

Instructional leadership development has been identified as a primary goal of training programs of many of the OERI-funded LEAD centers.

# Educational Leadership Development and the Implementation of Innovative Schooling Practices

by Margaret C. Wang, Richard M. Englert,  
and JoAnn B. Manning  
Temple University Center for Research  
in Human Development and Education  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Research on effective teaching and school effectiveness has contributed much to an increased recognition of the central role of educational leaders, particularly building principals, in instituting and maintaining systematic efforts

**Dr. Margaret C. Wang is Professor of Educational Psychology and Director of the Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education. She is recognized nationally and internationally for her research on learner differences and classroom learning, student motivation, implementation and evaluation of innovative school programs, and teacher development. Dr. Wang is co-principal investigator of the Pennsylvania LEAD Institute.**

**Dr. Richard M. Englert is Dean of the College of Education at Temple University and Professor of Educational Administration in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. He has emphasized research and analysis as important ways to improve educational systems and he is working on the redesign of an urban school administrator preparation program within the College of Education. Dr. Englert is co-principal investigator of the Pennsylvania LEAD Institute.**

to improve instruction and learning in schools. This research base clearly suggests that educational excellence is achieved and sustained when school improvement efforts are grounded firmly in scientific research and practical wisdom, and when they are led and nurtured by educational leaders knowledgeable in both the research base and the state-of-the-art practice and skillful in managing school resources to enhance the instructional capabilities of school staff.

The twofold purpose of this article is to provide a brief summary of this research base and to discuss its implications for designing educational leadership development programs.

Educational leadership, for the purposes of this article, is defined as initiating and maintaining systematic efforts to improve instruction and educational outcomes of students. Effective leadership in this context can be characterized as (a) the ability to develop a school improvement vision grounded in scientific research and sound professional practice; (b) human relations skills to enable professional colleagues within a school to share such a vision; (c) management skills to marshal resources to implement the vision; and (d) the ability to evaluate the success of the vision in terms of student learning.

Leadership in improving instruction and learning and executive skills in managing school and human resources for such improvements are both critical to the effective functioning of an educational leader. Furthermore, we see the successful implementation and institutionalization of school-based improvement initiatives as key indicators of effective educational leadership. The educational reform literature emphasizes these points (e.g., National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), as does the research on school effectiveness (cf. Kyle, 1985), the development of leadership skills in education and private industry (e.g., Levine, 1984; Peters and Waterman, 1982), and the realignment of formal authority that is taking place due to the movement toward professionalization of teaching (e.g., Ewing, 1985; Yankelovich, 1985).

## An Overview of the Research Base

**Effective Schools and Teacher Effectiveness.** Findings from the past two decades of research on effective teaching and school effectiveness provide substantial evidence suggesting that what teachers do and how schools operate make a significant difference in students' learning and achievement. This research base is provocative and provides a foundation on which to build current and future school improvement efforts. Although the lists of characteristics of effective schools and patterns of effective teaching vary somewhat across studies and reports (e.g., Austin, 1981; Brookover et al., 1982; Edmonds, 1979; National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1984; Purkey and Smith, 1983; Rutter, 1981), the resulting research base suggests remarkable consistency.

The extant research base on teacher effectiveness also provides a broad data base that suggests some consistent or "replicable" patterns of teacher behaviors and student

**Dr. JoAnn B. Manning is Research Associate at the Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education. Her major focus as a school administrator has been the development and implementation of exemplary school programs and the training of educational leaders and administrators. She is Coordinator of the Pennsylvania LEAD Institute.**

achievement (Good and Brophy, 1986). However, despite the substantial knowledge base on teacher effects and effective schools, there is little evidence that findings from research have been incorporated for the improvement of practice. One major reason for the lag between the state of the art of research and the state of practice is the failure of leadership training programs to address adequately how to apply the best of what we actually know in improving instructional and related service delivery in the schools.

Recent developments in theories and research in management and human resource development have resulted in major conceptual shifts and changes in various beliefs and expectations. These developments have important implications for current educational reform, especially for the concerns over the paradox of what constitutes educational leadership—substantive knowledge or management skills—and the issue of professionalization and realignment of formal authority.

**The Role of Substantive Knowledge.** There is a tendency in the extant management literature to treat leadership with no reference to substantive knowledge. The leader is viewed as one who facilitates a climate in which professionals are motivated to do their jobs. However, there is also increasing research evidence in the recent literature to support the notion that a leader needs to be actively engaged in the substance of an enterprise. At the forefront of this research are findings that effective educational leadership is characterized by (a) a combination of both authoritarian and democratic management styles (Lipham and Hoeh, 1974); (b) skill in organizing, planning, and evaluating instructional programs (Hughes and Ubben, 1978); (c) the ability to take a dynamic systems view of organizational relationships between constituent groups (Lipham and Hoeh, 1974); and (d) the ability to establish a climate for learning that facilitates student growth (Brookover, 1979; Currence, 1986; National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1984; Purkey and Smith, 1983).

The issue is not whether content knowledge is requisite for an educational leader; rather, the question is what the content knowledge should be in order to articulate a vision, give meaning to standards, encourage, and monitor efforts. The leader, in this view, is one who is particularly adept at monitoring, assessing, and communicating how current strategies are working, and he or she is sophisticated enough in the substantive content to recognize constructive versus nonproductive proposals for change. The leader makes an impact by articulating a vision for the organization and by helping people set goals and state values that give purpose to their work (Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Lawler, 1986; Fullan, 1985).

**Professionalization and the Realignment of Formal Authority.** The educational reform literature is ambiguous on the question of who should exercise leadership to improve practice within the school. The Holmes Group (1986) emphasizes the professionalization of teaching through more rigorous selection and training of teachers and the creation of a three-tiered career ladder culminating in the position of career professional. The career professionals would supervise novice teachers or instructors and serve as head teachers specializing in instruction or management. It is notable that the Holmes Group does not mention the role of principals or school district administrators in defining an agenda for the professionalization of teaching.

The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986) also calls for the professionalization of teaching. The Carnegie Forum goes further and specially calls for a new look at the principalship model in terms of the overall goal

of creating "a profession of well-educated teachers prepared to assume new powers and responsibilities to redesign schools for the future" (p. 2). The Carnegie Forum proposes an alternative model for instructional leadership in which a committee of lead teachers operates within a school, one of them acting as a managing partner and the principal being in a professional partnership with them, much like that found in medicine.

Both the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Forum agree that instructional leadership should be exercised by competent professionals working together collegially. These groups hold that the main controls on the quality of leadership should derive from improved teacher education programs, controlled entry to the profession, and established professional standards for teachers. A critical control device could be the establishment of a national board that would be entrusted with the responsibility to develop professional standards for teaching and issue certificate to those who meet the standards.

The recommendations of the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Forum in effect call for a new set of relationships among teachers and administrators and a realignment of formal authority within the school. Similarly, the Task Force on Leadership and Management of the National Governors' Association upholds a vision for "restructured schools" that includes a greater cooperative role for professional teachers, resulting in a more collegial and productive school climate (National Governors' Association, 1986).

**The Role of the Principal in Improving School Effectiveness.** The functioning of the principal as an educational leader has consistently been shown to be an essential ingredient of effective schools (cf. Bossert, 1985; Fullan, 1985; Purkey and Smith, 1983). The principal of an effective school is required not only to manage the business of the school, but also to function as an "instructional leader" who works with the teaching staff to implement academic goals, ensures that order and discipline prevail, and makes choices about materials and instructional strategies. Such principals are expected to have training and experience that give them a broad understanding of the nature of society and the learner, how both are changing, and how they are likely to continue to change in the future.

Kantor (1985), in her analysis of the role of the leader, suggests that leaders must have a degree of independent knowledge of what constitutes excellence. Kantor notes that consensus is important, but she resists an overly romantic view of "organizational democracy." She stresses that leadership involves a balancing of control and team opportunity. According to Kantor, participatory management does not mean abdicating managerial responsibility for monitoring and supporting the process. The effective manager sets the basic conditions and stays involved and available to support employees, review results, and redirect or reconfigure the team as necessary.

Principals are in a particularly strategic position to create conditions for excellence in their schools. They can contribute in unique ways to the attainment of educational objectives through application of the growing scientific knowledge of what works. The findings from syntheses of thousands of studies demonstrate that some instructional procedures and techniques are far more effective than others (c. U.S. Department of Education, 1986a, 1986b; Walberg, 1984; Wang, Reynolds, and Walberg, 1986; Witrock, 1986). Thus, the progress reflected in research and practice of the past two decades provides principals and other educational leaders with an increasingly greater technical knowledge of the means and ends, the causes and effects of the improved school programs and practices.

To be sure, there are areas of specialized knowledge in which all educational leaders need rigorous preparation. These areas include child development, organizational structuring and management of school and human resources, the application of research findings to the creation of school environments that promote learning and student achievement, techniques for evaluating school curricula to assess and improve effectiveness, and analysis of instruction and staff performance. What is less clear, however, is what a principal can do on a day-to-day basis, in the face of multiple episodic demands, to use his or her knowledge and leadership skills (Blumberg and Greenfield, 1980; Howell, 1981; Martin and Willower, 1981; Peterson, 1978; Southern Regional Education Board, 1986).

Traditional pre-service training programs for future principals are often criticized as unrelated to the on-the-job requirements of educational leadership (e.g., Blumberg and Greenfield, 1980; McCurdy, 1983). A recent report by the Southern Regional Education Board (1986) pointedly states that principals typically do not actively engage in school improvement efforts. This, however, is not a reflection of incompetence on the part of the principals. Principals have not been selected and trained on the basis of the knowledge and skills required to make sweeping reforms work.

There is clearly a need for training programs aimed at developing educational leaders who are able to take major positive steps in improving instruction and learning in schools. Training programs designed to enhance the capability of the school staff in implementing and maintaining

innovative programs in schools should focus on both the substantive knowledge and managerial skills required by educational leaders to initiate and institutionalize improved practices.

#### Approaches to Instructional Leadership Development.

Instructional leadership development has been identified as a primary goal of training programs of many of the OERI-funded LEAD centers. Based on the responses from a survey that was sent to all of the LEAD project directors, 23 of the LEAD centers (46 percent) have identified instructional leadership development as a primary focus of their work. Table 1 provides a list of all such LEAD centers. Because of space constraints, we are not able to provide descriptions of these programs. Interested readers can obtain information from the contact persons listed in the table.

Although the programs listed vary in their approaches and the specific substantive content of their training programs, they share a common element—characterizing effective instructional leadership as expertise in shaping, guiding, monitoring, and evaluating implementation of innovative practices to improve instruction and student learning. To provide an illustration of the design elements of a training program aiming to enhance the instructional leadership expertise of in-service and aspiring educational leaders, we include in the following section a brief overview of the instructional leadership development program currently being field-tested at the Pennsylvania Leadership in Educational Administration Development Institute.

Table 1

#### LEAD Centers Focusing on Instructional Leadership Development

Center	Contact Person and Address	Center	Contact Person and Address
Alabama LEAD Academy	John S. Martin P.O. Box 428 Montgomery, AL 36101-0428	Iowa Leadership in Educational Administration Development	James Sweeney N 225C Lagomarcino Hall Iowa State University Ames, IA 50011
Connecticut LEAD Center	Kathy Rockwood 205 Skiff Street Hamden, CT 06517	Kansas School Leadership Academy	Joy Kromer 820 Quincy-Suite 200 Topeka, KS 66612
Delaware Leadership in Educational Administration Development Center	Mary Ketchem P.O. Box 1402 Dover, DE 19903	Kentucky LEAD Center	Betty Lindsey 1121 Louisville Road Frankfort, KY 40601
Florida LEAD Project	Luther Rogers Clemons-A 102, Knott Bldg. Tallahassee, FL 32399	Massachusetts LEAD Center Project	Leslie F. Hergert 290 South Main Street Andover, MA 01810
Georgia LEAD Project	Carvin L. Brown G-9 Aderhold Hall University of Georgia Athens, GA 30602	Maryland LEAD Center	Lawrence Leak College of Education University of Maryland College Park, MD 20742
Hawaii Center for Leadership in Educational Administration	Ichiro Fukomoto P.O. Box 2360 Honolulu, HI 96804	Leadership for School Improvement Project	David M. Kahn 421 West Kalamazoo Street Lansing, MI 48933
Idaho School Administrator Assistance Center	Alf Langland 401 Broadway Boise, ID 83702	Missouri LEAD Project	Marjorie Spaedy P.O. Box 480 Jefferson City, MO 65102
Illinois Administrators' Academy	Ray Schaljo 100 North First Street Springfield, IL 62777	New Hampshire LEAD Center	Roland B. Kimball Department of Education Morrill Hall Durham, NH 03824

Table 1 (con't)

LEAD Centers Focusing on Instructional Leadership Development			
Center	Contact Person and Address	Center	Contact Person and Address
Oklahoma LEAD Project	Bill D. Osborne 131 South Flood Avenue Norman, OK 73069	Texas LEAD Center	Joan G. Burnham 1101 Trinity Street Austin, TX 78701-1994
Pennsylvania Leadership in Educational Administration Development Institute	Margaret C. Wang Ritter Annex, Room 933 Temple University Philadelphia, PA 19122	Vermont Center for Educational Leadership Development	E. Janet Jamieson Box 580 Manchester Center, VT 05255-0580
Rhode Island Educational Leadership Academy	Charles Mojkowski 78 Foxglove Drive Cranston, RI 02920	Wyoming LEAD Project	Myron R. Basom University of Wyoming P.O. Box 3374 Laramie, WY 82071
Tennessee LEAD	Ernest L. Bentley, Jr. East Tennessee State University Box 24511 Johnson City, TN 37614		

### Instructional Leadership Development Programs: An Illustration

The Pennsylvania Leadership in Educational Administration Development (PA-LEAD) Institute, established for educational leaders and aspirants at the Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education, is designed to provide opportunities for educational professionals to develop expertise in designing and implementing innovative programs that improve student learning, and to expand the recruitment and training of the next generation of school leadership.

The primary goal of the instructional leadership development programs of the PA-LEAD Institute is to forge a dynamic link between the development of educational leadership and improvement in schooling practices. The design of these programs are based on several premises: effective educational leaders play a key role in instituting programs that successfully enhance student learning; such leaders know both their schools and the state-of-the-art knowledge and technology in education and related fields; they use a comprehensive repertoire of instructional and executive skills to create and implement their vision of educational excellence; and the successful implementation of improved programs in actual school settings expand the knowledge base of what can successfully improve student learning.

Building on the best features of successful staff development and the findings from research on innovative program development and implementation, the professional development programs at the PA-LEAD Institute include two parallel strands. The first is the development of the knowledge base on improving instruction and learning in schools. The second focuses on the development of expertise in the implementation and institutionalization of innovative practices in schools.

#### Knowledge Development

The knowledge development strand consists of four programs. They are: state-of-the-art seminars, What Works workshops, Contemporary Issues Forums, and Institute Fellowships for innovative program development. Each is briefly discussed below.

**State-of-the-Art Seminars.** The Institute's state-of-the-art seminars provide overviews of recent developments from research and innovative program development for improving instruction and learning in schools. Currently, the seminars are organized around four topical areas that have

been identified by administrators and teachers as pressing programmatic concerns: (a) coordination of programs and resources to provide improved services for diverse student populations; (b) embedding development of higher-order cognitive skills in subject-matter instruction; (c) expanded use of informational and computer technology to enhance instructional/learning effectiveness and efficiency; and (d) development of school-home-community partnerships to raise general aspirations and motivation for achieving schooling success.

In addition to providing information on the research base related to these topical areas, the seminars also include discussion of practical issues related to program implementation, policy-related information, and executive skills. One of the major expected outcomes is increased interest among educational leaders and aspirants to engage in school improvement efforts. The state-of-the-art seminars generally begin with a keynote address by a nationally-known scholar who presents an overview of the research base and implications for improving instruction and learning in schools. The keynote speech is followed by group discussion sessions led by practitioner scholars, with presentations by instructional leaders on the design and implementation of improvement efforts they have initiated in their schools. The state-of-the-art seminars are usually two days long and take place at varied geographic locations across the state.

**What Works Workshop Series.** What Works workshops are held at school sites to provide opportunities for dialogue and information sharing among educational leaders. Individuals who have successfully introduced school improvement programs are invited by the PA-LEAD Institute to conduct these workshops. They are designed with a combination of demonstration and peer-coaching strategies to dialogue on common improvement goals and to discuss concerns, challenges, and solutions to implementation-related problems.

**Contemporary Issues Forum.** The Contemporary Issues Forum has a dual purpose: to solicit input for refining the Institute's professional development programs, and to give participants a concentrated period of time to discuss contemporary educational reform literature. Current and aspiring educational leaders are invited to participate in the Contemporary Issues Forums to read and discuss with colleagues in school leadership positions the implications of this literature for ongoing reform efforts. The Forum activi-

ties include panel discussions and work groups, which foster the exchange of ideas among educational leaders, faculty members of the PA-LEAD Institute, and representatives from the collaborating colleges of education, professional associations, and the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

**Institute Fellowships for Innovative Program Development.** The Fellowship Program is a six-month fellowship that gives participants an opportunity to spend an extended time at the PA-LEAD Institute working with the Institute's faculty in developing innovative programs for improving instruction and learning in schools. Institute Fellows are encouraged to spend their sabbatical leaves at the PA-LEAD Institute. They may focus on developing a particular improvement effort for their home schools, or they may work on a more broadly based, ongoing program development project at the Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education.

### School Implementation of Innovative Practices

The ultimate goal of the instructional leadership development programs is to help educational leaders institute programmatic changes to improve instruction and learning in their respective schools. The programmatic strand on school implementation of innovative practices is designed to provide technical assistance to school leaders interested in initiating and institutionalizing improvement practices to enhance student learning. It includes two series of activities. The first is a week-long internship program for the development of school-based implementation plans and the second is an ongoing technical assistance program.

**Internship for Development of School-Based Implementation Plans.** The internship program is designed to help educational leaders develop specific school-based implementation plans to meet the improvement needs of their respective schools. The internship is a follow-up activity from the state-of-the-art seminars and What Works workshops, which provide overviews of the research base and the state-of-the-art practice in selected areas. Participants interested in pursuing the development of innovative programs in their respective schools are invited to apply for the one-week internships. The program generally occurs during the summer months when school staff can devote concentrated time to the internship.

The Institute encourages applicants to invite their colleagues to join them in the internship program. This teaming strategy is based on the premise that effective implementation of any school-based improvement program requires collaboration among the school personnel and decision makers whose work is closely tied to the proposed changes. Ideally, the team includes the instructional leader (the principal, coordinator of specific subject-matter curricula such as reading, math, or social studies, school psychologist, etc.), a classroom teacher whose opinions and expertise are well respected by his or her colleagues, and/or other specialized professionals whose work is closely related to the specific area of improvement the team is interested in developing and implementing.

**Technical Assistance for Program Implementation.** After the school teams have received approval by their school district and their respective schools to implement the improvement program they have designed, they are eligible to apply for technical assistance from the faculty of the PA-LEAD Institute. A technical assistance plan is jointly developed by the Institute's staff and the specific school district based on the district's implementation plan and the staff's assessment regarding the readiness of school personnel and the nature of the improvement program. In addition

to providing training and technical assistance, the Institute's faculty and consulting staff also work closely with the school staff to describe and assess the implementation and outcomes of the improvement program.

We see the provision of support to school districts on an ongoing basis during their initial implementation stage as a critical element in realizing the Institute's vision of bringing research and innovative program development efforts to bear on program implementation in the schools.

To summarize, in the context of the leadership development program described in this article, effective educational leadership involves not only the knowledge base for creating an educational vision toward which school staff are expected to strive, but also management and human relations skills to influence others to share the vision and put it into effect in an organized and efficient fashion. In addition, effective leadership includes the evaluation and supervisory skills required to monitor, shape, guide, and evaluate the implementation of the vision. The strength of this concept of educational leadership is that it integrates substantive knowledge about the research base with practical wisdom and management skills for improving instruction and learning in school.

### References

- Austin, G.R. (1981). **Exemplary schools and their identification.** Unpublished manuscript. University of Maryland, Center for Educational Research and Development, College Park, MD.
- Bennis, W., and Nanus, B. (1985). **Leaders.** New York: Harper & Row.
- Blumberg, A., and Greenfield, W. (1980). **The effective principal.** Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bossert, S.T. (1985). Effective elementary schools. In R.M.J. Kyle (Ed), **Reaching for excellence: An effective school sourcebook.** Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Brookover, W.B. (Ed.). (1979). **School social systems and student achievement: Schools can make a difference.** New York: Praeger.
- Brookover, W.; Beamer, L.; Eftim, H.; Hathaway, D.; Lezotte, L.; Miller, S.; Passalacqua, J.; and Tornatzky, L. (1982). **Creating effective schools: An in-service program for enhancing school learning climate and achievement.** Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications.
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986). **A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century.** (Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession). New York: Author.
- Currence, C. (1986). **Time for results: The governors' 1991 report on education.** Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association, Center for Policy Research and Analysis.
- Emonds, R.R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. **Educational Leadership, 37,** 15-27.
- Ewing, D. (1985). The endless wave. In M. Beer and D. Spector (Eds.), **Human resource management.** New York: Macmillan.
- Fullan, M. (1985). Change processes and strategies at the local level. **Elementary School Journal, 85(3),** 391-422.
- Good, T.L. and Brophy, J.E. (1986). School effects. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), **Handbook of research on teaching** (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Holmes Group (1986). **Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group.** East Lansing, MI: Author.
- Howell, B. (1981, February). Profile of the principalship. **Educational Leadership, 41(3),** 21-25.

- Hughes, L.W. and Ubben, J.C. (1978). **The elementary principal's handbook: A guide to effective action.** Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kantor, R.M. (1985). Dilemmas of managing participation. In M. Beer and B. Spector (Eds.), **Human resource management.** New York: Macmillan.
- Kyle, R.M. (Ed.). (1985). **Reaching for excellence.** Washington, D.C.: E.H. White and Co.
- Lawler, E.E. (1986). **High-involvement management: Participative strategies for improving organizational performance.** San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Levine, J.M. (1984). **Excellence in education: Some lessons from America's best-run companies and schools.** Report prepared for the Committee for Economic Development.
- Lipham, J.M. and Hoeh, J.A. (1974). **The principalship: Foundations and functions.** New York: Harper & Row.
- Martin, W.J. and Willower, D.J. (1981, Winter). The management behavior of high school principals. **Educational Administration Quarterly.** 17(1), 69-90.
- McCurdy, J. (1983). **The role of the principal in effective schools: Problems and solutions.** AASA Critical Issues Report. Sacramento, CA: Education News Service.
- National Association of Elementary School Principals. (1984). **Standards for quality elementary schools.** Reston, VA: Author.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). **A nation at risk: The imperative for education reform.** Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Governors' Association. (1986). **Time for results: The governors' 1991 report on education.** Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association Center for Policy Research and Analysis.
- Peters, T. and Waterman, R. (1982). **In search of excellence.** New York: Harper & Row.
- Peterson, L. (1978). The principal's tasks. **Administrator's Notebook,** 26, 1-4.
- Purkey, S.C. and Smith, M.S. (1983). Effective schools: A review. **Elementary School Journal.** 83, 427-452.
- Purkey, S.C. and Smith, M.S. (1985). School reform: The district policy implications for the effective schools literature. **The Elementary School Journal,** 85(3), 353-389.
- Rutter, M. (1981). **School effects on pupil progress: Research findings and policy implications.** Paper prepared for National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education.
- Southern Regional Education Board Commission for Educational Quality. (1986). **Effective schools principals: A proposal for joint action by higher education, states, and school districts.** Atlanta, GA: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1986a). **Effective compensatory education sourcebook: Vol. 1. A review of effective educational practices.** Washington, D.C.: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1986b). **What works: Research about teaching and learning.** Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Walberg, H.J. (1984). Improving the productivity of America's schools. **Educational Leadership,** 41(8), 19-30.
- Wang, M.C.; Reynolds, M.C.; and Walberg, H.J. (1986). Rethinking special education. **Educational Leadership,** 44(1), 26-31.
- Wittrock, M.C. (1986). **Handbook of research on teaching** (3rd ed.). A Project of the American Educational Research Association. New York: Macmillan.
- Yankelovich, R. (1985). Responding to the employee's voice. In M. Beer and D. Spector (Eds.), **Human resource management.** New York: Macmillan.