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ABSTRACT

INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING AND TEACHING:
PERCEPTIONS OF PRACTICE AND DEPARTMENT
EXPECTATIONS OF PRINCIPAL PREPARATION
PROGRAM FACULTIES

by

David Lee DeWeese

This study of principal preparation programs composing the Danforth Foundation Program for the Preparation of School Principals (DPPSP) was conducted to identify and compare the perceptions of program faculty and program coordinators of their respective instructional planning and teaching practices, and their like perceptions of department expectations of faculty regarding these same roles.

Variables were constructed using a pilot survey with selected faculty who were members of the Southern Region Council for Education Administration.

There were three major findings. Faculty and program coordinators ranked their perceptions of their own practice highly. Faculty and program coordinators ranked their perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching higher than they ranked their perceptions of department expectations of faculty regarding their teaching. Faculty and program coordinators ranked their perceptions of their own practice higher than they ranked their self-reported use of various instructional planning and teaching strategies, and methods and resources.

Several recommendations resulted from this study. Faculty and program coordinators in DPPSP programs need to conduct research which focuses on graduate perceptions of the quality of instructional planning and teaching they experienced while in the preparation program. Similar research which focuses on other principal preparation program faculty teaching practices needs to be conducted, possibly using a qualitative approach. In light of the disparity between faculty and program coordinator perceptions of their instructional planning and teaching practices, and their self-reported utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources, it was recommended that DPPSP faculties and coordinators engage in critical assessment of the assumptions under which they plan for and enact teaching and learning activities.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Public school leadership preparation programs have become the focus of more intense scrutiny for those concerned with addressing the needs of American schools (Achilles, 1984; Goodlad, 1984; Joyce, Showers, & Rolheiser-Bennett, 1987; McCarthy, Kuh, Newell & Iacona, 1988; Griffiths, Stout & Forsyth, 1988). Partly as a result of the growing concern over the way public school leaders were being prepared, a study was conducted by the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, under the auspices of the University Council for Educational Administration (Griffiths et al., 1987). One ominous recommendation of the Commission was that at least 300 of the 505 existing preparation programs could be eliminated.

Among the growing chorus of critics of public school leadership preparation programs were former students. Bridges (1977) concluded that graduate preparation programs were dysfunctional. He characterized the typical school administrator's work day as a continuous series of brief, disjointed, verbal encounters with a variety of people seeking solutions. Academic preparation programs, on the other hand, required aspiring administrators to spend long hours alone reading, writing and contemplating potential solutions. Ourth (1979) concluded from his survey of leaders of 500 public school districts that practitioners ranked their university training programs very low in utility.
Erlandson and Churchill-Witters (1988) found in their study of graduates of Texas principal preparation programs that a lecture and discussion instruction mode was used for eight of nine skill areas examined. These practicing school leaders in Texas judged their university training to have been easy, boring, and only intermittently useful to them.

Thompson (1994) expanded on this criticism of current preparation programs. He acknowledged positive efforts at reform initiated by, among others, those affiliated with the Danforth Foundation Principal Preparation Program, a network currently composed of 18 public school leadership development programs. However, he noted the absence of a consistent framework for licensure as a principal and widely divergent program expectations.

These assessments would seem to mitigate a more optimistic appraisal by Farquhar (1977) who had earlier presented evidence that the preparation of school administrators was undergoing significant change. According to Farquhar, who conducted a self-reporting study of public school leadership program faculties, the focus of training was moving from delivering information about administrative tasks and processes to an emphasis on preparing practitioners to deal with major problems they would be expected to confront. Faculty respondents reported that the content of learning experiences had been affected by changing from reliance on insights of educational
professionals to the incorporation of materials from a wide variety of disciplines. Farquhar also reported a shift from the traditional lecture format to reality-oriented instructional methods, including workshops, seminars, computer programs, and more sophisticated supplementary field experiences.

The resulting image of principal preparation programs was anything but clear. On certain issues, however, there appeared to be an emerging consensus among researchers, leadership preparation program faculties, and public school leaders. First, public school leadership programs varied considerably in their respective philosophies (Griffiths et al. 1988; McCarthy, et al.; 1988; Murphy, 1992; Milstein, 1993). At one end of the philosophical continuum were found those departments and individual faculty members who wanted to see principal preparation programs emphasize research and the generation of theory (McCarthy et al., 1988). Those at the other pole were inclined to see programs focus more on clinical experiences which would be designed collaboratively by faculty and practicing public school administrators. The second area of evolving consensus was derivative of the first. Because of significant differences in preparation programs, many critics were doubtful that graduates were being equipped to lead public schools (Griffiths, et al., 1987; Griffiths, Stout & Forsyth, 1988; Thompson, 1994;).
If recent assessments of principal preparation programs are valid, reform of principal preparation programs has much further to go. Thompson (1994) stated:

To qualify for the initial license to practice, principals are required in 36 states to have a master's degree or a master's degree plus additional graduate hours. In the other states, some graduate credit is required. Most states, however, fail to stipulate a major for the master's degree. Thirty states only specify a certain number of graduate credit hours in the field of educational administration, and fewer than half of the states, 23, designate the content of graduate studies. Only 17 states require a clinical component for licensure, usually an internship. Small wonder the public and state legislatures become confused about the professional standards and status of the principalship. (Thompson, 1994, p.40).

Thompson further asserted that for true professionalization of the principalship to occur the quality of standards required for licensure and the relevancy of content and skills taught in preparation programs must "weave together theoretical knowledge, applied knowledge and skills, and clinical practice" (p.40).

Responding to voices clamoring for reform, many educational leaders involved with the preparation of public school principals began to reassess fundamental assumptions
underlying their programs. Subsequently, some have begun to rethink the processes, content, and structures of principal preparation programs (Murphy, 1993; Patterson, 1993).

As consequent public school leadership preparation program reform agendas have moved forward, however, one closely coupled pair of elements, the planning for and delivery of instruction, of vital importance to any educational reform initiative, frequently remained subordinate (McCarthy et al., 1988). While faculties of Educational Administration generally perceived curriculum reform in preparation programs to be the most vital concern in the field, instructional innovation and the development of sound clinical experiences were discouraged by university reward systems (Davis, 1993). Faculty, particularly new faculty, were not devoting the necessary time and resources to these vital areas of program reform (McCarthy et al., 1988).

Whether educational administration programs were indeed changing, specifically in regards to how they were enacted by faculty remained open to question. Even if educational administration faculty members had, in some instances, become more receptive to different teaching and planning practices, they might not have substantially differed from their colleagues in other fields in their proclivity to rely on traditional forms of instruction and planning (McCarthy et al., 1988).
Griffiths et al. (1988) included among their recommendations that professors needed to rethink what they did, how they did it, and with whom they did it. They further suggested that computers and advanced technologies could provide new means of connecting practitioners, researchers, graduate students and teachers. The cherished belief that a professor's primary role was to dispense knowledge (usually employing lecture-discussion delivery techniques) needed to be discarded and replaced by a variety of roles "contingent on...development of instructional materials, texts, and clinical learning opportunities consistent with the preparation of adult learners for the informed practice of school administration. Professors [needed to] collaborate with public school administrators on reforming curricula for administrator preparation. [They needed to be] rewarded for curriculum reform, instructional innovation, and other activities in addition to traditional scholarship" (p.300-301).

Changes of this magnitude, however, required considerable willingness to take risks within professional cultures which may not have encouraged change. Fullan and Miles (1991) noted that anxiety, difficulties, and uncertainty are intrinsic to all successful change. Individual willingness to take risks is enhanced within a context which fosters innovation and experimentation.
Brookfield cogently provided a description of the type of climate in which individuals might be willing to take risks:

...when [colleagues] assist people in questioning the assumptions underlying their structures of understanding, or in realizing alternatives to their habitual ways of thinking and living, they must act with care and sensitivity. They have to ensure that when the foundations of these structures are shaken, the framework of the individual's self-esteem is left relatively intact. Encouraging people to probe their assumptions, without taking them to the point at which this probing threatens their self-esteem, is crucial (Brookfield, 1987, p. 179).

As might be arguably true for aspiring public school leaders who would promote professional development for their staffs, so it would seem likely for those who prepare them. In each instance, a nurturing environment based on trust and collegiality might have a greater chance of fostering change than one where openly critical reflection is viewed with alarm and dismay.

Most professors were encouraged, either directly or indirectly, to carry out instructional planning and instructional delivery in isolation (McCarthy et al., 1988). This practice was likely attributable in large part to most institutions' persistence in minimizing collaborative
efforts in instructional planning and implementation (Davis, 1993; Griffiths, et al., 1988).

The profession of teaching at any level and within any setting is challenging at best. Davis (1993) likened effective teaching to the behaviors of an experienced athlete who is able to "read what is happening on the field and make informed ad hoc decisions (p.10)." Darling-Hammond (1993) described the "deliberative teacher" as one who "engages in self-reflection, and analysis, makes carefully considered choices about instruction based on the needs of students, and assumes responsibility for the curriculum" (p.25).

In his assessment of higher education faculty, Davis (1993) painted a bleak picture of the teaching practices most commonly employed. Faculty generally were provided few incentives by their respective institutions or colleagues to become better teachers. Compelled by the need to pursue research agenda and inundated by institutional responsibilities, college and university teachers were left with very little time or energy to devote to improving their teaching skills. McCarthy et al. (1988) found that faculty believed teaching to be their primary strength but few devoted much time to improving their instructional planning or teaching methods. Nagel and Nagel (1988) concluded that few if any educational administration programs appeared to have achieved any meaningful degree of individualization in
instruction or much variance from conventional teaching practices which relied almost exclusively on lecture-discussion methodology.

By whatever name, principal, master, director, head, the public school leader of today is faced with all of the complex challenges confronting teachers. Additionally, the public school leader is answerable to many constituencies and agencies and is required to have an array of skills and attributes (Griffiths et al., 1987). Instructional planning and teaching practices at both the elementary and secondary levels have consistently been subjects of intense supervisory scrutiny (Darling-Hammond, 1993). They have also been legitimate foci of formative and summative evaluation, and topics of a host of related research endeavors (Joyce, Showers & Rolheiser-Bennett, 1987). The need for comparable inquiries into the teaching and planning practices of school leadership preparatory faculties has been largely ignored by scholars, however, and by preparation program faculties themselves (McCarthy et al., 1988; Murphy, 1992). Notable exceptions such as studies conducted by Murphy (1990, 1992) and Milstein (1992) have provided a more richly textured portrait of specifically targeted principal preparation programs, but they have only peripherally addressed issues related to faculty teaching practices.

This study was designed to shed some light on the planning and teaching practices of faculty members involved
with the preparation of public school principals. While there are undoubtedly numerous appropriate foci for a study of principal preparation programs, those factors directly or indirectly connected to faculty choices of instructional planning and teaching might be indicative of marked change in faculties' receptivity to and involvement in programmatic innovation. Joyce et al. (1987) found in their review of research on effective teaching that teachers who carefully select and combine a variety of instructional strategies and methods experience greater success in achieving student learning outcomes. A study designed to elicit principal preparation program faculty perceptions of their own planning and teaching practices might be informative for those engaged in concerted public school leadership reform agenda.

Statement of the Problem

Recent studies of educational leadership programs have found that public school leadership program faculty generally considered curriculum reform to be one of the most important needs in the field of educational administration (McCarthy et al., 1988; Griffiths et al., 1988). These same studies also revealed, however, that faculty were frequently not encouraged by their respective departments and institutions to pursue curricular reform and concomitant instructional innovation (Griffiths, et al., 1987;
Griffiths, et al., 1988; McCarthy, et al., 1988; Murphy, 1992). Such a divergence between faculty perceptions and behaviors regarding the need for curricular reform and innovative instructional planning and teaching practices could be a compromising factor for any serious programmatic reform initiative.

Comprehensive studies encompassing virtually all educational administration faculties are essential to the formulation of global conceptualizations of this highly diverse group of programs. A study of a select group of principal preparation programs, however, might be useful for those involved with the targeted programs in that findings would be derivative of their own contexts. This study focused on just such a group of principal preparation programs, those principal preparation programs which composed the Danforth Foundation Program for the Preparation of School Principals (DPPSP).

The Danforth Foundation Program for the Preparation of School Principals has, as two of its stated goals, improvement of teaching and planning practices of faculty and promotion of collaborative activities between and among faculties of participating departments of educational administration (Milstein, 1993). Danforth Program coordinators reported findings which indicated that faculty involved in respective principal preparation programs were indeed utilizing different instructional planning and
delivery methods and resources (Cordiero, et al., in Milstein, 1993). The authors of the survey suggested that while the results were revelatory and useful, they were limited largely to what program coordinators perceived of their colleagues' practice. The problem addressed by this study was to determine whether DPPSP faculty members shared these same perceptions regarding their teaching and planning for instruction, and their perceptions of what was expected of them by their respective departments.

**Purpose of the Study**

The two primary purposes of this study were to identify how faculties and program coordinators involved in principal preparation programs composing the Danforth Foundation Program for the Preparation of School Principals perceived their instructional planning and teaching practices, and to compare these perceptions with their understanding of what was expected of them by their respective departments. A tertiary purpose of the study was to determine whether differences existed between the perceptions of faculty and program coordinators regarding instructional planning and teaching. In providing information concerning faculty and program coordinator perceptions of these two important components of program enactment, it was hoped that those involved in these principal preparation programs would be served in their efforts to improve program effectiveness.
Significance of the Problem

Studies have recently added to current understandings of the nature of the status, demographics, and procedures of principal preparation programs (McCarthy, et al., 1988; Griffiths et al., 1987). More specifically targeted studies by Milstein (1992), Murphy (1993), and Cordeiro, Krueger, Parks, Restine, and Wilson (1992) of programs participating in the Danforth Foundation Program for the Preparation of Public School Principals (DPPSP) indicated that these principal preparation program faculties had responded to the calls for reform and were actively restructuring their preparation programs. The researchers, however, relied on data garnered primarily from artifactual evidence and assessments by program coordinators (Milstein, 1993).

This study of DPPSP faculty and program coordinators was designed to determine whether faculty perceived their instructional planning and teaching practices differently than what had previously been reported of them by the authors of the earlier studies. In surveying both faculty and program coordinators concerning their perceptions of their own practice, and their perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty regarding instructional planning and teaching, it was hoped that a more sharply focused picture of faculty practice would emerge. It was also hoped that those involved with these programs would find such information useful as they continued their efforts to
improve the overall and quality of public school leadership preparation programs.

**Definition of Terms**

The definitions of the following terms were used in connection with this study.

**Andragogy** refers to an emergent body of theory relating to characteristics of the adult learner, and how those characteristics inform the teaching and learning practices most appropriate for the various ages and/or phases of adulthood. Knowles (1970).

**Danforth Foundation** is a private, philanthropic organization which has consistently funded and otherwise supported American education.

**Danforth Foundation Program for the Preparation of Public School Principals** is a network currently composed of 19 principal preparation programs. A list of these institutions is provided in Appendix C).

**Principal Preparation Program** refers to any public or private program which specifically addresses the area of preparing public school leaders.

**Instructional Planning/Teacher Planning** as described by Oliva (1989) is the first stage in a continuum, which is followed by implementation and evaluation. Instructional planning skill areas include: designing an instructional model which is based upon theoretically sound and
contextually secure foundations, following the model, formulating goals and objectives based on the model, developing specific learning activities to meet the objectives and goals, and formulating and implementing soundly based systems of evaluation.

Teaching Methodology/Instructional Delivery consists of any of a wide array of pedagogical practices which concern (a) the selection of specific teaching strategies to be used in particular teaching situations, (b) the presentation of instructional material/activities, (c) the motivation of learners, and (d) the evaluation of and planning for evaluation (Oliva, 1989).

Research Questions

The following research questions were posed for this study.

1. Are there differences between faculty perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practices and their perceptions of what is expected of them regarding these facets of their professional roles by their respective departments?

2. Are there differences between program coordinator perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practices and their perceptions of what is expected of them regarding these facets of their professional roles by their respective departments?
3. Are there differences between perceptions of faculty and those of principal preparation program coordinators regarding departmental expectations of faculty instructional planning and teaching practices?

4. Are there differences between faculty and program coordinator perceptions of their own teaching and planning practices and their utilization of a variety of instructional planning and teaching methods and resources?

**Null Hypotheses**

The following research hypotheses in null form were tested within this study.

1. There are no differences between faculty perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practices and their perceptions of their respective departments' expectations of faculty regarding these same factors.

2. There are no differences between faculty members' ranking of their perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practices and their ranking of utilization of a variety of instructional planning and teaching methods and resources.

3. There are no differences between program coordinator perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practices and their perceptions of their departments' expectations of faculty regarding these same two factors.

4. There are no differences between program coordinator
rankings of perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practices and their ranking of utilization of a variety of instructional planning and teaching methods and resources.

5. There are no differences between program coordinator and program faculty perceptions of their respective instructional planning and teaching practices.

6. There are no differences between faculty and program coordinator perceptions of their respective departments expectations of faculty regarding instructional planning and teaching

Research Assumptions

It was assumed that:

A. Respondents could and would honestly and accurately complete the instrument

B. Institutional cultures and climates which encouraged reform initiatives were likely to promulgate professional development activities which in this instance would include refinement and expansion of pedagogical skills.

Limitations

The limitations of the study included those associated with a narrowly defined population, design, and method of measurement. A further limitation relates to the vagaries of bias in human research. Myrdal stated:

Biases are not confined to the practical and political
conclusions drawn from research. They are much more deeply seated than that. They are the unfortunate results of concealed valuations that insinuate themselves into research at all stages, from its planning to its final presentation. As a result of this concealment, they are not properly sorted out and thus can be kept undefined and vague (Myrdal, in Eisner & Patton, 1990, p.32).

Ratcliff elaborated:
Most research methodologists are now aware that all data are theory-, method-, and measurement-dependent. That is, the "facts" are determined by the theories and methods that generate their collection; indeed, theories and methods 'create' the facts. And theories, in turn, are grounded in and derived from the basic philosophical assumptions their formulators hold regarding the nature of and functional relationship between the individual, society, and science (Ratcliffe, in Eisner & Patton, 1990, p.31).

Additionally, it must be remembered that certain types of data used in this study were limited because they were inherently dependent upon human assessments and perceptions. Respondents themselves might not have gotten things right.
CHAPTER 2

Review of Related Literature

The literature review was intended to identify what is known about faculties of educational administration. The first section presents an historical perspective of the evolution of the profession. The second section provides information concerning research findings which have provided descriptive data concerning faculty characteristics. The third section focuses on what is known about instructional planning and teaching practices of educational administration faculties. The fourth section focuses on research specifically targeting programs involved with the Danforth Foundation Program for the Preparation of Public School Principals. The fifth section reviews current theory and research related to teaching and learning in adult oriented settings and programs. The final section synthesizes the preceding sections.

Historical Evolution of Educational Administration

Preparation Programs and Faculty

With but few exceptions, and they of but short duration, societies providing for formal education, conducted by highly regarded teachers have consistently held dominant positions over their less enlightened neighbors (Hook, 1963). Aristotle recognized the importance of an educated citizenry. He defined the "good state" as being
"dependent upon education, and those charged with providing it" (p. 85). Centuries later, Comenius, phrased the same sentiment in anthropocentric terms: "...all who are born to man's estate have need of instruction, since it is necessary that being men, they would not be wild beasts, savage brutes, or inert logs" (p.66). Even a military leader like Napoleon recognized the importance of education. Napoleon stated, "of all political questions that [of education] is perhaps the most important. There cannot be a firmly established state unless there is a teaching body with definitely recognized principals" (p.85).

American society has largely been ambivalent in its acceptance and support of the fundamental relationship between societal perpetuation and teaching and learning, and of those who lead them. One need look no further than the Constitution of the United States for evidence, or perhaps the lack thereof of support for education in the American enterprise. The absence of any direct reference to education in so fundamental a document of a nation would seem to indicate that the founding fathers possibly assumed that education of the young would take care of itself, or, as Pulliam (1991) has suggested, was perhaps the soul province of the family and church.

American support of education has been largely uneven and at times completely absent within certain geographic regions, and for some chronically disenfranchised segments
of the population (Pulliam, 1991; DeYoung, 1988). The preparation of school leaders did not really begin in any formal sense until the end of the nineteenth century (Cooper & Boyd, 1988). During the years immediately prior to the Civil War, Americans had been bombarded by relentless propaganda which pounded home the "inextricable relationship between education and national progress" (Cremin, 1961 p.31). Mann, Barnard, Pierce and Lewis, each in his own voice had persuasively argued that universal schooling was the "great equalizer of human conditions, that it was the balance wheel of social machinery and the creator of wealth" (p.9). But a few decades later, however, Rice published a bleak portrait of American schools. The dream of universal education which had been so loudly championed and subsequently embraced by the populace as the great panacea for all societal ills had fallen far short of its lofty goals. Public apathy, political interference, corruption, and incompetence were endemic. Untrained teachers, hired by political hacks led innocent children in singsong drill, rote repetition, and meaningless verbiage (Cremin, 1961).

It took several more decades of decline before the need for stronger leadership of American schools resulted in movements to develop formal training programs. Payne published what was probably the first textbook on public school administration in 1879 (Cooper & Boyd, 1988). Payne also taught the first college-level course in school
administration at the University of Michigan (Murphy, 1992). The first graduates from university programs appeared soon thereafter (Griffiths, Stout, & Forsyth, 1988). The first departments of educational leadership did not appear until early in the twentieth century (Cooper & Boyd, 1987).

Murphy (1992) termed the period which spanned the first years of the twentieth century the "Era of Ideology" (p. 21). Educational leadership programs were largely taught by professors who were more concerned with theories and philosophies promoting "great leaders" (p. 22). This emphasis gradually crystallized into the "great man" and "traits" theories which came to dominate educational leadership preparation programs during the formative years (Cooper & Boyd, 1987).

Over the next several decades educational leadership programs proliferated. By the end of World War II, there were over 125 public school leadership programs in existence (Murphy, 1992). One of the emergent forces which shaped the character and content of these programs was the increasing influence of Taylor's system of scientific management which had already gained preeminence in American industry (Murphy, 1992). Instruction in these programs focused on preparing managers of educational institutions. Candidates were taught how to budget, supervise, graph and chart progress (Murphy, 1992).
Cullbertson (1983) and Farquhar (1972) identified four major trends in educational leadership development programs which evolved since the 1950's. These included a movement towards emphasizing a blending of social science theory and practice, intensification of field experiences, and an increase in faculty specialization. Previously, faculty members were usually drawn from pools of former public school practitioners.

Burkett and Kimbrough (1990) reported that other, more recent trends had appeared. These were: a) a growing number of women and minority candidates for the principalship; b) an increase in the specialization of programs to accommodate perceived need for principals prepared to lead specific types of public schools (magnate school, vocational schools); c) more flexible residency requirements; d) inclusion of more technology training to prepare candidates for professional responsibilities which would require such skill configurations as being adept in the use and application of computers; and, e) a growing impetus directed towards competency-based preparation programs.

Faculties of Educational Administration

In their replication of Campbell and Newell's study of contemporary educational administration faculties (1973), McCarthy, Kuh, Newell and Iacona (1988) found that as programs and underlying assumptions governing content,
structure, and policy had changed during the years between the earlier study and their own, faculties had changed in some ways, while in others they had remained pretty much the same. Their findings are summarized here. First, the number of full-time faculty decreased since the period of rapid growth during the fifties and sixties. This required that faculty had to reassess how they performed their many functions and carried out their many new roles. Because the majority of the remaining faculty were to retire by the year 2000, the shrinking pool of likely replacements would find it difficult to adjust to the increased work demands. Second, the number of women faculty members increased but they remained in the minority. Third, minority representation continued to be marginal in most programs. Fourth, faculties were increasingly more specialized. More faculty came to their current positions from a larger variety of disciplines and were specifically hired because of their respective expertise in one of a proliferation of subfields. Fifth, less than 25% of the faculty had any experience in public school leadership positions. This marked a substantial change from times when faculty were almost exclusively former principals or superintendents.

Among the remaining findings of McCarthy et al., were those which related more closely to teaching and instructional planning. They found that faculty were generally quite satisfied with their own preparation
programs, spent considerably less time than previously engaged in serious programmatic reform and curriculum revision, and were, as a group fairly satisfied with their own teaching.

Weise (1992) concluded that those responsible for instructional delivery had not changed their approaches to instructional planning and teaching significantly during the intervening years between the McCarthy et al. survey (1988) and the advent of the nineties. She found that programs generally lacked adequately supervised clinical experiences, instructional activities were determined by convenience rather than by carefully conceived design, and that field experiences, if they existed, were not coordinated.

The emergent portrait of educational leadership faculty was one of a group in transition. As older faculty retired, they were being replaced by specialists who did not necessarily have had any previous experience in public school leadership. Newer faculty members were less likely to follow their older colleagues' instructional practices, but because they were more driven by compelling institutional forces to pursue service and research activities, they found little time to devote to the improvement of their teaching practices (McCarthy, et al., 1988).

Fundamental to any reform effort in the field of principal preparation was a shift of "responsibility for much of the learning in preparatory programs... to trainees"
(Culbertson & Farquhar, 1971). This required a correlative shift in how the professoriate approached their instructional planning and teaching roles.

**The Art and Science of Teaching**

On bokes and on lerninge he it spente
And bisily gan for the soules preye
Of hem yaf him wher-withto scoleye.
Of studie took he most cure and most hede.
Noght o word spak he more than was nede,
And that seyde in forme and reverence,
And short and quik, and ful of hy sentence,
Sowninge in moral vertu was his speche,
And gladly wolde he lerne, and gladly tech.
(Chaucer, version. 1937)
Palgrave, 1861)

The art and practice of teaching has arguably never been so well described as it was by Geoffry Chaucer, the wily old Medieval bard, when he poetically portrayed the Oxford clerk, one of that redoubtable band of pilgrims wending their way to Canterbury. A willing and careful scholar who revered intellectual clarity, who practiced the highest level of ethical conduct and who, above all else "gladly" shared his love of learning with others, Chaucer's clerk embodied the essence of an archetypical pedagogue.
What comprises effective teaching has been a subject of considerable debate. There have been those who championed the assumptions underlying Eisner's view, that teaching was an art (Eisner, 1983). Others held a position comparable to that of Skinner, that teaching really was nothing more nor less than a science which could be practiced effectively by any reasonably bright individual if he or she was provided with soundly based technologies of education (Skinner, 1968).

Chaucer's clerk would doubtless be embraced by both camps. Skinnerians would applaud his love of learning which compelled him to embrace the highest standards of scholarship and intellectual pursuits. They would have seen in this a prototypical affinity to science and rationality. Eisnerians would have welcomed his overwhelming desire to model his love of learning for others. They would have argued that he approached learning and teaching with all the passions of an artist.

Gage (1978) provided a contemporary reconciliation between the two views of pedagogy by suggesting that there was a scientific basis for the art of teaching. Teaching, according to Davis involved "artistic judgments" that depended on science and that the practice of teaching should more accurately be conceived as that of a professional practicing a profession:

Perhaps the best way to think about teaching is to
call it what it should be called, not an art, not a science, but a profession. Teaching involves professional judgment. Teaching calls for the trained eye to see what is actually happening, and the trained mind to decide what to do next. (Gage, 1978, p.7).

Literature related to principal preparation programs has focused generally on curriculum design, organizational structure, climate, and culture, and student selection and evaluation Murphy, (1992) and Milstein, (1993). There were, to be sure, general categorical references to instructional planning and teaching methodologies identified as being integral to particular programs which have been described in recent works (McCarthy, et al., 1988; Murphy 1992, 1993; Milstein, 1993; Griffiths, Stout & Forsyth, 1988). These authors, while depicting other facets of educational administration programs, generally painted in broad strokes when addressing faculty teaching and instructional planning practices: they gave impressions rather than detailed portraits of current instructional planning and teaching practices. McCarthy, et al. (1988) found that while the majority (68%) valued their teaching roles more highly than their other roles, they were spending more time on research and less time on committee work related to curriculum and instruction than their predecessors did as reported by Campbell and Newell (1973). The researchers suggested that
several other findings of their study might be contributory to this apparent divergence between faculty belief in the importance of teaching and faculty behaviors relating to curricula development and implementation. Even though a majority ranked curriculum reform as the most critical issue confronting preparation program faculty, most respondents were quite positive about the caliber of their own preparation programs (McArthy, et al. 1988). Additionally, while fully half of the faculty were hired during the decade preceding the study, most were selected based on factors other than public school leadership experience. These findings seemed to suggest that although faculty did in fact recognize the need for curricula reform, they generally perceived their own program, and their own teaching to be satisfactory and were disinclined to change how or what they were doing.

Within the purview of principal preparation programs, Murphy (1992) suggested that the professorate needed to change its methods of instruction as part of general reform. In keeping with programmatic and organizational changes, faculty needed, in his assessment to incorporate substantial changes in instructional planning and teaching. Professors would no longer be able to function as jugs of knowledge whose job it was to pour information into empty mugs. Instructional planning and delivery would be based on personalized, student centered learning rather than on one
size fits all approaches so prevalent in current programs. Based on sound principles of adult learning theory, instruction would need to encompass a wide array of techniques and approaches.

Farquhar (1977) believed that there was a variety of instructional approaches being introduced to increase student involvement in reality-oriented classroom experiences. He argued that lecture-textbook courses had begun to be replaced by seminars and workshops relying heavily on the use of reality-oriented multimedia instructional materials and methods (including work with cases, simulations, games, laboratory training exercises, computer-aided instruction, sensitivity training, tapes, and films).

Subsequent studies, however, were not so euphoric in their assessment of the educational administration faculties' teaching practices. Alkire (1978), Davis & Spuck (1978), and Erlandson and Witters-Churchill (1986) found that lecture and discussion in a classroom setting based on textbook content delivery remained the dominant mode of instruction.

Nagle and Nagle (1988) stated their assessment of instructional planning and teaching practices of faculty involved in educational administration programs:

...despite the abundance of new instructional modes, techniques, and materials relevant to
university classrooms, educational administration courses continue to be characterized by lectures and/or large group discussions in traditional classroom settings of between ten and thirty students. Alternative approaches to instruction that employ one-to-one settings, programmed modules, and/or independent study were still very much the exception rather than the rule (Nagel & Nagel, p. 126).

Milstein (1993), in comparing traditional preparation programs to those defined as innovative in that their focus was on field-based experience described the former's typical pedagogical approach as being didactic with the professor positioned at the center as knowledge giver. The student played a passive role, professors did most of the instructing [and talking] and they usually operated alone,

Pervasive faculty resistance to change compounded the problems facing reformers as they attempted to answer calls for improved public school leadership (Davis, 1993). Brookfield pointed out in his general exploration of critical thought: "those who harbor desires to change the way things are done are often viewed by others as cynical noncontributors whose nonconformity to established practice represents antisocial behavior. Organizational perpetuation of the status quo usually holds precedence over individual motivations to change." (Brookfield, 1987, p. 10).
As the impetus to change how public school leaders led and how they were prepared to lead continued to grow apace, faculty intractibility to change was considered by some to be a major impediment. Murphy (1992) suggested that the crux of the problem, might in part have rested in the apparent intransigence of higher education in general and of principal preparation program faculties in particular to initiatives aimed at improving the teaching and learning processes so vital to program effectiveness. Too often, rather than functioning as agents of change they instead opted for the roles of defenders of current practice or perhaps worse, adopted mere cosmetic changes masquerading as meaningful responses to serious programmatic weaknesses.

The Danforth Program for the Preparation of Public School Principals

In 1986, The Danforth Foundation launched a new initiative which was conceived and designed to change the way public school leaders were being prepared. The initiative was called, the Danforth Program for the Preparation of Public School Principals (DPPSP). Foundation leadership offered financial support to preparation programs who had demonstrated commitment to programmatic reform by their previous involvement with other Danforth initiatives, or similar types of reform efforts (Danforth Foundation, 1986).
The goals of DPPSP were direct responses to the growing body of criticism of principal preparation programs and the National Commission's recommendations concerning school leadership (1988). The goals of the initiative were (a) to eliminate or at least modify drastically the manner in which candidates for the principalship entered into preparation programs, (b) to generate movement by program faculty away from sole reliance on lecture/textbook instructional delivery mechanisms, (c) to encourage greater collaboration among faculty, practitioners and policy makers in the design and implementation of preparation programs (Danforth, 1986, p.3).

The first cycle of DPPSP included three universities. The selection criteria generally encompassed factors which indicated receptivity to reform on the part of the faculty and departments involved and other factors which were deemed to be indicators of diversity, both in the student population and the faculties (Gresso, 1993 in Milstein, 1993). Since the original core group of three institutions began, 19 others have participated. Currently, there are 18 institutions involved. These are listed in Appendix D.

From its inception, the DPPSP has been the subject of several studies. Most targeted specific DPPSP institutions (Daresh & Playko, 1989; Krueger, 1991; Weise, 1992). Other researchers focused on how institutions organized their programs (Ubben & Fowler, 1989). In 1992, a research team
composed of DPPSP coordinators and Danforth Foundation leaders surveyed all DPPSP program coordinators (Cordeiro, Krueger, Parks, Restine and Wilson, 1993 in Milstein, 1993, chapter 2). Their findings included the following. All but 3 of the 21 responding coordinators indicated that their DPPSP participation continued. Course offerings at institutions varied considerably as did the manner in which they were scheduled and enacted. The coordinators reported that participating faculty were indeed changing their instructional planning and teaching methods as a result of their involvement in the program. While several issues remained troublesome for many of the coordinators (integration of courses, improvement of teaching, total department involvement, and overall curriculum improvement) program coordinators concurred that those faculty and students participating had found the changes meaningful and relevant. One overriding issue which concerned many of the respondents was their perception of the support they received from others in their department, from the college and from their university.

Research which focused on DPPSP programs described programmatic changes, reorganization efforts, and curricular reform initiatives. What was not determined was how faculty perceived themselves within the context of these significant efforts at reform.
The Adult Learner: Shifting Demographics

Murphy (1992) identified seven significant changes which needed to occur in the approaches used by faculty in instructional delivery:

1. Learning should be student-centered (as opposed to professor-centered).
2. Active learning should be stressed (as opposed to passive learning).
3. Personalized learning should be emphasized (as a collective assumption).
4. A balance of instructional approaches is needed (as opposed to dominant reliance on a lecture-discussion model).
5. Cooperative approaches to learning and teaching should be underscored.
6. Outcome-based (or mastery-based) learning should be stressed (as opposed to process-based learning).
7. Delivery structures should be built on developmentally based learning principles (as opposed to universally applicable principles) (Murphy, 1992, p.154).

If principal preparation program faculties were to address these changes in instructional planning and teaching, it would seem to be important to understand more completely the students who were currently aspiring to become principals.
An underlying assumption of Murphy's list of changes in instructional delivery approaches might have been a recognition and acceptance of the personal and professional maturity of the general population of current candidates for the principalship.

Griffiths, et al. (1988) in summarizing their findings gleaned from of *The Guide to the Use of Graduate Record Examination Program 1985-86*, reported that 35% of the candidates for the principalship scored at or above the overall means for verbal, quantitative and analytical sub-tests while the remainder scored below the overall means. Typically, most candidates chose to attend the program on a part-time basis. Most were employed by local school districts as either teachers or mid-range administrators. An increasing number of these candidates were women. Minority candidates had become more prevalent, at least in some programs in some areas of the nation. (Griffiths, et al., 1988). The majority of the candidates for the principalship were older than their predecessors (McCarthy, et al., 1988; Griffiths, et al., 1988, & Milstein, 1992). As the demographics of the entire college population shifted in the direction of the more mature student, increasing interest in the nature of the adult learner grew accordingly.
Characteristics of the Adult Learner

Merriam and Caffarella (1991) summarized an extensive body of research concerning the current status of adult education. Extending Cross's synthesis in Adults as Learners (1981) and Courtney's subsequent work on adult participation (1991) Merriam and Caffarella attempted to compile and interpret what was currently understood about the characteristics and objectives of adult learners. Cautioning their readers to be wary of substantive differences in socio-demographic profiles of particular sub-groups of the total population of adult learners, Merriam and Caffarella nonetheless advanced their conclusions which indicated that adults, for whatever reason, were participating in ever greater numbers in some sort of educational program.

Adult development studies have, in large part been driven by psychological interests. As a natural extension of childhood and adolescent psychology, adult developmental studies have been the primary sources of emergent theories relating to internal processes of development.

Havighurst (1972) and Levinson (1986) attempted to connect specific developmental periods to biological age. Erikson (1963) was less inclined to categorically connect developmental periods to age. He viewed these periods more to be a function of a person's idiosyncratic progression which might accelerate or impede maturation. Still others
saw the need for a new perspective which would draw equally on biology, psychology, and social sciences as well as the humanities to fully understand the complexities of adult human development (Levinson, 1986). By whatever method or within whatever paradigm, most concurred that adults learned differently than children.

One array of factors which accounted for adult learning patterns and profiles had to do with the natural aging processes which modified individual abilities and behaviors. Schaie and Willis (1986) in their studies of adult visual acuity concluded that most adults experienced loss of visual abilities between the ages of 40 and 50. This gradual deterioration of visual acuity resulted primarily from the optical lens becoming more dense and thus losing its elasticity. Cross (1981) found that adults appeared to need more illumination to see both near and far. This resulted from a combination of lens and pupil changes that allowed less light and a different quality of light to reach the eye. The eyes also became less translucent and yellower with age. The pupils became smaller. These changes caused adults to be less responsive to sudden changes in illumination.

A gradual degeneration of the auditory nerves and structures of the inner ear accounted for increased hearing difficulties experienced by older people. According to Mirriam & Caffarella (1991) one of the most notable consequences of this hearing loss was the inability of some
older adults to understand the spoken word. Those with acute hearing loss, and those who interacted with them frequently became frustrated with the whole communication process.

Knox (1977) reported that several findings of his and others' research helped to explain the nervous system and offered possible courses of action for those involved with older populations. The nervous system, consisting of the brain and the spinal cord, formed the primary biological basis for learning. While not much was known about how changes in this system affected learning, one set of findings seemed to be consistently born out by researchers. Reaction time, a measure of a person's ability to complete a psycho-motor task, decreased with age. Explanations as to why this was so usually focused on overall degeneration of nerve cells and lessened coordination of the body's arousal system. Mitigating factors such as an individual's familiarity with the task to be completed, and the exact nature of the task might have lessened but not eliminated all together the impact of potentially debilitating nerve cell deterioration.

Yet another complex set of biological factors which impacted on adult learners was derivative of chronic diseases. Cardiovascular diseases which may have resulted in strokes or heart attacks could have caused permanent or temporary memory loss and aphasia, which would restrict the individual's ability to generate speech and perhaps account
for difficulties experienced when one attempted to learn or recall past learning (Schaie & Willis, 1986).

Psychological studies of adults encompassed a broad array of ideas on how adults developed over a life span. These theories, have included those concerning ego development (Erikson, 1963), general personality development (Levinson, 1978), moral development (Kohlberg, 1973), and faith development (Fowler, 1981) and have appeared over the latter half of the twentieth century. While theories generated from these various lines of inquiry have frequently been contradictory, they did provide useful ideas on how adults learned and understood. Daloz termed these "alternative road maps" of how adults could develop. The stages of adult learning when viewed from this perspective were to be construed to be hierarchical in nature; each stage was a distinct and qualitatively different period. Movement from one stage to another betokened movement from relatively simple to complex ways of thinking about oneself and the world (Daloz, 1986). Cross (1991) proposed that if one accepted the notion of "alternative road maps" for adult human development, and if one believed that the role of educators was to help each individual develop to the highest possible level, then the role of educators of adults was to challenge students to move to increasingly more complex ways of thinking (Merriam & Caffarella, 1991).
Enhancing or inhibiting adult development were what Hultsh (1979) termed "benchmark events". The death of a loved one, a sudden change in career or lifestyle, or cataclysmic societal upheavals could either propel an individual into another stage of development or arrest development altogether. Bridges (1980) concluded that movement between stages could be sudden or gradual.

Sugarman (cited in Merriam & Caffarella, 1986), provided a conceptualization of the cycle of these transitions: (1) Immobilization, a sense of being overwhelmed or frozen in place by an event or set of circumstances which have disrupted one's equilibrium; (2) reaction, a sharp swing of mood from elation to despair depending on the nature of the transition; (3) minimization, minimizing one's feelings and the anticipated impact of an event; (4) letting go, breaking with the past; (5) testing, exploration of the new terrain; (6) searching for meaning, conscious striving to learn from the experience; (7) integration, feeling at home with the change (p. 109).

Schlossberg (1984) suggested that certain types of skills and areas of knowledge might be useful to adults who were experiencing life-transforming events. Among these would be understanding of transition events and processes, problem-solving techniques, and skills for coping with transition.

Knowles (1984) catalogued adult learner characteristics
which served as a basis for Andragogy, his theory of adult educational instructional planning and teaching. Advanced by Knowles and embraced by many others, Andragogy reconfigured the conceptual elements encompassing pedagogy, the theory of teaching children, with emergent theoretical constructs related to the adult learner. This theory of adult learning, evolved parallel to an increase in the number of adults who were, either by choice or obligation, returning to the classroom.

According to Knowles, in pedagogy, the learner is a child, or is assumed not to be an adult. The learner is dependent and the teacher is responsible for seeing that learning occurs. In andragogy, the learner is an adult. Perceived as such, the learner is assumed to be more self-directed. The teacher's role becomes one of a facilitator. In pedagogy, the student has very little experience to draw upon when confronting new concepts and knowledge in general. The teacher must provide experiential richness to help the child connect abstraction to an emergent reality. The adult learner, on the other hand, has a wealth of experience to draw upon. He or she values experience and therefore profits most from "hands on" learning through discussion (as opposed to lecture), laboratories, cases, simulations and field experiences. A pedagogical approach to the learner assumes generally that students should learn what society expects them to know, and students of a same age are exposed to
fairly standard curricula. An andragogical approach to the learner assumes that the he or she has been prepared for learning by a textured life of experiences. Learning experiences are therefore arranged in categories and in sequences. Adult learners expect that what they are learning would be applicable immediately in their lives: young learners operate on faith that what they are learning now will be applicable when they are older.

Teacher Planning for Instruction

In planning for teaching and learning activities, teachers of adults have recently been able to draw upon more soundly based bodies of theory.

In adult education, the two most prominent sources of theory informing this emerging field have been Kolb's Learning Style Inventory (1984) and The Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator (Murray, cited in Davis p.78).

Kolb (1984) concluded that individuals differed along two dimensions in their learning preferences, from abstract to concrete and from reflective observation to active experimentation. Figure 1 presents Kolb's theoretical model. Each quadrant represents a particular learning style. The directional arrows indicate movement toward polarity in the dimensions.
A learner with a *convergent* learning style is more facile in using problem-solving, decision-making, and practical application techniques. A *Divergent* learner style leads the individual to prefer organizing many specific relationships into a gestalt, generating alternative ideas and implications. An *Assimilative* learner has an affinity for reasoning, creating theoretical models, and working with ideas and concepts. *Accommodative* learners prefer doing things, taking action, fitting the theory to the facts (Kolb, 1984).

The four learning styles were predicated upon personality characteristics. The assumptive base here was that certain personality characteristics predisposed one to approach learning according to one of the four categories of learning styles (Davis, 1993).
The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator theory was a derivative of the work of Jung who conceived of two broad categories of personality: introvert and extrovert. These two types in turn shaped "polarities" related to sensing, intuition, thinking, feeling, judging and perceiving. (Davis, 1993).

From another perspective, Pratt (1988) developed a framework which merged specific learner characteristics, learning situations, and a continuum encompassing the amount of teacher support and formality of instruction needed. Level 1 learners needed both direction and support because they lacked competence and either commitment or confidence. Level 2 learners did not lack commitment or confidence but lacked competence and therefore needed assistance in designing instructional processes. Level 3 learners were reasonably self-directing because they had sufficient experience to decide what was to be learned, but they lacked either motivation or confidence. Lastly, level 4 learners were motivated, confident and experienced in the learning process and needed only moderate assistance. Figure 2 presents Pratt's framework.
Figure 2 - **Pratt's Framework for Instructional Situations**

Based on Direction and Support Needed by Learners

(Pratt, 1988, p.256)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High-3. Learners need support but are reasonably self-directing: Learners have sufficient experience to decide what is to be learned and how, but lack motivation or confidence</th>
<th>1. Learners need both direction and support: Learners lack competence and either commitment or confidence.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner-Directed</td>
<td>Teacher-Directed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Learners are at least moderately capable of providing their own direction and support: Learners are willing and able to take responsibility for all instructional functions.</td>
<td>2. Learners need direction: Learners lack competence in designing the instructional process but lack neither commitment nor confidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low <---------------------Direction--------------------->High

Low<----------------------Dependency--------------------->High

Pratt's model suggested different teaching strategies for adult learners. Learners of any age vary in experience, level of commitment, and level of confidence when approaching a learning experience. Using Pratt's model as a guide, teachers of adults would, like their counterparts who taught younger students, be more likely to achieve educational aims for their students if they planned their teaching based on careful assessment of their students' interest, background, and confidence levels rather than assuming that all adults come to a learning environment with fairly uniform preparedness (Pratt, 1988).

Grabowski (1976) suggested that those who were involved in teaching adult learners should incorporate the following abilities: (1) understanding of and accounting for the motivation and participation patterns of adult learners; (2) understanding of and provision for the needs of adult learners; (3) knowledge in the theory and practice of adult learners; (4) knowledge of the community contexts from which adult learners come; (5) knowledge of how to use various methods and techniques of instruction; (6) possession of communication skills and listening skills; (7) expertise in identifying and utilizing a variety of educational resources; (8) receptivity to divergence in adult learner thought, personality, learning style, and maturity; (9) Commitment to and practice of life-long learning, and (10) skills in program evaluation and appraisal.
Grabowski concluded that while these skills and aptitudes might arguably be desirable for teachers of any age group, how they were informed and practiced by teachers of adults would necessarily differ qualitatively if emergent theoretical frameworks regarding adult development proved to be durable.

For faculties involved with the preparation of principals the growing body of evidence supporting theoretical bases for intuitive observations which had generally held that adult learners came to the arena with different skills, experiences, aptitudes and traits would seem to indicate that pedagogical practices which had served the professorate well when dealing with less mature students, might no longer remain as the soul approach to planning and teaching for effective learning. Rather, they would be modified, enhanced or otherwise replaced according to what emergent data regarding adults, and concomitant theories has begun to reveal about the nature and needs of the adult learner.

The Climate of Higher Education Institutions

While there might have been many reasons why faculty were reluctant to change, one of the most important seemed to have been a consequence of climates within which faculty members operated; climates which either ignored or only marginally addressed the need for ongoing professional
development. Davis described the typical college or university teacher's activities within the university climate thusly:

most teachers... play out complex roles where teaching is only one of the many things they do, along with research, advising, professional service, consulting, and involvement in governance processes of their institution. In many proprietary institutions and in some community colleges, many teachers also manage a business, practice a trade or carry on a professional practice on the side." (Davis, 1993, p.8).

Given the wide array of distracting demands placed upon university faculty it was little wonder that minimal time or interest was devoted to the improvement of instruction or the development of more effective methods of planning instructional activities.

In sum, what would seem to have been true for professional development of higher education faculty in general would likely to have been true for instructional planning and instructional delivery improvement as well: organizational climates which did not encourage innovation in instructional approaches and which did not foster changes in instructional planning would have been less likely to generate evidences of either.
Conclusion

This study of how a targeted population of faculty involved in principal preparation programs planned and enacted teaching and learning activities was designed to shed some light on the methods by which future public school leaders were taught. As the planning and teaching behaviors of teachers involved in principal preparation programs are arguably the key ingredients in successfully implementing curricular, organizational, or other related innovations, such information would likely enhance reformers' effectiveness in articulating needed change.
Chapter three details the methodology used for this study. Research design, population description, sampling method, instrumentation, and procedures followed for data collection and analysis are included.

**Research Design**

This study was descriptive in nature. Danforth affiliated principal preparation program faculty members and program coordinator perceptions of their planning and teaching methods, and their perceptions of their department's support of their instructional planning and teaching roles were described and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

Descriptive research is by nature concerned with determining existing relationships between and among variables (Best & Kahn 1986). As the intent of this inquiry was to seek out such relationships and to analyze quantitatively their relative importance, a descriptive methodology seemed most appropriate.

**Population**

The population for this study included faculty members from institutions of higher education composing the Danforth Foundation Principal Preparation Network. These individuals were identified by respective Program Coordinators at each
institution as having performed active teaching and instructional planning roles in the principal preparation program during the academic year, 1993-94.

The rationale underpinning the selection of this particular population of faculty members involved with principal preparation programs hinged on two assumptions. First, the current status of principal preparation programs is virtually impossible to define. Along a continuum of principal preparation programs are found various configurations of organizational structures, differing patterns of faculty utilization, diverse levels of faculty expertise and specialization, and a wide array of programmatic offerings and philosophies (Thompson, 1993; McCarthy, Kuh, Newell, & Iacona, 1988; Murphy, 1992). Some programs involve only one or two faculty members who teach courses in traditional educational administration to students who may or may not be aspiring to the principalship (McCarthy, Kuh, Newell, & Iacona). Other programs may dedicate several faculty members to principal preparation, still others may use a conglomeration of adjunct faculty, departmental members, and private and public school personnel.

The second underlying assumption governing the selection of this population is derivative of the first. Because standards, programs, and levels of faculty involvement vary to such a degree (Thompson, 1993), it
seemed advisable to target a specific group of programs for this study which might share roughly similar characteristics. While there was certainly substantial variation between principal preparation programs affiliated with the Danforth Foundation, these programs did share certain general characteristics which could allow for some generalization of findings from this study to those targeted Danforth affiliated principal preparation programs. Among the shared characteristics were the following: a) involvement in a concerted effort to reform principal preparation programs; b) participation in the Danforth Foundation Program for the Preparation of School Principals which has as two of its stated goals, the improvement of leadership program pedagogy, and the overall improvement of leadership program faculty; c) active, faculty interaction with other Danforth Foundation-affiliated principal preparation program faculties; and, d) subjects of previous studies which specifically targeted them.

**Instrumentation**

After developing a preliminary instrument, initial modifications were undertaken based on the following: critical suggestions by faculty within East Tennessee State University's College of Education who had an opportunity to examine the early versions of the survey; an informal administration of the instrument to a small number of
faculty members involved with principal preparation programs; subjecting the ensuing prototype to a critical review by the researcher's doctoral committee and by students enrolled in a doctoral seminar. In this manner, the instrument's format and content validity was initially tested. The revised instrument was then used in a pilot study.

Twenty selected educational leadership faculty members who were current members of The Southern Regional Council for Educational Administration (SRCEA) were asked to complete the pilot instrument and to critically review its content and structure. These faculty members were selected based on personal and professional knowledge of the researcher's committee chair regarding each individual's experience as faculty members in principal preparation programs and their expertise in research design and instrument development.

Eleven useable surveys were returned. Seven individuals chose not to complete the survey but did complete an evaluation form, included in the mailing, which requested suggestions for the improvement of the questionnaire and evaluation of how the constructs were being measured.

The final survey instrument consisted of two parts. Part one contained a series of items soliciting general information regarding respondents' personal and professional background. Part Two was composed of a series of declarative
sentences which solicited respondents' perceptions of their own planning and teaching practices, their understanding of their respective departments' expectations of them for the same specific areas of planning and teaching, and their self-reported utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources.

Twenty-one items were included for each of the first two constructs, perceptions of practice and perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty regarding practice. Odd numbered items (1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 47, 39, and 41) asked respondents to rank their perceptions of their own practice. Even numbered items (2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, and 42) asked them to perform the same operation for their perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty regarding instructional planning and teaching. Specific practices addressed by the items are listed below.

1. Incorporation of personal philosophy and values into instruction
2. Application of fundamental tenets of basic learning theory when planning for instruction
3. Construction and utilization of student assessment instruments
4. Utilization of one's own and others' lists of ready-made instructional materials and resources
5. Construction and implementation of instructional materials
6. Implementation of measures of skills and competencies to assure that learning has taken place
7. Sensitivity to differences in student learning styles
8. Opportunities to exchange ideas and expertise with colleagues
9. Planning of lectures and other presentations to assure maximal instructional impact
10. Adaptation of space, time, and other resources to meet the needs of specific instructional activities
11. Planning instructional activities to meet the needs of individual students
12. Planning for the merger of theory and the practice of leadership
13. Consideration of logistical factors when planning for instruction
14. Utilization of a variety of teaching strategies
15. Utilization of a variety of communication techniques
16. Arrangement of learning experiences according to carefully planned sequences designed to accommodate different pacings
17. Receptivity to student feedback and utilization of feedback in instructional planning
18. Design of appropriate student evaluation instruments
19. Proficient analysis of data in evaluating students
20. Utilization of specialists in evaluating student performance data.

21. Assessment of the rewards of teaching

Items addressing the third construct, self-reported utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources are listed below.

1. Use of lectures in teaching
2. Use of small group activities in teaching
3. Use of field experiences in teaching
4. Use of practicing principals and mentors as resources
5. Practice of team teaching with colleagues
6. Use of individualized instruction
7. Use of outside resource persons for classroom and field presentations
8. Use of audio-visual technologies in instruction.

The final survey is found in Appendix C. To facilitate statistical analysis means were calculated for aggregated rankings of items in each sub-set.

A Likert scale format was chosen for the questions relating to the constructs being measured. The choices were: 1(N)=never; 2(R)=rarely; 3(S)=sometimes; 4(F)=frequently; and, 5(A)=always (DeVellis, 1991, p. 70).

Although the number of respondents for the Pilot was small, a reliability test using Cronbach's Alpha test was conducted for each of the subsets measuring faculty perceptions of their own instructional planning and
teaching, and their perceptions of department expectations. This test was conducted to identify any seriously weak items. A subsequent reliability test of the final survey returns for the actual study while somewhat divergent, particularly for the construct measuring perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty regarding practice did, nonetheless, seem to corroborate the determination that the instrument had utility in measuring the constructs involved. Alphas for both the pilot and the final studies for the two primary constructs, faculty perceptions of practice, and faculty perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty regarding practice are reported in Table 1.
Table 1  
Cronbach Alphas for Construct One, Faculty Perceptions of Practice, and Construct Two, Faculty Perceptions of Departmental Expectations of Faculty Regarding Practice: Pilot Study and Final Study

Cronbach Alpha by Item Subsets*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct Subset*</th>
<th>Pilot Survey</th>
<th>Final Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subset 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of practice</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subset 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Department Expectations</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Subset 1 consists of aggregated rankings for odd-numbered items which asked respondents to rank their perceptions of their own practice. Subset 2 represents aggregated rankings for faculty perceptions of department expectations concerning faculty instructional planning and teaching. The third construct, self-reported utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources, was not included in the pilot study.
Following further refinement, the final survey instrument was sent to each faculty member who had been identified by the program coordinator at each site as being involved in a principal preparation program. Each subject received the instrument, a post card (to have been mailed separately by the respondent to verify survey completion and return) and a pre-addressed, stamped envelope in which to return the completed survey. Because the initial mailing was conducted at the end of Spring semester, 1994, it was decided to postpone the second mailing to nonrespondents until the Fall semester began. A tracking code was created to monitor returns.

The initial mailing, conducted in the Spring and early Summer of 1994 yielded 90 useable cases out of a total mailing of 150. Ten individuals returned the survey without completing it, or sent letters indicating that they did not, in their judgment, play active teaching and planning roles in their department's principal preparation program. Thus, the actual number of potential respondents was corrected to be 140. Using this corrected number for the population, the initial return rate equaled 64.3%.

The second mailing, conducted at the beginning of Fall semester, 1994 yielded an additional 20 useable surveys. The addition of these to the previous total yielded a total number of useable surveys of 110 which equaled a 78.6% return rate.
After eliminating from the original list of potential respondents (provided by Principal Preparation Coordinators at each site) those faculty members who either wrote letters or otherwise noted that they did not, in their judgment, actively teach or plan instructional activities for respective principal preparation programs, the number of potential respondents for this population was established as 140 individuals. Such a return rate would represent 73.5% of the targeted total population. Combining the total number of responses from both mailings 110 useable responses were received. This number represented 78.6% of the defined population. This return rate was accepted as being sufficient for the purposes of this study.

Data Analysis

Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed rank tests were conducted to test for significant differences between faculty perceptions of personal practice and departmental expectations of faculty regarding instructional planning and teaching. This same test was conducted to determine whether differences existed between faculty perceptions of their instructional planning and teaching practices and their self-reported utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources. Because the population was greater than 25, Z scores were used as the test statistic. The Wilcoxon test was chosen because the research
involved a comparison analogous to a pre-test, post-test design in that ordinal data for each of the dependent variables were drawn from the same population (Hinkle, 1988).

Mann-Whitney U tests were conducted to determine whether significant differences existed between faculty and program coordinator perceptions of their respective instructional planning and teaching practices, and their perceptions of departmental expectations for these same aspects of their professional roles.

In performing both Wilcoxon matched-pairs, signed-rank, and Mann-Whitney U tests, the aggregated variables which were created previously were used. Each aggregated variable consisted of summed and averaged rankings for items which focused on one of three constructs. The constructs were: (a) perceptions of personal practice, (b) perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty regarding instructional planning and teaching, and (c) self-reported utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources. Odd numbered items within the range 1-41 asked respondents to rank their perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practices. Even numbered items within the range, 2-42 asked faculty to rank their perceptions of department expectations of faculty regarding instructional planning and teaching. Each set of Twenty-one items were summed and averaged to create an aggregate mean
rank. An aggregate mean was also calculated for the eight items which asked faculty to report their use of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources.

Alpha was set at .05 for each procedure.

Descriptive measures were also calculated for each of the demographic variables to provide additional information regarding the population.

Summary

The methodology and procedures used for this study were presented in this chapter. It presented the assumptive bases and methodological framework for the determination of the population, the procedures used to develop and refine the survey instrument, and the procedures and tools used for data collection and analysis.

The population for the study consisted of those individuals identified by site coordinators for the Danforth Foundation Program of the Preparation of Public School Principals as having played active instructional planning and teaching roles in a principal preparation program during the school year, 1993-94. An acceptable return provided sufficient data to allow generalizations of this targeted population to be made. Analysis of the findings are presented in Chapter 4.
Chapter 4
Results

Introduction

The analyses which are presented here are based on data generated from 110 returned surveys out of an adjusted population of 140 faculty members identified by program coordinators as having played active instructional planning and teaching roles during the school year, 1993-94, within a principal preparation program affiliated with the Danforth Foundation's Program for the Preparation of School Principals. Because all of the program coordinators were teachers in their respective principal preparation programs, they were included as members of the population.

The survey solicited faculty perceptions of their instructional planning and teaching practices and their perceptions of department expectations of faculty concerning these same responsibilities. Additionally, respondents were asked to rank their utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources. They were also asked to provide information regarding their personal and professional profiles.

Descriptive information regarding respondent profiles is presented in the first section of this chapter. A summary of analyses of the research questions and derivative hypotheses are presented in the second section.
Respondents

One hundred ten faculty members who played active instructional planning and teaching roles in Danforth Foundation affiliated principal preparation programs completed the survey. Demographic data for the respondents revealed that 79 (71%) were male and 31 (28%) were female. The average age of all respondents was 52.9. Of the faculty responding, 70 (64%) identified themselves as being faculty members in a principal preparation program. The rest were equally divided between those who identified themselves as Adjunct faculty 20 (18%), or program coordinators, 20 (18%).

Respondents were asked to estimate the amount of time spent during a typical week performing duties related to four general categories of faculty work. The categories were teaching, service (for the department, college or university, community, or private agency), administration, and research. With the exception of the teaching category, most faculty members spent less than 25% of their time devoted to the other categories of work. The range in percentage of time spent teaching was more evenly distributed among the faculty.

Percentages of time faculty reported spending involved with each of the four categories of work are presented in Table 2.
Table 2
Faculty Time Spent Performing Teaching, Service, Administrative, and Research Duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n/%</td>
<td>n/%</td>
<td>n/%</td>
<td>n/%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>31/28.0</td>
<td>87/79.1</td>
<td>74/67.3</td>
<td>81/73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>32/29.0</td>
<td>18/16.3</td>
<td>12/10.9</td>
<td>29/26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>32/29.0</td>
<td>3/ 2.7</td>
<td>14/12.7</td>
<td>0/ 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>15/13.6</td>
<td>2/ 1.8</td>
<td>10/ 9.0</td>
<td>0/ 0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 110/100 110/100 110/100 110/100

Note. n/% reports the number and percent of the total of respondents whose reported typical expenditure of time devoted to performing duties associated with each role fell within the percentage range indicated.

Respondents were asked to provide information concerning their professional development experiences related to teaching. Almost all faculty indicated they had some public school teaching experience. Those who did not have public school teaching experience, had taught in some other type of context, or at some level besides the college level prior to assuming their current position. A
substantial number had also completed a student teaching experience.

Table 3

Frequencies and Percentages for Faculty Professional Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Frequency of Reported Experience</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public School Teaching</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School Teaching</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business or other Type of Teaching</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military School</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College Teaching</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked to identify other types of professional development experiences which related to instructional planning and teaching. As might be expected, considering how many had completed a student teaching experience, most respondents had taken formal course work in
teaching. Additionally, a majority had also taken formal course work in instructional planning, participated in workshop, seminars, or conferences which focused on the improvement of teaching, and participated in these same types of professional development activities which involved instructional planning topics. A majority of the respondents had conducted research on subjects related to teaching or instructional planning. A summary of the findings is presented in table 4.

Table 4

Professional Development Experience Related to Instructional Planning and Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Experience</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal Course Work in Teaching Methods</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Course Work in Instructional Planning</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops, Seminars in Teaching Methods</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops, Seminars in Instructional Planning</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on Teaching</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on Instructional Planning</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n=110.
Respondents were asked to indicate the number of years they had taught in principal preparation programs. Two-thirds of the respondents had been involved in the preparation of public school principals for ten years or less. These findings are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5**

**Number of Years of Faculty Teaching Experience in Principal Preparation Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 or more years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Total Percentages do not equal 100% due to rounding.*
Analysis and Interpretation of Findings

Four research questions guided the study and eight derivative null hypotheses were tested.

Research Question 1
Are there differences between faculty perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practices and their perceptions of what is expected of them regarding these facets of their professional roles by their respective departments?

Research question 1 was analyzed to determine whether differences existed between faculty perceptions of their performance as teachers within a principal preparation program and their perceptions of what was expected of them by their respective departments.

An initial analysis was made of the responses to the items by faculty and program coordinators. Percentages were calculated for each of the response options for the 42 items on the survey which asked faculty and coordinators to rank their perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practices, and then to perform the same task for their perceptions of departmental expectations for these same two factors. The 42 items consisted of declarative sentences followed by 5 Likert scale options. The scale options were: 1, never; 2, rarely; 3 sometimes; 4, frequently; and, 5 always. A review of the response
percentages for the 42 items for both faculty and program coordinators is presented in Appendix D.

In reviewing the responses to the items, some patterns emerged. First, both faculty and program coordinators consistently ranked their perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practices higher than their perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty for these same factors. Second, both groups ranked both their perceptions of their own practice and their departments' expectations of faculty towards the higher end of the scale. The only discrepancy in this pattern was found for item pair twenty. In this instance, faculty and program coordinators ranked their perceptions of practice and expectations for practice fairly evenly across the scale.

Percentages were also calculated for each of the response options for the eight items on the survey which asked respondents to rank their utilization of various instructional planning materials and teaching methods and resources. A review of these percentages is found in Appendix E.

Faculty and program coordinators ranked their perceptions of their use of various instructional materials and teaching methods and resources towards the higher end of the scale. The one discrepancy was found in reported usage of lecture as a teaching method. Faculty rankings for lectures as a teaching strategy were more evenly distributed
among the option gradients than program coordinators. Tests of the null hypothesis are presented below.

**Hypothesis 1**

There is no difference between faculty perceptions of their own instructional planning practices and their perceptions of their respective departments' expectations of faculty regarding instructional planning.

A Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-rank test was conducted to determine whether there were significance differences between faculty perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practices, and their perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty concerning this factor.
Table 6
Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-ranks Test for Faculty Perceptions of Instructional Planning and Teaching and Perceptions of Departmental Expectations of Faculty Regarding Instructional Planning and Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signed-rank</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self &lt; Department</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self &gt; Department</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self = Department</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z-Score = -4.8198
2-Tailed p = .0001*

Note. n=110.

Note. Self refers to faculty perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practices. Department refers to faculty perceptions of department expectations of faculty regarding instructional planning and teaching roles.

The results of the Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-rank test to determine whether faculty ranked their perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practices differently than their perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty concerning these two factors indicated that there did indeed exist a disparity between
what faculty believed about their own teaching and what was expected of them. Faculty significantly ranked their perceptions of their own practice higher than they ranked their perceptions of department expectations. The null hypothesis was rejected with a z score of -4.8189 and 2-tailed p of less than .0001. The calculated z was greater than the critical value for acceptance of + or - 1.96. The p value approached 0 which exceeded the critical value of .05 established for this test.

**Hypothesis 2**

There is no difference between faculty perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practice and their utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources.

A Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-rank test was used to determine if a difference existed between faculty perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practices and their utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources. The results of this test are presented in Table 7.
Table 7
Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-ranks Test for Faculty
Perceptions of Their Instructional Planning and Teaching
Practices and Their Use of Varied Teaching and Planning
Methods and Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signed-rank</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self &lt; Use</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self &gt; Use</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self = Use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z Score = -6.5962
2-Tailed p = .0001*

Note. n=110.
Note. Self refers to faculty perceptions of their instructional planning and teaching practices. Use refers to their self-reported use of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources.

Prior to the performance of the Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-rank test item 43, concerning the use of lecture as a teaching method was recoded so that a ranking of 1 would indicate exclusive use of lecture as the teaching method, of choice. This was done because a higher score would tend to indicate a greater reliance on this type of teaching method.
and would bias the test results. The Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-rank test indicated that faculty ranked their perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practices significantly higher than their self-reported utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources. The null hypothesis was rejected. The z score was -6.592 and 2-tailed p was less than .0001. The calculated z was greater than the critical value for acceptance of + or - 1.96. The p value approached 0 which exceeds the critical value of .05 established for this test.

Hypothesis 3
There is no difference between faculty perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty regarding instructional planning and teaching and faculty use of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources.

A Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-rank test conducted to determine whether differences existed between faculty perceptions of departmental expectation of faculty concerning instructional planning and teaching practice and their self-reported utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources is reported in table 8.
Table 8
Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-ranks Test for Faculty
Perceptions of Department Expectations of Faculty Regarding
Instructional Planning and Teaching and Faculty Use of
Varied Instructional Planning and Teaching Methods and
Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signed-rank</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department &lt; Use</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department &gt; Use</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department = Use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z Score = -1.3058
2-tailed p = .1916

Note. n =110.

Note. Department refers to faculty perceptions of department expectations of faculty regarding instructional planning and teaching practices. Use refers to self-reported use of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources.

The results of the Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-rank test to determine whether differences existed between faculty perceptions of departmental expectations concerning faculty instructional planning and teaching practice and their self-reported utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources.
planning and teaching methods and resources indicated that there was no significant difference between the rankings. The calculated $z$ score of -1.3058 did not exceed the critical value of $z$ of 1.96. The 2-tailed $p$ of .1916 did not exceed the $p$ value of .05 set for this test. Thus, the null hypothesis was retained.

Research Question 2

Are there differences between program coordinator perceptions of their instructional planning and teaching practice and their perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty regarding these factors?

Hypothesis 4

There is no difference between program coordinator perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practice and their perceptions of their departments' expectations of faculty regarding these same two factors.

A Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-rank test was also conducted to determine if a difference existed between program coordinator perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practice, and their perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty regarding these two factors. The results of this test are presented in Table 9.
Table 9

Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-Rank Test for Program Coordinator Perceptions of Their Own Instructional Planning and Teaching Practices and Their Perceptions of Departmental Expectations of Faculty Regarding Instructional Planning and Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signed-rank</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self &lt; Department</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self &gt; Department</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self = Department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z-Score = -3.0182
2-Tailed p = .0025

Note. n = 20.

Note. Self refers to program coordinator perceptions of their instructional planning and teaching practices. Department refers to program coordinator perceptions of department expectations of faculty regarding instructional planning and teaching.

The results of the Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-rank test determined that program coordinators ranked their perceptions of their instructional planning and teaching practice significantly higher than their perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty concerning these two
factors. The null hypothesis was rejected with a z score of -3.0182 and 2-tailed p of .025. The calculated z was greater than the critical value for acceptance of the null of 1.96. The p value of .025 exceeded the critical value of p which was set at .05 for this test.

Hypothesis 4
There is no difference between program coordinator perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practice and their utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources.

A Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-rank test was performed to determine whether program coordinator perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practices differed from their self-reported utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources. As with the similar test for faculty, the item concerning the use of lecture was recoded to disallow a biased test result. The results of this test are presented in table 10.
Table 10

Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-Ranks Test Program Coordinator Perceptions of Their Instructional Planning and Teaching Practices and Their Use of Various Instructional Planning and Teaching Methods and Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signed-rank</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self &lt; Use</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self &gt; Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self = Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z-Score   -3.9199
2-Tailed p .0001

Note. n = 20.

Note. Self refers to program coordinator perceptions of their instructional planning and teaching practices. Use refers to their self-reported use of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources.

Program coordinators ranked perceptions of their use of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources lower than their perceptions of their practice. The null hypothesis was rejected with a z score of -3.9199 and 2-tailed p of .0001.
As with faculty rankings, program coordinator perceptions were tested using a Wilcoxon-pairs Signed-rank test to determine whether differences existed between their perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty concerning instructional planning and teaching, and their self-reported utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources. The results of this test are presented in table 11.
Table 11

Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-ranks Test for Program Coordinator Perceptions of Department Expectations of Faculty Regarding Instructional Planning and Teaching Practices and Their Use of Various Instructional Planning and Teaching Methods and Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signed-rank</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department &lt; Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department &gt; Use</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department = Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z-score = -3.9199
2-Tailed p = .0001

Note. n = 20.

Note. Department refers to program coordinator perceptions of department expectations of faculty regarding instructional planning and teaching. Use refers to their self-reported use of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources.

The Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-rank test to determine differences between program coordinator perceptions of departmental expectations of their self-reported utilization of various instructional planning and
teaching methods and resources were consistent with their rankings of their perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practices and use of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources. All program coordinators ranked their utilization of different instructional planning and teaching methods and resources lower than their perceptions of department expectations. The null hypothesis was rejected with a z score of -3.9199 and a 2-tailed p value of .0001.

Research Question 3
Are there differences between faculty and program coordinator perceptions of their respective instructional planning and teaching practice, and their perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty concerning these same factors?

Hypothesis five
There is no difference between faculty and program coordinator perceptions of their instructional planning and teaching practices.

A Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine whether differences existed between faculty and program coordinator perceptions of their respective instructional planning and teaching practices. The results of this test are presented in table 12.
### Table 12

Mann-Whitney U Test for Differences Between Faculty and Program Coordinator Perceptions of Their Respective Instructional Planning and Teaching Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>54.63</td>
<td>822.0</td>
<td>-.6052</td>
<td>.5451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n refers to number of respondents in each group.

The Mann-Whitney U test for differences between faculty and program coordinator perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practice indicated that there was no significant difference between them. The z score of -.6052 did not exceed the critical value of z of 1.96. The 2-tailed p value of .5451 did not exceed alpha of .05. The null hypothesis was thus retained.

**Hypothesis 6**

There is no difference between faculty and program coordinator perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty regarding instructional planning and teaching.

A Mann-Whitney U test was conducted to determine whether differences existed between faculty and program
coordinator perceptions of what was expected of them by their respective departments concerning instructional planning and teaching. The results of this test are presented in Table 13.

Table 13
Mann-Whitney Test for Differences Between Faculty and Program Coordinator Perceptions of Departmental Expectations of Faculty Regarding Instructional Planning and Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Rank U</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>-1.2094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n refers to number of respondents in each group.

The Mann-Whitney U test for differences between faculty and program coordinator perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practice and their perceptions of department expectations concerning these same factors indicated that there was no significant difference between them. The calculated z score of -1.2094 did not exceed the critical value of z of 1.96. The 2-tailed p value of .2265 did not exceed the .05 alpha used for this test. The null hypothesis was retained.
Summary

Descriptive and comparative analyses of the data generated from 110 respondents to a survey of Danforth Foundation affiliated principal preparation programs were presented in Chapter 4. The descriptive analyses included demographic information concerning faculty age, gender, role within the principal preparation program, professional preparation as it related to instructional planning and teaching and, length of involvement in principal preparation program delivery. Comparative analyses were presented for differences between faculty perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching, their perceptions of departmental expectations for these same factors, and their self-reported use of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources. The same types of comparative analyses were presented for program coordinators. Finally, this chapter presented comparative results of faculty and program coordinator perceptions of their own practice and their respective perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty concerning the preparation for instructional planning and teaching.
Chapter 5
Summary, Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

Research which focused on principal preparation programs affiliated with the Danforth Foundation Program for the Preparation of Public School Principals described programs in which substantial reform agenda were being advanced. Cordiero, et al. (1991) and Milstein (1992) reported that faculty were indeed engaged in important changes in their assumptions governing the way they planned and enacted programmatic goals and objectives with students. Because these studies relied heavily on program coordinator in-put and artifactual evidences of programmatic reform, they did not directly provide for feed-back from the faculty themselves.

The primary purpose of this study was to afford faculty the opportunity to report how they felt about their own instructional planning and teaching practices and to compare their perceptions with those of program coordinators. In so doing, it was hoped that a more complete picture of how faculty planned and taught might be forthcoming.

The population for this study consisted of 140 faculty members who were identified by program coordinators and themselves as having played active instructional planning and teaching roles during the 1993-94 school year in a
principal preparation program which was part of the Danforth Foundation Program for the Preparation of Public School Principals. One hundred-ten of these faculty responded which represented a return rate of 78.6%, a rate determined to be acceptable for the purposes of this study.

Findings

The following findings are presented as the result of the analyses and consequent interpretations of data generated from the returned surveys.

Analysis of the demographic data for the respondents indicated the following. They are predominantly male. Two-thirds of them have ten years or less of experience in principal preparation program teaching. They have undertaken considerable formal preparation in instructional planning and teaching, and all of them have teaching experiences outside the university setting. Most have public school teaching experience. The majority have conducted research into instructional planning and teaching and have participated in workshops, conferences, and seminars devoted to the improvement of instructional planning or teaching, or both.

A summary of the findings for the research hypotheses is presented below.
Hypotheses

1: There is no difference between faculty perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practices and their perceptions of departmental expectations regarding these same factors.

The null hypothesis was rejected. Faculty ranked their perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practices significantly higher than they ranked departmental expectations for these aspects of their professional lives.

2: There is no difference between faculty perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practice and their utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources.

The null hypothesis was rejected. Faculty ranked their perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practices higher than their self-reported utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources.

3: There is no difference between faculty perceptions of department expectations of faculty regarding their instructional planning and teaching practices and their self-reported utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources.
The null hypothesis was retained. Although faculty did rank their perceptions of departmental expectations higher than they ranked their self-reported utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources, the difference was not statistically significant.

4: There is no difference between program coordinator perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practice and their perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty regarding these factors.

The null hypothesis was rejected. Program coordinators significantly ranked their perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practices higher than their perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty regarding these factors.

5: There is no difference between program coordinator perceptions of their instructional planning and teaching practices and their utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources.

The null hypothesis was rejected. All Program Coordinators ranked their perceptions of their utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources lower than their perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty concerning these factors.
6: There is no difference between program coordinator perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty concerning instructional planning and teaching and their self-reported utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources.

The null hypothesis was rejected. All program coordinators significantly ranked their perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty concerning instructional planning and teaching higher than they ranked their perceptions of their own utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources.

7: There is no difference between faculty and program coordinator perceptions of their respective instructional planning and teaching practices.

The null hypothesis was retained. There was no significant difference between faculty and program coordinator perceptions of their respective instructional planning and teaching practices.

8: There is no difference between faculty and program coordinator perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty concerning instructional planning and teaching practice.

The null hypothesis was retained. There was no significant difference between faculty and program
coordinators for their perceptions of departmental expectations of faculty concerning instructional planning and teaching.

Conclusions

While no survey study can be completely free of bias or account for all possible factors which influence data generated from human respondents, there are certain that can be drawn this study of perceptions of instructional planning and teaching of faculties and program coordinators involved with the Danforth Foundation Program for the Preparation of Public School Principals. The following section presents these conclusions.

1. The majority of faculty members in DPPSP programs have substantial public school teaching and administrative experience. They have completed formal preparation programs which focused on instructional planning and teaching. Most have been involved in principal preparation programs for less than ten years.

2. Both faculty and program coordinators rank very highly their perceptions of department expectations of faculty concerning their instructional planning and teaching roles.

3. Faculty and program coordinators rank their perceptions of their own instructional planning and teaching practice higher than their self-reported utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources.
4. Faculty and program coordinators rank their perceptions of department expectations of faculty concerning their instructional planning and teaching roles higher than their self-reported utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources.

5. There is no difference between faculty and program coordinator perceptions of their respective instructional planning and teaching practices.

6. There is no difference between faculty and program coordinator perceptions of department expectations of faculty regarding instructional planning and teaching responsibilities.
Recommendations

The following recommendations are proposed as result of this study of faculty perceptions of instructional planning and teaching practices.

1. Faculty and program coordinators should participate in professional development activities which focus on effective utilization of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources.

Faculty involved in the Danforth Foundation Program for the Preparation of School Principals perceive their instructional planning and teaching to be of generally high quality yet they do not report comparably high frequencies of usage of various instructional planning and teaching methods and resources. This would seem to suggest that their perceptions of their own practice may in fact be based on assumptions which may no longer be valid concerning effective instructional planning and teaching. It is recommended, therefore, that faculty participate in professional development activities which refine individual skills in self-assessment, specifically focusing on alternative approaches to instructional planning and teaching.

2. Faculty should systematically engage in collaborative efforts to improve instruction.

One of the potential strengths of an affiliation such as that provided by the Danforth Program is that there are
mechanisms and resources in place to facilitate active intra-department, and inter-institutional collaboration. Faculties would be well served by aggressively utilizing the resources and networks associated with such a formally enacted alliance.

3. Danforth affiliated public school leadership programs need to continue to build effective ways of sharing what they are doing with other programs.

4. Graduates of Danforth programs need to be surveyed concerning their perceptions of the quality of instruction they received.

   It would be helpful to learn what clients think about the services they have received. Faculty members perceive themselves to be effective teachers who are involved in a personally and professionally rewarding work environment. It would be well for faculty to test these perceptions against what recipients feel they have experienced while under their tutelage.

5. The Danforth Foundation Program for the Preparation of School Principals needs to increase the number of participating programs.

   Of the original 22 affiliated programs there remain 18 active. Attrition is a natural part of change. Many factors cause participants to drop out. If the affiliation is to continue, however, existing connections must be strengthened and other programs should be recruited.
6. Case studies of Danforth Affiliated Principal Preparation programs would provide a more richly textured portrait of faculty instructional planning and teaching practices. It is therefore recommended that such studies be undertaken.

7. This study focused exclusively on one population of faculties involved with the preparation of public school principals, other studies of similarly configured principal preparation faculties should prove useful. It is, therefore, recommended that other such studies be undertaken.
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APPENDICES
Dear Dr. :

Dr. Charles Burkett, Chair of my doctoral committee at East Tennessee State University, has suggested to me that you might be willing to assist me in my efforts to pilot a survey instrument. If you are, I would greatly appreciate your kind consideration and completion of the enclosed survey, and accompanying reflection document.

I realize you must receive many such requests; they "come with the territory", I imagine. Taking the time to critique the work of neophytes in the field would probably not rank high on anyone's list of professional activities, especially when the person making the request is a stranger. I would also guess you are probably as busy as my committee members. Dr. Burkett assures me, however, that you are the kind of person who could and would take the time to carefully critique a student's work.

I have nothing to offer you for your professional expertise. I can only assure you that I will be honored by any attention you may give my request, and will be sincerely grateful for any help you are willing to give me. Perhaps, you may gain some small satisfaction in knowing that you are helping a potential colleague conduct more effective research.

Thank you, Dr., for any assistance you may provide me.

Respectfully,

David DeWeese
Pilot Survey and Critique Guide

FACULTY TEACHING AND PLANNING SURVEY

SECTION ONE: BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond to the following questions to help us compile demographic data about participants in the survey.

What is your age? ______ What is your gender? ______

What is your current academic rank?

a. Professor   b. Associate Professor
c. Assistant Professor d. Instructor
e. Research Fellow f. Administrative Fellow
g. Clinical Professor h. Adjunct faculty member

Your are currently (Please circle one)

a. Full-time b. Part-Time

You are currently (Please circle one)

a. Tenured b. Non-Tenured

Your position is (Please circle one)

a. Primarily Administrative b. Primarily Non-administrative

You are currently involved in the instruction of students who aspire to become school principals (Please circle one)

a. Yes b. No
Page Two

What percentage of your professional responsibilities is devoted to instructionally related activities for principal preparation programs?

a. 0-10%  b. 11%-25%  c. 26%-50%  d. 51%-75%  e. 76%-100%

You have been in the teaching profession for how long?

a. 0-5 years  b. 6-10 years  c. 11-15 years
d. 16-20 years  e. 21-25 years  f. more than 25 years

You have been involved with the preparation of school leaders for how long?

a. 0-5 years  b. 6-10 years  c. 11-15 years
d. 16-20 years  e. 21-25 years  f. more than 25 years

During the previous academic year, approximately how many hours have you been a participant in some sort of faculty development workshop/seminar/program?

a. 0-5 hours  b. 6-10 hours
c. 11-20 hours  d. 21-30 hours
e. more than 30 hours
1. I plan for the incorporation of my own philosophy and values in my instruction. 1 2 3 4 5

2. My department expects me to plan for the inclusion of my own philosophy and values in my instructional planning. 1 2 3 4 5

3. I apply the fundamental tenets of basic learning theories when planning for instruction. 1 2 3 4 5

4. My department expects me to apply the fundamental tenets of basic learning theories when planning for instruction. 1 2 3 4 5

5. I construct and use the results of student assessment instruments as part of instructional planning. 1 2 3 4 5
SECTION TWO CONTINUED

CODE: 1=NEVER; 2=RARELY; 3=SOMETIMES; 4=FREQUENTLY; 5=ALWAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. My department expects me to construct and use the results of student assessment instruments as part of instructional planning.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I make use of my own and others' lists of ready-made instructional materials when planning for instructional activities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My department expects me to use my own and others' lists of ready-made instructional materials when planning for instructional activities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I can and do prepare my own instructional materials.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My department expects me to be able to prepare my own instructional materials.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION TWO CONTINUED

CODE: 1=NEVER; 2=RARELY; 3=SOMETIMES; 4=FREQUENTLY; 5=ALWAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. I plan for and implement measures of skills and competencies necessary to confirm that learning has occurred.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My department expects me to plan for and implement measures of skills and competencies necessary to confirm that learning has occurred.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I am sensitive to and plan for a wide array of learning styles on the part of my students.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My department expects me to be sensitive to and plan for a wide array of learning styles on the part of my students.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION TWO CONTINUED

**CODE:** 1=NEVER; 2=RARELY; 3=SOMETIMES; 4=REGULARLY; 5=ALWAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. I find many opportunities to plan for the exchange of ideas and expertise with many of my colleagues.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My department encourages and expects faculty to have opportunities to exchange ideas and expertise with colleagues.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I carefully plan my lectures and presentations to better assure maximal instructional impact.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My department expects me to plan my lectures and presentations to assure maximal instructional impact.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I adapt space, time, and other resources to meet the needs of particular instructional activities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. My department encourages and facilitates faculty initiatives to adapt space, time and other resources to meet needs of particular instructional activities.  

21. I plan my courses to meet the individual needs of students and to allow them to work at their own pace.  

22. My department expects me to meet the individual needs of students and to allow them to work at their own pace.  

23. I plan my courses to facilitate merging appropriate bodies of theory with meaningful applications in the practice of leadership.
24. My department expects me to plan my courses to facilitate merging of appropriate bodies of theory with meaningful applications in the practice of leadership.  

25. I weigh logistical and practical factors when selecting among teaching strategies.  

26. My department expects me to be adept at weighing logistical and practical factors when selecting among teaching strategies.  

27. I use a variety of teaching strategies.
28. My department expects me to employ a variety of teaching strategies.  
   1 _ 2 _ 3 _ 4 _ 5 _

29. I am aware of and utilize various communication techniques when I teach.  
   1 _ 2 _ 3 _ 4 _ 5 _

30. My department expects me to be aware of and to utilize various communication techniques in my teaching.  
   1 _ 2 _ 3 _ 4 _ 5 _

31. When presenting learning experiences in my classes I follow a carefully designed sequence, and I provide for adaptations to meet emergent needs for different pacings of learning.  
   1 _ 2 _ 3 _ 4 _ 5 _
SECTION TWO

1 = NEVER 2 = RARELY 3 = SOMETIMES 4 = FREQUENTLY 5 = ALWAYS

Item

32. My department expects me to present learning experiences in my classes according to appropriate sequences but which allow for different pacings of learning.  

33. I receive and am receptive to student feedback which helps me to modify instructional pacings and emphases.

34. My department expects me to provide for student feedback and to use that feedback to modify instructional pacing and emphasis.

35. I design and use appropriate instruments to evaluate student performance.
36. My department expects me to design and use appropriate instruments to evaluate student performance. 1 2 3 4 5

37. I proficiently analyze data generated from various sources in evaluating students and apply what I learn when teaching. 1 2 3 4 5

38. My department expects me to be proficient in analyzing data generated from various sources in evaluating students and to apply what I learn to my teaching. 1 2 3 4 5

39. I use specialists within my department, college, university, and/or outside agencies to assist me in evaluating student performance. 1 2 3 4 5
Item

40. My department expects me to avail myself of expertise of specialists to assist me in evaluating student performance.  

41. My teaching roles are intrinsically rewarding to me.  

42. My department places a high priority on my teaching responsibilities.
Faculty Teaching and Planning Survey Instrument: Pilot Critique

Format:
Researchers relying on mailings for data collection find themselves competing with other reputable and not so reputable agents whose marketing budgets and sophisticated strategies allow them to stuff mail boxes with colorfully enticing solicitations. Higher education faculty are particularly marked for avalanches of "junk" mail because of their potential influence and status. With this in mind, I would very much appreciate your assessment of the instrument's format.

A. Are print fonts large enough? ___________
B. Are the various sections (Directions, item blocks, etc.) clearly discernible? ______
C. Would sophisticated graphics have influenced you to respond (or not respond) to the instrument? ______
D. From your experiences in designing and assessing instruments what suggestions might you offer regarding other format considerations for this instrument?

Content Validity
Kerlinger suggests that content validity is largely judgmental. Each item of an instrument must be weighed for its presumed representativeness of the universe comprising all items which measure a particular theoretical construct (Kerlinger, 1967).

The constructs being considered here are:
- Principal Preparation Program Faculty's Perceptions of Their Instructional Planning Behaviors
- Principal Preparation Program Faculty's Perceptions of Their Respective Department's Expectations
APPENDIX B

FINAL SURVEY
SECTION ONE

INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond to the following demographic questions as accurately as you can.

What is your age? What is your gender?

What is your current status?

a. Professor b. Associate Professor c. Assistant Professor
d. Instructor e. Research Fellow f. Administrative Fellow
g. Clinical Professor h. Adjunct faculty member

What was your role in your department's Principal Preparation Program during the last academic year (please specify: Coordinator, Teacher in program, Adjunct faculty instructor in program, etc.)

Please indicate the percentage of time during a typical work day that you devote to the following:

Teaching Research Service Administration

Please check all items below which you have performed as part of your professional experience:

Public School Teaching (k-12) Private School Teaching (k-12)
Private Sector Teaching (Business or Professional Training Programs) Military Program Teaching (Military Schools, Armed Forces Training Programs)
Community College Teaching Other teaching (please specify)

Please check all items which have been part of your professional development relating to teaching and planning for teaching:

Student Teaching
Formal course work in teaching methodologies (excluding workshops, conferences, seminars)
Formal course work in instructional planning (excluding workshops, conferences, seminars)
Participation in teaching methodology workshops, conferences, seminars
Participation in instructional planning workshops, conferences, seminars
Research into effective teaching
Research into effective instructional planning
Other types of professional development experiences you have undertaken which specifically relate to instructional planning and teaching (please specify)

How many years have you taught in principal preparation programs?

What percentage of your professional responsibilities involve teaching and planning for principal preparation programs?
FACTOR F ACULTY TEACHING AND PLANNING SURVEY

SECTION TWO

INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond to the following questions using the coding system given below. Your responses should reflect your perceptions of your teaching and planning practices over the last academic year.

CODE:

1 = NEVER: The statement describes something I perceive not to be true.
2 = RARELY: The statement describes something I perceive to be rarely true.
3 = SOMETIMES: The statement describes something I perceive to be sometimes true.
4 = FREQUENTLY: The statement describes something I perceive to be frequently true.
5 = ALWAYS: The statement describes something I perceive to be always true.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I plan for the incorporation of my own philosophy and values in my instruction.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My department expects me to plan for the inclusion of my own philosophy and values in my instructional planning.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I apply the fundamental tenets of basic learning theories when planning for instruction.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My department expects me to apply the fundamental tenets of basic learning theories when planning for instruction.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I construct and use the results of student assessment instruments as part of instructional planning.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My department expects me to construct and use the results of student assessment instruments as part of instructional planning.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I make use of my own and others' lists of ready-made instructional materials when planning for instructional activities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My department expects me to use my own and others' lists of ready-made instructional materials when planning for instructional activities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I can and do prepare my own instructional materials.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My department expects me to be able to prepare my own instructional materials.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. My department expects me to be sensitive to and plan for a wide array of learning styles on the part of my students.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I find many opportunities to plan for the exchange of ideas and expertise with many of my colleagues.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My department encourages and expects faculty to have opportunities to exchange ideas and expertise with colleagues.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I carefully plan my lectures and presentations to better assure maximal instructional impact.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My department expects me to plan my lectures and presentations to assure maximal instructional impact.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I adapt space, time, and other resources to meet the needs of particular instructional activities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My department encourages and facilitates faculty initiatives to adapt space, time and other resources to meet needs of particular instructional activities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I plan my course activities to meet the individual needs of students and to allow them to work at their own pace.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My department expects me to meet the individual needs of students and to allow them to work at their own pace.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I plan my course activities to facilitate merging appropriate bodies of theory with meaningful applications in the practice of leadership.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My department expects me to plan my course activities to facilitate merging of appropriate bodies of theory with meaningful applications in the practice of leadership.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I consider logistical and practical factors when selecting among teaching strategies.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. My department expects me to be adept at considering logistical and practical factors when selecting among teaching strategies.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I use a variety of teaching strategies.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODE: 1=NEVER; 2=RARELY; 3=SOMETIMES; 4=FREQUENTLY; 5=ALWAYS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My department expects me to plan my course activities to facilitate merging of appropriate bodies of theory with meaningful applications in the practice of leadership.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I consider logistical and practical factors when selecting among teaching strategies.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. My department expects me to be adept at considering logistical and practical factors when selecting among teaching strategies.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I use a variety of teaching strategies.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. My department expects me to employ a variety of teaching strategies.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I am aware of and utilize various communication techniques when I teach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. My department expects me to be aware of and to utilize various communication techniques in my teaching.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I arrange the learning experiences in my classes according to thoroughly planned sequences which are designed to adapt to different pacings of learning.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. My department expects me to arrange learning experiences in my classes according to thoroughly planned sequences which are designed to adapt to different pacings of learning.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I receive and am receptive to student feedback which helps me to modify instructional pacings and emphases.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. My department expects me to provide for student feedback and to use that feedback to modify instructional pacing and emphasis.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I design appropriate instruments to evaluate student performance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. My department expects me to design appropriate instruments to evaluate student performance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I proficiently analyze data generated from various sources in evaluating students and apply what I learn when teaching.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. My department expects me to be proficient in analyzing data generated from various sources in evaluating students and to apply what I learn to my teaching.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I use specialists within my department, college university, and/or outside agencies to assist me in evaluating student performance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. My department expects me to avail myself of expertise of specialists to assist me in evaluating student performance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. My teaching role is intrinsically rewarding to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. My department places a high priority on my teaching responsibilities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. I use lectures in teaching.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. I use small group activities in my teaching.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. I use field experiences in my teaching.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I use practicing principals as mentors and resources.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I team-teach with colleagues.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. I use individualized instruction.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. I use outside resource persons for classroom and field presentations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. I use audio-visual technologies in my instruction.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

LIST OF PARTICIPATING DPPSP INSTITUTIONS
Institutions Composing the Danforth Foundation
Program for the Preparation of School Principals

Brigham Young University
Provo, UT.
Program Coordinator: Dr. Ivan Muse (1993)

California State University
Fresno, CA
Program Coordinator: Dr. Donald Coleman

East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, TN
Program Coordinator: Dr. Louise MacKay

Iowa State University
Ames, IA
Program Coordinator: Dr. Barbara Licklider

Old Dominion University
Norfolk, VA
Program Coordinator: Dr. Petra Snowden

San Diego State University
San Diego, CA
Program Coordinator: Dr. William Streshly
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA
**Program Coordinator: Dr. Wayne Worner
Dr. David Parks

University of Alabama
Tuscaloosa, AL
Program Coordinator: Dr. Patsy Johnson

University of Central Florida
Orlando, FL
Program Coordinator: Dr. William Bozeman

University of Connecticut
Storrs, CT
Program Coordinator: Dr. Paula Cordiero

University of Houston
Houston, TX
Program Coordinator: Dr. Cynthia Norris

*University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA
Program Coordinator: Dr. Robert Sinclair
University of New Mexico  
Albuquerque, NM  
Program Coordinator: Dr. JoAnn Krueger

University of Northern Colorado  
Greeley, CO  
Program Coordinator: Dr. Bruce Barnett

University of Oklahoma  
Norman, OK  
Program Coordinator: Dr. Edward Chance

University of Tennessee/Knoxville  
Knoxville, TN  
Program Coordinator: Dr. Mary Jane Connelly

University of Virginia  
Charlottesville, VA  
Program Coordinator: Dr. Daniel Duke

University of Washington  
Seattle, WA  
Program Coordinator: Dr. Ken Sirotnik
University of Wyoming
Laramie, WY

Program Coordinator: Dr. Peggy Basom and Dr. Myron Basom

Number of participating programs = 18
Number of identified Program Coordinators = 20
* No longer participating in Danforth Foundation
** Changed positions during school year, 1993-94
***Reflects shared responsibilities at University of Wyoming and change in duties at Virginia Tech.
APPENDIX D
REVIEW OF SURVEY RESPONSE NUMBERS
AND PERCENTAGES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>%/(n)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q1</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q3</td>
<td>Applied Theory</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q5</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q7</td>
<td>Others' Lists</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q9</td>
<td>Own Materials</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q11 Measurement</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1.1/(0)</td>
<td>4.4/(4)</td>
<td>12.2/(11)</td>
<td>43.3/(39)</td>
<td>38.9/(35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
<td>10.0/(2)</td>
<td>50.0/(10)</td>
<td>40.0/(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q13 Learning Styles</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3.3/(3)</td>
<td>3.3/(3)</td>
<td>15.6/(14)</td>
<td>37.8/(34)</td>
<td>40.0/(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
<td>5.0/(1)</td>
<td>20.0/(4)</td>
<td>30.0/(6)</td>
<td>45.0/(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q15 Peer Exchange</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>7.8/(7)</td>
<td>10.0/(9)</td>
<td>31.1/(28)</td>
<td>25.6/(23)</td>
<td>25.6/(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>10.0/(2)</td>
<td>5.0/(1)</td>
<td>20.0/(4)</td>
<td>50.0/(10)</td>
<td>15.0/(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q17 Presentations</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2.2/(2)</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
<td>5.6/(5)</td>
<td>43.3/(39)</td>
<td>48.9/(44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
<td>5.0/(1)</td>
<td>45.0/(9)</td>
<td>50.0/(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q19 Resources</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2.2/(2)</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
<td>8.9/(8)</td>
<td>43.3/(39)</td>
<td>45.6/(41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
<td>45.0/(9)</td>
<td>55.0/(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q21 Varied Pacings</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1.1/(1)</td>
<td>8.9/(8)</td>
<td>32.2/(29)</td>
<td>40.0/(36)</td>
<td>17.7/(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
<td>5.0/(1)</td>
<td>10.0/(2)</td>
<td>65.0/(13)</td>
<td>20.0/(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>%/n*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q23 Merging Theory</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1.1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>0.0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q25 Teaching</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>0.0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>0.0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q27 Strategy</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>0.0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>5.0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q29 Communication</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2.2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>0.0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q31 Sequencing</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3.3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>5.0/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Table Continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q33 Student Feedback</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1.1/(1)</td>
<td>1.1/(1)</td>
<td>6.7/(6)</td>
<td>31.1/(28)</td>
<td>60.0/(54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
<td>5.0/(1)</td>
<td>15.0/(3)</td>
<td>30.0/(3)</td>
<td>50.0/(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q35 Student Performance</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1.1/(1)</td>
<td>2.2/(2)</td>
<td>15.6/(14)</td>
<td>42.2/(38)</td>
<td>38.9/(35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>5.0/(1)</td>
<td>5.0/(1)</td>
<td>20.0/(4)</td>
<td>30.0/(6)</td>
<td>40.0/(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q37 Data Analysis</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2.2/(2)</td>
<td>2.2/(2)</td>
<td>21.1/(19)</td>
<td>44.4/(40)</td>
<td>30.0/(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
<td>5.0/(1)</td>
<td>20.0/(4)</td>
<td>50.0/(10)</td>
<td>25.0/(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q39 Specialist Use</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>21.1/(19)</td>
<td>25.6/(23)</td>
<td>23.3/(21)</td>
<td>18.9/(17)</td>
<td>11.1/(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
<td>5.0/(1)</td>
<td>20.0/(4)</td>
<td>50.0/(10)</td>
<td>25.0/(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q41 Teaching</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1.1/(1)</td>
<td>1.1/(1)</td>
<td>2.2/(2)</td>
<td>31.1/(28)</td>
<td>64.4/(58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
<td>15.0/(3)</td>
<td>85.0/(17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n equals actual number of respondents for response category.
Table 15
Percentages and Numbers of Respondents for Survey Items Measuring Faculty and Program Coordinator Perceptions of Department Expectations of Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>%/n*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q2 philosophy</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>4.4/(4) 11.1/(10) 24.4/(22) 35.6/(32) 24.0/(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>20.0/(4) 10.0/(2) 20.0/(4) 20.0/(4) 30.0/(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q4 Applied Theory</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3.3/(3) 10.0/(9) 14.4/(13) 41.1/(37) 31.1/(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>20.0/(4) 10.0/(2) 5.0/(1) 30.0/(6) 35.0/(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q6 Assessment</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3.3/(3) 7.8/(7) 16.7/(15) 36.7/(33) 35.6/(32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>20.0/(4) 5.0/(1) 10.0/(2) 20.0/(4) 45.0/(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q8 Others' Lists</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>7.8/(7) 7.8/(7) 37.8/(34) 27.8/(25) 18.9/(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>10.0/(2) 10.0/(2) 10.0/(2) 70.0/(14) 0.0/(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q10 Own Materials</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3.3/(3) 4.4/(4) 18.9/(17) 35.6/(32) 37.8/(34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>10.0/(2) 0.0/(0) 15.0/(3) 20.0/(4) 55.0/(11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Continues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>%/π</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q12 Measurement</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>5.6/(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>5.0/(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q14 Learning Styles</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3.3/(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q16 Peer Exchange</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>7.8/(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>20.0/(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q18 Presentations</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>4.4/(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>10.0/(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q20 Resources</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>8.9/(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>20.0/(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q22 Varied Pacings</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>4.4/(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>20.0/(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table Continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q24 Merging Theory</strong> and Practice</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>4.4/(4)</td>
<td>4.4/(4)</td>
<td>17.8/(16)</td>
<td>28.9/(26)</td>
<td>44.4/(40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>5.0/(1)</td>
<td>10.0/(2)</td>
<td>10.0/(2)</td>
<td>40.0/(8)</td>
<td>35.0/(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>q26 Teaching</strong></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>4.4/9</td>
<td>4/3</td>
<td>20.0/18</td>
<td>40.0/36</td>
<td>32.2/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>5.0/1</td>
<td>45.0/9</td>
<td>50.0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>q28 Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>4.4/(4)</td>
<td>12.2/(110)</td>
<td>16.7/(15)</td>
<td>30.0/(27)</td>
<td>36.7/(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>10.0/(2)</td>
<td>20.0/(4)</td>
<td>15.0/(3)</td>
<td>35.0/(70)</td>
<td>20.0/(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>q30 Communications</strong></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>4.4/40</td>
<td>15.6/(14)</td>
<td>17.8/(16)</td>
<td>37.8/(34)</td>
<td>24.4/(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>20.0/(4)</td>
<td>10.0/(2)</td>
<td>20.0/(4)</td>
<td>30.0/(6)</td>
<td>20.0/(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>q32 Sequencing</strong></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>7.8/(7)</td>
<td>12.2/(110)</td>
<td>27.8/(25)</td>
<td>30.0/(27)</td>
<td>22.2/(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>20.0/(4)</td>
<td>20.0/(4)</td>
<td>15.0/(3)</td>
<td>20.0/(4)</td>
<td>25.0/(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Table Continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q34 Student Feedback</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3.3/(3)</td>
<td>6.7/(6)</td>
<td>17.8/(16)</td>
<td>25.6/(23)</td>
<td>46.7/(42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>5.0/(1)</td>
<td>20.0/(4)</td>
<td>25.0/(5)</td>
<td>20.0/(4)</td>
<td>30.0/(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q36 Student Performance</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>5.6/(5)</td>
<td>5.6/(5)</td>
<td>22.2/(20)</td>
<td>31.1/(28)</td>
<td>35.6/(32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>10.0/(2)</td>
<td>25.0/(5)</td>
<td>5.0/(1)</td>
<td>20.0/(4)</td>
<td>40.0/(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q38 Data Analysis</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>5.6/(5)</td>
<td>12.2/(11)</td>
<td>17.8/(16)</td>
<td>33.3/(30)</td>
<td>31.1/(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
<td>5.0/(1)</td>
<td>20.0/(4)</td>
<td>50.0/(10)</td>
<td>25.0/(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q40 Specialist Use</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>20.0/(18)</td>
<td>24.4/(22)</td>
<td>27.8/(25)</td>
<td>17.8/(16)</td>
<td>10.0/(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>25.0/(5)</td>
<td>15.0/(3)</td>
<td>15.0/(3)</td>
<td>35.0/(7)</td>
<td>10.0/(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q42 Teaching</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>4.4/(4)</td>
<td>3.3/(3)</td>
<td>16.7/(15)</td>
<td>34.4/(31)</td>
<td>41.1/(37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
<td>0.0/(0)</td>
<td>15.0/(3)</td>
<td>85.0/(17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n equals actual number of respondents for response category.
Table 16

Percentages and Numbers of Respondents for Survey Items Measuring Self-Reported Utilization of Various Instructional Planning and Teaching Methods and Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Group</th>
<th>%/n*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q43 Lectures</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q44 Small Groups</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q45 Field</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q46 Mentors</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q47 Team Teaching</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Continues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>%/n*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q48</td>
<td>Individualized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q49</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q50</td>
<td>Audio-visual</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n equals the actual number of respondents for response categories.
APPENDIX E

VITA
VITA
DAVID LEE DEWESEE

Personal Data:
Date of Birth: August 7, 1945
Place of Birth: East Alton, IL
Marital Status: Married

Education:
Illinois State University Lab School
Normal, IL
Chatham Township Junior High School
Chatham, NJ
Southern Illinois University High School
Carbondale, IL
Illinois State University
Normal, IL
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL
East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, TN

Professional Experience:
Reading Teacher/Assistant Coordinator
Thornton Community College
Harvey, IL
English/Reading Teacher/Track Coach
Proviso Township High Schools (East)
Maywood, IL
Doctoral Fellow
East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, TN