If we are to create schools that are generative and proactive places designed to fulfill the dual purpose of enculturation and equal access to knowledge, we must attend to the leader behavior of school principals.

NOT "RAMBO," NOT HERO: The Principal as Designer, Teacher and Steward

by Richard Andrews, Bill Berube
and Margaret P. Basom

Reflection on what makes a good leader and the tactics, strategies and/or processes good leaders use is not new: Socrates, Plato and Lao Tzu sponsored such issues. Almost every pundit on the educational scene has a favorite tactic, strategy, and/or process that will assure student success if only the principal were to diligently practice the tactic, strategy and/or process. (Andrews, Basom and Basom, 1991) Some writers who offer such antidotes, such as Glickman (1991), suggest that the role be weakly and narrowly defined and practiced as "the coordinator of teachers as instructional leaders". On the contrary, a substantial group of researchers and writers (see for example, Moe and Chubb, 1990; Andrews, Soder and Jacoby, 1986; Brookover and Lezotte, 1977; Cawelti, 1984; Edmonds, 1979, 1982; Lipham, 1981; Purkey and Smith, 1982; Andrews and Soder, 1987; Mortimer 1989; Heck, Marcoulides and Larsen 1990; Smith and Andrews, 1990; Andrews and Morefield, 1991; Bennis, 1989; and Senge, 1990) have concluded that due to the relationship between leader behavior and organizational productivity or the causal connection between principal behavior and student achievement, to weakly or narrowly define the leadership role of the school principal is also to weakly define the treatment effect of schools in a positive direction, particularly for children of color and children from poor families.

There are some fundamental notions that school administrators are obliged to do in a compulsory system of schooling. Those who become educational leaders assume enormous obligations under a compulsory schooling system in a democratic society. The most important obligation is to create good

Richard Andrews, Professor and Dean, College of Education, University of Wyoming

Bill Berube, Assistant Professor

Margaret P. Basom, Assistant Professor

schools. Much debate has ensued since the beginning of our schooling system about what is the purpose of schools and what are the characteristics of good schools. We concur with the two fold purpose of schools as set forth by Goodlad, Sirotnik and Soder (1990)—enculturation and access to knowledge. Schools are good, to the extent that they fulfill this dual purpose.

In regard to the first purpose, enculturation, public supported schools have been viewed as essential to induct youth into our culture. This induction process has historically been stated as educating for responsibility as a parent, worker, and citizen. Today, we must educate for self-actualization. Kerr (1987) reminds us that valuing one's self, one's plans, hopes and dreams and unique abilities is a cultural achievement. To maintain self-respect, then, means that education must initiate children and youth into a culture that respects the culture of their families. We must now think of enculturation as the extent to which educators behave in schools to tap the uniqueness of each child so that the child can maximize his/her performance and self-concept. Enculturation is the pursuit of excellence. By excellence, we mean the extent to which the environment in the school maximizes the performance of each child. Concerning the second purpose, access to knowledge, the most frequently and clearly articulated goal for schools is promoting intellectual knowledge. There is a substantial body of evidence that suggests children come to school after five to six years of treatment in families where knowledge that is useful for success in school is not equally distributed. Further opportunities to gain access to use full knowledge is also not equally distributed in most schools. Poor children and youth of color are on the short end of the distribution in both cases. (see for example, Oakes, 1985; Goodlad and Keating (eds.), 1989; and Andrews and Soder, 1985) At the heart of the issue of access to knowledge is equity. By equity, we mean the extent to which entry level differences among groups of children (white versus children of color, affluent versus poor, single parent versus dual parent households, etc.) are reduced over time. A school is instructionally effective, then, in the extent to which the educators in the school behave in ways that promote both excellence and equity in the performance of students in the school.

To fulfill this obligation, the most important task of educational leadership is to build a structure of relationships within schools so that all children learn. There is little question that the school principalship in the American schooling system is a powerful social instrument that is either reactive, bureaucratic and status quo oriented or generative, proactive and change oriented. When school principals behave in a reactive, bureaucratic manner with a focus on keeping the status quo, they seem to focus on being sure that bad things don't happen. School principals must do more than just behave in such a way that bad things do not happen; principals are obliged to behave in ways that assure good things happen to all children. The principalship is a tough, demanding job. The role is not for those who aspire to lead out of a desire to control, or gain fame, or simply to be at the center of the action, but for those who want to design, teach and provide stewardship to create conditions for higher levels of learning for the development of our most precious resource—our children. (Andrews and Berube, 1991, in press)

Principals must decide to behave in such a way that each child in an elementary school will reach 6th grade on time with the knowledge, critical-thinking and problem-solving skills necessary to enter the secondary school experience, no matter what. Every secondary school principal must decide that it is his/her job to ensure that each secondary school student will graduate from high school on time and with the knowledge, thinking and problem-solving skills necessary to become a successful, productive adult. Principals are obliged to decide that no student will receive a decelerated remediation program or be sent off to special education for learning problems unless he/she

is seriously handicapped. What do we know about principal leader behavior in schools where the principal has made such conscious decisions, where principals simply refused to accept the idea that a single student will fail?

In 1979, Ron Edmonds started us down a path of research and inquiry which became popularized as the "effective schools" movement. At the heart of the movement was a focus on school level conditions rather than teacher or student characteristics. Over the past decade we have learned much about the conditions in schools that promote learning for children, particularly children of color and children who come from families who have few resources to devote to school learning. An impressive body of research worldwide [Mortimer (1990); Andrews et al., (1986; 1987; 1990); Creamers, et. al (1989); Heck, et al. (1990)] has reaffirmed Edmonds' original correlates of achievement (strong leadership, high expectations, positive learning climate, frequent monitoring of student progress, and clear goals). The findings from this research support not only relationships but causal connections between these correlates and the performance of students, particularly poor children and children of color. The single greatest predictor of children's performance in school is teachers' perception of the quality of their workplace. The single greatest predictor of teachers' perception of the quality of instructional leader behavior of the school principal.

If we are to create schools that are generative and proactive places designed to fulfill the dual purpose of enculturation and equal access to knowledge, we must attend to the leader behavior of school principals. Much has been learned over the past decade or so about effective leader behavior. Does that research tell us that the school principal should be "Rambo" or the hero who "leads the school up the path of glory" or the guy who comes sharply to mind with the statement, "make my day"? No!

Not "Rambo" not hero, the principal of schools in which all children learn best is perceived by teachers as an instructional leader. A leader who can garner the resources so that the teachers can play their important instructional role, have confidence in the principal's knowledge of teaching and learning, can communicate a vision for the school, and behaves in such a way that the vision is implemented day-in and day-out. Such leaders are not heroes or "Rambos" but are designers and teachers, and engage in the all important act of stewardship for the students in the school. As designer, teacher and steward the principal's behavior gets played out in four areas of strategic interaction between teachers and the school principal. These four areas as conceptualized by Smith and Andrews (1989) are communicator, visible presence, resource provider, and instructional resource.

As communicator the principal provides the design for the school. Organizational design is not moving boxes and lines around on an organizational chart, but crafting the governing ideas of purpose, vision, and core values by which people live. Few acts of leadership have a more enduring impact on an organization than building a foundation of purpose, vision and core values. At the heart of purpose, vision, and core values are beliefs—beliefs about people, about schooling, about learning, and about teaching. As communicator, the principal focuses the conversation in a school around beliefs. The principal decides whether the conversation will be one of power and hope or a conversation as too many schools that can best be described as kid and parent bashing. The conversation must communicate the vision in both formal and informal ways. That vision needs to be one which has "the capacity to relate a compelling image of a desired state of affairs—the kind of image that induces enthusiasm and commitment in others" (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 33)—a vision in which teachers move from having ideas that foster a self-reliant, congenial community adapting to the circumstances it finds engulfing it, to a community of learners who feel empowered and who can generate conditions of change, progress and hopefulness.

Utilizing every opportunity to communicate the vision should be a priority task for the building principal. Formal strategies such as the use of public media, school newsletters, supervision conferences and faculty meetings are important and necessary. The principal also needs to communicate through newspaper articles along with presentations at local and national meetings. Informal strategies which enhance communication of the vision are also very important. Being obsessed with the mission by modeling a positive, strong work ethic will assist the principal in this area. What the principal does is more important than what the principal says. Providing informal opportunities for conversation on a one on one basis will pay dividends. The principal must become an active listener in order for the communication process to work effectively in translating the vision. Where the vision is not communicated, there is no vision. Where there is no vision, there is no hope. When the vision is communicated effectively, its presence is felt throughout the school and good things happen for kids. "A dream that is not understood remains a mere occurrence. Understood, it becomes a living experience." (Bennis, 1991, p. 4) The principal's challenge as a communicator is to make the dream understood.

As a visible presence, the principal greatly enhances the probability that the vision will be communicated. Peters (1987) explained visibility as management by walking around, the vehicle that makes it possible for the principal to teach values to every member of the school. A principal does this by being out and about in the school; informally visiting classrooms; making staff development a priority; and, by modeling behaviors consistent with the vision, in other words, living and breathing his/her beliefs about education. Consistent communication with all staff members, positive notes, quick responses to requests, and filling in for staff members who need help are examples of trust building activities that come from being available and accessible. On the other side of the coin, not tolerating unprofessional behaviors and caring enough to confront are also products of visible presence that enhance the vision-keeping role of the principal. What the principal chooses to reward, to notice, to recognize, puts into operation the core values of the school. It is through this process that the design—the dream, the vision—becomes realized. This is the act of stewardship, the keeping of the dream. The principal's visible presence enables the creation and maintenance of the attitude that he/she cares for the people he leads and the larger purpose of mission of the school. Enthusiasm and commitment to a dream is catching. A consistent visible presence is the foundation for trust building, a necessary component for a learning community to build proactive generative school culture.

As resource provider and instructional resource, the principal performs the role of head teacher. by helping everyone gain insightful views of current reality. By facilitating the teaching/learning process through needed resources, the principal enhances the productivity of the staff and thus the achievement of all students. Those resources may vary according to the needs of individuals within the school. For some, it might be as simple as a note or a kind word of encouragement, for others help in sponsoring a school activity, for still others it might be as a listener or intensive counseling. The principal must release time for teachers seeking to observe other teachers, tuition for attending classes, in house study groups, support for individual projects, dollars for equipment or other more tangible forms of support. In essence, the principal becomes a broker of teachers, their ideas and expertise. The principal's role is not to be all knowing about all topics, but to know the teachers, their strengths and needs in order to make appropriate matches. The principal must empower teachers to become more responsible for their learning by encouraging and providing guidance or other resources as needed. The principal then becomes a master coach, a communicator whose goal is to enable teachers to grow through introspection of themselves as teachers. This is

nothing more than what good teachers do with students. The principal as instructional/resource provider is a model teacher.

We have come a long way in understanding the purposes of schools and what makes schools work for all children. We have a clear sense of what we must do if schools are going to overcome the resistors to change. Clearly, good schools demand good leaders—leaders who behave in such a way that teachers buy into the dream that all children can learn, accept no failures and promote success for all. Schools do make a difference. Let us resolve to do what is necessary to be sure that all children have the opportunity to learn in a school in which the school principal knows what he/she wants, communicates those intentions, and provides the necessary design for it to happen. A school where principals see themselves as teachers of others, provide the necessary stewardship for people in the organization, and for the larger purpose of enculturation and equal access to knowledge. A school that is empowered.

References

Andrews, R., Soder, R., & Jacoby, D. (1986). Student Achievement, Principal Leadership and Other In-School Variables. Paper presented at the American Education Research Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California.

Andrews, R. & Soder, R. (1987). Student Achievement and Principal Leadership. *Educational Leadership, 44*(6).

Andrews, R. (1989). Teacher and Supervisor Assessment of Principal Leadership and Student Achievement. In Creemers, Bert, Tom Peters and Dave Reynolds (Eds.) *School Effectiveness and School Improvement.* Amsterdam: Swets and Zeitlinger; Berwyn: Swets and Zeitlinger, 211–220.

Andrews, R. & Morefield, J. (1991). Effective Leadership for Effective Urban Schools. *Education and Urban Society, 23*(3), 270–278.

Andrews, R., Basom, M. & Basom, M. (1991). Instruction Leadership: Supervision That Makes a Difference. *Theory Into Practice,* XXX: 2, 95–101.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge.* New York: Harper and Row.

Bennis, W. (1989). *Why Leaders Can't Lead,* San Francisco, CA: Jossey–Bass Publishing.

Bennis, W. (May, 1991). 21st Century Leadership. *Executive Excellence,* p. 3–4.

Brookover, W.B. & Lezotte, L.W. (1977). Changes in School Characteristics Coincident with Changes in Student Achievement. Occasional Paper No. 17, University Institute for Research on Teaching, East Lansing, MI.

Cawelti, G. (1984). Behavior Patterns of Effective Principals. *Phi Delta Kappan, 41*(3).

Chubb, J.E. & More, T.M. (1990). *What Price Democracy: Politics, Markets, and America's School.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institue.

Creemers, B., Peters, T., & Reynolds, D. (Eds.) (1989). *School effectiveness and school improvement.* Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective Schools for the Urban Poor. *Educational Leadership, 22,* 22–23.

Edmonds, R. (1982). Speech on his effective-schools research presented at the Annual Conference of the Washington State Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, Seattle, WA, February, 1982.

Glickman, C. (1991). Pretending Not to Know What We Know. Educational Leadership, 4–10.

Goodlad, J.I., Sirotnik, K. & Soder, R. (1990). (Eds.). *The Moral Dimensions of Teaching.* Berkeley, CA: Jossey–Bass, Inc.

Goodlad, J.I., & Keating, P. (1989). *Access to Knowledge: An Agenda for Our Nation.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Heck, R.H., Marcoulides, G.A. & Larsen, T.J. (1990). Principal Instructional Leadership and School Achievement: Empirical Validation of Causal Model. Paper presented to American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Kerr, D. (1987). *The Ecology of School Renewal.* In Goodlad, J.I. (ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lipham, J.M. (1981). *Effective Principal, Effective School.* National Association of Secondary School Principals, Reston, VA.

Mortimer, P. (1989). *School Matters.* Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Press.

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Purkey, S.C. & Smith, M.A. (1982). Too Soon to Cheer? Synthesis of Research on Effective Schools. *Educational Leadership, 40* 64–69.

Senge, P. (1990). The Leader's New Work: Building Learning Organizations. *Sloan Management Review,* 7–23.

Soder, P. & Andrews, P. (1985). Excellence and Equity: The Moral Imperatives of Schooling. *Curriculum in Context, 3*(1), 6–9.

Smith, W. & Andrews, R. (1989). *Instructional Leadership: How Principals Make a Difference.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD Press.