

Excerpt from ...

Successful School Leadership

What It Is and How It Influences Pupil Learning

by

Kenneth Leithwood, Christopher Day,

Pam Sammons, David Hopkins and Alma Harris

Report to the U.K. Department for Education and Skills

March 30, 2006

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
THE STATE-OF-THE-CONFUSION	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
THE MEANING OF LEADERSHIP	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF SCHOOL LEADERSHIP	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
CONCLUSION	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

excerpted chapter

2. THE NATURE OF SUCCESSFUL LEADERSHIP PRACTICES.....	4
INTRODUCTION.....	4
JUSTIFYING THE CORE LEADERSHIP PRACTICES	5
CORE PRACTICES AND COMPARATORS BASED ON RESEARCH IN SCHOOL CONTEXTS.....	6
CORE PRACTICES AND COMPARATORS BASED ON RESEARCH IN NON-SCHOOL CONTEXTS	9
THE CORE PRACTICES DESCRIBED	16
<i>A Theoretical (But Practical) Perspective on the Core Practices</i>	16
<i>Setting Directions</i>	18
<i>Developing People.....</i>	20
<i>Redesigning the Organization</i>	22
<i>Managing the Instructional Program</i>	26
CONCLUSION	27

3. DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL LEADERSHIP ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

INTRODUCTION	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
THE EFFECTS OF DISTRIBUTED LEADERSHIP.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
FORMS AND PATTERNS OF DISTRIBUTED LEADERSHIP.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
CONCLUSION	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

4. ROOTS OF SUCCESSFUL LEADERSHIP PRACTICE ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

INTRODUCTION	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
COGNITIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESSFUL LEADERS ...	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
<i>Intelligence and Other Intellectual Functions</i>	<i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i>
<i>Problem Solving.....</i>	<i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i>
<i>Knowledge.....</i>	<i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i>
AFFECTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESSFUL LEADERS ...	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
<i>Personality</i>	<i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i>
<i>Motivation</i>	<i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i>
<i>Social Appraisal Skills</i>	<i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i>
<i>Values.....</i>	<i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i>
CONCLUSION	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

5. FROM SUCCESSFUL LEADERSHIP PRACTICES TO PUPIL LEARNING....ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

INTRODUCTION	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
--------------------	-------------------------------------

HOW LEADERS INFLUENCE THEIR IMMEDIATE COLLEAGUES**ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**
 Followers' Perspectives.....*Error! Bookmark not defined.*
 Leaders' Perspectives*Error! Bookmark not defined.*
TEACHERS' INTERNAL STATES **ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**
 Classroom Conditions.....*Error! Bookmark not defined.*
 School Conditions*Error! Bookmark not defined.*
 Conditions in the Home.*Error! Bookmark not defined.*
CONCLUSION **ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**
6. CONCLUSION**ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**
REFERENCES.....**ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**

Chapter 2

The Nature of Successful Leadership Practices

Introduction

The bulk of this section is devoted to a description of practices common to successful leadership in many different situations and sectors but especially schools. We begin by acknowledging the substantial diversity to be found within the academic literatures about the nature of successful leadership more generally. The plural, “literatures” is used, because there is only occasional acknowledgement of research and theory across school and non-school sectors; transformational leadership is the most obvious exception to this general claim with significant numbers of adherents in both camps who do interact in print about their work.

For the most part, educational leadership researchers are exclusively concerned with leadership in school organizations. And while they occasionally draw on evidence collected in other settings, they rarely show any interest in extending their own work to those other settings. In contrast, leadership researchers working in non-school contexts have typically worried quite a bit about how well their theories and evidence travel across organizational sectors, although schools have been a relatively minor focus of their attention.

A series of related research summaries over the past three years have described the central elements of what we describe, in this section, as the “core practices” or “basics” of successful school leadership (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Leithwood & Riehl, 2005; Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). The four broad categories of practices identified in these research summaries include:

- Setting Directions;

- Developing People;
- Redesigning the Organization; and
- Managing the Instructional Programme.

Each of these categories, further refined for purposes of this review, encompasses a small number of more specific leadership behaviors (14 in total). The bulk of available evidence indicates that these categories of practice are a significant part of the repertoire of successful school leaders whether working in an elementary or secondary school, a school or a school district/LEA, a school in England, the United States, Canada or Hong Kong.

Many of our core practices have their genesis in several different models of transformational leadership – the early work of Burns (1978) and the follow-up empirical work of both Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990) and Bass (1985). But considerable work with this approach to leadership in district and school contexts has led to the current formulation. We have recently counted in excess of 40 published studies and some 140 unpublished studies focused on many of these leadership practices in school and district contexts since about 1990. The considerable evidence now available tells us a good deal about their relative contribution to organizational improvement and student learning. Core practices are not all that people providing leadership in schools do. But they are especially critical practices known to have significant influence on organizational goals. Their value lies in the focus they bring to what leaders attend to.

Justifying the Core Leadership Practices

The main sources of evidence justifying our core practices can be found in the reports cited above. In this section, however, we compare the core practices with other formulations of consequential leadership practices in order to further justify our claims about the validity and

comprehensiveness of the core practices. The first set of comparisons is restricted to school-related conceptions of effective leadership practice while the second set looks more broadly across organizational sectors.

Core Practices and Comparators Based on Research in School Contexts

Although our core practices were developed from a broad array of empirical evidence collected in school contexts, we provide further justification of their validity and comprehensiveness by comparing them with behaviors included in the most fully tested model of instructional leadership available in the literature (Hallinger, 2003) and a recent meta-analysis of empirical evidence about the practices of leaders which demonstrably contribute to student achievement (Marzano et al., 2005; Waters et al., 2003).

1. Hallinger's Model of Instructional Leadership

While the term “instructional leadership” has been mostly used as a slogan to focus administrators on their students’ progress, there have been a small number of efforts to give the term a more precise and useful meaning. Book-length descriptions of instructional leadership by Andrews and Soder (1987) and Duke (1987) are among such efforts, for example. However, Hallinger (2000), Hallinger and Murphy (1985), and Heck, Larson, and Marcoulides (1990) have provided the most fully specified model and by far the most empirical evidence concerning the nature and effects of that model in practice. By one estimate, this evidence now runs to 125 studies reported between 1980 and 2000 (Hallinger, 2003). Three categories of practices are included in the model, each of which encompasses a number of more specific practices (10 in total):

- *defining the school's mission* includes framing and then communicating the school's goals;

- *managing the instructional program* includes supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, and monitoring student progress; and
- *promoting a positive school learning climate* encompasses protecting instructional time, promoting professional development, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers, and providing incentives for learning.

Hallinger's recent (2003) review of evidence concerning instructional leadership found that mission-building activities on the part of principals are the most influential set of leadership practices.

2. Waters, Marzano and McNulty's Meta-analysis

A paper (2003) and subsequent book (2005) by these authors report the results of a meta-analysis of 70 empirical studies reported over a 30 year period which included objective measures of student achievement and teacher reports of leadership behaviors. The main product of the analysis is the identification of 21 leadership "responsibilities" which contribute significantly to student achievement. These are responsibilities that are exercised in degree; the more the better. We consider 17 of these to be "behaviors" while the remaining four are traits or dispositions (Knowledge of curriculum, ideals/beliefs, flexibility, situational awareness).

Table 1 summarizes the relationship between our core practices, the behaviors included in Hallinger's (2003) instructional leadership model, and Waters, Marzano and McNulty's (Waters et al., 2003; Marzano et al., 2005) meta-analysis. All behaviors included in the two comparators are encompassed by our core leadership practices with the exception of a category called "Communication" (establishes strong lines of communication with teachers and among students) in the Waters et al. analysis. Communication is an undeniably important skill and

behavior for people in many walks of life – certainly for those in leadership roles – but we have chosen to focus on behaviors relatively unique to those in leadership roles.

Table 1
Core Practices of Successful School Leaders Compared with Successful Practices Reflected in Other School-related Sources

Core Leadership Practices	Hallinger’s Model of Instructional Leadership	Waters et al. Meta-analysis
Setting Directions		
Vision	Developing a clear mission focused on students’ academic progress	Inspires and leads new & challenging innovations
Goals	Framing the school’s goals Communicating the school’s goals	Establishes clear goals and keeps them in forefront of attention
High performance expectations		
Developing People		
Individualized support/consideration	Providing incentives for teachers	Recognizes & rewards individual accomplishment Demonstrates awareness of personal aspects of teachers and staff
Intellectual stimulation	Promoting professional development	Is willing to, and actively challenges, the status quo Ensures faculty & staff are well informed about best practice/fosters regular discussion of them
Modelling	Maintaining high visibility	Has quality contacts & interactions with teachers and students)
Redesigning the Organization		
Building a collaborative culture		Fosters shared beliefs, sense of community, cooperation Recognizes and celebrates school accomplishments & acknowledges failures Involves Ts in design and implementation of important decisions and policies

Core Leadership Practices	Hallinger's Model of Instructional Leadership	Waters et al. Meta-analysis
Structuring the organization to facilitate work	Providing incentives for learning	
Creating productive relations with families & communities		Is an advocate & spokesperson for school to all stakeholders
Connecting the school to its wider environment		
Managing the Instructional Programme		
Staffing		
Providing instructional support	Supervising & evaluating instruction Coordinating the curriculum	Establishes set of standard operating procedures & routines Provides materials necessary for job Directly involved in design & implementation of curriculum, instruction and assessment practices
Monitoring	Monitoring student progress	Monitors the effectiveness of school practices & their impact on student learning
Buffering	Protecting instructional time	Protects teachers from issues & influences that would detract them from their teaching time or focus

Core Practices and Comparators Based on Research in Non-school Contexts

Substantial evidence demonstrates the value of our core leadership practices in non-school as well as school contexts (e.g., business and military organizations), as well as in quite diverse national cultures. While the fourth and most recently added category, Managing the Instructional Program, seems unique to schools, it is easily applicable to other organizations slightly reworded as Managing the Organization's Core Technology.¹

¹ Evidence in support of this claim in school contexts can be found in Geijsel, Slegers, Leithwood and Jantzi. (2002). See Bass (2004) for evidence of this claim in the business and military sectors.

In this section, we compare the core practices with two other sources of evidence about key leadership practices justified by evidence primarily collected in non-school organizational contexts – Yukl’s taxonomy of managerial behaviors and a synopsis of a significant selection of alternative leadership “models” or theories.

1. Yukl’s Taxonomy

This classification of important leader or manager behaviors was the outcome of synthesizing seven earlier behavioral taxonomies, each of which built on quite substantial empirical and/or theoretical foundations. Yukl (1994) found many points of agreement across these taxonomies and identified some 14 managerial behaviors reflecting these areas of agreement. and Table 1 compares our four core practices of successful school leadership with Yukl’s synthesis of what he called “managerial behaviors”. Described in some detail by Yukl (1989, 1994), these behaviors included planning and organizing, problem solving, clarifying roles and objectives, informing, monitoring, motivating and inspiring, consulting, delegating, supporting, developing and mentoring, managing conflict and team building, networking, recognizing, and rewarding.

2. Alternative Leadership Theories

A recent “state-of-the-science” review (Yammarino, Dionne, Chun, & Dansereau, 2005) of leadership theories largely developed in non-school contexts pointed to some 21 approaches or models that have been the object of considerable, though quite varying, amounts of theoretical and empirical development. Seventeen of these approaches have attracted an especially impressive amount of research attention. We provide a brief synopsis of the main theories as a prelude to comparing the behaviors they highlight with our core leadership practices.

Ohio State model. This highly durable two-dimensional conception of leadership includes two leadership “styles” - initiating structure (a task oriented and directive style) and consideration (a friendly, supportive style). Each style is considered to be differentially effective depending on such variables as the size of the organization, how clear people are about their roles and how mature people are in their jobs.

Contingency theory. Also a two-dimensional conception of leadership, this theory explains differences in leaders’ effectiveness in terms of a task or relationship style (as with the Ohio State model) and the situation in which the leaders finds herself. Task- oriented leaders are predicted to be more successful in high- and low-control settings, whereas relationships-oriented leaders are predicted to more successful in moderate- control settings. To be most effective, then, leaders styles need to match the setting in which they find themselves.

Participative leadership model. This approach is concerned with how leaders select among three distinct approaches to their colleagues’ participation in organizational decisions: an autocratic approach which allows for almost no member participation; a consultative approach in which participation is restricted to providing information and; a more extensive and inclusive form of participation called “collaborative sharing”. The choice among these forms is to be based on achieving such goals as improving decision quality, increasing the development of those to be involved and minimizing decision costs and time.

Situational leadership. Also oriented to the level of follower’s development, this approach to leadership varies the extent to which the leader engages in task oriented and relationship oriented practices Hersey & Blanchard (1984). According to this theory, as follower maturity develops from low to moderate levels, the leader should engage in more relations behaviors and fewer task behaviors. Decreased behaviors of both types are called for as

followers move from moderate to maximum levels of maturity; leadership should be delegated with considerable autonomy for its performance.

Path-goal theory. Yukl describes this approach to leadership as a motivational one consisting of "...increasing personal payoffs to subordinates for work-goal attainment and making the path to these payoffs easier to travel by clarifying it, reducing roadblocks and pitfalls, and increasing the opportunities for satisfaction en- route." (1989, p. 99). Organizational members will make the effort to succeed only if they believe valued outcomes can be accomplished through serious effort. Depending on the situation, leadership may contribute to such beliefs by being supportive, directive, participative or achievement-oriented.

Vertical dyad linkage model, leader-member exchange (LMX) theory and individualized leadership theory. Beginning with vertical dyad concepts and developing into LMX, this approach recognizes that leaders treat members of the same group differently. Until its development, the common assumption was that all members of the organization experienced the same relationship with leaders. Leader-member exchanges can result in some members becoming part of an "in-group", enjoying the trust and confidence of leaders and, or an "out-group", experiencing a more distant and formal relationship with leaders. Leaders and their individual colleagues, more generally, develop unique one-to-one relationships as they influence each other and negotiate the role of the follower. This individual, rather than group, focus led to the development of individualized leader theory. Each leader/follower dyad involves investments by the leader in and returns from the follower as well as followers' investments in and returns from the leader. Leaders secure followership, for example, by supporting a follower's feelings of self-worth

Transformational and charismatic leadership. These closely related approaches to leadership are defined in terms of leaders' influence over their colleagues and the nature of leader-follower relations. Transformational leaders (e.g., Dumdum, Lowe, & Avolio, 2002) need not be charismatic (e.g. Kim, Dansereau, & Kim, 2002), although some argue that it is the key component of such leadership and the only quality that accounts for extraordinary or outstanding leadership. Typical of both forms of leadership are such behaviors as communicating a compelling vision, conveying high performance expectations, projecting self confidence, role modelling, expressing confidence in followers' abilities to achieve goals, emphasizing collective purpose and identity. Charismatic leaders engender, among their colleagues, exceptionally high levels of trust, loyalty, respect, and commitment. But some of these outcomes depend on whether the charismatic leadership is socialized or personal. Socialized charismatic leaders are also transformational; that is, they help bring about desirable improvement in the organization. They acquire the commitment of their colleagues through the compelling nature of their vision and ideas, as well as their genuine concern for the welfare of their colleagues. Personalized charismatics are unlikely to be transformational. They are attributed charismatic stature by virtue of their attractive personal qualities, for example. But they are prone to exploiting others, serving their own self interests and have a very high need for power.

Substitutes for leadership. This conception of leadership, introduced by Kerr and Jermier in 1978, has enjoyed a significant following in spite of difficulties in producing evidence confirming its central propositions. From this perspective, leadership can be a property of the organization as much as something engaged in by a person. Furthermore, features of the organizational setting either enhance or neutralize the influence of people attempting to function as leaders – engaging in either task or relationship-oriented functions. Routine and highly

standardized tasks that provide their own outcome feedback, cohesive work groups, no control over rewards and spatial distance between leaders and followers are among the conditions hypothesized to neutralize task-oriented leadership. Relationship-oriented leadership, theorists argue, is neutralized by colleagues' need for independence, professional orientation and indifference to organizational rewards (Yammarino et al., 2005).

Romance of leadership. This is a follower-centric view of leadership (Meindl, 1998) premised on the claim that leadership is an overrated explanation for organizational events. Its attraction may be a function of the simple, if incorrect, explanation it provides for quite complex and difficult to understand organizational events. Furthermore, there is a social contagion associated with leadership attributions; people begin to persuade one another of the importance of leadership quite apart from any other evidence that it matters. As Yammarino and his coauthors explain "Heroic social identification, articulation of an appealing ideology, symbols, rituals and rites of passage all play a role in this process" (2005, p. 900).

Self leadership. The focus of this line of theory and research concerns the strategies that individuals and groups can use to improve their own leadership capacities (Markham & Markham, 1998). To the extent that such strategies are available and have the desired effect, self management and self leadership has the potential to increase employee empowerment and reduce the resources devoted to traditional sources of leadership and supervision.

Multiple linkage. Developed by Yukl and his colleagues (e.g., Yukl, 1998), this approach includes the fourteen managerial behaviors identified in Table 2, along with a set of intervening and situational variables, along the lines of the framework used for our review. According to Yammarino, "The model proposes that leaders institute short-term actions to deal with

deficiencies in the intervening variables and positively impact group performance in the long term” (2005, p. 901).

Table 2

Core Practices of Successful School Leaders Compared with Successful Practices Identified in Non-school Organizational Contexts

Core Leadership Practices	Yukl’s Taxonomy of Managerial Behavior	Alternative Leadership Theories
Setting Directions		
Vision	Motivating and inspiring	Charismatic and Transformational theory
Goals	Clarifying roles and objectives Planning and organizing	Substitutes theory
High performance expectations		Charismatic & Transformational theory
Developing People		
Individualized support/consideration	Supporting Developing and mentoring Recognizing Rewarding	Ohio State, Contingency Model, Path-goal theory Transformational theory LMX, Individualized leadership
Intellectual stimulation		Transformational theory
Modelling		Charismatic and Transformational theory
Redesigning the Organization		
Building a collaborative culture	Managing conflict and team building Delegating Consulting	Participative Leadership,
Structuring the organization to facilitate work		Ohio State, Contingency Model, Participative Leadership, Path-goal theory
Creating productive relations with families & communities		
Connecting the school to its wider environment	Networking	
Managing the Instructional Programme		
Staffing		
Resources		

Core Leadership Practices	Yukl's Taxonomy of Managerial Behavior	Alternative Leadership Theories
Monitoring	Monitoring	
Buffering		

Table 2 indicates considerable endorsement for our core practices from both Yukl's taxonomy and our selection of leadership theories. Only one practice or function identified in these two sources is not reflected in the core practices, Yukl's problem solving "behavior". Expertise in problem solving makes a crucial contribution to a leader's success. In this review, however, we treat it not as a behavior but as a cognitive activity leading to behavior. Evidence about successful leaders' problem solving is reviewed as part of our treatment of the roots or antecedents of successful leadership practice.

Our selection of leadership theories includes much more about leadership than simply behaviors, it should be noted; for example, propositions about how behaviors and elements of the context interact to produce favorable outcomes. These additional features go beyond our purposes here, however.

The Core Practices Described

A Theoretical (But Practical) Perspective on the Core Practices

Lists of things - like leadership practices - can be pretty forgettable and not very meaningful unless there is some underlying idea holding them together. The great advantage of leadership theories, for example, as compared with the many lists of leadership standards now so popular in policy circles is that the theories possess a conceptual glue almost entirely missing from the standards. This glue offers an explanation for how and why things work as they do and so builds understanding.

The glue that holds our core practices together might be drawn from many sources since the practices themselves reflect many elements of existing leadership theory. We limit ourselves here to a type of glue which aims to explain why each of the main categories of our core practices are important to exercise if leaders are to have a substantial and positive impact on their schools.

We begin by pointing out that the extent to which educational policies and other reform efforts improve what students learn finally depends on their consequences for what teachers do. And what teachers do, according to a particularly useful model for explaining workplace performance (O'Day, 1996; Rowan, 1996) is a function of their motivations, abilities, and the situations in which they work. The relationship among these variables can be represented in this deceptively simple formula:

$$P_j = f(M_j, A_j, S_j)$$

in which

- *P* stands for a teacher's performance
- *M* stands for the teacher's motivation (in Yukl's, 1989, Multiple Linkage model of managerial effectiveness, *M* includes the effort to engage in a high level of performance as well as demonstrating a high degree of personal responsibility and commitment to the organization's goals).
- *A* stands for the teacher's abilities, professional knowledge, and skills (in Yukl's model, such performance also includes their understanding of their job responsibilities); and
- *S* represents their work settings – the features of their school, and classroom.

Relationships among the variables in this model are considered to be interdependent. This means two things. It means that each variable has an effect on the remaining two (for example,

aspects of teachers' work environments are significant influences on their motivations). It also means that changes in all three variables need to happen in concert or performance will not change much. For example, neither high ability and low motivation, nor high motivation and low ability foster high levels of teacher performance; neither does high ability and high motivation in a dysfunctional work environment. Furthermore, a dysfunctional work setting will likely depress initially high levels of both ability and motivation.

The implications for leadership practice of this account of workplace performance are twofold. First, leaders will need to engage in practices with the potential to improve all elements in the formula – teachers and other staff members abilities, motivations and the settings in which they work. Second, leaders will need to engage in those practices more or less simultaneously. The overall function of successful leaders, according to this formulation is to improve the condition of all three variables.

Setting Directions

This category of practices carries the bulk of the effort to motivate leaders' colleagues (Hallinger & Heck, 1998). It is about the establishment of “moral purpose” (Fullan, 2003; Hargreaves & Fink, 2006) as a basic stimulant for one's work. Most theories of motivation argue that people are motivated to accomplish personally important goals for themselves. For example, such goals are one of four sources of motivation in Bandura's theory of human motivation (1986).

Three more specific sets of practices are included in this category, all of which are aimed at bringing a focus to both the individual and collective work of staff in the school or district. Done skillfully, these practices are one of the main sources of motivation and inspiration for the work of staff.

Building a shared vision. Building compelling visions of the organization's future is a fundamental task included in both transformational and charismatic leadership models. Bass's (1985) "inspirational motivation" is encompassed in this practice, a dimension that Podsakoff defines as leadership behavior "aimed at identifying new opportunities for his or her unit....and developing, articulating, and inspiring others with his or her vision of the future" (1990, p. 112). Silins and Mulford (2002b) found positive and significant effects of a shared and monitored mission. Harris and Chapman's small scale qualitative study of effective leadership in schools facing challenging circumstances reported that:

Of central importance ... was the cooperation and alignment of others to [the leader's] set of values and vision ... Through a variety of symbolic gestures and actions, they were successful at realigning both staff and pupils to their particular vision (2002, p. 6).

Locke (2002) argues that formulating a vision for the organization is one of eight core tasks for senior leaders and a key mechanism for achieving integration or alignment of activities within the organization; that is, "...tying all the processes together so that they are not only consistent with one another but actively support one another. After Locke (2002), we include as part of vision building the establishment of core organizational values. Core values specify the means by which the vision is to be accomplished.

Fostering the acceptance of group goals. While visions can be inspiring, action typically requires some agreement on the more immediate goals to be accomplished in order to move toward the vision. Building on such theory, this set of practices aims not only to identify important goals for the organization, but to do so in such a way that individual members come to include the organization's goals among their own. Unless this happens, the organization's goals have no motivational value. So leaders can productively spend a lot of time on this set of practices. Giving short shrift misses the point entirely. This set of practices includes leader

behaviors “...aimed at promoting cooperation among [teachers] and getting them to work together toward a common goal” (Podsakoff et al., 1990, p. 112).

In district and school settings, strategic and improvement planning processes are among the more explicit contexts in which these behaviors are manifest. One of the eleven effective managerial behaviors included in Yukl’s Multiple Linkage model, “planning and organizing”, encompasses a portion of these practices. Planning and organizing include “Determining long-range objectives and strategies..., identifying necessary steps to carry out a project or activity...” (1989, p. 130).

High performance expectations. This set of leadership practices is included as part of direction setting because it is closely aligned with goals. While high performance expectations do not define the substance of organizational goals, they demonstrate, as Podsakoff explains, “the leader’s expectations of excellence, quality, and/or high performance”(Podsakoff et al., 1990, p. 112) in the achievement of those goals. Demonstrating such expectations is a central behavior in virtually all conceptions of transformational and charismatic leadership.

Developing People

The three sets of practices in this category make a significant contribution to motivation. Their primary aim is capacity building, however, building not only the knowledge and skill staff need to accomplish organizational goals but also the dispositions to persist in applying that knowledge and skill (Harris & Chapman, 2002). Individual teacher efficacy is arguably the most critical of these dispositions and it is a third source of motivation in Bandura’s (1986) model. People are motivated by what they are good at. And *mastery experiences*, according to Bandura, are the most powerful sources of efficacy. So building capacity leading to a sense of mastery is highly motivational, as well.

Providing individualized support/consideration. Bass and Avolio include, as part of this dimension, “knowing your followers’ needs and raising them to more mature levels...[sometimes through] the use of delegation to provide opportunities for each follower to self-actualize and to attain higher standards of moral development” (1994, p. 64). This set of behaviors, claims Podsakoff et al. (1990), should communicate the leader’s respect for his or her colleagues and concerns about their personal feelings and needs. This is a set of practices common to all of the two-dimensional models of leadership (Ohio State, Contingency theory and Situational Leadership theory) which include task orientation and *consideration for people*. Encompassed by this set of practices are the “supporting”, and “recognizing and rewarding” managerial behaviors associated with Yukl’s (1989) Multiple Linkage model, as well as Hallinger’s (2003) model of instructional leadership and the Waters et al. (2003) meta-analysis. This set of leadership behaviors has likely attracted more leadership research outside of schools since the 1960s than any other.

Intellectual stimulation. Behaviors included in this dimension include encouraging colleagues to take intellectual risks, re-examine assumptions, look at their work from different perspectives, rethink how it can be performed (Avolio, 1994; Podsakoff et al., 1990), and otherwise “induc[e]...employees to appreciate, dissect, ponder and discover what they would not otherwise discern...” (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996, p. 415-416). Waters, Marzano and McNulty (Waters et al., 2003; Marzano et al., 2005) include “challenging the status quo” among the practices contributing to leader effects on students.

This is where the leader’s role in professional development is to be found a key role especially for leaders of schools in challenging circumstances (Gray, 2000). But it recognizes the many informal, as well as formal, ways such development occurs. It also reflects our current

understandings of learning as constructed, social and situated. All models of transformational and charismatic leadership include this set of practices. A considerable amount of the educational literature assumes such practices on the part of school leaders, most notably the literature on instructional leadership which places school leaders at the centre of instructional improvement efforts in their schools (e.g., Hallinger, 2003; Stein & Spillane, 2005).

Providing an appropriate model. This category entails “leading by example,” a general set of practices associated with models of “authentic leadership” (Avolio & Gardner, 2005), demonstrating transparent decision making, confidence, optimism, hope, resiliency and consistency between words and deeds. Locke (2002) claims that core values are established by modelling core values in one’s own practices. Both Hallinger (2003) and Waters et al. (2003) note the contribution to leader effects of maintaining high visibility in the school, a visibility associated with high quality interactions with both staff and students. Harris and Chapman found that their successful heads “modeled behavior that they considered desirable to achieve the school goals (2002, p.6).

Also encompassed by this dimension is Bass’s “idealized influence,” a partial replacement for his original “charisma” dimension: Avolio (1994) claims that leaders exercise idealized influence when they serve as role models with the appropriate behaviors and attitudes that are required to build trust and respect in followers. Such modeling on the part of leaders “...sets an example for employees to follow that is consistent with the values the leader espouses” (Podsakoff et al., 1990, p. 112).

Redesigning the Organization

This is the “S”, or situation, or working conditions variable in our equation for predicting levels of performance described earlier. There is little to be gained by increasing peoples’

motivation and capacity if working conditions will not allow their effective application. In Bandura's (1986) model, beliefs about the situation is a fourth source of motivation; people are motivated when they believe the circumstances in which they find themselves are conducive to accomplishing the goals they hold to be personally important. The three practices included in this category are about establishing the conditions of work which will allow staff to make the most of their motivations and capacities.

Building Collaborative Cultures. A large body of evidence has accumulated since Little's (1982) early research which unambiguously supports the importance of collaborative cultures in schools as central to school improvement, the development of professional learning communities and the improvement of student learning (e.g., Louis & Kruse, 1998; Rosenholtz, 1989).

Additional evidence clearly indicates that leaders are able to build more collaborative cultures and suggests practices that accomplish this goal (e.g., Leithwood, Jantzi, & Dart, 1990; Waters et al., 2003). For leaders of schools in challenging circumstances, creating more positive collaborative and achievement-oriented cultures is a key task for leaders (West, Ainscow, & Stanford, 2005).

Connolly and James (2006) claim that the success of collaborative activity is determined by the capacity and motivation of collaborators along with opportunities for them to collaborate. Success also depends on prior conditions. For example, a history of working together will sometimes build trust making further collaboration easier. Trust is increasingly recognized as a key element in encouraging collaboration and that individuals are more likely to trust those with whom they have established good relationships (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Louis & Kruse, 1995). Participative leadership theory and Leader-member exchange theory are concerned with the nature and quality of collaboration in organizations and how to manage it productively.

Leaders contribute to productive collaborative activity in their schools by being skilled conveners of that work. They nurture mutual respect and trust among those involved in collaborating, ensure the shared determination of group processes and outcomes, help develop clarity about goals and roles for collaboration, encourage a willingness to compromise among collaborators, foster open and fluent communication among collaborators, and provide adequate and consistent resources in support of collaborative work. (Connolly & James, 2006; Mattessich & Monsey, 1992).

Restructuring. This is a function or behavior common to virtually all conceptions of management and leadership practice. Organizational culture and structure are two sides of the same coin. Developing and sustaining collaborative cultures depends on putting in place complementary structures, typically something requiring leadership initiative. Practices associated with such initiatives include creating common planning times for teachers and establishing team and group structures for problem solving (e.g., Hadfield, 2003). Hallinger and Heck (1998) identify this variable as a key mediator of leaders effects on students. Restructuring also includes distributing leadership for selected tasks and increasing teacher involvement in decision making (Reeves, 2000).

Building productive relationships with families and communities. Shifting the attention of school staffs from an exclusively inside-the-school focus to one which embraces a meaningful role for parents and a close relationship with the larger community was identified during the 1990s as the biggest change in expectations for those in formal school leadership roles (e.g., Goldring & Rallis, 1993). More recently, Muijs, Harris, Chapman, Stoll and Russ (2004) have identified this core practice as important for improving schools in challenging circumstances. Attention to this focus has been encouraged by evidence of the contribution of family

educational cultures to student achievement in schools (e.g., Coleman, 1966; Finn, 1989), the increase in public accountability of schools to their communities through the widespread implementation of school-based management (Murphy & Beck, 1995), and the growing need for schools to actively manage public perceptions of their legitimacy (e.g., Mintrop, 2004).

Connecting the school to its' wider environment. School leaders spend significant amounts of time in contact with people outside of their schools seeking information and advice, staying in tune with policy changes, anticipating new pressures and trends likely to have an influence on their schools and the like. Meetings, informal conversations, phone calls, email exchanges and internet searches are examples of opportunities for accomplishing these purposes. The extensive number of Network Learning projects facilitated by the National College of School Leadership in England provide especially powerful opportunities for connecting one's school to at least its wider educational environment (Jackson, 2002). Bringing in external support may also be a productive response to schools engaged in significant school improvement projects (Reynolds, Hopkins, Potter, & Chapman, 2001).

In spite of the considerable time spent by school leaders on this function, we are unaware of any research, to date, that has inquired about its contribution to improving pupil learning and/or the quality of the school organization. However, research has been conducted about the effects of this practice in non-school organizations. Referring to it as “networking”, Yukl includes it in his Multiple Linkage model of leadership as one of eleven critical managerial practices. He describes this practice as “Socializing informally, developing contacts with people who are a source of information and support, and maintaining contacts through periodic interaction, including visits, telephone calls, correspondence, and attendance at meetings and social events” (1994, p. 69).

Improvint the Instructional Program

There is some potential confusion about the effects of this set of practices. Surprisingly, Hallinger's (2003) recent review suggested that those management practices which involve close association with the classroom and supervision of what happens in the classroom appear to have the least effect on students. On the other hand, when managerial behaviors have been included in other recent research on school leadership effects, they have explained almost as much as did leadership behaviors (e.g., Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999). So they are important, as a class, especially those that create stability and strengthen the infrastructure. But those of a more supervisory nature seem not to be in most cases.

Staffing the program. Although not touched on by Hallinger (2003) or Waters et al. (2003), this has proven to be a key function of leaders engaged in school improvement. Finding teachers with the interest and capacity to further the school's efforts is the goal of this activity. Recruiting and retaining staff is a primary task leading schools in challenging circumstances (Gray, 2000).

Providing instructional support. This set of practices, included in both Hallinger (2003) and Waters et al. (2003) includes "supervising and evaluating instruction", coordinating the curriculum" and providing resources in support of curriculum, instruction and assessment activity. West et al. (2005) indicate that, for leaders of schools in challenging contexts, focusing on teaching and learning is essential. This includes controlling behavior, boosting self esteem and talking and listening to pupils. It also may include urging pupils and teachers to put a strong emphasis on pupil achievement. Such an "academic climate" makes significant contributions to achievement (De Maeyer, Rymenans, Van Petegem, van der Bergh, & Rijlaarsdam, 2006)

Monitoring school activity. Waters et al. analysis associated leadership effects on students with leader monitoring and evaluating functions, especially those focused on student progress. The purposeful use of data is reported by West et al. (2005) to be a central explanation for effective leadership in failing schools (see also Reynolds, Stringfield, & Muijs, forthcoming). Hallinger's (2003) model includes a set of practices labelled "monitoring student progress". Monitoring operations and environment is one of Yukl's (1989) eleven effective managerial practices. And Gray (2000) reports that tracking student progress is a key task for leaders of schools in challenging circumstances.

Buffering staff from distractions to their work. A long line of research has reported the value to organizational effectiveness of leaders preventing staff from being pulled in directions incompatible with agreed on goals. This buffering function acknowledges the open nature of schools and the constant bombardment of staff with expectations from parents, the media, special interest groups and the government. Internal buffering is also helpful, especially buffering teachers from excessive pupil disciplinary activity.

The four sets of leadership practices in this category provide the coordination for initiatives stimulated by the other core leadership practices. They help provide the stability so necessary for improvement to occur.

Conclusion

Four broad categories of leadership practices – and fourteen more specific categories – capture our review of the evidence about what effective leaders do. They do not do all of these things all of the time, of course; you don't have to create a shared vision everyday. And the way you go about each set of practices will certainly vary by context. If your school has been labelled as "failing" you likely do more selling of your vision to staff than developing it collaboratively –

so you can get on with your turnaround mission. So what is contingent about leadership is not the basic or core practices but the way they are enacted. It is the enactment that must be sensitive to context, not the core practices themselves. The core practices provide a powerful source of guidance for practicing leaders, as well as a framework for the initial and continuing development of leaders.

