the pilot group for this study due to their experiences as principals, their leadership roles in public schools, and ultimately because they are licensed practitioners in school administration in the state of Pennsylvania, a state that has participated in adoption of the ISLLC standards as part of recent licensure requirements. These individuals were asked to provide feedback relative to the instrument and its ability to measure the research questions upon which the survey was designed.

The pilot testing of the original instrument occurred after receiving Human Subjects approval from the Indiana University of Pennsylvania in May of 2007. The pilot survey was mailed to 20 practicing school principals currently employed in western Pennsylvania. The mailing of the pilot survey was coordinated through the Indiana University of Pennsylvania's Research Laboratory during the summer of 2007 utilizing an online format. Thirteen of the 20 individuals surveyed responded to the pilot study, establishing a response rate of 65%. Results of the pilot study were tabulated and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software at the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Research Laboratory during August and September of 2007. Correlations were used to assess the reliability of the survey instrument. A

factor analysis was also conducted on each Likert question of the survey to assure correlations existed within the targeted research question it was designed to address. Cronbach's Alpha, the average of all possible split halves, was statistically tabulated utilizing SPSS software by the research laboratory in the summer of 2007. McMillan (2004) states that in instruments where there are subscales, a separate measure of internal consistency should be reported for each subscale. Since this research instrument consisted of six ISLLC performance strands and their specific knowledge indicators, the alpha coefficient was determined immediately after the conclusion of the online pilot study.

Results of the analysis indicated a Cronbach's Alpha level of .936 indicating that the survey items actually measured the same construct with very strong correlation values. The original intent was to generate Cronbach alpha levels greater than .80, therefore the reliability of this instrument was adequately established for the purpose of this study. In addition to the statistical calculation, the pilot survey sample population was also encouraged to offer suggestions via e-mail to the researcher. The feedback received from the pilot population was positive in that there were no significant recommendations made regarding the survey design. All of the feedback was positive regarding the content, readability, usability, and time-on-task issues related to the survey.

Development of the Final Survey

There were two questions added to the original survey after piloting due to accidental omission during the piloting process. These questions were necessary to address one of the knowledge indicators as they relate to perceived importance and preparation. After review with the Research Laboratory, it was agreed these questions

positively correlated and, if added, would not significantly impact the survey data. No other revisions were recommended due to the positive reliability data generated from the pilot study and the positive feedback received from the pilot survey sample and administrative panel.

The Formal Study and Data Analysis

Upon completion of the formal study (which will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4), the SPSS was used to determine specific frequencies and relationships of the formal study data. Descriptive statistics were also used to summarize the demographics of the population. Since a number of factors could potentially influence the perceptions of the principals being studied regarding the ISLLC standards and licensure requirements, measures of central tendency and frequency distributions were used to provide a thorough overview of the various differences in participant perceptions based on the independent variables.

A summary of the descriptive statistics and survey results were also utilized for the purpose of defining a valid percentage for each item in the response category. Inferential statistics were generated through a series of independent t-tests. Hypothesis testing was conducted in order to identify the factors that influence principal perceptions on the ISLLC standards in relation to the research questions. Analysis of variance procedures were utilized to determine results through ANOVA procedures. ANOVA hypothesis testing was conducted to explore the effects of principal characteristics and demographic attributes on their perceptions of the ISLLC standards. A significant part of the analysis was conducted in conjunction with the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Research Laboratory during the winter of 2008. The research laboratory assisted in

utilizing the SPSS program for the final development of frequency tables, mean, Standard deviation totals for each subscale of the survey, and ANOVA tables based upon the independent variables. These tables are presented extensively in Chapter 4 and serve as a visual representation of the statistical data generated from this study.

The following survey matrix displays the formal survey questions relating to each of the individual knowledge indicators that are embedded in each of the six ISLLC standards. The first question asked participants about their perceived importance of the underlined indicator, while the second survey question asked participants about their perceived preparation level of the same concept. (This matrix was used extensively for data analysis, as indicated in Chapter 4.)

The Formal Survey Matrix

The following survey questions relate to the same knowledge indicator, per standard, and were used for analysis purposes to gain "importance" and "preparation" data. The first question asks about the importance of the underlined concept while the second question asks about the principals' perceived preparation level on this same topic.

Standard 1: Facilitating the development, articulation, and stewardship of a vision.

Questions 9 and 52 (understanding learning goals relevant to a diverse student population)

Questions 10 and 53 (understanding and developing of strategic plans) Questions 11 and 54 (understanding of systems theory) Questions 12 and 55(understanding of information sources, data collection, data analysis)

Questions 13 and 56 (understanding effective communication skills)

Questions 14 and 57 (understanding effective consensus-building)

Standard 2: Promoting the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture conducive to student learning and professional growth.

Questions 15 and 58 (understanding student growth and development)

Questions 16 and 59 (understanding learning theories)

Questions 17 and 60 (utilizing motivational theories)

Questions 18 and 61 (understanding curriculum design, implementation,

evaluation, refinement)

Questions 19 and 62 (understanding the principles of effective instruction)

Questions 20 and 63 (understanding measurement, evaluation, and assessment strategies)

Standard 3: Ensuring the management of the organization and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Questions 21 and 64 (considering diversity)

Questions 22 and 65 (understanding adult learning and professional development models)

Questions 23 and 66 (understanding the change process)

Questions 24 and 67 (understanding role of technology)

Questions 25 and 68 (understanding school culture)

Questions 26 and 69 (understanding theories and models of organizations)

Questions 27 and 70 (understanding operational procedures)

Questions 28 and 71 (understanding principles and issues relating to safety and security)

Questions 29 and 72 (understanding human resources management)

Questions 30 and 73 (understanding principles and issues relating to fiscal operations)

Questions 31 and 74 (understanding and addressing principles relating to school facilities)

Questions 32 and 75 (understanding legal issues)

Questions 33 and 76 (understanding current technologies that support

management functions)

Standard 4: Promoting the success of all students by collaborating with

families and community members, responding to community interests and needs,

and mobilizing community resources.

Questions 34 and 77 (understanding emerging issues and trends)

Questions 35 and 78 (understanding conditions and dynamics of diverse school community)

Questions 36 and 79 (understanding of school resources)

Questions 37 and 80 (understanding community relations and marketing strategies)

Questions 38 and 81 (understanding successful models of partnerships)

Standard 5: Promoting the success of all students by acting with integrity,

fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Questions 39 and 82 (understanding purpose of education)

Questions 40 and 83 (understanding various ethical frameworks and perspectives on ethics)

Questions 41 and 84 (understanding values of the diverse school community)

Questions 42 and 85 (understanding codes of ethics)

Questions 43 and 86 (understanding the philosophy and history of education) Standard 6: Promoting the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Questions 44 and 87 (understanding principles of representative governance)

Questions 45 and 88 (understanding role of public education)

Questions 46 and 89 (understanding the law)

Questions 47 and 90 (understanding political, social, cultural, and economic systems)

Questions 48 and 91 (understanding models and strategies of change and conflict resolution)

Questions 49 and 92 (understanding global issues and forces affecting teaching and learning)

Questions 50 and 93 (understanding the dynamics of policy development)Questions 51 and 94 (understanding and recognizing the importance of diversity

and equity)

CHAPTER 4

DATA AND ANALYSIS

Introduction

This study was designed to specifically answer the following research questions:

- 1. Which ISLLC standards and knowledge indicators are viewed as most important to practicing Pennsylvania school principals?
- 2. To what extent have the ISLLC standards and knowledge indicators been addressed in the preparation of Pennsylvania Principals?
- 3. What demographic factors have the most significant impact upon principals' perceptions of the ISLLC standards and knowledge indicators as they relate to preparation and practice?

After reviewing the literature regarding the implementation of the ISLLC's Standards for School Leaders, it was clear that their intended purpose was to create standards that improved school leaders' performance in their daily activities. If this intended target were true, it was assumed that school leaders would view them as important to their practice and that these standards would be seen as integral components of their preparation programs. It was determined that by surveying practicing Pennsylvania school principals, an assessment of perceptions could be gathered to see whether these standards were truly viewed as important by these practitioners and whether they were emphasized in their educational administration programs.

In January of 2008, the formal survey was put into electronic format for distribution to 1,000 practicing public school principals who were currently practicing in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Principals and assistant principals in various

demographic regions of the state were also part of the targeted sample. It was strategically determined that retired individuals and those practicing in roles without principal's certification would not be included in the sample population. Demographic variables were also considered to assure that a representative sample of the practicing principal population was attained. The total population sample was 1,000 individuals, and it was hoped that the survey would result in a minimum 30% response-rate. Each of the 1,000 targeted participants was sent weekly reminders in an attempt to maintain their interest in the survey and to achieve the response-rate that was desired. As part of the reminders and the initial request for participation, it was clearly described that the study was voluntary, anonymous, and approved as legitimate research by the IRB at the university level. After the fourth week, it was determined, by the researcher and the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Research Laboratory, that the survey be closed due to the limited number of responses in the final week of the survey. Upon the closing of the survey, it was evident that the survey resulted in a response-rate of 26.7 % which was deemed as an adequate response-rate for meaningful analysis. (Although the responserate indicated a total of 267 individuals participated in the survey, it is important to note that 304 individuals participated, but only 267 completely finished the survey. As not to skew the results, since the parts of the survey were specifically designed to capture similar standards and strands, only those answers generated from those that completed the survey were used in the final analysis [267]).

Demographic Variables

The tables that follow represent the demographic information regarding the 267 respondents to the survey. Each demographic variable has been presented in a table and

analyzed using descriptive statistics from the SPSS at Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Respondents to Survey

Table 1 presents the statistics regarding the number of responses in each of the demographic categories.

Table 1

Respondents to Survey

	Statistics							
		Age	Gender	Ethnicity	School Level	School Size	Years as a Principal	College/ University Attended
N	Valid	267	267	267	267	267	267	267
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Two hundred sixty-seven individuals responded to the survey and completed it in its entirety. These individuals represented various age levels, genders, ethnic groups, school levels, school sizes, and levels of experience as a principal. They each represented a variety of different colleges and university preparation programs.

Age of Pennsylvania Principals

Table 2 represents the various age ranges of the participants.

Table 2

Age Pennsylvania Principals

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 20-29	3	1.1	1.1	1.1
30-39	85	31.8	31.8	33.0
40-49	67	25.1	25.1	58.1
50-59	104	39.0	39.0	97.0
60+	8	3.0	3.0	100.0
Total	267	100.0	100.0	

The majority of participants ranged in age from 30-59. Thirty-nine percent were aged 50-59, 31.8 % ranged in age from 30-39, while 25.1 % ranged in ages from 40-49. Less than 5% of those participating in this study were younger than 30 or older than 60. This was consistent with state and national statistics for age in school administration.

Gender of Pennsylvania Principals

Table 3 represents the gender breakdown among the respondents.

Table 3

Gender of Pennsylvania Principals

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Male	160	59.9	59.9	59.9
Female	107	40.1	40.1	100.0
Total	267	100.0	100.0	

The demographic information shows the percent of male to female administrators was 59.9 and 40.1 respectively. This was consistent with state and national statistics for gender in school administration.

Ethnicity of Pennsylvania Principals

Table 4 displays the ethnicity of the respondents.

Table 4

Ethnicity of Pennsylvania Principals

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid African-American	5	1.9	1.9	1.9
Caucasian	258	96.6	96.6	98.5
Hispanic	2	.7	.7	99.3
Other	2	.7	.7	100.0
Total	267	100.0	100.0	

Caution must be used if any conclusions are generated from this data regarding race or ethnicity variables. Almost all of the participants in this study were Caucasian (96.6%). Less than 4% of the principals who participated were from other ethnic groups consisting of African Americans (1.9 %), Hispanics (.7%), and other categories (.7%).

School Level of Pennsylvania Principals

Table 5 provides an overview of participants from the types of schools they were representing.

Table 5

School Level of Pennsylvania Principals

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Elementary School	99	37.1	37.1	37.1
	Middle School	58	21.7	21.7	58.8
	Junior High School	4	1.5	1.5	60.3
	Senior High School	87	32.6	32.6	92.9
	K-12	3	1.1	1.1	94.0
	Other	16	6.0	6.0	100.0
	Total	267	100.0	100.0	

The majority of the participants were currently working in elementary buildings (37.1%), senior high schools (32.6%), and middle schools (21.7%). Less than 9% of the principals who participated in this study were practicing in a junior high school, K-12 building, or other grade-level configuration.

Principals by School Location

Table 6 displays the school setting for the administrators represented by this study. Pennsylvania has a wide variety of communities ranging from urban, suburban, and rural areas.

Table 6

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Rural	116	43.4	43.4	43.4
	Suburban	131	49.1	49.1	92.5
	Urban	20	7.5	7.5	100.0
	Total	267	100.0	100.0	

Principals by School Location

The majority of participants in this study indicated they were from rural or suburban school districts with less than 8% of individuals coming from large metropolitan or urban school districts.

Experience Level of Pennsylvania Principals

Table 7 represents the experience level, in years, of the various participants.

The information in Table 7 demonstrates that there was a wide range of experience levels among the various participants in this study. Almost half of the participants in this study consisted of individuals with five or less years of experience (47.6%). Less than 6% of the individuals had 21 or more years of experience. The

Table 7

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 0-5	127	47.6	47.6	47.6
6-10	73	27.3	27.3	74.9
11-15	38	14.2	14.2	89.1
16-20	15	5.6	5.6	94.8
21+	14	5.2	5.2	100.0
Total	267	100.0	100.0	

Experience Level of Pennsylvania Principals

majority of participants had between 6 and 20 years of experience, representing 48.1% of the research population.

Principals by Preparation Program

Table 8 represents the number of principals who attended state-related, stateowned, or private educational institutions as part of their principal training program.

Table 8

Principals by Preparation Program

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid State-Related	69	25.8	25.8	25.8
State-Owned	90	33.7	33.7	59.6
Private	108	40.4	40.4	100.0
Total	267	100.0	100.0	

The majority of participants (approximately 60%) in this study attended a staterelated or state-owned institution for their principal training. Approximately 40% of participants received their principal training at a private educational institution.

Principals by College or University

Table 9 represents the number of principals who participated in the study, by name of college or university.
Principals by College or University

Frequency

Valid		2
	Alvernia College	7
	Arcadia University	1
	Arizona State University	1
	Bank Street College of Education	1
	Beaver College	2
	Bowie State University	1
	Bucknell University	8
	California University of Pennsylvania	6
	Carlow College	2
	Carnegie Mellow University	3
	Castleton State	1
	Cheyney University	1
	College of New Jersey	1
	Delaware Valley College	1
	Drexel University	2
	Duquesne University	16
	East Stroudsburg University	3
	Edinboro University of Pennsylvania	9
	ESU	1
	Franciscan University	1
	Frostburg State University	6
	Gannon University	2
	George Mason University	1
	Gwynedd-Mercy College	4
	Immaculata University	4
	Indiana University of Pennsylvania	31
	Lehigh University	17
	Marshall University	1
	Marywood University	3
	McDaniel College	3
	Millersville University	1
	Northern Arizona University	1
	•	

Table 9 (Continued)

Principals by College or University

Frequency

Regent University	1
Rider University	2
Rowan	1
Rutgers University	1
Saint Francis University	7
Shippensburg University	12
Slipperv Rock University	1
St. Bonaventure	1
St. Joseph's University	4
Temple University	16
Texas Women's University	1
The Pennsylvania State University	30
University of Nevada Las Vegas	1
University of North Carolina	1
University of Pennsylvania	1
University of Pittsburgh	13
University of Scranton	2
University of South Florida	1
Villanova University	4
Western Maryland College	1
Westminster College	2
Widener University	6
Wilkes University	10
Youngstown State University	4
Total	267

A large number of schools including state-related, state-owned, and private educational institutions were represented by members of the sample population.

Research Questions and Data Analysis

The ISLLC standards were analyzed through the answers to the survey described in Chapter 3. This survey contained specific questions about importance and preparation with questions derived specifically from the knowledge indicators that corresponded with each individual ISLLC Standard. The following standards were analyzed:

Standard 1: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

Standard 2: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. Standard 3: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. Standard 4: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

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

65

Standard 6: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

The following tables present the findings as they relate to the research questions regarding the perceived importance and the preparation levels of each of the aforementioned ISLLC Standards. The Likert scale in this study was designed with a range of 1 (negative attitude) to 4 (positive attitude) for data analysis purposes.

Research Question One

Which ISLLC standards and knowledge indicators are viewed as most important to practicing Pennsylvania school principals?

Tables 10 through 16 portray the results of the survey as it relates to the perceived importance of the six ISLLC standards.

Table 10

Perceived Importance of Standard 1

	Importance for Standard 1 by Individual Questions					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	
Q9	267	2.00	4.00	3.7528	.46568	
Q10	267	1.00	4.00	3.4944	.60307	
Q11	267	2.00	4.00	3.2218	.59411	
Q12	267	2.00	4.00	3.7640	.45113	
Q13	267	3.00	4.00	3.9588	.19912	
Q14	267	1.00	4.00	3.7903	.45987	

Standard 1 (a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community) and its embedded knowledge indicators was viewed as important to the principals surveyed. Mean scores ranged from 3.22 to 3.95 indicating moderate to high agreement of importance. "Understanding effective communication skills" received the highest mean score, however all indicators were perceived positively.

Table 11

Perceived Importance of Standard 2

		Importance for Standard 2 by Individual Questions					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation		
Q15	267	2.00	4.00	3.7828	.43959		
Q16	264	2.00	4.00	3.4167	.54517		
Q17	261	1.00	4.00	3.4789	.57222		
Q18	267	2.00	4.00	3.7004	.49063		
Q19	267	2.00	4.00	3.8127	.40964		
Q20	267	3.00	4.00	3.7416	.43859		

Standard 2 (a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth) and its embedded knowledge indicators were perceived as important or very important to practicing school administrators. Mean scores among the indicators ranged from 3.41 to

3.81 indicating moderate to high agreement of importance. "Understanding the

principles of effective instruction" received the highest mean score among the indicators,

however all indicators were perceived as important.

Table 12

Perceived Importance of Standard 3

	Importance for Standard 3 by Individual Questions					
	Ν	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	
Q21	266	2.00	4.00	3.5301	.53644	
Q22	262	1.00	4.00	3.3817	.58667	
Q23	267	2.00	4.00	3.6217	.49354	
Q24	267	3.00	4.00	3.5768	.49500	
Q25	267	3.00	4.00	3.8727	.33398	
Q26	263	2.00	4.00	3.2776	.58197	
Q27	266	2.00	4.00	3.7406	.45599	
Q28	267	3.00	4.00	3.8277	.37834	
Q29	263	1.00	4.00	3.4183	.61778	
Q30	267	2.00	4.00	3.4232	.51728	
Q31	267	2.00	4.00	3.4232	.51728	
Q32	267	3.00	4.00	3.7228	.44843	
Q33	262	2.00	4.00	3.4008	.52127	

Standard 3 (a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment) and its embedded knowledge indicators were perceived as important or very important to practicing school administrators. Mean scores ranged from 3.27 to 3.87 indicating moderate to high

agreement of importance. "Understanding legal issues" received the highest mean score among the indicators, however all indicators were perceived as important.

Table 13

Perceived Importance of Standard 4

		Importance for Standard 4 by Individual Questions					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation		
034	265	2.00	4.00	3.5736	.51055		
035	266	2.00	4.00	3.6015	.50566		
Q36	267	2.00	4.00	3.6479	.48630		
Q37	261	2.00	4.00	3.3525	.51728		
Q38	264	1.00	4.00	3.2917	.57363		

Standard 4 (a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources) and its embedded knowledge indicators was viewed as important or very important to practicing school administrators. Mean scores ranged from 3.29 to 3.64 indicating moderate to high agreement of importance. "Understanding school resources" received the highest mean score among the indicators, however all indicators were perceived as important.

Perceived Importance of Standard 5

		Importance for Standard 5 by Individual Questions					
	Ν	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation		
039	266	2.00	4.00	3.6316	.51357		
040	265	2.00	4.00	3.5774	.52464		
Q41	266	2.00	4.00	3.5602	.51957		
Q42	267	2.00	4.00	3.6929	.47816		
Q43	259	1.00	4.00	3.0425	.58579		

Standard 5 (a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner) and its embedded knowledge indicators was perceived as important or very important to practicing school administrators. Mean scores ranged from 3.04 to 3.69 indicating moderate to high agreement of importance. "Understanding codes of ethics" received the highest mean score among the indicators, however all indicators were perceived as important.

Standard 6 (a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context) and its embedded knowledge indicators was viewed as important to very important to practicing school administrators. Mean scores ranged from 3.15 to 3.77 indicating moderate to high agreement of importance. "Understanding the law" received the highest mean score among the indicators, however all of the indicators were perceived as important.

Perceived Importance of Standard 6

num Maximu	um Mean	Standard Deviation .61963
0 4.00) 3.1600	.61963
1 100) 2 2101	
J 4.00) 3.3101	.59568
0 4.00) 3.7790	.41568
0 4.00) 3.4677	.56445
0 4.00) 3.4389	.60179
0 4.00) 3.3487	.56593
0 4.00) 3.1550	.58449
0 4.00) 3.4449	.56942
	$\begin{array}{cccc} 0 & 4.00 \\ 0 & 4.00 \\ 0 & 4.00 \\ 0 & 4.00 \\ 0 & 4.00 \\ \end{array}$	0 4.00 3.4389 0 4.00 3.3487 0 4.00 3.1550 0 4.00 3.4449

Summary of Perceived Importance

	Ν	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Standard 1: Shared Vision Standard 2: Professional	267	3.00	4.00	3.6663	.27343
Growth Standard 3: Safe; Effective	267	2.67	4.00	3.6558	.29206
Environment Standard 4: Collaboration with Family and	267	2.62	4.00	3.5549	.29427
Community Standard 5: Acting with Integrity, Fairness, and	267	2.40	4.00	3.4911	.38570
Ethics Standard 6: Influencing the Political and Cultural	267	2.20	4.00	3.4995	.39147
Context	267	1.63	4.00	3.3856	.41291

Standard 1 (facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community) had the highest mean score among participants while Standard 6 (understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context) had the lowest mean. Although these two standards' mean scores indicated a "high" and a "low," there was little difference in the perceptions of importance between the standards. Mean scores ranged from 3.38 to 3.66 indicating that all of the ISLLC standards were viewed as important to practicing Pennsylvania administrators. The mean scores and standard deviations indicate that there was very little variance in the perceptions of the importance of all six of the standards. Collectively, practicing Pennsylvania administrators felt that creating a school vision, promoting professional development, managing a safe, effecting learning environment, collaborating with families and the community, acting with fairness, integrity and ethics, and influencing the political and cultural context are professional standards that are either important or very important to practice. None of the standards can be dismissed as non-essential based upon these results from the survey participants.

Research Question Two

To what extent have the ISLLC standards and knowledge indicators been addressed in the preparation of Pennsylvania Principals?

Tables 17 through 23 portray the results of the survey as it relates to the perceived preparation of the six ISLLC standards.

73

Perceived Preparation of	f Standard 1
--------------------------	--------------

	Preparation for Standard 1 by Individual Questions					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	
Q52	264	2.00	4.00	3.1061	.68949	
Q53	265	1.00	4.00	2.9962	.80009	
Q54	259	1.00	4.00	3.0039	.72869	
Q55	266	1.00	4.00	3.0451	.83204	
Q56	263	2.00	4.00	3.5513	.55622	
Q57	265	1.00	4.00	3.2755	.70413	

Mean scores regarding the preparation level of Standard 1 (a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community) and its embedded knowledge indicators ranged from 2.99 to 3.55 indicating principals felt moderately to strongly prepared by their university program. "Understanding effective communication skills" received the highest mean score among the indicators, however principals felt their program adequately prepared them in meeting all of the indicators embedded in this standard.

Mean scores regarding the preparation level of Standard 2 (a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth) and its embedded knowledge indicators ranged

74

Perceived Preparation of Standard 2

	Preparation for Standard 2 by Individual Questions					
	Ν	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	
Q58	264	2.00	4.00	3.3485	.67531	
Q59	262	1.00	4.00	3.1489	.65271	
Q60	265	1.00	4.00	3.1358	.66032	
Q61	266	1.00	4.00	3.2895	.68048	
Q62	263	1.00	4.00	3.3574	.65500	
Q63	266	1.00	4.00	3.2218	.70017	

from 3.13 to 3.35 indicating principals felt moderately to strongly prepared by their university program. "Understanding the principles of effective instruction" received the highest mean score among the indicators, however principals felt their program adequately prepared them in meeting all of the indicators embedded in this standard.

Table 19

		Preparation for Standard 3 by Individual Questions										
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation							
Q64	264	1.00	4.00	2.9697	.77449							
Q65	260	1.00	4.00	2.9000	.71228							
Q66	263	1.00	4.00	3.2510	.71898							
Q67	264	1.00	4.00	2.8977	.79504							
Q68	266	1.00	4.00	3.3534	.69168							
Q69	265	1.00	4.00	3.3245	.63987							
Q 70	265	1.00	4.00	3.1585	.75213							
Q71	262	1.00	4.00	3.0076	.78292							
Q72	263	1.00	4.00	3.0456	.70292							
Q73	265	1.00	4.00	3.1283	.68434							
Q74	263	1.00	4.00	2.9240	.70027							
Q75	266	1.00	4.00	3.5376	.56343							
Q76	262	1.00	4.00	2.7366	.78985							

Perceived Preparation of Standard 3

Mean scores regarding the preparation level of Standard 3 (a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment) and its embedded knowledge indicators ranged from 2.73 to 3.53 indicating principals felt moderately to strongly prepared by their university program. "Understanding legal issues" received the highest mean score among the indicators, however principals felt their program adequately prepared them in meeting all of the indicators embedded in this standard.

Table 20

		Preparation for Standard 4 by Individual Questions										
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation							
077	264	1.00	4.00	3.2311	.68361							
Q78	261	1.00	4.00	3.0421	.72467							
Q79	263	1.00	4.00	2.9316	.72251							
Q80	265	1.00	4.00	2.8906	.72254							
Q81	258	1.00	4.00	2.8915	.75620							

Perceived Preparation of Standard 4

Mean scores regarding the preparation level of Standard 4 (a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources) and its embedded knowledge indicators ranged from 2.89 to 3.23 indicating principals felt moderately to strongly prepared by their university program. "Understanding emerging trends and issues" received the highest mean score among the indicators, however principals felt their program adequately prepared them in meeting all of the indicators embedded in this standard.

Perceived Preparation of Standard 5

		Preparation for Standard 5 by Individual Questions										
	Ν	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation							
Q82	261	1.00	4.00	3.3372	.58286							
Q83	264	1.00	4.00	3.2462	.63783							
Q84	264	1.00	4.00	3.0644	.72412							
Q85	265	2.00	4.00	3.3283	.61063							
Q86	262	1.00	4.00	3.2863	.65370							

Mean scores regarding the preparation level of Standard 5 (a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner) and its embedded knowledge indicators ranged from 3.06 to 3.33 indicating principals felt moderately to strongly prepared by their university program. "Understanding the purpose of education" received the highest mean score among the indicators, however principals felt their program adequately prepared them in meeting all of the indicators embedded in this standard.

Perceived	Preparation	of Standard 6
rerectived	reparation	oj Sianaana o

		Preparation for Standard 6 by Individual Questions									
	Ν	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation						
Q87	258	1.00	4.00	2.9845	.70002						
Q88	258	2.00	4.00	3.0426	.64383						
Q89	266	1.00	4.00	3.5789	.55912						
Q90	265	1.00	4.00	3.2415	.64709						
Q91	261	1.00	4.00	3.1379	.70448						
Q92	254	1.00	4.00	2.9488	.74477						
Q93	259	1.00	4.00	2.9421	.72639						
Q94	259	1.00	4.00	3.0309	.68129						

Mean scores regarding the preparation level of Standard 6 (a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context) and its embedded knowledge indicators ranged from 2.94 to 3.57 indicating principals felt moderately to strongly prepared by their university program.

"Understanding the law" received the highest mean score among the indicators, however principals felt their program adequately prepared them in meeting all of the indicators embedded in this standard.

	Ν	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Standard 1: Shared Vision Standard 2: Professional	266	1.33	4.00	3.1609	.54748
Growth Standard 3: Safe; Effective Learning	267	2.00	4.00	3.2478	.50987
Environment Standard 4: Collaboration with	266	1.31	4.00	3.0959	.51984
Family and Community Standard 5: Acting with Integrity,	266	1.00	4.00	2.9959	.59447
Fairness, and Ethics Standard 6: Influencing the Political and Cultural	266	1.60	4.00	3.2503	.49891
Context	266	1.50	4.00	3.1186	.52843

Summary of Perceived Preparation

Standard 5 (acting with integrity and fairness) had the highest mean score while Standard 4 (collaboration with family and community) had the lowest mean score. Once again, although there was a "high" and a "low," the results are indicative that the administrators surveyed in Pennsylvania perceived their preparation programs, as they relate to all six standards, as doing a good job in preparing them for their role as a building principal. Although there are modest fluctuations with the mean scores in this area, the results indicate that the administrators surveyed collectively felt adequately prepared by their respective programs as the mean scores ranged from 2.99 to 3.25. It is important to note that the "preparation" mean scores on each standard, although high, were moderately lower across all standards when compared to mean scores for perceived "importance." This may indicate a moderate difference in the degree of agreement between importance and preparation levels.

Table 24 displays the results of the comparison of the standards as a whole, taking into consideration both "importance" and "preparation" factors.

Table 24

	Ν	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Standard 1	267	2.50	4.00	3.4143	.32562
Standard 2	267	2.58	4.00	3.4536	.32185
Standard 3	267	2.46	4.00	3.3270	.33434
Standard 4	267	2.10	4.00	3.2456	.41554
Standard 5	267	2.40	4.00	3.3766	.38119
Standard 6	267	1.94	4.00	3.2506	.40508

Comparison of the Standards as a Whole

Standard 2 (professional growth) had the highest mean while Standard 4 (collaboration with family and community) had the lowest mean however there is only a moderate difference between the means. The means all indicate a very positive agreement with the importance and the preparation for each standard.

Based on all of the comparisons regarding Standards 1-6, strong agreement exists when analyzing both the importance of the standards as well as the perceptions of preparation levels of practicing Pennsylvania administrators. These results occur when breaking them into "importance" and "perception" parts in addition to analysis based on the survey as a whole. The mean scores in both the "importance" and "preparation" categories indicate that practicing school administrators perceive the indicators as important to practice. It is also evident that these same administrators feel they have been adequately prepared in all areas represented by the knowledge indicators of the ISLLC standards.

Research Question Three

What demographic factors have the most significant impact upon principals' perceptions of the ISLLC standards and knowledge indicators as they relate to preparation and practice?

In order to address research question three, the standards were broken down, by demographic variable, into two distinct parts. Each standard was analyzed in order to attain "importance" data as well as "preparation" data. Independent t-tests and post-hoc tests were also utilized in order to determine if significant differences existed within the data and to determine exactly where these differences occurred.

82

Tables 25 through 30 display the demographic statistical analysis by gender for each of the six ISLLC standards.

Table 25

						Standa	rd 1 Group Sta	ntistics				
	Gen	der	١	Ň	Mea	ın	Standard Deviation	Standa Error N	ard Iean			
Standard 1 Importance Standard 1 Preparation	Mal Fem Mal Fem	Male 10 Female 10 Male 10 Female 10		60 3.634 07 3.714 60 3.144 06 3.186		2 3 2 2	.29277 .23486 .52736 .57815	.0231 .0227 .0416 .0561	5 0 9 6			
		Independent Sample Test										
		Leve Test Equa Of Vari	ene's for ality ances				t-test for Equality of Means					
		F	Sig. t		df Sig. (2 df Tailed		Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confi of the	dence Interval Difference		
Standard 1	Equal								Lower Upper Lower Upper Lower Upper Lower Upper	Lower		
Importance	Variances Assumed Equal Variances	8.349	.004	-2.368	265	.019	08016	.03386	14682	01350		
Standard 1	Not Assumed Equal			-2.472	256.276	.014	08016	.03242	14401	01631		
Preparation	Variances Assumed Equal Not	1.400	.238	612	264	.541	04200	.06865	17716	.09316		
	Assumed			600	210.434	.549	04200	.06994	17987	.09588		

Gender played an important part in the perceived importance of Standard 1 (vision) since the p-value = 0.14 which was less than the alpha of 0.05. There was no significant difference detected in the perceived "preparation" for Standard 1. Gender played a role in determining the attitude toward importance, but no role in determining the principals' attitude toward preparation. Although statistical significance was detected in the importance category, both males and females viewed Standard 1 as important to practice and felt that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

Gender played a role in determining the attitude toward perceived importance of Standard 2 (advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture conducive to student learning and staff professional growth), but no role in determining the principals' attitude toward preparation. Although statistical significance was detected for both males and females in the importance category, both male and female administrators viewed Standard 2 as important to practice and felt that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 3 (a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment) based on gender. Both male and female administrators felt Standard 3 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

84

						Standa	rd 2 Group St	atistics				
	Gen	Gender		der		1	Mean		Standard Deviation	Standa Error N	Standard Error Mean	
Standard 2 Importance Standard 2 Preparation	Male Female Male Female		e 160 ale 107 e 160 ale 107		3.6033 3.7343 3.2385 3.2617		.31151.0246.24109.0233.47716.0377.55724.0538		3 1 2 7			
		Independent Sample Test										
	-	Levene's Test for Equality Of Variance		's y res			t-test for Equality of Means					
	F		Sig. t		df	Sig. (2- Tailed)	Mean Std. Error Difference Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference			
Standard 2	Equal								Lower Upper Lower Lower Upper Lower Upper	Lower		
Importance	Variances Assumed Equal Variances	8.354	.004	-3.673	265	.000	13093	.03565	20112	06075		
Standard 2	Not Assumed Equal			-3.862	259.325	.000	13093	.03391	19770	06417		
Preparation	Variances Assumed Equal Not	5.378	.021	363	265	.717	02314	.06378	14872	.10244		
	Assumed			352	202.914	.725	02314	.06577	15281	.10653		

						Standa	rd 3 Group St	atistics				
	Gen	der	N	1	Mea	ın	Standard Deviation	Standa Error M	ard Iean			
Standard 3 Importance Standard 3 Preparation	Male Female Male Female		160 107 159 107		3.5314 3.5899 3.0765 3.1246		.28594 .0226 .30430 .0294 .52969 .0420 .50594 .0489		1 2 1 1			
					Independent Sample Test							
	_	Levene's Test for Equality Of Variances F Sig.					t-test for Equali	ty of Means				
				t	t df	Sig. (2- Tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confi of the	dence Interval Difference		
Standard 3	Equal								Lower Upper Lower Upper Lower Upper Lower Upper	Lower		
Importance	Variances Assumed Equal Variances	1.021	.313	-1.598	265	.111	05854	.03664	13069	.01361		
Standard 3 Preparation	Not Assumed Equal Variances			-1.578	217.567	.116	05854	.03710	13166	.01458		
Preparation	Assumed Equal Not Assumed	.551	.459	739 746	264 234.464	.460 .456	04811 04811	.06506 .06447	17620 17513	.07999 .07892		

		Standard 4 Group Statistics											
	Geno	der	1	N	Mea	ın	Standard Deviation	Standa Error N	ard Iean				
Standard 4 Importance Standard 4 Preparation	Male Female Male Female		160 107 159 107		3.455 3.544 2.969 3.034	7 7 99 6	.37377 .39866 .57709 .62012	.0295 .0385 .0457 .0599	5 4 7 5				
		Independent Sample Test											
		Levene's Test for Equality Of Variances F Sig.		3			t-test for Equality of Means						
	_			Sig. t		Sig. (2- Tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confie of the l	5% Confidence Interval of the Difference			
Standard 4	Faual								Lower Upper Lower Upper Lower Upper Lower Upper	Lower			
Importance	Variances Assumed Equal Variances	1.162	.282	-1.864	265	.063	08939	.04795	18379	.00501			
Standard 4	Not Assumed Equal			-1.841	217.214	.067	08939	.04856	18511	.00633			
Preparation	Variances Assumed Equal Not	.778	.378	870	264	.385	06466	.07437	21109	.08176			
	Assumed			857	216.276	.392	06466	.07542	21332	.08399			

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 4 (a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources) based on gender. Both male and female administrators felt Standard 4 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 5 (acting with integrity and fairness) based on gender. Both male and female administrators felt Standard 5 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 6 (a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context) based on gender. Both male and female administrators felt Standard 6 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

In summary, although statistically significant differences occurred among males and females regarding the perceived importance of Standards 1 and 2, there were no differences detected in the preparation category. There were no differences detected for Standards 3, 4, 5, and 6. The analysis, by gender, indicates that both male and female administrators perceived all of the standards as important and that their preparation programs adequately prepared them to meet all of the ISLLC standards.

Tables 31 through 36 display the demographic statistical analysis by age for each of the six ISLLC standards.

88

		Standard 5 Group Statistics											
	Geno	der	1	1	Mea	an	Standard Deviation	Standa Error N	ard Iean				
Standard 5 Importance Standard 5 Preparation	Male Fem Male Fem	e ale e ale	160 107 160 106		3.4873 3.5178 3.2427 3.2618		.39064 .39384 .48487 .52152	.0308 .0380 .0383 .0506	8 7 3 5				
						Inc	lependent Sa	mple Test					
		Levene's Test for Equality Of Variances F Sig		ie's or ity nces			t-test for Equality of Means						
	_			t	df	Sig. (2- Tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confi of the 1	dence Interval Difference			
Standard 5	Equal								Lower Upper Lower Upper Lower Upper Upper	Lower			
Importance	Variances Assumed Equal Variances	.189	.664	622	265	.534	03047	.04894	12683	.06590			
Standard 5	Not Assumed Equal Variances			621	226.116	.535	03047	.04902	12707	.06614			
reputation	Assumed Equal Not	1.599	.207	305	264	.761	01908	.06259	14232	.10415			
	Assumed			500	213.403	.704	01908	.00332	14430	.10015			

		Standard 6 Group Statistics								
	Geno	der	١	N	Mea	an	Standard Deviation	Standa Error N	ard Iean	
Standard 6 Importance Standard 6 Preparation	Male Fem Male Fem	e ale e ale	1 1 1 1	60 07 60 06	3.375 3.401 3.132 3.097	52 13 24 77	.39399 .44113 .52499 .53539	.0311 .0426 .0415 .0520	5 5 0 0	
						Inc	lependent Sar	nple Test		
		Leve Test Equa Of Varia	ne's for lity ances				t-test for Equali	ty of Means		
	_	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- Tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confid of the D	lence Interval Difference
Standard 6	Faual								Lower Upper Lower Upper Lower Upper Lower Upper	Lower
Importance	Variances Assumed Equal Variances	3.576	.060	504	265	.614	02605	.05164	12772	.07562
Standard 6 Preparation	Not Assumed Equal Variances			493	209.509	.622	02605	.05281	13016	.07806
1	Assumed Equal Not Assumed	.222	.638	.523	264 221.915	.601	.03466	.06627 .06653	09582 09646	.16514 .16578

Age: Standard 1

		Standard 1 ANOVA					
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.	
Standard 1	Between Groups	.022	4	.006	.074	.990	
Importance	Within Groups	19.865	262	.076			
-	Total	19.888	266				
Standard 1	Between Groups	1.745	4	.436	1.466	.213	
Preparation	Within Groups	77.684	261	.298			
-	Total	79.429	265				

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 1 (vision) based on the age of participants. All groups felt Standard 1 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

Table 32

Age: Standard 2

		Standard 2 ANOVA					
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.	
Standard 2	Between Groups	.159	4	.040	.462	.764	
Importance	Within Groups	22.531	262	.086			
-	Total	22.690	266				
Standard 2	Between Groups	.775	4	.194	.743	.564	
Preparation	Within Groups	68.375	262	.261			
-	Total	69.151	266				

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 2 (advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture conducive to student learning and staff professional growth) based on the age of participants. All groups felt Standard 2 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

Table 33

		Standard 3 ANOVA					
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.	
Standard 3	Between Groups	.177	4	.044	.507	.731	
Importance	Within Groups	22.858	262	.087			
-	Total	23.035	266				
Standard 3	Between Groups	1.659	4	.415	1.547	.189	
Preparation	Within Groups	69.953	261	.268			
-	Total	71.612	265				

Age: Standard 3

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 3 (a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment) based on the age of participants. All groups felt Standard 3 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

Age: Standard 4

		Standard 4 ANOVA					
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.	
Standard 4	Between Groups	.799	4	.200	1.351	.252	
Importance	Within Groups	38.772	262	.148			
	Total	39.572	266				
Standard 4	Between Groups	2.199	4	.550	1.569	.183	
Preparation	Within Groups	91.450	261	.350			
-	Total	93.649	265				

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 4 (a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources) based on the age of participants. All groups felt Standard 4 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

Significant differences in preparation among age groups were detected for Standard 5 (acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner). This was detected since the p-value for the preparation component of Standard 5 is 0.017 which is less than 0.05, indicating a significant difference exists.

Age: Standard 5

			Standard 5 ANOVA						
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.		
Standard 5 Importance	Between Groups Within Groups Total Between Groups Within Groups Total		.688 40.076 40.764	4 262 266	.172 .153	1.125	.345		
Standard 5 Preparation			2.953 63.009 65.962	4 .738 261 .241 265		3.058	.017		
			Multiple Comparisons						
Bonferroni Dependent Variable	(I) Age (J) Age		Mean Difference (I – J)	Std. Error	Sig.	959 Confide Interv	6 nce 7al		
						Lower Bound Upper Bound Lower Bound Upper Bound	Lower Bound		
Standard 5	20-29	30-39 40-49 50-59	29683 32761 20865 25000	.28870 .28996 .28774 33264	1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000	-1.1142 -1.1485 -1.0233	.5205 .4933 .6060		
	30-39	20-29 40-49 50-59	.29683 03079 .08817 54683(*)	.28870 .08048 .07208	1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000	5205 2586 1159 0321	1.1917 1.1142 .1971 .2922 1.0615		
	40-49	20-29 30-39 50-59 60+	.32761 .03079 .11896 .57761(*)	.28996 .08048 .07697 .18379	1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 .019	4933 1971 .0990 .0573	1.1485 .2586 .3369 1.0979		

Table 35 (Continued)

Age: Standard 5

Bonferroni Dependent Variable	Multiple Comparisons								
	(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (J) Age (I – J)		Sig.	959 Confide Interv	95% Confidence Interval		
	50-59 60+	20-29 30-39 40-49 60+ 20-29 30-39	.20865 08817 11896 .45865 25000 54683(*)	.28774 .07208 .07697 .18027 .33264 .18180	1.000 1.000 1.000 .115 1.000 .029	6060 2922 3369 0517 -1.1917 -1.0615	1.0233 .1159 .0990 .9690 .6917 0321		
		40-49 50-59	57761(*) .45865	.18379 .18027	.019 .115	-1.0979 .9690	0573 .0517		

Note. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Post-Hoc testing for Standard 5 indicated that the differences occurred between the 30-39 and the 60+ age groups and between the 40-49 and the 60+ age groups. This is because their p-values are less than 0.05 at 0.029 and 0.019, respectively. This indicates that although all age groups had a positive perception of the importance and preparation regarding Standard 5, younger principals felt moderately more prepared in meeting this standard than their older counterparts.

Significant differences in preparation among age groups were detected for Standard 6 (understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context). This was detected since the p-value for the preparation component was 0.033 which is also less than the 0.05, indicative of a significant difference between age groups with respect to perceived preparation.

Age: Standard 6

			Standard 6 ANOVA						
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.		
Standard 6 Importance	dard 6 Between Groups ortance Within Groups Total dard 6 Between Groups oaration Within Groups Total		.407 44.945 45.352	4 262 266	.102 .172	.593	.668		
Standard 6 Preparation			2.897 71.099 73.997	200 4 261 265	.724 .272	2.659	.033		
			Multiple Comparisons						
Bonferroni Dependent Variable	(I) Age (J) Age		Mean Difference (I – J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval			
						Lower Bound Dower Bound Lower Bound Upper Bound	Lower Bound		
Standard 6	20-29	30-39 40-49 50-59 60+	22609 18843 13504 38021	.30667 .30801 .30565 35335	1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000	-1.0943 -1.0604 -1.0004	.6421 .6836 .7303 1.3806		
	30-39	20-29 40-49 50-59	.22609 .03766 .09105 60630(*)	.30667 .08549 .07657	1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 0.19	6421 2044 1257 0596	1.0943 .2797 .3078		
	40-49	20-29 30-39 50-59 60+	.18843 03766 .05339 .56864(*)	.30801 .08549 .08176 .19524	1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000	6836 2797 .1781 .0159	1.0604 .2044 .2849 1.1214		

Table 36 (Continued)

Age: Standard 6

Bonferroni Dependent Variable	Multiple Comparisons								
	(I) Age (J) Age		Mean Difference Std. Age (I – J) Error		Sig.	95% Confidence Interval			
	50-59 60+	20-29 30-39 40-49 60+ 20-29 30-39	.13504 09105 05339 .51525 38021 60630(*)	.30565 .07657 .08176 .19150 .35335 .19312	1.000 1.000 1.000 .076 1.000 .019	7303 3078 2849 0269 -1.3806 -1.1530	1.0004 .1257 .1781 1.0574 .6202 0596		
		40-49 50-59	56864(*) .51525	.19524 .19150	.039 .076	-1.1214 -1.0574	0159 .0269		

Note. *The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Post-Hoc testing for Standard 6 indicated that the differences occurred between the 30-39 and the 60+ age groups and between the 40-49 and the 60+ age groups. This is because their p-values are less than 0.05 at 0.019 and 0.039, respectively. This indicates that although all age groups had a positive perception of the importance and preparation regarding Standard 6, younger principals felt moderately more prepared in meeting this standard than their older counterparts.

In summary, there were no significant differences detected among the various age groups for Standards 1, 2, 3, or 4 in either the perceived "importance" or the perceived "preparation" categories however there were significant differences detected in preparation for Standard 5 (acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner), and Standard 6 (understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context).

These findings suggest that younger principals believe they were more adequately prepared than the older principals in the area of ethics and understanding and responding to political, social, economic, legal, and cultural issues. All other areas within their principal training, as they relate to the ISLLC standards, indicate a common, positive feeling regarding their perceived preparation level. Although statistical differences existed among groups, all groups had positive perceptions regarding their preparation.

Tables 37 through 42 display the demographic statistical analysis by school level for each of the six ISLLC standards.

98
School Level: Standard 1

		Standard 1 ANOVA					
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.	
Standard 1	Between Groups	.612	5	.122	1.656	.146	
Importance	Within Groups	19.276	261	.074			
•	Total	19.888	266				
Standard 1	Between Groups	.285	5	.057	.187	.967	
Preparation	Within Groups	79.145	260	.304			
-	Total	79.429	265				

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 1 (vision) based on the school level of the participants. Principals practicing at various levels felt Standard 1 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

Table 38

School Level: Standard 2

		Standard 2 ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.		
Standard 2	Between Groups	.572	5	.114	1.349	.244		
Importance	Within Groups	22.118	261	.085				
•	Total	22.690	266					
Standard 2	Between Groups	.264	5	.053	.200	.962		
Preparation	Within Groups	68.887	261	.264				
-	Total	69.151	266					

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 2 (advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture conducive to student learning and staff professional growth) based on the school level of the participants. Principals practicing at various levels felt Standard 2 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

Table 39

			Sta	indard 3 AN	OVA	
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.
Standard 3	Between Groups	.524	5	.105	1.215	.302
Importance	Within Groups Total	22.511 23.035	261 266	.086		
Standard 3 Preparation	Between Groups Within Groups	.499 71.113	5 260	.100 .274	.365	.872
	Total	71.612	265			

School Level: Standard 3

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 3 (a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment) based on the school level of the participants. Principals practicing at various levels felt Standard 3 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

School Beren Stendend	School Level:	Standard 4
-----------------------	---------------	------------

		Standard 4 ANOVA					
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.	
Standard 4	Between Groups	.830	5	.166	1.118	.351	
Importance	Within Groups	38.742	261	.148			
•	Total	39.572	266				
Standard 4	Between Groups	.755	5	.151	.422	.833	
Preparation	Within Groups	92.895	260	.357			
-	Total	93.649	265				

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 4 (a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources) based on the school level of the participants. Principals practicing at various levels felt Standard 4 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 5 (acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner) based on the school level of the participants. Principals practicing at various levels felt Standard 5 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

School Level: Standard 5

		Standard 5 ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.		
Standard 5	Between Groups	1.075	5	.215	1.414	.220		
Importance	Within Groups	39.690	261	.152				
	Total	40.764	266					
Standard 5	Between Groups	1.696	5	.339	1.372	.235		
Preparation	Within Groups	64.266	260	.247				
•	Total	65.962	265					

Table 42

School Level: Standard 6

		Standard 6 ANOVA					
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.	
Standard 6	Between Groups	1.501	5	.300	1.787	.116	
Importance	Within Groups	43.851	261	.168			
•	Total	45.352	266				
Standard 6	Between Groups	2.309	5	.462	1.675	.141	
Preparation	Within Groups	71.688	260	.276			
-	Total	73.997	265				

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 6 (understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context) based on the school level of the participants. Principals practicing at various levels felt Standard 6 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

In summary, there were no significant differences detected in either the perceived "importance" or the perceived "preparation" level from individuals from different levels of schools. All levels of schools indicated a positive importance and preparation level for Standards 1 through 6. This suggests that the type of school that principals work in does not have an impact upon principals' perceived importance or preparation levels regarding the ISLLC standards.

Tables 43 through 48 display the demographic statistical analysis by school size for each of the six ISLLC standards.

Table 43

School Size: Standard 1

		Standard 1 ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.		
Standard 1	Between Groups	.281	2	.140	1.890	.153		
Importance	Within Groups	19.607	264	.074				
I	Total	19.888	266					
Standard 1	Between Groups	.100	2	.050	.165	.848		
Preparation	Within Groups	79.330	263	.302				
-	Total	79.429	265					

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 1 (vision) based on the school size of the participants. Principals practicing in schools of various sizes felt Standard 1 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

Table 44

School Size: Standard 2

		Standard 2 ANOVA					
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.	
Standard 2	Between Groups	.035	2	.017	.202	.817	
Importance	Within Groups	22.655	264	.086			
-	Total	22.690	266				
Standard 2	Between Groups	.628	2	.314	1.209	.300	
Preparation	Within Groups	68.523	264	.260			
-	Total	69.151	266				

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 2 (advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture conducive to student learning and staff professional growth) based on the school size of the participants. Principals practicing in schools of various sizes felt Standard 2 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

School	Size:	Standard	3

		Standard 3 ANOVA					
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.	
Standard 3	Between Groups	.077	2	.039	.445	.641	
Importance	Within Groups	22.957	264	.087			
1	Total	23.035	266				
Standard 3	Between Groups	.306	2	.153	.564	.570	
Preparation	Within Groups	71.306	263	.271			
-	Total	71.612	265				

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 3 (a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment) based on the school size of the participants. Principals practicing in schools of various sizes felt Standard 3 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 4 (a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources) based on the school size of the participants. Principals practicing in schools of various sizes felt Standard 4 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

School Size: Standard 4

		Standard 4 ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.		
Standard 4	Between Groups	.053	2	.027	.178	.837		
Importance	Within Groups	39.519	264	.150				
-	Total	39.572	266					
Standard 4	Between Groups	1.216	2	.608	1.729	.179		
Preparation	Within Groups	92.434	263	.351				
•	Total	93.649	265					

Table 47

School Size: Standard 5

		Standard 5 ANOVA							
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.			
Standard 5	Between Groups	.143	2	.072	.465	.628			
Importance	Within Groups	40.621	264	.154					
•	Total	40.764	266						
Standard 5	Between Groups	.936	2	.468	1.894	.153			
Preparation	Within Groups	65.025	263	.247					
-	Total	65.962	265						

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 5 (acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner) based on the school size of the participants. Principals practicing in schools of various sizes felt Standard 5 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

Table 48

			Sta	indard 6 AN	IOVA	
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.
Standard 6	Between Groups	.583	2	.291	1.719	.181
Importance	Within Groups	44.769	264	.170		
_	Total	45.352	266			
Standard 6	Between Groups	.753	2	.376	1.351	.261
Preparation	Within Groups	73.244	263	.278		
-	Total	73.997	265			

School Size: Standard 6

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 6 (understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context) based on the school size of the participants. Principals practicing in schools of various sizes felt Standard 6 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

In summary, there were no significant differences detected in either the perceived "importance" or the perceived "preparation" level from individuals from different sizes of schools. All levels of schools indicated a positive importance and preparation level for

Standards 1 through 6. This suggests that the size of the school where principals work does not have an impact upon their perceived importance or preparation level for any of the ISLLC standards.

Tables 49 through 54 display the demographic statistical analysis by experience level for each of the six ISLLC standards.

A significant difference exists in the perceived "importance" of Standard 1 (vision) with respect to years as a principal since p=0.034 which is less than the alpha of 0.05. Although a significant difference in the perception of importance was detected, principals of various experience levels viewed Standard 1 as important and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 2 (advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture conducive to learning and professional growth) among participants of varying experience levels. Principals of various experience levels viewed Standard 2 as important and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

A significant difference was detected among principals of varying experience levels regarding the perceived "importance" of Standard 3 (providing a safe and effective learning environment) since p=0.02, which is less than the alpha of 0.05. Further analysis indicated that this difference occurred between those with 0 to 5 years experience and those with 21+ years and those with 6-10 years of experience and those with 21+ years of experience since their p-values were 0.010 and 0.002, respectively. Although all groups had a positive attitude toward the importance and preparation factors, this difference suggests that newer principals view safe and effective learning

108

				Stan	dard 1 AN	OVA	
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.
Standard 1 Importance	Between (Within Gi	Groups roups	.770 19.117	4 262	.193 .073	2.639	.034
T Standard 1 B Preparation W T	Total Between (Within Gi Total	Groups coups	19.888 1.087 78.342 79.429	266 4 261 265	.272 .300	.906	.461
	Multiple Comparisons						
Bonferroni Dependent Variable	(1) Years as a Principal	(J) Years as a Principal	Mean Difference (I – J)	Std. Error Sig.		95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound Upper Bound Lower Bound Upper Bound	Lower Bound
Standard 1 Importance	0-5	6-10 11-15 16-20	00715 .12923 .03683	.03967 .04995 .07375	7 1.000 5 .102 5 1.000	1195 0122 1720	.1052 .2706 .2456
	6-10	0-5 11-15 16-20 21+	.00715 .13639 .04399 15192	.03967 .05403 .07658 07881	1.000 3 1.22 3 1.000 550	1052 0166 1728 - 0712	.1195 .2894 .2608 3750
	11-15	0-5 6-10 16-20 21+	12923 13639 09240 .01554	.04995 .05403 .08237 .08445	5 .102 3 .122 7 1.000 5 1.000	2706 2894 3256 2235	.0122 .0166 .1408 .2546

Table 49 (Continued)

	Multiple Comparisons									
Bonferroni Dependent Variable	(1) Years as a Principal	(J) Years as a Principal	Mean Difference (I – J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confide Inter	6 ence val			
	16-20 21+	0-5 6-10 11-15 21+ 0-5 6-10 11-15	03683 04399 .09240 .10794 14477 15192 01554	.07375 .07658 .08237 .10038 .07607 .07881 .08445	1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 .581 .550	2456 2608 1408 1762 3601 3750 - 2546	.1720 .1728 .3256 .3921 .0706 .0712 2235			
		16-20	10794	.10038	1.000	3921	.1762			

		Standard 2 ANOVA							
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.			
Standard 2	Between Groups	.690	4	.172	2.054	.087			
Importance	Within Groups	22.000	262	.084					
•	Total	22.690	266						
Standard 2	Between Groups	.437	4	.109	.416	.797			
Preparation	Within Groups	68.714	262	.262					
	Total	69.151	266						

				Stan	dard 3 AN	OVA	
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.
Standard 3 Importance	Between (Within Gr	Groups roups	1.437 21.598 23.035	4 262 266	.359 .082	4.357	.002
Standard 3 Preparation	Between (Within Gr Total	Groups roups	.743 70.869 71.612	200 4 261 265	.186 .272	.684	.603
			Multiple	e Compa	risons		
Bonferroni Dependent Variable	(1) Years as a Principal	(J) Years as a Principal	Mean Difference (I – J)	Std. Error Sig.		95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound Upper Bound Lower Bound Upper	Lower Bound
Standard 3 Importance	0-5	6-10 11-15 16-20 21+	04415 .09385 02071 26821(*)	.04217 .05309 .07839	1.000 .783 1.000	Bound 1635 0564 2426 0393	.0752 .2441 .2012 4971
	6-10	0-5 11-15 16-20 21+	.04415 .13800 .02345 .1237(*)	.04217 .05743 .08139	1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000	0752 0246 2070 0752	.1635 .3006 .2539
	11-15	0-5 6-10 16-20 21+	09385 13800 11456 .17436	.05309 .05309 .05743 .08755 .08976		2441 3006 3624 0798	.0564 .0246 .1333 .4285

Table 51 (Continued)

Experience: Standard 3

Bonferroni Dependent Variable	Multiple Comparisons									
	(1) Years as a Principal	(J) Years as a Principal	Mean Difference (I – J)	Std. Error	Sig.	959 Confid Inter	% ence tval			
	16-20	0-5 6-10 11-15 21+	.02071 02345 .11456 .28892	.07839 .08139 .08755 .10670	1.000 1.000 1.000 .072	2012 2539 1333 0131	.2426 .2070 .3624 .5910			
	21+	0-5 6-10 11-15 16-20	26821(*) 31237(*) 17436 28892	.08085 .08377 .08976 .10670	.010 .002 .532 .072	4971 5495 4285 5910	0393 0752 .0798 .0131			

Note. *The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

environments as a moderately more important aspect of the principalship than those of their veteran counterparts.

Regarding experience and the perceived "importance" of Standard 4 (collaboration with family and community), a significant difference was detected among principals of varying experience levels since p=0.001, which is less than the alpha of 0.05. Post-Hoc testing determined that differences existed in the perceived importance of Standard 4 among the 0 to 5 year and the 21+ experience ranges, the 6 to 10 and the 11-15 year principals, and also the 6 to 10 and the 21+ experience ranges since their p-values were 0.007, 0.047, and 0.003, respectively. Although all groups had a positive attitude toward the importance and preparation factors, the difference suggests that less experienced principals perceive collaboration with family and community as moderately more important than their veteran counterparts. Those in the 11-15 year range showed more agreement with the veteran administrators than those with lesser experience.

The data regarding Standard 5 (acting with integrity, fairness, and ethics) reflected a significant difference in perceived "importance" among those of varying experience levels, since p=0.002 which is less than the alpha of 0.05. Post-Hoc testing of Standard 5 found that significant differences existed between those with 0-5 years and 21+ years of experience and those with 6-10 years and 21+ years of experience since their p-values were 0.013 and 0.017, respectively. Although all groups had a positive attitude regarding the importance and preparation factors, the difference suggests that less experienced principals viewed this standard as moderately more important than their veteran counterparts.

114

				Stan	dard 4 AN	OVA	
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.
Standard 4 Importance	Between (Within Gr	Groups coups	2.872 36.700 39.572	4 262 266	.718 .140	5.126	.001
Standard 4 Preparation	Total tandard 4 Between Groups reparation Within Groups Total			200 4 261 265	.452 .352	1.286	.276
			Multiple	e Compa	risons		
Bonferroni Dependent Variable	(1) Years as a Principal	(J) Years as a Principal	Mean Difference (I – J)	Std. Error Sig.		95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound Upper Bound Lower Bound Upper Bound	Lower Bound
Standard 4 Importance	0-5	6-10 11-15 16-20 21+	03745 .17623 .11816 .36007(*)	.05497 .06920 .10218 10540	1.000 .115 1.000	1931 0197 1711 0617	.1182 .3721 .4074
	6-10	0-5 11-15 16-20	.03745 .21369(*) .15562 20752(*)	.05497 .07487 .10610	1.000 1.000 0.047 1.000 0.002	1182 .0017 1448	.1931 .4256 .4560
	11-15	0-5 6-10 16-20 21+	17623 21369(*) 05807 .18383	.06920 .06920 .07487 .11412 .11701		3721 4256 3812 1474	.0197 0017 .2650 .5151

Table 52 (Continued)

Experience: Standard 4

Bonferroni Dependent Variable	Multiple Comparisons									
	(1) Years as a Principal	(J) Years as a Principal	Mean Difference (I – J)	Std. Error	Sig.	959 Confide Inter	% ence rval			
	16-20 21+	0-5 6-10 11-15 21+ 0-5 6-10 11-15	11816 15562 .05807 .24190 36007(*) 39752(*) 18383	.10218 .10610 .11412 .13908 .10540 .10920 .11701	1.000 1.000 1.000 .832 .007 .003 1.000	4074 4560 2650 1518 6584 7067 5151	.1711 .1448 .3812 .6356 0617 0884 .1474			

Note. *The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

				Stan	dard 5 AN	OVA	
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.
Standard 5 Importance	Between (Within G	etween Groups 2.565 4 .641 Yithin Groups 38.199 262 .146		.641 .146	4.398	.002	
Standard 5 Preparation	Total Between (Within Gr Total	Groups roups	40.764 .939 65.022 65.962	266 4 261 265	.235 .249	.943	.440
			Multiple	e Compa	risons		
Bonferroni Dependent Variable	(1) Years as a Principal	(J) Years as a Principal	Mean Difference (I – J)	Std. Error Sig.		95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound Upper Bound Lower Bound Upper Bound	Lower Bound
Standard 5 Importance	0-5	6-10 11-15 16-20 21+	00303 .18548 .12373 .35039(*)	.05608 .07060 .10425 .10753	3 1.000 0 .091 5 1.000 3 .013	1618 0144 1714 .0460	.1557 .3854 .4189 .6548
	6-10	0-5 11-15 16-20 21	.00303 .18851 .12676 .25242(*)	.05608 .07638 .10825	3 1.000 3 .142 5 1.000 017	1557 0277 1797	.1618 .4047 .4332
	11-15	0-5 6-10 16-20 21+	18548 18851 06175 16491	.07060 .07638 .11643	.017 .091 .142 1.000 .1000	3854 4047 3914	.0088 .0144 .0277 .2679

Table 53 (Continued)

Experience: Standard 5

	Multiple Comparisons									
Bonferroni Dependent Variable	(1) Years as a Principal	(J) Years as a Principal	Mean Difference (I – J)	Std. Error	Sig.	959 Confid Inter	% ence val			
	16-20 21+	$\begin{array}{c} 0-5 \\ 6-10 \\ 11-15 \\ 21+ \\ 0-5 \\ 6-10 \\ 11-15 \\ 16-20 \end{array}$	12373 12676 .06175 .22667 35039(*) 35342(*) 16491 22667	.10425 .10825 .11643 .14190 .10753 .11141 .11938 .14190	$\begin{array}{c} 1.000\\ 1.000\\ 1.000\\ 1.000\\ .013\\ .017\\ 1.000\\ 1.000\\ 1.000\\ \end{array}$	4189 4332 2679 1750 6548 6688 5029 6284	.1714 .1797 .3914 .6284 0460 0380 .1730 .1750			

Note. *The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

				Stan	dard 6 AN	OVA	
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.
Standard 6 Importance	Between (Within Gr	Groups coups	2.268 43.084 45.352	4 262 266	.567 .164	3.448	.009
Standard 6 Preparation	Between (Within Gi Total	Groups coups	1.048 72.949 73.997	200 4 261 265	.262 .279	.938	.443
			Multiple	e Compa	risons		
Bonferroni Dependent Variable	(1) Years as a Principal	(J) Years as a Principal	Mean Difference (I – J)	Std. Error Sig.		95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound Upper Bound Lower Bound Upper Bound	Lower Bound
Standard 6 Importance	0-5	6-10 11-15 16-20 21+	02382 .18587 .03151 30175	.05956 .07498 .11071 11420	1.000 .138 1.000 087	1924 0264 2819 - 0215	.1448 .3981 .3449 6250
	6-10	0-5 11-15 16-20 21+	.02382 .20969 .05533 32557	.05956 .08112 .11496	1.000 .103 1.000 .063	1448 0200 2701	.1924 .4393 .3808
	11-15	0-5 6-10 16-20 21+	18587 20969 15435 .11588	.07498 .08112 .12365 .12678	.138 .103 1.000 1.000	3981 4393 5044 2430	.0264 .0200 .1957 .4748

Table 54 (Continued)

Bonferroni Dependent Variable	Multiple Comparisons								
	(1) Years as a Principal	(J) Years as a Principal	Mean Difference (I – J)	Std. Error	Sig.	959 Confide Inter	% ence val		
	16-20	0-5 6-10 11-15	03151 05533 .15435	.11071 .11496 .12365	1.000 1.000 1.000	3449 3808 1957	.2819 .2701 .5044		
	21+	21+ 0-5 6-10 11-15 16-20	.27024 30175 32557 11588 27024	.15069 .11420 .11832 .12678 .15069	.741 .087 .063 1.000 .741	1564 6250 6605 4748 6969	.6969 .0215 .0094 .2430 .1564		

The data regarding Standard 6 (influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context) indicated that a statistically significant difference occurred between varying experience levels of principals since p=0.009 which is less than the alpha of 0.05 in regard to the perceived "importance" of this standard. Although some values were close to being statistically significant, no significant differences were detected in the Post-Hoc test. The perceived importance of Standard 6 (influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context) varied moderately depending upon the experience level of administrators, although all groups viewed the importance and preparation factors positively.

In summary, the importance of Standard 1 (vision), standard 3 (providing a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment), Standard 4 (collaborating with family and community), and Standard 5 (acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner), and Standard 6 (influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context) all showed statistically significant differences within the principals being surveyed. Although principals representing various levels of experience felt Standards 1 through 6 were important and that they were adequately prepared to meet them, those principals with less experience perceived Standards 3, 4, and 5 as moderately more important than their veteran counterparts.

Tables 55 through 60 display the demographic statistical analysis, by type of school attended, for each of the six ISLLC standards.

121

School	Attended:	Standard	1

		Standard 1 ANOVA					
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.	
Standard 1	Between Groups	.028	2	.014	.186	.830	
Importance	Within Groups	19.860	264	.075			
	Total	19.888	266				
Standard 1	Between Groups	.908	2	.454	1.520	.221	
Preparation	Within Groups	78.522	263	.299			
*	Total	79.429	265				

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 1 (vision) based on the type of school attended. Principals from state-related, state-owned, and private universities collectively felt Standard 1 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

Table 56

		Standard 2 ANOVA					
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.	
Standard 2	Between Groups	.364	2	.182	2.150	.119	
Importance	Within Groups	22.326	264	.085			
	Total	22.690	266				
Standard 2	Between Groups	.958	2	.479	1.855	.159	
Preparation	Within Groups	68.193	264	.258			
-	Total	69.151	266				

School Attended: Standard 2

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 2 (advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture conducive to learning and professional growth) based on the type of school attended. Principals from state-related, state-owned, and private universities collectively felt Standard 2 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

School Attended:	Standard 3
50110011111011010001	57077070707070

		Standard 3 ANOVA					
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.	
Standard 3	Between Groups	.004	2	.002	.024	.976	
Importance	Within Groups	23.031	264	.087			
Ĩ	Total	23.035	266				
Standard 3	Between Groups	1.375	2	.687	2.574	.078	
Preparation	Within Groups	70.237	263	.267			
1	Total	71.612	265				

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 3 (providing a safe and effective learning environment) based on the type of school attended. Principals from state-related, state-owned, and private universities collectively felt Standard 3 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

Table 58

		Standard 4 ANOVA					
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.	
Standard 4	Between Groups	.496	2	.248	1.675	.189	
Importance	Within Groups	39.076	264	.148			
•	Total	39.572	266				
Standard 4	Between Groups	1.451	2	.726	2.070	.128	
Preparation	Within Groups	92.198	263	.351			
-	Total	93.649	265				

School Attended: Standard 4

There were no significant differences detected for Standard 4 (collaboration with family and community), based on the type of school attended. Principals from staterelated, state-owned, and private universities collectively felt Standard 4 was important to practice and that they were adequately prepared to meet this standard.

School	Attended:	Standard	5

				Sta	andard 5 A	ANOVA	A	
		Sun Squ	n of ares	df	Mean Square	S	F	Sig.
Standard 5 Importance	Between Gro Within Grou Total	Between Groups .191 Within Groups 40.573 Total 40.764		2 264 266	.095 .154	.6	.621	
Standard 5 Preparation	Between Gro Within Grou Total	oups 2.0 ps 63.9 65.9	044 018 062	2 263 265	1.022 .243	4.2	206	.016
			Multipl	e Comj	parisons			
Bonferroni Dependent Variable	(1) College/ University Attended	(J) College/ University Attended	lege/ Mean ersity Difference nded (I – J)		Std. Error	Sig.	Co I	95% nfidence nterval
Standard 5 Preparation	State- Related State- Owned Private	State-Owned Private State-Related Private State-Related State-Owned	153 220 .153' 0662 .2201 .0662	95 19(*) 95 23 19(*) 23	.07921 .07632 .07921 .07036 .07632 .07036	.159 .013 .159 1.000 .013 1.000	Lowe Bound Lowe Bound 3448 4041 0369 2358 .0363 1033	r Lower l Bound l r l .0369 0363 .3448 .1033 .4041 .2358

Note. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

For Standard 5 (acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner), a significant exists between the type of school attended and the perceived preparation level since the p-value = 0.016 which is less than the alpha of 0.05. Post-Hoc testing indicated that the significant difference exists between those who attended state-related schools and those who attended private schools (p=0.013). This suggests that although all groups viewed Standard 5 as important and that they were adequately prepared, those who attended private institutions felt moderately more prepared in meeting this standard than those who attended state-related institutions.

For Standard 6 (influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context) a significant difference exists between the type of school attended and the perceived preparation level since the p-value = 0.031 which is less than the alpha of 0.05. Post-Hoc testing indicated that the significant difference exists between those who attended state-related schools and those who attended private schools (p=0.036). This suggests that although all groups viewed Standard 6 as important and that they were adequately prepared, those who attended private institutions felt moderately more prepared in meeting this standard than those who attended state-related institutions.

In summary, the type of school attended did not have a significant difference upon the perceived perceptions of principals regarding the importance or the preparation in Standards 1-4. However, statistically significant differences did occur in perceived preparation levels for Standard 5 (acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner), and Standard 6 (influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context). Although individuals who attended state-related, state-owned, and

127

School Attende	d: Standard 6
School Intende	a. Sianaana o

				Sta	andard 6 A	ANOVA	A	
		Sur Squ	n of ares	df	Mean Square	S	F	Sig.
Standard 6 Importance	Between Groups Within Groups		008 344 352	2 264	.004 .172	.022		.978
Standard 6 Preparation	Between Gro Within Grou Total	pups 1.9 pps 72.0 73.9	932 932 065 997	263 265	.966 .274	3.5	526	.031
	Multiple Comparisons							
Bonferroni Dependent Variable	(1) College/ University Attended	(J) College/ University Attended	M Diffe (I -	ean erence – J)	Std. Error	Sig.		95% onfidence interval
Standard 6 Preparation	State- Related State- Owned Private	State-Owned Private State-Related Private State-Related State-Owned	11 20 1 .18 02 1 .20 .02	3030)513(*) 3030 483 513(*) 483	.08411 .08104 .08411 .07471 .08104 .07471	.099 .036 .099 1.000 .036 1.000	Lowe Boun Uppe Boun Lowe Boun 3829 4004 0222 2048 .0099 1552	r Lower d Bound r d . r d . 0223 40099 3 .3829 3 .1552 9 .4004 2 .2048

Note. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

private institutions all felt the ISLLC standards were important and that they were adequately prepared to meet them, those who attended private institutions felt moderately more prepared in meeting these two standards than those who attended state-related institutions.

Chapter 5 discusses the findings, draws conclusions, and makes recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS Summary

This purpose of Chapter 5 is to review the research problem, research questions that served as the basis for this study, and summarize the findings. Conclusions will be drawn and recommendations for further study will be presented.

The purpose of this study was to explore the standards-based changes that have been made to principal preparation programs in Pennsylvania, and to gather perceptions of practitioners to assist in understanding whether these new changes in preparation and licensure have adequately addressed the preparation issues that were discussed in Chapters 1 and 2. An online survey consisting of questions directly derived from the knowledge indicators of the ISLLC standards was created for the purpose of gaining perceptions of Pennsylvania principals, specifically in the areas of their perceived importance and preparation levels regarding these standards. Previous studies, as outlined in Chapters 1 and 2 were indicative of a crisis in the area of leadership preparation. Two hundred sixty-seven principals participated in this study by completing an online survey that was disseminated in the winter of 2008. A 2001 public agenda survey found that 69% of principals and 80% of superintendents believed that typical leadership programs were out of touch with the realities of what it takes to run today's school district (Farkas, et al., 2001). Art Levine concluded that most university-based preparation programs for administrators ranged in quality from "inadequate to appalling" (Archer, 2005). Due to the obvious concerns raised by these and many other researchers, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) organized by the Council of Chief School Officers, was formed for the purpose of developing model standards and assessments for school leaders. Many states, including Pennsylvania, have embraced the six standards the ISLLC have developed, and required them to be taught to future school leaders in an attempt to revitalize principal preparation programs and create much greater relevancy to those in leadership positions. Murphy (2000), a major catalyst behind the ISLLC standards, believed that the standards should be the core of productive leadership preparation. An underlying assumption of this research study was that the ISLLC standards and their infusion into leadership programs would have an impact upon the perceptions of practicing school administrators.

Early programs preparing educational administrators emphasized school finance, business methods, organization of schools, and school budgets with a smaller emphasis on curriculum and instructional methodology (Sharpe & Walter, 1997). The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (1996) indicated that previous changes in preparation programs were most likely initiated as early as the 1960s when the federal government began to focus on school curriculum, but most certainly with the publication of *A Nation At Risk* in the early 1980s, which greatly heightened the perception that schools needed to improve. During the 1970s, external factors began exerting a heavy influence on administration of schools (Ohman, 2000). There was a strong emphasis on accountability which would indicate that the efforts of an instructor, department, or institution were actually moving toward a desired end. This included measurement and documenting progress toward the specific goals (Ohman, 2000). Sergiovanni (1999) indicated that during this time, administrators needed to consider themselves as integral members of the community and that civic leadership was an expectation of school

131

officials. Democratic ideals emerged and became a very strong component of managing schools. *A Nation at Risk* (1983) signed by President H. W. Bush began placing pressure on administrators to increase student success through increased accountability. This also sparked an interest in reforming leadership preparation programs. Murphy (1989) felt that the reform movement, although beneficial in some aspects, had little impact upon the preparation programs for administrators. These feelings prompted a collective national outcry that resulted in the creation and implementation of the ISLLC standards that many states adopted, and subsequently implemented, in the late 1990s.

In Pennsylvania, the implementation of the ISLLC standards into preparation programs for school leaders was an effort to provide much needed change, rigor, and relevancy to the preparation programs for future school leaders.

The ISLLC standards call on school leaders to develop and articulate a vision of learning, advocate and sustain a school culture conducive to student learning and growth, ensure the management of a safe and effective learning environment, collaborate with families and community members, act with integrity and fairness, and understand and influence the larger political and legal context in which they work. (Murphy, Yff, & Shipman, 2000, p. 24-25)

As described earlier, this study examined the perceptions of 267 practicing principals in Pennsylvania through their completion of an online survey designed to answer the following questions regarding the ISLLC standards-initiative:

 Which ISLLC standards and knowledge indicators are viewed as most important to practicing Pennsylvania school principals?

- 2. To what extent have the ISLLC standards and knowledge indicators been addressed in the preparation of Pennsylvania principals?
- 3. What demographic factors have the most significant impact upon principals' perceptions of the ISLLC standards and knowledge indicators as they relate to preparation and practice?

Findings

Importance of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards and Knowledge Indicators

The data presented in Chapter 4 indicates that practicing administrators in Pennsylvania perceived the six ISLLC standards and their knowledge indicators as important or very important based on the questionnaire that consisted of a four-point Likert-scale. Mean scores for each of the standards ranged from 3.38 to 3.66 indicating that practicing principals in Pennsylvania believe that developing and articulating a vision of learning (Standard 1), advocating and sustaining a school culture conducive to student learning and growth (Standard 2), ensuring the management of a safe and effective learning environment (Standard 3), collaborating with families and community members (Standard 4), acting with integrity and fairness (Standard 5), and understanding and influencing the larger political and legal context in which they work (Standard 6) are all important or very important to their daily responsibilities as an administrator in today's schools. These mean scores across all standards validates Joseph Murphy's (2002) claim that "The standards are exactly what they claim to be- what practitioners and researchers have told us are critical aspects of effective leadership" (p. 41).

Within these standards, knowledge indicators, dispositions (attitudes), and performances were specifically defined for each of the six standards. Murphy (2000) believed that these indicators, dispositions, and performances were the essence of what administrators needed to have in order to be effective. In addition to studying the standards themselves, this study sought to determine whether the knowledge indicators, embedded in the standards, were also deemed as important to today's practitioners. The results of perceived "importance" of these indicators also indicated that Pennsylvania administrators collectively viewed them as very important or important in the practice of their profession. Mean scores ranged from 2.73 to 3.95 across all of the six ISLLC standards. All of the knowledge indicators reflected mean scores indicative of high to moderate agreement. Understanding effective communication skills, understanding principles of effective instruction, understanding school culture, understanding school resources, understanding codes of ethics, and understanding the law were the knowledge indicators that received the highest rankings within the indicators relevant to their standard. Principals viewed these knowledge indicators as very important to the principalship in Pennsylvania.

Preparation Levels of Pennsylvania Principals

Mean scores for the "preparation" component of the survey ranged from 2.99 to 3.25 indicating that only modest variances existed in the opinions of the respondents regarding their perceived preparation level as it relates to the six ISLLC standards. Collectively, the administrators that their principal training adequately addressed the key concepts of developing and articulating a vision of learning (Standard 1), advocating and sustaining a school culture conducive to student learning and growth (Standard 2),

134
ensuring the management of a safe and effective learning environment (Standard 3), collaborating with families and community members (Standard 4), acting with integrity and fairness (Standard 5), and understanding and influencing the larger political and legal context in which they work (Standard 6). There was very little variance in the responses which indicates consensus among the 267 survey participants that their preparation programs adequately addressed the key elements covered by the ISLLC standards.

In looking at the knowledge indicators that are embedded in each of the standards, mean scores ranged from 2.73 to 3.57 across all of the six ISLLC standards. All of the knowledge indicators indicated moderate to high agreement among the principals that they have been adequately prepared by their respective universities. Understanding effective communication skills, understanding the principles of effective instruction, understanding legal issues, understanding emerging issues and trends, understanding the purpose of education, and understanding the law were the individual indicators that received the highest rankings relevant to their respective standards. The consensus is that these areas are among those that receive the greatest emphasis among the various leadership training programs.

Demographic Factors and the Impact Upon Perceived Importance and Preparation

As discussed earlier, the principals surveyed for this study had a positive perception toward the standards as well as their preparation program's ability to address them. Several demographic factors created statistically relevant differences in the perceived perceptions of practicing school administrators. Gender, school level, and school size did not impact the respondents' perceptions regarding importance or preparation, however age, experience, and type of school did create statistically significant variances among the respondents.

The data indicated that age caused a difference in the perception of perceived preparation for Standard 5 (acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner) and Standard 6 (understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context). The differences occurred between the 30-39 and the 60+ age groups and between the 40-49 and the 60+ age groups. These findings suggest that younger principals feel they were more adequately prepared than the older principals in the area of ethics and understanding and responding to political, social, economic, legal, and cultural issues. Although statistical differences existed, all groups agreed that they were adequately prepared, but the younger principals had a stronger level of agreement than their older colleagues which may suggest these areas (ethics/ understanding to political, social, economic, legal, and cultural issues) have gained more attention in preparation programs than years ago when the principal's role was significantly different.

Experience-level was another factor that detected statistically significant differences in the data. Differences in perceptions among principals of varying experience levels were detected in the area of perceived "importance" of Standard 3 (providing a safe and effective learning environment), Standard 4 (collaboration with family and community), and Standard 5 (acting with integrity, fairness, and ethics). In all of these areas, the newer principals had stronger levels of agreement than those of their veteran counterparts suggesting that these areas have become more important to school

leaders over time as the role of the principal, and the expectations placed upon them, have continued to evolve.

In addition to age and experience, the type of school that the principal attended for their leadership program also had an influence as indicated by the data. In regards to preparation issues, those individuals who attended state-related and private schools demonstrated moderate differences in opinion. Specifically, those who attended private institutions felt they were more prepared in the area of ethics (Standard 5) and understanding and influencing the larger political, social, economics, legal, and cultural context (Standard 6) than those in state-related institutions. Although both groups had positive perceptions regarding their preparation in this area, those in private schools felt they had been moderately more prepared in these areas.

Summary of Findings

- Pennsylvania principals perceived the ISLLC standards and their respective knowledge indicators as important or very important to practice.
- Pennsylvania principals perceived that the ISLLC standards and knowledge indicators were moderately or strongly emphasized in their respective preparation programs.
- Younger Pennsylvania principals perceived they were more prepared than their older colleagues in the area of ethics and understanding and responding to political, social, economic, legal, and cultural issues.
- Pennsylvania principals with less experience perceived providing a safe and effective learning environment, collaboration with family and

community, and acting with integrity, fairness, and ethics as more important to their position than their more experienced counterparts.

 Pennsylvania principals who attended private institutions for their principal training felt moderately more prepared in the area of ethics and understanding and influencing the larger political, social, economics, legal, and cultural context than their counterparts who attended staterelated institutions.

Conclusions

Based upon the results of this research, it can be concluded that Pennsylvania principals perceive the current standards to be important to practice and that their preparation programs have done a good job in addressing them. Creating a school vision, promoting professional development, managing a safe and effective learning environment, collaborating with families and community, acting with fairness, integrity, and ethics, and influencing the political and cultural context have an importance in today's educational environment.

Contrary to research conducted prior to the implementation of the standards, as outlined in previous chapters, it appears that preparation programs in Pennsylvania have not only addressed the standards that principals feel are important to daily practice, but they have done a very good job. A very strong linkage exists in Pennsylvania between university preparation programs and on-the-job expectations of principals, based upon the areas addressed by the ISLLC standards. It appears that university programs, like principals, embrace the inherent elements of the standards and have supported their implementation. Younger principals felt they were more prepared than their older colleagues in the area of ethics and understanding and responding to political, social, economic, legal, and cultural issues. This may suggest the ISLLC standards implementation within university preparation programs has had a modest impact, but could also be a direct result of changes in current educational literature, the implementation of other standards not covered by this study, or changes in curricula brought about by societal changes themselves. Although these younger principals felt more prepared in these areas than their older counterparts, both groups of individuals felt their preparation programs positively addressed these areas.

Principals with less experience perceived providing a safe and effective learning environment, collaboration with family and community, and acting with integrity, fairness, and ethics as more important to their position than their more experienced counterparts. The fact that less experienced principals found these areas as more important than those with greater experience may indicate the ISLLC standards implementation has had a moderate impact upon educational administration. In addition, it may also be indicative of evolutionary changes to the principalship that have occurred over time, changes in state and national mandates, shifts in educational literature, or societal changes impacting the principalship. It is important to note that, although less experienced individuals felt stronger about these issues, experienced individuals also felt these areas were important.

Finally, administrators who received their training in private institutions felt moderately more prepared in the area of ethics and understanding and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context than their counterparts who

attended state-related institutions. This may indicate that private institutions place a greater emphasis on these areas when preparing future educational administrators, a direct result of general perceptual differences between those who choose to attend private institutions and those who attend state-related schools, or a result of philosophical differences in the education of their respective students.

In summary, research conducted prior to this study has indicated that principals have been trained and certified as administrators through programs that are largely irrelevant to, and grossly inadequate for, the work responsibilities found in the school principalship (Doud & Keller, 1998) and that principal training programs have failed to keep pace with today's diverse society and the changing expectations of school leaders (Fenwick, 2000). Preparation programs were being asked to provide much less emphasis on management and more emphasis on instructional leadership to provide a much better framework for leadership programs (Barnett, 2004). Murphy (1992) felt that one of the most serious problems prior to the standards was that the current knowledge base in educational leadership did not reflect the realities of the workplace and did not provide the kinds of experiences that practitioners felt they needed. In an effort to improve the knowledge base in educational leadership across the nation and provide these "realistic" experiences, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium created the ISLLC standards. Green (2001) felt that the implementation of the standards would eliminate confusion and increase conformity among leadership organizations, especially administrative preparation programs. Critics of these standards felt they would be insignificant in addressing the preparation issues of school administrators and predicted their inevitable extinction (Leithwood & Steinbach, 2002).

Based on the results of this research study, it appears that Murphy (2002) was correct when he predicted that these standards could possibly unify the profession by ensuring that all within the profession received similar training, testing, and ultimately had the same expectations for the position. Although it appears that the implementation of the ISLLC standards have had a positive impact in Pennsylvania, it is important to clarify that other variables, that were not part of this study, could prove to play an equal or greater part in the attainment of these positive results. Recommendations for further study may assist in the identification of these other variables.

Recommendations for Programs and Practitioners

Based on the results of this study, it is recommended that preparation programs continue to utilize the ISSLC standards to provide relevant learning experiences for aspiring administrators. The 267 participants in this study clearly indicated the standards directly parallel expectations of the workplace. This was clear among the various variables studied that included a wide array of demographic variables relevant to the population of principals currently practicing in Pennsylvania.

Although higher educational institutions were deemed as inept by previous researchers who have studied principal preparation prior to the ISLLC standards initiative, it is apparent that those training principals today have done a good job in meeting the realities of today's administrators. The knowledge indicators, as outlined by the ISLLC standards, currently serve as the recommended knowledge base for principals in meeting the daily demands of this profession. The standards were to serve as a guide for programming, testing, certification, and professional development for school leaders.

It is recommended that this practice continue to assure conformity exists among those responsible for administrator training.

Preparation programs and practicing administrators must resign themselves to being lifelong learners. This requires continuous awareness of evolutionary changes to the principalship caused by a variety of factors that include, but are not limited to, trends in education, changes in state and national mandates, changes in society and societal expectations, and changes in political, economic, and technological factors that impact education. The ISLLC standards and their knowledge indicators reflect these very issues. It is the responsibility of training programs and educational leaders to keep abreast of these changes to assure that the knowledge base that was deemed so important in this study continues to be refined and infused into the skill set of those leading our schools.

Recommendations for Further Study

As discussed earlier, the results of this study indicate administrators in Pennsylvania perceive the ISLLC standards and knowledge indicators as important or very important to practice, and feel their respective training programs have done a good job in emphasizing these standards. Based on the results of this study, the following are recommendations for further study that may provide more insight into the effectiveness of the ISLLC standards initiative and the programming needs for universities responsible for administrator training:

 Qualitative or quantitative studies should be conducted in other states to determine whether these results are representative of national perceptions of the ISLLC standards and knowledge indicators.

- Qualitative or quantitative studies should be conducted with university personnel to determine their perceptions of the ISLLC standards and knowledge indicators.
- 3. Qualitative or quantitative analyses of college syllabi should be conducted to validate the perceptions found in this study and to determine areas of emphasis as they relate to the ISLLC standards and their knowledge indicators.
- Qualitative or quantitative studies should be conducted with school superintendents to gather their perceptions of the ISLLC standards as they relate to principal effectiveness.
- Qualitative or quantitative studies should be conducted to research the relationship between leadership preparation and subsequent administrative performance.
- Qualitative or quantitative studies should be conducted to determine the methodology utilized by preparation programs and link these findings to the perceived preparation level of practicing administrators.
- 7. Qualitative or quantitative studies should be conducted to link preparation practices, perceived preparation levels of principals, and the achievement of students.
- Qualitative or quantitative studies should be conducted to identify important preparation program issues relevant to the needs of today's school administrators.

Final Summary

This study suggests that the ISLLC standards have had a moderate impact upon the perceived preparation level of practicing school administrators. Due to the fact the respondents in this study represented a 26.7% response-rate, the reader is cautioned not to make broad generalizations based on the data. The results of this study, consisting of data generated from practitioners currently employed in Pennsylvania, also suggests that the university programs that once were the focus of much scrutiny have generally conformed to these standards and have made them a viable component of their leadership training curricula. Age, experience, and type of school attended had a moderate impact upon these positive perceptions. Although statistically significant variances were detected in the data representing the 267 participants of this study, these variances cannot be concluded as "educationally" relevant or significant. The data clearly indicates that although slight variances exist, the principals in this study feel the ISLLC standards and knowledge indicators accurately reflect the realities of the principal position, are viable issues needing addressed in preparation programs, and were addressed positively by their respective training programs. Although the standards initiative most likely represents only one piece of the "preparation puzzle," it is assumed that other variables, not included in this research, also play a critical role in these positive results. In closing, The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium's Standards for School Leaders may be the standards-based reform that serves as the catalyst in beginning to maximize the effectiveness of preparation programs and the subsequent leaders derived from them, ultimately to the benefit of those that matter most in the educational arena--the students.

REFERENCES

- Archer, J. (2005). Leadership training seen to fall short. Education Week, 24(38), 1-9.
- Archer, J. (2005). Study blasts leadership preparation. Education Week, 24(27), 1-18.
- Archer, J., Bushweller, K., & Viadero, D. Report roundup. Education Week, 24(12), 10.
- Barnett, B., Basom, M., Yerkes, D., & Norris, C. (2000). Cohorts in educational leadership programs: Benefits, difficulties, and the potential for developing leaders. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *36*, 255-282.
- Barnett, D. (2004). School leadership preparation programs: Are they preparing tomorrow's leaders? *Education*, 125(1), 121-129.
- Bass, B., & Steidlemeier, P. (1998). Ethics, character and authentic transformational leadership. http://cls.binghamton.edu.BassStead.html
- Beck, L., & Murphy, J. (1993). Understanding the principalship: Metaphorical themes 1920s-1990s. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bennis, W. (1990). Managing the dream: Leadership in the 21st century. *Training: The magazine of human resource development*, 27(5), 44-46.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row.
- Blase, J., Anderson, G., & Dungan, S. (1995). Democratic principals in action: Eight pioneers. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Blase, J., & Kirby, P. Bringing out the best in teachers: What effective principals do. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

- Bogotch, I. (2002). Enmeshed in the work: The educative power of developing standards. *Journal of School Leadership*, *12*(5), 503-525.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1979). *Educational research: An introduction* (3rd ed.), White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Bridges, E., & Hallinger, P. (1993). Problem-based learning in medical and managerial education. In P. Hallinger, K. Leithwood, & J. Murphy, *Cognitive Perspectives on Educational Leadership* (pp. 253-267). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Browne-Ferrigno, T., Barnett, B., & Muth, R. (2002). *Performance outcomes and accreditation: A national research agenda*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Shoho, A. (2002). An exploratory analysis of leadership preparation selection criteria. Paper presented at the annual conference of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.
- Campbell, K. B., & Denhardt, J. V. (2006). The role of democratic values in transformational leadership. *Administration and Society*, *38*(5), 556-572.
- Cascadden, D. S. T. (1998). Principals and managers and leaders: A qualitative study of the perspectives of selected elementary school principals. *Journal of School Leadership*, 8(2), 137-170.
- Conley, D. T., & Goldman, P. (1994, August). Facilitative leadership: How principals lead without dominating. OSSC Bulletin Series. Eugene, OR: Oregon School Study Council.

- Cooley, V., & Jianping, S. (2003). School accountability and professional job responsibilities: A perspective from secondary principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 87(634), 10-25.
- Copland, M. (2001). The myth of the superprincipal. Phi Delta Kappa, 82(7), 528-533.
- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Daresh, J. (1997). Improving principal preparation: A review of common strategies. *NASSP Bulletin*, *81*(585), 3-8.
- Day, C. (2005). Principals who sustain success: Making a difference in schools in challenging circumstances. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 8(4), 273-290.
- Day, C. (2000). Beyond transformational leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 57(7), 56-59.
- Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (1994). *The leadership paradox: Balancing logic and artistry in schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- De Pree, M. (1989). Leadership is an art. New York: Doubleday.
- DiPaola, M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The principalship at a crossroads: A study of the conditions and concerns of principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 87(634), 43-66.
- Division of Teacher Education and Licensure: Virginia Department of Education.
 (2003). Report of the task force to evaluate and redesign preparation programs and professional development for school leaders. Richmond, VA.

- Duttweiler, P. C., & Hord, S. M. (1987). *Dimensions of effective leadership*. Austin,TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- Doud, J. L., & Keller, E. P. (2000). *The K-8 principal in 1998*. Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.
- Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Washington, DC: The Albert Shanker Institute.
- English, F. W. (2000). PSSSST! What does one call a set of non-empirical beliefs required to be accepted on faith and enforced by authority? (Answer: A religion, aka the ISLLC standards). *International Journal of School Leadership in Education*, *3*(2), 159-167.
- English, F. W. (2000). A critical interrogation of Murphy's call for a new center of gravity in educational administration. *Journal of School Leadership, 10*, 445-463.
- English, F. W. (2006). The unintended consequences of a standardized knowledge base in advancing educational leadership preparation. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(3), 461-472.
- Farkas, S., Johnson, J., Duffett, A., & Foleno, F. (with Foley, P.). (2001). Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about school leadership.
 New York: Public Agenda.
- Fenwick, L. T. (2000). *The principal shortage: Who will lead?* Cambridge, MA:Harvard Graduate School of Education, The Principals' Center.
- Ferrandino, V. L. (2001). Challenges for 21st century elementary school principals. *Phi* Delta Kappan, 82(6), 440-442.

- Findley, B., & Findley, D. (1992). Effective schools: The role of the principal. Contemporary Education, 63(2), 102-104.
- Furman, R. (1999). 14 ways to make more time for leadership. *High School Magazine*, *7*(1), 41-44.
- Futrwengler, W., & Furwengler, C. (1998). Performance assessment in the preparation of educational administrators: A journey. *Journal of School Leadership*, 8, 65-85.
- Fusarelli, L. D., & Smith, L. (1999). Improving urban schools via leadership: Preparing administrators for a new millenium. *Journal of School Leadership*, 9, 534-551.
- Giroux, H. (1992). *Educational leadership and the crisis of democratic culture*. University Park, PA: University Council of Educational Administration.
- Goleman, D., McKee, A., & Boyatzis, R.E. (2002). Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Green, R. L. (2001). *Practicing the art of leadership: A problem-based approach to implementing the ISLLS standards.* Columbus: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Hackman, D., Schmitt-Oliver, D., & Tracy, J. (2002). The standards-based administrative internship: Putting the ISLLC standards into practice.
 Maryland: The Scarecrow Press.
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), 329-352.

- Hallinger, P., & Bridges, E. (1997). Problem-based leadership development: Preparing educational leaders for changing times. *Journal of School Leadership*, 7, 592-608.
- Hallinger, P., Leithwood, K., & Murphy, J. (1993). Cognitive perspectives on educational leadership. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hancock, V. (1990). Technology and administrator preparation programs. *Educational Leadership*, 48(2), 85-86.
- Hargraves, A., & Fink, D. (2000). The three dimensions of reform. *Educational Leadership*, 7(7), 30-33.
- Hart, A.W., & Pounder, D.G. (1999). Reinventing preparation programs: A decade of reform. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Hartley, D. (2004). Management, leadership, and the emotional order of the school. *Journal of Education Policy*, *19*(5), 583-594.
- Haughey, M. (2006). The impact of computers on the work of the principal: Changing discourses on talk, leadership, and professionalism. *School Leadership and Management*, 26(1), 23-36.
- Hess, F. (2003). A license to lead? A new leadership agenda for America's schools.Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute.
- Houston, W. (1998). Innovators as catalysts for restructuring schools. *The Educational Forum*, 62, 202-210.
- Huffman, J. B. (2001). The role of shared values and vision in creating professional learning communities. <u>http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/recordDetail</u>? accno=ED466028

Institute for Educational Leadership. (2000). Leadership for student learning:
 Reinventing the principalship. School leadership for the 21st century initiative: A report on the task force on the principalship. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. (1996). *Standards for school leaders*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Keller, B. (2000). Building on experience. Education Week, 19(34), 36-40.

- Leithwood, K., Menzies, T., Jantzi, P., & Leithwood, J. (1995). Preparing school leaders: What works? *Connections*!,*3*(3), 1-8
- Leithwood, K. (1993). *Contributions of transformational leadership to school restructuring*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Houston, TX.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, J., & Steinbach, R. (2000). *Changing leadership for changing times*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University, Laboratory for Student Success.
- Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2003). *What we know about successful school leadership*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University, Laboratory for Student Success.
- Lindle, J. C., Stalion, N., & Young, L. (2004). Content validity of the interstate school leaders licensure consortium's (ISLLC) standards for school leaders: To what extent do ISLLC skill indicators describe school leaders' instructional leadership work? Paper presented at the annual convention of the University Council for Educational Administration, Kansas City, MO.

Lumsden, L. (1993). The new face of principal preparation. Research Roundup, 9, 2-5.

- Manasse, A. L. (1986). Vision and leadership: Paying attention to intention. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 63(1), 150-173.
- McCarthy, M. M. (1999). The Evolution of educational leadership preparation programs. In J. Murphy & K. Seashore-Lewis, *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 119-139). San Franciso: Jossey-Bass.
- McMillan, J. H. (2004). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer*. (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.
- Milstein, M. M. (1999). Reflections on "The evolution of educational leadership programs." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *35*(4), 537-545.
- Murphy, J. (2003). *Reculturing educational leadership: The ISLLC standards ten years out.* Paper prepared for the National Policy Board for Educational Administration.
- Murphy, J. (2002). How the ISLLC standards are reshaping the principalship. *Principal*, 82(1), 22-26.
- Murphy, J. (2000). A response to English. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 3(2), 411-414.
- Murphy, J. (1998). Preparation for the school principalship: The United States. *School Leadership & Management*, 18(3), 359-372.
- Murphy, J. (1992). The landscape of leadership preparation reframing the education of school administrators. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Murphy, J. (1990). Principal instructional leadership. In P.W. Thurston & L. S. Lotto,
 Perspectives on the school. Advances in educational administration. Greenwich,
 CT: JAI Press Inc.

- Murphy, J. (1989). The reform of school administration: Pressures and calls for change. Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Murphy, J. T. (1988). The unheroic side of leadership: Notes from the swamp. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *69*, 654-659.
- Murphy, J., & Datnow, A. (2003). Leadership lessons from comprehensive school reform designs. In *Leadership lessons from comprehensive school reforms* (pp. 263-278). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Murphy, J., Yff, J., & Shipman, N. (2000). Implementation of the Interstate SchoolLeaders Licensure Consortium Standards. *Leadership in Education*, 3(1), 17-39.
- Newsom, J. (2001). Leadership 101. American School Board Journal, 118(11), 30-33.
- Norton, J. (2002). *Preparing school leaders: It's time to face the facts*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Ohman, R. (2000). Historical reflections on accountability. Academe, 86(1), 24-29.
- Scribner, J. P., & Donaldson, J. F. (2001). The dynamics of group learning in a cohort: From nonlearning to transformative learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37, 605-636.
- Schermerhorn, J. R. (1996). *Management and Organizational Behavior Essential*. New Jersey: John Wiley and Sans Inc.
- Schmoker, M., & Marzano, R. (1999). Realizing the promise of standards-based education. *Educational Leadership*, 56(6), 18-21.
- Sergovanni, T. J. (1999). Re-thinking leadership: A collection of articles. Arlington Heights, IL: Skylight Professional Development.

- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1996). Leadership basics for principals and their staff. *The Educational Forum*, 60, 267-270.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994). Building community in schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1984). Leadership and excellence in schooling: Excellent schools need freedom within boundaries. *Educational Leadership*, *41*(5), 4-13.
- Sharp, W., & Walter, J. (1997). The school superintendent. Lancaster, CA: Technomic Publishing Company.
- Southern Regional Education Board. (2002). Are SREB states making progress?: Tapping, preparing and licensing school leaders who can influence student achievement.
- Spoehr, L. (2004). Where do principals come from? *Journal of Education*, *184*(1), 57-69.
- Starratt, R. J. (1995). *Leaders with vision: The quest for school renewal*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Supovitz, J. A. (2000). Manage less: Lead more. Principal Leadership, 1(3), 14-19.
- Stone, P. (1992). Transformational leadership in principals: An analysis of the multifactor leadership questionnaire results. *Monograph Series*, 2(1), 1-27.
- Timperley, H. S. (2005). Distributed leadership: Developing theory from practice. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *37*(4), 395-420.
- Ubben, G. C., & Hughes, L. W. (1987). *The principal: Creative leadership for effective schools*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Westley, F., & Mintzberg, H. (1989). Visionary leadership and strategic management. Strategic Management Journal, 10, 17-32.

Williamson, R. D. (1995). Leadership: A focus on leadership for student achievement.

Schools in the Middle, 5(2), 17-22.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Survey

Principals' Perceptions of the ISLLC Standards ~ Mark Gross

Description: PDA List: Email Distribution: Yes Additional Notes: Dates are approximate but we would like this pilot to go out as soon as possible. Client will provide e-mail distribution list. Client will need a StudentVoice login. Thanks for your help.

Date Created: 5/16/2007 12:20:22 PM

Date Range: 1/1/2008 12:00:00 AM - 2/15/2008 12:00:00 AM Word PDF

Page - Principals' Perceptions of the ISLLC Standards and Knowledge Indicators, Department of Administration and Leadership Studies, Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Educational Administration has undergone major changes at the local, state, and national levels. The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium developed model standards for school administrators designed to have a major impact upon the preparation of school administrators. This survey is designed to assess your perceptions regarding the elements within this standards initiative, specifically the knowledge indicators that have been established by the ISLLC. The Human Subjects Committee has approved this survey at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. It is divided into three parts and should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Thank you in advance for your participation in this survey!

Required answers: 0 Allowed answers: 0 Next Page:

Q1 Please indicate your age range:
20.20 vegra Code 11

Page - Demographic Data

20-29 years[Code = 1]		
30-39 years[Code = 2]		
40-49 years[Code = 3]		
50-59 years[<i>Code</i> = 4]		
60+ years[Code = 5]		
	Required answers: 1	Allowed answers: 1
Q2 Please indicate your gender:		
Male[Code = 1]		
Female[Code = 2]		
	Required answers: 1	Allowed answers: 1
Q3 Please indicate your ethnicity:		
African American[Code = 1]		
Caucasian[Code = 2]		
Hispanic[Code = 3]		
Asian American[Code = 4]		
Other (please specify)[Code = 5] [TextBox]		
	Required answers: 1	Allowed answers: 1

	Required answers: 1	Allowed answers: 1
Other (please specify)[Code = 6] [TextBox]		
K-12[Code = 5]		
Senior high school[Code = 4]		
Junior high school[Code = 3]		
Middle school[Code = 2]		
Elementary school[Code = 1]		
Q4 At what level do you serve as a school principal?		

Next Page: Sequential

Page - Demographic Data		
OF Plassa indicato your school district's size:		
Q5 Flease Indicate your school district's size.		
Rulai (0-1,999 students) $[Code = 1]$		
Suburban $(2,000-6,999$ students)[Code = 2]		
Orban (7,000+ students) [Code = 3]	De mine de manuella d	Allance el anaccesario d
	Required answers: 1	Allowed answers: 1
Q6 How many years have you been a school principal	?	
0-5 years[Code = 1]		
6-10 years[Code = 2]		
11-15 years[Code = 3]		
16-20 years[Code = 4]		
21+ years[Code = 5]		
	Required answers: 1	Allowed answers: 1
Q7 Please list the college or university from which you	earned your principal's certification	n:
[TextBox]		
	Required answers: 0	Allowed answers: 1
O8 Please indicate which term best describes the colle	ae or university you attended.	
State-related (Code = 1)	go or anivorony you anonaou.	
State-owned/Code = 21		
Private[Code = 3]		
	Required answers: 1	Allowed answers: 1
	,	Next Page: Sequenti
		0,1
Page - ISLLC Knowledge Indicators: Importance to your	daily practice as a school adminis	trator
Please indicate your level of agreement with the follow	ing statements:	
Q9 It is important for principals to understand learnin	g goals relevant to a diverse stud	ent population.
Strongly Agree[Code = 4]		
Agree/Code = 31		

Disagree[Code = 2]

Strongly Disagree[Code = 1]

No Opinion[Code = 0]

Required answers: 1

Q10 An understanding of developing and implementing strategic plans is important in the job as a principal. Strongly Agree[Code = 4]

Agree[Code = 3]

Disagree[Code = 2]

Strongly Disagree[Code = 1]

No Opinion[Code = 0]

Allowed answers: 1

Allowed answers: 1

Required answers: 1

011 An understanding of quaterns theory is important in the principal position

Strongly AgroalCodo - 41		
Strongly Agree/Code = $4j$		
$\frac{1}{2}$		
Disagree[Code = 2]		
Strongly Disagree/Code = 1		
No Opinion[Code = 0]		
	Required answers: 1	Allowed answers:
Q12 An understanding of information sources, dat to the principal position.	ta collection, and data analysis stra	ategies are important
Strongly Agree[Code = 4]		
Agree[Code = 3]		
Disagree[Code = 2]		
Strongly Disagree[Code = 1]		
No Opinion[Code = 0]		
	Required answers: 1	Allowed answers:
Q13 Understanding effective communication skills	s is important as principal.	
Strongly Agree [Code = 4]		
Agree[Code = 3]		
Disagree[Code = 2]		
Strongly Disagree[Code = 1]		
No Opinion[Code = 0]		
No Opinion[Code = 0]	Required answers: 1	Allowed answers:
No Opinion[Code = 0] Q14 Understanding effective consensus-building a position. Strongly Agree[Code = 4]	Required answers: 1 and negotiation skills are important	Allowed answers:
No Opinion[Code = 0] Q14 Understanding effective consensus-building a position. Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3]	Required answers: 1 and negotiation skills are important	Allowed answers:
No Opinion[Code = 0] Q14 Understanding effective consensus-building position. Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2]	Required answers: 1 and negotiation skills are important	Allowed answers:
No Opinion[Code = 0] Q14 Understanding effective consensus-building a position. Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1]	Required answers: 1 and negotiation skills are important	Allowed answers:
No Opinion[Code = 0] Q14 Understanding effective consensus-building position. Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0]	Required answers: 1 and negotiation skills are important	Allowed answers:
No Opinion[Code = 0] Q14 Understanding effective consensus-building position. Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0]	Required answers: 1 and negotiation skills are important Required answers: 1	Allowed answers: in the principal Allowed answers:
No Opinion[Code = 0] Q14 Understanding effective consensus-building a position. Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0]	Required answers: 1 and negotiation skills are important Required answers: 1	Allowed answers: in the principal Allowed answers:
No Opinion[Code = 0] Q14 Understanding effective consensus-building position. Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0] Q15 As a principal, it is important to understand si	Required answers: 1 and negotiation skills are important Required answers: 1 tudent growth and development.	Allowed answers: in the principal Allowed answers:
No Opinion[Code = 0] Q14 Understanding effective consensus-building a position. Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0] Q15 As a principal, it is important to understand st Strongly Agree[Code = 4]	Required answers: 1 and negotiation skills are important Required answers: 1 tudent growth and development.	Allowed answers: in the principal Allowed answers:
No Opinion[Code = 0] Q14 Understanding effective consensus-building a position. Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0] Q15 As a principal, it is important to understand so Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3]	Required answers: 1 and negotiation skills are important Required answers: 1 tudent growth and development.	Allowed answers: in the principal Allowed answers:
No Opinion[Code = 0] Q14 Understanding effective consensus-building a position. Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0] Q15 As a principal, it is important to understand so Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2]	Required answers: 1 and negotiation skills are important <i>Required answers: 1</i> tudent growth and development.	Allowed answers: in the principal Allowed answers:
No Opinion[Code = 0] Q14 Understanding effective consensus-building position. Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0] Q15 As a principal, it is important to understand strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1]	Required answers: 1 and negotiation skills are important <i>Required answers: 1</i> tudent growth and development.	Allowed answers: in the principal Allowed answers:
No Opinion[Code = 0] Q14 Understanding effective consensus-building a position. Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0] Q15 As a principal, it is important to understand si Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0]	Required answers: 1 and negotiation skills are important Required answers: 1 tudent growth and development.	Allowed answers: in the principal Allowed answers:
No Opinion[Code = 0] Q14 Understanding effective consensus-building a position. Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0] Q15 As a principal, it is important to understand sa Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0]	Required answers: 1 and negotiation skills are important Required answers: 1 tudent growth and development. Required answers: 1	Allowed answers:
No Opinion[Code = 0] Q14 Understanding effective consensus-building position. Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0] Q15 As a principal, it is important to understand statistication of the statistication of t	Required answers: 1 and negotiation skills are important Required answers: 1 tudent growth and development. Required answers: 1	Allowed answers:
No Opinion[Code = 0] Q14 Understanding effective consensus-building position. Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0] Q15 As a principal, it is important to understand si Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0] ease indicate your level of agreement with the following the second secon	Required answers: 1 and negotiation skills are important Required answers: 1 tudent growth and development. Required answers: 1 owing statements:	Allowed answers: in the principal Allowed answers: Allowed answers:
No Opinion[Code = 0] Q14 Understanding effective consensus-building position. Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0] Q15 As a principal, it is important to understand so Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0] ease indicate your level of agreement with the follow	Required answers: 1 and negotiation skills are important <i>Required answers: 1</i> tudent growth and development. <i>Required answers: 1</i> owing statements:	Allowed answers:
No Opinion[Code = 0] Q14 Understanding effective consensus-building position. Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0] Q15 As a principal, it is important to understand st Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0] ease indicate your level of agreement with the foll Q16 It is important for principals to understand ap	Required answers: 1 and negotiation skills are important <i>Required answers: 1</i> tudent growth and development. <i>Required answers: 1</i> owing statements: plied learning theories.	Allowed answers:
No Opinion[Code = 0] Q14 Understanding effective consensus-building position. Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0] Q15 As a principal, it is important to understand s Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0] ease indicate your level of agreement with the foll Q16 It is important for principals to understand ap Strongly Agree[Code = 4]	Required answers: 1 and negotiation skills are important <i>Required answers: 1</i> tudent growth and development. <i>Required answers: 1</i> owing statements: plied learning theories.	Allowed answers:
No Opinion[Code = 0] Q14 Understanding effective consensus-building position. Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0] Q15 As a principal, it is important to understand s Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3] Disagree[Code = 2] Strongly Disagree[Code = 1] No Opinion[Code = 0] ease indicate your level of agreement with the foll Q16 It is important for principals to understand ap Strongly Agree[Code = 4] Agree[Code = 3]	Required answers: 1 and negotiation skills are important <i>Required answers: 1</i> tudent growth and development. <i>Required answers: 1</i> owing statements: plied learning theories.	Allowed answers:

	Required answers: 1	Allowed answers:
Q17 As a school principal, it is important to utilize mo	tivational theories in daily activi	ties.
Strongly Agree[Code = 4]		
Agree[Code = 3]		
Disagree[Code = 2]		
Strongly Disagree[Code = 1]		
No Opinion[Code = 0]		
	Required answers: 1	Allowed answers:
Q18 It is important for principals to understand currice refinement.	ulum design, implementation, e	valuation, and
Strongly Agree[Code = 4]		
Agree[Code = 3]		
Disagree[Code = 2]		
Strongly Disagree[Code = 1]		
No Opinion[Code = 0]		
	Required answers: 1	Allowed answers:
	and a station of the state of the	
Q19 An understanding of principles of effective instru	ction is important in the daily a	ctivities as a principal.
Strongly Agree [Code = 4]		
Agree/Code = 3/		
Disagree/Code = 2)		
Strongly Disagree/Code = 1		
No Opinion[Code = 0]		
	Required answers: 1	Allowed answers:
Q20 It is important for principals to understand measure	urement, evaluation, and asses	sment strategies.
Strongly Agree [Code = 4]		_
Agree [Code = 3]		
Disagree/Code = 21		
Strongly Disagree/Code = 1]		
No Opinion/Code = 0		
,	Required answers: 1	Allowed answers:
Q21 As a school principal, it is important to consider	diversity and its impact upon ec	lucational programs.
Strongly Agree[Code = 4]		
Agree[Code = 3]		
Disagree[Code = 2]		
Strongly Disagree[Code = 1]		
No Opinion[$Code = 0$]		
No Opinion[Code = 0]	Required answers: 1	Allowed answers:
No Opinion[Code = 0] Q22 An understanding of adult learning and profession principal.	Required answers: 1	Allowed answers:

d answers: 1	
	Allowed answers
as it relates to	o individuals and
d answers: 1	Allowed answers
ning is an impo	ortant aspect of being a
d answers: 1	Allowed answers
ncinal	
icipai.	
d answers: 1	Allowed answers
i important asp	pect of the principal
d answers: 1	Allowed answers
iroo of the act	ool and district level
nes at the sch	oor and district level.

	Required answers: 1	Allowed answers: 1	
Q28 Understanding principles and issues relating to school safety and security are important as a principal.			
Strongly Agree[Code = 4]			
Agree[Code = 3]			
Disagree[Code = 2]			
Strongly Disagree[Code = 1]			
No Opinion[$Code = 0$]			
	Required answers: 1	Allowed answers: 1	
Q29 Understanding human resources management and c	levelopment is an importan	t part of my job.	
Strongly Agree[Code = 4]			
Agree[$Code = 3$]			
Disagree[Code = 2]			
Strongly Disagree[Code = 1]			
No Opinion[$Code = 0$]			
	Required answers: 1	Allowed answers: 1	