

ENHANCING INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP Lessons From the California School Leadership Academy

DAVID D. MARSH

University of Southern California

Current thinking about reform in American education emphasizes the need for school principals to serve as instructional leaders. Support for this position is derived from several research bases: site-based management and restructuring (David, 1988; Elmore & Associates, 1990; Malen, Ogawa, & Krantz, 1990); school change (Fullan, 1991; Huberman & Miles, 1984); school improvement (Berman & Gjelten, 1984; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982); policy implementation (Odden, 1991); staff development (Joyce & Showers, 1988; Little et al., 1987); the administrator as instructional leader (Hallinger & Murphy, 1991; Murphy, 1988; Murphy & Hallinger, 1987); and school/district effectiveness (Elmore & Associates, 1990; Murphy, 1990). A common element in these bodies of research is the potential power of the administrator as a significant force in the improvement of the organizational conditions and instructional forces that affect student outcomes.

Murphy (1988), Smith and Andrews (1989), and Duke (1987), however, report that most site administrators are not effective instructional leaders and that major revisions in administrator training are needed to transform the role of the site administrator. Murphy (1988) points to other pressures to reform administrative training including (a) an emerging belief that new models of school organization, governance, and management are needed; (b) a growing disenchantment with the theory movement in administrative training; (c) an increasing disgruntlement with the prevailing university training model; and (d) a growing perception that little has changed in administrative training in the last 30 years.

Murphy and Hallinger (1987), among others, have analyzed traditional patterns of administrator training and found that innovations are needed both

EDUCATION AND URBAN SOCIETY, Vol. 24 No. 3, May 1992 386-409

© 1992 Sage Publications, Inc.

in the content and process of the training. They have identified five content and five process criteria for defining innovative administrative training. Recently, many innovative administrative training programs have been established across the country which meet the criteria established by Murphy and Hallinger. Several of the most significant of these have been state-sponsored efforts that serve sizable populations of administrators and are linked in some way to reform efforts in the state.

It is now possible to examine the results of one of the most prominent of the innovative programs designed to help site administrators become better instructional leaders. The California School Leadership Academy (CSLA) serves aspiring and practicing site administrators in a 3-year program emphasizing the instructional leadership dimensions of site leadership in the context of a comprehensive state-initiated school reform strategy. The academy is both centralized and decentralized in its organization. The central staff coordinates both the development of training materials and the training of trainers to deliver the materials and activities at the regional centers. The training effort itself is decentralized through 14 Administrative Training Centers (ATCs) located throughout the state. Each ATC has a full-time director and usually one or several other full-time staff in addition to a set of trainers.

Each year, approximately 1,500 participants begin the CSLA training at one of 14 regional training sites. The program is made up of three components: core module workshops, follow-through support and networking activities, and comprehensive school improvement projects. The program is designed around a 3-year commitment by participants, to minimize the limitations associated with isolated short-term professional development exercises.

PURPOSE

What use do CSLA graduates make of innovative administrative training that has an instructional leadership focus? A team of researchers at the University of Southern California examined CSLA graduates to learn:

- In what ways, and to what extent, were graduates operating as instructional leaders?
- What influence had CSLA had on this pattern of practice?
- What factors were associated with extensive transfer of the CSLA experience?

The overall purpose of the study was to learn about instructional leadership as it is practiced in schools and about the use of innovative administrative training by site administrators, especially when the training was linked to state reform strategies and focused on instructional leadership.

METHODOLOGY

Sample. A comparative case survey methodology was used to study 44 graduates who had served as site principals for at least 18 months. The graduates were members of the first cohort to complete the CSLA training; they finished their 3-year program in May 1989. The sample was selected in several steps. First, graduates were grouped into five broad geographic regions which, for logistical reasons, excluded the most northern and southern regions of the state. This resulted in excluding 152 of the 1,129 graduates from that cohort. Second, a sample was selected so that each of the five regions was proportionally represented. Within each region, the sample was selected to reflect as much as logistically possible the geographic diversity of the region, ethnicity and gender of the graduates, and the demographic characteristics of the school and district. Graduates in the sample represented 11 of the 14 regional training centers.

Instruments. Data sources included (a) extensive interviewing of the graduate, teachers at the school, and district administrators; (b) shadowing of the principal; (c) classroom observation with the principal, followed by a debriefing interview; (d) teacher questionnaires; (e) a principal questionnaire; and (f) document review. A case survey guide focused the interviews and document review, covering the following topics: personal background of the graduate, school/district/community context of the current job, the CSLA experience as seen by the graduate and district leaders, bridging/training transfer strategies used, and other factors influencing the transfer of training. The case study also focused on the instructional leadership views of the graduate, instructional leadership as practiced by the graduate, and the impact of CSLA on the school/district, including the impact on the local educational reform agenda.

Data collection. Data collection entailed a minimum of three days on-site with each CSLA graduate. Each of the 14 data collectors had extensive field

experience as an instructional leader and six had completed the CSLA experience. Data collectors were provided with extensive training, including establishing reliability on the rating scales, as described in Marsh, McMahon, Pahre, and Sevilla (1990).

Data analysis. Each CSLA graduate was written up as a case study averaging 60 pages in length. The case itself, the principal and teacher questionnaires, the observations and shadowing reports, and documents from the site were combined to form a qualitative and quantitative composite picture of the graduate.

To study the extent of instructional leadership at the site, a conceptual framework of instructional leadership was used to organize items from the principal and teacher questionnaires in order to provide a profile of the extent that functions of instructional leadership were carried out. Ratings of principal's leadership skills—including instructional analysis, developmental supervision, management efficiency, analysis of classroom culture, and reflectivity—were drawn from the observation/shadowing guides. These were analyzed statistically and were combined with case study information to clarify the relationship of views of instructional leadership to actual practice. Factors that influenced the transfer of training were also analyzed, using both qualitative and quantitative techniques (see Marsh et al., 1990).

PATTERNS OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AT SCHOOL SITES

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP: THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The study used two lenses for viewing instructional leadership found in schools where the CSLA graduate served as the principal. The first lens focused on instructional leadership functions as the long-term pattern of practice reported in the principal and teacher questionnaires and the case study. The second lens focused on specific instructional leadership skills, including several dimensions of supervision of instruction in classrooms and several dimensions of broader leadership in the schools. These skills were directly observed by the data collectors and illuminate the capacity of the principal in these areas.

TABLE 1
Instructional Leadership Functions Carried Out by CSLA
Graduates as Perceived by Teachers and the Principal (N = 42)

<i>Instructional Leadership Functions</i>	<i>Mean Scores Across Schools</i>		
	<i>Teachers</i>	<i>Principal</i>	<i>Difference</i>
Mission and goals	1.76	1.77	.01
Managing the education production function	2.02	1.92	.10
Promoting an academic learning climate	2.01	1.76	.25
Developing a supportive work environment	2.08	2.00	.08

NOTE: Scale 1 = High, 5 = Low.

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP: AN ANALYSIS OF FUNCTIONS

Instructional leadership studies have been plagued by conceptual problems. As a result, many studies present a narrow view of instructional leadership defined along specific constraints, such as the individual characteristics of the administrator or the organizational hierarchy. Murphy (1988) has synthesized the literature to provide a holistic framework for the study of instructional leadership. The Murphy framework was used in this study of instructional leadership among the CSLA graduates. A panel of judges confirmed the close fit between the Murphy framework and the content of modules used in the CSLA training.

Murphy (1988) has organized the framework around four major dimensions: developing mission and goals; managing the education production function; promoting an academic learning climate; and developing a supportive work environment. Each dimension is further subdivided into distinct functions that an administrator performs. The functions, in turn, are translated into policies, practices, and behaviors (Murphy, 1988).

Table 1 shows how teachers and principals see each of the four major functions occurring at their school sites. Overall, principals and teachers scored principals high in all areas, with the highest scores seen in the mission and goals function. Managing the education production function, promoting an academic learning climate, and developing a supportive work environment were scored slightly lower than mission and goals. Moreover, teachers and principals are in agreement on all functions carried out by the principals. In essence, teacher and principal perceptions of the instructional leadership functions carried out by CSLA graduates are very similar.

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP: AN ANALYSIS OF SKILLS

In addition to the instructional leadership functions found at the school, we were concerned with several specific leadership skills that were directly observed by our data collectors. These skills include the following:

Instructional leadership: The ability of the principal to carry out developmental supervision and provide curriculum/instructional leadership in the school. A high score would reflect the principal's ability to describe in detail the purpose of instruction and what a teacher had done to achieve the goals and to provide a sophisticated, comprehensive evaluation of the instructional process. In addition, the high score would include the ability to describe at least one appropriate area where a teacher might improve and describe a strategy to accomplish this purpose. The scoring for this component is a cumulative score on three areas of skills: supervision focus, instructional focus, and instructional leadership focus. The dimensions were highly correlated ($r = .87$).

Classroom culture: The ability of the principal to analyze the culture/climate of the classroom. A high score on the classroom culture component would indicate that the principal could characterize the climate of the classroom including such items as feeling tone, type of student engagement, involvement of various ethnic groups in instruction, or group dynamics.

Management efficiency: The ability of the principal to handle management tasks such as scheduling, coordination of noninstructional activities, logistics, and budgeting with efficiency. Management efficiency was rated while field researchers shadowed the principal.

Reflectivity: The tendency of the principal to reflect on management and/or instructional leadership decisions. A high score would indicate that the principal spent time thinking about decisions made in the course of the day or year in terms of their relationship to the goals of the school and of instruction, and the quality of that reflection.

These four skills were assessed by the data collector through two forms of direct observation/interview. The first form involved observing three

classrooms with the principal and then interviewing the principal about what he/she noted about the classroom. The second form involved shadowing the principal before, during, and after the instructional school day. For each skill area, the data collector provided a rating of the principal's skill and a written explanation of the rating. Both forms of observation/interview were carried out in the context of an overall case study of the principal and the school which was conducted by the same data collector.

Unlike Table 1, which presents teacher and principal perceptions, Table 2 shows the results of ratings by the data collector after observing classrooms and shadowing and interviewing principals. Table 2 shows principals as strong in two skills, management efficiency and classroom culture. Principals were strong in their ability to handle management tasks such as scheduling, budgeting, logistics, and coordination of noninstructional activities. Management tasks involve areas related to the school itself and to the individuals within the school. Principals were also strong in noting the classroom culture/climate in their observations. They could describe the feeling tone of the class, the type of student engagement, and the involvement of different ethnic groups in instruction and/or group dynamics.

Principals were moderate in reflectivity skills and moderate to weak in instructional leadership skills. In general, they had a moderate to strong grasp of the types of instruction they observed in classrooms; however, it became more difficult for principals to explain, in detail, what the teacher had or had not done to achieve the goals and/or purposes of the lesson. The greatest area of difficulty for principals was attempting to explain areas of weakness in teachers and how they might improve. Principals were weakest in their ability to have a dialogue with themselves in order to solve problems or arrive at decisions, especially regarding instructional issues.

EXAMINING PRACTICE: RELATIONSHIPS AMONG FUNCTIONS AND SKILLS

Table 3 shows the relationship between management efficiency and instructional leadership. Most of the 44 graduates were efficient managers, but only 14 were rated as both efficient managers and effective instructional leaders. In order to become effective in instructional leadership, the principal must be able to manage an instructional program as well as his/her human resources. Those principals who scored high on management skills but medium on instructional leadership skills may be at a transitional stage in their instructional leadership development and, at the time of this study, had not been able to articulate a full conceptual map for the next step.

TABLE 2
The Number of Principals Rated
High/Medium/Low on Dimensions of Skills (N = 41)

<i>Skill</i>	<i>Ratings</i>		
	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>
Instructional leadership	17	17	8
Instructional analysis			
Instructional leadership			
Supervision focus			
Classroom culture analysis	29	12	0
Management efficiency	29	11	1
Reflectivity	7	24	10

TABLE 3
The Number of Principals Rated High/Medium/Low on Instructional
Leadership and Management Efficiency (N = 42)

		<i>Instructional Leadership</i>		
		<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>
<i>Management Efficiency</i>	<i>High</i>	14	12	3
	<i>Medium</i>	3	5	4
	<i>Low</i>	0	0	1

Reflectivity. Principals who scored high on management efficiency also scored medium to high on reflectivity. The case study analysis indicates, however, that although principals spent time thinking about their decisions, several problems often existed—the quality of their reflection was weak or the time they were spending was insufficient or inadequately used for reflection. Moreover, most principals focused their reflection on management issues rather than on instructional leadership issues. Management skills involve daily activities and, for the most part, routine practices. Routines do not call for innovative, reflective thinking but reactive, standardized thinking.

Reflectivity worked very differently for seven principals. These principals were efficient managers who also were rated highly on their instructional

TABLE 4
Number of Schools Where Teachers Perceive
Slight to Extensive Change in the Last 2 Years (N = 42)

<i>Degree of Change</i>	<i>Number of Schools</i>
Slight	16
Moderate	20
High	6

leadership. The case studies showed these principals reflected on their instructional leadership as well as on management issues.

Degree of change found at the schools. Table 4 displays the degree of change which has occurred over the last 2 years at the 44 schools.

Given the substantial amount of change proposed for California's schools, the findings reported in Table 4 are disturbing. Teachers and principals see the principal as an instructional leader—but in a status quo school! Instructional leadership did not translate into the dynamic momentum needed for the changes envisioned in the curriculum frameworks and other state-initiated reform strategies.

Interestingly, principal reflectivity about instructional leadership was closely associated with the degree of change at the school, as reported by teachers. In all but one of the schools with instructionally focused, reflective principals, teachers reported a major departure from what they were doing 2 years ago. Instructionally focused reflectivity by the principal was associated with major change at the school.

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP: VIEWS AMONG GRADUATES

Two views of instructional leadership were derived from the interviews with principals: a process-oriented and a comprehensive view. In the process-oriented view, the principal views instructional leadership only as the means of involving teachers in decision making or improvement. This is not a view of instruction; instead, it is only a view of the process of involving teachers. The views of process-oriented principals were found to be superficial in several ways and typically involved only process activities.

The comprehensive view of instructional leadership is one in which the principal has a comprehensive view of instruction. This view included the various components of instruction as described by Murphy (1988) as well as of the leadership needed to engage teachers and others in instructional

improvement. These principals included both direct (e.g., developmental supervision) and indirect (e.g., school culture) influences on instruction.

In the interviews, most principals were found to view instructional leadership in the process-oriented fashion, and far fewer principals presented the comprehensive view. This finding is quite surprising, given the extensive attention in the CSLA training to major elements of the comprehensive view of instructional leadership.

A principal with the process-oriented view responded:

Instructional leadership means enhancement of staff abilities. It may mean teachers helping teachers, rewarding change, or helping teachers to overcome insecurity. Instructional leadership means involvement of staff members.

Case 041

Principals who presented the comprehensive viewpoint of instructional leadership may have possessed some process-oriented ideas as well:

An instructional leader understands and makes decisions which improve instruction and curriculum. It goes beyond knowledge (the what) to the processes as well (the how). Through time a common understanding evolves between the administration and the staff as to the ways we do things, the policies and practices. There is an intangible sense about the school, how people relate to each other, the children's attitudes, it is hard to explain.

Case 152

Another principal with a comprehensive view stated:

Instruction of students is more important than running a building. I can promote instructional leadership by providing materials to teachers, supporting what they are doing, and showing them how to move from where they are to where they need to be. Instructional leadership involves reevaluating periodically what is important. By doing so, we keep ourselves on task as well as the children.

Case 043

In the process-oriented view, the principal's main emphasis was on the development of teachers and the development of the school environment. Process-oriented principals focused on easily observed aspects of instructional leadership. They were able to note how many of their staff members had attended workshops or the latest statistics on campus crime, but they could not relate these changes to the curriculum, instruction, or the mission of the school.

Process-oriented principals appear to have quick fix solutions to their problems and external loci of control. Their interviews lacked an emphasis on a school mission and how that mission was articulated to the school community. Rather than broad areas of concern, these principals focused on narrow concerns that easily changed. Most process-oriented principals were effective managers but were not effective instructional leaders or high scorers in Murphy's functions. These principals lacked depth in their understanding of instructional leadership.

Comprehensive-oriented principals wove their understanding of instructional leadership through connecting various aspects of the instructional program. They emphasized a oneness with their staff and an emphasis on children. Their vision included the process-oriented view but also how that view envelops the entirety of their schools. The view also included teachers, students, attitudes, curriculum, instruction, materials, policies, and practices. These principals were not afraid to change their goals as the needs of their schools change.

Analysis of the interviews showed the thinness of process-oriented views of instructional leadership. Responses to Murphy's four functions and subfunctions were either few in number or absent. When asked their views of instructional leadership, most process-oriented individuals would offer lists of characteristics and could not describe specific examples of how the characteristics related to activities they would carry out in their role as an instructional leader. For example,

An instructional leader is a decision maker, communicator, and mission developer.

Case 012

An instructional leader drops notes in teacher's boxes, is highly visible, and arranges schedules so students do not miss the same class repeatedly.

Case 103

Beyond their number of responses related to the Murphy framework, it appears that process-oriented principals lack the ability to connect the various facets of their particular roles as principals. They view instructional leadership as a series of disjointed pieces that need management.

Analysis of the comprehensive-oriented views demonstrated a theme of richness. These principals were more apt to respond to several of the four Murphy functions and to many of the subfunctions. They viewed the importance of supervising and evaluating instruction and framing school goals just as the process-oriented principals: However, they also mentioned the impor-

tance of developing staff collaboration and forging the links between home and school.

A principal with a comprehensive view was willing to discuss, in detail, his/her views of instructional leadership. For example,

Instructional leadership is a series of little steps which include understanding the content and processes that are needed to improve the curriculum and instruction. A lot of what I do is manage but to see change, you need to understand the opinions from all sides and know what it is that you want to change.

Case 122

Comprehensive-oriented principals have found a method of connecting the seemingly disjointed pieces of their roles, allowing for a richer, more global view of instructional leadership. While working to improve on one of the pieces of instructional leadership, they are simultaneously able to find ways to improve the other pieces. Principals who had a comprehensive view of instructional leadership were also principals who

- brought about extensive change in their schools in the last 2 years
- scored high on principal reflectivity
- were observed to have strong instructional leadership skills (with moderate to high ratings) in their schools
- combined management efficiency and instructional leadership skills.

What was distinctive about the comprehensive-view principals was the close relationship of these views to a combination of principal reflectivity, instructional leadership skills, and management efficiency.

SYNTHESIS: STAGES IN DEVELOPING INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERS

The findings fit together to show that instructional leadership is formed in three stages, as summarized in Figure 1. In Stage 1, principals are socialized into the role of the administrator. In this stage, they are focused on routine management but have little focus on instructional leadership. Most CSLA graduates in this study had passed through this stage already, as was reflected in the case studies and the findings presented above.

Stage 2 is built on solid management capability and is best characterized by doing the pieces of instructional leadership. These principals have a fragmented view of instructional leadership—they see instructional leadership as isolated pieces and emphasize a process-oriented view of leadership.

STAGE 1: *Getting Started*

- Initial socialization into the role of site administrator
- Development of routine management skills
- No real focus on instructional leadership

STAGE 2: *Doing the Pieces of Instructional Leadership*

- Enhancement of management capability
- Mastery of pieces of instructional responsibilities
- Fragmented views of instructional leadership
- Reflectivity about management and instructional leadership pieces
- School change is incremental and fragmented

STAGE 3: *Understanding the Whole of Instructional Leadership*

- Integration of management and instructional leadership
- Integration of instructional leadership pieces (activities and functions)
- Deepening and integration of views of instructional leadership
- Reflectivity about integrated instructional leadership and school life
- Transformation of the school in relation to the vision; the school is substantially changed

Figure 1: Site Administrators as Instructional Leaders: Developmental Stages

Their reflection is about their management or about the pieces of instruction in isolation. Teachers at their schools report that little has changed in the last 2 years, despite a heavy reform emphasis at the state level.

Stage 3 principals are different in their integration and their understanding of instructional leadership. They do not ignore management issues; instead, they have integrated management and instructional leadership activities. More uniquely, they have integrated their instructional leadership activities and functions, and their views of instructional leadership are very rich and detailed. Their reflection is about this integrated instructional leadership. Teachers report that change at the school has been substantial in the last 2 years, and the case studies show how the change is closely linked to the broad vision the principals hold.

THE TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRAINING

LEVEL OF IMPACT AT THE SCHOOL

The impact of instructional leadership training at the school can be seen in several ways. The first is the extent to which this training has influence beyond the principal to impact other individuals and structures at the school site. Because a major part of the principal's job involves working through others, effective administrative training must emphasize both the context of the school organization and culture in order to affect the entire school.

Effective training programs should focus on the following areas of school organization and culture:

- Principal's ideas and attitudes—the personal thoughts, concerns and ideas of the individual
- Principal's actualized behavior and practices—the realm between what is said and actually done
- School leadership structures—organizational structures that the principal may have set up to facilitate decisions and instructional leadership (i.e., school site councils, curriculum councils, school-level cabinet)
- Policies—school-level policies involving homework, discipline, instructional content, textbooks, and cultural norms and expectations of the school and/or community
- Teacher beliefs—personal belief systems of the teachers which influence their decisions and actions
- Teacher classroom practice—actual professional practice of the teacher in relationship to students.

To analyze the extent to which CSLA penetrated various aspects of schooling, three dimensions of CSLA were examined: CSLA training, networking, and the culminating project. Data collectors rated the dimensions on the degree of influence each had on the specific areas of schooling listed above. Ratings were high, medium, or low. A high rating for CSLA training on a principal's ideas and attitudes, for example, would indicate that CSLA greatly influenced his/her perceptions of the principalship. Table 5 presents the extent that dimensions of the CSLA experience influenced important aspects of the school. The table shows the number of schools where data collectors rated the extent of influence as high, medium, or low.

Several insights emerge from this analysis. First, programs designed to enhance instructional leadership of principals can have a profound influence on many aspects of the school. The dominant pattern indicates substantial influence for all the various dimensions of instructional leadership training on all aspects of schooling. The penetration of this leadership experience into the various levels of the school organization was very impressive.

Second, although the impact of the training was substantial across many aspects of the school, the influence was greatest on the principal's ideas/attitudes and somewhat less on the actual behavior and practice of the principal. What the principal did in practice was slightly more difficult to influence than were beliefs.

For most of the schools involved, the impact of the instructional leadership experience was moderate or high for most aspects of the school organization.

TABLE 5
The Number of Schools Where Researchers Rated the
Extent of Influence of Dimensions of CSLA on
Various Aspects of the School as Being High, Medium, or Low

<i>Aspect of the School That Was Influenced</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Dimension of CSLA</i>		
		<i>CSLA Training</i>	<i>Networking</i>	<i>Project</i>
Principal's ideas/attitudes	High	33	18	23
	Medium	8	18	10
	Low	1	6	9
Principal's practice	High	21	15	17
	Medium	21	14	14
	Low	1	13	11
School leadership structures/people	High	15	11	19
	Medium	24	16	14
	Low	3	15	9
School policies	High	11	8	10
	Medium	20	19	20
	Low	11	15	11
School culture	High	16	7	13
	Medium	23	19	18
	Low	3	16	11
Teacher beliefs	High	11	6	14
	Medium	20	17	17
	Low	11	18	10
Classroom practice	High	12	9	16
	Medium	20	12	17
	Low	10	21	9

School policies were more difficult to influence—even more difficult than teacher beliefs and practices. In order to have an impact on classrooms at the school site, instructional leadership programs need to influence teacher beliefs and practices by working through the graduates. In doing so, instructional leadership programs could accomplish one of their long-term goals—an increase in student achievement through administrative training. The

results of our analysis indicate that teacher beliefs and practices were, in fact, strongly influenced.

Shifting the focus to the relative contribution of training, networking, and the culminating project, all three dimensions of efforts to enhance instructional leadership were able to penetrate the school site beyond the principal. The training itself had a high degree of influence on principal's ideas and attitudes as well as on the principal's actual practice. Training also penetrated school leadership structures, culture, and teacher beliefs and practice.

The overall pattern of influence of the culminating CSLA project was similar to that of the training, although the impact of the project was stronger on teacher beliefs and practice. Influence was high on the principal's ideas/attitudes and school leadership structures. Many graduates indicated that the culminating project was one of the first CSLA activities applicable to the entire school. In fact, the successful implementation of the project could not be accomplished by the principal alone.

Networking influenced the principal as an individual and was least able to influence policies, school culture, and teacher beliefs and practice. Although the influence of networking on principal's ideas and practice was less than other dimensions of CSLA, the influence was strong.

In short, administrative training programs that focus on instructional leadership can have a considerable influence on the graduate and his/her school site. Three dimensions of these programs—the training itself, the networking, and a culminating project—all had an impact beyond the principal as an individual. All three dimensions were able to penetrate the level of the classroom and influence the culture of the school.

FACTORS THAT INFLUENCED TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRAINING TO THE WORK SITE

Many factors influence the extent to which administrative training is transferred to the principal's work site. As Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) point out, attempts to change the role of the principal are influenced by the competing work demands on the principal, personal factors, and the school/district context in which the principal operates. Our analysis focused on the relative effects of five factors related to the principal's ability to use administrative training. The following factors were examined:

Training program strategies:

Specific transfer-of-training strategies that were used by the training program to assist in the transfer process

<i>Personal factors:</i>	Strategies and characteristics of individual graduates which were developed and/or used to enhance their own transfer of training
<i>School and district leadership factors:</i>	School and/or district focus, support, pressure, or organizational structure that influenced transfer of CSLA training to the school site
<i>Teachers and school culture factors:</i>	Characteristics of the teachers and/or schools, norms, and expectations, especially as they relate to collegiality and continuous improvement
<i>Demands and focus of principal's job:</i>	The ways that the work life of the principal influences the transfer of training.

Table 6 shows the extent of influence (high, moderate, or low influence) which each factor had on the transfer of training, as rated by the data collector. Personal factors—that is, the proactive nature of the principal in using transfer strategies—and realities of the work site had by far the strongest influence. Personal factors enhanced the transfer of training. Demands and focus of the principal's job inhibited that transfer. Both sets of influence were substantial. As one graduate indicated, the principal's job often inhibited transfer:

Our plate is full and we just can't dump more on it. We do the urgent. I would suggest that school shut down for a year, allowing us to plan and try out changes, then re-open. Somehow the work was always still there at the school, waiting, when you returned.

Case 102

Personal factors also influenced the principal as an instructional leader. These factors refer to how the principal understands, internalizes, reflects on, and uses the instructional leadership skills of the CSLA training. The ways that the principal initiated use of the training was the strongest positive factor that influenced the transfer of the CSLA experience. Proactive principals captured assistance from CSLA trainers, district leaders, and peers. Our case studies show how principals, rather than others, initiated this process.

By comparison, the influence of CSLA transfer strategies, school/district leadership factors, and school culture was only modest. Training transfer was enhanced when the principal was engaged in reflective activities in the workshops and completed the culminating project. Despite the intent of CSLA leaders, however, many participants did not actually experience these

TABLE 6
The Number of Principals Whose Transfer of CSLA
Training Was Influenced by Each Factor (N = 37)

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Extent of Influence</i>		
	<i>High</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>Low</i>
CSLA transfer strategies	12	18	7
Personal factors	24	12	0
School district leadership factors	14	7	15
Teacher/school cultural factors	12	18	6
Demands/focus of principal's job	20	13	3

transfer strategies. Specifically, site-based assistance proved difficult to provide. Training transfer was enhanced when the training fit with district reform priorities, when district leaders supported the use of leadership skills by the principal, and when these principals were used as models for other principals in the district. Use of the training in multicultural settings was especially difficult for several reasons. First, the content of the training was not focused on the needs of multicultural settings, especially for language-minority students. Second, despite the emphasis in urban areas on using the training as the primary vehicle for district administrative advancement, the complexity of the principal's job and the organizational complexity of the school were often substantial barriers to use. Moreover, the networking among principals often focused more on district and/or community politics than on instructional programs for the school.

DISCUSSION

Three conclusions can be drawn about the effects of training in instructional leadership as reflected in this study. These conclusions follow:

1. Graduates were practicing many pieces of instructional leadership at their sites. Instructional leadership included

- Many of the instructional leadership functions described by Murphy were being carried out by site administrators who had completed the training. These practices were confirmed by both the principal and teachers at the school.
- Most graduates were able to carry out parts of instructional leadership as seen in their ability to carry out classroom analysis of instruction, develop sugges-

tions for teacher improvement, and recognize effective classroom climate.

- Management efficiency was strong for most graduates.

2. The training made a real difference for the graduates. From the study, one could conclude that

- The training had a positive impact on many dimensions of the school.
- The positive impact was related to many aspects of training experience: the training itself, networking/culture, and the project.

3. Instructional leadership is developed in stages. After a high quality, 3-year program,

- Most principals were Stage 2 leaders—they were efficient managers who were good at doing the pieces of instructional leadership. However, these principals lacked an integrated view of instructional leadership and had made little change in their schools in the last 2 years.
- Seven of the 44 principals were Stage 3 leaders—they were efficient managers who also were strong instructional leaders. They held integrated views of instructional leadership, reflected about instructional issues, and had brought substantial change in their schools.

CHALLENGES AND DILEMMAS

Viewed from the Stage 2 perspective of site administrators as instructional leaders, graduates of this administrative training program were impressive in carrying out pieces of instructional leadership while also enhancing their management skills. However, from a Stage 3 view of instructional leadership, such developments are important, but unlikely to be sufficient for providing the powerful leaders needed to carry out proposed reforms in American education. One should view the challenge of developing Stage 3 instructional leaders as a generalizable problem pertinent to many educational leaders. In this sense, it is not a set of dilemmas for this program alone.

CHALLENGES: DEVELOPING POWERFUL INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AT THE SITE LEVEL

The first set of challenges pertain to developing powerful versions of instructional leadership in local schools. These challenges include:

1. Developing site administrators who have an integrated, powerful and holistic view of instructional leadership.

The CSLA leadership — and state and national leaders — argue that administrators must have an integrated view of their work. They must understand how the pieces of an organization and of the “technical core” of curriculum and instructional fit together. However, most of the graduates had a fragmented and “thin” view of instructional leadership, including:

- A process-oriented view of instructional leadership; they thought of instructional leadership as the process of engaging teachers or establishing a vision or school culture without the corresponding sense of (for example) *what* vision was important or *what* a culture should accomplish in a school
- A fragmented view of instructional leadership; they could discuss the pieces of instructional leadership without being strong at tying the pieces of the technical core together.

The dilemma is how to develop this integrated conceptual understanding among participants of innovative administrative training programs.

2. Developing site administrators able to reflect in powerful ways about instructional leadership.

The CSLA leadership and most state and national leaders emphasize the need for reflective practice, especially for administrators who must solve technically and politically complex problems while working through others. Few skills have the magic of always working; instead, they must be fit into the complexities of appropriate strategy and organizational culture. Administrators must also work through others amid the fragmented life of the site administrator (see Peterson [1977-1978] and Duke [1987] for a discussion of these realities for the site administrators and Schon [1987] for characteristics of reflective practice). For CSLA graduates, however,

- Most handled managerial tasks with considerable efficiency, however . . .
- Most were reflective primarily about managerial tasks and not instructional leadership, and . . .
- Most had discontinued the reflective practices established in the CSLA training.

The dilemma is how to develop this reflective focus about instruction in a way that is sustained past the training experience.

3. Developing site administrators able to facilitate major changes in their schools.

Most national leaders emphasize the need for dramatic reform in American schools. This view has been fundamental for the leadership in many state departments of education, universities, and school districts. The reforms needed are comprehensive and integrated; they include linking curriculum, instruction, assessment, and personalized learning for all students, and a restructured school day. A typical pattern in the research on instructional leadership is that most principals do not operate primarily as instructional leaders. Moreover, most schools do not reflect more than partial implementation of the educational reforms including new curriculum and assessment approaches. For most CSLA graduates, however,

- Little change was made in their schools in the last 2 years despite the considerable demands of implementing the new reforms.
- CSLA was seen as confirming their views and practices of instructional leadership rather than transforming these views and practices.
- Graduates valued the parts of the training that were immediately useful in an instrumental sense and often "down-sized" big ideas to allow them to fit with preexisting perceptions of their work.
- Although graduates were doing many of the instructional leadership functions, there was often a sense that their instructional leadership was superficial in nature.

In short, the dilemma is how to structure administrative training so as to support the transformational nature of reform. Graduates often saw the training in incrementalist rather than transformational terms. It is likely that graduates of this and other administrative training programs in their current form will not have the instructional leadership power to implement the national reform agenda.

CHALLENGES: CSLA TRAINING AND ITS TRANSFER TO THE SITE

The second set of challenges pertains to the transfer of innovative training to the site level. These challenges include:

4. Developing more powerful training transfer strategies for the CSLA training.

Coaching is critical to the transfer of training, especially when the new practice is complex and requires considerable executive control (see Joyce &

Showers, 1988). Despite the many ways that CSLA designed the training and its transfer to enhance the use of site training, little actual coaching was carried out. In some cases, coaching was available on a voluntary basis, even when limited resources were available to support the coaching activities. The dilemma is how to generate an extensive level of coaching and how to structure the coaching to support the transformational shifts needed in administrator practice.

5. Including other key players from the local setting in the training transfer.

Transfer of training happens in a local context where district/school leadership patterns and the relationship among school leaders are critical. Such linkages feature a substantive as well as a political/cultural/symbolic dimension. In many respects, principals are middle managers who do not match the chief executive officer model featured in organizational leadership literature (e.g., Bennis, 1989); this fact also has implications for administrator training. In practice, leaders other than the participant were not sufficiently engaged in helping transfer the training for the graduate *per se*. In addition, few districts linked the training to other dimensions of the reform agenda in the district. The dilemma is how to enhance the transfer of training for principals when leadership is a collective enterprise that typically includes district and school leadership teams.

6. Developing better ways to adapt the training transfer to variations in local settings.

Work settings vary quite considerably. In general, participants from secondary schools found the training to be less useful to their work than did graduates from elementary schools. In addition, graduates who work in schools with sizable populations of limited English proficiency (LEP) students reported that the training did little to help them work in this environment—specifically in addressing the needs of LEP students. The dilemma is how to help administrators adapt the generic training more powerfully to the needs of their specific site.

7. Helping participants become more proactive in their use of the training.

The study found that the personal characteristics of the participant/graduate were critically important to successfully transferring the training experience. It is difficult to know how certain graduates became so proactive

and reflective. However, it is clear that these graduates participated in the training and used the training in very different ways than did other graduates. The dilemma is how to help all graduates generate this level of commitment, insight, integrative reflection, and proactive behavior.

8. Helping participants transfer the substantive aspects of the training in more powerful ways.

The training itself emphasized vision, mission, curriculum frameworks, and many other substantive aspects of instructional leadership. Yet the effect of the training was often that the graduates grasped the process by which these aspects are established in schools but not the substance of the instructional leadership needed to create something worthwhile in the school. Many graduates said they were not challenged or sufficiently assisted in the training on the substance of their work, while also reporting (we think they were ultimately wrong) that the substance was easy to grasp and not new to them. However, most of the graduates transferred the group process techniques used in the training.

The dilemma is how to help practitioners seize the practical while also understanding the depth of the substantive ideas needed to serve as a guide for transformational change in schools. The dilemma is also how to help principals build the reflective perspective and skills needed to guide this transformational work.

In general, the California School Leadership Academy offers real hope that effective training programs for instructional leadership can be implemented on a broad front. Certainly, these programs can be effective in creating Stage 2 leadership, the piecemeal version of leadership that probably characterizes most school principals. What remains to be seen is whether integrated forms of instructional leadership can be nurtured in schools.

REFERENCES

- Bennis, W. (1989). *On becoming a leader*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Berman, P., & Gjelten, T. (1984). *Improving school improvement: The final report of the statewide study of the California school improvement program: Vol. 2. Findings*. Berkeley, CA: Berman, Weiler & Associates.
- David, J. (1988). *Restructuring in progress: Lessons from pioneering districts*. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.
- Duke, D. (1987). *School leadership and instructional improvement*. New York: Random House.

- Elmore, R., & Associates (1990). *Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1991). Developing leaders for tomorrow's schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72(8), 514-520.
- Huberman, M., & Miles, M. (1984). *Innovation up close: How school improvement works*. New York: Plenum.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1988). *Student achievement through staff development*. New York: Longman.
- Leithwood, K., & Montgomery, D. (1982). The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement: A review. *Review of Educational Research*, 52(3), 309-339.
- Little, J. W., Gerritz, W., Sterns, D., Guthrie, J., Kirst, M., & Marsh, D. (1987). *Staff development in California: Public and personal investments, program patterns, and policy choices*. Berkeley: Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), School of Education, University of California.
- Malen, B., Ogawa, R., & Krantz, J. (1990). What do we know about school-based management: A case study of the literature—A call for research. In W. Clune & J. Witte (Eds.), *Choice and control in American education* (Vol. 2, pp. 289-342). Philadelphia, PA: Falmer.
- Marsh, D., McMahon, J., Pahre, B., & Sevilla, J. (1990). *School principals as instructional leaders: The impact of the California school leadership academy*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.
- Murphy, J. (1988). The instructional leadership role of the school principal: An analysis. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 10(2), 71.
- Murphy, J. (Ed.). (1990). *The reform of American education in the 1980s: Perspectives and cases*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1987). *Approaches to administrative training in education*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Odden, A. (1991). *Educational policy implementation*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Peterson, K. (1977-1978). The principal's tasks. *Administrator's Notebook*, 26(8), 1-4.
- Schon, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smith, W., & Andrews, R. (1989). *Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference*. Arlington, VA: Association for Curriculum Development and Supervision.