DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 478 253   EA 032 626

AUTHOR   Lunenburg, Fred C.
TITLE   Paradigm Shifts in Educational Administration: A View from
                the Editor's Desk of "Educational Leadership Review" and
                "NCPEA Yearbook".
PUB DATE   2003-04-22
NOTE   18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American
                Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 21-25,
                2003).
PUB TYPE   Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE   EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *Administrative Principles; Administrator Characteristics;
                Administrator Education; Administrators; Behavioral Sciences;
                *Educational Administration; Educational Research; Elementary
                Secondary Education; Faculty Publishing; *Instructional
                Leadership; Journal Articles; *Management Development;
                *Organizational Theories; Periodicals; School Administration;
                Social Sciences

ABSTRACT
                This essay addresses changes in perspectives, research,
theories, and practices in educational administration. The first part
discusses theories and studies of educational administration, taking the
position that educational administration is an applied science. That is, most
theories in the social sciences, like educational administration, require a
process of refinement through revision and extension. This section discusses
the development of thought in and research on educational administration,
highlighting the differences between four major developments in
administrative thought: (1) classical-organizational theory; (2) the human-
relations model; (3) the behavioral-science approach; and (4) the post-
behavioral-science era. The second part of the paper examines the paradigm
shifts in educational administration through the lens of two academic
publications, "Educational Leadership Review" and "National Council of
Professors of Educational Administration Yearbook." This section examines the
goals, styles, editorial philosophy, and editorial requirements of these
publications, and the topics of recent editions to show the shifts in
approaches to educational administration. Included is a table presenting an
overview of the four major developments in administrative thought, and a list
of topics in eight issues of "Educational Leadership Review" for 2002 and
2003. (Contain 14 references.) (WFA)

Running Head: PARADIGM SHIFTS

Paradigm Shifts in Educational Administration: A View from the Editor's Desk of

Education Leadership Review and *NCPEA Yearbook*

Fred C. Lunenburg, Ph.D.
Professor & Senior Research Fellow
Center for Research & Doctoral Studies in Educational Leadership
Sam Houston State University
P.O. Box 2119
1908 Bobby K. Marks Drive
Huntsville, TX 77341-2119
Telephone: (936) 294-3838
Fax: (936) 294-3886
E-mail: flunenburg@shsu.edu

Paradigm Shifts in Educational Administration: A View from the Editor's Desk of

Education Leadership Review and *NCPEA Yearbook*

Introduction

I found Fenwick English's (2003) distinction between Kuhn's (1962) modernistic

paradigmatic theory and Feyerabend's (1995) and Lakatos's (1999) postmodern

paradigmatic theory quite interesting and thought provoking. I place myself within both

paradigmatic theories. I take the position that educational administration is an applied

science. That is, most theories in the social sciences, like educational administration,

require a process of refinement through revision and extension (Lunenburg & Ornstein,

2004).

Several such efforts to refine and extend the scientific theory movement deserve

mention. To begin with, Griffiths (1995, 1997) proposes "theoretical pluralism" that is

linked to problems of practice. Willower (1998) suggests philosophical naturalism and

pragmatism, variously called scientific methods, inquiry, or reflective methods. These

philosophies rely on logic and evidence, consistent with such definitions of truth as

Dewey's (1938) warranted assertibility. Hoy (1996) provides a pragmatic perspective on

science and theory in the practice of educational administration. He suggests the heuristic

value of social science research and theory. He argues that research and theory building

can serve as useful frames of reference for practitioners as they engage in real-world

problem solving. Evers and Lakomski (1996) provide a postpositivist conception of

science in educational administration that they call "naturalistic coherentism". This view

contends that knowledge generation should be assessed on the basis of its testability,

simplicity, consistency, comprehensiveness, fecundity, familiarity of principle, and

explanatory power. Bridges and Hallinger (1992, 1995) espouse a problem-based

learning model, which simulates the world of practice. Donmoyer (1999) introduces the

concept of "utilitarianism", sometimes called the "big tent" approach. This perspective

takes the form of expanding the definition of knowledge to include nontraditional along

with more traditional methods of inquiry, which resembles Feyerabend's (1995) and

Lakatos's (1999) postmodern paradigmatic theory. He sees the resulting fusion of

quantitative and qualitative methods of inquiry as valuable to both the researcher and the

practitioner. Finally, Murphy (1992, 2002) discuss a "dialectic" strategy and later offers

some unifying concepts – a "synthesizing paradigm" – to aid in the preparation and

practice of school administrators. Murphy's approach resembles somewhat Kuhn's

(1962) modernistic mindset but does not negate postmodernistic perspectives, particularly

his concept of social justice, which has a distinctly postmodern flavor.

<center>Development of Thought in Educational Administration</center>

My (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004) framework employs a variation of the Kuhnian

(1962) approach in that it provides a schematic of periods in the development of

administrative thought, which are un-dated, fluid, and re-visited periodically. In addition,

my framework includes a postmodern mindset in that it embraces subjectivist and

interpretivist approaches to the study of educational administration (variously labeled

neo-Marxist/critical theory and postmodernism), which emerged in the late 1970s and has

continued to the present. The scholars in this tradition have attempted to expand the

traditional knowledge domains that define educational administration. These alternative,

nontraditional perspectives have spawned scholarship on ethics and values, gender,

race/ethnicity, and class; and critical theory and postmodernism.

I have attempted to place the development of administrative thought into a loose historical framework (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004). In general, four models emerge: classical organizational theory, the human relations model, the behavioral science approach, and the post-behavioral science era. The classical "rational" model evolved around the ideas of scientific and administrative management, including the study of administrative processes and managerial functions. The human relations "social" model was spurred by some early seminal social science research, including experimentation and analysis of the social and psychological aspects of people in the workplace and the study of group behavior. The behavioral science approach was an attempt to reconcile the basic incongruency between the rational-economic model and the social model. The more recent post-behavioral science era includes the interrelated concepts of school improvement, democratic community, and social injustice, as well as subjectivist and interpretivist approaches to the study and practice of educational administration variously labeled neo-Marxist/critical theory and postmodernism. Table 1 briefly summarizes the major differences among the four approaches to administrative thought.

_____

Insert Table 1 about here.

_____

As shown in Table 1, differences in leadership, organization, production, process, power, administration, reward, and structure are important distinguishing characteristics of the four approaches to administrative thought. We can see how the evolution of organization and administrative theory has developed from a concern for efficiency theory and the basic principles of management to an emphasis on human and

psychological factors to social systems and contingency theory and, finally, to a concern for school improvement, democratic community, and social justice, as well as subjectivist and interpretivist approaches to the study and practice of educational administration, including Neo-Marxism, critical theory, and postmodernism. While I have not included all people who have made contributions in the evolution of administrative thought, major contributors and basic concepts are noted and primary eras in the evolution are highlighted. Furthermore, no attempt is made to date the eras precisely. In fact, if we view the sequence of developments in organizational and administrative theory, we notice a correlational rather than a compensatory tendency. Traces of the past coexist with modern approaches to administration. For example, while the classical "rational" model has been modified somewhat since its emergence during the 1900s, views of the school as a rational-technical system remain firmly embedded in the minds of policymakers and pervade most educational reforms proposed since the publication of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) and the many reports that followed. Indeed, this view of schooling is in place today with current accountability policy to assess student, teacher, and school performance. Implicit in the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* is the concomitant expectation that school administrators and teachers will adjust instructional strategies to yield more effective learning outcomes for all children.

Emergent Perspectives

Positivism was the dominant orthodoxy in educational administration until the late 1970s. Positivism is a view of knowledge as objective, absolutely true, and independent of other conditions such as time, circumstances, societies, cultures,

communities, and geography. Another tradition of positivism is "empiricism." Empiricism maintains that knowledge of the world can only be acquired through the senses and through experience. This view of science came to be known as "logical empiricism" or "logical positivism." From these philosophies there developed "positivism"- the view that any investigation in the natural or social sciences must be derived from empiricist postulates in order to be considered academically acceptable. Simply stated, *positivism* is a world view that all knowledge of the world comes to us from sense experience and observation.

The positivist approach to research consists of several functions: (a) the observation and description of perceptual data coming to us from the world through our senses, (b) the development of theories inferred from such observations and descriptions of perceptual data, (c) the testing of hypotheses derived from the theories, and (d) the verification of hypotheses that are then used to verify the theories derived from the observation and description of perceptual data. The approach evolved from an empiricist model of science that involves observation and description, theory building, and hypothesis testing verification. Quantitative methods using large samples with the objective of statistical inferences was the predominant tool used. The positivist approach to the generation of knowledge dominated research in educational administration until the late 1970s.

In the late 1970s, objections began to surface regarding the dominant (positivist) orthodoxy. Alternative paradigms began to appear and continued to be refined through the 1980s. These emerging, nontraditional perspectives came under the general heading of subjectivist and inerpretivist approaches. Subjectivist and interpretivist views refer to

perspectives that look inward to the mind rather than outward to experience and that connect to philosophical idealism and, more recently, to phenomenology and existentialism. Subjectivist and interpretivist perspectives are illustrated by the early work of scholars such as T.B. Greenfield in Canada; by the work of neo-Marxist and critical theorists such as Bates and others; and by the early work of postmodernists such as Derrida, Foucault, and Lyotard. These alternate nontraditional approaches spawned scholarship on ethics and values; gender, race/ethnicity, and class; and critical theory and postmodernism as mentioned previously.

The subjectivist and interpretivist perspectives led to the increased popularity of qualitative research methods under various labels: qualitative methods, ethnography, participant observation, case studies, fieldwork, and naturalistic inquiry. These approaches are attempts to understand educational processes within local situations. Societies; cultures; communities; unique circumstances; gender, race, and class; and geography serve as important analytical categories in such inquiry. There seems to be an increasing interest in bringing together positivist and interpretive paradigms that may prove valuable to both the researcher and practitioner (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004).

Irrespective of the theoretical perspective of the editor of *Educational Leadership Review* and the editing of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) 2002 and 2003 Yearbooks, I view the eight issues of *ELR* and the last 11 volumes of the NCPEA Yearbook as providing an open playing field for a variety of approaches to the study and practice of educational administration. The range of topics in *ELR* and the yearbooks attest to that fact.

A View from the Editor's Desk

Education Leadership Review

NCPEA's two major goals in sponsoring *ELR* are: (1) to refine the knowledge base for preparing administrator's and professors of educational administration and (2) to promote the application of theory and research in the field to the practice of educational administration. Both quantitative and qualitative studies are of interest, though the editors will seek a 50/50 balance of the two research methods. Other styles of writing will be considered; however, an interest of the editors is to connect the application of research to the practice of educational administration.

The NCPEA-*ELR* Editorial Advisory Board and the NCPEA Publications Committee seek a "Guest Editor" for each issue. This provides the experience of journal editing for members, especially those who may want to expand their professional activities. The guest editor helps to select/solicit and coordinate the approved articles for publication. In addition, the guest editor is responsible for final editing and copy, and sending page proofs to individual authors for final editing.

Submissions are typically 2,000 to 3,000 words in length, excluding references. A 100 word abstract precedes the article. Articles, references, and abstracts must follow the guidelines in the Fifth Edition of the *American Psychological Association Publication Manual*. Submissions written in different formats are automatically rejected. Articles are typed in Microsoft Word, Times or Times New Roman, size 12 font. Submissions can be emailed directly to the publication office at: creitheo@shsu.edu or sent to the publication office address above. Reviewers are nationally recognized education researchers and

practitioners representing universities across the country. Each submission is blind-reviewed by members of the Editorial Review Board.

Kuhnian Paradigmatic Theory Q & A

1. How would you characterize the nature of the submission to your journal in the last 3-5 years in terms of Kuhnian paradigmatic theory? Is there a dominant paradigm and if so, how would you characterize it?

ELR is sponsored by NCPEA and published at Sam Houston State University. Since its publication in 2000, there is no dominant paradigmatic theory. Articles tend to have a balance among quantitative and qualitative methods, as well as expository pieces.

2. Do the nature of these submissions suggest a paradigm change? If so, in what direction or in what way?

I see no particular trends in the published manuscripts.

3. What are the common kinds of discursive conflicts at work in your publication? Here we are asking if the "normal friction" of the review process reveals shifts in foundational beliefs that might be considered "non normal."

ELR experiences few discursive conflicts. Consultant reviewers are carefully selected and matched with the content of the manuscripts submitted. ELR, as do other journals, suffers from quick submissions-to print timelines. When manuscripts are accepted within the journal's timeframe, they are published rather than being stockpiled for publication in a subsequent issue.

Feyerabendian/Lakatosian Q & A

1. Do the nature of the submissions for your journal suggest the presence of a multiparadigmatic focus at work in educational administration?

Yes.

2. If yes to #1, in what ways or in what manner are these multiple foci manifest?

Multiple foci are manifest in the variety of topics addressed in each issue of *ELR*. (See Table 2.)

Insert Table 2 about here.

---

3. What issues/problems do you confront as an editor working with reviewers to deal with the "publication/review" friction of resolving multiple paradigmatic differences?

ELR is a "refereed" publication. That is, reviewers decide which manuscripts will be published in each issue of *ELR*. The key to the success of this endeavor is to facilitate an appropriate match between the expertise of the consultant reviewers and the content of the manuscript submitted. For those manuscripts that are not published (rejected), a letter is sent to the submitter. All of the consultant reviewers' comments are gathered and incorporated into the letter, which, in essence, provides the researchers with suggestions for improving the paper and sending it elsewhere if they so desire.

NCPEA Yearbook

The purpose of the NCPEA Yearbook is to provide professors of educational administration and practicing administrator with a scholarly, yet practical distillation of the current year's research and thought in educational administration. The Yearbook serves as a major resource for updating knowledge in educational administration.

Kuhnian Paradigmatic Theory Q & A

1. How would you characterize the nature of the submissions to your yearbook in the last 3-5 years in terms of Kuhnian paradigmatic theory? Is there a dominant paradigm and if so, how would you characterize it?

Chapters in the yearbook have included quantitative, qualitative, and expository pieces. There has not been a dominant paradigm in the last five years.

2. Do the nature of these submissions suggest a paradigm change? If so, in what direction or in what way?

I have not seen any particular trends in the published manuscripts.

3. What are the common kinds of discursive conflicts at work in your publication? Here we are asking if the "normal friction" of the review process reveals shifts in foundational beliefs that might be considered "non-normal."

There is nothing deemed "non-normal." The manuscript review process was structured to include four reviewers for each manuscript submitted. Two established scholars were assigned as consultant reviewers for each manuscript. In seeking these analysts, I looked primarily at expertise but also weighted heavily diversity of perspectives. In addition, each of the two editors read each manuscript that was submitted. Furthermore, one member of the Executive Board read several manuscripts when questions arose. While the overall review process could be deemed adequate, it was far from perfect. A number of colleagues who had volunteered as consultant reviewers initially disappeared in the heat of battle.

Feyerbendian/Lakatosian: Q & A

1. Do the nature of the submissions for your yearbook suggest the presence of a multiparadigmatic focus at work in educational administration?

Yes.

2. If yes to #1, in what ways or in what manner are these multiple foci manifest?

Developing a yearbook that reveals the full range of current issues in educational leadership is not an easy task. The first decision centered on the selection of contributors to the volume. Another decision dealt with providing an organizing framework for the volume. I treat those two issues in the paragraph below. A third decision had to do with the question of the target audience. As was the case with previous yearbooks, the audience for this volume is practicing school leaders in PK-12 schools and university faculty who prepare leaders for work in PK-12 schools.

3. What issues/problems do you confront as an editor working with reviewers to deal with the "publication/review" friction of resolving multiple paradigmatic differences?

My initial ideas about the matter of contributors to the volume had taken shape when I was second editor of the 2002 NCPEA Yearbook, and I was also influenced by my earlier experience on editorial boards of several refereed journals. I decided that the author roster should include a mix of invited senior scholars as well as contributors who responded to a call for manuscripts. As an official publication of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, a call for manuscripts was sent to the entire membership. In addition, I personally contacted senior scholars. Moreover, it is traditional to include in the annual NCPEA Yearbook, both the Cocking Lecture and the Corwin Lecture. John Hoyle and Jeffrey Glanz, respectively contributed their work to the

Yearbook. Thus, the framework for organizing the chapters consisted of three parts: (1)

invited chapters, (2) leadership preparation, and (3) leadership in practice.

References

Bridges, E. M., & Hallinger, P. (1992). *Problem-based learning for administrators.*

Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational

Management.

Bridges, E. M., & Hallinger, P. (1995). *Implementing problem-based learning in*

leadership development. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, ERIC Clearinghouse

on Educational Management.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Logic: The theory of inquiry.* New York: Henry Holt.

Donmoyer, R. (1999). The continuing quest for a knowledge base: 1976-1998. In J.

Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational*

administration (2nd ed.) (pp. 25-43). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

English, F. W. (2003, April). *Checking the editorial seismograph for a paradigm shift in*

educational administration. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the

American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Evers, C. W., & Lakomski, G. (1996). Science in educational administration: A

postpositivist conception. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 32,* 379-402.

Feyerabend, P. (1995). *Problems of empiricism: Philosophical papers.* Cambridge, UK:

Cambridge University Press.

Griffiths, D. E. (1995). Theoretical pluralism in educational administration. In R.

Donmoyer, M. Imber, & J. J. Scheurich (Eds.). Albany, NY: State University of

New York Press.

Griffiths, D. E. (1997). The case for theoretical pluralism, *Educational Management and*

Administration, 25, 371-380.

Hoy, W. K. (1996). Science and theory in the practice of educational administration: A

pragmatic perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 32*, 366-378.

Kuhn, T. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago

Press.

Lakatos, I. (1999). *The methodology of scientific research programmes.* Cambridge, UK:

Cambridge University Press.

Lunenburg, F. C., & Ornstein, A. O. (2004). *Educational administration: Concepts and*

practices. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Murphy, J. (1992). *The landscape of leadership preparation: Reframing the education of*

school administrators. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. (2002). Reculturing the profession of educational leadership: New blueprints,

Educational Administration Quarterly, 39, 176-191.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk.* Washington,

DC: Government Printing Office.

Willower, D. J. (1998). Fighting the fog: A criticism of postmodernism. *Journal of*

School Leadership, 8, 448-463.

Table 1   Overview of the Four Major Developments in Administrative Thought

Period	Management Elements	Procedures	Contributors and Basic Concepts
Classical organizational theory	Leadership Organization Production Process Authority Administration Reward Structure	Top to bottom Machine Individual Anticipated consequences Rules;coercive Leader separate Economic Formal	Taylor (time-and –motion study, functional supervisor, piecerate) Fayol (five basic functions, fourteen principles of management) Gulick (POSDCoRB) Weber (ideal bureaucracy)
Human relations approach	Leadership Organization Production Process Authority Administration Reward Structure	All directions Organism Group Unanticipated consequences Group Norms Participative Social and psychological Informal	Mayo, Roethlisberger, and Dickson (Hawthorne studies); intellectual undercurrents: Lewin (group dynamics); Lewin, Lippitt, and White (leadership studies); Rogers (client-centered therapy); Moreno (sociometric technique); Whyte (human relations in the restaurant industry); Homans (small groups)
Behavioral science approach	Consideration of all major elements with heavy emphasis on contingency leadership, culture, transformational leadership, and systems theory		Barnard (cooperative systems);Bakke (fusion process);Argyris (optimal actualization-organization and individual);Getzels and Guba (social systems theory-nomothetic and idiographic); Maslow (need hierarchy); Herzberg (hygiene-motivation);McGregor (Theory X and Y); Likert (Systems 1-4);Halpin and Croft (open-closed climates); Blake and Mouton(leadership grid);Fiedler(contingency theory); Vroom (expectancy theory); Reddin (3-D leadership), Etzioni (compliance theory), Mintzberg (structure of organizations); Hersey and Blanchard (situational leadership); Bennis (leadership-unconscious conspiracy)
Post-Behavioral Science Era	Interrelated concepts of school improvement democratic community, and social justice including leadership; and emergent nontraditional perspectives		School improvement, democratic community, and social justice (Murphy); transformational leadership (Bass, Leithwood); learning organizations (Senge); reframing organizations (Bolman and Deal); TQM (Deming); synergistic leadership theory (Irby, Brown, Duffy, and Trautman); instructional leadership, transformational leadership moral leadership, participative leadership, contingency leadership (Leithwood and Duke); values and ethics (Hodgkinson, Stevkovich, Shapiro, Beck, and Starratt); gender, race/ethnicity, and class (Shakeshaft, Grogan, Brunner, Tallerico, Irby, Brown, Skrla, Johnson, Ortiz, Marshall, Lomotey, Jackson, Pounder, Mertz, Dillard Rossman); critical theory and postmodernism (T.B. Greenfield, Derrida, Foucault, Lyotard, Giroux, Bates, McLaren, Foster, English, Capper, Maxcy, Scheurich, Dantley, West, Young, Larson, Furman, Anderson, Shields, Lather, Freire, and Murtadha

Table 2 Topics in ELR 2000-2003

School Law
School Finance
Instructional Television
Gender and Race
Student Outcomes
High Stakes Testing
University-School District Partnerships
Principal Internships
School-Based Counseling
High School Restructuring
Teacher Evolution
Distance Learning
Mentoring
Professional Development
ISLLC Standards
Parental Aggression
Stresses of Superintendent Spouses
Reform of Principal Preparation Programs
Multicultural Education and School Leadership
Socialization of New Principals
Career Paths of Female Superintendents
Student Achievement and School Funding
Community Input and Superintendent Selection
Leadership and Cultural Values
Spiritual School Leaders
Collaboration in Preparing School Leaders
Leadership and Special Education

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Paradigm Shifts in Educational Administration: A View from the Editor's Desk of Education Leadership Review and NCPEA Yearbook

Author(s): Fred C. Lunenburg

Corporate Source: Sam Houston State University, Box 2119, Huntsville, TX 77341-2119	Publication Date: 2003

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY ____Sample____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY ____Sample____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY ____Sample____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ↑ [X]	Level 2A ↑ [ ]	Level 2B ↑ [ ]
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here,→ please	Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title: Fred C. Lunenburg
	Organization/Address: Sam Houston State University, Box 2119 Huntsville, TX 77341-2119	Telephone: 936-294-3838 FAX: 936-294-3886
		E-Mail Address: flunenburg@shsu.edu Date: 5-20-03

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:

Address:

Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education
Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, NY 10027

Telephone: 212-678-3433
Toll Free: 800-601-4868
Fax: 212-678-4012

WWW: http://eric-web.tc.columbia.edu

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@ineted.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)