academicJournals

Vol. 7(2), pp. 47-60, March, 2015
DOI: 10.5897/IJEAPS2015.0394
Article Number: DC713E652004
ISSN 2141-6656
Copyright © 2015
Author(s) retain the copyright of this article
http://www.academicjournals.org/IJEAPS

International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies

Full Length Research Paper

Values and context: Taiwan principal preparation and practice from an American perspective

Linda R. Vogel

University of Northern Colorado, U.S.A.

Received 20 February, 2015, Accepted 26 March, 2015

This qualitative study explores the preparation and practice of school leaders in Taiwan based on in-depth interviews and observations with six Taiwan school directors serving geographically diverse student populations. The journey leading to school leadership and the challenges that this representative group of educational leaders face are discussed and also compared to the preparation of American school leaders and the challenges that U.S. counterparts experience. As educational systems around the globe work toward educating more students to higher standards of achievement in order to increase national productivity, the insights gained through this study can be used to inform conversation regarding the restructuring of school leader preparation programs to answer the persistent question of "How are great school leaders developed?" within specific cultural contexts.

Key words: Principal preparation, school leadership, Taiwan.

INTRODUCTION

American educational policy has been shaped by international competition, dating back to the curricular reforms supported by the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in response to the Russian launch of the Sputnik satellite to the myriad reform and accountability measures resulting from the *A Nation at Risk* (U.S. Department of Education, 1983) report which attributed the decline in American economic productivity to the low achievement of U.S. students. The current federal education policy embodied by the Obama administrations *Race to the Top* initiative emphasizes "adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy" and "recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals" as a means of developing globally competitive citizens (U. S. Dept. of Education, 2013.) In the pursuit of *Race to the Top* funds, states have rapidly adopted the Common Core Standards and new educator evaluations systems, the most recent education policy response to the perceived dismal performance of U. S. students on international assessments (Zhao, 2012).

A growing body of research has identified the substantial role that effective principals play in student academic success (Leithwood et al., 2010; Robinson et al., 2008; Waters and Cameron, 2007) which merits the examination of school leadership recruitment and development systems of countries that demonstrate greater student achievement on international tests, the most cited means of international student achievement (Zhao, 2012). Taiwan scored 56 points higher on the mathematics scale, 18 points higher on the science

E-mail: linda.vogel@unco.edu. Tel: (970) 351-2119.

Author agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License

scale, and within five points of the United States on the reading scales in the 2009 Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) (OECD, 2010). In 2006, Taiwan students were the highest performers on the overall science PISA, beating out Finland by one point, scoring 532 compared to the U.S. score of 489. In overall mathematics performance that year, Taiwan scored 539 while the U.S. scored 474, a difference of 65 points (OECD, 2007). These trends have also been reflected in the Trends in International Math and Science Study (TIMSS), with Taiwan consistently scoring higher than the U.S. in both the 2007 and 2011 administration of the TIMMS (NCES, 2013). Based on the higher performance of Taiwan students on these international assessments, the question arises as to whether the recruitment and training of school leaders plays a role in these performance differences.

Before such a question can be answered, however, the system for school leader development in each country[1] must be examined. The actual nature of the job varies in each nation based on a myriad of factors, thus not only how school leaders are prepared but also what they are prepared to do is important to understand in order to compare the different systems. Understanding these differences between nations is also important as university preparation programs expand to meet greater international demands (Easley and Tulowitzki, 2013). A study was conducted in 2012 with six Taiwan school leaders from various regions who served as the principals of schools serving diverse student populations in both urban and rural settings. These school leaders were asked a variety of open-ended questions regarding elements of school leadership identified in American educational research and literature as critical for successful school leadership in the twenty-first century. The information obtained through these interviews and other artifacts collected from the Taiwan principals and schools were then compared to the “traditional” American system of principal recruitment and training based on the author’s decade of experience in school leadership preparation at an American university and awareness of alternative paths that have become available in America for aspiring school leaders. The author utilizes the data from a large national survey conducted in America and other research literature to compare the nature of school leadership in the U.S. with the responses from study participants in Taiwan. The author also situates the American context of school leadership within the parameters of current national educational policy.

Following a review of the literature regarding the national standards for American school leaders that are required to be addressed in accredited principal preparation programs which provided the study’s framework and research regarding the characteristics demonstrated by successful principals, the contexts of school leadership for the six Taiwan principals are described, followed by an explanation of the themes that emerged from the interview data and artifacts obtained from the participating principals.

Finally, the author offers an analysis of the differences between the school leadership preparation system in Taiwan and traditional and non-traditional paths to school leadership in the U.S., as well as the demands of the position in both countries.

In comparing the systems of recruitment and training, the cultural values of each society emerged as a pivotal factor in how each system was designed. Competition emerged as a common challenge for school leaders in both nations with the nature of the competition defined by how each country defined and measured student success.

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of Taiwan school leaders as to their preparation for the position and the challenges that they have encountered as school leaders.

The themes identified from the responses of the six Taiwan principals were then also compared to the preparation and challenges identified in the literature experienced by American school leaders.

American perspectives of 21st century school leader roles and challenges

Instructional leadership has emerged in the past three decade as the critical focus of school leadership (Glick, 2011). Starting the 1980s with Brookover and Lezotte’s (1982) work with effective schools, principals who were instructional leaders rather than solely managers or administrators were found to significantly improve students’ achievement. “Since then, the evidence of the importance of instructional leadership at schools continues to mount,” both in the United States and around the world (Glick, 2011; Lahui-Ako, 2001; Lee et al., 2012).

Principals engage in instructional leadership through a variety of practices including establishing long and short-term goals related to the school’s mission and vision, building a safe and healthy school climate that focuses on and supports student learning, supervising and evaluating teachers in formative manner that promotes continual professional growth of teachers in a school, and utilizing human and material resources to support the instructional process (Glickman et al., 2013; Hoy and Hoy, 2013; Ylimaki, 2014).

In a study by Hallinger and Murphy (1986), effective instructional leaders of high-performing schools accomplished the following:

[1] The terms “country” and “nation” are used interchangeably throughout this article.

1. Developed mission and goals
2. Promoted quality instruction through supervision
3. Promoted a positive learning culture through rewards, high expectations, and professional development
4. Developed a safe and orderly environment with appropriate economic and community resources (Ylimaki, 2014, p. 2).

Based on this early research, a consortium of national education organizations was convened by the National Governors Association in 1995 to develop national principal standards to guide practice and preparation of school leaders across the United States. Groups in the consortium included the following, covering all major national education groups:

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
American Association of School Administrators
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Council of Chief State School Officers
National Association of Elementary School Principals
National Association of Secondary School Principals
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
National Council of Professors of Educational Administration
National School Boards Association
University Council of Educational Administration

This consortium produced the first American national principal standards in 1997 (NPBEA, 2011).

The most recent national standards for principal preparation were revised in 2008 by the Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISSLC), changing the wording of the standards and elements listed within each standard but not significantly changing the content of the standards from the original 1997 standards (NPBEA, 2011). One standard is devoted solely to instructional leadership and covers curriculum, instruction, learning, and assessment, as well as high expectations for all students. Another national standard covers strategic leadership which includes vision, mission, and goal development, as well as leading planned school improvement efforts. A third national standard covers human resource leadership in areas such as professional development; recruiting, hiring, placing, and mentoring teachers; and supervising and evaluating teachers. Leadership of the development of a positive and equitable school climate is a fourth national standard. A fifth national standard outlines the elements of principal leadership regarding working with parents and the community, advocating for students and the school, and developing collaborative partnerships to build school resources. Responsibility for student growth is a sixth national standard. Only one national standard relates to the managerial duties of school leaders which means that the majority of national principal standards deal with instructional leadership elements covered in Hallinger's and Murphy's (1986) list of essential characteristics of effective school leaders. These national standards have been adopted verbatim by 19 states and with slight modifications in wording and/or the inclusion of additional standards in the remaining 31 states across America (Vogel and Weiler, 2012). Furthermore, these national standards are the criteria used to determine national accreditation for leadership preparation programs across the United States by Council for the Accreditation of Education Preparation (CAEP, 2013). Thus, these standards provide both the criteria by which principal preparation programs are approved both nationally and regionally and by which practicing principals are evaluated in all fifty states, providing both consistency of preparation and practice as discussed by Stewart (2013) in her analysis of various nation's school leadership systems. Many principal preparation texts used in American programs are explicitly based on and address each of these instructional leadership standards (Baker and Doran, 2007; Engler, 2004; Green, 2012; Guthrie and Schuermann, 2010; Hanson, 2008; Hessel and Holloway, 2002; Whitehead et al., 2013), creating an intense focus on instructional leadership in principal preparation programs across the country.

Research conducted by Waters et al. (2003) and Robinson et al. (2008) identified specific school leadership characteristics and associated effect sizes through meta-analyses of a plethora of studies over thirty years. The characteristics of school leadership that emerged as impacting student achievement included the following, in order of greatest impact to least: establishing a healthy school culture; establishing an orderly environment; ensuring teachers have necessary resources and professional development; ensuring teachers deliver a rigorous curriculum through appropriate instruction and assessment; establishing focused goals; understanding curriculum, instruction, and assessment; communicating with teachers; and advocating on behalf of the school's needs, all of which are considered to be characteristics of instructional leaders (Waters et al., 2003). Similar characteristics of instructional leadership in high-performing schools have been documented by Lee et al. (2012). Waters et al. (2003) also noted that effective school leaders enact change within their schools with being a "change agent" showing a .30 effect size. Numerous other researchers have echoed their findings (Ash and D'Auria, 2013; Drago-Severson et al., 2013; Guthrie and Schuermann, 2010; Hargreaves and Fullan, 2012; Leithwood and Louis, 2012).

The role of the principal as a change agent regarding instruction; as well as all of the other functions that are

related to instruction such as assessment, data collection and use, technology, curriculum development, teacher supervision, and professional development and more supportive functions of developing a healthy, orderly, and safe environment or establishing a focus on goals for student growth is also a focus of leadership preparation programs. The expectation for continuous improvement of schools, evidenced by both teacher and student growth, is explicitly stated in the national principal standards (NPBEA, 2011). The most pressing changes that American school leaders have been asked to respond to in the past two decades center on federal and state accountability requirements. The 2003 adoption of Federal No Child Left Behind (Public Law 170-110, 2002) legislation made federal funding contingent upon the demonstration of student achievement growth, particularly for at-risk students such as minority, special education, and low socio-economic students. The current Race to the Top federal funding directly links teacher evaluation to student achievement growth, as well (Race to the Top, 2013). The collection, analysis, and use of data to inform school and classroom practices and the effective use of technology to support student learning and achievement in a global environment are two dominant areas of school reform spurred by both of the aforementioned federal initiatives which are also components of teacher supervision and evaluation (Glickman et al., 2013; Hord and Roussin, 2013; Joyce and Calhoun, 2012). Data use, technology, and teacher supervision and evaluation are thus required components of both national principal standards for preparation programs and practicing principal evaluations across the nation (McCann et al., 2012; Glickman et al., 2013; Shields, 2013).

The focus of school leadership in the United States thus has been on instructional leadership for the past several decades with an emphasis on implementing change that impacts student achievement. This necessitates knowledge of assessment strategies, the use of data to inform practice, and the utilization of technology to ensure that the instruction taking place in classrooms is rigorous, substantive, addresses the needs of 21st century learners, and produces measureable student academic growth on the part of principals. Principals are responsible for developing and guiding these practices in their schools through their work with teachers in the supervision and evaluation process thus impacting classroom instruction and student achievement (Waters et al., 2003; Glickman et al., 2013; Kalule and Bouchamma, 2013). These elements identified through the research and manifested in federal, state, and professional organization policies served as the framework for the development of the interview questions used in this study to investigate the preparation and practices of principals in Taiwan.

METHODS

Qualitative methodology and grounded theory were used to answer the following research questions guiding this study:

(1) What are the perceptions of Taiwan school leaders of their preparation to lead schools in the 21st century?
(2) What are the perceptions of Taiwan school leaders of the challenges they face on a day-to-day basis?

Qualitative methodology was used in this study based on a constructivist perspective that participants could construct meaning regarding their experiences as school leaders in response to the guiding research questions. Because the context of each principal's experiences was critical to the research, open-ended interview questions, school and principal-generated documents, and researcher observations of interactions between the directors and others in the school setting were used to develop rich contextual descriptions (Miles et al., 2013).

Six Taiwan principals serving diverse regions and student populations were purposefully selected to participate in open-ended interviews to discuss their paths to school leadership and various aspects of the work that they do as school leaders. The researcher worked with educational leadership faculty at a university in Taiwan to identify school principals that served a variety of communities, i.e. rural mountain regions and urban centers. The university faculty contacted each principal by phone and invited them to voluntarily participate. The principals were also given a copy of the questions that would be asked in the interviews. The researcher visited Taiwan for only five days so there was only time for six school site visits and interviews which kept the number of participants relatively low. School sites included two remote rural mountain elementary schools, an elementary school serving aboriginal students, an urban elementary school serving a low socioeconomic area, and very large, affluent elementary and secondary schools in a major metropolitan area. Two principals were female and led elementary schools, one urban and one rural school serving indigenous children. Four principals were males with three serving elementary schools, two rural and one urban, and one principal leading a secondary urban school. The open-ended research questions were sent to the participants prior to the site visits and interviews. The interview questions asked of each participant are as follows:

(1) Please describe your professional background before becoming a school leader.
(2) Please describe your reasons for wanting to become a school leader.
(3) Please describe what education you obtained in order to prepare to become a school leader.
(4) Please describe any other experiences that you feel helped prepare you to become a school leader.
(5) Please describe the school you currently lead (for example, how many students are enrolled, etc.)?
(6) Please describe your typical work day.
(7) What parts of your job do you feel make you an instructional leader?
(8) What experiences have you had that have helped you serve as an instructional leader?
(9) How is teacher supervision and evaluations conducted at your school?
(10) What experiences have you had that have helped you supervise and evaluate teachers effectively?
(11) How is technology used in classrooms to enhance student

learning?
(12) What experiences have you had that have helped you facilitate the use of technology in classrooms to enhance student learning?
(13) How do you use data to inform your decisions regarding each of the following:
(a) Teachers' performance
(b) Students' performance
(c) Schools' improvement
(14) What are the biggest challenges you feel school leaders in the 21st century face?
(15) How do you feel school leader preparation has changed in the past decade?
(16) What advice would you give to people who would like to become school leaders?

The questions were developed around the themes of leadership preparation, instructional leadership (including the elements of teacher supervision and evaluation, use of technology, and data to inform instruction), and perceptions of change, based on the literature and national principal standards for preparation and practice in America outlined earlier, particularly the ISLLC standards.

The interviews took place at each principal's school and were guided by open-ended questions. The interviews took place over several hours for each participant with the actual interview process interspersed with school tours, student presentations, and frequently a meal. At the beginning of each site visit, the researcher reviewed the purpose of the visit and interview and confirmed the participant's voluntary participation. Each interview was conducted with a translator present, typically the school's English teacher, although the reliance upon the translator varied in each interview, based on the participant's fluency in English.

The digitally recorded interviews were transcribed and reviewed by a native of Taiwan to verify the accuracy of the translations, as well as the transcriptions. The transcripts, researcher observation field notes, and school documents that were obtained from the school leaders were then coded, first using open coding and then axial coding, and themes identified in and among the data according to recommended grounded theory practices (Creswell, 2012). The themes that were emerged included the following: experiential leadership development, the importance of influence, a whole-person approach to both leading and learning, providing professional support to teachers, and the challenges of competition and decreases in authority. A brief description of each school is provided before a discussion of the themes identified from the data in order to lay a contextual foundation for the findings.

RESULTS

School descriptions

The condition of the facilities and the staffing resources of each school varied, but each school appeared to be well-staffed. The first elementary school that was visited was in a rural area near a smaller, urban area. This school served a total of 34 students and had nine full-time and seven part-time teachers. Five of the teachers had Masters degree while the others all had Bachelor degree. The parents of the students attending this school were predominantly farmers who sold their produce to the nearby city. The principal of this school day said that he usually arrived at the school by 7:30 in the morning and that he tried to leave the school by 4:30 pm, but "I always seem to leave later."

The second school visited served 540 elementary students in a large urban area which the principal characterized as having a lower socioeconomic base than the next two schools that the research was scheduled to visit. "The parents and community are very resourceful because it is an old community," the principal explained, "Most of the the parents work and there is a night market here. The low birth rate in this area is of concern because many people work here but don't want to live here." Over the over 200 elementary schools in this urban center, this school is one of only four that provides gifted classes. Special education services are also provided for 60 students, with the category of disability for the students in this group broken down in approximately equal thirds between minor disabilities, learning disabilities and more serious mental or physical disabilities, according to the school's principal. Because of the location of his school, this principal also checks the traffic each morning because, "parents don't obey traffic lights," he noted. His work day typically began at 7 am and ended between 5:30 and 6 pm.

The third school visited was a very large urban high school serving affluent students. With a university in the neighborhood, the parents of many of the students attending this school were university faculty or administrators. The school was also relatively new and included several quality sports facilities and technology integrated into classrooms. The number of students attending the school was over 4,000 and admittance is based on the results of an examination given to those who are interested in attending the school. The principal reported that he came to school at 7 am each day and left at 6 pm.

The elementary school adjoining the urban high school described above was described by the principal as the largest elementary school "in the land" with nearly 3,000 students. The principal described the school as "very expensive" with over 100 classes offered to students by 187 teachers, 156 which were full-time teachers. The female principal described the faculty as being "very well educated" and her day as "filled with a lot of meetings, decision making, reading and signing documents" followed by communicating with parents and teachers, but "not so much with students." Her typical work day started at 7:30 am and often ended at 10 pm.

The fifth school visited served a remote mountain community. The elementary school served 55 students, 45 who were aboriginal students, in kindergarten through sixth grade. The school employed twelve full-time teachers and seven part-time teachers, in addition to a janitor and a cook. Half of the faculty lived in a dormitory

next to the school. The principal said the he arrived at the school at 7:30 am each day and left around 4:30 pm, with his time often spent on talking to students during their lunch hours, helping them with their studies, and checking to see that cleaning and maintenance of the facilities were completed.

The final school visited in this study was also a mountain elementary school. The school served over 70 students with a faculty of 17 full-time and five part-time teachers. The school had been destroyed in an earthquake over a decade before and had been rebuilt through community and outside contributions. The resulting building and grounds were modern, clean, and very stable in construction including a high quality acoustics music room, gymnasium, and auditorium, in addition to the athletic field. This principal also started his day at 7:30 am and typically leaving around 6 pm.

Themes

Experience is required. The principals in this study had substantial experience as teachers, ranging from 8 to 19 years, and then in various other school administration positions. Participants had between 27 and 40 years of experience overall in education. Being an educator in Taiwan is an early career choice and university's that train educators, typically the only purpose of such institutions, admit only a specific number to teaching programs each year. One participant explained, "Many, many are turned away. But there are only so many positions and they want to make sure that everyone can find a job. After he graduates, he is definitely a teacher."

Before applying to take the Ministry of Education examination to be admitted into school leadership training, one must hold at least one of the four other school administration positions, but most of the participants said they had held all four positions during their career. These positions include the director or dean of instruction which oversees curriculum and pedagogy, director of the general office which includes management of the budget and personnel, director or dean of student affairs which manages student behavior, and director of human resources which includes teacher and staff management. "Before you get the credentials for becoming a principal, you had to go through four different departments in our school. You have to be the dean for different groups and you get very familiar with each part of administration," the principal of a very successful urban elementary school explained. Two of the principals had also had experience as a regional director and one had also worked with the Ministry of Education, providing an understanding of the larger educational system according to one urban principal.

Once a person has experience as a director, then they can apply to take a test given by the Ministry of Education that determines who may participate in the training to become a principal. As one principal shared, "Everyone in Taiwan must pass a strict test—it is very difficult. Only 10% will pass this test. It's not an easy job to become a principal." Another principal noted that, "Sometimes people try for many years to pass this test and get the status," and many never are successful. The principals conveyed that passing the test is considered prestigious and an honor.

For those who do succeed in passing this test, a rigorous period of training follows. Four participants said that their training took place over a period of eight weeks with full-day sessions every day of the week, while one person said that his training took place over twelve weeks and another person said the training was 10 weeks in duration. Within this time period, each participant mentioned a variety of topics that were covered. These included school management and leadership, school administration, public relations and marketing, education law, interpersonal communication, global education trends, and educational research being conducted in Taiwan. Once an individual completed the principal training successfully, they could be assigned by the Ministry of Education to the position of principal at a school in Taiwan. After being appointed as a principal, performance is reviewed after four years and a second four-year term as principal can be granted. After eight years, however, a principal is reassigned.

The role of influence. Positively influencing others and recognition of the positive influence that others have had on one's career was another theme that emerged from the data. Half of the principals attributed the guidance of principals that they had worked with as teachers as the reason that they sought to become school leaders, typical of the experiences of principals in many nations (Piggot-Irvine and Youngs, 2011; Young et al., 2005). A principal of an urban school stated that, "We all have important people in our life. I met an excellent principal in my years as a teacher and he guided me to get my experience in school administration that led me to be a principal like him. I attended principal professional training because of how he affected me." Two other participants explained that they were given leadership opportunities early in their careers and those experienced led to their pursuit of training to become school leaders. One participant noted that he had always wanted to become a principal, from his earliest days as a teacher. The guidance and examples of other educational leaders was a dominant theme in response to the question of how these principal decided on their career paths.

Influencing others, both students and teachers, also

emerged from the data. Each participant stated that great influence on student learning was the reason he or she became a principal." If you're just a teacher, you teach one class, but you can teach a whole school as a principal," one participant declared. The principal of a remote mountain elementary school explained that he prays "for teachers and students and to make myself more humble and competent to serve them" every day as he makes the long drive from his home to his school. Ensuring the character of the teachers serving students was also mentioned by all but one of the principals interviewed, echoing the emphasis on character development in each that was noted by each participant when discussing the structure of their schools. Two participants also discussed the potential to impact education policy, particularly in overseeing implementation at the school level.

Body, mind and spirit. Throughout the participant's responses, the development of all aspects of a person was emphasized. While academic achievement and intellectual development were part of the stated goals of each school's mission or vision statements, this was never the sole goal. Rather, Good character and healthy, active bodies were also and often equally emphasized. This theme also surfaced in the responses to how some of the participants prepared to be school leaders. Interestingly, three principals emphasized their hobbies as reasons that they were good school leaders. This included exercise in a general sense and fishing. Combined with aspects of his personal life, one of these principals explained that school leadership "is my next step toward actualization," emphasizing the importance of a well-balanced life.

This emphasis on being well-rounded was linked to character development which was emphasized by each participant as a central purpose of their school's structure and curriculum. As the principal of a small rural school explained, "Their education is divided into three parts. First is behavior, second is study, and third is outside activity or games—including learning the recorder. Behavior is ranked number one. We are very strict. It's not allowed to fight. Honestly, this is very important." The students attending this school mostly lived alongside the school and half of the teachers lived in a dormitory next to the school so behavioral norms were continually taught and enforced. A principal of another rural school serving indigenous students touted the various extracurricular activities offered at the school which included violin, swimming, and table tennis. The violins were purchased through fundraising that the principal had done with the community and others outside of the community. The visits to each of these two schools included performances for the researcher to demonstrate the talents of the students. In the larger, urban schools, auditoriums and spacious sports facilities were highlighted on the school tours. The number of students participating in extracurricular activities and winning regional and national awards was highlighted in formal PowerPoint presentations at three of the schools visited, two urban and one rural. The options for extracurricular activities, particularly two of the urban schools, were impressive and wide-ranging, including drama, debate, judo, wrestling, soccer, swimming, and several academic competitions.

Developing relationships. All of the details shared by the six principals as to what their daily professional routines entailed centered on developing relationships. Relationships with teacher were most frequently mentioned, followed by student interactions. Meetings with parents, community members or potential donors, and other educational officials were noted by each participant as a smaller part of their daily activities. All but one of the principals said that they started their day by going around the school to greet teachers and "encourage each other" one principal added. In the morning before classes begin at one school, a formal teachers' meeting is held three days each week. This principal also noted that he attends professional development seminars with teacher each week. Another principal meets with students each Monday morning and teachers on Tuesday mornings. A principal of a remote rural elementary school explained that each day he says, "hello to students and show I care about the character of every teacher. I communicate first with teachers to see if they need any help or assistance. Then I communicate with the community and parents." This principal also explained that, when he first came to this school, he could, "see that the teachers' hard working attitude and that the students' character is very good" despite many of the student's mothers not being native born in Taiwan.

There was a distinct difference between the focus of interactions between the principals and their students that appeared to be dependent upon whether the school was rural or urban. The rural schools visited where all fairly small while the urban schools were very large. The principals of the small rural schools talked about visiting with students about what they ate. One principal at a mountain school shared that, "We see how many are eating for lunch. We see if they just eat meat or if they each eat their vegetables. I advocate for eating a balanced diet." This principal felt that keeping a good relationship with the local people was very important to having the community support his school and devoted time to developing those relationships. When this principal escorted the researcher to a local cultural center, he was happily welcomed and treated with the

highest respect. Another principal asked the researcher if she knew how to cut a boy's hair, explaining that he gives the students haircuts when they need them to promote good hygiene and to keep down the incidence of head lice. The urban school leaders identified more of their days spent interacting with teachers or others outside of the school, particularly in meetings, rather than directly with students.

Relationships with people who could positively impact the school's resources were also an important part of several principal's daily priorities. One principal of a rural school explained that she plans visits to "some agency or a member of parliament who could assist the school or someone who can give some donation and supply more resources." Another rural principal noted that, "Sometimes, I have to receive the guests coming to the school or I meet with parents who come to the school." When asked if many parents come to visit the school, this principal replied that, "No, not often. They work hard…and they feel that, if a teacher or principal invites them to the school, they feel their child has some problem. If it isn't a problem, they don't like to come, too." The principals of the urban schools did mention that parents came to their schools to inquire about enrollment because of the reputation of quality that the schools have developed over the years.

Each principal also mentioned time that they set aside each day to do paperwork, including the two principals serving mountain schools who mentioned making a point of reading the newspaper so they were aware of social trends and policy changes. The principals closer to or in urban areas discussed their more direct access to policy makers and the time that they spent with Ministry of Education personnel, trying to interpret or influence education policy and advocating for more resources. The principals at the large elementary and secondary schools reported that a great deal of their typical days focused on meetings and the review of documents while this was discussed by rural principals as taking up only a small amount of their time.

Professional support. Asked asked about their role as instructional leaders and the supervision of teachers at their schools, the principals in this study described themselves as both role models and as leaders of faculty learning. Each principal talked about how they encouraged teachers to attend professional development seminars, many times attending these with teachers, and also encouraging the teachers to obtain advanced degrees. Four of the principals had earned doctoral degrees and a fifth was currently working on his Ph.D. One of the principals was also a part-time faculty member at a local university. He described his university teaching experiences as "stimulating because I get to discuss student education which is truly a treasure to me." Participating in voluntary professional development seminars was described by one principal as a means for her to "help my teachers to develop the curriculum and discuss models of instruction." Formal and informal discussions between the principals and their teachers also played a large role in their instructional leadership. One principal described how he shares materials with teachers in order to develop professional dialogues aimed at improving instruction. Another principal of a rural school noted that, "I try not to get disconnected with teaching with being a principal for so many years and taking on administrative tasks every day. I have to attend some workshops so I can obtain information to come back and show to my teachers." This principal sees himself as a model for his teachers. "If I have the courage to do this, then my teachers can follow my work and, step by step, improve instruction." Another rural principal explained that he will develop a curricular plan and set goals. As he observes in classrooms, he will check to see how teachers are attending to these goals.

In the four smaller schools in the study, the principals held meetings with teachers on a regular basis and also made it a priority of their days to visit classrooms to "inspect the learning" and "instructional methods" in every teachers room. Visibility of the principal in classrooms and direct feedback to teachers regarding what is observed in classrooms were emphasized by the principals in these schools. In the two larger schools, classroom visitations, the coordination of professional development and teacher meetings were conducted by one of the school directors who then reported back to the principals on a regular basis. Supervision of teachers included the examination of student workbooks and contact books, attendance of professional development seminars, and recorded comments from classroom observations, whether by the principal or a director. The response from the principal of the urban high school emphasized the daily attendance of teachers. "There are several indexes for teacher performance. The first one depends on the attendance of the teacher—how many leaves he takes in a month or a term. If it is too many, more than 14 days, the grade will not be so good." This principal also discussed looking at the average results of the classes taught by each teacher and classroom management information. The school has a teacher appraisal committee made up of the school directors and "a few teachers elected by the whole school's teachers."

Aside from the reference cited above to looking at how students perform in classrooms, the use of data in the schools visited in this study appeared to focus on reporting out to stakeholders, rather than internal school use to guide instruction. However, one principal of a rural school said that he discuss student performance with his

teachers weekly because, “students change weekly and so we need to talk about what assistance they need to improve.” Students were given an examination twice during each term in each class, although other assessments were up to individual teachers. Overall student performance on these assessments was reported in an annual school publication. Also included in the annual performance report were student achievements in various competitions within schools or within the region or nation, teacher performance (although how this was described was not explained), and parent satisfaction.

Competition. The theme that emerged regarding both the nature of the work of the principal and the challenges facing schools in Taiwan focused on competition. Principals in the study identified the competition for students with rural school leaders citing concerns about the decreasing birth rate in the country and their regions and urban schools noting the competition among schools for the highest quality students. Pressure from parents was also described by the large urban school principals as on the increase as a result of this competition. Responses included the adoption of new technology, particularly using “the cloud,” and increased extracurricular activity options.

Global competition was also discussed by principals as impacting the educational system in Taiwan. A new education policy aimed at opening admittance to top-ranked universities to a larger group of students, particularly those students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds was viewed as highly controversial. The leaders of the smaller schools who served lower socioeconomic communities favored the proposed policy, while the principal of the large urban schools expressed wariness that such a policy would diminish overall student competition and achievement across the nation.

Decreasing authority. Five of the six principal in the study expressed concern that teachers had gained power in the past decade, whereas school administrators had lost power. One principal explained that his response to this shift in power is a greater emphasis on collaboration. “Teachers have been empowered. The government thinks highly of performance. Media has more power. Principals get less and less power so it is a struggle to face this situation. But I try my best. Even though teachers and parents get more power, if I can collaborate with them, then I will and we will improve out school. I am very optimistic,’ he shared. Another principal described it as a situation where, “in the past, the school leaders were to tell the teachers of the students what to do. Now the school leaders can only influence them and can’t control them or their ways of thinking. In the past, you may be able to control them.” The urban high school principal very directly attributed the shift to the growth of teacher unions. When asked why more teachers were joining the unions, he replied, “They want to protect their rights. They have their own thinking. They don’t want to listen to authority. They don’t like authority guiding them. They want to express their own thinking through the teacher union.” Economic factors were dismissed by the principal as not playing a part in the growing union membership.

The one principal who did not specifically talk about a loss of power did say, “Now it is all very diplomatic. We have all kinds of meetings. The principal cannot do whatever she wants to do. Everything we have to do is according to the meetings. If she wants to do something, she has to do a lot of communication so everyone understands. It’s a very big challenge. But I have learned to accept the politics and to cope with it to change myself to get fast results.” Her comments were a tacit recognition of the loss of direct authority or control by school leaders, as well.

One rural principal attributed the loss of authority by school administrators to the “conflict between modern and traditional education and values. This was echoed by another principal who pointed to the “changing face of society” as a challenge for school leaders in the twenty-first century. An influx of students whose mothers are not native to Taiwan was identified by a third principal as a reason for a decline of traditional values in society that was being reflected in the schools.

Advice. The final question asked to participants was what advice they would give to new school leaders. Perhaps the most succinct response also captured the many elements of a principal’s role. “You have to be just like a priest and appear as everyone’s servant—but with a professional background,” the principal of a rural school responded. Attributes that these principals recommended that new administrator nurture included confidence, communication skills, a realistic perception of the responsibilities and duties of a principal, keeping a positive attitude, the ability to guide change and develop resources, and continuing to learn, particularly about new educational policies and the use of technology to support learning. One principal also stressed that new principals need to understand how to involve stakeholders in order to make the school the center of the community. As one long-time principal explained, “First, you must be interested in the development of humans. Second, you must have enough patience in dealing with everything. Third, you must upgrade your communication skills. Fourth, being a principal is not a matter of power but rather a matter of service.” Each principal observed that a school leader’s goal should be to leave the school better than when you arrived.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION[2]

Leader selection and preparation. Fwu and Wang (2008) described the American principal preparation as a professional model based on task and theory and the Taiwan system of school leader preparation as an experiential model focused on people and practices. While this description is fitting, leadership preparation in each country is shaped by basic tenets of the role of an individual in society. Throughout the history of the United States, individual achievement has been touted, achieving iconic status from the survival skills of pioneers and cowboys to the economic success of business entrepreneurs. The Confucian tradition of Taiwan society focused on respect for authority, learning through experience, and working through existing social structures (Shouse and Lin, 2010). These two perspectives represent almost diametrically opposing values, one which encourages the power of an individual's ideas to change the system to one which encourages learning the system in order to make it stronger. While three of the Taiwan principals in this study discussed the need for schools and school leader preparation systems to change to produce globally competitive students, they looked to the Ministry of Education to create policies that would foster these changes.

In the United States, public school principals are required to complete a course of training, traditionally through universities authorized by each state to deliver such programs. These programs are frequently linked to a degree program and require at least one to years to complete. An internship is typically required as part of the university training program, but these vary in length from state to state (Vogel and Weiler, 2012). Criteria for admittance to university principal preparation programs also varies, but frequently requires documentation of at least two years of experience as an educator, although serving as a school counselor or psychologist can also meet this requirement. Any educator who is able to pay for this university training (or is willing to incur debt to do so) is potentially able to gain admittance to these principal preparation programs.

Applicants are not required to demonstrate through experiential or behavioral exercises their leadership and management skills and instructional expertise, much less a belief system and orientation that are critical to the job. Instead, programs rely on minimal GPAs, resumes, generic essays, and sometimes GRE scores to select candidates. This simple screen is not sufficient to generate sound evidence that a candidate has the requisite skills and beliefs to become an effective principal (Cheney and Davis, 2011, p. 13.)

Upon completion of the principal license program, passing a state examination is required in most states in America. The proliferation of alternative programs that may be shorter in duration and are directed toward encouraging non-educators to become school leaders often do not require any prior educational experience. Furthermore, private and charter school leaders do not need to possess a license to serve as a principal. This means that, although it varies across states and types of schools (public, private, and charter), any individual who has the time and money to complete some type of program could become a school leader in the U.S.

While research has indicated that many school leaders have chosen their career path because of the support and encouragement early in their career of an administrator (Gates et al., 2003), the decision to pursue a position as a school leader is largely a matter of self-selection in the U.S. Although states have adopted new standards for principals and requirements for university programs to align their training programs with these standards, including greater emphasis on the demonstration of knowledge and skills by program completers since Levine (2005) decried the state of university principal preparation programs and the Obama administration's implementation of the *Race to the Top* grant competitions, the process by which an individual decides to become a school leader is largely open to anyone who wants and is able to complete a training program and take an examination. In this respect, the potential pool of school leaders is tremendous. Although this pool is diminished by those who do not successfully complete the required program or do not pass the required state examination, it is really up to the school districts that hire school leaders to decide who ultimately does become a principal in the United States. The system of developing school leaders is loosely controlled by each state and structured to be inclusive of anyone interested in meeting the criteria ultimately established by local school districts in their hiring decisions.

In Taiwan, a person must work their way through a series of educational positions from teacher through school director in order to be able to apply to take the exam to be admitted to the nation's principal training program. The experiential requirement diminishes the pool of potential school leaders and the national exam further decreases the pool by another 90%, resulting in a few very experienced educators who are allowed to complete the training required for them to then be considered by the Ministry of Education to be appointed as a principal. The process of selecting school leaders is very centrally controlled and developed to be exclusive rather than inclusive, exhibiting all of the characteristics

[2] Although the number of participants was small and predominantly leaders of elementary schools, the preparation of each participant prior to assuming a principal position was the same and can be considered representative of principal preparation across Taiwan.

identified by Stewart (2013) and Dimmock and Tan (2013) in nation's with high international assessment performance.

The differences between the U.S. and Taiwan systems of school leadership preparation can be viewed from several perspectives. First, while the American perspective has long been that anyone who is willing to try to do a job should be given an opportunity to prove his or her abilities, it could be argued that the importance of the position in increasing student achievement is not a role to be experimented with. This perspective would advocate requiring more experience as an educator and perhaps in some type of school support or administrative role as criteria for admission to principal licensure preparation programs and would address what Stewart (2013) identified as a weakness in the American school leadership pipeline in comparison to other nations. This added requirement could ensure that school leaders understand how to teach effectively and school systems and result in a more tightly-coupled system characteristic of nation's with high achievement on international assessments (Dimmock and Tan, 2013; Seong, 2013). The opposing perspective would advocate that the Taiwan system should provide alternative paths that may not require years of experience in various administrative role at the school level so that new and perhaps more efficient or effective ideas could be implemented to support student learning. Advocates for this perspective would point to Zhao's (2012) demonstration of the results of entrepreneurial opportunities in the U.S. that have yielded significant achievements. To that point, it is interesting that a huge mosaic of Steve Jobs occupies a large section of the front of the large urban high school visited in this study. The may be no "correct" perspective, but changes to the current systems in either country might rest on the answer to the following question: Does the educational system want to produce a reliable flow of students who score well on national and international exams or does the educational system want to produce more entrepreneurs? If the former result is desired, an experienced administrator in every school would become the goal of system changes. If the latter result is desired, greater diversity in leadership paths would be the focus of system changes. Ideally, a system would provide for a baseline of stability focused on the achievement of all students while also allowing individual alternatives, both in student learning and in the leaders shaping those learning opportunities.

The nature of the job. For over a decade, principals in the U.S. have been increasingly encouraged to be instructional leaders. This shift from a view of the principal as a school manager was in response to increased accountability measures adopted by states as part of the federal *No Child Left Behind* legislation adopted in 2001. Obama's *Race to the Top* policy has also explicitly encouraged states to develop detailed processes for evaluating both teachers and principals. Inherent in the processes adopted by many states is the elimination of tenure for teachers which had meant that, unless a teacher committed an illegal act or jeopardized student safety, it was very difficult to fire them after they had completed three years of employment with a school district. Tenure was seen as a policy promoted by teacher unions which protected teachers from unfair treatment by administrators. In order for principals to support teacher growth, as measured by student achievement in the new evaluation systems adopted to obtain *Race to the Top* federal funds, frequent observations and feedback on specific indicators related to effective teaching are required. Although many of these new evaluation systems have only recently been adopted, teacher supervision would occupy a much larger amount of every principal's daily routine than it had in the past.

While the evaluation of teachers in Taiwan seem to be somewhat linked to student performance, none of the principals in this study portrayed teacher evaluation as linked to larger accountability systems, with the exception of the annual school report. Student performance, particularly in extracurricular activities, seemed to be more important to a school's reputation than the teacher's performance. The supervision of teachers and the related concept of instructional leadership were discussed by participants as more of a collaborative interaction between teachers and principals rather than a mandated system directly linked to school ratings or reputation. Research conducted in China and Malasia echoed the participants' belief that good supervision increased teacher satisfaction, as well as performance (Hamzah et al., 2013). Encouraging continued professional development and the implementation of effective pedagogy was viewed by these principals as a significant part of their responsibilities simply by the nature of their position, rather than any externally mandated policies or accountability systems. The increased voice of teachers in the educational process as a result of growing union membership was viewed as a change that was decreasing the authority of school leaders that required greater collaboration with faculty at these schools.

In the U.S., new policies that allow for the loss of teacher tenure could be seen as a decrease in the power of teachers and teacher unions and potentially an increase in the power of school leaders. The associated increased emphasis on teacher supervision and feedback to support greater student learning of the new teacher evaluation policies adopted across the U.S. could also increase collaborative, professional dialogues between teachers and principals regarding instructional practices

and increased teacher effectiveness. Few educators could argue that such a result would be a negative change. Perhaps the difference in the educational environment or the context of those conversations in the two nations lie in whether those conversations are conducted because of internal or external expectations for both student and teachers' performance. As instructional leadership of teacher learning becomes a more central focus of American school leadership, it can be hoped that, eventually, that focus will simply be seen as part of the role of the principal rather than imposed by state or federal policies. Such a view could potentially increase the professionalism and regularity of those conversations, while also decreasing the high-stakes context that currently may push teachers into a defensive mindset (Hargreaves and Fullan, 2012).

Challenges. Competition also weighs on the mind of American principals regarding student, teacher, and school performance in local, national, and international venues. Principals in the U.S. believe that their job has become more complex in the past five years, according to a recent MetLife survey (MetLife, 2012). Aspects of being a school leader that the 500 principals in the MetLife survey identified as being very challenging or challenging included the following: addressing the individual needs of diverse learners, managing the budget and resources to meet school needs, engaging parents and the community in improving the education of students, implementing the Common Core State Standards, creating and maintaining an academically rigorous learning environment, evaluating teacher effectiveness, provide guidance and opportunities for teachers to build their competence and skills, and maintain an adequate supply of effective teachers (p. 12). Each of these challenges can be linked back to competition for accountability ratings based on student achievement. Ironically, in America, the group that student achievement seems to be the least important to is the students.

In Taiwan, the influence of traditional Confucian values places a high value on academic success (Shouse and Lin, 2010), but Taiwan does not emphasize strict accountability measures, such as Quality Management (QM) that is popular in China (Cheng and Yau, 2011). Instead, students' performance at different levels of education, particularly on key examinations determines their career opportunities and eventual earning capabilities. For this reason, exam scores are important to both students and their parents. In the U.S., the assessments that determine teacher and school ratings have very little impact on students. Parents and students see little to no relationship between such student achievement measures used in accountability systems and the adult earning capabilities of students. While academic success, measured by either the ability to read and write or the attainment of a degree or professional license, may be increasingly required for adults to earn a livable wage in America, the entrepreneurial ideal discussed earlier extends the possibility that there are always alternative pathways to individual success. America is also more diverse than Taiwan's population, resulting in less consistency of values across various groups and regions in the U.S. (Shouse and Lin, 2010).

While current American educational policies and school reform efforts are centered on standardized assessment scores, an emphasis on the development of the "whole child" or the connection between a well-developed body and character in addition to the intellect has decreased (Armstrong, 2006; Zhao, 2012). The over-emphasis on testing that has been spawned by global competitiveness concerns in the U.S. could, ironically, serve to decrease the creativity and freedom of opportunity that has been the hallmark of American productivity. Traditional Confucian values promote an integrated view of human development (Shouse and Lin, 2010) that are played out in Taiwan school settings as a balance between character, physical, and intellectual development within the school day. Having no widely-held common philosophical base to unit American society, perhaps human development theory, as advocated by Armstrong, could be used to build such a common perspective and value. Such a change would greatly benefit both students, educators, and the greater society. Active citizens with positive social skills and intrinsic motivation could potentially contribute more to the American society as a whole than than just scoring well on a standardized assessment as youths.

Social class impacts educational opportunities and achievement in both Taiwan and the U.S. (Liu, 2013). In Taiwan, where assessments are considered high-stakes for students and families, the value of education and the demands placed upon schools and school leaders differ from the pressures U.S. school leaders face in accountability systems where, in most states, student assessments are considered high-stakes only for educators. The goal of both educational systems is ultimately, however, to open educational opportunity and achievement to all students. Preparing leaders to serve in these different systems, albeit with similar goals, comes down to a question not so much of what process yields the most competent leaders but rather equitable access to the opportunity to be a school leader. Which issue a nation decides to focus upon depends upon the society's fundamental values.

While there are elements of Taiwan principal preparation that could inform American preparation structures, the entrepreneurial spirit of self-selected school leaders might ultimately be better suited to implement change in

school settings than the reproduction of traditional leadership practices associated with the Taiwan principal preparation system. However, a shift of focus on the development of effective instructional practices used by teachers to support student learning and a more balanced integration of activities provided by schools that encourage both personal and physical growth in addition to intellectual development that is found in the Taiwan system could benefit American educational stakeholders, particularly if such changes were led by school leaders for the good of society rather than in response to high-stakes policy mandates. While both educational systems are creations of national policies, given the differing social values of the two societies, American principals have perhaps both greater power to enact change within the system and greater challenges to overcome in helping every student achieve to their fullest potential. Lessons can be learned from both systems to strengthen school leadership, depending on the desired outcomes in educational structure and student performance desired, in either nation.

Conflict of Interests

The author has not declared any conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

Armstrong T (2006.) *The best schools: How human development research should inform educational practice.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Ash PB, D'Auria J (2013). *School systems that learn: Improving professional practice, overcoming limitations, and diffusing innovation.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Baker JR, Doran MS (2007). *Human resource management: In-basket exercises for school administrators*, revised edition. Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Brookover WB, Lezotte L (1982). *Creating effective schools.* Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications.

CAEP (2013). CAEP accreditation standards. Retrieved on September 2, 2013 from http://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/final_board_approved1.pdf

Cheney GR, Davis J (2011.) *Gateways to the principalship: State power to improve the quality of school leaders.* Center for American Progress.

Cheng ALF, Yau HK (2011). Principals' and teachers' perceptions of quality management in Hong Kong primary schools. *Q. Assurance in Educ.* 19(2):170-186.

Creswell JW (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research, 4th ed.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Dimmock C, Tan CY. (2013). Educational leadership in Singapore. *J. Educ. Admin.* 51(3):320-340.

Drago-Severson E, Blum-DeStefano J, Asghar A (2013). *Learning for leadership: Development strategies for building capacities on our schools.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Easley J, Tulowitzki P (2013). Policy formation of intercultural and globally minded educational leadership preparation. *Int. J. Educ. Manage.* 27(7):744-761.

Engler CM (2004). *The ISLLC standards in action: A principal's handbook.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Fwu BJ, Wang HH (2008). "Leadership preparation in Taiwan and the US: Professional versus experience models." *Bulletin of Educ. Res. 54(2*):65-91.

Gates KM, Ringel JS, Santibanex L, Ross KE, Chung CH (2003). Who is leading our schools? An overview of school administrators and their careers. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Glick M (2011). *The instructional leader and the brain: Using neuroscience to inform practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Glickman CD, Gordon SP, Ross-Gordon JM (2013). *The basic guide to supervision and instructional leadership,* 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Green RL (2012). *Practicing the art of leadership: A problem-based approach to implementing the ISLLC standards,* 4th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Guthrie JW, Schuermann PJ (2010). *Successful school leadership: planning, politics, performance, and power.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Hallinger P, Murphy J (1986). The social context of effective schools. *Am. J. Educ. 94*(3):328-355.

Hamzah MIM, Wei Y, Ahmad J, Hamid AHA, Mansor AN (2013). Supervision practices and teachers' satisfaction in public secondary schools: Malaysia and China. *Int. Educ. Stud.* 27(6).

Hanson KL (2008). *A casebook for school leaders: Linking the ISLLC standards to effective practice,* 3rd ed. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hargreaves A, Fullan M (2012). *Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Hessel K, Holloway J (2002). *A framework for school leaders: Linking the ISLLC standards to practice.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Hord SM, Roussin JL (2013). *Implementing change through learning: Concerns-based concepts, tools, and strategies for guiding change.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Hoy AW, How WK (2013). *Instructional leadership: A research-based guide to leaning in schools*, 4th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Joyce B, Calhoun E (2012). *Realizing the promise of 21st-century education.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Kalule L, Bouchamma Y (2013). Supervisors' perception of instructional supervision. *Int. Stud. Educ. Admin.* 41(1):89-104.

Lahui-Ako B (2001). The instructional leadership behaviour of Papua New Guinea high school principals-A provincial case study. *J. Educ. Admin.* 39(3):233–265.

Lee M, Walker A, Chui YL (2012). Contrasting effects of instructional leadership practices on student learning in a high accountability context. *J. Educ. Admin.* 50(5):586-611.

Leithwood K, Seashore Louis K, Anderson S, Wahlstom K (2010). How leadership influences student learning. Retrieved from http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key- research/Documents/How-Leadership-Influences-Student-Learning.pdf on September 5, 2013.

Leithwood K, Seashore Louis K (2012). *Linking leadership to student learning.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Levine A (2005). Educating school leaders. The Education Schools Project. Retrieved from: http://www.edschools.org/pdf/Final313.pdf

Liu J (2013). An overview of student achievement and the related factors in Taiwan. In Hattie J, Anderman EM (Eds.) *International guide to student achievement* (pp. 490-492). New York, NY: Routledge.

McCann TM, Jones AC, Aronoff GA (2012). *Teaching matters most: A school leader's guide to improving classroom instruction.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

MetLife (2012). *Challenges for school leadership: A survey of teachers and principals.*

Retrieved from https://www.metlife.com/assets/cao/foundation/MetLife-Teacher-Survey- 2012.pdf on April 23, 2013.

Miles MB, Huberman AM, Saldana J (2013.) *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

NCES (2013.) *Highlights from TIMSS 2011 mathematics and science achievement of U.S. fourth- and eighth-grade students in an international context.* Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2013/2013009rev.pdf on September 13, 2013.

NPBEA (2011). *Educational leadership program standards: 2011 ELCC building level.* Retrieved on September 3, 2013 from http://npbea.org/2012/06/2011-elcc-building-level- standards/

OECD (2007). *2006 PISA results: Executive summary.* http://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisaproducts/pisa2006/39725224.pdf

OECD (2010.) *2009 PISA results: Executive summary.* http://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisaproducts/46619703.pdf

Pggot-Irvine E, Youngs H (2011). Aspiring principal development programme evaluation in New Zealand. *J. Educ. Admin.* 49(5):513-541.

Public Law 107-110, 107th Congress. (2002). "An Act to Close the Achievement Gap with Accountability, Flexibility, and Choice, so that No Child is Left Behind." (pp. 15-16) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Printing Office.

Race to the Top Fund. (2013). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved on January 14, 2014 from http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/index.html .

Robinson VMJ, Lloyd CA, Rowe KJ (2008). The impact of leadership on school outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. Educ. Administration Q. 44(5):635-674.

Shields CM (2013). *Transformative leadership in education: Equitable change in an uncertain and complex world.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Shouse R, Lin K (2010). Principal leadership in Taiwan schools. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Seong DNF (2013). Assessing leadership knowledge in a principalship preparation programme *Int. J. Educ. Manage.* 27(4):425-445.

Stewart V (2013). School leadership around the world. *Educ. Leadership* 70(7):48-54.

US Department of Education. (1983.) *A nation at risk.* Retrieved from http://datacenter.spps.org/uploads/sotw_a_nation_at_risk_1983.pdf on September 5, 2013.

US Department of Education. (2013.) *Race to the top: Program description.* Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/index.html on September 5, 2013.

Waters T, Cameron G (2007.) The balanced leadership framework. Retrieved from http://www.mcrel.org/~/media/Files/McREL/Homepage/Products/01_99/prod54_BL_Framework.ashx on September 5, 2013.

Waters T, Marzano RJ, McNulty B (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement.* Denver, CO: McCREL.

Whitehead BM., Boschee F, Decker RH (2013). *The principal: Leadership for a global society.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Vogel LR, Weiler S (2012). "Aligning preparation and practice: An analysis of states' principal licensure requirements and performance standards." Presented to the University Council of Education Administration at Denver, Colorado.

Ylimaki RM ed. (2014). *The new instructional leadership: ISLLC standard two.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Young PG, Sheets JM, Knight DD (2005). *Mentoring principals: Frameworks, agendas, tips, and case stories for mentors and mentees.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Zhao Yong (2012.) *World class learners: Educating creative and entrepreneurial students.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.