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ABSTRACT

The preparation of educational leaders has been at the forefront of various policy discussions and initiatives over the past two decades. Particularly, with the changing fabric of our schools, families, and communities, along with comprehensive reforms that require increased accountability for student learning and achievement, the roles and responsibilities of educational leaders in our schools have become complex and challenging. As a result, there has been a continued focus on ensuring that those who choose to become educational leaders are adequately prepared to meet the demands of the job.

The purpose of this study was to examine the potential relationship between the components of a preparation program for educational leaders and the relationship to three dimensions of leadership performance—technical skills, collegial relationships that promote socialization, and role awareness, as perceived by three consecutive cohorts who recently completed such a program. The cohorts in the study also experienced differing program components and requirements, therefore, a secondary purpose of the study was to see if the variability in program components had any impact on the perceptions or attitudes held by any particular cohort.

The data for this study was obtained from a Survey of Beginning Educational Leaders, which was developed specifically for this study. From a
potential population of 104 beginning educational leaders, 94 or 93.06% chose to participate.

The results of the study showed, to a degree, that the field-based components of a preparation program, including a mentor in a field-based internship were of value to the participants. The milder differences between cohorts suggested that in general, all beginning educational leaders find value in their preparation programs. Consequently, the findings of the study indicate a need for continued efforts to develop a comprehensive preparation program that provides a balance between theory and practice. In addition, there is a need for collective dialogue and collaborative efforts, between local school districts and universities, in the quest to develop more meaningful preparation programs and professional development activities to meet the broad needs of educational leaders in our schools.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

With the continued focus on accountability for learning and various school reform initiatives, the context of public education in contemporary American society has become diverse and multilayered. As a result, the roles and responsibilities of educational leaders in our public schools have also become increasingly more complex and challenging. Some of the challenges confronting school leaders include increased organizational and individual accountability for student learning (Murphy & Beck, 1994), implementing structures for school-based collaborative decision making (Kelley & Peterson, 2002), building capacity for leadership within the school organization (Grogan & Andrews, 2002), and confronting the changing social fabric in schools and communities across the nation (Murphy & Beck, 1994).

Given the present context of education and educational leadership, Grogan and Andrews (2002) suggest that the educational leader in today's school must be a leader of leaders. In essence, one individual cannot effectively address all dimensions of the job, therefore, an educational leader must build capacity among the ranks of the school organization in order to effect meaningful change. Others (Leithwood & Duke, 1999; Kelley & Peterson, 2002) suggest that an educational leader move beyond managerial functions to become a transformational leader and moral leader. In essence, the effective
school leader possesses the ability to foster a vision, articulate common goals, convey high-performance expectations, offer support, and model best practices and values. In particular, the moral leader is cognizant of the moral purpose of schooling, is able to direct change processes with a clear vision, and possesses the ability to articulate and share that vision with others in the organization (Sergiovanni, 1992, 2000, 2001; Goodlad, 1990).

While the need for reform in the preparation of educational leaders has been well-acknowledged (McCarthy, 1999; Kelley & Peterson, 2002), the context of preparation programs, particularly at the university level, has held on to more traditional models of preparation, focusing largely on preparation for managerial/technical roles. Many professional organizations and other entities in nationwide forums have worked to develop new, enhanced leadership standards for school leaders (Murphy, 1991a; McCarthy, 1999; Jackson & Kelley, 2002). In some cases, universities have restructured or designed new preparation programs to address these standards. However, despite efforts to institute reform measures, the general structure of preparation for educational leaders has remained generally unaffected and unchanged (Murphy, 1991a; McCarthy, 1999). Cooper & Boyd (1998) and McCarthy (1999) assert that in part, preparation programs are still designed to meet licensing and certification requirements, further promoting a reliance on a traditional model.
Curricular requirements and course content provide limited focus on the knowledge and skills required for leadership, the areas of curriculum instruction, and learning theory, and the critical link between theory, preparation and practice (Crews & Weakley, 1995, in McCarthy, 1999). Content and skills are also delivered via more traditional methods of pedagogy (Young & Peterson, 2002), providing limited attention to the tenets of adult learning theory, constructivist thinking, and critical reflection, all essential skills for school leaders.

Consequently, the manner in which we prepare future educational leaders must change to meet the vast needs of public education in the 21st century and beyond. Over the past fifteen years, various researchers and others involved in this reform movement assert that collaboration between university professors, professional organizations, and educational practitioners is an essential component. We need to realize our obligation to make a collective contribution to the design, implementation and further evaluation of both preparation programs and professional development activities for educational leaders (Griffiths, Stout, & Forsyth, 1988; Daresh & Playko, 1992a; Sirotnik & Kimball, 1996; Young, Peterson & Short, 2002).

More specifically, as a result of research, reviews of programs in progress and exemplary preparation programs, various researchers have suggested that the following changes and innovations be considered in the
reform and redesign of preparation programs in educational leadership. First, promote the utilization of collaborative learning arrangements that focus on both process and outcomes for individuals and groups (Daresh & Playko, 1992; Sykes, 2002). Second, integrate a meaningful context of field-based experiences with opportunities to practice skills and apply theory in a real-life context (Daresh & Playko, 1992; Sykes, 2002). Third, utilize a problem-based learning format to allow novices to deal with problems of practice and develop problem-solving expertise (Bridges, 1992; Sykes, 2002). Fourth, provide opportunities for novices and experts or interns and mentors to reflect in action and about action, particularly in dealing with real problems of practice (Crow & Matthews, 1998; Sykes, 2002; Grogan & Andrews, 2002). Finally, reconceptualize a curriculum, framed in terms of learning objectives (Sykes, 2002), that is linked to a knowledge base of standards for educational leaders (Hackman, Schmitt-Oliver, & Tracy, 2002; Grogan & Andrews, 2002).

The themes emerging from this body of research provide a foundation for suggesting that several critical components be integrated into the design and implementation of preparation programs. These include field-based internships, utilization of cohort groups or similar structures that promote continuous, self-directed learning in a learning community (Kelley and Peterson, 2002; Tucker & Codding, 2002), problem-based learning (Bridges, 1992) or case studies with opportunities for field-based application (Kelley &
Peterson, 2002), and utilization of trained, experienced mentors to guide novices or proteges (Crow & Matthews, 1998; Kelley & Peterson, 2002).

These components may also interact within learning environments to promote more optimal levels of learning and development. For example, the use of problem-based learning within a learning community or cohort has promoted the learning and development of a range of skills and knowledge (Norris, Barnett, Basom, & Yerkes, 2002). Also, mentors in a meaningful field-based internship, coupled with opportunities to engage in reflective activities, has also promoted the development of novice educational leaders (Crow & Matthews, 1998). This would provide further support for a premise that we continue to work to develop integrated program structures for the preparation of educational leaders to fully develop the potential for leadership, a critical need in our schools today (Kelley & Peterson, 2002).

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of this study will be to examine the relationship between the elements of a preparation program for school leaders, including an internship, assistance of a mentor, cohort groups, and problem-based learning, on the leadership performance or areas of critical need among beginning educational leaders. Further, this study also seeks to identify which program
elements have the most significant impact, if any, on the perceptions of leadership and practice of beginning administrators.

For this particular study, the areas of need have been defined by three major sub-groups: technical skills, socialization, and role awareness. This framework was based on previous studies which focused on defining the critical needs of beginning educational leaders (Daresh & Playko, 1986, 1991, 1992a, 1992b, 1997; Wiendling & Earley, 1987; Hall & Parkay, 1992).

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The program components in a state/university preparation program for new school administrators in Hawai‘i served as an initial framework for this study. Although budgetary constraints have modified the program almost annually over the past five years, the basic elements have included a field-based internship of some duration, guidance of a mentor, utilization of a cohort group structure, and problem-based learning activities in a summer training component. These dependent variables were further conceptualized and refined after examining the research literature that calls for the inclusion of these components in a comprehensive preparation program and reports the general success of these components in the preparation of educational leaders.

These components were thought to have some impact on the emerging practice of new educational leaders as they attained the various knowledge and
skills necessary for school leadership. Studies by Daresh and Playko (1991, 1992b, 1997) identified the critical needs of beginning principals. The skills or needs were grouped into three general areas: technical skills, socialization, and self-awareness or role awareness. In particular, the results of this study indicated that socialization and role awareness were two areas that were of greatest concern to beginning administrators. Again, after reviewing the literature in these areas, it was determined that all three areas could be included in the model, with the anticipation that program components may have the greatest impact on skills and behaviors related to the dimensions of socialization and role-awareness.

**STATEMENT OF NEED**

This study is prompted by a need to gain a clearer understanding of the areas and types of support needed by all educational leaders, aspiring, new, and veteran, as they attempt to fulfill the complex and challenging demands of their jobs. In turn, this may lead to the identification of the critical elements of program design and delivery to develop an enhanced framework for the preparation of educational leaders.

In addition, this study may also contribute to an increased understanding of how leaders may be better socialized as they enter the field of educational leadership. Finally, it is expected that the findings of this study
would help to further frame a realistic context of school leadership, including an awareness of the roles and responsibilities of educational leaders as well as an awareness of self in the context of building and nurturing relationships in the school community. Again, a clearer, comprehensive understanding of this context would serve as a guide for those involved in the design, implementation, and evaluation of new educational leaders, particularly, those individuals and entities who are directly involved in this effort in the state of Hawai‘i.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study has been designed to focus on an examination of the elements of a preparation program for educational leaders which may have the greatest impact on the preparation, leadership practice, and socialization of beginning administrators.

Using this focus as a foundation, the following research questions serve to frame the context of the study, as well as the specific dimensions that will be explored through the design of the study and survey instrument.

- Do mentors and field-based internships have an impact on the preparation, practice, and socialization of beginning educational leaders?
> When considered collectively, do the components of a preparation program for beginning educational leaders have a substantial impact on the preparation, leadership practice, and socialization of beginning educational leaders?

> In considering the differences in program requirements across cohorts, were there any differences in the impact of program components or elements on the preparation, leadership practice, and socialization of beginning educational leaders?

**DEFINITION OF TERMS**

As the field is generally embracing the broader concept of educational leadership, over the more narrowly defined concept of educational administration, a specific attempt will be made throughout this study to use the terms “educational leadership” and “educational leader,” unless a context of understanding dictates the use of terms such as administrator, principal, or assistant principal, to be more appropriate.

With respect to the context of the public education system and the preparation program in the state of Hawai‘i, a specific term, “educational officer,” is utilized. This is a general term that refers to any school-level administrator—principal, assistant principal—and all district and state administrators or educational specialists.
Additionally, in Hawai‘i an assistant principal is referred to as a vice principal. For the purposes of maintaining clarity within the national perspective the term assistant principal will be used.

For the purposes of the design of this particular study, the term “beginning” or “new,” with respect to educational leader, will also be utilized as appropriate. In the specific context of the study, a beginning educational leader is further defined as an individual with 6 months to 4 years of experience in the field.

Finally, although the literature reviewed in this study centers on university-based preparation programs, the focus of this study is more closely aligned with the program for training school leaders in the state of Hawai‘i. This program, although university-affiliated, is designed and implemented by the Hawai‘i State Department of Education. The structure, design, and framework of the program will be addressed in another chapter.

**DELIMITATIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

This study will be confined to educational leaders, either practicing principals or assistant principals, who have completed the preparation program and licensing requirements to be an administrator in the state of Hawai‘i.
Given this and the fact that all participants in the study will have completed a preparation program that is generally state-directed with some collaborative input from the local state university, the results of the study may not be generalized to all university-based preparation programs.

Although based on a theoretical model, the data collected from the survey is largely based on participants' perceptions, attitudes, and estimation of their emerging expertise over time. As Fowler (2002) indicates, survey research is an adequate and appropriate means for examining the attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of a group of individuals. However, it is important to acknowledge that the effect of program elements on the actual practice of educational leaders may not be measured. Therefore, conclusions relative to effects may not be derived from the data collected and the findings of the study.

As a result, this study must be viewed as an initial investigation, which may inspire further studies that explore the effects on the development and practice of these new educational leaders as they gain experience and develop expertise over time.
Chapter 2
Review of the Literature

In the same way that the landscape of educational leadership has become a complex and challenging venue, the context of preparation for these roles and responsibilities has become equally as complex and challenging. This review of the literature is organized in four sections. The first section examines the context of educational leadership, examining the past, the present, and looking a bit into the future. The second section examines the complex roles of educational leaders, setting a foundation for what needs to occur in preservice preparation and beyond. The third section looks at some of the research on the skills, needs, and critical areas of development for beginning educational leaders. The fourth section examines preparation programs as a whole, and also examines some of the critical components of these programs. A conclusion will encapsulate the salient points highlighted by the review, as well as some of the major themes which have been embedded in the theoretical model and design of this study.

Thus, this review of the literature has served to provide a foundation of knowledge and understanding that aided in framing a context for this study and a foundation for potential future research in this arena.
A Historical Perspective

Daresh & Playko, (1992a) highlight three historical perspectives in the realm of educational administration and leadership. They assert the importance of these perspectives in that each presents a philosophical approach to the ways that schools should operate.

In the early part of the 20th century, the scientific management principles of Frederick W. Taylor (1916) were advocated as a system to ensure good practices in industrial organizations. Taylor’s ideas were met with much enthusiasm, and an attempt was made to apply the principles of scientific management to many aspects of American life, including education (Callahan, 1962; Sergiovanni, 1992). By 1913, it was the primary topic of discussion at a national convention of superintendents. Within the next decade, there were scores of articles, books, and reports on economy and efficiency in education (Callahan, 1962).

In an educational perspective, the view of scientific management suggests that there is one “right way” of doing things in education, and once that path is identified, administrators have to responsibility to ensure that other members of the organization know and follow it.

The period of 1920 – 1960 witnessed the emergence of a “human relations” approach to administration. This philosophy placed a primary
emphasis on developing individuals in the school organization and satisfying their personal interests. During this period support developed for cooperative group effort and advocated for allowing employees to work together to define organizational goals and design appropriate activities to achieve those goals. This perspective witnessed the shift from the needs and goals of the organization to the members of the organization.

Daresh and Playko (1992a) suggest that the human relations perspective may provide a strong emphasis on the development of interpersonal and communication skills in the preparation of educational leaders. There would also be an increased focus on attending to the personal needs of new administrators. Such would warrant the development of induction programs to help the newcomer adjust to and feel comfortable in the organization.

The human resource development perspective has emerged as the predominant perspective in the last two decades of the century. This perspective suggests that the primary role of the leader is to assist individuals in an organization—its human resources—to become effective and skillful. As employees become more effective, the organization will improve accordingly.

Although there appears to be some overlap between the human relations perspective and the human resource development perspective, Daresh and Playko (1992a) highlight a major difference. Human relations
advocates emphasized that the happiness of the employees would almost automatically guarantee an increase in the effectiveness and productivity of the organization. The human resource development approach advocates the happiness and satisfaction of employees only if they are first satisfied by working in a productive organization.

According to Daresh and Playko (1992a) these perspectives suggest the following implications for the preparation of educational leaders. Preservice preparation should place greater emphasis on helping prospective leaders develop a personal vision of organizational effectiveness that would allow them to guide an educational institution appropriately. This would also require a concurrent effort to integrate a focus on organizational outcomes with an appreciation for the individuals who comprise the organization. Induction programs would focus on providing the new leader with time and tools to build a shared vision of effectiveness and productivity with the entire staff.

Daresh and Playko (1992a) conclude that quite likely, all three perspectives continue to exist within the present American school system. They further suggest that although one of the perspectives may be more closely aligned with one's own personal values, individuals currently in school leadership positions are represented in all three perspectives.

Acknowledgment of this fact, as well as the current view that educational leaders are not adequately prepared to provide quality leadership
in our schools, lead Daresh & Playko (1992a) to focus on two recommendations from the 1987 report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (NCEEA), published under the title *Leaders for Tomorrow's Schools: The Report of the National Commission* (Griffiths, Stout, & Forsyth, 1988). First, the report called for greater collaboration between universities and local education agencies toward the preparation of educational leaders. Second, preparation programs must include increased opportunities for clinical approaches to learning as an integral component of the preservice preparation of educational leaders.

From this context and these recommendations, Daresh (1990) formulates a proposal for a tri-dimensional model for the professional development of educational leaders, which includes academic preparation, field-based learning, and personal and professional preparation. This model will be discussed in further detail in another section of this review. Additionally, professional development should occur throughout an individual's career and thus, should include three distinct phases: preservice preparation, induction, and continuing inservice education. All three phases are interactive in nature and should not be viewed as isolated events in an individual's career.
Evolution of Training in School Leadership

In one of the papers included in Leaders for Tomorrow's Schools: The Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (Griffiths, Stout, & Forsyth, 1988), Cooper and Boyd (1988) contend that a "nearly universal model for the training of school administrators and supervisors has evolved in America in the last half-century." In the "One Best Model," training is state controlled, closed to nonteachers, mandatory for all who are entering the profession, university based and credit driven, and certification bound.

In the same paper, Cooper and Boyd (1988) present the evolution of training in school administration. Although rudimentary forms of informal and formal training for administrators has existed since the latter part of the 19th century, it was only between 1915 and 1929 that the notion of formal graduate training for school administrators was institutionalized. Training was practical, applied, and direct. Thus, administrators were trained to function as business managers or school executives.

During the Great Depression and World War II optimism and confidence in the business world declined. Consequently, administrators were forced to consider the realm of social and economic issues, which put the role of schooling in a broader context. Thus, there was increased consideration of the relationship between the purpose of schools and classroom learning and
teaching. By the late 1950s and 1960s administrators were being trained as applied social scientists. The framework of behavioral research provided a broader understanding of the relationship of human behavior to administering schools and creating functional organizational structures. It is during this period that the “One Best Model” emerged and formalized the structure of preparation programs for school leaders.

The “One Best Model” has been subject to criticism from many quarters. Cooper and Boyd (1988) highlight the following concerns. First, having to be a trained, licensed, and experienced teacher limits the pool of potential candidates and rules out talented individuals who might present a fresh, different perspective. Second, the noncompetitive admission standards admits most applicants. This lowers the level of training and experience possible, since courses are geared to the background and intelligence of students. Further, eased entry requirements downgrade the status of students and the program in general, particularly in the eyes of the general population. The lack of rigor at entry also reflects a lack of clear criteria for training and a clear vision of what candidates should and will look like.

Third, with graduate programs that allow teachers to take up to twelve credits prior to admission, there is lack of a clear, meaningful, coherent programmatic structure or curricular focus. Griffiths, Stout, and Forsyth (1988) offer similar criticisms, asserting that preparation programs are of low
quality, irrelevant for practice, hold to low admission standards and present limited opportunities for clinical training.

Reconceptualizing the Preparation of Educational Leaders

Cooper & Boyd (1988) propose ways of reconceptualizing the training and preparation of educational leaders. Two suggestions include: activities and programs jointly sponsored by school districts, universities, and professional organizations and internship in an approved program of inservice training. Murphy and Hallinger (1987) present further examples of alternatives, some currently in practice. Their proposals include: 1) new recruitment practices which allow for recruitment outside the ranks, 2) higher standards for admission and training, and 3) integrated, high-powered, and exciting training that is coherent, focused on real-world problems, and both theoretical and practical.

Griffiths, Stout, and Forsyth (1988) support these alternatives and offer their own set of recommendations that should lead to better students in preparation programs, and ultimately, better educational leaders. First, bright individuals with leadership potential should be recruited to join the ranks of educational leaders. They suggest however, that more careful recruitment and selection from a pool of teachers would result in admitting students with higher intellectual ability and demonstrated capacity for leadership. They
assert that the best indicator for determining leadership potential rests in identifying those who have had successful leadership experiences.

Second, they propose that the study of educational administration be a full-time endeavor and that students should move through the program as cohorts. Planning for the program should include both professors and practitioners. Since the programs should prepare students to act and function as leaders, clinical training must be integrated with the academic aspects of preparation.

Finally, Griffths et al. (1988) propose a program consisting of five strands or themes: 1) the theoretical study of educational administration, 2) the study of the technical core of educational administration, 3) solution of problems through applied research and the development of administrative skills, 4) involvement in supervised practice, and 5) the demonstration of competence. They acknowledge that the strands may be delivered in various ways. In addition, with the exception of the demonstration of competence, the other strands could be taken concurrently and delivered in different environmental contexts.

All of the proposals included in the papers presented by Cooper and Boyd (1988) and Griffiths, Stout, and Forsyth (1988) are significant today, not because they would change the face of preparation for educational leadership roles and prepare better leaders. Instead, the value is highlighted in the fact
that nearly fifteen years ago, these ideas began to lay a foundation for proposing what was considered to be radical changes to the “One Best Model” framework of university-based preparation programs. While it is disappointing that not much has changed over this period of time, the need for meaningful change and reform continues to be at the forefront of the recognized need of reform in the preparation of educational leaders in the twenty-first century.

McCarthy (1999) asserts that within the past two decades, preparation programs for educational leaders have felt the impact of external influences in the public education arena. These include reports and articles criticizing the state of public education in the 1980s, subsequent politically-driven school reform initiatives, changing school demographics, site-based management and other governance initiatives, the focus on standards and assessment, and school choice, including charter schools, and privatization (Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), 1996).

As McCarthy (1999) states, state licensure mandates have had a profound impact on preparation programs for educational leaders. In some states, this has prompted policymakers to explore and initiate other venues for the preparation and professional development of educational leaders. In some cases, these initiatives have been designed to improve the quality of preparation and practice of these leaders without necessarily involving the
universities, who have held the primary responsibility of preparing educational leaders for our schools and public education system.

Additionally, several states, such as Indiana, Kentucky, and North Carolina (McCarthy, 1999), have created professional standards boards to establish standards for licensure. In some states, a prerequisite to receiving a license includes some type of formalized assessment procedure, similar to the PRAXIS assessments for teacher certification.

McCarthy (1999) highlights the work of various practitioner-oriented professional organizations, in particular the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), as well as professor-oriented organizations, including the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) and the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) as leading the commitment and collective efforts to improve leadership preparation.

The National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) was established in 1988, as recommended by the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (NCEEA). This board brought together some of the major professional organizations interested in improving educational leadership. The focus of their work includes licensure, preparation, recruitment and selection of administrators, and the development of models of integrated leadership focused on promoting student outcomes.
In 1994, the NPBEA in conjunction with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) initiated a consortium to establish national standards for licensure for school administrators. The work of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) resulted in the development of six standards for school leaders which were adopted by the 24 states in the consortium in 1996.

The six standards (CCSSO, 1996) focus on the role of school leaders in developing and sustaining a shared vision of learning within the school community; nurturing a school culture and instructional program conducive to learning and staff development; ensuring a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment; collaborating with families and community members in mobilizing community resources; acting fairly and ethically; and, understanding and responding to the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context of schools.

In examining these standards, Kelley and Peterson (2002) highlight several major areas of emphasis: 1) defining the mission of the school, 2) ensuring the effective management of the school, 3) shaping a positive, healthy school culture, 4) managing and leading the instructional program, and 5) building positive relationships with parents and community. They further indicate that these points closely parallel the research on principal’s work, effective schools, and instructional leadership.
In addition, at least five states in the consortium have implemented a performance-based assessment instrument, developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS), to be used with other measures to effect the licensing and relicensing of educational leaders. The School Leadership Licensure Assessment (SLLA) was developed through collaboration between the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) and the Teaching and Learning Division of the Educational Testing Service (ETS). The assessments are divided into four sections: Evaluation of Actions I, Evaluation of Actions II, Synthesis of Information and Problem Solving, and Analysis of Information and Decision Making (Educational Testing Service (ETS), 2003).

The CCSSO standards were officially adopted by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in the spring of 2002 and later, implemented by the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) for NCATE accreditation review. As a result, there is now a single, unified set of standards to guide the practice for the preparation of principals, superintendents, curriculum directors, and supervisors. (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2002; Jackson & Kelley, 2002).

Additionally, the NPBEA is continuing to work toward ensuring that the work to establish standards and assessments is compatible and will continue to influence preparation programs in appropriate ways. This would prompt educational units to comply with National Council for the
Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) accreditation guidelines and further modify program content to ensure that prospective leaders have also met AASA and ISLLC standards for school leaders. One recent initiative has prompted the NPBEA (2002) to introduce a seventh standard which focuses on the administrative internship. The internship provides opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop skills identified in the standards through work in real settings. (NPBEA, 2002; Jackson & Kelley, 2002).

McCarthy (1999) continues to highlight some of the foundation-supported projects that have impacted educational leadership programs. Most major initiatives in the past century have been supported by Carnegie, Danforth, Ford, Kellogg, Pew, or other philanthropic organizations. In particular, the Danforth Foundation has continued to support various educational leadership initiatives since the 1970s. Two projects have focused on 1) preparing principals, and, 2) revitalizing the professoriate with the intent of instituting program reform through collaboration across universities. “Moreover, these projects have nurtured a professional culture encouraging ‘reconstruction’ rather that simply reshaping existing programs.” (Cambron-McCabe, 1993)

The Danforth principal preparation program was offered by 22 universities in five cycles from 1987 through 1991. Candidates were teachers
who were identified by school districts as having a potential for school leadership. At most of the participating universities, the preparation program consisted of several common features, including student cohorts, clinical or field-based experiences, field mentors, collaboration with school districts, and a coordinated curriculum across courses (Milstein et al., 1993, in McCarthy, 1999).

The Danforth program for professors (Jackson & Kelley, 2002) was designed to promote collaboration and sharing of ideas across universities and opportunities to engage in program development with the assistance of external consultants. Both Danforth programs have had a substantial impact on the preparation program reform agenda, as a majority of universities that have instituted major reforms have participated in one of the two Danforth programs.

THE COMPLEX ROLES OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERS

Effective school administration has been defined as “a condition wherein successful and appropriate teaching and learning are occurring for all students and teachers in the school; the morale of students, teachers, and other school members is positive; and parents, other community members, and the school district’s administration judge the school to be effectively fulfilling both the letter and the spirit of local, state, and federal laws and policies”
(Greenfield, 1995). These three dimensions of educational administration or leadership appear to suggest that, unlike most other types of organizations, leadership in schools is a moral enterprise. Moreover, school leadership is comprised of a complex array of processes and activities. Voluntary changes in the beliefs, behaviors, and attitudes of others are initiated, guided, cultivated, sustained, and supported by the formal and informal leaders within the organization. In this context, the school administrator plays a key leadership role in coordinating and guiding a complex range of processes and activities (Etzioni, 1964, 1965, 1975; Greenfield, 1991a, 1991b; Lipham, 1964, 1973, in Greenfield, 1995).

A New Conceptualization of the Work of Educational Leaders

The period of the late 1980s and 1990s brought forth a change in the conceptualization of the work of superintendents and principals. The primary work of the principal, et al., became centered around the role of instructional leader, moving beyond the realm of technical building manager (Grogan & Andrews, 2002). Part of this change in focus is due, in part, to the research findings that linked the guiding behaviors of instructional leadership with increases in student achievement (Heck, Larsen, & Marcoulides, 1990; Hallinger & Heck, 1996).
Grogan & Andrews (2002) suggest that this strict conceptualization of the principal as the sole instructional leader is inadequate for the current role definition of school-level educational leaders. With the complex and evolving nature of the tasks confronting today's educational leader, more collaborative forms of leadership are warranted. Thus, leadership processes should be more transformational in nature, utilizing the context of an expanded leadership team to attend to the goals and needs of the school. With the educational leader now functioning more as a facilitator of leaders, preparation programs for aspiring educational leaders must be redesigned, beginning with a common understanding of what occurs in good classrooms and good schools, and attending to the quality of the workplace for teachers and other individuals who serve to promote the learning and achievement of students (Grogan & Andrews, 2002).

The prevailing research (Andrews, Mohn, Hatley, & Goettel, 1994; Andrews and Morefield, 1991; Andrews & Soder, 1987; Purkey & Smith, 1982, in Grogan and Andrews, 2002; Hallinger and Heck, 1998; Heck, Marcoulides, & Larsen, 1990; Senge et al., 2000) indicate that the intensity of instruction and the active engagement of all students increase when five conditions are present in schools: 1) teachers view their principals as instructional leaders, 2) educators in schools hold uniform and high expectations for all students, 3) educators monitor student progress frequently and adjust instruction
according to assessment of student performance, 4) educators in schools hold a shared vision and common set of goals for the school, and 5) a nurturing learning environment is supported by a collegial community with high levels of professional autonomy.

These conditions serve to aid in the redefinition of the expanded role of the educational leader. In addition, Grogan and Andrews assert that these leaders need to provide attention to the building and maintenance of caring relationships throughout the organization. As the executive power of the educational leader is expanded through the sharing of power, collaborative interactions are characterized by inquiry, reflection, exploration and the leader seeks to focus on building capacity in other leaders, staff members, and students.

Again, as with other studies, this viewpoint, highlights the framework for the conceptualization of an expanded role for the educational leader and perhaps, a reconceptualization of the goals, intents, and processes that are included in any preparation program for aspiring educational leaders.

**Leadership and the Demand Environment of School Administration**

Greenfield (1995) suggests that three conditions shape the unique environment of school leadership. This include: 1) the moral character of the school as an institution, 2) the presence in the school of a highly educated,
autonomous, generally permanent teacher workforce, and 3) a school environment characterized by continuous, unpredictable threats to its stability. These three broad conditions shape the demand environment of educational leadership, in that the work and role behavior of such leaders are largely in response to this demand environment. While good administrative routines and management strategies may help, leadership exhibited by the school administrator is central to his or her ability to respond to the conditions posed by this demand environment.

Greenfield (1995) presents five interrelated role demands which constitute the demand environment of the school administrator. A product of the three broad conditions discussed above, these role demands are always present in the administrator's work environment, whether acknowledged or addressed as such. They include the moral, social/interpersonal, instructional, managerial, and political aspects of the school demand environment. Greenfield further asserts that educational leaders can do little to alter this aspect of their working world. Further, it is the pervasive nature of this broad set of role demands that distinguishes the work of school leader from the work of leaders in other types of organizations.

Given this context, Greenfield (1991a, 1991b, in Greenfield, 1995) concludes that leadership is critical in the administration of a school for two basic reasons. First, it is the most effective means by which teachers and other
role groups in the school community may be positively influenced to change their individual perspectives. Second, it sets a foundation by which administrators may effectively negotiate and respond to the demand environment that constitutes their work world. The complexity of interactions between these role demands and the conditions which constitute the demand environment highlight the need for skilled, competent educational leaders. It also suggests that more attention be given to the preservice preparation and continuous professional development to build the necessary skills and knowledge to deal with this complex, ever changing landscape (Kelley & Peterson, 2002).

Kelley and Peterson (2002) also address the prevailing crisis in school leadership. Over the past two decades, critics of preparation programs for educational leaders have expressed concerns about the systems of recruitment, screening, selection, and training. Moreover, in the next three to five years, a significant portion of today's principals are expected to retire and quality candidates to fill these positions are currently in short supply. The results of a study (Educational Research Service, 1998), indicate that the major factors that discourage candidates from seeking leadership positions are insufficient compensation, the stressful nature of the role, and the large amount of time required to do the job.
Nonetheless, research and practical knowledge point to the importance of strong principal leadership to effectively manage complex organizational systems and promote school improvement. Good principals are able to engage their schools in the core processes of establishing, maintaining, evaluating, and improving their structures and cultures. In particular, some of the literature on effective schools and leadership, (Heck, Larsen, & Marcoulides, 1990; Murphy & Louis, 1994; Hallinger & Heck, 1996) support the premise that implementing meaningful and successful change is linked to the central role of school leaders.

The Principal's Role in School Effectiveness

Since the 1980s studies have investigated the relationship between the role of the principal and school effectiveness. Heck, et al., (1990) test a theoretical causal model to determine the effect of three latent variables related to principal instructional leadership—school governance, instructional organization, and school climate—on student achievement. The findings indicated that instructional leadership behaviors, particularly as related to school climate and instructional organization have a direct effect on/are predictive of school achievement. A related finding was that principals in high-achieving schools involve teachers in instructional decision making to a much greater extent. Although the instructional leadership behaviors of a principal
are a multidimensional construct, and the results of the study are limited to
the variables explored, these findings serve as a basis for understanding the
critical role of the principal in achieving the goals of the school.

Hallinger and Heck (1996) conducted a review of the empirical research
from 1980 to 1995 on the principal's role and school effectiveness. Forty
studies from journals, papers presented at conferences, dissertations, and book
chapters, were analyzed with respect to five theoretically-based conceptual
models. In general, findings again support the hypothesis that principal
leadership aimed toward influencing internal school processes has a positive
impact on student learning and achievement. Further, studies categorized
under two of the models—mediated effects and mediated effects with
antecedent variables—utilized more sophisticated theoretical models,
employed stronger research designs and more powerful statistical methods.
These studies yielded more instances of positive findings concerning the role of
the principal in school effectiveness. This speaks to the greater sophistication
of theoretical frameworks and methodology, and additionally, provides greater
power to the findings and results of more recent studies.

Overall, this area of research continues to support the premise that an
educational leader's capacity for effective leadership has a positive impact on
student learning and achievement, as well as other areas of school
effectiveness. In addition, the findings reported in these studies have
important implications for principal assessment/evaluation and the design and content of programs for the preparation of school leaders (Heck, et al., 1990).

The Work of Administrators

Kelley and Peterson (2002) assert that a clear understanding of the work of principals is essential to any efforts to redesign and implement more meaningful preparation programs for school leaders. However, they acknowledge that the daily work world of school leaders is extremely complex and demanding.

First, much of an administrator's day is spent on interactions that last less than a minute. Many problems and questions must be addressed immediately, with little time for reflection or careful consideration of multiple solutions (Peterson, 1982, in Kelley & Peterson, 2002).

Second, tasks confronting an administrator vary greatly, depending on a range of features, including: individuals involved, complexity of problems, thinking and emotional processes involved, and expertise necessary. Problems are multilayered or multifaceted and pathways to solutions are rarely the same in every similar instance.

Third, the work day of an administrator is highly fragmented. Many demands and problems are directed to the principal's office for resolution. A great majority of these cannot be easily ignored or prioritized.
Administrators are, in essence, responsible for a wide range of basic tasks. They must be problem-solvers, but they must also be leaders. They must maintain the routine functioning of schools and also provide the vision and motivation. In short, they must both manage and lead, while providing an effective, appropriate balance to these two dimensions.

More recently, Kelley and Peterson (2002) indicate that new responsibilities are being added to an already complex and demanding position. Some of these sources include school-based decision making, along with the increased focus on collaborative decision making, accountability for administrators and teachers, diversity of communities, and concern for listening to and including other role groups and stakeholders. Without a doubt, districts and other educational and non-educational entities will need to consider ways to redesign and support the work of principals. Additionally, preparation programs for aspiring educational leaders will need to address the broad realm of existing realities, such that we have a larger pool of qualified candidates to meet the demands of a complex role and responsibilities.

The Challenging Role of the Principal

In further defining the challenging role of the principal, Murphy & Beck (1994) highlight the often contradictory demands of the role. On one hand,
principals are expected to work diligently and actively to transform, restructure, and redefine schools, processes, and individual role group members (Goldring & Rallis, 1993; Murphy, 1992, in Murphy & Beck, 1994). On the other hand, they hold positions that are traditionally committed to maintaining stability and status quo (Sergiovanni, 1987, 1992). In addition, principals are being forced to clarify roles and responsibilities while schools and societies are in a state of upheaval (Murphy & Hallinger, 1992). Political, social, economic, and demographic changes introduce a range of opportunities, problems, and crises, all of which have some impact on the system and the organization (Murphy, 1991b).

Murphy and Beck (1994) suggest four forces that influence conceptions of who principals are, what they do, and what they should do: 1) the demands for accountability coming from many different entities, 2) the economic crisis and the expectations that schools play in improving this situation, 3) the changing social “fabric” in the nation, communities, and schools, and 4) the evolution toward a post-industrial world and the impact of this evolution. They further suggest six metaphors to conceptualize a framework of the administrator needed in the schools. These include principal as: 1) servant, 2) person in community, 3) moral agent, 4) organizational architect, 5) social advocate and activist, and 6) educator. The acknowledgment of these multiple roles that educational leaders confront in practice should begin to promote
thought, discussion, and debate that may lead to a clearer understanding of the professional identity of the educational leader in the 21st century.

This discussion also promotes the understanding that educational leaders need to be more proactively involved in defining who they are and what they do, with a specific focus on the issues related to or affected by schooling. This would further promote a definition of missions, visions, standards, roles, and responsibilities of school leaders (Murphy & Beck, 1994).

The Role of the Assistant Principal

In recent years, the role of the assistant principal has evolved from someone who shares some of the burden of leadership to an integral component of a leadership team (Hausman, Nebeker, McCreary, & Donaldson, 2002). Yet, there has been little research that has provided a clearer understanding of the roles, responsibilities, selection, and training of assistant principals, and how these critical leaders derive satisfaction, meaning and purpose from their work (Marshall, 1992).

A study conducted by Hausman, et al. (2002) investigated how assistant principals spend their time and attempted to determine if personal background influences how they enact their roles. Additionally, the study also attempted to define the activities at which assistant principals feel successful and the factors that possibly predict these feelings.
Assistant principals of all public and approved private K-12 schools in a Eastern state were surveyed. Of 300 surveys, 125, or 42 percent were completed and returned.

The results of the study found that assistant principals in this state devoted the largest amount of time to student management, which involves resolving student problems and following up with teachers and parents of the students involved. Other areas which demanded their time were interacting with the education hierarchy and personnel management. Interacting with the education hierarchy involves the following task indicators: attending district administrative team meetings, consulting with superiors, dealing with state and community agencies, meeting with the school board, and completing required reports. Personnel management includes the following task indicators: orientation of employees, supervision and evaluation of teachers and support personnel, social activities with staff, scheduling work assignments for personnel, recruitment of support personnel, scheduling classes, running faculty meetings, and responding to the needs of teachers. Assistant principals spent the least amount of time on tasks related to instructional leadership and resource management.

With respect to the influence of personal background, the study found that females reported higher levels of engagement in professional development and instructional leadership tasks. Females were also more likely to be
involved in personnel management tasks, including scheduling classes, running faculty meetings, and coordinating staff efforts, as compared to males. Males, on the other hand, reported more involvement in student management tasks than their female colleagues.

In terms of the impact of years of teaching experience, the results revealed that assistant principals with five or less years of teaching experience spent less time as an instructional leader as compared to assistant principals with ten years of experience. Equally important, assistant principals with five or less years of teaching experience also reported understanding the role of an instructional leaders less than any of their counterparts. However, years of experience as an administrator did not result in more time devoted or greater success in tasks related to instructional leadership.

With respect to activities that help assistant principals feel successful, the results indicated that they reported the greatest success with student management, interactions with educational hierarchy, and personnel management. Interestingly, these areas corresponded to the areas in which they invested the most time. This might appear to indicate that they spend more time on tasks that help them feel successful or tasks they believe they do well. The results also indicated that assistant principals devoted more time to tasks in which their role was clearly defined.
One other important finding of this study was concerned with prior experiences that contributed to their success as an administrator. The respondents rated graduate training in educational leadership, an internship, professional readings, and attending professional development seminars/conferences significantly lower than experience as a teacher and experience in management. However, it should be noted that participation in professional development activities remained low for over half of the respondents, with nearly 14 percent of respondents not participating in any activities of this type.

The results of this study on the worklife of the assistant principal is important in that it serves to frame an emerging understanding of the current role of assistant principals. It is a role that centers on the management of people, in particular, students. Reacting to needs of people and resolving problems appeared to take priority over other proactive responsibilities that include instructional leadership, allocation of resources, and professional development activities. Of particular concern is the point that these individuals have the lowest participation in professional development activities and have a less developed understanding of the role of the instructional leader.

These findings have important implications for preparation programs as well as programs and activities that promote adequate professional socialization. It suggests that the assistant principalship does little to prepare
educational leaders to assume the role of a principal. Consequently, preparation programs and university programs in educational leadership may need to provide training for both groups of leaders. In addition, school districts may need to also focus on creating programs and activities to promote appropriate professional socialization and professional development to promote a transition from assistant principal to principal.

The study also appears to validate some of the earlier work by Marshall (1992). In her studies of the assistant principal, Marshall found that these individuals most often adopt or adapt to the style and philosophy promoted by the principal. Creating new projects or inspiring initiatives are generally in the realm of the principal, therefore, the assistant principal has few opportunities to take risks and assume a primary leadership role. More often they assume more supportive, less visible roles and functions.

Although Marshall (1992) found some tasks to be relatively the same, with attention to people related tasks, such as student discipline, interactions with parents, teachers, and staff in meeting needs, addressing concerns, and resolving problems, she also found wide variability in tasks and responsibilities. This appears to indicate that as a whole, the assistant principal does not have a clearly defined job description. This may result in role ambiguity, role conflict, and role overload. Role ambiguity refers to the lack of clarity with respect to roles, responsibilities, and resources. Sometimes,
this is compounded by lack of a clear delineation between the role of assistant principal and principal.

Role conflict refers to the aspects of the job that are at cross-purposes with each other. An example might be working with teachers to develop a new curriculum and the conflict with having the responsibility of supervising and evaluating the same group of teachers. Role conflict is also experienced when the immediate demands of the job conflict with conducting the work they value as educational professionals. Here an example would be dealing with student discipline before working with teachers in the classroom to improve instruction.

Finally, role conflict and role overload are experienced when they discover it is not possible to attend to all the tasks and responsibilities in an adequate and timely manner. Also, conflict and overload occur when responsibilities demand an inordinate amount of time, energy, and emotion, leaving little or no time for professional development or a personal life.

These areas of concern also have important implications for preparation programs as well as the ongoing professional development of assistant principals and other educational leaders. The ambiguity, conflict, and overload will always be present to a degree, therefore, those who design and implement preparation programs must prepare new educational leaders to deal adequately with these aspects of the job. Again, participation in a program of ongoing
professional development that attends to the individual and collective needs of this group of educational leaders is critical. Moreover, specific programs and activities must be planned to allow assistant principals to be prepared to understand and assume the role and responsibilities of principal.

The Evolving Role of the School Leader

In another review of the studies that examine the role of the principal in restructuring efforts, Murphy (1994) frames the complexity and ambiguity of the principalship in relation to the increased complexity of the educational system. In essence, expectations are greater and the number of stakeholders and their respective groups have also increased, thereby increasing the scale and complexity of management and leadership tasks for school leaders.

The findings of this review indicate, in addition to the changes in the work environment as outlined by Greenfield (1995), a fundamental change to the nature of the role of educational leader, particularly in the following contexts: leading from the center, enabling and supporting teacher success, managing reform, and extending the school community. Some of the critical skills that support these roles are 1) the ability to develop collaborative decision making processes, 2) delegating leadership and sharing authority, 3) formulating a shared vision, 4) cultivating a network of relationships, 5) promoting the school, and 6) working effectively with all role groups.
As principals come to a more complete understanding of the nature and complexity of their role as leaders, other dilemmas surface. Murphy (1994) conceptualizes these issues under the following four headings: the complexity dilemma, the search dilemma, the dilemma of self, and the accountability dilemma.

The complexity dilemma focuses on the overwhelming workload, particularly following any new reform initiatives, and the challenging working conditions. Concurrently, leaders are also confronted with conflicting policy directives and expectations from various levels of the system, both internal and external. For example, school leaders often find themselves caught between district level and school level change or between federal government initiatives and school level implementation efforts.

The search dilemma focuses on educational leaders seeking support and adequate development opportunities. It also highlights the absence of road maps to guide leaders and schools toward the future and meaningful change. This issue is exacerbated by the fact that educational leaders are being asked to radically reconceptualize the roles and actions, while resources to assist them are few or nil.

The dilemma of self focuses on how leaders perceive innovations and initiatives will impact them. Here the primary facet of the dilemma is how to empower others while maintaining a presence as a leader. In grappling with a
sense of the fear or loss of power and autonomy, educational leaders also balance their professional roles and responsibilities. When limited by the instructional hours in the school day, leaders find that both managerial tasks and leadership task must be attended to in a timely, expeditious manner.

Finally, the accountability dilemma focuses upon maintaining ultimate responsibility while others are empowered to make the decisions. Among the principals in these studies, there is a concern that if parents and teachers are provided with authority to make decisions, they should also be accountable for results (Hallinger, et al, 1992). In reality, this may not be fully possible, under the current organizational structure of the system.

In outlining the changing roles of educational leaders, Murphy (1994) also addresses some of the major challenges and possibilities confronting educational leaders in the 21st century. This further adds to an understanding of the complexity of the role, as well as the need for quality preparation and continuous professional development throughout the career.

Overall, the series of articles reviewed in this section makes an initial contribution toward the conceptualization of a model for the educational leader of the future. However, the indication (Louis & Murphy, 1995) is that our knowledge regarding the scope and nature of the effective educational leader's role is far from being fully conceptualized. Nonetheless, the evidence provided will suggest and frame some of the directions in which research,
preparation, training and reflective practice should move, as efforts proceed to create better schools and quality educational leaders to effect meaningful change.

RESEARCH ON BEGINNING EDUCATIONAL LEADERS

Critical Skills for Beginning Educational Leaders

Daresh & Playko (1992b) provide a brief review of the research focused on problems faced by beginning educational leaders. Although most of the previous work has looked at beginning classroom teachers, this review highlights major differences between the needs of administrators and teachers. For the most part, there is much need for further research exploration in this area.

Wiendling and Earley (1987) conducted a study which reviewed the characteristics of beginning secondary head teachers (principals) in the United Kingdom. Information, by way of surveys and interviews, was gathered from beginning principals, supervisors, and teachers regarding the frustrations principals encountered in their new positions. The findings brought forth some interesting recommendations. First, principals need support and special consideration from their employers or from within the system ion which they work. The study also noted that a common problem faced by head teachers/principals was isolation from peers. This suggests that we must create
ways for novice administrators to interact and network with their peers or colleagues, with the prospect of reducing the sense of separation.

Among the range of professional organizations for educational leaders, in recent years the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) has taken a leadership role in promoting the development of assessment centers to assist in the identification of potential educational leaders. The model formulated by the NASSP Assessment Center identifies sixteen skill areas which serve as the foundation of a composite vision of school leadership. (NASSP, 1982; Daresh & Playko, 1992a; Daresh & Playko, 1997).

The skill areas are:

1. **Problem analysis**: the ability to seek out relevant data and analyze complex information to determine the important elements of a problem situation, searching for information with a purpose
2. **Judgment**: the ability to reach logical conclusions and make high-quality decisions based on available information; skill in identifying educational needs and setting priorities; ability to critically evaluate communications
3. **Organizational ability**: the ability to plan, schedule, and control the work of others; skill in using resources in an optimal fashion; ability to deal with a volume of paperwork and heavy demands on one’s time
4. **Leadership**: the ability to get others involved in solving problems; ability to recognize when a group requires direction; ability to interact effectively with a group to guide them to accomplish a task
5. **Sensitivity**: the ability to perceive the needs, concerns, and personal problems of others; tact in dealing with persons from different backgrounds; ability to deal effectively with people concerning emotional issues; knowing what information to communicate and to whom
6. **Decisiveness**: the ability to recognize when a decision is required and to act quickly

7. **Range of interests**: competence to discuss a variety of subjects—educational, political, current events, economic, etc.; active participation in events

8. **Personal motivation**: the need to achieve in all activities; evidence that work is important to personal satisfaction; ability to be self-policing

9. **Educational values**: possession of a well-reasoned education; philosophy; reactivity to new ideas

10. **Stress tolerance**: the ability to perform under pressure and during opposition; the ability to think on one’s feet

11. **Oral communication**: the ability to make clear oral presentations of facts or ideas

12. **Written communication**: the ability to express ideas clearly in writing; to write appropriately for different audiences—students, parents, etc.

13. **Conflict management**: the willingness to intervene in conflict situations and the ability to develop solutions that are agreeable to all persons involved

14. **Political astuteness**: the ability to perceive critical features of the environment such as power structure, principal players, and special interest groups; the ability to formulate alternatives that reflect realistic expectations

15. **Risk taking**: the extent to which calculated risks are taken based on sound judgments

16. **Creativity**: the ability to generate ideas that provide new and different solutions to management problems or opportunities

While Daresh and Playko (1992a) recognize that the items formulate a foundation which may be used to guide the broad and general screening of candidates for administrative positions, these items may also be useful in providing feedback concerning strengths and needs to future and practicing educational leaders. The items also provide an understanding of the broad expanse of critical skills needed by beginning educational leaders.
Needs of Beginning Principals

Hall and Mani (1992) conducted a study focusing on the entry activities and behaviors of beginning high school principals. The intent of the study was to identify how new principals begin preparing for a new position and what actions appear to be keys to successful entry. In the study, the initial step was to compile a list of specific behaviors and activities of each first-time high school principal in the Beginning Principal Study (BPS) field study (Parkay & Hall, 1992; Parkay, Currie, Rhodes, & Rao, 1992). These were actions taken during the first three to four months after selection. Lists were consolidated into a set of twelve focus areas (Hall & Mani, 1992). The focus areas were as follows:

- **Homework**: time and activities related to learning about the school, district, policies and procedures, budget, background of personnel, and review of written reports
- **Setting Expectations**: actions taken to inform stakeholders about this principal’s beliefs, priorities, and goals—what the principal believes is important
- **Planning**: mental charting of priorities and steps to be taken, both immediate and long range
- **Reversing Prior Decisions**: knowingly changing a decision, policy, or going against the norm that his predecessor had in place
- **Staff Development**: supporting formal training opportunities for various school personnel
- **Culture Building**: actions taken to facilitate the development of certain values and norms among various target groups—school as a whole, administrative team, teachers, students, community
- **Personnel**: selection and assignment of school employees
- **Visibility**: actions taken to let various constituencies see the principal
- **Politics:** feeling out the lay of the land, determining likely allies and opponents, the influentials, and determining how things really get done—both within school and within district office
- **Setting Academic Expectations:** actions and events that highlight the value and priority for student learning
- **Student Focuses:** dealing directly with students and issues related to student concerns
- **Discipline:** setting and reinforcing rules and expectations for student behavior

The behaviors of each principal were subsequently clustered around the identified focus areas.

The following key themes and trends are highlighted in the findings of the study. First, most principals emphasized developing a positive school climate as a key area of concern. Actions taken focused on “culture building” and “setting of expectations.”

Second, most principals placed a primary focus on academics from the beginning. Most reviewed relevant student achievement data to gain a sense of the school’s stance in this area.

Third, much was done by principals to set the stage before teachers returned. The summer months proved to be a time for principals to become familiar with issues, strengths, and deficiencies, utilizing this information to develop a direction and priorities for the first few months of the school year.

Fourth, striving for continuity was vital. In this area, principals would make conscious efforts to link action with development in one of the focus
areas, also keeping in mind the long term goals and themes they were developing to get there.

Fifth, emphasizing a set of themes and phrases was important. These few themes and phrases, such as “be the best you can be,” provide a framework of understanding to guide a new principal.

Finally, in all cases, principals began their new jobs without the benefit of any special orientation, designated mentor, supervision, or coaching. This appears to highlight a specific need to formalize specialized induction programs for all new principals. In reality, this needs to be a program, rather than simply an orientation meeting.

As with other studies that emerged from the Beginning Principal Study (BPS), this study, through an examination of entry behaviors of new principals, offers a perspective of the needs of beginning principals and offers specific recommendations for preparation programs and the continuing professional development of educational leaders.

Types of Supports Needed

In the Beginning Principal Study (BPS), (Parkay et al., 1992) the results of a survey of 113 beginning high school principals indicated that a wide array of problems deter educational leaders from realizing their educational goals. While these principals did see themselves as providing leadership for their
schools' curricular and instructional programs, they lacked the time to devote to the task.

The findings from this study point to the need to develop support programs for beginning principals that help them to attend to priority tasks and enable them to address issues related to teaching and learning. Parkay and colleagues (1992) suggest that these supports focus on three areas: 1) providing prospective principals lacking assistant principal experience with opportunities to participate in a realistic internship experience, 2) providing opportunities to participate in professional development workshops that focus on skill development in attending to daily operational tasks, and 3) providing principals with knowledge and skills to work with key stakeholders and organizations outside of the school.

**Stages of Career Development in Beginning Principals**

In a continuing study, Hall and Parkay (1992; Parkay, Currie, & Rhodes, 1992) were able to track a group of 12 beginning principals for three years after they assumed their principalships. The data collected over this period suggest identifiable stages of career development. At Stage 1, Survival, the principal enters the school environment as a new leader. Personal concerns and professional insecurity are frequently high and the new principal may feel overwhelmed.
At Stage 2, Control, the primary focus is on setting priorities and seeking ways to manage the overwhelming flow of demands. In response, the principal relies more on positional power than on the demonstrated power of expertise.

At Stage 3, Stability, previous frustrations have become less intense and managerial tasks are generally handled efficiently and effectively. Leaders at this stage may develop a more realistic outlook that promoting meaningful change in the school is not a simple process. Consequently, they may become quite content with simply doing the job.

At Stage 4, Educational Leadership, a strong vision emerges for the first time. Thus, at this stage, the leader expects and is willing to work for long-term success from change implementation strategies. However, the transition from Stage 3 to Stage 4 can bring increased conflict within the organization, as might be expected with any movement toward meaningful change in the organization.

At Stage 5, Professional Actualization, the principal manifests respect for the vision the faculty has for the school. The Stage 5 leader has worked to energize, coordinate, and bring out the best among the various components and members of the organization. Consequently, faculty members truly believe that are empowered and are willing to work collegially and harmoniously to improve the school.
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Beyond the five stages in the proposed model, Hall and Parkay (1992) highlight two themes that underscore the changes that principals manifest early in their careers. First, there is a movement from positional power toward personal power. Positional power is derived from the office the leader holds in the organization; personal power is derived from the leader's personal characteristics (Etzioni, 1975).

Second, the behavior of principals at the lower stages of the career development model often reflects a desire to restrict or control the actions of others. As principals progress to higher stages in the model, they become more open to facilitating learning and growth in others and themselves.

Hall and Parkay (1992) offer four basic assumptions that frame the perspective from which the career development of beginning principals may be viewed: 1) principals enter the principalship at different stages of development, 2) within their careers, principals develop at different rates, 3) no single factor determines a principal's stage of development and, 4) principals may operate at more than one stage simultaneously.

With respect to the factors that may impact career development, while personal characteristics make a critical contribution, Hall and Parkay (1992) also recognize that situational and contextual variables may have a significant influence. In addition, a principal's predecessor can have an impact on career
development—a principle that is also supported by the leader succession research conducted by others (Hart, 1993).

The data and findings from this study present the following implications for educational leadership preparation programs. First, individuals in the district and throughout the system need to acknowledge and encourage the beginning principal. It should not be assumed that a new principal automatically knows everything that needs to be known and will thus do everything correctly.

Second, formal support systems must be developed for beginning principals. A recommended “tripod” of support would provide training, networking, and coaching opportunities that extend well beyond the first year. Additionally, principals early in their careers could benefit from opportunities to interact with colleagues at other stages of development.

Third, specific training should be provided in facilitating the change process. Such developmental opportunities would promote an awareness and sensitivity to the dynamics of the school improvement process and an ability to recognize and develop the goals, dreams, and abilities of members of the organization. This process would result in an understanding and internalization of the principles of the empowerment process.

Finally, this model of career development will help beginning principals realize that they will progress through the five stages. Thus recognized,
problems encountered in practice would be viewed as typical of a certain stage rather than personal inadequacies. Resolution of problems and issues would present opportunities for professional growth, continuous progress through the stages of career development and ultimately, personal self-actualization.

Need for Reform in the Preparation of Educational Leaders

A report issued by the National Commission of Excellence in Educational Administration (NCEEA) in 1987, criticized preparation programs for a number of deficiencies, which include the following (Jackson & Kelley, 2002):

- A lack of a definition of good educational leadership;
- A lack of leader recruitment programs in the schools;
- A lack of collaboration between school districts and universities;
- A lack of minorities and women in the field;
- A lack of systematic professional development for school administrators;
- A lack of quality candidates for preparation programs;
- A lack of preparation programs relevant to the job demands of school administrators;
- A lack of sequence, modern content, and clinical experience in preparation programs;
- A lack of licensure systems to promote excellence; and
- A lack of a national sense of cooperation in preparing school leaders.

In the years following the commission’s 1987 report, programs to prepare educational leaders have attempted, in various ways, to respond to the recommendations made by the commission. “Despite these efforts, many
preparation programs continue to lack the curricular coherence, rigor, pedagogy, and structure to provide the kinds of knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to produce a large supply of exceptional school and district leaders” (Jackson & Kelley, 2002).

Jackson and Kelley (2002) review a large number of exceptional, innovative preparation programs across the nation. The preface to the review emphasizes that the quality and supply of educational administrators is affected by more than just the quality of preparation programs. Other factors include the structural features of administrative work, such as job responsibilities, job security, and compensation (Educational Research Service, 1998); the need for better identification and support of individuals with leadership potential; improved recruitment, training, and induction for new educational leaders; and revised licensure policies. (Kelley & Peterson, 2000).

**Major Areas of Concern or Need in Leadership Preparation**

Daresh and Playko (1986) found that beginning principals’ concerns were in three areas: 1) role clarification: which focuses on an understanding of who they are and how they best handle the power and authority they possess, 2) limitations on technical expertise: which focuses on meeting the tasks of the job, according to the given job description, and 3) socialization to the profession and organization: learning how to do things in a new setting.
Continuing their focus on these three areas of critical need, Daresh and Playko (1992b) conducted a study with a group of selected superintendents. The participants were selected by multiple nominators and were identified as those district administrators who were likely to provide valuable insights into the problems confronting beginning principals. Additionally, each participant had hired one or more principals in the past two school years.

The superintendents worked through two rounds to refine a list of 155 unprioritized, brainstormed items to a final list of 24 items. Consistent with earlier analyses of the skills of beginning principals, the items were classified in three major groups: technical skills, socialization, and role clarification.

The findings appeared to indicate that superintendents place high premium on skills related to role clarification. Beginning principals are expected to demonstrate a sense of personal understanding of leadership and how it relates to the role of a leader. They should also possess self-confidence, a personalized definition of authority, and understand the reasons why they were selected for a leadership role.

Superintendents ranked items in the category of socialization in the middle, with items in the area of technical skills receiving the lowest ranking. The finding support the findings of other studies (Daresh & Playko, 1986, 1997) and also provide some basic insights, from an external perspective, into
the types of knowledge, skills, and dispositions expected of beginning principals.

In a similar study, Daresh and Playko (1997) continued to examine the relative importance of the three areas of concern identified in earlier studies. Again, different groups of educational administrators were asked to rank the importance of certain job tasks or skill dimensions. These were grouped in the three areas—technical skills, socialization skills, and self-awareness skills. When principals with at least five years of experience were asked to rate the importance of tasks for success and survival by beginning colleagues, they found socialization skills to be most critical, followed by self-awareness/role-awareness skills, with technical and managerial skills being least important.

Among those who were enrolled in university programs leading to certification or licensure, technical and managerial skills were deemed most important, followed by socialization skills, with self-awareness/role-awareness skills being least important.

In this case the findings suggest some key ideas about the issues faced by beginning principals. Those with little or no experience as principals felt technical skills would be most critical to their success. As individuals move from the ranks of scholar to practitioner, they may perceive other skill areas, such as socialization and role-awareness, as being more critical to their success. Perhaps, practitioners may also learn to delegate technical skills to
other staff members, with the understanding that these areas should not necessarily occupy the time and interests of the principal constantly.

In addition, the findings suggest that colleagues and supervisors at different levels have different expectations of beginning principals. For example, experienced principals and superintendents value the ability to demonstrate greater self-confidence and the ability to fit into the social context of the school district. These perceptions have important implications for the design of induction programs or mentoring schemes to assist beginning educational leaders.

At the same time, Daresh and Playko (1997) emphasize that research on beginning principals has shown that all three areas of critical need are important and must be attended to quite routinely. It is knowledge of this fact that makes the job of the principal so complex. Consequently, Daresh and Playko (1997) assert that the key to effectiveness and survival as an educational leader is to develop the ability to maintain a proper balance among the three critical skill areas. They also conclude, while there is not a rich tradition of research into issues faced by beginning administrators, the findings of their research, overall, tend to suggest that novices and newcomers need special assistance and support directed toward clear and consistent themes (Daresh & Playko, 1997).
In a study of beginning high school principals, Parkay, et al. (1992) survey respondents were asked to rank thirteen internal issues and twelve external issues confronting principals. With respect to internal issues, beginning principals found at least eight of the thirteen to be labeled as "serious" or "moderately serious." This appears to underscore the complex, often stressful nature of the principalship. Additionally, the range of issues further substantiates the many different constituencies and constraints with which principals must work.

The top-ranked internal issues were: 1) coping with a wide range of tasks and 2) establishing/improving channels of communication. Among the external issues, "creating a better public image of the school" and "working with parental problems" were ranked as most serious. With respect to both sets of issues, it is important to note that means of items did not differ greatly.

For the thirteen internal issues, means ranged from 2.50 (2 = Serious on a five-point Likert scale) to 3.77 (3 = Moderate). For the twelve external issues, means deviated even less, with all items falling in the range of 3.02 to 3.91 (3 = Moderate). This would provide additional support to the initial premise highlighting the perception of the complexity of the principalship, when viewed through the eyes of beginning principals.
Socialization

The research on beginning principals (Daresh & Playko, 1992a, 1992b, 1997) highlights three critical areas of need. These include technical skills, socialization, and role awareness. Of the three, socialization has been a key area in the research literature, first for teachers, (Lortie, 2002) and more recently for educational leaders.

Lortie (2002), who has conducted research in teacher socialization, has suggested that there are three types of occupationally-related socialization: 1) formal education, 2) apprenticeship, and 3) “learning by doing.” With respect to models of preparation for educational leaders, formal education might include university-based preparation programs as well as graduate degree programs in educational administration and leadership. Apprenticeship might include a field-based internship under the guidance of a mentor, while “learning by doing” might be a component of “on-the-job” training, or perhaps a short tenure as a temporarily assigned principal or assistant principal. Reflecting these ideas, Daresh (1988) has also suggested that preparation for leadership roles provide equal, balanced attention to strong academic programs, realistic practice in the field, and the professional formation of aspiring leaders.

Socialization is “those processes by which an individual selectively acquires the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to adequately perform
a social role," in this case principal or educational leader. Essentially, it involves individuals' adjustments and adaptations to the expectations of a group, both the members of a profession as well as the members of an organization. The socialization of an educational leader to the profession and the occupation of school leader begins in preparation programs and training (Hart, 1993).

Hart (1993) outlines two types of socialization that impact principals: professional socialization and organizational socialization. Professional socialization involves the internalizing of norms, values, and behaviors generally accepted as part of the professional role. It occurs as educational leaders enter the profession and interact with other professionals. Organizational socialization (Schein, 1986, in Hart, 1993) teaches an individual the knowledge, values, and behaviors required to maintain a particular role within a particular organization. These values and norms may be quite different from those learned in the process of professional socialization.

Organizational socialization sometimes overpowers or supercedes the effects of professional socialization as the individual seeks to fit into the immediate work environment of a particular school. Hart (1993) further asserts that first-time educational leaders experience a dual socialization experience as they experience the need to become socialized to the profession
and the immediate work setting, or organization, simultaneously.

Organizational socialization also occurs each time an individual moves from one work setting to another, understanding that no two organizations possess or operate under the same set of norms, values, and behaviors.

The models of socialization, along with other similar models that exist in the literature suggest that organizational socialization is a process which operates to effectively transition a new leader into the new organization. The process involves many challenges, as the new leader seeks to find a balance between the ideals of self and the norms, values, and expected behaviors of the organization. In the work on principal succession by Hart (1993), it is also important to acknowledge that the process is also impacted by the norms, values, and behaviors of one’s predecessor in the organization. This adds another level of complexity to the socialization process as this is not always something that is overtly observed or communicated.

Greenfield, (1985a, in Hart, 1993) found that professional socialization of principals is generally informal and random. Over a variable time frame, individuals must gradually release their teacher identities. In a later study, Greenfield (1985b) asserts that professional socialization has two primary objectives: moral socialization and technical socialization. Moral socialization is concerned with the values, beliefs, and attitudes required to perform adequately in the role. Technical socialization focuses on the knowledge and
behavior, reflecting technical, conceptual, and social skills and activities necessary to perform as a school leader.

Greenfield further asserts that these socialization processes occur in both formal and informal settings. In formal socialization settings, both the role of the learner and the material to be learned are specified. A preparation program is a worthy example of this type of setting. The role of “student” is defined, along with the specification of the material to be learned. Informal socialization processes may occur in a new school setting, as a mentor might model leadership norms, values, and behaviors.

A study by Heck (1995) examined the impact of organizational and professional socialization on the performance of new administrators. In this study, the subjects were 150 first- to third-year assistant principals. The assessment instruments consisted of a performance assessment of the assistant principal that was completed by his or her immediate supervisor. The assistant principal also completed a self-appraisal questionnaire.

The study was designed to explore the relationship between variables associated with organizational socialization—relationship with principal, parent/community support, support network, orientation to school, job satisfaction, and school climate, and variables associated with professional socialization which focused on the domains of leadership and operations encountered during a field-based internship. The impact of these variables was
measured against three variables of assistant principal job performance, which included: governance, developing/maintaining school culture, and monitoring instructional organization.

The findings of this study support Hart's (1991) assertion that the elements of organizational socialization may be more critical in shaping the performance of the new leader than elements of professional socialization. However, Heck (1995) also found that the quality of professional socialization experiences during an internship significantly influenced performance observed later in time.

Findings also suggest that assistant principals who have more opportunities to learn basic, day-to-day administrative responsibilities, along with opportunities to demonstrate leadership during the initial training also received higher performance ratings from their principals. In a sense, this finding provides indirect support of the utility and value of the meaningful experiences in a field-based internship, as part of a preparation program for new educational leaders. A key action would be to immerse a novice into the mainstream of meaningful experiences that would promote the development of effective leadership skills over time.

The results suggest any evaluation or appraisal system also consider the unique setting of the school. This further suggests that systems be context-based, to the greatest degree possible.
PREPARATION PROGRAMS FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERS

Over the past several years, educational leadership has been the focus on many national fronts. This has been a concern of many individuals, organizations, and corporations, including the U.S. Department of Education, the Annenberg Foundation, the Broad Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, Wallace Funds, state governors, educational officials, and leaders of several national corporations (Young, Petersen, & Short, 2002; Young & Petersen, 2002). Additionally, focus on educational leadership is garnering increasing media attention. A majority of the articles have been critical of the traditional university preparation of school leaders and have explored the potential of alternative preparation programs. However, authors (Young, et al., 2002; Young & Petersen, 2002) point out, in a positive light, that leaders in the field and the professoriate, particularly over the past decade, have responded to the need for proactive change in preparation and practice.

In a paper commissioned for the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation (NCAELP) and the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), Young, et al. (2002) assert that the challenges facing educational leadership are multifaceted and complex. National standards for educational leaders alone will not improve the preparation and professional development of educational
leaders. Subsequent efforts “to positively and substantively change the preparation of school leaders will require a commitment among stakeholders to defining common ground and interdependent efforts toward the realization of mutually agreed upon goals.”

With respect to the interdependency of stakeholder role groups, Young, et al., (2002) utilize the following example. The admission/selection criteria and the selection process for students entering a university preparation program or graduate degree program has generally been the responsibility of departments of educational leadership. However, the selection of future educational leaders is in actuality, linked to a broad range of factors, including but not limited to state licensure requirements and the need to identify candidates who have the potential and motivation to do the work in the field, in the schools. Consequently, Young, et al. (2002) state that “addressing the issues of who applies and is admitted to preparation programs will require collaboration between universities, practitioners, professional organizations, state licensing agencies, and state legislatures, among others.” School leaders alone cannot ensure the success of all children; therefore, preparation of educational leaders must be a collaborative effort. University programs, field-based practitioners, and professional organizations need each other to achieve this goal. Sadly, this level of collaboration and interdependence has not been explored in a meaningful fashion with focus on actual outcomes. In this sense,
more focused collaboration is a fundamentally necessary component for the improvement of quality preparation programs.

The article (Young, et al., 2002) continues to highlight the challenges confronting educational leadership preparation programs. Although many programs in colleges and universities across the nation have engaged in program improvement and reform efforts, these changes have resulted in negligible change, some with little support or recognition. Among the many complex factors affecting the preparation of educational leaders, Young, et al. (2002) highlight the following: institutional support for educational leadership programs, faculty professional development, increased numbers of preparation programs, pool of capable and diverse applicants, ongoing program enhancement, program content, licensure and accreditation, and focus of the profession.

Young, et al. (2002) conclude with the following comments: 1) we must acknowledge the fundamental interdependence of our work and, 2) we must rethink what we need do to ensure a collective contribution to quality preparation. It is our collective responsibility, thus, we need to move beyond individual and group interests to create and implement an organized and collective framework for the improvement of educational leadership preparation.
The Development of Preparation Programs

Utilizing the framework of the Danforth Educational Leadership Program at the University of Washington and the literature on innovative preparation programs in the 1980s and early 1990s (Milstein, 1993; Murphy, 1992, 1993; Sergiovanni, 1991), Sirotnik and Kimball (1996) outline six programmatic commonplaces or features that should be utilized in reframing the landscape of leadership preparation.

First, leadership preparation programs must be organized around and guided by a set of values reflected in a program philosophy and working assumptions. Such a philosophy should be reflected in the design and implementation of specific program features and activities. It should also be evident in the thematic content of curriculum and instructional practices.

Second, programs should incorporate shared decision-making processes and input from stakeholder representative groups in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the program. Sirotnik and Kimball (1996) emphasize that collaborative structures must be developed and implemented in a manner that ensures that representation and power are balanced equitably among stakeholder groups.

Third, in line with the program philosophy, program structures must incorporate the best practices of pedagogy, curriculum, and adult learning, while also embedding experiential opportunities. Cohort groups, facilitative
learning activities, and a balance of field-based/university-based components are program features worthy of consideration.

Fourth, recruitment and selection efforts are critical to the development of a quality leadership preparation program. These efforts have several dimensions. In addition to acknowledging and moving forward with the need to identify educators with leadership potential, recruitment efforts should also clearly communicate program expectations with the goal of insuring that candidates have a commitment to fulfill program requirements. Recruitment must also be a shared effort, as identification of these individuals must include the perspectives of both university and district/school representatives.

In the selection of students, consideration of cohort structures require that group chemistry be considered as well as individual qualifications, particularly if the group is to function as a learning community.

Fifth, curriculum and pedagogy should reflect the best of quality adult learning, providing an interactive teaching/learning environment that is responsive to the changing needs and varied experiences of students, and the expertise of both instructors and students. The content of curriculum should be designed with current perspectives of leadership in schools. Sirotnik and Kimball (1996) emphasize that there is no one best curriculum or set of instructional strategies. They suggest, however, that approaches incorporate ideas from students, review of program evaluative data, and organized faculty.
efforts toward program improvement. Such efforts are certain to enrich both curriculum and pedagogy. These are highly dynamic processes, therefore, working for improvement must be a continuous process.

Finally, program evaluation and related activities must be a regular part of the program. As such, it should be formative, with data collected in the context of action, and utilized to inform program decisions. Data must be sought from all stakeholder groups.

The essence of the discussion on these six programmatic commonplaces sets a foundational base for the development of quality preparation programs. Programs should meet the needs of students, as well as produce quality educational leaders for our schools.

Peterson (2002) offers similar recommendations for the design of professional development programs for educational leaders. While he examines the total context of providing ongoing professional development for educational leaders, his recommendations have relevance for those individuals and parties involved in designing quality preparation programs. His recommendations include: 1) programs should be career staged, with specialized training for aspiring, new, and experienced principals, 2) program components should communicate quality at all levels, 3) programs must incorporate a core mission that focuses on leading schools to promote high-quality learning, 4) selection procedures should be rigorous, fair, and must
incorporate multiple measures; 5) programs should have a well-conceived structure, clear focus, and strong culture-building elements; 6) programs should be structured to enhance learning, providing a set of intensive experiences over a period of time (link preparation with professional development to reduce redundancy of content); 7) programs should make logical use of new information technologies; 8) curriculum should be designed and sequenced with attention to prior learning; and 9) pedagogy and training strategies should be varied, engaging, and ultimately, enhance learning and motivation of all students. With respect to this area, Peterson (1996) also recommends that learning should be job-embedded wherever possible, with opportunities to engage student participants in thinking, reflection, analysis and practice, with a strong component of coaching and feedback.

In conclusion, Peterson (1996) suggests that attention be focused on the symbols and culture of the program. Over time, programs must build strong cultures among participants to enhance learning, build relationships between educational leaders, and foster a career-long commitment to professional development.

**Common Themes and Elements in Program Design**

Daresh (1988) examined other studies of beginning administrators, and uncovered a rather consistent set of themes that have implications for the
ways individuals might be better prepared to assume leadership roles in schools. He suggests that preservice preparation programs focus on the development of strong norms of collegiality within and among aspiring administrators. Promoting the concept of cohort groups in preparation programs could support this (Scribner & Donaldson, 2001; Basom, 2002; Norris, Barnett, Basom, & Yerkes, 2002). Second, “hands on” learning of administrative tasks and responsibilities allow individuals to develop capacity and confidence in their ability to do their work. Third, strategies must be developed to allow individuals to test some of their fundamental assumptions and beliefs regarding the nature of leadership, power, and authority prior to assuming a leadership role. Both of these themes point to the value of some type of internship or field-based learning experience.

McCarthy (1999) in a comprehensive review of stability and change in educational leadership units highlights the following common features among preparation programs. Data from the 1970s to the mid-1990s indicate that there has been stability in the number of institutions offering graduate degree programs. There is a nearly universal “one best model” of leadership preparation that continues to be state controlled, open only to those with teaching experience, university-based, credit driven, and tied to certification or licensure (Cooper & Boyd, 1998). Therefore, since the 1970s, most graduate degree programs in educational leadership have a specific number of required
courses, written and oral qualifying exams, a dissertation, possibly an internship, and often a residency requirement. (Hackman & Price, 1995; Silver & Spuck, 1978; Farquhar, 1977, in McCarthy, 1999). Recent studies have indicated that changes in educational leadership programs have been largely incremental in nature. For example, Murphy (1991) reported that despite the reform activities of the 1980s, leadership preparation programs remained generally unaffected and unchanged.

As with the continuity in degree programs and components of preparation programs, the courses offered by educational leadership units has remained relatively stable. One central criticism is that course content and curricular requirements provide limited attention to curriculum, instruction, and learning, as well as to linkages between theory, preparation, and practice. Another criticism is that courses lack cohesion and grounding in principles of cognition and leadership (Murphy, 1993b; Van Berkum, Richardson, & Lane, 1994, in McCarthy, 1999). This deficit is indicative of a need for better prepared, skilled leaders; leaders who can impact learning and affect change.

Two reviews of topical emphases and course offerings, first by Davis and Spuck (1978) and nearly two decades later by Pohland and Carlson (1993) noted little change. Courses focused largely on administrative theory, leadership, educational law, decision making, school district administration, finance/budgeting, organizational development, and school-community
relations. By contrast, the NPBEA (2002) recommended that the curriculum of leadership preparation programs focus on the following topical areas: social and cultural influences on schooling, teaching and learning processes and school improvement, organizational theory, methodologies of organizational studies and policy analysis, leadership and management processes and functions, policy studies and the politics of education, and the moral and ethical dimensions of schooling.

In part, the continuity in course offerings may be explained by several factors (McCarthy, 1999). First, faculty generally teach what they know; thus, faculty specializations may influence program and curricular offerings. Second, state licensure requirements often determine what is emphasized in curriculum and thus, course offerings. These courses, which are largely similar in states across the nation, are required for individuals to be licensed as school administrators.

In the 1990s, there has been a movement to suggest that preparation programs be linked to a concept of leadership that shifts the focus from manager to educational leader. Crews and Weakley (1995, in McCarthy, 1999) assert that leadership preparation must emphasize decision making, problem solving, team building, goal setting, self-assessment, delegating, conflict resolution, and encouraging innovation. The primary focus is to develop leaders who are able to motivate people to effect change and improvement in
the organization. In essence, this new perspective of leadership focuses on the "centrality of student learning" (Cambron-McCabe, 1993).

With the focus on instituting curricular changes, there is also an identified need to institute instructional and pedagogical reforms as well (McCarthy, 1999). Strongly suggested are student centered approaches that involve students in the learning process and utilize case studies to promote critical reflection. Some redesigned programs are including reflective seminars, in which students apply multiple perspectives to assess the complexities of various courses of action. This is highly reflective of Schon's concept of reflection in action (Schon, 1987).

More recently, educational units have also been utilizing cohort groups. Cohorts serve to build a sense of community among students and with faculty, as well as provide a strong system of support. The community within the group also allows individuals to practice and develop skills they will need to utilize as school leaders (Yerkes, Basom, Norris, & Barnett, 1995). In another study, Norris and Barnett (1994) concluded that cohort groups help individuals understand the benefits of dynamic interactions in a community of learners. As the group becomes stronger and cohesive, the individual's development is enhanced.

With respect to establishing meaningful connections with the field, the NPBEA (2002), along with other similar professional associations, have
highlighted a need to use multiple perspectives to address problems of practice and that field-based, clinical experiences, in the form of internships, practica, and field-based research be interwoven through all levels of leadership preparation. A commitment to this area of change has also been reflected in faculty hiring patterns in educational leadership programs. In recent years, a greater percentage of faculty have had prior administrative experience in the K-12 public education arena (McCarthy, 1999).

McCarthy (1999) also indicates that the recruitment of highly talented students has been a longstanding problem. Recent efforts among educational units have included strengthening student selection criteria, utilizing alternative assessment strategies to evaluate student performance, and increasing emphasis on student self-assessment and personal reflection.

In concluding this discussion, McCarthy (1999) highlights the lack of sufficient research documenting the merit of various program components relative to administrator performance. While some recent case studies of redesigned programs have explored the value of certain program features, including cohort groups, mentors, problem-based learning, etc., there is still a need for continued research to determine if program components and preparation programs are indeed having a impact on preparing school leaders to create schools that enhance and promote student learning.
Daresh (1988) suggests that preservice preparation programs utilize a tri-dimensional approach to leadership development. This model would include three types of learning experiences: academic preparation, field-based learning, and personal formation.

Traditionally, academic preparation is delivered in the form of university-based course work and university faculty in educational administration have been the guardians of this dimension. Daresh suggests that courses delivered in this context are useful in assisting individuals in acquiring the basic language and knowledge base of their field.

The second arm of the tri-dimensional approach would be field-based learning. These experiences would present aspiring administrators with opportunities to witness the practical context of running schools, particularly when provided an opportunity to work with experienced, talented administrator mentors.

The third arm or dimension is personal formation. Daresh (1988) asserts that this most important dimension is rarely addressed in a direct fashion. That is, the field normally assumes that leaders will develop these skills on their own, through somewhat natural processes. Personal formation should include activities consciously directed toward assisting aspiring leaders to synthesize learning acquired from other sources and to develop a personal sense or awareness of what it means to be an educational leader. Five specific
elements are suggested as components of this dimension: mentoring, personal reflection, education platform development, appreciation for alternative interpersonal styles, and personal professional action planning.

In this context, mentoring and personal reflection are relatively simple concepts to define. Educational platform development, appreciation for alternative styles, and personal professional action are dimensions that may benefit from additional definition and clarification. Educational platform development involves the preparation of a formalized statement of one’s educational philosophy, beliefs, and values. The development of this statement would enable an educational leader to acknowledge their strongest beliefs regarding education. Daresh (1988) also asserts that an aspiring, beginning, or continuing educational leader should periodically articulate and share their personal educational platform with others. Such communication would allow others to gain valuable insights into one’s behavior. Moreover, Daresh also asserts that platform development is a dynamic, continuous process that is conducted by a thoughtful, reflective administrator.

Another important dimension of personal formation includes the appreciation and understanding of different interpersonal styles. Daresh (1988) contends that successful educational leaders operate with an appreciation of different interpersonal styles. They also maintain an
understanding of how their own interpersonal style may or may not relate with the interpersonal styles of others in the organization.

The final dimension in personal formation is the development and articulation of a personal professional action plan. This process would allow the educational leader to integrate all of the insights from other dimensions—academic preparation, field-based learning, mentoring, personal reflection, platform development, interpersonal style analysis—into a single, coherent, professional action plan. The process, according to Daresh (1988), allows an educational leader to identify areas of future need and utilize such information to focus upon continuous professional development.

Daresh (1988) further asserts that the emphasis on personal formation as a vital component of a preservice preparation program is based on two foundational assumptions: 1) beginning administrators normally respond to crises in a reactive manner and have little time to engage in a reflective review of their personal and professional priorities, and 2) adults need to learn in other than the traditional ways normally used in college courses. Additionally, Daresh (1988) contends that the personal formation dimension should remain constant throughout all phases of an individual's professional career. Leaders need to engage in reflection, thinking about personal ethical stances, and maintaining a professional commitment.
Good schools need good leaders. Consequently, more effective, realistic approaches are needed to prepare individuals to become educational leaders. The Danforth Foundation has launched major initiatives to support the development of new, innovative preparation programs for educational leaders. Various organizations focusing on the preparation of educational leaders, including the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA), the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), the Interstate Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), the National Association for Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), and other affiliate organizations have all assisted in the efforts to design new programs to prepare educational leaders.

The dialogue emanating from this common interest in the ways individuals become educational leaders has led to the emergence of some common themes. Daresh (1997) summarizes ten strategies that have been suggested to build more effective leadership preparation programs. Five strategies focus on improving the content of preservice programs or “what future leaders should know.” The other five strategies address the delivery in preservice programs or “how leaders should learn what they need to know.”

The five content-related recommendations are: 1) preservice programs should emphasize the development of reflective skills, 2) preparation programs
should help people acquire skills as moral and ethical leaders, 3) principles of adult learning should guide practice in preparation programs, 4) curricula should be coherent, integrative, and sequenced in a logical fashion, and 5) greater emphasis should be placed on learning about teaching and learning processes in schools.

While all recommendations are of importance, it is essential to note that first, the increased emphasis on teaching and learning processes in schools, supports the premise that effective school outcomes are correlated with instructional leadership of the principal (Heck, Larsen, & Marcoulides, 1990; Hallinger & Heck, 1996). Consequently, educational leaders must be prepared to guide and supervise the teaching-learning activities in their schools as a primary area of attention and responsibility.

Second, the relationship of adult learning principles and leadership practices speaks to developing the necessary capacity of leaders to deal effectively with adults. This include patterns of communication, but also helps a leader to focus on learning among a school community comprised primarily of a broad range of adult constituencies.

The five delivery-related recommendations (Daresh, 1997) are: 1) opportunities for more clinical learning—internships, practica, field-based learning opportunities, etc.—should be made available to aspiring principals, 2) experienced administrators should serve as mentors to aspiring leaders, 3)
aspiring principals should proceed toward their goals in cohorts, 4) authentic assessment techniques should be used to track student progress, and 5) preservice preparation is viewed as only part of a bigger picture of professional development.

Daresh (1997) concludes that these recommendations should not be viewed as theoretical solutions to the problems. Rather, these recommendations should be considered and utilized in recrafting models and reforming practices to improve the preparation of educational leaders.

Innovative Programs in Educational Leadership

Kelley and Peterson (2002) and Jackson & Kelley (2002) conducted a review of educational leadership programs throughout the nation. The review examined elements of student selection, program structure, pedagogy, curricular focus, program effects, program costs and other challenges. They highlight examples of innovative principal preparation programs, including three programs supported by the Danforth Foundation Program for the Preparation of School Principals (Milstein, 1993). The three Danforth sites are the University of Washington Danforth Educational Leadership Program, the East Tennessee State University administrative endorsement program, and the California State University at Fresno principal preparation program.
According to Jackson and Kelley (2002), these programs differ from the traditional preparation programs in that they: 1) tend to be more demanding of participants, 2) incorporate more careful selection and screening processes, and 3) are more coherent and focused, with specific attention to course sequence, scheduling of courses, and collaboration with area districts. The programs all incorporate a cohort of 20-25 students. In addition, faculty members work with area practitioners to develop a coherent, integrated program focus, which allows students to master critical competencies.

The University of Washington Danforth Educational Leadership Program emphasizes the development of moral and ethical leadership as an essential component of effective leadership practice. The cohort structure, aided by a two-week summer institute, serves to reinforce the development of moral and ethical leadership while shaping the norms and collective expectations of the cohort in ways that promote focus on program goals. The program also includes an extensive, half time internship and mentoring. Mentors are screened through an application process that includes letters of recommendation and a professional portfolio.

The East Tennessee State University program supports the development of ethical leadership through curricular coherence and program structure. It requires an extensive field experience with requirements designed to allow students to continue full-time employment in their regular jobs.
Program administrators feel that the field experience structure allows for exposure to a range of strengths and approaches to leadership. This in turn creates a useful opportunity for discussion and analysis of leadership approaches.

The California State University at Fresno incorporates a two-tiered preparation program, which reflects the California licensure requirements for school administrators. Tier 1 focuses on instructional leadership and includes a field experience as a master teacher. After completing Tier 1, participants are placed in administrative roles, generally as an assistant principal. They then enroll in Tier 2 courses, which cover transformational leadership and other courses which are more practical in nature and are directly related to administrative practice.

In concluding their examination of innovative programs, Jackson and Kelley (2002; Kelley & Peterson, 2002), outline some common characteristics: 1) guidance by a clear vision which drives programmatic decisions and thus provides opportunities for the development of programmatic coherence, 2) identification, selection, and screening of students to ensure leadership potential, 3) a clear, well-defined curricular focus reflecting agreement on the relevant knowledge base needed by educational leaders in the first years of practice, 4) a knowledge base linked to the ISLLC standards, 5) meaningful, significant collaboration among faculty members and between university and
practicing administrators, and 6) a program developed through strong collaboration with local districts, incorporating extensive preplanning, ongoing discussions, and continued planning to formulate the program design structure.

In concluding their review, Jackson and Kelley (2002; Kelley & Peterson, 2002) state that the examination of these innovative preparation programs suggest further opportunities for strengthening the preparation of educational leaders. They assert that meaningful change will require all stakeholders—faculty, students, practitioners, the state, and the institution—to make a commitment to develop high-quality, demanding preparation programs. While these programs require a high degree of time investment among all partners, they will also require an investment of initial and ongoing resources, continuous collaboration and mentorship, connections to the field, and a willingness to put program/student outcomes ahead of income earning. They reiterate that standards alone are not enough to ensure quality stakeholder commitment and engagement in order to develop focused, systemic change and the overall improvement of preparation programs for future educational leaders.
Research Related to Critical Components of Preparation Programs

A review of the common elements of successful preparation programs appear to highlight several components that should be incorporated in the design of implementation of preparation programs for educational leaders. Several of these components, including cohorts, problem-based learning, field-based internships and mentoring, along with the critical research will be reviewed in this section.

Cohort Learning Communities

An approach that is becoming more common and popular, particularly in leadership preparation programs and graduate degree programs in educational leadership, is the use of student cohorts (Cordiero, Krueger, Parks, Restine, & Wilson, 1992; Barnett, Basom, Yerkes, & Norris, 2000) or the utilization of a learning community concept (Norris, Barnett, Basom & Yerkes, 2002). Research has indicated that learning is enhanced in cohorts or learning communities when participants have opportunities to share ideas, elaborate on their own thoughts, and consider the ideas of others (Senge, 1990; Norris et al., 2002). In terms of program delivery the cohort arrangement provides a clearer program structure and course sequencing, peer group support, and increased contact with instructors (Scribner & Donaldson, 2001).
In a cohort arrangement, groups of students take all or most of the coursework with an intact group, rather than enrolling in courses randomly at their own choosing and pace. The approach allows for student to engage in a common set of courses, activities, and learning experiences (Barnett & Muse, 1993; Basom, 2002).

Despite its increased use, there is little research on cohorts (Barnett, Basom, Yerkes, & Norris, 2000; Scribner & Donaldson, 2001). Most of the studies have focused on the perceptions of students and faculty who have experienced this approach, student satisfaction with the social climate of the program, and program completion rates (Reynolds and Hebert, 1995, in Scribner & Donaldson, 2001). Studies have relied on limited samples, and these samples generally focus on programs that utilize cohorts, ignoring those programs that have chosen not to utilize the cohort approach. Consequently, the effect of cohorts on leadership development has not been fully explored.

An article by Basom (2002) explores the nature of the process curriculum, which facilitates learning in the cohort structure, as it applies to leadership preparation programs. The data for this exploration was provided by two studies of cohorts in four different university-based preparation programs (Norris et al., 2002). The findings from these studies highlighted the value of a process curriculum centered on: 1) developing the individual, 2) encouraging group interaction, 3) focusing on reflection, and 4) utilizing
concepts of adult development and a constructivist approach to learning. Basom's discussion of each of these points provides evidence of how learning communities may operate effectively as cohesive groups while promoting the enhanced development of individuals.

Within the learning community, group processes may foster the development of individual members. However, throughout the learning process, individuals must balance the realization of the group's purpose and goals with the need to achieve and satisfy personal goals. Strategies to foster individual development may include a variety of self-assessment instruments and feedback received from others. Students may use this data to develop an individual growth plan or a professional platform. In the platform, students identify core values which are at the heart of who they are as moral leaders. Sharing of this platform with other group members serves to promote an understanding, and perhaps, an acknowledgment of the core values held by other group members.

Basom (2002) asserts that when individuals within groups interact and become collaborative, groups develop into interdependent entities. Consequently, group members support each other, pool their resources, combine their efforts and develop friendship bonds. A learning community is characterized by the cohesiveness of social interactions among members. Social interactions influence member's attitudes, behaviors, and perceptions.
Individual and group interaction can be encouraged by attention to the size of the group and the frequency and intensity of group interactions. Limiting the size of the group allows for the development of closer relationships and provide faculty with better opportunities to attend to the needs of students. Frequent interaction promotes positive involvement and accountability of all group members in accomplishment of group tasks. To foster group interaction, faculty should promote activities that build trust with an understanding and appreciation of individual differences, attitudes, skills and aspirations. Group development may also be fostered through the clear articulation and modeling of a common purpose.

Reflecting on one's educational practice is a necessary element for professional growth. The process does require devoting time for considering one's practice, committing to objectively and occasionally dealing with discomfort, and working toward the goal of generating greater self awareness. Staratt (1995, in Basom, 2002) suggested that we benefit from reflecting with others and that leaders need to invite the entire school community to reflect on what they are doing. The group reflection helps to build a reflective community, which is the heart of a learning community. Ultimately effective reflective practice enables group members to build a trusting learning environment, develop systems of support, and leads them to further clarify their personal vision.
Professional platforms and journals may be used to foster individual and community reflection. Another idea is built around the concept of a reflective seminar. In these seminars, participants are presented with an opportunity to examine relationships, develop new insights, and create personal meaning from real-life experiences from the field. Given problems of practice, groups reflect together, refine collaborative problem-solving skills, and have the potential to clarify individual thinking and ultimately, refine practice.

Basom (2002) contends that theories of adult learning and development must serve as a foundation or guide the creation of learning communities in leadership preparation programs. Adult learners prefer opportunities to grow and learn with others, reduce isolation in learning, and are motivated by strong relationships and affiliation. Positive group interaction and processes contribute to a sense of ownership and commitment to learning that an adult needs. Time should be devoted at every session for participants to get to know each other better. Participants should also be presented with opportunities to input into program and coursework development and use of areas of expertise and knowledge in contributing to the teaching responsibilities. As a result, students will sense and develop a sense of ownership in the learning process, another tenet that supports adult growth and development.

A constructivist approach to teaching and learning is based on the work of Dewey (1938), Piaget (1970), and Vygotsky (1978). Relevant strategies may
include: teachers’ seeking and considering students’ points of view, lessons orchestrated to challenge students’ suppositions, students’ finding relevance in the curriculum, lessons designed around big ideas, and students’ learning assessed in the context of the learning environment. These strategies allow students to construct their own learning by having a voice in what and how they learn.

Recommendations for promoting a constructivist learning environment include utilizing a problem-based learning approach. The process allows groups of participants to examine problems of practice and engages learners in acquiring new knowledge as they work collaboratively to solve realistic problems. A constructivist approach also implies that assessment should be meaningful and authentic (Johnson & Johnson, 1996), should measure what was learned, and be based on knowledge and skills that address problems of practice (Tucker & Codding, 1998 in Basom, 2002). Such assessment measures might include products from problem-based learning activities, case scenarios, portfolio demonstrations, and self-assessment of course performance objectives (Norris et al., 2002).

In concluding this discussion, Basom (2002) highlights the critical role of the instructor in building a learning community. The instructor is a facilitator who works to incorporate various instructional strategies that promote personal learning on both the individual and group level. As opposed
to more traditional methods of instructional delivery, there should be a
dedication and commitment to theories of adult learning and a constructivist
approach to teaching and learning. To meet the varied needs and learning
styles of all learners, a balance of instructional approaches is needed and the
program/process should stress doing as opposed to passive listening. The
commitment to adult learning promotes a focus on the development of an open
learning environment where social interaction is encouraged and a supportive
climate of respect and acceptance facilitates quality learning and instruction.
Finally, the critical component of the facilitator's role allows group members to
feel important and worthwhile, have a sense of belonging, and be accepted by
other group members (Merriam & Cafferella, 1991).

Barnett and associates have explored the use of cohorts in university-
based preparation programs and graduate degree programs. One study,
(Barnett, Basom, Yerkes, & Norris, 2000) was an exploratory investigation
that examined the benefits and difficulties associated with cohorts, as
perceived by educational leadership faculty who were and were not using
cohort structures.

A survey was distributed to 383 university-based educational leadership
programs. A final sample was comprised of 223 programs. Of this total, 141
universities, or 63%, were using cohorts in some or all of the preparation
programs; 82 universities, or 37%, were not using cohorts. Although this
appears to be a fairly large sample, only 60% of the educational leadership programs nationwide were represented in this study. As a result, the findings cannot be generalized to all educational leadership programs.

The findings focused on three areas: 1) respondents’ perception of the benefits of using cohorts, 2) the disadvantages of cohort use, and 3) the impact of the cohort experience on the development of students as educational leaders.

Faculty who were using cohorts highlighted four major advantages: impact on students during their program, efficiency of program delivery, implications for faculty and program, and effects on students after program completion. Most significant was the perception of benefit to the student, particularly in terms of the development of positive interpersonal relationships and the quality of the learning experience. Almost as important was the efficiency of program delivery. The predictability of course scheduling and program delivery positively affected enrollment management.

Among cohort nonusers, a smaller proportion of faculty reported the same four types of benefits as users. Again, the two most highly perceived advantages were positive student relationships and efficacy in scheduling and enrollment management. Nonusers viewed the cohort structure as providing students opportunities to create professional networks, obtain support from peers, build collegial teams, and bond with members of the group.
In terms of the disadvantages of using cohorts, the following difficulties were noted: structural and organizational costs, negative impact on students, and implications for faculty and program. Among faculty who were using cohorts, the structural and organizational problems were the greatest liability. In particular, the rigid delivery structure, time demands placed on faculty and students, and financial burdens were highlighted as concerns. Negative consequences for students included unrealistic expectations of students and the potential impact of negative peer interactions and group composition. To a lesser degree, the strong personalities of certain individuals in the group could adversely impact group structures/processes and faculty-student relationships.

Among the cohort nonusers, the vast majority of faculty members were concerned with various structural and organizational costs, in particular the rigidity of program delivery and the strain on faculty time and program finances.

Finally, the study focused on whether students in cohorts were better prepared for leadership roles. User and nonuser reasons fell into four categories: 1) greater propensity for group development, 2) improved skills and knowledge, 3) more efficient program structure, and 4) increased professional networks and contacts. Findings were not separated according to users and nonusers.
In terms of group development, comments focused on mutual support, collaboration, and team building. The responses by nearly half of the respondents suggested that cohorts developed strong collaborative structures, but other comments also suggest that the experience will facilitate their roles as educational leaders.

The second largest number of comments were in the area of skill and knowledge acquisition. Generally, respondents felt that students develop better group process skills and the development of these skills builds leadership skills that are critical for school leaders. Fewer comments focused on the program structure and professional contact that were afforded students.

Conversely, comments from the respondents also indicated that the cohort arrangement/structure is only one of many factors that promote leadership development. This is a key point that indicates the probable relevance of other strategies that impact leadership development and should be considered when designing a preparation program for school leaders. Further, little direct evidence was provided by respondents regarding how the job performance had been impacted by the cohort experience. Norris, et al, (2000) also indicate that student perceptions of on-the-job performance are also absent from the research agenda. The impact of the cohort experience on future practice would appear to warrant further investigation in future research. Without these types of studies, we would continue to speculate about
the value added of participating in cohorts and of graduate degree programs or preparation programs in educational leadership.

A case study design was utilized by Scribner and Donaldson (2001) to examine a single project team within a cohort. The purpose of the study was to determine if the group dynamics of the team facilitated or impeded learning, and further, what type of learning occurred. The basic premise was that group dynamics, such as climate, group norms, and roles impact group interaction, communication, and cohesion, along with group problem solving processes.

The entire cohort of 59 students in a doctoral program for educational leaders was asked to form project teams with five to eight of their cohort colleagues. One team, comprised of 7 members, was selected for the study based on the following reasons. First, this team represented one region within the state and would thus provide the best opportunity to then observe the cohort effect. Second, this team was willing to submit to being studied during the summer session. Finally, this group was diverse across several dimensions—gender, leadership roles/positions, and range of experience. Learning in the team was explored through observations, one focus group interview, individual interviews, and document analysis. The documents included artifacts from student group work and final products.

Mirroring the basic premise of the study, the findings were reported according to two themes: 1) factors that influenced learning: group climate,
group norms, group roles, communication and problem solving, and 2) types of learning acquired: non-learning, nonreflective learning, reflective learning, and critically reflective or transformative learning.

The findings suggest that due to the intensity of social relationships within a cohort team, some learning may be overshadowed by the affective learning that takes place. The dynamic of the group is a factor that must be attended to in order to ensure that learning is maximized for all students and further, that learning occurs in reflective and critically reflective ways. In addition, the results highlighted the fact that learning and performance, though not mutually exclusive, are not synonymous. Groups with high task orientation and product completion are not those that learn most effectively. Conversely, groups that learn in critically reflective or transformative ways may not always complete course requirements in a traditional manner or in the manner expected.

Within this particular cohort team, the nature of learning was dependent upon various aspects of group dynamics. The most fundamental impact on learning and group dynamics was the context of the learning experience itself. Contextual factors such as time constraints, an intensive, in-residence program, individual and group work deadlines, evaluation rubrics and a select group of participants (i.e., educational leaders in a doctoral program) all influenced the impact of group dynamics.
Group dynamics influenced how and what was learned. Rigid role assignments, prompted by preconceived perceptions of individual expertise and experience, often resulted in non-learning. For example, skill building in report writing, data collection and analysis, was not evenly distributed across the group. Tasks were given to those members who appeared better equipped to handle the task or complete it within the time constraints.

Nonreflective learning may have occurred for students who held strong beliefs and assumptions regarding the impact of the policy being studied. Thus, nonreflective learning was possibly a result of the inability of students to listen openly to and critically examine all the ideas shared. Scribner and Donaldson (2001) found that reflective learning occurred for students who acquired alternative views of the policy's impact or their understanding of the role of inquiry in their profession. Critically reflective learning occurred primarily in terms of each individual's understanding of his or her role in influencing the dynamics of the group. The depth and intensity of cohort-created problems encountered provided an opportunity for further reflection and prompted individuals to critically examine their behaviors within the group experience and the implications of those behaviors.

Scribner and Donaldson (2001) concluded that while group cohesiveness may be a necessary condition to achieve the full potential of learning in a cohort, it is not sufficient. For students to engage with the content of the
course or program, learning must address group dynamics and development. Some group skills, such as the resolution of persistent tension, may need to be taught and practiced.

They also offer the following suggestions for those who are building a cohort program design or utilizing this approach to learning. While the affective learning outcomes are vital to context of the world of school leadership, cognitive gains and knowledge must also transfer to the workplace. Instructors or facilitators of the process will need to plan actively, with adequate attention to the design and management of groups, so that all types of learning may occur.

Additionally, both instructors and participants must be careful not to unknowingly blur the distinction between learning and performance. Participants, must be able to utilize group processes to complete products and course requirements, while working to ensure that learning occurs for all.

Finally, formative evaluation methods which utilize both focus groups and individual interviews may provide an essential forum for students to air issues, both programmatic and group, that may be limiting the potential of the learning experience.

Scribner and Donaldson (2001), highlighting the need for further research, suggest the following possible areas of inquiry: the relationship between learning styles and the actions of individuals in the group setting and
the different experiences and perceptions of men and women in the cohort. In addition, with the understanding that cohort experiences may lead to transformative learning or a change in practice, more research should focus on the transfer of learning issue, or how cohort experiences, over time, impact the practice of educational leaders.

Norris et al. (2002) assert that groups are sociological and psychological in nature. The sociological dimension is concerned with how the group develops, group interaction processes, and how the group interacts with other groups. In a university preparation program, a cohort group might interface with many other individuals, including but not limited to professors, field-based mentors, district personnel, other students, and members of professional organizations. The psychological dimension focuses on the growth and development of the individual. In this type of learning community, individuals develop greater self-awareness, receive mutual feedback in a safe environment, and develop greater knowledge through dialogue with other group members (Senge, 1990).

Norris et al. (2002) further assert that interdependence is a quality of a true group; however, based on studies of learning communities, Norris, Barnett, Basom, and Yerkes (1996) found that genuine groups embrace four specific qualities. First, dynamic interaction takes place among group members. In a learning community, group members focus their attention on
each other and strive for positive involvement of all members. Second, group members strive to work together toward a unified purpose. If students are able to determine their own purposes in the learning process, they are more likely to work toward promoting the acknowledged goals of the group. Third, a true group is interdependent. Levels of collaboration and interaction provide a group identity. The cohesiveness of the group is evidenced by the quality and quantity of interaction, as well as the collective outcomes of the group’s efforts. Lastly, group members demonstrate respect for each other along with an appreciation for individual contributions and an acknowledgment of individual differences. This quality promotes the free exchange of ideas, a sense of security, and a safe, nurturing environment.

These ideas are based on the findings from two studies of cohorts in educational leadership cohorts in four universities: Houston, Northern Colorado, Wyoming, and California at Fresno. The first study (Norris and Barnett, 1994, in Norris et al., 2002) collected data from 51 students at all four universities. The second study (Norris, Basom, Yerkes, & Barnett, 1996, in Norris et al., 2002) included data from an additional 100 students at all four sites. In both studies, students kept journals of their experiences in the learning communities. At the end of their program, each student submitted a summary of the insights she or he had gained throughout the program.
In terms of the sociological perspective, or group development, groups bonded into cohesive learning communities. Findings suggest that factors that promoted bonding included availability of time, modeling, varied activities, activities outside of class, and opportunities to dialogue about what was being experienced. Students also felt that two factors that increased their cohesiveness were time spent planning group projects and participating in joint group presentations. On the other hand, not all feelings were positive. Students identified the following factors that inhibited collaboration: unbalanced contributions by group members and unequal participation by group members.

In terms of the psychological perspective, or the development of the individual, the findings appear to indicate that individual development in a learning community progresses through a continuum of five developmental stages. These include support, security, friendship, knowledge acquisition, and personal dream (Norris, et al., 1996).

At the first stage, students in these learning communities expressed the belief that individual growth occurred as a result of their experience. The group provided support and reduced feelings of isolation. At the second stage, security, learning communities established a climate of trust that helped individuals to feel emotionally secure. The nurturing atmosphere seemed to
promote feelings of security and connectedness, along with opportunities to begin taking risks and vocalizing ideas and asking questions.

In the third stage, friendship, individuals responded to feelings of warmth and concern received from others. In turn, they reached out to others and friendships developed. In addition, individuals acknowledged feelings of tolerance, acceptance, and care toward others in the group. In the fourth stage, knowledge acquisition, students indicated that their knowledge and understanding were enhanced as a result of group experiences. Their learning experience became relevant, meaningful, and allowed for the application of theory to reality. However, students did not view their learning as complete and appeared to be committed to building upon and promoting future learning.

In the final stage, the personal dream, group interaction afforded students to develop greater self-awareness. Viewing themselves as future leaders, they came to terms with their personal values and beliefs as a portion of the dimension of self-awareness.

Norris et al. (1996, 2002) note that although these developmental steps are presented in a hierarchical structure, each step continues to reinforce all others and impacts the individual’s life and future development. As the group is strengthened, the individual’s development in the learning community is enhanced. The further an individual progresses in the hierarchy, or is
empowered, the greater the individual's contribution to the development of the group. This is the nature of the interdependency of group processes.

For those who are involved in the preparation of educational leaders, it is not enough to assemble a group of students and call it a cohort or learning community. Learning experiences for aspiring educational leaders must occur within a true learning community. Norris et al. (2002) offer the following considerations toward the design of such a learning community. First, the learning experience should be designed on the basis of what truly meets students' needs. Principles of adult learning provide a sense of these needs. Adults require increasing opportunities to direct their own learning and participate in experiential learning opportunities. Learning experiences should be problem centered and linked to the demands of their professional roles (Knowles, 1980).

Second, a values base that encourages an ethic of care, an emphasis on inquiry, an opportunity to question practice, a search for meaning and purpose, and an emphasis on vision and renewal must shape the learning community. These values develop and are shaped by individual goals as well as the nature of group processes.

Finally, the design must promote the concept of thinking. The rationale is embedded in a philosophy of knowledge acquisition. If we believe that knowledge grows out of dialogue and various viewpoints and opinions, if
knowledge in constructed through narratives, shared experiences, exploration
and discovery, if knowledge is both cognitive and affective, then we must strive
to incorporate these elements into the design and structure of the learning
community.

Norris et al. (2002) explore the nature of curriculum in learning
communities. They suggest that such a curriculum serves a dual purpose: 1) to
explore the content, or knowledge base, that provides a contextual
understanding of the development of transformational leadership, and 2) to
inform the process of developing a learning community through the acquisition
and application of learning in a community setting. The process curriculum
incorporates elements of adult learning theory, and constructivism. Relevant
instructional strategies may also include a focus on reflection, problem-based
learning activities, and journaling, as well as other strategies that help
students understand and formalize group processes.

Problem-Based Learning

Problem-based learning (PBL) is an instructional strategy that has been
utilized in medical education with relative success. However, the highly
contingent nature of school leadership and the fact that successful educational
leaders must possess the skill and ability to understand, formulate, and solve
problems, suggests a need to focus on improving the quality of problem solving
in the preparation of educational leaders (Leithwood & Steinbach, 1992; Copeland, 2000).

Bridges (1992) asserts that PBL has the following characteristics: 1) it utilizes a problem as a starting point for learning, 2) the problem is based on a real-life situation that may be encountered in the field, 3) knowledge acquired during professional training is organized around problems rather than disciplines, 4) students assume responsibility for their instruction and learning, both individually and collectively, and 5) learning occurs in the context of small groups.

There are two versions of problem-based learning: problem-stimulated learning and student-centered learning (Waterman, Akmajian, and Kearny, 1991, in Bridges, 1992). Both approaches begin with an administrative problem that introduces a variety of learning issues. Students normally work in a team or small group, with a faculty member who serves as a resource. Multiple assessments of student learning and group progress and learning are conducted by instructors, peers and self. The two approaches also share common goals: 1) developing both administrative and problem-solving skills, and 2) building a knowledge base for practice in the field.

However, student-centered learning puts greater emphasis on fostering skills needed for lifelong learning. Beyond the presentation of a problem, students identify learning issues and then proceed to define and locate all
resources that they will need. By contrast, in problem-situated learning objectives, learning issues and possible resources are provided for students. The outcome for both approaches is the same. Students utilize newly acquired knowledge to deal with the problem.

More recently, some university-based preparation programs in educational leadership have been utilizing PBL in courses, with the goal of bringing real-life situations into the classroom and providing students with a context of practice they will need as future educational leaders. Bridges (1992), in providing a rationale for its use, cites three grounds: cognitive, motivational, and functional.

The underlying rationale for cognitive grounds is that prior knowledge is activated. Students apply knowledge they already possess to understand new information. Because problems are linked to real-life situations, the context in which information is learned resembles the context in which it will be applied in the future. Finally, an opportunity to elaborate on information increases the likelihood of information being better understood, processed, and recalled.

The motivational grounds are based on two factors: the degree to which students expect to be able to perform the task successfully and the degree to which they value the rewards that accompany successful performance. In terms of maintaining expectations of success in a PBL instructional environment, the instructor must ensure that projects have been designed and
sequence in a way that promote student success. Student need to be able to acknowledge that their individual and collective effort will lead to success.

In highlighting the value of learning activities in the PBL curriculum, both extrinsic and intrinsic strategies are essential. An extrinsic motivational strategy links task performance to a positive outcome that students value. In a PBL environment, the value of learning activities is emphasized. In this sense, the instructor must develop and communicate a rationale for learning that is linked to the student's understanding of their future responsibilities as an educational leader. Intrinsic motivational strategies are based on the premise that students will devote greater effort to tasks which they find interesting and enjoyable, even in the absence of extrinsic rewards. Some of the elements in PBL that would prompt intrinsic motivation include: 1) active response or learning by doing, 2) opportunity to apply higher order thinking skills and knowledge, 3) use of simulations, 4) immediate feedback, 5) opportunity to create a finished project, and 6) opportunities to interact with peers.

The functional base links motivation to exploring the actual work of a leader. Bridges (1992) asserts that PBL narrows the gap between student and administrator. He examines the parallels in the two dimensions along four dimensions: the rhythm of the work, the hierarchical nature of the work, the character of work-related communications, and the role of emotions in work.
In a PBL environment, students work under time constraints to complete a project and in most cases the available time is rarely sufficient. Time deadlines also force the students to balance the need to understand with the sometimes more immediate need to act. Thus, with respect to the rhythm of the work, the pacing of time in the PBL environment is much closer to the actual work pace of an administrator.

With respect to the hierarchical nature of the work, the PBL environment can create a context for different roles a practicing administrator may actually encounter in the field. Students serve as facilitators, leaders, and members of a team. Many times, they will have to work through the frustration of obtaining results/outcomes through other members of the team.

The character of work-related communication in a PBL environment may include forms of communication that normally don’t exist in a traditional classroom setting. Like educational leaders, students operate in both sending and receiving roles, rely on oral modes of communication, prepare written memos, and work in small, interpersonal settings that promote two-way communication.

Finally, students may encounter the role of emotions as they work with other individuals in a problem-solving context. There are immediate opportunities for students to develop competence in interpreting and responding to the feelings of others. When things don’t go smoothly, students
gain important insights into how they deal with frustration, anger, and disappointment. These are emotions that educational leaders encounter consistently in the field of practice.

The value of problem-based learning, understanding that it makes a difference for students, has been studied more extensively in the training of future physicians. The research base is still somewhat limited as the majority of research has focused on whether PBL programs produce better outcomes for medical students than traditional programs (Bridges, 1992). In general, the results report that students in PBL programs maintain more positive attitudes toward their training. They are also more inclined to adopt a meaning orientation in studying. This involves being intrinsically motivated by the subject matter and striving to understand the material. Finally, students who acquire information in the context of problem solving are more likely to use it spontaneously to solve new problems.

To a degree, PBL students also display better knowledge of basic disciplines and more clinical competence than their counterparts in traditional programs, but the difference is too small to be considered significant.

Bridges (1992) looked at student learning outcomes in a problem-stimulated learning project that was part of a course in a program for prospective principals at a major university. One of the outcomes he examined was what students learned from the experience. His account is drawn from
observation of team meetings and a review of products and participant essays submitted at the end of the project.

One of the unanticipated learning outcomes was that students came to value time devoted to team building, especially when working in a new group. Additionally, some group members discovered that having a non-participating, neutral facilitator helps to manage and promote group processes. When a facilitator becomes overly involved in the discussion, the ability to manage group processes effectively is relinquished.

In terms of instructor outcomes, Bridges (1992) highlights a need to monitor how groups are approaching their tasks. In doing so, some problems that groups encountered in the process could have been reduced or minimized. Further, observations of group processes and the problems that surface, aid instructors in evaluating the design and structure of the project, making adjustments or modifications for the future, which will ultimately result in enhanced learning and satisfying, productive experiences for all participants.

An exploratory study by Copland (2000) examined the problem-framing skills of three successive student cohorts in a PBL environment. The study was designed to test the hypothesis that greater exposure to problem-based preparation experiences is associated with better problem-framing ability in prospective principals. In this context problem-framing involves a conscious effort to size up a situation and reframe a problem using multiple lenses.
(Bolman & Deal, 1993). Jacob Getzels (1979) refers to the initial formulation of a problem as “problem-finding ability. One who has learned to be concerned with problem finding will not approach a problem with a preconceived solution. Past experiences will not completely determine a solution; new solutions will emerge as new challenges are identified. Ultimately, different and equally viable solutions to problems may exist, even for complex, nonroutine problems or dilemmas.

The 18 students in study were in three successive cohorts in a university-based program for prospective principals. Each of the students developed individual written responses to a series of five administrative problem scenarios. All problems were actually faced in practice by a school principal. The first-year cohort completed the exercise prior to participation in any PBL experience or exposure to the concept of problem framing. The second-year cohort completed the assessment during the second summer of a PBL practicum, following approximately seven PBL projects. The third-year cohort completed the assessment during the final summer in the practicum after participation in approximately twelve PBL projects.

The study was tempered by various limitations; in particular, the small sample size, the lack of random assignment to groups, and the fact that the administration of the scenario exercise may have been construed by some students as an evaluation tool which may have influenced their responses to
the problem scenarios. Further, students in the second and third semesters of the preparation program may have benefitted from increased exposure to problems in the workplace along with opportunities to practice problem framing skills in response to these situations.

Nonetheless, the results suggest that greater exposure to PBL is associated with greater problem-framing ability among students. This has important implications for the preparation of administrators. Scholarship in the field of preparation suggests a strong need for principals to be able to understand, frame, and solve problems in practice. The study does appear to indicate that problem-framing in an administrative context may be taught to students and developed during the process of preparing for a leadership position.

The results of this study (Copeland, 2000) highlight the need for more research in examining the impact and effects on students enrolled in preparation programs. A follow-up study may track the development of problem-framing ability in one group of students over time. Additionally, it might also be worthwhile to examine the degree and extent to which graduates of preparation programs spontaneously utilize the problem-solving strategies acquired once they are in the field.

Bridges (1992) also supports the need for further research, particularly in explicating the student-centered learning approach to problem-based
learning. In the student centered model, students determine the learning objectives and identify the learning resources. Proponents of PBL postulate that the student-centered approach affords students an opportunity to internalize lifelong learning skills that will serve them in the field of practice. Consequently, further research might explore the impact of such an approach on the practice of administrators. Do they in fact carry these skills into the field of practice and demonstrate the professional skills of lifelong learners?

Field-Based Internships

The administrative internship is also recognized as one of the critical components in the preparation and continuous professional development of new educational leaders (Daresh & Playko, 1992; Morgan, Hertzog, & Gibbs, 2002). Recently, (Morgan, et al., 2002) the internship has become the focus of attention and concern in the reform agenda of preparation programs. First, university-based programs often lack direct control over instituting meaningful field-based internships. The lack of collaborative partnerships between universities, school districts and other sponsoring organizations has often resulted in isolated, splintered efforts. Second, licensing requirements and state/district expectations for knowledge, skills, and practice impact the quality of the internship experience. These concerns should serve as a point of departure for a review of preparation programs, with the goal of exploring
methods and modes to make the internship the relevant experience that it should be for the preparation of educational leaders.

In addition, the work of various professional organizations, including the University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA), the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), and the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), among others, have reaffirmed the legitimacy of field-based learning experiences to promote a venue for the application and demonstration of knowledge and skills. The National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (Griffiths, Stout, Forsyth, 1988; National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2001; Hackmann, Schmitt-Oliver, Tracy, 2002) have recommended the inclusion of internships as an essential component of preparation programs for educational leaders. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) considers the clinical component critical to the preparation of administrators. Consequently, they have created a standard devoted to the internship. This serves to support the notion that these experiences allow the intern with opportunities to engage in clinical activities throughout the academic years, see tasks through to completion, and gain a systematic, more comprehensive understanding of the organization (Hackmann, Russell, & Elliott, 1999).
A review of field-based programs (Daresh & LaPlant, 1985, as cited in Daresh and Playko, 1992) found the following general characteristics of programs in institutions affiliated with the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA): 1) typical field-based programs are required only of students seeking an administrative credential, 2) most programs offer an internship in a credit-bearing course, where students spend anywhere from 10 to 40 hours during a term observing a practitioner and conducting tasks or projects to meet course requirements, 3) although academic credit is provided, student evaluation is generally pass/fail, 4) responsibility for evaluating student performance most often is the responsibility of university faculty, 5) the duration of the internship is dictated by the length of the university's term, 6) in most internships students are not paid for their work, and 7) a majority of participants are involved on a part-time basis while continuing teaching or other professional responsibilities.

Nonetheless, field-based experiences or internships may serve to allow aspiring educational leaders with an opportunity to put theory into practice and develop their technical/leadership skills and competence (Daresh & Playko, 1992; Morgan et al., 2002). These experiences also allow interns to witness the practical aspects of leading schools, particularly if they are able to work with talented, experienced leaders as role models or mentors. Finally, the
Internship or field-based learning opportunity provides a novice with an opportunity to develop and refine a leadership philosophy (Morgan et al., 2002).

Hackmann et al. (2002) highlight the potential benefits for the intern. First, the internship helps the intern deepen her or his understanding of content and skills delivered in university course work by participating in an authentic leadership experience while under the supervision of a mentor and field coordinator. Second, by being immersed in the real life world of the school and working alongside an exemplary school leader, interns are afforded an opportunity to practice and master skills that they can only learn in the educational setting. Third, students who complete a high-quality internship will be better prepared candidates to fill administrative vacancies in the district. Fourth, when the internship is designed to provide a range of experiences, an opportunity exists for the intern to broaden their thinking. Fifth, the internship allows the intern a chance to establish a close relationship with a mentor who has direct knowledge of the skills, talents, and abilities required for effective leadership. This mentor can become a lifelong professional colleague, who can be consulted for advice, encouragement, and support. Finally, at the conclusion of the internship, interns generally possess a new level of confidence, or they may realistically decide that they are not ready for leadership roles and responsibilities.
Morgan et al. (2002) highlight several benefits for the school system or district. First, district leadership and related personnel have an opportunity to assess the leadership potential of aspiring administrators. Second, an intern with a solid theoretical background may bring current theory and techniques to the school and district (Hackmann et al., 2002). Finally, a university internship supervisor may serve as an outside consultant to school-based programs and initiatives or to changes being considered by the school community.

Additional benefits for school districts are highlighted by Hackmann et al. (2002). Given that the ideal internship would be a year-long paid internship, the school and district will benefit by having an additional administrator who is learning leadership skills at a reduced salary. School districts may also provide interns with specialized experiences in areas that would also help promote the goals and objectives of the district. Finally, there is overall benefit to the system and profession as the internship contributes to the pool of well-prepared candidates for educational leadership positions.

There may be a few potential limitations for field-based learning (Daresh & Playko, 1992). These limitations persist when field-based activities are not combined with other dimensions of preservice preparation, particularly the knowledge-based, academic content. Another limitation is that field-based programs often prepare individuals for the world of schools at the present and
for what schools were like in the past. Little is provided to help aspiring school leaders to anticipate what reality will be like in the future. The world of school leadership is dynamic and subject to constant change; consequently, present experiences also need to focus on a perception and preparation for future realities. These limitations do appear to highlight the need to provide preservice preparation programs with a balanced perspective of ideas and experiences.

As a result of the limitations of field-based experiences, another approach which has emerged over the past decade is the full-time paid internship (Daresh & Playko, 1992). In this model, an aspiring administrator is placed in a school on a full-time basis, to serve as an administrative assistant or trainee/intern for either a semester or an entire school year. The intern would be expected to live the life of a school leader as completely as possible, adhering to all typical job requirements expected of veteran administrators. A full range of responsibilities would include both positive and challenging experiences. The intern benefits from gaining work experience before accepting a position.

There are some drawbacks to full-time internships. Perhaps the most significant is that fact that such programs are extremely costly. Adding a paid intern to the district also creates a cost of an additional full-time teacher. In many cases of smaller school districts, this cost is far too great. Additionally,
from the perspective of those individuals and role groups outside of education, including the general public, this cost is not necessarily viewed as a benefit, in terms of student learning and achievement.

Daresh and Playko (1992) also highlight a concern that sometimes internship programs do little more than perpetuate undesirable existing practices, particularly when internships are designed to show novices how things are done, rather than providing them with opportunities to construct better approaches to practice. They suggest that internships be paired with effective mentoring programs and a comprehensive program of professional development for both aspiring and practicing administrators. As discussed in another section of this review, training for mentors is also a critical component that will positively impact the quality of the internship experience (Daresh & Playko, 1992a; Playko, 1995; Crow & Matthews, 1998).

Other alternatives to full-time internships are offered by Daresh and Playko (1992). These include planned field experiences and course-embedded field experiences. However, with both alternatives the quality and quantity of the full-time internship are compromised.

In concluding this discussion of field-based experiences, Daresh and Playko (1992) provide a caution that the program designers of preservice preparation programs and internships must act with a clear vision of what they are attempting to accomplish. This vision would then serve as a guide
toward institutionalizing a clear, well-designed, focused set of instructional objectives and outcomes. Morgan et al. (2002) also highlight the need for a collaborative partnership between universities and school districts in designing an internship program/experience that will prepare future educational leaders for the complex, multilayered world of school leadership.

There has been little empirical research on internships in educational administration; consequently, Daresh and Playko (1992) believe that the assumptions of the value of internships have not been widely tested. Although there is a view that individuals will become better leaders by participating in an internship, there is no comprehensive theory to guide the use of practica.

Baugh (2003) conducted a study that explored the internship expectations of students enrolled in administrative/supervisory credential programs in the state of Utah. The study was designed to measure student expectations in four areas: 1) the academic value of the internship as an addition to classroom learning, 2) relationships with supervisors—both faculty and school administrators, 3) activities to be performed during the internship, and 4) requirements of the internship that must be completed to earn the administrative/supervisory certificate.

The participants in the survey included 89 students enrolled in one of three university-based educational leadership certification programs in Utah.
Data analysis included frequency of responses, percentages, means, and standard deviations.

In the area pertaining to academic value, most students felt the internship was a valuable learning experience and felt that the internship experience should be comparable to a new administrator's experience. In the area of relationships with supervisors, students felt that there should be relevant feedback from their university supervisor following an internship visit and that the supervising principal should have contact with the university supervisor two or three times during the internship.

In the area of activities to be performed, a majority of students felt they should be involved in administrative duties during the internship. Nearly three-fourths of the students agreed that they should participate in seminar with professors and other interns. In the area of the requirements of the internship, nearly all of the students agreed that the internship should be part of their university program. Most of the students felt that the internship should be performed during school hours and that they would learn more through a full-time internship.

Although the findings appear to be based solely on percentages of responses, they do support a need to develop internship programs that allow students to experience the real world of school leadership, with opportunities
to be actively involved in a range of administrative duties and to receive feedback from supervisors.

Hackman et al. (2002) suggest that the following be considered as universities and school districts move to develop comprehensive, high quality internship programs or field-based opportunities/experiences. First, while a full-year paid internship has been suggested, clinical, field-based activities should be integrated throughout a preparation program, with specific opportunities to link course content with relevant, related experiences.

Second, clinical activities must be of significant duration and intensity. The goal is to provide aspiring educational leaders with exposure to administrative life on an extended basis, so they develop a comprehensive, in-depth understanding of the demands and complexity of the role.

Third, to the greatest degree possible, clinical experiences should occur in multiple settings. Interns should be able to observe several administrators working in varied settings and a range of grade levels, in order to gain exposure to a variety of leadership styles. Further, exposure to a range of diverse educational/organizational settings will help the intern to determine the leadership style that is in concert with his or her personality and philosophy of education.

Finally, clinical activities and experiences must be authentic and engaging, increasing in complexity as the intern gains skills and confidence. It
is suggested that activities be scaffolded and/or multilayered. Additionally, as interns demonstrate appropriate levels of confidence and skill, they should experience confrontational situations and other realities of school leadership.

**Mentoring**

In an examination of the research base in mentoring for educational leaders, Daresh (1995) asserts that the focus on mentoring and mentoring relationships reflect some of the other suggestions for reform/change in the way school leaders are prepared to carry out their craft/practice in the real world of the school. Thus, he suggests a critical link exists between mentoring programs and the use of field-based internships.

Daresh (1995) also reports that despite the recent efforts to suggest that mentoring programs might serve as the central component of a preservice preparation, induction, or ongoing professional development program, there has been a lack of systematic analysis of this issue in the existing research. He further highlights the fact that there have been few published descriptions of research that indicate the effect that the structure, implementation, evaluation, or outcomes of mentoring programs have had on the enhancement of the development of educational leaders. Essentially, while there has been a belief purported in the need to promote mentoring for aspiring and new
educational leaders, this issue has not been the focus of the scholarly community.

Much of the working on mentoring in education has been in the area of research on supports to beginning teachers (Daresh, 1995). One of the outcomes of scholarly inquiry in this area is that beginning teachers benefit from differentiated support. Unfortunately, mentoring relationships in other areas of education have not been tailored to the individual needs of proteges, instead focusing on providing similar forms of support to all proteges.

This particular review of the mentoring research literature was based on data from two sources. First, dissertation abstracts in the humanities and social sciences were reviewed from 1984 through 1994. Out of 310 dissertations, sixty-six dealt specifically with the use of mentoring for educational leaders. Second, more than 150 articles were located in thirty different journals. Only 44 of these articles focused on mentoring for aspiring or practicing administrators, with only 11 of the 44 classified as original research on mentoring. In total, 77 items were examined in this review.

The findings indicate that completed research tended to fall into one of two general categories: implementation issues related to the structure of mentoring programs or program evaluation regarding the outcomes of mentoring relationships.
With respect to implementation issues for mentoring programs, Daresh (1995) notes the following similarities in the studies. First, assumed patterns of mentoring in terms of matching mentors and proteges was not discovered. For example, there was little or no effect for same gender mentor relationships or relationships favoring older mentors and younger proteges.

Second, the majority of mentor relationships were arranged relationships established by a school system or some other agency. There was no evidence of "naturally-evolving" relationships where individuals with common needs and interests come into a relationship.

Finally, the mentoring programs of greatest interest to researchers involved preservice preparation programs.

With respect to program evaluation of organized mentor programs, the findings of the review indicate that research design and studies were generally similar. Researchers contacted former participants and asked them to describe their perceptions and highlight the benefits of the program. The inquiries tended to focus on benefits to proteges. The results clearly indicate that proteges appreciate and value the efforts of mentors. Additionally, they feel more comfortable in their professional roles as a result of mentoring.

In this review of the research, Daresh (1995) also found that the majority of research in mentoring for educational leaders was directed toward solving local, school-based issues. He found an absence of theory-based
research or research designed around or emanating from a theoretical framework. As a result, he recommends that future studies utilize other methodologies and develop conceptual frameworks to guide their analyses.

Other recommendations include a greater focus on the program evaluation outcomes and whether mentoring has an impact on continuous professional development, as well as the practice of educational leaders. In cases where mentoring programs have been in place for a number of years, studies might attempt to discover whether mentoring changes the traditional culture of school leaders, in particular, patterns of isolation and approaches to work that promote survival, as opposed to professional growth.

Daresh (1995) found a consistent lack of clarity regarding the purposes and definitions of mentoring, the perceived benefits of mentoring by mentors and proteges, and apparent benefits to the systems which utilize mentoring in the preparation, induction, or professional development of educational leaders. Further recommendations are that studies provide clarity to the assumed benefits of mentoring, as well as the purposes of mentoring programs and the expressed/identified purpose of the research.

In studies of mentoring in corporate organizations, Kram (1985, in Crow and Matthews, 1998) suggested two functions of mentoring. One is the career function, which focuses on learning the ropes and preparing for a career move. The second is the psychosocial function. This involves the overall development
of the individual in the social environment. The former serves to aid career
advancement, the latter affects the individual on a personal level, serving to
clarify role identity.

Crow and Matthews (1998) choose to add another dimension to a
proposed mentoring model. A third, professional development function focuses
on the development of knowledge, skills, behaviors, and values for school
leadership. The career development function focuses to a lesser degree on
upward mobility, and instead balances a focus on career satisfaction,
awareness, and advancement. The psychosocial development function involves
personal and emotional well-being, in addition to role expectation,
clarification, and conflict. Crow and Matthews (1998) also assert that these
three dimensions are guided by both content and methods of mentoring.

Crow and Matthews (1998) in their discussion of mentoring to promote
the professional development of educational leaders, examine mentoring in the
theoretical framework of socialization. They believe that this framework
clarifies the goals of mentoring and further guides any choice of content and
methods to achieve mentoring goals. When viewed as a socialization method, it
becomes clear that the nature of mentoring may serve to promote professional
development and learning throughout the career. Additionally, as Daresh
(1995) suggests, further research in this area should incorporate a theoretical
framework, so that goals will be clearly linked to outcomes.
In creating the link between mentoring and socialization, Crow and Matthews (1998) acknowledge that mentoring is not the only method utilized in the socialization of educational leaders, thus the goals and properties of socialization may be affected by other methods. For example, when mentoring and internship are utilized in university-based graduate degree programs, both may complement the socialization process.

For interns in a preservice preparation program, Crow and Matthews (1998) examine socialization through both organizational and professional dimensions. Particularly for interns, initial professional socialization begins with courses, seminars, and field based experiences designed to help interns develop an administrative/leadership perspective. Recent reform efforts highlight the value of clinical field-based experiences and the opportunity to apply new knowledge in this context. Therefore, a comprehensive internship helps a novice obtain a sense of role tasks and additionally, role values and expectations.

Within the organizational dimension, socialization begins as soon as the intern enters the school. Beyond mentors, interns are also socialized by other administrators, faculty, students, and parents. Cordeiro and Smith-Sloan (1995, in Crow & Matthews, 1998) identified five stages of transition for interns. At the “initial contact stage,” interns still function from the perspective of their former professional selves, generally teachers, and their
former schools. Generally curious and excited, their interaction with their mentor is formal. During the "liminal stage," interns feel apprehensive and uncomfortable when performing certain tasks and functions. The relationship between intern and mentor is somewhat cautious. During the "settling-in stage," the intern feels and exhibits greater control over time, feels more accepted by adults in the new environment, and relates more openly with the mentor. In the "efficacy stage," the intern feels and acts with increased confidence and autonomy, along with greater creativity and competence performing assigned duties and responsibilities. At this stage the mentor-intern relationship is based on sharing and mutual respect. During the "independence stage," interns acknowledge that there is more to learn in the current context; however, thoughts of leaving promote a sense of loss. Interns and mentors at this stage relate as colearners and colleagues. These stages appear to suggest that the new school environment is a powerful socialization force for the intern and contributes to the overall organizational socialization of the novice.

As a result of their research, Daresh and Playko (1992a, 1997), recognize the potential and value of mentoring for beginning principals. However, they suggest that this practice works optimally if it is directed at supporting beginning educational leaders in increasing skills related to socialization and self-awareness in the organization (Daresh & Playko, 1997).
Such mentoring would focus on the needs and feelings of the individual, rather than a focus on technical and managerial proficiency. In addition, mentoring increases potential value when it is part of a program of induction for beginning school leaders.

With the emphasis on current efforts to support the preparation and induction of new school leaders that supports the traditional, university-based model, Daresh and Playko (1992a) also identify mentoring as a concept that will aid aspiring and beginning administrators in making a successful transition from the realm of teaching to the realm of school leader. They highlight two considerations when utilizing mentors to improve the ways individuals are prepared to become school leaders. First, it is critical to identify individuals who would serve as appropriate mentors. Mentors are more than role models or sponsors. They must be able to effectively describe and outline procedures, policies, and practices in a school and district. They must also be able to provide meaningful feedback to novices, with respect to their specific development in leadership roles and responsibilities. In many ways, mentors must be able to facilitate learning and reflection so that a novice is able to learn how to do something according to his or her own personal skills and talents.

Daresh and Playko (1992a) further indicate that a individual who would choose to serve as a mentor must possess the desire to act in this capacity.
Additionally, mentoring arrangements should considered the matching of proteges with ideal mentors, to the greatest extent possible. This one-to-one matching should be based on professional goals, interpersonal styles, learning needs and any other potential variables.

There are a range of desired characteristics that should be considered in the selection of mentors, particularly for preparation and entry-year programs. The following are suggestions (Daresh & Playko, 1990; Daresh & Playko, 1992a, Daresh & Playko, 1997). Mentors should:

- be experienced educational leaders who are regarded by peers and others as effective
- be leaders who demonstrate good communication skills, intelligence, clarity of vision and the ability to share that vision with others, positive interpersonal skills, and sensitivity
- be individuals who ask the right questions; they do not simply provide the right answers
- accept others’ ways of doing things
- desire other individuals to go beyond their present levels of performance
- model principles of continuous learning and reflection
- awareness of political and social realities that impact the school system

Mentors use different routes or methods to present content and guide the intern in acquiring knowledge, skills, behaviors, and values. Crow and Matthews (1998) suggest that methods fall into two broad categories: teaching/coaching and reflective mentoring. In the realm of teaching and coaching, the following methods may be utilized: planning, informing, suggesting, prompting, challenging, protecting and supporting, and
advising/offering feedback. In terms of planning, mentors must acknowledge that proteges are developing a new perspective of school leadership. As proteges begin to develop a leadership perspective, mentors need to plan a course of action that will provide interns with broader experiences. While it is necessary to inform proteges, caution should be exercised to ensure that information is not overwhelming. Additionally, information should be presented in a manner that is conducive to adult learning.

Particularly with respect to providing support, protection, and freedom, the mentor needs to provide a balance. In consideration of the total development of the intern, a mentor will need to consider whether protection or freedom is warranted. Additionally, the intern must understand that when in need, support is always available.

Reflective mentoring (Crow & Matthews, 1998), allows interns to make sense of the journey, as well as begin to confront their assumptions and practices. Mentors facilitate reflection by involving the intern in open dialogue, tempered with careful questioning to prompt open-ended exploration of events, issues, and actions. Other approaches, such as shadowing, modeling, visioning, storytelling, and reflective journals are effective strategies which have value. However, many of these approaches should be utilized within the context of reflective conferences, to allow the collaborative dialogue between mentor and protege to promote reflective thought.
Although the use of mentoring is a valuable approach to professional
development, Daresh and Playko (1992a) offer the following cautions: 1) a
single mentor may provide beginning school leaders with a limited, narrow
perspective, 2) proteges may become too dependent on their mentors, 3)
proteges may idolize or idealize their mentors and seek to become carbon
copies of their mentors, 4) mentors may not recognize or acknowledge the
limitations of their proteges or, 5) they may try to hold all beginning school
leaders to a standard of performance or an ideal vision which may never be
attainable. These potential problems do highlight the need to provide
specialized, ongoing training for mentors, as well as careful attention to the
structure and design of mentoring and induction programs.

Similarly, Crow and Matthews (1998) issue the following potential
pitfalls. First, mentoring relationships may become too protective and
controlling, often limiting the protege's development. Second, mentoring may
also restrict problem-solving and decision making perspectives, such that
alternate styles of leadership or a variety of solutions are not fully explored.
Third, a mentoring relationship may create dependency. Some times, either
party cultivates a reliance, such that the protege cannot forward a decision
before consulting with a mentor. Fourth, mentors can encourage cloning (Hay,
1995, in Crow & Matthews, 1998). Utilizing strong, established leaders may
have the effect of reproducing existing roles. Finally, Crow and Matthews offer
the following thought: Being a novice in a mentoring relationship may support a belief that mentors have all the right answers or no answers. Realistically, it is important to remember that all mentors possess strengths, as well as weaknesses.

Daresh and Playko (1992a) outline the benefits that may be derived from a well-designed mentoring program. While there are benefits for both mentors and proteges, the article highlighted three sets of benefits for mentors: improved job satisfaction, increased peer recognition, and potential career advancement. The greatest number of motivators were in the area of improved job satisfaction. Mentors found that working with a promising new leader was a challenging and stimulating personal experience, particularly when new leaders are successful and perform their jobs well. With respect to career advancement, the mentor often “receives” new ideas and perspectives through daily interaction and dialogue with a protege. Even for an experience principal, this could translate into a new source of knowledge, a different insight, or a change in practice.

Finally, Daresh and Playko (1992a) highlight the importance of investing adequate resources into specialized training for mentors. From their research and the existing literature, they suggest six domains that reflect the realities of administrative life, as well as areas of preparation for individuals to become effective mentors for aspiring and new school leaders. First, there
must exist an appreciation of a validated knowledge base. Mentors need to be able to guide proteges to seek validated sources of information before effecting any decisions. While it would be ideal for mentors to be actively using research to inform practice or contributing to the development of research in the profession, mentors should be aware of their school environment, the needs of individuals within their schools, and the nature of trends and practices that would be appropriate and serve the needs of proteges.

Second, knowing that an educational leader is a key ingredient in effective schools, a mentor must have the ability to model practice as an instructional leader. Training should focus on a review of the skills and dimensions of effective practice of instructional leadership.

Third, training must also include a focus on mentoring skills to support the formation/building of a positive relationship, including focus on the development of peer-to-peer relationships. Fourth, mentoring must promote a mutually enhancing relationship, therefore training must include a focus on human relations skills toward the goal of promoting optimal communication, listening, and the cultivation of other attributes such as trust, honesty, sincerity, and sensitivity. Additionally, in this area, mentors must be aware of how to promote learning in adults.

Fifth, training should also reflect the issues and concerns that are unique to an individual school district. Mentors may benefit from general
orientation to the common goals of the district, and essentials policies and procedures. Thus, they will be able to effectively communicate information regarding the general organizational structure and operations of the district.

The final domain should provide skills that will allow mentors to work with proteges in the area of personal formation. This would help a protege to understand personal abilities as they begin to assume a new professional role. Part of this training would provide an essential focus on the development of critical reflective processes, an area that Daresh and Playko (1992a) highlight as critical to the professional development of educational leaders.

Crow and Matthews (1998) suggest that five components be considered in developing mentoring and internship programs: 1) organizational planning, 2) mentor selection, 3) mentor training, 4) mentor and protege matching, and 5) evaluation. Organizational planning will ensure the development of a solid foundation and the necessary consideration of time, sources, goals, content, and methods. It is also advised that all parties included in the program also be included in the planning.

Mentor selection is a key element of a successful program. Mentors should exemplify good school leadership. They should be highly regarded educators and well-respected leaders in the school community. Mentors should be learners who are also able to engage others in learning. Finally, mentors need to be committed to the concept of mentoring, willing to provide the time
and additional resources, and have a commitment to the training to become a better mentor.

Training for mentors is essential. Many of the skills needed in the mentoring process, particularly the reflective component, must be learned and practiced. Three stages of mentor training are suggested: selection and training of trainers, annual orientation, and mentor workshops. This schema would provide a system of ongoing training and supports for all mentors.

Matching mentors and proteges should be given careful consideration whenever necessary. Parkay (1988) found that mentoring relationships are optimally developed when mentors and proteges share a similar style of thinking. Thus, consideration should be given to pairing according to similar styles and ideologies.

Evaluation of several types should be utilized as part of any mentor program. First, a comprehensive program evaluation should be conducted for all parties involved in the program. Consideration should be given to the evaluation of both content and methods. A second component should be a needs assessment. This would allow for program modifications to be made relative to the needs of schools and districts, as well as program renewal. A third evaluation component should provide feedback on the quantity and quality of mentoring in the program. In addition to feedback from proteges,
entities from the sponsoring organizations should also be involved in this dimension of the evaluation process.

Playko (1995) provides a personal reflection-based perspective to the dimension of mentoring for educational leaders. She speaks from her background as a consultant and trainer for agencies wishing to establish mentoring programs, as a practitioner implementing a district mentoring program in her own school, and finally, as an educator whose career has been enhanced as a result of mentoring relationships in her own professional development.

Her initial commentary focuses upon some general observations on mentoring and related practices. She indicates that educational leaders will be better equipped to step into their roles if they spend a considerable amount of preservice training in real-life school situations; therefore, field-based learning is a critical component of preservice preparation. Additionally, preservice learning must be coupled with induction programs for new leaders and continuing, career-long professional development. All leaders may be assisted through contact with mentors at all phases of career development. Such action promotes the concept of professional development and lifelong learning as an integral part of the profession.

Playko (1995) recognizes that mentoring is not a panacea that will address all of the issues associated with the preparation of educational leaders
or the ways that neophytes assume their initial leadership roles. Nonetheless, there are acknowledged benefits for mentors, proteges, and their corresponding sponsoring organizations.

In speaking of the benefits for mentors, Playko highlights the following. First, and perhaps the greatest benefits is that mentoring relationships with proteges aids reflection on one’s own behaviors, attitudes and values. Even when responding to a question or concern raised by a protege, the dialogue often promotes thinking at a different level. Such reflection, according to Playko, serves to strengthen leadership ability. Second, mentoring relationships serve to help a mentor feel less isolated and more like a member of a productive, cohesive team. Again, the opportunity to dialogue openly and honestly with colleagues who share your professional interests is a highly powerful form of learning.

Finally, mentoring relationships and guiding others toward successful professional practice serves as an indicator of one’s abilities to assist others. It promotes a feeling of individual self-worth and thus serves as a powerful form of professional support and recognition. It also allows us opportunities to re-explore the dimension of teaching and assisting learners that was left behind in the classroom, an instructional role where one is able to share important information and insights with others.
Similarly, Crow and Matthews (1998) suggest the following benefits for mentors: 1) a renewed enthusiasm for the profession, 2) new insights, 3) an opportunity to evaluate their intuitive processes, 4) the satisfaction of becoming a teacher again, 5) a network for ideas and opportunities for career advancement, 6) validation of their importance and the importance of their work, and 7) an opportunity to develop meaningful, long-lasting friendships.

In terms of benefits to proteges, Playko (1995) highlights the following. First, working with a mentor provides the practical insights and understanding which will be needed to conduct effective professional work. It is a specific level of insight that moves beyond role modeling and communicating the "tricks of the trade." Second, proteges report that they gain a degree of self-confidence as a result of a mentoring relationship. Having a mentor allows proteges to try out newly-acquired behaviors and receive non-critical feedback from another professional. Third, mentoring is recognized as a valuable way to promote professional and organizational socialization (Crow & Matthews, 1998). In many ways, true success is not only doing the job effectively, but acting with sensitivity to the norms and culture of the organization and its members. Mentors are able to lead proteges to this realization.

A final benefit is that working with a mentor is another way to tap into a network that supports future advancement as educational leaders. In any
organizational system, these networks serve to help identify the strongest candidates for open positions. The relationship with a mentor allows for these positive characteristics and potential to be initially identified by another professional.

Crow and Matthews (1998) highlight similar benefits for proteges: 1) exposure to new ideas and levels of creativity, 2) visibility with key personnel, 3) protection from harmful situations, 4) opportunities for challenging and risk-taking activities, 5) increased competence and confidence, and 6) improved reflective ability.

Mentoring also has benefits to the system or organization. Playko (1995) notes that mentoring programs are a way to ensure that the spirit or culture of collegiality begins to emerge and prosper in an organization. It creates a culture that promotes and values working with colleagues in collaborative problem solving and decision making.

Playko (1995) closes her reflection with a discussion of planning and implementation issues that impact mentoring programs. With respect to planning issues, there are three areas of concern: 1) a lack of focus and commitment by the district/agency to mentoring as a valuable practice, 2) inadequate preparation and training of mentors, and 3) ineffective matching procedures for pairing mentors and proteges.
Creating a true focus and commitment must begin before much of the initial planning begins. Mentoring is much more than role modeling or an apprenticeship. It must be recognized as a valuable form of instruction that requires proactive participation from all who choose to be involved. It is also a program where consistency and continuity are promoted through the positive, effective mentor relationships between mentor and protege, recognizing that the true goal is to promote leadership not survivorship.

Mentors must be able to effectively demonstrate a broad base of critical skills and abilities in the realm of leadership. Consequently, mentor programs must be designed to provide ongoing, specialized training in areas such as human relations skills, instructional leadership skills, and critical reflection, as well as a basic understanding of mentoring as an instructional, developmental strategy.

Finally, and perhaps the most critical aspect is the nature of matches made between mentors and proteges. While a perfect relationship may never be guaranteed, it must be recognized that matches based on gender, age differences, and type of school to be served do not necessarily lead to a mutually enhancing relationship (Daresh, 1995). While there are no absolute practices or guaranteed indicators, Playko (1995) suggests that careful, serious consideration be given to the matching of mentors with proteges, with the goal
of creating a collaborative team that will result in mutually beneficial outcomes as well as a lifelong professional and personal relationship.

**Summary**

The multifaceted levels of complexity and challenges that confront educational leaders in schools throughout the United States continue to highlight the need for quality educational leadership preparation programs. With the existing focus on student learning and achievement, schools and their leaders are charged with the immense task of being accountable for learning, particularly with the broad range of school reform measures. The research on school effectiveness (Heck, Larsen, & Marcoulides, 1990; Murphy & Louis, 1994; Hallinger & Heck, 1996) has suggested that implementing meaningful and successful change is specifically linked to the efforts made by school leaders. Thus, designing and implementing quality programs to prepare educational leaders for the wide range of responsibilities must be an essential area of focus for both universities and local school districts.

Additionally, the recruitment and selection of individuals to fill these leadership positions in our schools will remain an issue, particularly as many veteran educational leaders are reaching retirement and very few educators are willing or prepared to fill the vacant positions. These factors highlight the need for reform in all areas related to the recruitment and preparation of
future educational leaders. The current dialogue in various educational policy arenas acknowledges the need for interdependence as we work to effect meaningful change and reform. Thus, educators and policy makers, have a collective responsibility to move beyond individual and group interests to achieve this task (Young, Petersen, & Short, 2002; Young & Petersen, 2002). Cooper & Boyd (1998) further suggest that programs and activities be developed with input from various stakeholder groups and jointly sponsored by school districts, universities, and professional organizations.

Other research has identified the value of field-based internships as an essential component of quality preparation programs (Cooper & Boyd, 1988; Parkay, Currie, & Rhodes, 1992; Daresh, 1992, 1997; Morgan, Hertzog, & Gibbs, 2002, Hackmann, Schmitt-Oliver, & Tracy, 2002). Field-based internships provide job-embedded learning, opportunities for thinking, reflection, analysis, and practice, coaching, and feedback, particularly with a trained, experienced principal mentor (Peterson, 1996).

With respect to the value of mentoring in the preparation of educational leaders, Crow and Matthews (1998) assert that working with a mentor serves to promote more effective socialization, particularly organizational socialization, when mentoring occurs within the context of a field-based internship.
Similarly, Crow and Matthews (1998) and Daresh (1995) suggest a critical link between mentoring and field-based internships. The internship is enhanced by opportunities to observe and be coached by a seasoned, experienced mentor. Additionally, the context also allows for meaningful dialogue, and reflection to occur in a timely manner and naturalistic setting, where situations emanate and future action occurs.

Consequently, this study will explore the value of these program components, along with other components of the preparation program under study, and the perceived impact on the performance of new educational leaders. It is anticipated that the study will, in part, serve to demonstrate the link between these components and the readiness of beginning educational leaders to assume leadership roles and responsibilities, particularly with respect to the dimensions of technical skills, collegial relationships, and role awareness.

Finally, the limited body of research and generally narrow focus of these studies suggest the need for further research. Particularly, studies must begin to examine the effect of preparation and training on the practice of administrators over time. Future efforts must also include an ongoing assessment of program needs along with systematic evaluation of programs, to ensure that the broad array of needs of educational leaders are being
appropriately addressed in both pre-service training, induction, and ongoing professional development.
Chapter 3
Research Methods

This study was designed to survey all educational leaders who completed the state-sponsored preparation program in the state of Hawai‘i within a three-year period, from June 1999 - May 2002. The participants were limited to individuals who were currently serving in the Department of Education as school administrators—principals, assistant principals, and other state and district educational officers—as the study was intended to focus on several dimensions of practice as an educational leader.

The study was framed by a theoretical model that evolved from the current research literature, including other studies, policy discussions and suggested models of reform in the preparation of future educational leaders. Survey research (Babbie, 1990) will allow this model to be examined statistically and findings may allow for generalization of the results of the sample to a larger population, such that inferences may be offered regarding the characteristics, attitudes, and behaviors of the population of educational leaders under study.

THE CONTEXT OF THE PREPARATION PROGRAM IN THE STUDY

Preparation programs for aspiring educational leaders in the state of Hawai‘i have always been under the control, direction and sponsorship of the
Hawai’i Department of Education. During the period of this research, the faculty in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Hawai’i at Manoa was involved in delivering course work, serving as field coordinators for internships, and assisting with reflective seminars scheduled throughout the year. To a limited degree, university faculty had input into the program design and requirements. In a state-sponsored program, program components and requirements are largely determined by the certification requirements which, in this case, were defined by the Department of Education.

The program budget for the preparation program is a line item in the Department of Education budget, which is thus subject to budget cuts and program revisions as deficits in the state budget occur. While program components have remained relatively intact, budgetary constraints have resulted in program modifications in each of the three cohort groups included in the study. The discussion in this section will highlight the significant changes and similarities in each of the three cohorts. Table 3.1 offers a comparison of the program components relative to the groups included in this study.

One of the components that remained intact was the use of cohorts. The members of each cohort proceeded through all phases of the program together. In most cases, members of each cohort formed strong personal and
professional bonds which served as a support throughout the program and beyond.

A summer institute comprised the initial training phase of the program. In Cohort I, the summer institute consisted of two consecutive sessions. The first two-week session utilized a problem-based learning (PBL) environment to promote the integration of content knowledge and problem solving processes. The second three-week session focused on the school improvement process, which has since evolved into a standards-based model, now referred to as the Standards Implementation Design (SID). In Cohort II, the second phase of the institute was delivered in the summer following the first year in the program when the focus shifted to preparation for tasks related to instructional leadership and the principalship. In Cohort III, the second three-week training phase was eliminated. This was largely a cost-saving measure due to budget restrictions, as housing and air travel for neighbor island participants presented a major cost item.

All three cohorts participated in the Problem-Based Learning (PBL) experience delivered over the course of the two-week summer institute. The amount of time and degree of emphasis varied slightly every year. A review of the daily schedule from each year reveals more time spent in PBL during Cohort I. However, with Cohort III, time was devoted following each PBL
session to sharing action plans and group outcomes, an activity that occurred only sporadically during Cohort I.

Table 3.1: Comparison of Preparation Program Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cohort</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentor</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no trained, school-based mentor; limited availability by district</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internship</strong></td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>none, on-the job training</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer Training Institute</strong></td>
<td>5 weeks total</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Course Work</strong></td>
<td>yes, provided during summer training and program</td>
<td>no, during 1st year; yes, during 2nd year; some courses taken on own time</td>
<td>yes, during program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem-Based Learning</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflective Seminars</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshops</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of the Program</strong></td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>1 year; initially planned for two years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All three cohorts also participated in a full-year of reflective seminars and operational workshops. For Cohort II, some of these sessions continued through the second year of the program. These were full-day sessions, scheduled at least two to three times a month during the school year, sometimes covering two or more topics, particularly in the case of the workshops.

The content and focus of the reflective seminars focused on theoretical or philosophically driven aspects of leadership, including ethics, organizational change, and facilitative leadership. The content and focus of the workshops were more technical in nature, covering topics such as budgeting, fiscal management, discipline guidelines, facilities management, and personnel management.

All cohorts were required to take a series of seven graduate-level courses in educational administration, delivered by faculty in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Hawai‘i at Manoa. In general, courses identified to fulfill program requirements were determined by program foci and needs. However, university faculty maintained professional autonomy in determining course focus and content. The program of graduate course requirements was structured to provide participants with an opportunity to complete a Master’s degree in Educational Administration, utilizing the
courses taken to meet program requirements and completion of a few additional electives.

In Cohort I, courses were delivered during the summer training and throughout the course of the school year. Since neighbor island participants had to fly in, courses were generally scheduled a day before or after a seminar or workshop.

In Cohort II, courses were not offered during the program year. During the second year, cohorts were offered some opportunities to take courses in the evening as a cohort; however, participants needed to complete some course requirements on their own. With Cohort III, courses were again delivered during summer training and throughout the program year. Table 3.2 compares the set of required courses for each cohort.
Table 3.2: Program Course Requirements By Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▶ EDEA 601 Introduction to Educational Administration</td>
<td>▶ EDEA 780K Seminar in the Vice Principalship</td>
<td>▶ EDEA 780K Seminar in the Vice Principalship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ EDEA 602 Research in Educational Administration</td>
<td>▶ EDEA 610 School/Community Relations</td>
<td>▶ EDEA 610 School/Community Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ EDEA 610 School/Community Relations</td>
<td>▶ EDEA 630 School Law</td>
<td>▶ EDEA 630 School Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ EDEA 630 School Law</td>
<td>▶ EDEA 650 Human Factors in Organizations</td>
<td>▶ EDEA 650 Human Factors in Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ EDEA 650 Human Factors in Organizations</td>
<td>▶ EDEA 670 School Supervision</td>
<td>▶ EDEA 670 School Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ EDEA 670 School Supervision</td>
<td>▶ EDEA 780F Seminar in Curriculum Administration</td>
<td>▶ EDEA 780F Seminar in Curriculum Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ EDEA 780F Seminar in Curriculum Administration</td>
<td>▶ EDEA 780K Issues in the Principalship</td>
<td>▶ EDEA 780K Issues in the Principalship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 21 credits</td>
<td>Total: 21 credits</td>
<td>Total: 21 credits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most important difference between cohorts occurred in the field-based internships and mentoring components. In Cohort I, participants had a one-semester, paid internship in a public school with a mentor principal. In most cases, interns were matched with seasoned, veteran principals who served as mentors. During the second semester, interns applied for assistant principal vacancies in their respective districts. However, a year-long, field-based school improvement project generally required the intern to maintain...
contact with his/her mentor principal and internship school throughout the second semester.

For Cohort II, the internship was eliminated and participants who successfully completed the summer training were placed in assistant principal vacancies in their respective districts. This was on-the-job training without a trained, school-based mentor. In some instances, the supervising principal, by virtue of position, became a mentor. In some districts, a mentor, usually a retired veteran principal, was available for consultation as needed. However, not all districts had identified these mentor principals at the start of the school year. This resulted in variable levels of assistance in both degree and kind throughout the year. In some cases, since placement was determined by availability of vacant positions, participants were working with principals who were also new to the school.

With Cohort III, a paid, full-time internship, with the guidance of a mentor, was reinstated for the entire school year. Due to the length of the internship, participants were also able to participate in a cross-training component at another school in the district, generally for four to six weeks. In most cases, cross training was also arranged so that elementary-based interns would be assigned to a secondary school. Conversely, secondary-based interns would be assigned to an elementary school.
Finally, the program was expanded into a two-year program for Cohort II, with a second year of program requirements designed to prepare leaders for the principalship. Some activities, primarily in the form of specialized professional development sessions, were provided in order to center upon second year program objectives.

With Cohort III, there was an intent to maintain a two-year program, with one full year to focus on the assistant principalship and a second year to focus on preparation for the principalship. However, after the first year, the second year was waived due to budgetary constraints.

**POPULATION AND SAMPLE**

The population of educational leaders surveyed was comprised of three consecutive cohorts in a state-sponsored preparation program, from 1999-2002. Program officials provided lists of participants who completed program and certification requirements and were currently serving as educational officers in the Department of Education. In total, 104 beginning educational leaders were identified from program rosters. Cohort I, 1999-2000, was comprised of 24 educational leaders; Cohort II, 2000-2002, was comprised of 42 educational leaders; and Cohort III, 2001-2002, was comprised of 39 educational leaders.
Of the original group of 104 potential respondents, one individual from Cohort II has left the state, one individual from Cohort III has left school administration, and one individual from Cohort III has taken an administrative position in a private school. Two attempts to contact these individuals were both unsuccessful. Consequently, the pool of potential respondents was adjusted to 101. A total of 94 surveys were completed and returned, resulting in a 93.06% return rate.

In Cohort I, 21 out of 23 respondents completed and returned surveys, for a return rate of 91.30%. In Cohort II, 36 out of 41 respondents completed and returned surveys, for a return rate of 87.80%. In Cohort III, 37 out of 37 respondents completed and returned surveys, for a 100% return rate.

**Demographic Information**

The demographic information in the survey instrument was designed to create a portrait of the group of beginning educational leaders in the study. Additionally, it was initially surmised that some elements might be utilized as a subset of independent variables in the proposed model for data analysis. A complete summary of demographic information is included in Appendix A.

Of the 94 respondents, 36 were male (38.3%) and 58 were female (61.7%). Respondents described their primary ethnicity as Asian (51.1%), White (25.5%), and Part-Hawaiian (10.6%). The majority of Asians were
Japanese. These three ethnicities comprised 87.2% of the total respondents.

The remaining 12.8% of the respondents were Mixed, other than Part-Hawaiian (5.3%), Other Pacific Islander (3.2%), Black/African American (1.1%), and Hawaiian (1.1%).

With respect to age at the time of responding, 27 respondents (28.7%) were in the range of 31-40 years of age, 27 (28.7%) in the range of 41-50 years of age, and 40 (42.6%) within the range of 51-60 years of age.

Overall, 76.6% or 72 respondents have earned a master’s degree. Six respondents or 6.4% have a bachelor’s degree, 12 respondents or 12.8% have a professional diploma or certificate beyond a bachelor’s, and 4 respondents or 4.3 % have a doctorate. Of the respondents, 54.3% indicated that one of their degrees is in Educational Administration or Educational Leadership.

Respondents also indicated a range of 9-33 years of service in education, with a mean of 18.87 years. They also had a range of 2-16 years of experience as an educational officer, with a mean of 4.20 years. Although most had 2-4 years of experience in this category, some respondents had a number of years in a temporary assignment outside of program certification. A few others were previously certified and practicing administrators in other states. Finally, when asked to indicate age when they first became an educational officer, a range of 29-57 was reported with a mean of 42.5 years of age.
In terms of current position at the time of administration of the survey, 28 respondents were currently principals, 56 were vice/assistant principals, and 9 were educational specialists in district or state positions. In terms of time in current position, a range of 1 month to 8 years was reported, with a mean of 2.23 years. While this mean may present a realistic average, it appears to reflect a current trend of moving into other administrative positions quite rapidly. This is also supported by the relatively large number of individuals reporting to be principals (28 respondents) after a short term as an entry-level educational officer or assistant principal.

At the time, 44 were assigned to an elementary school, 19 were at a middle or intermediate school, and 17 at a high school. Two respondents were at a K-8 school, one was at a K-12 school, two were at a 7-12 school, and three were at some other type of school. In terms of student enrollment, 17 respondents are at a school with an enrollment of less that 500 students, 33 at a school with 501-800 students, 12 at a school with 801-1100 students, 11 at a school with 1101-1500 students, 9 at a school with 1501-2000 students, and 3 at a school with more than 2000 students.

The number of teachers in the respondents' schools ranged from 10-160, with a mean of 55.77. The number of classified staff ranged from 2-100, with a mean of 29.69. In most schools, classified staff includes office, cafeteria, and
custodial staff. Also included in this group would be paraprofessional and related student support personnel.

The number of assistant principals ranged from 0-4, with 17 (18.1%) reporting no assistant principal, 32 (34.0%) with one assistant principal, 25 (26.6%) with two assistant principals, 9 (9.6%) with three assistant principals, and 2 (2.1%) with four assistant principals.

**INSTRUMENT**

The survey instrument titled “Survey of Beginning Educational Leaders” was developed from a theoretical model conceptualized by the researcher and supported by theoretical models developed in earlier research studies of beginning educational leaders, both principals and vice principals (Daresh & Playko, 1991, 1992b, 1997; Heck, 1995).

The survey examined three dimensions of a preparation program and the perceptions of the impact on three areas of leadership performance. The first three sections of the survey—supportive relationships, preparation program, and administrative internship—comprised the independent variables in the study. Supportive relationships included three indicators—mentor, cohort, and other colleagues. Preparation program included five indicators which reflected the components of preparation program—graduate course work, summer training institute, problem-based learning, reflective seminars,
and operational workshops. The administrative internship included three indicators which may have had a critical impact on the outcomes of the internship. These included daily experiences, faculty/staff relationships, and relationships with other individuals/stakeholder groups.

The fourth section of the survey instrument, “Leadership Performance” comprised the dependent variables in the model. Included were three dimensions of leadership performance that have been identified as critical to the practice of beginning principals (Daresh and Playko, 1991, 1992b, 1997). These include technical skills, collegial relationships that promote socialization, and role awareness.

All survey items in the first four sections utilized a continuous scale (Creswell, 2003) or a Likert scale (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003), as the intent was to measure the attitudes or perceptions of educational leaders. Along this scale items could be rated: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, or 5 = strongly agree.

A fifth section, “Significance of Program Components” asked respondents to rank order the five most significant components of their preparation program, with “5” being most significant and “1” being least significant. The eight items were cohort/peer relationship, internship, mentor relationship, university courses, summer training, reflective seminars, workshops, and shadowing the superintendent. The final item, shadowing the
superintendent, was included in an attempt to assess the relative value of this activity. All three cohorts had an opportunity to shadow the state superintendent of education and the deputy superintendent for one week during the school year.

The sixth and final section solicited demographic information that could be utilized in the model as independent variables. Information included but was not limited to gender, primary ethnicity, age, earned degrees, years in education, years as a public school educational officer, current position, time in current position, prior experiences and positions held, type and size of school. The specific demographic information and results will be discussed more fully later in this chapter.

Various forms of surveys were considered, including a computer-based version. However, a mail survey was deemed most feasible as many school-level educational leaders have variable, sometimes limited, access to computers and other technologies. Some individuals in outlying areas of the state may not have equal ability to access the survey if it were presented on a web-based system. As Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) have suggested, a mail survey also provides all individuals with time to respond and greater opportunity to forward thoughtful responses. On the other hand, completion of a mail survey may be subject to the complex schedules maintained by educational leaders in
the field. Strategies to encourage a timely response were considered in the plans for distribution.

**Description of Sections in the Instrument**

This section presents descriptions of the sections included in the survey instrument. The first section of the survey instrument explored three dimensions of supportive relationships that may have enhanced the preparation/internship. These three dimensions include, mentor, cohort, and other colleagues.

**Mentor.** The items in this section centered upon the impact a mentor had on the intern during the course of the preparation program. Items focused on how a mentor may have aided the intern's ability to engage in meaningful reflection, understanding of relationships within the school setting and the development of a philosophy of leadership. In a general sense, items were developed to gauge how a mentor allowed the intern to grow and if having a mentor contributed to the value and worth of the preparation program experience.

**Cohort.** The term cohort, in this section, referred to the members of the group with whom a respondent went through the program. Items in this section focused on the support and assistance provided to the respondent by other members of the cohort during the preparation program and whether the
interaction further aided in the development of a philosophy of leadership.

Items focused more on those indicators with the potential to provide support to the intern/respondent rather than the type of support provided.

*Other Colleagues.* This section focused on the impact of other colleagues who may have provided support to the respondent during the preparation program and internship. These colleagues would include other vice principals, principals, and educational officers in the district and complex area; teachers, other staff members and other vice principals in the school. These individuals, in their respective capacities, may have provided the intern/respondent with support, advice, positive feedback, assistance, and additionally, may have served as role models.

The second section of the survey instrument focused on components of the preparation program, including graduate course work, summer institute, problem-based learning, reflective seminars, and operational workshops.

*Graduate Course Work.* The items in this section examined the value of graduate courses taken as part of the requirements of the preparation program. To what degree did the courses provide a knowledge base that could be utilized in resolving problems confronted in daily practice, and further, did courses promote better reflective practice as a school leader? Additionally, did the courses assist in the establishment of professional networks with other administrative colleagues.
Summer Institute. The focus of items in this section paralleled those included in the previous section on the value of graduate course work.

Problem-Based Learning (PBL). A Problem-Based Learning (PBL) approach was utilized in the summer training institute as a means to develop problem-framing and problem-solving ability in a small group. The items in this section focused on Problem-Based Learning as an effective means of solving problems of practice, the value of PBL in a small group of cohort members, and application to situations confronted as a leader. Additionally, is PBL still utilized to resolve difficult problem situations?

Reflective Seminars. To what degree, if any, did the content and strategies provided in the reflective seminars help beginning educational leaders to resolve problems confronted in daily practice? Other items examined the degree to which seminars aided group and personal reflection, promoted more effective leadership, and created an understanding of how experienced educational leaders think and act.

Operational Workshops. Operational workshops focused on the technical, day-to-day operational aspects of administration/educational leadership. Did the workshops help to prepare the leader for operational administrative tasks? Further, did the workshops promote an understanding of how administrators think and act, deal with situations confronted in daily
practice, and promote more effective administrative practice and decision making?

The third section of the survey instrument focused on three dimensions of the Administrative Internship—daily experiences during the internship, relationships with faculty and staff during the internship, and relationships with other individuals and stakeholders. The latter would include parents, families, students, and community members.

Daily Experiences During the Internship. The items in this section focused on the dimension of daily experiences during the internship. Did these experiences foster an understanding of the responsibilities of an administrator, the nature of the school organization, and a realistic portraiture of the context of administration that a beginning administrator would encounter? Did the internship provide the intern with opportunities to develop leadership skills and become more reflective? Additionally, did the support of a mentor enhance the internship experience?

Faculty/Staff Relationships During the Internship. Items in this section focused on the value of relationships formed with faculty and staff during the internship. Beyond creating opportunities to better administrative practice through relationships developed with faculty and classified staff, were there opportunities to work on trust-building with these role groups and did such efforts promote a clearer understanding of the importance of positive
relationships, building a positive image, and the role and responsibility of an instructional leader?

*Relationships with Others During the Internship.* As mentioned previously, the "others" in this section include students, parents, families, and community members. Did the internship present opportunities to work with and build positive relationships with these stakeholder groups? Further, did the internship promote an understanding of the importance of bridging gaps of understanding between parents and school and establishing school-community relationships?

The fourth section of the survey instrument focused on three dimensions of leadership performance of concern to beginning educational leaders. These dimensions include technical skills, collegial relationships that promote socialization, and role awareness. Respondents were asked to respond to items in consideration of the degree to which their preparation program influenced their perceptions of their leadership performance with respect to the three dimensions.

*Technical Skills.* Items in this section focused on some of the technical or operational aspects of educational leadership, including curriculum leadership. The specific areas included an ability to evaluate staff, manage personnel, maintain the school plant, implement student discipline guidelines, implement special education programs, design and implement a data-based
school improvement process, and work with teachers to improve classroom instruction.

Collegial Relationships That Promote Socialization. The items in this section broadly focused on the leader's ability to become socialized into the organization through the development of collegial relationships with various stakeholder groups. The items focused on broader dimensions of leadership which included communicating the goals and purposes of the school and a vision of education. Additionally, items also focused on the ability of a leader to acknowledge the social and cultural norms of the school organization, acquire an awareness of how faculty and staff view an educational leader, and develop collegial relationships with all stakeholder groups in the school community.

Role Awareness. In general, this section focused on an emerging awareness of various dimensions of leadership, including an understanding of the organizational power and authority a school leader possesses and one's position as a leader in the organizational structure of the school and district. Items also focused on an awareness of one's strengths and needs, including personal and professional biases, a personal vision of school leadership, the ability to make a positive difference in the lives of staff and students, and the ability to perform leadership responsibilities with confidence.
Limitations

Even in the most well-designed survey procedures and survey instruments limitations are always present. Particularly with respect to individual items in the instrument, care and judgment must be exercised to ensure that items are written and presented in a manner that promotes clear, common understanding. Items should be stated and presented to reflect the intent and purpose of the survey, to the best extent possible.

As mentioned earlier, the entire instrument was revised and refined over the course of several months, through a series of twelve drafts, resulting in the final instrument. Additionally, the pilot testing further allowed a group of respondents to provide feedback on the quality of the items and the general survey design. The informal results of the pilot testing also allowed the researcher to identify items which might be suspect with respect to common understanding.

Nonetheless, there is a certain expectation that any group of participants will respond to items honestly, rather than simply providing an expected response. While it is difficult to control how participants may choose to respond, care and judgement were again exercised in wording items in an objective manner that would serve to promote an honest, objective response. Also, a cover letter which accompanied the survey clearly outlined the intent of the survey and how honest feedback would enhance the results of the study.
Finally, as steps were followed to ensure the confidentiality of all respondents and outlined in the cover letter, participants were provided assurance that honest responses would be protected and valued.

**Pilot Testing**

The survey was pilot tested with a group of 21 assistant principals at the end of their monthly district meeting. This particular group of assistant principals, relative to those in other districts, appeared to possess a range of knowledge and experience. In addition the schools in this district also presented a range of environments in terms of clientele served, size and location, the latter being both suburban and rural.

Beyond completing the survey, respondents were asked to offer comments on items, specifically to clarify items that appeared to be misleading or confusing. Respondents were also provided a feedback sheet to log the time it took to complete the survey and offer any additional comments on the content and focus of the survey instrument or individual items.

Pilot testing provided feedback on the instrument, the design and clarity of items, and time needed to administer, thus furnishing the researcher with an opportunity to assess content validity of the instrument and improve both survey items and format. Comments and feedback were incorporated into a revised final instrument.
Distribution of the Survey

The survey was distributed in four phases, a modification of a process suggested by Salant and Dillman (1994). Initially, a brief, pre-distribution notification was sent to all participants via e-mail. Group lists were established from the Department of Education’s e-mail address list. The following week, the survey, along with a formal cover letter and return envelope were sent to all prospective respondents at their place of work via the Department of Education’s mail courier service. The surveys were distributed during the third week of January, shortly after the winter vacation. Distribution was planned for this time of the year, since it was toward the end of the semester and the beginning of a new semester. It was felt that respondents would be more inclined to complete and return the survey at a time in the school year when most educational leaders might be experiencing a brief break in their normal routine of daily activities.

Participants were asked to return the survey within two weeks. An e-mail reminder was sent to all those who did not return completed surveys by the stated deadline. Finally, a brief thank-you letter was forwarded to all respondents by the Department of Education courier service.
DATA ANALYSIS

The plan for data analysis included initial descriptive statistics for all sections in the survey. The results would allow the researcher the opportunity to identify initial patterns and emerging relationships. Additionally, results would serve to identify any potential problems or concerns with the data set and allow for corrections and adjustments to be made before proceeding.

A reliability analysis would help to determine the relative strength of items in each section and collectively, items that could be included in the process of scale development. Concurrently, an earlier analysis of demographic information served to identify six possible variables which could be incorporated into the regression model. These variables included gender, highest earned degree, degree in educational administration/leadership, current position, school type/context, and enrollment size. Original demographic information was dummy coded and utilized as a subset of independent variables in the regression model.

Multiple regression was run with several different models. The results of the regression analysis appeared to indicate that variables might be interacting in such a manner that would make some program components appear to be non-significant, whereby earlier estimations appeared to indicate otherwise. Subsequently, bivariate correlation, independent samples T-test, and a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), were conducted on all variables.
in an attempt to further examine and define the specific relationship between variables and the possible effect on the outcomes.

Finally, multiple regression analysis was conducted, controlling for different cohorts. The results are presented and discussed in Chapter 4.

**Descriptive Statistics**

Descriptive statistics and frequencies were run on the seventy-six items in the first six sections as well as the demographic information, as appropriate. The means and standard deviations for survey items are presented in Appendix B.

In general, the means were higher for mentor (3.37 - 4.49), cohort (4.17 - 4.56), operational workshops (4.01 - 4.42), daily experiences during the internship (4.31 - 4.52), faculty and staff relationship in the internship (4.15 - 4.34), and relationships with others during the internship (4.12 - 4.34.).

Individual items with the highest means focused on some type of dimension of support or a relationship with some individual or group of individuals. The relative strength of the means in the sections related to the internship may be reflective of the perceived value of the entire internship experience. Again,

---

1 In controlling for the different cohorts, Cohort II was selected as the reference group as this was the cohort that did not have an internship or trained, on-site mentor.

2 Prior to initial data analysis, items were adjusted to account for missing data and items scored as “not applicable.” In all cases, an average of all items in the subsection was calculated and entered.
individual items with the highest mean centered on relationships and an emerging knowledge and understanding.

With respect to the three dimensions of leadership performance—technical skills, collegial relationships that promote socialization, and role awareness—means ranged from 3.49 to 4.31. In general, means were higher for items related to role awareness (4.07 - 4.31). Keeping in mind that respondents were asked to consider the items in view of how their preparation program influenced their perceptions of leadership ability and performance in the three dimensions, it appears that respondents’ assessment of ability and performance may be somewhat lower as compared to their perception of the value of the components of their preparation program.

A reliability analysis was run to provide an alpha value to assess the relative similarity of responses for items in each sub-section as the initial step toward the development of scales. The results of the analysis provided alpha values within the range of .777 to .953, indicating that items in each section were similar enough to be grouped into scales. The alpha values for each sub-section are also provided in Appendix B.

In two sections, “Mentor” and “Other Colleagues,” single items were found to be too weak to include in the final scale development. “Mentstil,” the respondent still consults mentor, was the only item presented in present tense and possibly too unlike the other six items. It did not examine the context of
prior experience, as did other items. "Colladv," other assistant principals in the school provided advice, was possibly not applicable in any situation where the respondent was the sole assistant principal. In fact, the item was left blank or marked "not applicable" by 37 respondents (39.4%), a possible indication of the lack of another assistant principal on site.

The fifth section of the survey asked respondents to rank order the five most valuable components of their preparation program from a list of eight items, including cohort/peer relationship, internship, mentor relationship, university course work, summer institute, reflective seminars, operational workshops, and shadowing the superintendent.

Three items were selected most often as having some relative level of value: cohort/peer relationship (77 or 81.9%), internship (82 or 87.2%), and mentor relationship (68 or 72.3%). Of the three items, 26.6% or 25 respondents reported the mentor relationship to be the most valuable, 22.3% or 21 respondents ranked the cohort/peer relationship as the most valuable, and 21.3% or 20 respondents reported the internship as the most valuable component.

Two items, summer training (60 or 63.8%) and reflective seminars (46 or 48.9%), followed the first three items in being a valuable component of the preparation program. However, for the summer institute only 7.4% of the respondents felt it was the most valuable component of their preparation
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program. Similarly, with the reflective workshops only 2.1% reported that it was the most valuable component.

Interestingly, 43 respondents reported that the graduate course work was a significant component, with 8 respondents or 8.5% reporting it as the most valuable component. This appears to indicate that for some respondents the graduate course work was as valuable as the reflective seminars and relatively more valuable that the operational workshops. Other items, operational workshops, problem-based learning and shadowing the superintendent appeared to have less impact on respondents.

Variables or Constructs in Scale Development

As previously reported, the strength and consistency of alpha values in the reliability analysis indicated that the items in each sub-section were strong enough to warrant the development of scale variables.

The following scale variables were developed. Three variables were created in the sub-section, “Supportive Relationships.” The variables are mentorel: Mentor Relationship, cohrel: Cohort Relationship, collrel: Relationships with Other Colleagues.

Five variables were created in the sub-section, “Preparation Program.” The variables are gradprep: Graduate Course Work, trnprep: Summer Training
Institute, \textit{pblprep}: Problem-Based Learning, \textit{semprep}: Reflective Seminars, and \textit{workprep}: Operational Workshops.

Three variables were created in the sub-section “Administrative Internship.” The variables were \textit{expint}: Daily Experiences, \textit{frelint}: Faculty/Staff Relationships, and \textit{orelint}: Relationships with Others.

Finally, three variables, which comprise a set of dependent variables, were created in the sub-section “Leadership Performance.” The variables were \textit{skllead}: Technical Skills, \textit{crellead}: Collegial Relationships that Promote Socialization, and \textit{rolelead}: Role Awareness.

Six demographic variables were created for use as a subset of independent variables in the initial data analysis. It was surmised, on the basis of the analysis of descriptive statistics, that these variables might have an impact on other variables included in the model.

For \textit{gender}, a new variable, \textit{female}, was created (female = 1, male = 0). For \textit{hidegree}, or highest earned degree, the variable \textit{degree}, was created (masters/doctorate = 1, bachelors/professional diploma = 0). For \textit{eadeg}, the variable measuring a degree in educational administration or leadership, the variable \textit{eadegree} was created (yes = 0, no = 1).

For \textit{currpos}, the current position of the respondent, the variable \textit{currprin} was created (principal = 1, all others = 0). For \textit{schtype}, or the type of school context the respondent currently worked in, the variable \textit{schelem} was
created (elementary = 1, all others = 0). For schenrol, the categorical
enrollment of the school, the variable lgschool was created (large = 1; small =
0). For the purposes of categorizing schools as large or small, any enrollment
considered over 800 was categorized as large. Rather than using a larger
number, 800 was used due to the large number of placements in elementary
schools (n = 44) reported in the survey.

The eleven independent variables, three dependent variables, and six
demographic variables comprised a model that was utilized in the initial
regression analysis.
Chapter 4
Results

The results of the study are presented in this chapter and are organized according to the patterns of results that emanated during the course of the study. As mentioned in the initial plan for data analysis, discussed previously in Chapter 3, the results of the multiple regression analysis prompted several new questions for consideration. As a result, the subsequent statistical measures reflected the need to examine the data with greater specificity, which would perhaps lead to a better understanding of the patterns and relationships that appeared to be emerging.

The initial regression model, presented in this section as Model I, examined the effect the dimensions of supportive relationships, preparation program components, and administrative internship have on respondents’ appraisal of leadership performance in the following areas: technical skills, collegial relationships that promote socialization, and role awareness. The focus or intent of the analysis was to determine if any of the three dimensions or individual variables, such as mentor, cohort, etc., affected any or all of the dimensions of leadership performance included in the model.

The second stage of the analysis, presented as Model II, examined the effect of the program variables, or membership in one of three cohorts, on any of the dimensions of leadership performance. Further, it explored the question...
of whether any cohort found more value in the experiences related to any specific program components or in the preparation program as a whole.

**REGRESSION ANALYSIS**

**Model I: Initial Regression Model**

Multiple regression analysis separates the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variable so that the unique contributions of each variable may be examined (Allison, 1999). Three different models were proposed; however, the following model appeared to present the best effect.

The components were entered in the following order, as was presented in the survey instrument: supportive relationships, preparation program, and administrative internship.

For each of the dependent variables technical skills (*skllead*), collegial relationships (*crellead*), and role awareness (*rolelead*), a regression model was created. In the dimension of supportive relationships, the independent variables are mentor relationship (*mentorel*), cohort (*cohrel*), and other colleagues (*collrel*). These variables were loaded at the first level of regression analysis.

In the second equation, the three variables that comprised Supportive Relationships remained and variables in the dimension of Preparation Program Components were added. The five variables were graduate course
work (gradprep), summer training institute (trnprep), problem-based learning (pblprep), reflective seminars (sembprep) and operational workshops (workprep).

At the third level, the eight variables entered at the second level remained and three additional variables, which comprised the dimension of the Administrative Internship were added. The set of variables included daily experiences in the internship (expint), faculty and staff relationships (frelint), and relationships with others (orelinit).

### Demographic Variables in Regression Model

Building on the initial model, six demographic variables were incorporated into the regression model, as an extension of the initial model. The six variables measured the following: gender (female; female = 1, male = 0), highest earned degree (degree; master’s/doctorate = 1, all other degrees = 0), degree in educational administration/leadership (eadegree; yes = 0, no = 1), current position (currprin; principal = 1, all other positions = 0), type of school (schelem; elementary = 1, all other types = 0), size of school\(^1\) (lgschool; large school (800+ students) = 1, small school (under 800 students) = 0).

The results of the regression analysis on the demographic variables indicated that none of the variables had an effect on any of the three dependent variables. This is a positive outcome which appears to indicate that

---

\(^1\)Differentiation between small school and large school as set at 800, due to the large number of elementary schools (n = 34) in the sample.
when controlled for any of the other independent variables, none of the demographic variables had an impact on any of the three dimensions of leadership performance.

Results for Model I

The results for the initial model are presented in Table 4.1. In the leadership performance dimension of Technical Skills (skllead), the standardized beta coefficients in the dimension of Supportive Relationships are significant\(^2\) \((p < .05)\) for Mentor Relationship \((.270)\) and Cohort Relationship \((.234)\), both moderately strong predictors of leadership performance in the area of technical skills. This suggests that respondents valued the contributions by their mentor and members of their cohort, with respect to the development of technical skills, indicators that represent some of the operational tasks that educational leaders must attend to. The adjusted \(R^2\) \((.173)\) indicates that approximately 17\% of the variance in Technical Skills \((skllead)\) is accounted for by the three variables.

\(^2\)Throughout the regression analysis, significance levels have been adjusted to \(p < .05\) and \(p < .10\), which is appropriate, given the small sample size \((n = 94)\).
Similarly, in the leadership performance dimension of Collegial Relationships that Promote Socialization (crellead), the standardized beta coefficient values are significant ($p < .05$) for Mentor Relationship (0.301) and Cohort Relationship (0.274), and significant ($p < .10$) for Relationships with Others (0.180).
Other Colleagues (.216). While the values still indicate that all three variables are moderately strong predictors of the development of collegial relationships that promote socialization, the adjusted $R^2$ (.284) indicates that the three variables account for 28% of the variance in Collegial Relationships. Overall, these results suggest that collegial relationships with other educational leaders supports socialization processes, with the contribution provided by a mentor being slightly more valuable or important as compared to any other colleague. This may have implications for the processes that guide the socialization of beginning educational leaders.

In the leadership performance dimension of Role Awareness ($rolelead$), the standardized beta coefficient values are again significant ($p < .05$) for Mentor Relationship (.243) and Cohort Relationship (.343). The Adjusted $R^2$ (.211) indicates that the three variables account for a little over 20% of the variance, with respect to an awareness of the role of an educational leader. While both mentor and cohort contribute in a moderate sense to the awareness of role, the slightly stronger impact of cohort suggests that beyond the modeling and reflection with a mentor, the dialogue and networking support among cohort members may have been more meaningful to the respondents in this study.

In the dimension of Preparation Program Components, the standardized beta coefficient value for Operational Workshops (.209) is
significant ($p < .10$) with a moderate impact on the leadership performance
dimension of Technical Skills. This suggests that the content and focus of the
operational workshops might directly contribute to the development of
technical skills and expertise in a beginning educational leader. While the
relative value of other program components, including the summer training
institute and graduate course work, might also contribute to the development
of technical skills, the results of the analysis did not support this assumption.
The Adjusted $R^2$ (.311) indicates that the eight variables now account for 31% of the variance.

In the dimension of Collegial Relationships that Promote Socialization,
one variable, Reflective Seminars (.288) was significant ($p < .01$). Again, the
content and focus of the reflective seminars would not appear to promote
collegial relationships that would impact the socialization processes. However,
some of the seminar topics, such as personnel management, transformational
leadership, and organizational change, may have provided a context of
understanding of how vital collegial relationships may be in promoting both
organizational and professional socialization processes. Curiously, Problem-
Based Learning, which involves collaborative problem-solving processes, was a
weak indicator (.058) for the development of collegial relationships that
promote socialization. The Adjusted $R^2$ (.433) indicates that the eight variables
account for 43% of the variance with respect to collegial relationships that promote socialization.

In the dimension of Role Awareness, one variable, Operational Workshops (.397), was significant (p < .05). Again, this outcome does not appear to have a plausible explanation to support the evidence of a relationship. An underlying assumption might be that beginning educational leaders, generally vice principals or principals and other leaders with limited experience, might still be attempting to cope with the technical, operational aspects and demands posed by their current position. However, given the items in the leadership dimension of Role Awareness, the moderate strength of the relationship is not easily discerned.

In the dimension of the Administrative Internship, none of the three variables were significant for Technical Skills. The Adjusted $R^2$ (.388) indicates that all eleven variables account for slightly less that 40% of the variance, suggesting that 60% of the development in the area of Technical Skills might be due to other factors.

Two variables proved significant for Collegial Relationships that Promote Socialization. Faculty and Staff Relationships During the Internship (.288) was significant at p < .05. Relationships with Others (.180) was significant at p < .10. Daily Experiences (.048) was not significant.

Considering the individual items in these variable clusters, this would appear
to suggest that an understanding and opportunity to develop relationships, particularly with faculty and staff, but also with other stakeholder groups, remains central to development of collegial relationships that affect socialization processes.

For the leadership performance of Collegial Relationships that Promote Socialization, the Adjusted $R^2$ (.540) indicates that the eleven variables account for 54% of the variance, with 46% due to other factors not included in the scope of this study.

Finally, in the leadership performance dimension of Role Awareness, the standardized beta coefficient value was significant ($p < .05$) for Faculty and Staff Relationships (.250). This appears to suggest that the quality of interaction and developed relationships with faculty and staff help the beginning educational leader develop an awareness of role. This could be an indicator of how faculty/staff view a leader and perceive the power and authority that comes with the position.

As with the previous dimension, the Adjusted $R^2$ (.504) indicates that the eleven variables in the model account for 50% of the variance, further suggesting that 50% may still be due to other factors.
Summary of Results for Model I: Initial Regression Analysis

The results suggest, across all three dimensions of leadership performance, that supportive relationships, particularly those with mentor or cohort, tend to be significant. However, at best, the overall impact may be moderate.

The variables related to the awareness and development of relationships during the internship tended to be somewhat important, particularly with respect to the leadership performance dimensions of collegial relationships and role awareness.

Although it may be presumed from their inclusion in the preparation program that the broad range of components in the preparation program would have a direct relationship on the dimensions of leadership performance, the results of the analysis indicated that none of the components had a substantial impact, aside from operational workshops for Technical Skills and Role Awareness and reflective seminars for Collegial Relationships that Promote Socialization. This suggests that program components of a preparation program may need to be supported by other hands-on, field-based experiences, in order to effect a comprehensive program that prepares educational leaders to meet the broad, diverse range of responsibilities.

In examining the model as a whole, it appeared that as variables were added into the model, the effect was weaker than had been originally
anticipated at the onset of the data analysis process, particularly given the results from the descriptive statistics and initial analysis of individual items as discussed in the last section of Chapter 3.

This effect, or lack of it, prompted several questions that were a bit more specific and beyond the realm of the original set of research questions posed in the development of the study. First, how does each dimension or area, as defined by the subsets of independent variables, impact the dimensions of leadership performance? Second, what is the relative importance of the three dimensions that define the program components? Finally, are there any differences across programs or cohorts?

An attempt to address the first two questions involved re-examining the variables in the model through other statistical analyses that would allow for the examination and comparison of group means and correlations between variables. The results of these statistical procedures are outlined in the next section.

The third question regarding differences across programs or cohorts would be addressed by a second regression model, which would include the program variable, as defined by the cohort.
CORRELATION

A correlation analysis allows for an examination of the extent to which two variables are related. This may be useful in uncovering the possible relationships hidden previously in the analysis. The correlation matrix for all scale variables in the model are presented in Appendix D.

In general, the results depict a moderate correlation across and within dimensions. Also of note is that nearly all of the variables are significant at the $p < .01$ level.

The results identify a moderate relationship (.564) between the mentor relationship ($\text{mentorel}$) and the daily experiences in the internship ($\text{expint}$), significant at $p < .05$.

Among the variables that comprise the components of the preparation program, there is a moderate relationship between the summer training institute ($\text{trnprep}$), the problem-based learning component of the training ($\text{pblprep}$), reflective seminars ($\text{semprep}$), and operational workshops ($\text{workprep}$). Correlation values range from .0505 to .698 and are all significant ($p < .01$). This may be a logical relationship as the content and focus of these elements are often integrated through the context of the preparation program. The within-group relationship as evidenced by the correlation, may serve as a preliminary indicator that these components of the preparation program do not stand vastly apart or isolated from each other.
A similar, but slightly weaker relationship exists among the three variables in administrative internship, daily experiences in the internship (expint), relationships with faculty and staff (frelint), and relationships with others (orelint). The correlation values range from .495 to .654 and are all significant (p < .01). Here, the within-group relationship again appears to serve as an indicator that the three variables are not isolated and may further suggest the integrative nature of the administrative internship.

Finally, there is a moderate relationship between the three dependent variables in the model, technical skills (sklead), collegial relationships that promote socialization (crelead), and role awareness (rolelead) and the four variables in the preparation program, aside from graduate course work, and the three variables in the administrative internship.

Across the variables, correlation values range from .504 to .663, and are all significant (p < .01). This seems to provide some evidence of the general relationship between and among all of the variables in the model, and further, provides preliminary evidence as to why effects of variable dimensions added at the second and third level of the regression model do not appear to be as strong nor significant. However, it must be acknowledged that a correlation only provides support for the existence of relationships between variables and indicates that similar attitudes and perceptions among respondents are reflected in similar responses to individual items in each sub-group.
Model II: Regression Analysis for Cohorts

In this model, the variables representing the three dimensions of the preparation program (Supportive Relationships, Preparation Program Components, and Administrative Internship) were added separately with the cohort variables that corresponded with membership in one of three cohorts. The variables were loaded with each of the dimensions of leadership performance (Technical Skills, Collegial Relationships that Promote Socialization, and Role Awareness). Since program dimensions were considered separately in this model, the results are summarized in the following three tables (Table 4.2 - Table 4.4) and will be discussed separately, followed by a general summary of results for the model.

Results for Model II

The results for the variables in the sub-group Supportive Relationships are presented in Table 4.2. In general, the results parallel those in Model I, with a slightly stronger effect. This may be due, in part, to separating out the

---

3 Variables were dummy coded for Cohort 1 and Cohort 3. Cohort 2 was used as the reference group, since their program lacked an internship and, in most cases, a trained, site-based principal mentor.

4 A model similar to Model I was initially proposed; however, the results of the regression analysis demonstrated a similar effect, in that the levels of significance dropped out as independent variable clusters were added on. Thus, a model in which independent variables were considered at three separate dimensions—Supportive Relationships, Preparation Program Components, and Administrative Internships—was utilized to determine the effect of program or cohort membership on the variables included in the model.
sub-groups in the regression analysis, as opposed to adding on variables in the sub-group.

Table 4.2
Model II: Standardized Beta Coefficients for Supportive Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Technical Skills</th>
<th>Collegial Relationships</th>
<th>Role Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supportive Relationships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Relationship</td>
<td>.319*</td>
<td>.326*</td>
<td>.291*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort Relationship</td>
<td>.236*</td>
<td>.279*</td>
<td>.324*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with Other Colleagues</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.196**</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cohort 1</strong></td>
<td>-.251*</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>-.190**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cohort 3</strong></td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05  
**p < 0.10

Across all dimensions of leadership performance, the mentor relationship and cohort relationship were significant (p < .05). The standardized beta coefficients indicate that the mentor relationship was slightly stronger for Technical Skills (.319) and Collegial Relationships (.326). The cohort relationship was slightly stronger for the dimension of Role Awareness (.324). The difference between Mentor Relationship and Cohort Relationship was very small for role awareness, suggesting a somewhat equal contribution along the indicators that comprise the variable. The broadest
differences were in the dimension of Technical Skills, (mentor relationship = .319, cohort relationship = .236), suggesting that the mentor had more of a contribution to make with respect to the indicators in Technical Skills. This would make sense as we might assume that mentors would possess the specialized knowledge and experience to deal with technical issues, as compared with fellow novices in the cohort.

A moderate difference was noted in the dimension of Collegial Relationships that Promote Socialization (mentor relationship = .326, cohort relationship = .279). Again, assuming that collegial relationships that promote socialization might be best observed during the internship, it would follow that the mentor relationship would better facilitate the socialization processes, both organizational and professional, for the novice educational leader.

In the leadership performance dimension of Collegial Relationships that Promote Socialization, the standardized beta coefficients for relationships with other colleagues (.196) are also significant (p < .10). This suggests that within the context of the internships, other colleagues in the school and district might serve to socialize the novice into both the profession and organization. For example, other vice principals could model appropriate and expected behaviors, in both an organizational and professional context.

The Adjusted $R^2$ for all three dimensions of leadership performance—Technical Performance (.213), Collegial Relationships (.287),
and Role Awareness (.222)—indicates that Supportive Relationships account for 21% to nearly 29% of the variance across the dimensions of leadership performance. Accordingly, 71 - 79% of the variance could still be due to other factors. These factors could be other role groups or stakeholders whose support was greater. In some cases, with the lack of support from a mentor, members of the cohort or other colleagues, faculty and staff could have played a key supportive role in each of the three dimensions of leadership performance.

An examination of the effect of cohort membership in this first stage of analysis hints of a pattern that may be emerging. Curiously, the standardized beta coefficients for Cohort I are presented as negative values for all three dimensions of leadership performance—Technical Skills (-.251), Collegial Relationships (-.140), and Role Awareness (-.190). This would indicate that when controlled for supportive relationships, the group means for Cohort I, relative to Cohort II, are consistently lower.5

The results for the sub-group, Preparation Program Components, are presented in Table 4.3. Again, the results suggest, as with Model I, that the preparation program components have a milder, somewhat variable impact on the dimensions of leadership performance in the model. With respect to the leadership performance dimension of Technical Skills, Problem-Based Learning (.222) was significant (p < .10). With respect to Collegial

5As this trend continues, the possible reasons for this outcome will be discussed later in this chapter.
Relationships that Promote Socialization, two variables, Summer Training Institute (.224) and Reflective Seminars (.305) were significant at p < .10 and p < .05, respectively. With respect to Role Awareness, Operational Workshops (.355) was significant (p < .05).

Table 4.3
Model II: Standardized Beta Coefficients for Preparation Program Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Technical Skills</th>
<th>Collegial Relationships</th>
<th>Role Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation Program Components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Course Work</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Training Institute</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.224**</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-Based Learning</td>
<td>.222**</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.179†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Seminars</td>
<td>.193†</td>
<td>.305*</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Workshops</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.355*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 1</td>
<td>-.210*</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>-.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 3</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05
**p < 0.10
† close to p < 0.10 level of significance

The relationship between the levels of significance in the variables that comprise the components of the preparation program and the three dimensions of leadership performance are not easily distinguishable. The potential link between technical skills and operational workshops is a logical one, but not necessarily applicable to the problem-based learning component,
other than the fact that the context of problems and issues integrated in the PBL sessions may address a foundation of technical knowledge and skills.

In the area of Collegial Relationships that Promote Socialization, both the Summer Training Institute (.224) and Reflective Seminars (.305) are significant at \( p < .10 \) and \( p < .05 \) respectively. One might surmise that the respondents felt slightly more positive about the impact of these program components on the development of Collegial Relationships. Both components may have presented opportunities for respondents to network or link with individuals and resources within the department that would impact their socialization processes. Nonetheless, it is must be acknowledged that the small sample size and wider variability in perceptions regarding the relative value of program components is what is clearly reflected in these results.

The adjusted \( R^2 \) for the three dimensions of leadership performance at this level of regression analysis present a range of .359 to .428, estimating that 36% to 43% of the variance is due to the variables included in the model. However, 57% - 64% of the variance may still be due to other factors.

The results for the sub-group, Administrative Internship, are provided in Table 4.4. Contrary to the results presented in Model I, all of the variables are significant across the three dimensions of leadership performance, with one variable, Role Awareness (.140), being relatively close to an acceptable level of significance (\( p < .10 \)). The results suggest that when controlled for
cohort, all variables had an impact on the three dimensions of leadership performance. The differences in the degree of impact were not great, which may further suggest that when viewed as a whole, the components of the internship had a comprehensive, collective impact on the three dimensions of leadership performance.

Table 4.4
Model II: Standardized Beta Coefficients for Administrative Internship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Technical Skills</th>
<th>Collegial Relationships</th>
<th>Role Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Experience in the Internship</td>
<td>.261*</td>
<td>.215*</td>
<td>.263*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff Relationships</td>
<td>.204**</td>
<td>.326*</td>
<td>.393*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with Others</td>
<td>.283*</td>
<td>.285*</td>
<td>.177†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 1</td>
<td>-.190*</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.140**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 3</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>-.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05  
**p < 0.10  
† close to p < 0.10 level of significance

The Adjusted R² for the three dimensions of leadership performance, with respect to the variables in the sub-group, Administrative Internship, present a range of values from .397 for Technical Skills to .495 for Role Awareness. This indicates that nearly 40% to 49% of the variance may be due
to the collective sub-groups in the model. However, it must still be
acknowledged that 51% -60% of the variance may still be due to other factors.

The negative effect for Cohort I, as compared to the reference group Cohort II, has remained consistent at all levels of analysis in the model. In an attempt to delve a bit deeper into the possible reasons for the group means for Cohort I to be consistently lower, a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), was conducted to examine the differences in group means across the three cohorts for all of the variables included in the model.

**ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (ANOVA)**

The results of the One-Way ANOVA for the three cohorts are presented in Table 4.5. In support of the results of the regression analysis on Model II, we see a general trend where the means for the outcome variables are consistently lower for Cohort I. The $F$ statistic becomes larger as the differences in means becomes greater. In examining the outcome variables—Technical Skills, Collegial Relationships, and Role Awareness—the differences in means are not significant.

---

6 An Independent Samples T-test for Cohort I was conducted prior to the One-Way ANOVA, to examine the differences in means for all items in the survey. However, the results were inconclusive and unfortunately, did not allow for comparison between cohorts. Therefore, the results are omitted from this discussion.
Table 4.5  
One Way ANOVA for Program/Cohort Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Cohort I N = 21</th>
<th>Cohort II N = 36</th>
<th>Cohort III N = 37</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Skills</td>
<td>23.270</td>
<td>26.000</td>
<td>25.806</td>
<td>1.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial</td>
<td>23.000</td>
<td>24.194</td>
<td>24.135</td>
<td>.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>24.333</td>
<td>25.956</td>
<td>24.972</td>
<td>1.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Relationship</td>
<td>27.000</td>
<td>23.758</td>
<td>26.351</td>
<td>3.481*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort Relationship</td>
<td>17.286</td>
<td>18.083</td>
<td>16.595</td>
<td>2.905**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with</td>
<td>17.738</td>
<td>18.672</td>
<td>18.281</td>
<td>.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation Program Components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Course Work</td>
<td>14.524</td>
<td>15.556</td>
<td>15.686</td>
<td>1.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Training Institute</td>
<td>15.667</td>
<td>15.861</td>
<td>15.865</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-Based Learning</td>
<td>15.476</td>
<td>15.528</td>
<td>14.378</td>
<td>1.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Seminars</td>
<td>16.238</td>
<td>15.722</td>
<td>16.622</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Workshops</td>
<td>16.238</td>
<td>17.083</td>
<td>16.351</td>
<td>.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Internship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff Relationships</td>
<td>26.514</td>
<td>26.750</td>
<td>25.722</td>
<td>.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with Others</td>
<td>26.048</td>
<td>26.083</td>
<td>24.761</td>
<td>1.454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05  
** p < 0.10  

In the dimension of Supportive Relationships, the mentor relationship (F = 3.481) is significant at p < .05 and the cohort relationship (F = 2.905) is significant at p < .10. An examination of the differences in means across
groups indicates that Cohort II had the lowest group mean (23.758) for a mentor relationship. This was a surprising outcome, as this was the group that had no trained mentor or had variable access to a mentor. However, an examination of comments drawn from the survey for members of this group implies that to some degree, in the absence of an assigned mentor during the course of the program, respondents relied on a principal who may have mentored them prior to their entry into the preparation program. In other cases, resourceful individuals sought and identified individuals who eventually mentored them in various ways and over a period of time.

Cohort III and Cohort I reported lower means for the cohort relationship (16.595 and 17.286 respectively). The $F$ statistic (2.905) indicates that the difference is significant ($p < .10$). This may suggest that the cohort may be an important component as respondents matriculate through the program, but the general impact, with respect to the specific indicators, may be variable at best.

The results of the One-Way ANOVA for the two other dimensions of the program did not present a substantial impact, when examined for the differences in group means. In general support of the results of the regression analysis on Model II, Cohort I in general, presents lower group means across all dimensions, particularly when the relationship between the program components and the outcome variables are considered. Realistically, there is a
range of plausible reasons for the discrepancy consistently identified in Cohort I. Perhaps, the entire experience for the members of the cohort was simply not comparable, as compared with the members of the other two cohorts. The difference could also be due to sampling error, or perhaps, the passage of time and a broader exposure to a range of knowledge, experience, and skill development, has resulted in members of the group identifying decreased value in the dimensions of the preparation program and increased value in the experiences and knowledge gained from other activities. This could very well be true and the implications will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter. Nonetheless, it must be acknowledged that an analysis of variance is best conducted with a large sample, and the small sample (N = 94) in this study does not present an appropriate context for reliable analysis.

Summary of Results for Model II: Regression Analysis for Cohorts

In general, the results of data analysis on Model II parallel the results presented by the analysis of Model I. When considered as separate dimensions of the preparation program, the supportive relationships provided by a mentor or by members of the cohort were significant across all dimensions of leadership performance, when controlled for membership in any one of the cohorts. The contribution of a mentor, in promoting an awareness and understanding along the three dimensions of leadership performance were
slightly more valuable when compared to relationship with and contribution of members of the cohort or any other colleagues.

All of the dimensions of the Administrative Internship—daily experiences, faculty/staff relationships, and relationships with others—were significant for all dimensions of leadership performance, when controlled for cohort group membership. In particular, faculty and staff relationships appeared to have the largest impact on the development of collegial relationships that promote socialization and role awareness.

Preparation program components, such as graduate course work, summer training institute, problem-based learning, reflective seminars, and operational workshops, had a variable impact, if any, across all dimensions of leadership performance.

Collectively, the results from the analysis of Model II suggest that the programmatic components of any preparation program for aspiring educational leaders should be supported by field-based components that would serve to provide skills, knowledge, and dispositions that would promote the development of a meaningful perspective of leadership. Such a perspective would further promote a focus on collegial, collaborative relationships and support for the processes of both organizational and professional socialization.

Finally, the results from Model II also showed that the means for Cohort III were very similar to those of Cohort II, the reference group in the model.
This outcome appears to suggest that despite differences in components of their respective programs, members of the cohort maintained similar perceptions regarding the overall value of their program. This might further suggest that the various elements are not specific or isolated in their impact, such that a broad, comprehensive program that addresses a range of needs may be a potential solution.

The means for Cohort I were consistently lower, when compared to the reference group. A range of plausible explanations have been offered in the discussion, which present implications for further investigation and research. These implications will be discussed more completely in the next chapter.
Chapter 5
Discussion of Findings, Implications, Conclusion

SUMMARY AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The increased focus on accountability for student learning and various school reform initiatives, along with the changing social fabric in schools and communities across the nation (Murphy & Beck, 1994), have made the roles and responsibilities of educational leaders increasingly more complex and challenging (McCarthy, 1999; Young, Petersen, & Short, 2002). Grogan and Andrews (2002) have suggested that the educational leader in today's schools cannot meet the challenges of the job alone and thus, must be a leader of leaders. Others (Leithwood & Duke, 1999; Kelley & Peterson, 2002) have suggested that educational leaders, in the context of contemporary American society, must become transformational leaders.

In the complex and challenging world of an educational leader, there has been much focus on the need for reform in the way we prepare educational leaders (McCarthy, 1999; Kelley & Peterson, 2002). McCarthy (1999) highlights the work of professional organizations—the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA), and the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA)—in leading the commitment and some of the
collective efforts to improve leadership preparation. In 1994, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA), in conjunction with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) initiated a consortium to establish national standards for school administrators.

The six standards, developed by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) and adopted by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Educators (NCATE) in 2002, present a unified framework to guide the future development and implementation of preparation programs for educational leadership (National Policy Board for Educational Administrators, 2002; Jackson & Kelley, 2002). However, while there has been increased discussion and focus on the content and form of preparation programs for aspiring educational leaders, along with efforts by professional organizations, colleges and universities to institute a variety of reform measures, the general structure of preparation for educational leaders has remained generally unchanged (Murphy, 1991a; McCarthy, 1999).

With the intent of contributing to the broader body of research literature on preparation programs for educational leadership, this study has examined the components of a preparation program and the relationships or links to the dimensions of leadership practice and performance, as perceived by those beginning leaders who have recently completed such a program. Further, since program components and requirements have varied to a degree among
the three cohort groups included in the study, a related purpose was to see if the variability in program components may have had an impact on the perceptions and attitudes held by any particular cohort group.

The conceptual framework for this study has been drawn from three primary sources. First, a case study by this researcher (Shiraki, 2003), which examined the value of the field-based components of a preparation program, suggested that the contribution of a site-based mentor during the internship and a cohort structure had a substantial impact on the emerging attitudes and perceptions of these beginning educational leaders and their ability to understand and manage the range of responsibilities confronting an educational leader. This study highlighted the potential value of a mentor, cohort, and administrative internship, and provided a framework for the design of the study and focus for one of the research questions.

Second, a study by Heck (1995), examined the impact of organizational and professional socialization on the performance of new administrators. This study was designed to explore the direct and indirect relationship between variables associated with organizational and professional socialization on three dimensions of assistant principal job performance. The conceptual framework of this study served to lay the foundation for the model developed and tested in this study.

Third, several studies by Daresh and Playko (1991, 1992b, 1997),
identified the critical areas of need of beginning principals. The dimensions of
technical skills, socialization, and role awareness, emerged as critical to the
success of beginning principals and thus, served to frame the dependent or
outcome variables, which describe the dimensions of leadership performance in
this study.

In addition, the development of a conceptual framework for this study
was supported by a comprehensive review of the literature. In particular, the
research base on the specific field-based program components, along with the
current policy discussions on the future of preparation programs for
educational leaders, served to lay a foundation for the conceptual framework
that was being formulated. The impact of cohort learning communities,
mentors, and field-based internships highlight the value of these components
in a well-designed preparation program for educational leaders (Cordeiro,
Krueger, Parks, Restine & Wilson, 1992; Barnett, Basom, Yerkes, & Norris,
2000; Scribner & Donaldson, 2001; Basom, 2002; Norris, Barnett, Basom &
Yerkes, 2002; Daresh and Playko, 1990, 1992a, 1997; Daresh, 1995; Crow and
Matthews, 1998; Codeiro & Smith-Sloan, 1995; Daresh & Playko, 1992;
Hackmann, Russell, & Elliot, 1999; Hackmann, Schmitt-Oliver, and Tracy,
2002; Morgan, Hertzog, & Gibbs, 2002).

The contextual focus of each of these components suggests an
interrelated, integrated dimension that would serve to foster the design of a
meaningful, comprehensive preparation program. For example, Daresh (1995), along with Crow and Matthews (1998), posit that training for mentors is a critical component of a successful administrative internship. A range of similar themes link various program components and collectively lay a foundation for a conceptual framework that suggests the value of designing and implementing a comprehensive preparation program that includes a well-developed, integrated field-based component, along with other venues for meaningful support.

**DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS**

The discussion of findings is organized by the three research questions of the study as stated in Chapter 1. The research questions focus on the impact of three dimensions of a preparation program on the dimensions of leadership performance that impact program, practice, and socialization processes. The first question is addressed in Model I and Model II, both of which examined the value of the field-based program components along with other preparation program variables. The second research question is addressed primarily by Model I, and in part by Model II, which examined the differences in perception of the value of program components as related to membership in a specific cohort group. The third research question is addressed solely by Model II,
which examined the differences in the perception of value of program components between three cohorts.

**Research Question 1**

*Do mentors and field-based internships have a collective impact on the preparation, practice and socialization of beginning educational leaders?*

The results from the analysis of multiple regression on Model I identified a problem in assessing the collective value of these two field-based components. As was discussed in the analysis of Model I in Chapter 4, the variables in the model were all significantly correlated. As a result, when the variables in the administrative internship dimension were added into the model, their importance declined and it appeared that the variables which comprised the dimension of the administrative internship were less significant than originally anticipated. Nonetheless, the results indicated that the contributions of a mentor and administrative internship were both valuable.

These findings lend support to the existing research and current focus on the inclusion of field-based internships as a critical component in the preparation of educational leaders (Daresh & Playko, 1992; Morgan, Hertzog, & Gibbs, 2002). However, as Daresh and Playko (1992) indicate, the limitations of a field-based internship persist when it is not integrated with other relevant dimensions of a comprehensive preparation program. This
implies that efforts must be made to integrate emerging knowledge and understanding of theory with practice throughout the preparation program.

The findings from the analysis of Model II, which examined the differences in program variables across cohort groups did not support the length of the internship as a critical factor. As compared to Cohort II, the only group that did not have the benefit of the internship, Cohort III, the group with a full year internship, found it only slightly more valuable across all three dimensions of leadership performance. On the contrary, Cohort I felt that the one-semester internship was less valuable, as compared to Cohort II. However, it must be acknowledged that the results indicated that Cohort I held to a lower perception of value for all aspects of their preparation program across the three dimensions of leadership performance as compared with Cohort II. While this phenomenon could be due to sampling error, another consideration could be that the passage of time impacted the perceptions of Cohort I, the group with the most experience as educational leaders at the inception of the study.

As Daresh and Playko (1992) indicate, field-based internships often prepare individuals for the world of schools at the present and the world of schools in the past. Little is provided to help individuals deal with or anticipate future realities. From this perspective, as individuals gain more experience
over time and confront the realities of educational leadership they may, as a result, attribute a declining value to the internship.

Another perspective is offered by Bratlein and Walters (1999, in Grogan & Andrews, 2002). In a study of principals and superintendents, their jobs and preparation programs, areas of weakness in one program were cited as areas of strength in another program. No clear picture of the strength or shortcoming of typical preparation programs emerged. Ultimately, respondents were not overly critical of their programs. This effect may be reflected in the differences between cohorts. In general, all groups held positive perceptions of their program. Perhaps the differences between the results between groups are not clearly indicative of any relative strength or weakness in program components. The results may simply reflect how a group of individuals responded to a set of survey items.

Similarly in Model I, the dimensions of the mentor relationship were found to be significant across all dimensions of leadership performance. These results were also found in Model II. This suggests that all groups found the relationship with a mentor to be a valuable component of the preparation program. Curiously, both Cohort I and Cohort III felt less positive about the value of their relationship with their mentor, or even having a mentor, as compared to Cohort II, the group that had no mentor, or variable access to a mentor. This may be related to the fact that beyond simply showing interns
how things work or focusing on the technical dimensions of the job, mentors must model effective leadership practices and facilitate the processes of socialization and reflective inquiry. As both Daresh and Playko (1992a) and Crow and Matthews (1998) suggest, training for mentors is also a critical component that enhances the quality of the entire internship experience. Therefore, it is not sufficient to simply assign a mentor to an intern, a mentor must be able to model and guide an intern through a complex induction and socialization process.

The results may also reflect a context of variable experiences that occurred during the internship due to the manner in which mentors were assigned to proteges or interns during the years included in this study. In most cases, mentors were assigned in consultation with district or complex area superintendents. As a result, the vacant administrator positions that existed at the time of placement and schools requiring additional administrative support were factors that may have impacted intern placement and consequently, assignment to a mentor. As was mentioned in Chapter 3, in some cases, supervising principals became mentors simply due to the fact that they occupied the position. This context suggests that matching mentors and interns be given consideration to the degree that is possible (Crow & Matthews, 1998). A study by Parkay (1988) found that mentoring relationships develop optimally when mentor and intern share a similar style of thinking. Therefore,
mentors and interns may be paired according to similar styles and ideologies. In total, pairing of mentors and interns according to criteria, along with appropriate training for mentors, may result in more optimal developmental outcomes in beginning leaders.

The work of Hart (1993) in organizational and professional socialization presents another factor to consider in the perceptions of the mentor/intern relationship and outcomes of the socialization process. In the process of professional socialization, a predecessor or mentor has a definite impact on the norms, values, and behaviors of a new educational leader. Similarly, Greenfield (1985) points out that one of the primary objectives of professional socialization is moral socialization, which is concerned with the values, beliefs, and attitudes required to perform adequately in the role. A mentor, by virtue of position, experience, and inherent power may have an impact on the moral socialization of an intern. In some cases, the intern may feel compelled to adopt the values and beliefs held by the mentor. In other cases, some of the values and beliefs may also be embedded in the culture of the organization.

Further, a mentor, who is also acting as the immediate supervisor of an intern, may be perceived as a “boss” or gatekeeper. The evaluation of an intern by a mentor will often determine the future of that educational leader. A mentor, may also influence, either overtly or covertly, informally or formally, the future career options for an intern. Within the organizational structure,
there is always a succession of supervisors, beginning with a mentor, that may influence the intern’s future access to desired positions in the educational organization. All of these factors, to some degree, may have an impact on the relationship between a mentor and intern, as well as the perceptions of the contribution and value of a mentor.

With the administrative internship and mentoring (Daresh & Playko, 1992) further research is necessary to examine and assess the collective impact of the two field-based components. Daresh (1995) also reports the lack of systematic analysis of the benefits of mentoring as a component of the preparation program. As a result, the benefits of mentoring may largely be assumptive rather than actual. Further studies must provide greater clarity to the potential benefits of mentoring, as well as the purposes of the mentoring program.

Crow and Matthews (1998) suggest that the collective consideration of the benefits and value of the internship, paired with mentoring, highlight the importance of conducting a systematic program evaluation. Such an evaluation should include a needs assessment and an evaluation of the content, features, and instructional methods of all the components in the preparation program. This suggestion highlights a critical point. Very often program evaluation processes are designed to examine outcomes and efforts are instituted to gather outcome data. It is equally as important for program evaluation to
examine features of the program, including content, form, and organization of various components, as well as the program as a whole. Sirotnik and Kimball (1996) further suggest that program evaluation and related activities should be formative, with data collected in the context of action. Data should be sought from all stakeholder groups and must be utilized to inform program decisions.

While the results from the data analysis in this study identify the value of the field-based components, such as a mentor and internship, further research is necessary to examine the collective value of both dimensions. Additionally, as the literature appears to suggest, more consideration must be given to defining with greater clarity, the purposes and intended outcomes of such field-based measures within the context of a more comprehensive preparation program (Daresh, 1995).

**Research Question 2**

*When considered collectively, do the components of a preparation program for beginning educational leaders have a substantial impact on the preparation, leadership practice, and socialization of beginning educational leaders?*

Research Question 1 examined the impact of the mentor relationship and the administrative internship as components of the preparation program. Similar results were reported for the value of the cohort relationship in both
models. This appears to support the claim that cohorts serve to build a sense of community among students, as well as provide a strong system of support. The community that develops within the group provides individuals with opportunities to practice and develop skills they will need to utilize as school leaders (Yerkes, Basom, Norris, & Barnett, 1995). Norris and Barnett (1994) found that cohorts help individuals to understand the benefits of dynamic interactions in a community of learners. As the group becomes stronger and more cohesive, the development of the individual is also enhanced. Ultimately, the development of the individual may result in better leadership practices.

When considered collectively, none of the components of the preparation program—graduate course work, summer training institute, problem-based learning, reflective seminars, and operational workshops—were consistently found valuable across all dimensions of leadership performance. In isolation, some components of the preparation program were significant, such as Operational Workshops for the development of Technical Skills, Reflective Workshops for the development of Collegial Relationships that Promote Socialization, and Operational Workshops for Role Awareness. In Model II, Problem-Based Learning was significant for the development of Technical Skills, Reflective Workshops and Summer Training Institute for the development of Collegial Relationships, and Operational Workshops for Role Awareness.
In these cases, examination of the individual survey items in each variable cluster indicated that much of the value, as indicated by higher means and stronger $t$ values, was related to opportunities to develop relationships and network with colleagues. For example, the strongest indicator for Problem-Based Learning was that it allowed for interaction in a small group. While collaboration and collegial support is a critical leadership skill, Problem-Based Learning must also guide the development of problem solving processes.

Sometimes, within a training or classroom context, group efforts are often directed toward meeting group outcomes. As a result, the time for thinking and reflection is compromised. The benefit of constructivist learning strategies, as applied in this context, will possibly result in promoting more optimal development of problem solving ability. It must also be acknowledged that in the day-to-day life of an educational leader, not all decisions will be made by a group; therefore, it is essential that at some point in time, leaders are able to render decisions based on individual problem solving processes, again suggesting the benefits of incorporating constructivist learning strategies.

Nevertheless, these findings lend further support for the inclusion of a practical, field-based component in a comprehensive preparation program (Cooper & Boyd, 1988; McCarthy, 1999). The components of the preparation program, such as graduate course work, reflective seminars, workshops,
training, etc. need to be connected in a meaningful way to develop effective leadership practice as an educational leader (Sirotnik & Kimball, 1996; Young, Petersen, & Short, 2002).

In addition, there needs to be continued dialogue between institutions of higher education and state/district agencies to develop a meaningful framework for a comprehensive preparation program that does more than simply impart skills and knowledge (McCarthy, 1999). Building upon this foundation, a commitment among various stakeholders toward defining a common vision and interdependent efforts and the realization of mutually agreed upon goals is optimal (Young, Petersen, & Short, 2002). These perspectives suggest that we continue to work collaboratively to redefine preparation programs so that various components reflect the goals, values, and intent/outcomes of contemporary leadership (Sirotnik & Kimball, 1996; Young, Petersen, & Short, 2002). As with other field-based initiatives, continued feedback from practitioners in the field and research are necessary in order to effectively determine the goals and outcomes that are necessary to promote the practice of leadership (McCarthy, 1999).

Further, these results indirectly suggest that a preparation program, in and of itself, may not be sufficient to meet the goals and challenges of contemporary educational leadership. As Daresh (1990) suggests, it must be
part of a comprehensive model that links pre-service preparation with ongoing professional development throughout the career of a leader.

Additionally, in the context of building a community of both leaders and learners, creating opportunities for teacher leadership would be a meaningful developmental activity (Lambert, 2002), particularly if many of our aspiring educational leaders continue to move along a career pathway, rising from the ranks of teachers to become principals and other educational leaders.

**Research Question 3**

*In considering the differences in program requirements across cohorts, were there any differences in the impact of program components or elements on the preparation, leadership practice, and socialization of beginning educational leaders?*

The results of the analysis on Model II, which was conducted specifically to examine the differences that occurred across cohorts, indicated relatively similar perceptions between Cohort II and Cohort III, although the field-based components differed greatly for the two groups. This suggests that although preparation programs may differ in organization, content, and form, there is not a substantial difference in individual or group perceptions of the impact on leadership performance, particularly with respect to the three dimensions examined in this study.
Across all cohorts, a common theme was the usefulness of the preparation program in providing an opportunity to build relationships and network with colleagues. The means for individual items in each variable cluster were generally higher for items related to building relationships and networking. The opportunity to foster group interaction and build a network of support is generally thought to be a natural outcome of a cohort (Basom, 2002; Norris, Barnett, Basom, & Yerkes, 2002).

A case study of beginning assistant principal interns (Shiraki, 2003), lends further support to the notion that these relationships among members are critical to both the personal and professional growth of new leaders, particularly as they grappled with becoming socialized, both organizationally and professionally. One female intern shared that her mentor principal wanted her to work through problems on her own. Consequently, she often called upon her cohort colleagues and tapped them for both professional expertise and personal support. All of the individuals in this case study reported the need for support from their colleagues to varying degrees, sometimes to problem solve, at other times for collegial support. One male intern also highlighted that connecting with fellow cohorts sustained him through some of the most difficult periods of the internship and preparation program, when it seemed he had no one else to turn to. Across all cases, members of the cohort appeared to have developed strong professional and personal bonds.
Basom (2002) also notes that the role of the instructor or facilitator is critical in building a learning community within a cohort structure. Consequently, as with other components of a preparation program, it is not sufficient only to create the structure of a cohort by having individuals enter and proceed through a program together. In addition, the group must be guided to listen and value the ideas and opinions of others, toward the larger goal of building community and collaborative structures among professional colleagues.

To develop these structures, a context must be set for the collective development of members of the cohort, particularly as related to skills for working in groups (Scribner & Donaldson, 2001) and critical reflection (Basom, 2002). Theories of adult learning and development may serve as a foundation or guide to the creation of learning communities in a constructivist learning environment (Basom, 2002). Such an environment could include a problem-based learning approach. However, it is not so much the approach as it is developing and utilizing new skills and internalizing new professional behaviors that support collaborative group processes.

An unanticipated outcome was the difference in perception between Cohort I and Cohort III across all variables in the dimensions related to the preparation program and dimensions related to leadership performance. The group means for Cohort I were consistently lower as compared to Cohort II.
Again, Cohort I was the group with a one semester internship and a site-based mentor. Earlier, one of the possible explanations given, beyond sampling error, was the fact that given more experience and more time as educational leaders, the members of this group relied less on the dimensions of the preparation program to support them as they met the complex responsibilities of their lives. The data analysis suggested some possible explanations but remained inconclusive for the reasons underlying this unanticipated outcome. This poses an area for further investigation and research.

As with other components of the preparation program there has been little research on the effect of cohorts (Barnett, Basom, Yerkes, & Norris, 2000; Scribner & Donaldson, 2001). Consequently, Barnett, et al. (2000) suggest a continued expansion of the research agenda to link the cohort learning structure with individual perceptions of on-the-job performance, along with other objective measures or indicators of job performance.

**Summary of the Findings**

In a general sense, the findings from this study collectively begin to frame the context of the future efforts that must occur in the area of educational leadership preparation programs.

First, the focus of this study has been to examine relationships between preparation program components and the development of dimensions of
leadership in beginning educational leaders. Although the results suggest that, as a whole, preparation programs are valuable and necessary, maintaining an isolated focus on pre-service preparation is simply not enough. The breadth and depth of complexity and challenges facing practicing educational leaders at all levels of the organization will continue to require ongoing, systematic, and meaningful professional development. This suggests new roles for individuals and groups or organizations involved in providing professional development for educational leaders. The future role of the university and departments of educational administration should be explored, as well as the role of inservice professional development that is provided within the public school system. As mentioned earlier, it appears that the future efforts of the university and the Hawaii State Department of Education must be more collaborative and clearly focused on promoting integrated outcomes that support the professional development needs of educational leaders.

Second, if endeavors to craft meaningful preparation programs and professional development are paramount, then there is a need for ongoing program evaluation, and other forms of assessment that would provide evidence of the progress toward necessary goals and outcomes for educational leaders. Evaluation procedures should be designed to evaluate program features, such as content, form, organization, and instructional methodology,
as well as program outcomes. The evaluation would further provide a context and framework for ongoing professional development needs in the field.

Third, as the results appear to indicate, the field-based components of the preparation program, including a mentor and an internship, have relative value. There is also sufficient evidence that a cohort program structure and any other opportunities to build relationships are also of value. It suggests that these components should be included as part of a comprehensive, well-balanced program. Additionally, some consideration must be given to the other components currently included in the program to ensure that their inclusion also promotes the goals and outcomes of the program. It is not sufficient to simply include various program components because they seem to have some inherent value. The value of each component and the contribution to a comprehensive preparation program must be linked to analysis of appropriate data and ongoing research efforts that serve to link program features and outcomes with the future needs and success of educational leaders. Graduate course work, seminars, and workshops are essentially valuable components; however, they should reflect program goals and be integrated with other program components in a meaningful way. This task will require thinking, planning, and action that is collaborative and taps on the expertise of all of those individuals who have a role in the preparation of future educational leaders. Again, this may suggest different roles for university programs in
educational administration/leadership and the similar efforts made by the Hawaii State Department of Education.

Finally, in all areas, there is a vital need for further research in dimensions of educational leadership, and particularly in the preparation and ongoing development of educational leaders. There are many different areas that appear to be valuable, but need further validation through empirically-based research efforts.

Some of these points will be discussed in greater detail in the next section which addresses the future implications of the study.

**IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY**

In this study a model of variables has been proposed and tested. This section presents a discussion of the implications of the study, highlighting implications for policy, practice, and future research.

**Implications for Policy**

The results of this study, which offers a perspective of preparation for educational leadership that is more comprehensive and promotes a balance between theory and practice, further suggests a new lens for examining policy formation and decisions regarding the preparation and professional development of educational leaders. We may have been searching for solutions
that ensure all new educational leaders are adequately prepared to meet the complex and challenging demands of their jobs. Perhaps it is not merely the coursework or the field-based components that should drive our inquiry. Further, even the national standards for educational leaders alone will not improve the preparation and professional development of beginning leaders and is far too limiting a perspective by which we are able to frame a meaningful preparation program for educational leaders (Young, Petersen, & Short, 2002).

One potential avenue is to frame a focus on the preparation of educational leaders around the goals, values and outcomes of leadership (Sirotnik & Kimball, 1996; Young, Petersen, & Short, 2002). Goals, values and outcomes may present a logical framework through which the skills, knowledge, and dispositions of leadership are reflected. This framework moves the task of preparation beyond deciding what are the essential components of a preparation program to examining the goals and outcomes for creating a contingent of educational leaders that have internalized a set of values that may be reflected in all dimensions of their work as leaders in our schools and educational system.

Grogan and Andrews (2002) state that we must prepare educational leaders to be more than building managers with technical expertise. They suggest that principals become instructional leaders in a community of leaders.
In essence, we may need to form a theoretical perspective that guides the development of preparation programs organized and implemented around the goals of developing leaders with the capacity to become better thinkers and problem solvers, and to guide and lead those processes in others. Szabo and Lambert (2002) suggests that the formal preparation of constructivist leaders reflects a programmatic focus that would enable participants to reflect upon, question, and challenge current ways of thinking, acting, and leading; to clarify, change, and strengthen their values, beliefs, and ways of thinking; and to work at aligning leadership behavior and practice with the strengthened ways of thinking.

Ultimately, beyond a stronger commitment to research and development of programs that prepare educational leaders, there needs to be an equally strong commitment by educational organizations, both the K-12 public schools and institutions of higher learning, to devote both personnel and financial resources to support these efforts. In both cases, additional personnel to carry forth the effort to develop and implement these programs and related professional development activities will be necessary. More essentially, local, state and federal government must acknowledge this need and allocate more financial resources to this effort, particularly in consideration of the local and national shortage of administrators.
Additionally, the promise of research to identify needs, frame future program goals and objectives, and evaluate program features and outcomes cannot be underestimated nor left unfunded. Conducting good research will require both a commitment of time, energy and financial resources. It must be recognized that without further research efforts, we will continue to implement a traditional program structure without an empirically-based understanding of what really works.

In essence, the implications of this study begin to suggest and reflect new and creative ways to set policy that will serve to guide the future of preparation programs for educational leaders. In doing so, we will be able to envision new ways of formulating preparation programs that will promote meaning and success for the next generation of educational leaders. In turn, these efforts will present platforms for more meaningful research.

The results of this study have helped to identify other potential relationships that may exist. These might be explored or examined in more detail as implications for future research are discussed and other research designs and studies are conceptualized and implemented.

**Implications for Practice**

The results of this study reinforce the idea that the preparation of future educational leaders should be a collective responsibility and a
collaborative effort. An essential starting point may be to re-examine the role of the university and state department of education to determine how the relatively isolated efforts may be integrated into a collective vision for the preparation of educational leaders. These efforts would also serve to initiate discussions on how preparation for educational leadership may be made more meaningful through the integration of theory and practice. This is one area that has always appeared to have suffered from a difference in perspective and opinion and as a result, preparation has remained somewhat disjointed. Unfortunately, the outcome might be that practitioners would view theory as divorced or separated from practice when in reality, theory and practice should inform each other.

One other implication, also reflected in the results of this survey, is guided by the emerging understanding that a preparation program alone will never be sufficient in ensuring that the best candidates will be leading our nation’s schools. Thus, we need to continue to develop a model that provides for the career-long professional development needs of all educational leaders, beginning with pre-service preparation. This is reflected in a model suggested by the work of Daresh and Playko (1990). In this model professional development occurs throughout the career and includes the three phases of pre-service preparation, induction, and continuing inservice. All phases are interactive in nature and must be coordinating with the needs and
development of leaders. Consequently, input and feedback must be sought from practitioners who are dealing with the issues in the schools on a daily basis. There is sometimes a mistaken perception that these individuals are so busy that they may not be able to identify the appropriate context of their needs.

Additionally, the external requirements posed by various elements of the educational system and policy decisions that occur outside of the system lead some individuals and other entities to believe that principals and other educational leaders need to have access to particular types of information and skill development that will help them to meet the responsibilities of their jobs. As a result, the organization or system will decide on the type and form of professional development that is necessary. While this may be true in some instances, there is still a fundamental need to include the thoughts, ideas, and opinions of those leaders who are doing the work in the schools. Their input is essential if we are to meet the ongoing career/professional development needs of educational leaders in a meaningful way.

Finally, the findings from this study suggest a need for systematic annual evaluation of the preparation program and other related components. Again, such an evaluation should include the perspective of those who participated in the programs at specific career checkpoints, beginning with their commencement. Program designers and other officials must be able to
confront any and all suggestions for improvement that are linked to clear indicators of what worked and what will continue to be meaningful.

Further, evaluative perspectives from others, including those who supervise educational leaders must also be sought. These perspectives would then serve to balance the perspectives held by the leaders themselves. One of the goals or desired outcomes from this program evaluation effort would be to ensure that the program, in a holistic manner, is continuing to meet the needs of the practicing educational leaders in the system. Evaluation outcomes will also serve to identify the future needs of educational leaders, as well as ensure that program improvements reflect the needs of leaders.

**Implications for Future Research**

The findings from this study highlight the need for further research in numerous areas related to educational leadership. As the literature has indicated, there has been a lack of adequate research in the area of administrator preparation (Murphy & Vriesenga, 2004). Additionally, a vast majority of the research conducted in this area has been framed by surveys that examine the viewpoints of those who completed the program successfully. While survey research is an adequate and appropriate means for examining the attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of a group of individuals (Fowler, 2002), this study has served to identify several important considerations for survey
research. The measures of leadership development and performance will need to be considered carefully as a conceptual model for the study is being formulated. Further, the individual survey items as well as the instrument must be carefully developed in order to optimally ensure the content validity of the instrument.

As the framework of the study was being conceptualized, the researcher attempted to create a model that would bring forth a realization of the importance of the integrated field-based components of a preparation program. It was more than a thought or idea that entered the mind of the researcher and subsequently, was incorporated into a survey design. Much of the conceptual framework of the study was grounded in the limited, yet emerging research literature.

One of the lessons learned from the entire process of developing, implementing and analyzing the results of the study is that it is so essential to carefully and judiciously consider what it is one really wants to measure. In examining the results from the data analysis, what really appeared to be essential for these beginning educational leaders were opportunities to network with colleagues and other stakeholder groups as they came to understand their role within the school and within the structure of the educational system or organization. In retrospect, but also looking ahead to future research agendas, it might have been more appropriate to employ a
framework for a study to examine the impact of program variables on socialization processes. In essence, the development of technical skills and other dimensions of leadership performance included as outcome variables in this study may be more dependent on the outcomes of the development of collegial relationships that serve to support both professional and organizational socialization processes.

There is also a need for other types of research to examine the outcomes and effects of our efforts to prepare educational leaders. Initial efforts at developing a case study approach to this area of research and the subsequent decision to employ a model that incorporated survey research suggests that consideration for future research be framed by blended methods and use of naturalistic designs (Murphy & Vriesenga, 2004). Such a design would allow for an examination of the context of some of the perception outcomes and allow a researcher to delve a little deeper into the reasons why individuals and groups continue to maintain particular perspectives. Murphy and Vriesenga (2004) also recommend programmatic research that is grounded in both comprehensive and longitudinal analyses. These measures will ultimately provide greater depth and breadth to the limited scope and nature of studies conducted in the area of educational leadership.

Consideration of research design also suggest several other studies that are perhaps, extensions of this initial study. First, as was suggested earlier, the
Hawaii State Department of Education (in other states this may be other educational agencies and local school districts), in cooperation with the university and its body of researchers, should work at designing and implementing a program evaluation model, one that would allow for early, formative assessment, while experiences may be recalled in a relevant and meaningful context. The results and findings from an ongoing program evaluation would present a worthy contribution toward identifying the value of preparation programs, as well as suggesting program design and modifications that should be instituted over time.

Second, related to the need to continue research efforts in problem-based learning in a cohort, additional research could be conducted on the development of problem-solving ability incorporating case study approaches. As was suggested by the literature and some of the outcomes of this study, utilizing a cohort approach and a problem-based learning model may not be enough. Perhaps a research agenda that examines the use of a case study instructional approach to the development of problem-solving processes for educational leaders would be an appropriate research focus.

Finally, as an extension of this study and incorporating the original case study of four beginning educational leaders in a state-sponsored preparation program, a context for further research would examine how leadership is impacted by dimensions of a preparation program and initial professional
development activities four years hence. All of the original participants have now had a minimum of four years experience. It would be interesting and valuable to see how, if at all, their professional lives may still be framed by dimensions of the preparation program.

In a real sense this study, with its limited scope and findings presents a context for future research on many different levels. Additionally, there is an important context for meaningful research to be continued in the area of educational leadership, particularly with respect to the initial preparation and long-term professional development of educational leaders. In this way, although the lives of educational leaders will continue to be challenging in many contexts, research efforts will continue to support meaningful and collective efforts to provide the type of essential support that is both necessary and valuable.

CONCLUSION

A study such as this always presents some interesting outcomes, some of which confirmed what was known and understood prior to the study and others which appeared to emerge from the findings.

One point that cannot be overemphasized is the need to provide the necessary and essential attention to research, with a focus on empirically-based theoretical frameworks and study designs. There are many opportunities
for a wide range of research efforts that will provide a context for reform and consistent improvements in the preparation and professional development of educational leaders.

As reform efforts continue, there is a realization that meaningful change will require thoughtful inquiry and honest discussion among various stakeholders, possibly beginning with universities and school districts and/or departments of education. The opportunities for meaningful change will be tied to the quality of efforts that will take place over time, coupled with ongoing evaluation and assessment of program implementation efforts.

Preparation programs and professional development are valued by those who have accepted the challenges of leadership in education. As a result, the sum total of our efforts must continue to support the development of leaders who have the ability to have a meaningful, productive impact on schools and related organizations. These efforts will in turn, continue to have a positive impact on the quality of student learning and achievement.
## Appendix A: List of Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AASA</td>
<td>American Association of School Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPS</td>
<td>Beginning Principal Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSSO</td>
<td>Council of Chief State School Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELCC</td>
<td>Educational Leadership Constituent Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETS</td>
<td>Educational Testing Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC</td>
<td>Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAESP</td>
<td>National Association of Elementary School Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASSP</td>
<td>National Association of Secondary School Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAELP</td>
<td>National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCEEA</td>
<td>National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCPEA</td>
<td>National Council of Professors of Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPBEA</td>
<td>National Policy Board for Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBL</td>
<td>Problem-Based Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID</td>
<td>Standards Implementation Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLLA</td>
<td>School Leadership Licensure Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCEA</td>
<td>University Council of Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B: Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Hawaiian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed (other than Part-Hawaiian)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 and older</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Earned Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Diploma</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree in Educational</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration/Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Position</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant/Vice Principal</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Specialist, District</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Specialist, State</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of School Presently Assigned</strong></td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle/Intermediate School</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-800</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801-1100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101-1500</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501-2000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Prior Positions (may have selected more than one)</td>
<td>No. of Times Selected</td>
<td>Range (In Years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Principal</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Specialist</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Teacher</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1-27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years in Education</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td>6.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years as DOE Educational Officer</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age First Became an Educational Officer</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>7.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years in Current Position</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Teachers</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>56.45</td>
<td>36.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Classified/Support Staff</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30.07</td>
<td>20.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Assistant/Vice Principals</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Means and Standard Deviations for Survey Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supportive Relationships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentor</strong></td>
<td>$\alpha = .918$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentgrow</td>
<td>Mentor aided growth</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentcons</td>
<td>Consulted with mentor</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentrefl</td>
<td>Mentor aided reflection</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentphil</td>
<td>Mentor helped develop philosophy of leadership</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentrel</td>
<td>Mentor helped develop understanding of relationships</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentval</td>
<td>Mentor made preparation more valuable</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentstil*</td>
<td>Still consults mentor</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cohort</strong></td>
<td>$\alpha = .825$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cohsupp</td>
<td>Cohort provided emotional support</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cohasst</td>
<td>Called on cohort for assistance</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cohphil</td>
<td>Cohort helped develop a philosophy of leadership</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cohcont</td>
<td>Maintains contact with cohort</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Colleagues</strong></td>
<td>$\alpha = .777$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collsupp</td>
<td>Administrative colleagues provided support</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collmodl</td>
<td>Administrative colleagues were role models</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colladv*</td>
<td>Other assistant principals in school provided advice</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collasst</td>
<td>Contacted administrative colleagues for assistance</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colltchr</td>
<td>Teachers/staff provided support</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collothr</td>
<td>Principals in district provided support</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Courses</strong></td>
<td>$\alpha = .834$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gradknow</td>
<td>Graduate courses provided knowledge base</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gradnetw</td>
<td>Graduate courses allowed networking</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gradprob</td>
<td>Graduate courses helped resolve problems</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gradrefl</td>
<td>Graduate courses promoted reflection</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Item removed from final model following reliability analysis*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer Institute</strong></td>
<td>$\alpha = .875$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tmknow</td>
<td>Summer institute provided knowledge base</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trnnett</td>
<td>Summer institute promoted networking</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trnprob</td>
<td>Summer institute aided problem solving</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tmrefl</td>
<td>Summer institute promoted reflection</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem-Based Learning</strong></td>
<td>$\alpha = .933$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pblprob</td>
<td>PBL aided problem solving</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pblgrp</td>
<td>PBL provided small group interaction</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pblapp</td>
<td>PBL useful in application</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pbluse</td>
<td>Still use PBL process</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflective Seminars</strong></td>
<td>$\alpha = .953$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semthink</td>
<td>Seminars provided understanding</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semrefl</td>
<td>Seminars allowed for reflection</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semprob</td>
<td>Seminars aided problem solving</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semeffc</td>
<td>Seminars increased effectiveness</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshops</strong></td>
<td>$\alpha = .948$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worktask</td>
<td>Workshops prepared for administrative tasks</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workthk</td>
<td>Workshops helped understanding</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workprob</td>
<td>Knowledge gained aided daily practice</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workeffc</td>
<td>Workshops increased effectiveness</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Internship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Experiences</strong></td>
<td>$\alpha = .898$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expund</td>
<td>Internship provided understanding of responsibilities</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exprefl</td>
<td>Internship promoted reflection</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expnatur</td>
<td>Internship created understanding of school</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explead</td>
<td>Internship provided opportunities to develop</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expment</td>
<td>Internship was enhanced by mentor support</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expreal</td>
<td>Internship framed context of daily administrative practice</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty/Staff Relationships</strong> $\alpha = .891$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frelfacl</td>
<td>Faculty relationships made a better administrator</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frelstaf</td>
<td>Staff relationships made a better administrator</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frelpost</td>
<td>Understanding of creating positive relationships</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freltrus</td>
<td>Opportunities to build trust with staff</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frelgain</td>
<td>Faculty gained positive image of me</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frelrole</td>
<td>Understanding of role as instructional leader</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships With Others</strong> $\alpha = .853$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orelpost</td>
<td>Built positive relationships with parents and families</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orelcomm</td>
<td>Built positive relationships with community</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orelstud</td>
<td>Provided time with students</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orelsch</td>
<td>Importance of school/community relations</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orelund</td>
<td>Bridge gaps between school and parents</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orelprob</td>
<td>Deal with parents students in problem solving</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimensions of Leadership Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Skills</strong> $\alpha = .911$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skleval</td>
<td>Ability to evaluate staff</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sklpers</td>
<td>Ability to manage classified staff</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sklfacil</td>
<td>Ability to maintain school plant and facilities</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skldisp</td>
<td>Implement student discipline guidelines</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sklsped</td>
<td>Implement special education programs</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sklstand</td>
<td>Ability to work on school improvement process</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skltchr</td>
<td>Ability to work with teachers to improve instruction</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collegial Relationships That Promote Socialization</strong> $\alpha = .907$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crelnorm</td>
<td>Awareness of the norms of the school organization</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crelview</td>
<td>Awareness of how faculty/staff view leader</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crelinvl</td>
<td>Ability to encourage stakeholder involvement</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creldevl</td>
<td>Ability to develop relationships with school and community</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crelvis</td>
<td>Ability to communicate a vision of education</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crelcomm</td>
<td>Ability to communicate the goals and purposes of school</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rolepowr</td>
<td>Awareness of power and authority of leader</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roleposi</td>
<td>Awareness of role within structure of the school/district</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rolediff</td>
<td>Ability to make a positive difference</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rolebias</td>
<td>Awareness of personal/professional biases</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rolevis</td>
<td>Awareness of personal vision of leadership</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roleconf</td>
<td>Ability to perform as a confident leader</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Role Awareness  \( \alpha = .936 \)

247
Appendix D: Correlation Matrix for All Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mentorel</th>
<th>cohrel</th>
<th>collrel</th>
<th>gradprep</th>
<th>tmnprep</th>
<th>pblprep</th>
<th>semprep</th>
<th>workprep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mentorel</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cohrel</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collrel</td>
<td>.218*</td>
<td>.417**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gradprep</td>
<td>.238*</td>
<td>.329**</td>
<td>.415**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tmnprep</td>
<td>.358**</td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td>.433**</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pblprep</td>
<td>.289**</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.292**</td>
<td>.340**</td>
<td>.698**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semprep</td>
<td>.299**</td>
<td>.333**</td>
<td>.285**</td>
<td>.473**</td>
<td>.588**</td>
<td>.505**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workprep</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.305**</td>
<td>.251*</td>
<td>.299**</td>
<td>.602**</td>
<td>.532**</td>
<td>.632**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expint</td>
<td>.564**</td>
<td>.384**</td>
<td>.307**</td>
<td>.274**</td>
<td>.409**</td>
<td>.379**</td>
<td>.399**</td>
<td>.443**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frelint</td>
<td>.284**</td>
<td>.262*</td>
<td>.315**</td>
<td>.211*</td>
<td>.372**</td>
<td>.352**</td>
<td>.383**</td>
<td>.480**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orelint</td>
<td>.231*</td>
<td>.286**</td>
<td>.310**</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>.369**</td>
<td>.312**</td>
<td>.374**</td>
<td>.409**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skilead</td>
<td>.323**</td>
<td>.318**</td>
<td>.289**</td>
<td>.344**</td>
<td>.567**</td>
<td>.532**</td>
<td>.545**</td>
<td>.548**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crellead</td>
<td>.377**</td>
<td>.396**</td>
<td>.395**</td>
<td>.460**</td>
<td>.631**</td>
<td>.525**</td>
<td>.650**</td>
<td>.576**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rolelead</td>
<td>.296**</td>
<td>.406**</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>.373**</td>
<td>.574**</td>
<td>.550**</td>
<td>.581**</td>
<td>.663**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
### Appendix D: Correlation Matrix for All Variables (continued)

| mentorel | cohrel | collrel | gradprep | trnprep | pblprep | semprep | workprep | expint | frelint | orelint | skllead | crellead | rolelead |
|----------|--------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|----------|-------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
|          |        |         |           |         |         |         |          | 1.000  | 1.000  | 1.000   |         |         |         |          |
|          |        |         |           |         |         |         |          | .495** | 1.000  |         |         |         |         |          |
|          |        |         |           |         |         |         |          | .530** | .654** | 1.000   |         |         |         |          |
|          |        |         |           |         |         |         |          | .517** | .504** | .528**  | 1.000   |         |         |          |
|          |        |         |           |         |         |         |          | .530** | .603** | .586**  | .773**  | 1.000   |         |          |
|          |        |         |           |         |         |         |          | .530** | .636** | .570**  | .725**  | .860**  | 1.000   |          |

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
Appendix E: Survey Instrument

SURVEY OF BEGINNING EDUCATIONAL LEADERS
Spring 2004

CONFIDENTIAL

The aim of this survey is to learn more about preparation programs for administrators and the impact program components have on perceptions of leadership performance among beginning administrators. The survey is being sent to inservice administrators who completed the Cohort School Leadership Program or the Certification Program for School Leaders between 1999 and 2002. The results of this study will serve to improve training and other supports for future educational leaders.

The survey has been designed with multiple choice items, demographic information and some space at the end for your written comments. Your responses will be treated confidentially and no direct references will be made to you or your school.

Please return the survey in the stamped, self-addressed envelope by Friday, March 5, 2004. Thank you very much for taking the time to participate in this study.

Supportive Relationships

Using the following scale, please indicate by circling the response that most accurately represents the degree to which you agree with the statements listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mentor  
In these questions, “mentor” refers to the primary individual who mentored you in the preparation program/internship, not the principals involved in the summer training. (For CPSL 1 respondents, this may or may not have been the principal of your school.)

1 2 3 4 5 n/a 1. My mentor gave me room to grow on my own.
1 2 3 4 5 n/a 2. When faced with a problem or dilemma, I consulted with my mentor.
1 2 3 4 5 n/a 3. My mentor and I had regular opportunities to engage in reflective dialogue.
1 2 3 4 5 n/a 4. Observing my mentor on a daily basis helped me to develop a philosophy of leadership.
1 2 3 4 5 n/a 5. Having a mentor helped me to understand the dynamic relationships within the school setting.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 2 3 4 5 n/a 6. Having a mentor made my preparation a more valuable experience.
1 2 3 4 5 n/a 7. I still consult my mentor when I have questions related to professional practice.

**Cohort**

*In these questions, “cohort” refers to the members of the group you went through the program with.*

1 2 3 4 5 n/a 8. Members of my cohort provided me with emotional support throughout the preparation program.
1 2 3 4 5 n/a 9. When faced with a problem or dilemma, I called upon members of my cohort for assistance.
1 2 3 4 5 n/a 10. Sharing experiences with fellow cohorts helped me to develop a philosophy of leadership.
1 2 3 4 5 n/a 11. I still remain in contact with members of my cohort.

**Other Colleagues**

1 2 3 4 5 n/a 12. Vice principals in my district and complex provided me with support.
1 2 3 4 5 n/a 13. Other vice principals in my district and complex served as role models for me to emulate.
1 2 3 4 5 n/a 14. When faced with a problem, I turned to other vice principals in my school for advice and support.
1 2 3 4 5 n/a 15. When confronted by a problem or dilemma, I usually contacted a vice principal colleague in my district for assistance.
1 2 3 4 5 n/a 16. Teachers and other staff members provided me with support and positive feedback.
1 2 3 4 5 n/a 17. I sought support from other principals and educational officers in my district.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Preparation Program

### Graduate Coursework

1. The graduate courses in Educational Administration provided me with a knowledge base to utilize in daily practice.

2. The graduate courses allowed me to create professional networks with other educational leaders.

3. The graduate courses have helped me in resolving problems that confront me in daily practice.

4. The graduate courses have helped me become a more reflective school leader.

### Summer Institute

5. The summer training served to provide me with an essential knowledge base that I utilize in daily practice.

6. The summer training allowed me to establish professional networks with other novice administrators.

7. The summer training has helped me to resolve problems that I confront in daily practice.

8. The summer training has helped me to become a more reflective school leader.

### Problem-Based Learning (PBL)

9. The problem-based learning (PBL) component helped me to develop a method for solving problems of practice.

10. The PBL component was enhanced by the opportunity to work in a small group of fellow cohorts.

11. The PBL component is useful when applied to problems I confront as a leader.

12. I still use a PBL process when faced with difficult problem situations.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reflective Seminars

Reflective seminars generally covered topics related to leadership and school improvement. In most cases, these seminars were scheduled periodically throughout the school year. Examples include: governance, moral/transformational leadership, ethics, curriculum leadership, assessment and accountability, etc.

1 2 3 4 5 n/a 30. The reflective seminars allowed me to understand how experienced administrators think and act.

1 2 3 4 5 n/a 31. The reflective seminars allowed me to engage in both group and personal reflection.

1 2 3 4 5 n/a 32. I utilized strategies shared in reflective seminars to deal with problems confronted in daily practice.

1 2 3 4 5 n/a 33. The reflective seminars helped me to become a more effective administrator.

Operational Workshops

The workshops generally focused on areas related to the operational and technical dimensions of leadership. In most cases, these seminars were scheduled periodically throughout the school year. Examples include: Chapter 19, school safety, facilities management, handling personnel issues, hiring staff, civil rights, staff evaluation, special education, etc.

1 2 3 4 5 n/a 34. The content of the workshops helped to prepare me for many of the tasks I handle as an administrator.

1 2 3 4 5 n/a 35. The workshops helped me to understand how experienced administrators think and act.

1 2 3 4 5 n/a 36. I have utilized the content knowledge gained from the workshops to deal with situations confronted in daily practice.

1 2 3 4 5 n/a 37. The workshops helped me to become a more effective school administrator.

Administrative Internship

Please check here if you were a members of the CPSL 1 cohort and had no internship. If checked, please consider your first on-the-job training (OJT) experience in responding to items #38-55.

Daily Experiences

1 2 3 4 5 n/a 38. The experiences during the internship helped me to develop an understanding of the responsibilities of an administrator.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. The internship experiences helped me to be a more reflective administrator.
40. The experiences helped me to understand the ever changing nature of the school organization.
41. The experiences during the internship provided me with many opportunities to develop my leadership skills.
42. The experiences during the internship were enhanced by the support provided by my mentor.
43. The experiences painted a realistic portrait of the context of administration that I would confront in daily practice.

Faculty/Staff Relationships

44. Relationships developed with faculty members during the internship helped me to become a better administrator.
45. Relationships developed with classified staff members during the internship helped me to become a better administrator.
46. The internship helped me to understand the importance of establishing positive relationships with faculty and staff.
47. I had adequate opportunities to work on trust-building with faculty during the course of the internship.
48. During the course of the internship I felt that faculty and staff were able to gain a positive image of me as a school leader.
49. Interaction with faculty helped me to understand my role and responsibility as an instructional leader.

Relationships With Others  Others in this section includes students, parents, and community members.

50. The internship helped me to build positive relationships with parents and families.
51. The internship helped me to build positive relationships with community members.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. The internship allowed me to spend time with students in positive learning experiences.

53. The internship helped to develop an understanding of the importance of developing school-community relationships.

54. The internship helped me to understand my role in bridging gaps of understanding between parents and the school.

55. I had many opportunities to work directly with students and parents in problem-solving situations during the internship.

* * *

Leadership Performance

In the following sections, consider your preparation program as a whole. To what degree did your preparation program influence your perceptions of your leadership ability and performance in the following areas?

Technical Skills

56. Knowledge and ability to evaluate staff

57. Ability to manage clerical, custodial, and food service personnel

58. Ability to maintain school plant and facilities

59. Knowledge and ability to implement student discipline guidelines

60. Knowledge and ability to implement special education programs according to state and federal guidelines

61. Ability to design and implement a data-based improvement process within the framework of the state content and performance standards.

62. Ability to work directly with teachers to improve classroom instruction and student learning
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consider your preparation program as a whole. To what degree did your preparation program influence your perceptions of your leadership ability and performance in the following areas?

**Collegial Relationships That Promote Socialization**

1. Awareness and understanding of the social and cultural norms (the unspoken rules, expectations, etc.) of the school organization
2. Awareness and understanding of how the faculty and staff view an educational leader
3. Ability to encourage involvement by all stakeholder groups in the school community
4. Ability to develop collegial relationships with all members of the school/educational community
5. Ability to communicate a vision of education within the public education system
6. Ability to communicate the goals and purposes of the school to others in the school community

**Role Awareness**

To what degree did your preparation program influence your awareness of your role as an educational leader?

1. Awareness of the organizational power and authority a school leader possesses
2. Awareness of my position as a leader within the organizational structure of the school and district
3. Ability to make a positive difference in the lives of both staff and students
4. Awareness of my personal and professional biases, strengths, and needs
5. Knowledge and awareness of my personal vision of school leadership
6. Ability to perform my leadership responsibilities with confidence
Significance of Program Components

75. Rank order the five most significant components of your preparation program, with 5 being the most significant and 1 being the least significant. Assign each number to any item only once.

___ cohort/peer relationship
___ internship
___ mentor relationship
___ university courses
___ summer training
___ reflective seminars
___ workshops
___ shadowing the superintendent

Demographic Information

This last section asks for information on your background and experiences, along with information about your current work setting.

Gender: ___ male   ___ female

Primary Ethnicity:
___ Black/African American
___ White
___ Hawaiian
___ Part Hawaiian
___ Other Pacific Islander
___ Asian (please indicate) ______________________
___ Mixed (includes mixtures other than Part-Hawaiian)
___ Other (please indicate) ______________________

Age Group: Which best describes your age group?
___ under 30
___ 31 - 40
___ 41 - 50
___ 51 - 60
___ 61 and older

What is your highest earned degree?
___ Bachelor’s
___ Professional Diploma
___ Master’s
___ Doctorate
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Are any of your degrees in Educational Administration or Educational Leadership?
   ___ yes
   ___ no

Number of years in Education: ______

Number of years as an DOE Educational Officer: ______

What was your age when first becoming an educational officer in the state of Hawaii? ______

What is your current position
   ___ principal
   ___ vice principal
   ___ educational specialist, district
   ___ educational specialist, state
   ___ other: __________________________

How long have you been in this position? ______

Prior to your current position, please indicate the number of years for which you held each of the following positions.
   ___ assistant/vice principal
   ___ principal
   ___ educational specialist
   ___ classroom teacher
   ___ other: __________________________

To what type of school are you presently assigned:
   ___ elementary
   ___ middle/intermediate school
   ___ high school
   ___ K-8
   ___ K-12
   ___ 7-12
   ___ other: __________________________

Student enrollment
   ___ less than 500
   ___ 501 - 800
   ___ 801 - 1100
   ___ 1101 - 1500
   ___ 1501 - 2000
   ___ greater than 2000

Number of teachers: ______

Number of classified/support staff: ______

Number of Assistant/Vice Principals: ______
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Participation In Other Areas Of Research

An extension of this study may include individual interviews and/or focus groups. The principal investigator is also designing other research studies that focus on the needs of beginning educational leaders. Please indicate your willingness to participate in any or all of these future endeavors.

I would like to participate in any individual interviews or focus groups related to this study.

Please indicate:  
  ____ interviews  
  ____ focus groups  
  ____ both

I would like to participate in future research studies conducted by this principal investigator.

Comments

Please use this space to clarify or comment upon your responses to any of the items in the survey.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.  
Please take a moment to check that you've responded to every item and return the survey in the enclosed envelope.
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