Journal of International Education and Leadership
http://www.jielusa.org/
Volume 3 Issue 1 Spring 2013
ISSN: 2161-7252

A Comparative Study of Leadership Preparation Programs in Gama (Brazil) and the United States

Mara Rubia Fonseca Borges-Gatewood
Larry McNeal
University of Memphis

The objective of the study was to determine the relationship, if any, between leadership preparation programs types and, how well school administrators are prepared to set a widely shared vision, develop a school culture, effectively management school operations and resources, collaborate with faculty and community members, act with integrity and understand the context of education in Gama (Brazil) and the United States.

The study compares findings from the Adkins (2009) to the findings from this study. Both studies used the *School Administrator Preparedness Survey*. The survey consists of 93 questions based on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISSLC) and Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standards for education leadership.

The findings are similar to those of Adkins (2009) with the exception of creating a shared school vision. The findings also show the array of leadership preparation types in Gama versus the United States. Furthermore, regards of the program types respondents were prepared to create a widely shared vision, develop a school culture, effectively management school operations and resources, collaborate with faculty and community members, act with integrity and understand the context of education.

The findings, however, do not provide insight about well school leaders create a widely shared vision, develop a school culture, effectively management school operations and resources, collaborate with faculty and community members, act with integrity and understand the context of education. Additional research is required to understand these issues.

Keywords: education, leadership, preparation programs, international

Research shows that the impact of school leadership on pupil learning is direct (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). In the United States school principals were rare prior to the Civil War. Callahan and Burton (as cited in Taylor, Cordeiro, & Chrispeels, 2009) points out that the inception of the school principal had its start in the mid-nineteenth century (Rousmaniere, as cited in Rowland, 1998). Most urban schools had a principal by the end of the nineteenth century and the role was very diverse because it functioned as a principal and teacher. The role of the principal was that of a manager where the principal was expected to manage personnel, manage the budget, handle operational issues and implement district mandates (Usdan, McCloud, & Podmostko, as cited in Rowland, 1998). However, Fullan (2001) shows that the demands of the principalship have become more complex each year over the past decade.

Beck and Murphy (1993) described the roles of principals as an instructional leader, problem solver, resource provider, visionary, and change agent; changes in the roles of principals have brought pressure to programs that prepare principals. According to Lashway (2003), aspiring principals need to be exposed to intense and relevant preparation because of the new roles and high expectations required to lead today's schools. Fry, Bottoms and O'Neill (2005) stated that many university preparation programs fail to offer authentic leadership opportunities. Adkins (2009) pointed out those attempts to improve principal preparation programs in the United States lead to the development of national standards like Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISSLC)

and Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC).

To understand the development of the principalship in Brazil requires some understanding of the country's history. President Juscelino Kubitscheck inaugurated the new capital of Brazil on April twenty-first of 1960 after a thousand days of construction. Brasilia, the new capital of Brazil, is located in the center of Brazil in the area of the Federal District. The legislation of the Department of Education for the Federal District [SEDF], 2011 defines the goal of the educational institutions of the public school network of the Federal District as being pedagogy with administration done being by the regional board of education. The National Basic Education guide which is supported by the Federative Republic of Brazil's Constitution, the Law of National Educational (LNE) and Plan of National Education (PNE) requires the Federal District to offer all areas of Basic Education (SEDF, 2011) to children. The basic education is composed of Elementary Education, Middle School and High School, and the education modality: Professional Education, Special and Adult Education.

According to (SEDF, 2011) legislation, the educational system of the public schools of the Federal District has 640 schools, with 564 public urban schools and 76 public rural schools. There are fourteen regional boards of education. The purpose and principles of the educational institutions are based on the principles of freedom and the ideas of human solidarity. They are intended to provide high quality public education at no cost for the families and community that ensure (a) the development of the student; (b) basic training for work and for citizenship; and (c) improvement of the student as a human being (ethics, intellectual autonomy, critical thinking, and creativity).

The management of educational institutions, listed in (SEDF, 2011) legislation, is exercised by the principal and vice-principal, with support from an administrative supervisor from the educational supervision department in line with the deliberations of the local school board. The school board is a collegiate advisory body employing administrative and financial activities from the different segments that comprise the school community.

The selection of principals and vice-principals occur by election, according to the rules and regulations of (SEDF, 2011), every two years. In case of agreement, they can be re-elected for two more years. All principals and vice-principals sign an agreement letter, in which they identify the individual goals for the specific school to which they are applying for. The goals set in the Proposal Plan have to deal with students' improvement, and the quality of the pedagogical, administrative and financial management of each educational institution.

The tasks of principals have extended beyond the goals in the Proposal Plan because of the increasing complexities associated with improving education. Krawczk (1999) indicates that current approaches to the preparation of school leadership needs to reflect current demands rather than past notions. Furthermore, he observed "that it is not difficult to understand the necessity of transforming the dynamics of school leadership in Brazil so it can contribute to renew and development of the financial and democratic efficacy" (p. 116). Teixeira (1968) agrees with Krawczk. Teixeira stated "that as doctors take care of human's health, educators take care of human's culture" (p. 10). However, in Brazil "leadership is not a career for someone who wants to start in preparation leadership courses, but is a later option for a teacher with a degree in pedagogy and experience which is acquired through specialization" (Teixeira, 1968, p. 14). So in Brazil preparation of the administrator comes after being given the job of which contrasts with the leadership preparation required prior to getting the job of administrator in the United States.

The objective of this study was to determine the relationship, if any, between leadership preparation programs types and, how well school administrators are prepared to set a widely shared vision, develop a school culture, effectively management school operations and resources, collaborate with faculty and community members, act with integrity and understand the context of education.

Research Methods

This quantitative study was conducted using a survey given to school principals in Gama (Brazil). The results were compared to the

findings from the Adkins (2009) study; the same objectives with principals randomly selected from the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) membership list. This study also included randomly selected Gama principals utilizing a list of secondary principals from the Department of Education in Brasilia.

Both studies used the *School Administrator Preparedness Survey*. The survey is based on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISSLC) and Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standards. These standards are the most commonly used standards by principal preparation programs in the United States. The survey consists of 93 questions based on the ISSLC and ELCC standards for education leadership. The first section requested demographic information that included sex, age, administrative position, number of years of administrative experience, total number of years in the field of education, and preparation program type. The second section consisted of six sub-sections organized by six educational leadership functions. The sections are:

1. Setting a widely shared vision for learning;
2. Developing a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth;
3. Ensuring effective management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment;
4. Collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources;
5. Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner; and
6. Understanding, responding to the political, social, legal, and cultural context of education (The Council of Chief School Officers, 2008, p. 14).

The sub-sections were expanded to specific survey items based on the performance expectations and indicators for school leaders. The level of perceived preparedness was measured using a 10-point Likert Scale format ranging from "not prepared" to "very prepared" (Adkins, 2009).

Adkins' study produced 293 returned surveys. The sample consisted of 199 males and 94 females. The age of the sample participants included 170 respondents who were 49 years of age or older, with the remaining 121 below the age of 49. The sample also included 279 principals, 8 assistant principals, and 5 other individuals with administrative training. The preparation program types included 273 university based programs, 16 partnership based programs, and 5 other program types (district based and third party-based).

The Gama study produced 85 returned surveys. The sample consisted of 20 males and 65 females. The age of the sample included 5 respondents 49 years of age or older with the remaining 80 below the age of 49. The sample included 30 principals, 7 assistant principals, and 48 other individuals with administrative training. The sample for preparation program type included 56 university based programs, 12 district based programs, 12 partnership based programs, and 17 other program types (school based and community based).

Findings

A One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to examine administrator preparation programs types in United States compared to Gama. These data were compared for differences in means using SPSS 19.0 to run an analysis of variance (AN0VA). Each ANOVA procedure was accompanied by a test for homogeneity of variance to indicate if the assumption of the application of ANOVA was met. Where this assumption was not met, a Welch test for equality of means was conducted in place of the ANOVA. Post hoc comparisons using Turkey procedures were conducted for each significant test to determine which pairs of group means differed.

ANOVA to Examine Vision and Types of Preparation Programs

A One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to examine the question of whether the influences of the participants' preparation type impact respondents' level of preparedness by the

six educational leadership functions. First, a one-way ANOVA was used to examine preparation types of vision. The independent variables represented the preparation types of the participants: (1) university based; (2) partnership based; (3) district based; (4) third-party based; and (5) other (school-based and community-based). The dependent variable was vision. See Table 1 for the means and standard deviations for each of the groups.

Table 1
Means and Standard Deviation for Preparation Types by Vision

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Preparation Type			
1. University Based	7.75	1.76	56
2. District Based	8.40	1.04	12
3. Third Party Based	8.44	2.14	9
4. Partnership Based	6.75	.525	6
5. Other Based	6.15	4.28	2

The test of homogeneity of variance for vision and types of preparation type was significant (Levene's test F (4, 80) = 3.005; p =.023) indicating that the assumption underlying the application of ANOVA was not met. Because of this violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance, the Welch test for equality of means was used instead of ANOVA to determine whether there were significant differences between the group means. Furthermore, the Welch test for vision and types of preparation revealed a statistically significant main effect (Welch F (4, 6.421) = 4.655; p = .043), indicating that not all five types of preparation groups felt equally prepared to develop a school vision. The $\acute{\omega}2^2$ = .158 indicated that approximately 15.8% of the variance in vision is attribute to preparation type. Also, post hoc comparison using Turkey procedures were used to determine which pairs of the five group means differed. These results are given in Table 2 and indicate that group 2 (district based) and group 3 (third party based) differed (p=.040).

Table 2
Turkey Post Hoc Results for Preparation Types by Vision

Preparation Type	Mean	Pairwise Mean Difference			
		1	2	3	4
1. University Based	7.748				
2. District Based	8.403	.656			
3. Third Party Based	8.443	.696	.040		
4. Partnership Based	6.748	-.998	-1.655	-1.695	
5. Other Based	6.150	-1.596	-2.253	-2.293	-.598

ANOVA to Examine Culture and Types of Preparation Programs

Second, a one-way ANOVA was used to examine preparation types and culture. The independent variables represented the preparation types of the participants: (1) university based; (2) partnership based; (3) district based; (4) third party based; and (5) other (school-based and community-based). The dependent variable was culture. See Table 3 for

the means and standard deviations for each of the groups.

Table 3
Means and Standard Deviation for Preparation Type by Culture

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Preparation Type			
1. University-Based	7.28	2.47	56
2. District Based	7.94	1.68	12
3. Third Party Based	7.38	1.35	9
4. Partnership Based	7.09	1.64	6
5. Other Based	5.93	3.44	2

The test of homogeneity of variance for culture and types of preparation type was not significant (Levene's test F (4, 80) =1.023; *p*=.401), indicating that the assumption underlying the application of ANOVA was met. The one-way ANOVA for culture by types of preparation did not reveal a statistically significant main effect (*F* (4, 80) = .437; *p* = .782). This indicates that there is no relationship between preparation types and culture.

ANOVA to Examine Management and Types of Preparation Programs

Third, a one-way ANOVA was used to examine preparation type and management. The independent variables represented the preparation types of the participants: (1) university based; (2) partnership based; (3) district based; (4) Third-party based; and (5) other (school based and community-based). The dependent variable was management. See Table 4 for the means and standard deviations for each of the groups.

Table 4
Means and Standard Deviation for Preparation Type by Management

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Preparation Type			
1. University Based	7.16	2.16	56
2. District Based	8.15	1.45	12
3. Third Party Based	7.94	1.99	9
4. Partnership Based	7.47	.783	6
5. Other Based	4.72	.643	2

The test of homogeneity of variance for management and types of preparation type was not significant (Levene's test F (4, 80) = 1.315; *p* =.271), indicating that the assumption underlying the application of ANOVA was met. The one-way ANOVA for management by types of preparation did not reveal a statistically significant main effect (*F* (4, 80) = 1.489; *p* = .213). This indicates that there is no relationship between preparation types and management.

ANOVA to Examine Collaboration and Types of Preparation Programs

Fourth, a one-way ANOVA was used to examine preparation type and collaboration. The independent variables represented the preparation types of the participants: **(**1)

university based; (2) **partnership based;** (3) district based; (4) third party based; and (5) other (school based and community based). The dependent variable was collaboration. See Table 5 for the means and standard deviations for each of the groups.

Table 5
Means and Standard Deviation for Preparation Type by Collaboration

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Preparation Type			
1. University Based	7.16	2.15	56
2. District Based	7.61	1.30	12
3. Third Party Based	7.79	1.56	9
4. Partnership Based	7.04	.779	6
5. Other Based	5.71	2.92	2

The test of homogeneity of variance for collaboration and types of preparation was not significant (Levene's test F (4, 80) = .810; p =.523), indicating that the assumption underlying the application of ANOVA was met. The one-way ANOVA for collaboration by types of preparation did not reveal a statistically significant main effect (F (4, 80) = .628; p = .644). This indicates that there is no relationship between preparation types and collaboration.

ANOVA to Examine Integrity and Types of Preparation Programs

Fifth, a one-way ANOVA was used to examine preparation type and integrity. The independent variables represented the preparation types of the participants: (1) University-Based; (2) Partnership; (3) District-Based; (4) Third-Party Professional; and (5) Other. The dependent variable was integrity. See Table 6 for the means and standard deviations for each of the groups.

Table 6
Means and Standard Deviation for Preparation Type by Integrity

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Preparation Type			
1. University Based	7.46	2.10	56
2. District Based	8.17	1.51	12
3. Third-Party Based	8.57	.529	9
4. Partnership Based	6.71	.882	6
5. Other Based	8.57	.997	2

The test of homogeneity of variance for integrity and types of preparation was not significant (Levene's test F (4, 80) = .609; p=.657), indicating that the assumption underlying the application of ANOVA was met. The one-way ANOVA for integrity by types of preparation did not reveal a statistically significant main effect (F (4, 80) = 1.446; p = .227). This indicates that there is no relationship between preparation types and integrity.

ANOVA to Examine Context and Types of Preparation Programs

Last, a seventh one-way ANOVA was used to examine preparation type and context. The independent variables represented the preparation types of the participants: (1) university based; (2) partnership based; (3) district based; (4) third party based; and (5) other (school based and community based). The dependent variable was context. See Table 7 for

the means and standard deviations for each of the groups.

Table 7
Means and Standard Deviation for Preparation Type by Context

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Preparation Type			
1. University Based	7.16	2.16	56
2. District Based	8.15	1.45	12
3. Third Party Based	7.94	1.99	9
4. Partnership Based	7.47	.783	6
5. Other Based	4.72	.643	2

The test of homogeneity of variance for context and types of preparation type was not significant (Levene's test F (4, 80) = .813; p = .521), indicating that the assumption underlying the application of ANOVA was met. The one-way ANOVA for context by types of preparation did not reveal a statistically significant main effect (F (4, 80) = 1.682; p = .162). This indicates that there is no relationship between preparation types and context.

Discussion

In the literature review by Adkins (2009) four categories of preparation program types were identified (a) university-based programs, (b) district-based programs, (c) third-party professional development organization programs, and (d) partnership programs. This study included (a) university based programs, (b) district based programs, (c) third-party based programs, (d) partnership based programs, and (c) other including school based and community based. Apparently there are a few more preparation program models in Gama then in the United States.

The data collected from Adkins' (2009) study revealed that 273 of the 295 respondents (92.5%) were prepared by university-based programs, 15 (5.5%) were prepared by partnership programs, and 5 (2%) were prepared by other methods. The findings show that the majority of respondents are prepared by university-based programs. The data collected in Gama revealed that 56 of the 85 respondents (65.89%) were prepared by university-based programs, 6 (7.05%) were prepared by partnership programs, and 23 (27.06%) were prepared through the rest of the program types. . The findings show that the majority of respondents are prepared by university-based programs with the other programs preparing a little more than a third of the respondents. The difference in the number of preparation types and respondents prepared by program types indicates that respondents had more program choice in Gama. It also suggests that preparation by non-university-based programs is more widely accepted than in the United States.

The findings also show that there were some significant differences in the relationship between leadership preparation programs types and how well school administrators are prepared to set a widely shared school vision. The two types that show a statistical difference was district based programs and third-party based programs. There were not statistical differences between the preparation types and the other leadership functions.

Conclusion

The objective of this study was to determine the relationship, if any, between leadership preparation programs types and, how well school administrators are prepared to set a widely shared vision, develop a school culture, effectively management school operations and resources, collaborate with faculty and community members, act with integrity and understand the context of education. The findings are similar to those of Adkins (2009) with the exception of creating a shared school vision. The findings also show the array of

leadership preparation types in Gama versus the United States. Furthermore, regards of the program types respondents were prepared to create a widely shared vision, develop a school culture, effectively management school operations and resources, collaborate with faculty and community members, act with integrity and understand the context of education.

The findings, however, do not provide insight about well school leaders create a widely shared vision, develop a school culture, effectively management school operations and resources, collaborate with faculty and community members, act with integrity and understand the context of education. Additional research is required to understand these issues.

References

Adkins, E. (2009). *The effectiveness of principal preparation program type for administrative work.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://mds.marshall.edu/etd/4

Beck, L., & Murphy, J. (1993). *Understanding the principalship: Metaphorical themes, 1920's – 1990's.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Council of Chief School Officers. (2008). *Performance expectations and indicators for education leaders, an ISLLC-based guide to implementing leader standards and a companion guide to the educational leadership policy standards: ISLLC 2008. Washington, D.C.*

Fry, B., Bottoms, G., & O'Neill, K. (2005). *The principal internship: How can we get it right?* Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.

Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Krawczyk, N. (1999). A gestao escolar: um campo minado…analise das propostas de 11 municipios brasileiros. *Educacao e Sociedade, ano XX, n. 67.*

Lashway, L. (2003). Transforming principal preparation. *ERIC Digest, 165,* 1-6.

Leithwood, K., Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). How leadership influences student learning. Report No. 1. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation.

Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders.* New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University- The Education Schools Project.

Luck, H. (2000). Perspectivas da gestao escolar e implicacoes quanto a formacao de seus gestores. *Em Aberto, Brasilia, v. 17, n. 72,* p. 11-33.

Murphy, J., Moorman, H., & McCarthy, M. (2007). *A framework for rebuilding initial certification and preparation programs in educational leadership: Lessons from whole-state reform initiatives.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Peel, H., Buckner, K., Wallace, C., Wrenn, S., & Evans, R. (1998). *NASSP Bulletin.* December, 26-34.

Ribeiro, J.Q. (1968). Introducao a Administracao Escolar (Algums Pontos de Vista). In ANPAE (Eds.), *Administracao escolar. Edicao Comemorativa do I Simposio de Administracao Escolar* (pp. 23128). Brazil: ANPAE.

Rodriguez, A., & Hovde, K. (2002). The challenge of school autonomy: Supporting principals. Human Development Department LCHSD. Paper series No. 77. The World Bank: Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Office. Retrieved from http://new.promente.org/files/research/ESPdocs/77-School-Autonomy-Principals

Secretaria do Estado de Educacao do Distrito Federal [Department of Education for the Federal District]. (2011). Retrieved from http://www.sedf.org.br http://www.se.df.gov.br/

Taylor, D. L., Cordeiro, P.A., & Chrispeels, J.H. (2009). Pedagogy. In Young, M.D., Crow, G.M., Murphy, J. & Ogawa, R.T. (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on the Education of*

School Leaders (pp. 319-369). New York, NY: Routledge.

Teixeira, A. (1968). Natureza e funcao da administracao escolar. In ANPAE (Eds.), *Administracao escolar. Edicao Comemorativa do I Simposio de Administracao Escolar* (pp.09-14). Brasil: ANPAE.

Authors

MARA RUBIA FONSECA BORGES-GATEWOOD, Doctoral Student, Department of Leadership University of Memphis 123 Ball, Memphis, TN 38152, mfborges@memphis.edu.

Mara Borges-Gatewood is a teacher with expertise in English as a Second Language acquisition. In the past 27 years she has worked in Brazil and US public schools, as well as a College professor. Mara has a Master degree from Fairleigh Dickinson University in Education, a Specialization from the University of Brasilia, in Education Administration, and is currently a doctorate student at the University of Memphis, in Leadership and Policy Studies. She has been the recipient of a three-year scholarship from Brazil, and also has been award with a scholarship to visit and study in Israel. She is an active member of the organization for Teachers in Brazil, and also a member of the TN-TESOL.

Dr. LARRY McNEAL, Professor, Department of Leadership University of Memphis 123 Ball, Memphis, TN 38152, lmcneal1@memphis.edu
Dr. McNeal is Department Chair at The University of Memphis. His research interest includes school communitarianism, organizational change, leadership, and educational finance. He has numerous publications on topics ranging from leadership, school improvement, school finance, and school-community relations. Dr. McNeal has presented at conferences in 25 states as well as Mexico and Puerto Rico. Dr. McNeal has also chaired or served on more than 100 dissertations focusing on leadership, school improvement and school community relations