

***El Escalafón y el Doble Turno:***  
**An International Perspective on School Director Preparation**

*Charles L. Slater*  
*California State University - Long Beach*

*Mike Boone, Sarah Nelson and Maria De La Colina*  
*Texas State University - San Marcos*

*Elizabeth Garcia*  
*School Improvement Resource Center in Texas*

*Leticia Grimaldo*  
*University of Texas - Austin*

*Grace Rico*  
*Hutto Independent School District*

*Sonia Rodríguez and Cheryl Sirios*  
*Texas State University - San Marcos*

*Damaris Womack*  
*Lanier High School*

*Jose Maria Garcia Garduno*  
*Universidad Estatal de Hidalgo en Mexico*

*Ruth Arriaga*  
*Universidad del Noroeste en Mexico*

### *Abstract*

*El Escalafón is the process for appointing school directors and el Doble Turno is the double shift of morning and afternoon sessions in Mexican schools. These two concepts open the door to examine more general issues in the appointment of school directors and the structure of the school day. Director appointment and school time are rooted in local culture but can have implications across national borders. This study reports interviews of six first-year school directors in the state of Sonora, Mexico and six principals in Texas, USA. It is part of a larger international study that includes Australia, Canada, England, Jamaica, Scotland, South Africa, and Turkey. The purpose is to look at the appointment, preparation, and challenges of first-year school directors. School directors in both countries wrestled with parent expectations and relations with teachers. The systems for appointing school directors and the structure of the school day were different. These differences were based in cultural orientations and suggested contradictions and shortcomings in each educational system. These issues are important to consider in planning programs of educational administration preparation.*

### **Introduction**

In recent decades the economic, technical and socio-cultural forces that drive globalization have pushed education into the forefront of international interest. “Education,” write Dimmock and Walker, “is increasingly viewed as a key lever for national economic competitiveness and development” (2005, viii). Yet for all its prominence in the eyes of governmental policy makers, education remains a culturally embedded enterprise, and the values that drive educational practices remain tied to the cultural values of a particular society.

For a considerable period of time the study of educational leadership has been undertaken from a largely Western perspective, making it ethnocentric and mono-cultural (Dimmock & Walker, 2000, 2005; Diaz-Loving, 1999; Hallinger & Leithwood, 1996; Heck, 1998; Leithwood & Duke, 1998). This limited view is both inward looking and dismissive of the nature of leadership in non-Western societies. Such an approach also ignores the benefits of examining the phenomenon of educational leadership across cultures, among which is the ability to recognize other values and other ways of doing things (Hallinger & Leithwood, 1998). Cross-cultural study can lead us away from

a one dimensional, universalistic conceptualization of leadership and into a deeper understanding of the complexities of leadership in all societies (Fidler, 1997).

The call to broaden the study of educational leadership has not gone unheeded. For example, Slater, Boone, Price, Martinez, Alvarez, Topete and Olea (2002) reported on the differences in educational leadership preparation programs in Mexico and the United States. Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, Dorfman, and Javidan (1999) looked at the issue of culture-specific leadership theories. Oplatka's (2004) study of principals in developing countries revealed a number of common features of the role. These included limited autonomy for principals, predominance of an autocratic leadership style, a low-degree of change initiation on the part of principals, and a lack of instructional leadership functions.

Clarke and Wildy (2004) delved into the complex pressures confronting principal/teachers in remote Australian schools. Huber (2004) and his colleagues produced an extensive study of school leader preparation programs in Europe, Asia, Australia/New Zealand, and North America (excluding Mexico). This study resulted in a series of nineteen recommendations for designing and conducting training and development programs for school leaders. The recommendations provide "stimuli for school leader development programs" in the countries examined (Huber et. al., 2004, p. xiii), but might also serve as quality standards for preparation programs or even as certification/licensure standards.

This study extends the international work with a specific examination of the school director appointment process and the structure of time in schools in Mexico and the US. It is part of a larger international study of the challenges of first-year principals that includes Australia, Canada, England, Jamaica, Scotland, South Africa, and Turkey. The purpose is to improve educational administration preparation.

### ***Educational Administration Preparation Programs: The United States***

Each state in the U.S. establishes requirements for certification of school leaders; thus preparation programs vary widely in admission standards, program content, and innovativeness (Hale & Moorman, 2003). Browne-Ferrigno and Shoho (2002) note that two-thirds of the states require that principals have a minimum number of years of teaching experience, hold an administrative certificate, and complete a state-approved preparation program. Admission

criteria for entry into principal preparation programs may include Graduate Record Examination scores, undergraduate grade point average, in-depth interviews with candidates, and assessment-center activities (Creighton & Jones, 2001). Practices such as school district nominations, cohort formation, and individual assessment of leadership potential are also widely employed (Jackson & Kelley, 2002).

In addition to setting standards for principal certification, many states have also established standards for preparation programs. At least thirty-five states have adopted or adapted the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards for Principal Preparation (Hale & Moorman, 2003) to shape principal preparation programs. The original ISLLC standards have been embedded in the accreditation standards of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). NCATE has delegated the review of principal preparation programs to a consortium of the four professional school administrator groups, The Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC). About one third of US principal preparation programs currently hold ELCC accreditation (Orr, 2006.) Many states also use a mandatory state-level licensing examination to assess the quality of principal preparation programs.

### ***Criticisms of Educational Administration Preparation: The U.S.***

Principal preparation programs in university schools of education have come under increasingly hostile criticism in the past few years. The most recent of these critiques comes from Arthur Levine, President of Teacher's College, Columbia University. Levine's *Educating School Leaders* takes a critical look at the state of principal preparation programs in the U.S. schools of education and concludes that, with few exceptions, these programs "range from inadequate to appalling" (Levine, 2005, p. 24). Levine measured the quality of principal preparation programs against nine indicators: clarity of purpose, coherence of purpose and curriculum, curricular balance between theory and practice, a faculty composed of academics and practitioners, rigorous admissions criteria, requirements for degrees, the utility of the faculty's research to practice, adequate financial support from the university, and continuing efforts of the program to assess itself. Levine concluded: "Collectively, school leadership programs are not successful on any of the nine criteria" (p. 23).

Levine's ideal for leadership preparation in the U.S. is Britain's National College for School Leadership, established in 1998 by Prime Minister Tony

Blair (Levine, 2005). The characteristics of this program that particularly appeal to Levine were an approach to leadership preparation that was geared to the stages of the leader's career from aspiration to mastery; a multi-disciplinary faculty drawn from across the university; the use of "active modes of pedagogy" (p. 55) such as case studies, problem-based instruction, and field-based experiences; and program success measured by the achievement of students in schools led by the program's graduates. Levine urged adoption of these practices as a way to redeem educational leadership preparation programs, and perhaps schools of education themselves.

Jerome T. Murphy (2006) is in general agreement with Levine and other critics of leadership preparation. While Murphy noted that criticisms of education schools in general and leadership preparation in particular were nothing new, the current political climate may provide "the external pressure needed to spur schools of education to embrace widespread reform" (p. 490). In particular, the widespread recognition that principal leadership is central to school improvement, the loosening of the university's control of administrator preparation, and the heightened attention being paid to the relevance of higher education may compel schools of education to place their houses in order.

Young, Crow, Orr, Ogawa, and Creighton (2005) responded to *Educating School Leaders* with a more positive report of educational administration preparation. They argued that Levine did not acknowledge ongoing reforms, failed to point out programs that were doing well and did not distinguish between certification and degree programs. Other researchers similarly argued that the structure of principal preparation in the U.S. had undergone significant attention in recent years, as have efforts to evaluate the impact of preparation programs on the effectiveness of new school leaders (Barnett, 2003; Bloom, Barnett, & Strong, 2003; Daresh & Male, 2000; Hall, Berg, & Barnett, 2003; Whitaker & Barnett, 1999).

### ***Educational Administration Preparation Programs: Mexico***

Principal preparation in Mexico had its beginnings in the early 1900s when the School of Higher Education of the National University (*La Escuela de Altos Estudios de la Universidad Nacional*) started a principal preparation program. However, by the 1920s the program had disappeared and another university-based program would not emerge until decades later.

In the late 1950s and early 1960s, institutions of higher education began to offer courses in organization and educational management,



supervision and evaluation. In 1975, a Master's degree in Administration and Development Programs in Human Resources at the School of Higher Education in Management and Administration (*Escuela Superior de Comercio y Administración, ESCA*) was established to train administrators for educational systems in Latin America and the Caribbean (Alvarez, 2003). The first modern-day undergraduate program in educational administration was implemented in 1979 at National Pedagogical University (*Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, UPN*).

During the 1980s, the availability of principal preparation courses expanded considerably. For example, in 1984, the National Poly-Technical Institute (*Instituto Politécnico Nacional, IPN*) established the Master's program in Administration of Institutions of Higher Education. In 1989, *ESCA* founded the Master's in Administration and Development of Education (MADE, 1989), aimed at the formation of leaders in educational institutions and coordinators of research projects (Alvarez, 2003). At the same time, workshops and Bachelor's and Master's programs in educational administration were implemented in private schools across the country. In 1998 the Secretariat of Public Education (*Secretaría Educación Pública*) established the first national curriculum for the preparation of school administrators (Alvarez, 2003).

In 1992 and 1993, the National Agreement for Modernization of Elementary Education (*Acuerdo Nacional para la Modernización de la Educación Básica*) and the General Education Law (*La Ley General de Educación*) established standards for the decentralization of the operation of schools, promotion of social participation from all stakeholders, redefinition of basic education, a re-examination of the value placed on the teacher's role, and redesign of preparation programs for primary and secondary school directors. These standards led to the Education Development Program (*Programa de Desarrollo Educativo 1995-2000, PDE*) that created the first national courses for elementary and secondary school principals (Alvarez, 2003).

The Schools of Quality Project (*Programa de Escuelas de Calidad, PEC*) had two fundamental ideals: participation of the school with the community and consensus on the way the project should be implemented. Part of the funding was allocated to teacher development and more than 15,000 school directors had access to staff development courses in public and private universities.

The International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP-UNESCO, Buenos Aires) has had considerable influence in promoting nine inter-related

competencies for educational administrators throughout Latin America including Mexico. The standards specified competencies for educational administrators in strategic planning, leadership, communication, delegation, conflict negotiation, problem solving, teamwork, anticipation, and participation of diverse communities (Pozner, 2000).

### ***Criticisms of Educational Administration Preparation: Mexico***

Programs for the preparation of educational administrators in Mexico and Latin America have been given special attention in the last decade (Braslavky & Acosta, 2001). Despite plans for decentralization and advancement of educational administration, decision-making is still concentrated within the Secretariat of Public Education (*Secretaría de Educación Pública, SEP*). Alvarez (2003) characterized educational management in Mexico as centralized, bureaucratic, and authoritarian, with short-term goals and significant isolation between government sectors and society. The system is characterized by centralized changes rather than initiatives emerging from educators at the local level. Legislation, rules and regulations are rigid with little flexibility for creativity and innovation. Furthermore, Garcia (2004) reported that less than thirty percent of the courses taught at the National Pedagogical University (*University Pedagógica Nacional, UPN*) were related to the basic knowledge of educational management, but teachers were often not trained in their field, and future administrators did not participate in a field experience prior to beginning their principalship. This lack of relevancy in course content and absence of field based practice is particularly problematic given the systemic challenges school leaders in Mexico face, including lack of adequate school funding, the influence of the teacher's union, and over-centralization of management.

Unlike other Latin American countries, Mexico has a strong teacher's union. The National Teachers Union plays such a dominant role in education that it tops the list of issues that confront public education in Mexico. Education authorities, including the teacher's union, are seen as rife with cronyism and unable or unwilling to react to the nation's educational problems in creative ways (Martin & Solorzano, 2003).

Garcia (1999) added the issue of school hours as one of the hardest to resolve. The excessive load that is given to school administrators and the shortened school day are not sufficient to achieve educational goals. There are

two sessions of four and half hours each day. School directors and teachers usually serve in two schools. The length of the school day may not allow adequate time for student learning.

Lack of adequate funding hinders the effectiveness of the system. Increasing numbers of middle and upper class parents opt for private education, particularly at the primary and university levels. The nation continues to struggle with school failure and high drop-out numbers, especially among rural and indigenous populations. Further, the exodus of young people crossing the Mexico-United States border for better educational opportunities and jobs represents a loss of valuable human resources (Martin & Solórzano, 2003).

### ***First-year principals***

Barnett and Shoho (2003) note that beginning principals face a number of challenges for which their preparation programs have adequately prepared them. Among these challenges are the high number of tasks and volume of paperwork to be completed on a daily basis, the lack of time to devote to curricular and instructional concerns, conflict with staff members, the intractability of school culture, the need to establish a trust relationship with staff members, inability to control their own time, problems in dealing with difficult parents, and the need to foster change in the school.

At the same time, novice principals reported finding unexpected challenges in defining their role, managing their time, socialization into the profession, isolation from peers, and negative interaction with parents and community members (Barnett & Shoho, 2003; Begley, 2000; Chapko & Buchko, 2001; Normore, 2004). These unexpected challenges are evidence that effective leader preparation programs must equip new principals for rapid and dramatic adjustment to the demands of the job. Moreover, these challenges lend support to the notion that a principal's career can be conceptualized as unfolding in a series of developmental stages (Hart, 1993; Louis, 1980).

In their review of the research on the challenges facing novice school leaders, Barnett and Shoho (2003) noted that new principals spend a great deal of time attempting to understand the peculiar dynamics of their school organization, assessing staff member's strengths and weaknesses, and determining areas of need. By their second year, principals were ready to begin to initiate changes and take actions to shore up areas of need. It is during this critical two-year period when new principals either develop the confidence and competence to become effective school leaders or burn out.



The school principal's role is more demanding today than it has perhaps ever been (Ferrandino, 2001; Flanary & Terehoff, 2000), and the challenges of the position seem to come from every direction. But Nathan (2004) reminds us that the toughest challenge is "to remain focused on what teachers and students need most when the daily routine of running a school and its innumerable minor crises become overwhelming" (p. 82). This focus can clarify the principal's job remarkably.

## **Methods**

Our research looked at how new-to-profession principals were appointed and what challenges they faced. The especially challenging research task was to take a cross-cultural perspective to look at educational administration in both the U.S. and Mexico. Educational leadership is an artifact of the cultural traditions and values of the society in which it is exercised (Dimmock & Walker, 2005). Cultural influences in educational leadership are multifaceted and often subtle. They are often difficult to discern by those outside the culture. Within a culture, people take habits for granted at an unconscious level.

The task for the researcher is to describe the regularities and listen to the voices of those native to the culture. Coming from outside gives the vantage of another culture and leads to the question as to what appears unfamiliar or unusual. The exploration of this question is the heart of cross-cultural work.

We start with these additional questions: How will the responses vary between the Mexico and the U.S.? Are some of the differences cultural? What insights can we garner from these differences? What implications should be addressed in educational administration preparation?

Because this was a cross-cultural study, we paid careful attention to cultural perspectives both in the data collection and analysis. Researchers from La Universidad del Noroeste, Hermosillo, Sonora, Mexico and from Texas State University, San Marcos, Texas, United States worked collaboratively to recruit participants, conduct interviews, and analyze the data.

## ***Participants***

The research team, consisting of professors and doctoral students from the two universities, identified potential participants in each of the geographic regions surrounding the universities. For purposes of consistency

and comparison across settings, only principals of elementary or *basica* schools who were in their first year of principalship or directorship were considered. Six school directors of education *basica* from Mexico (two males and four females) agreed to participate and were interviewed in fall 2005. Six participants in the U.S. (three males and three females) were identified and interviewed in spring 2006.

The participants were relatively similar in age with a range from 32-48 years. The participants were also similar in level of education; the majority of participants held a Master's degree, including all of the U.S. participants and half of the participants from Mexico. In terms of educational experience, however, the participants were much more diverse. The participant with the fewest years of experience had six years, while the most experienced participant had worked in the field for 26 years. Interestingly, the Mexico participants were significantly more experienced than their U.S. counterparts. The average number of years of experience of Mexico participants was 19.8 years, whereas the average for the U.S. participants was 14.7 years. Although all of the participants were in their first year as principal or director, the number of months they had been in the position varied due in part to when they were interviewed, but also due to when they were appointed, as not all were appointed at the beginning of the school year.

### ***Interviews***

We chose the interview as the qualitative method most appropriate for our inquiry as interviews answer questions that “stress how social experience is created and given meaning” (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998, p. 8). In an attempt to gain understanding of multiple aspects of the novice principal experience, the interview focused on five themes: 1) initial appointment; 2) preparation; 3) reasons for becoming a school director; 4) challenges; and 5) recommendations. These themes guided the development of the interview guide.

Participants completed a Background Data form to descriptive statistical data that aided in the analysis. Following the completion of the form, individual interviews were conducted by teams consisting of one professor and one Ph.D. student. One team member served as the interviewer while the other monitored the recording device and took notes. The interviewers utilized a semi-structured interview guide that contained primary and follow-up questions concerning the five themes. To provide consistency across interviews, the primary question

for each theme was read exactly as written. Interviewers asked follow-up questions from a suggested list on the interview guide to probe for more information or clarification as needed. A final, open-ended question was posed at the conclusion of each interview to allow the participant to report additional information or ask questions at his or her discretion. Each interview lasted 60 to 80 minutes.

### *Analysis*

The work of Patton (2002), Lincoln and Guba (1985), and Strauss and Corbin (1998) helped to guide this qualitative work. Such inquiry is open ended with few preconceived notions about the views of the participants. The goal was to understand their stories and report thick descriptions with less emphasis on causality. This type of study exerts less control than a quantitative approach, but still must meet standards of verifiability. These data were subject to a method of constant comparison, a process of continual discovery, questioning and confirmation. Results may not generalize to other settings, but they can meet the standard of transferability as determined by those who would apply the results. Throughout the analysis, there was an attempt to be faithful to the voices of the participants.

To facilitate analysis, the interviews were summarized in three steps. First, immediately following the interview, each interview team wrote an initial summary of the session based on the session notes and their recollections of what occurred during the interview. Second, the U.S. researchers read the initial summaries, listened to the tapes of the interviews, and wrote a more detailed summary for each participant. Third, the U.S. researchers summarized the responses by question. That is, the responses from all the participants to a particular question were grouped so that the responses could be easily compared.

The U.S. researchers worked as a team to read each summary and identify themes, first for the Mexican school directors and then for the U.S. participants. The team strove for precision and conscientiousness and to review constantly the data with open questioning for true understanding. To encourage varying points of view to emerge, the research team designated time in each analysis session during which objections and critiques were raised and considered. Through this process of “selecting, focusing simplifying, abstracting, and transforming (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 10), the team reduced the data

so that its meaning could be succinctly conveyed. We attempted to uncover and categorize patterns and examine convergences and divergences (Patton, 2002).

### ***Limitations***

The sample size was small and caution was taken not to generalize to the rest of Mexico or the U.S. Logistical and technical constraints restricted opportunities to verify some interpretations of the data with participants. Mexico participant interviews were conducted in Spanish and translated to English, and the participation of the Mexican researchers was limited to reviewing the summaries written by the U.S. researchers.

Given these limitations, according to Merriam and Simpson (2000) we must stop and ask ourselves, is our data trustworthy? Do we believe it? Do we have confidence in it? After careful consideration, we concur that our data and our interpretation are, in fact, trustworthy. Our data tell a particular story, set in a particular time, of a particular group of novice school leaders. And though it is a particular story, it is a story that adds to our understanding of the novice principal experience and the role preparation programs play in creating successful school leaders.

### **Results**

Two interview questions can serve to highlight differences between the U.S. and Mexico and suggest important issues for administrator preparation: How were the principals appointed? What challenges did they report?

#### ***Appointment***

*Mexico.* In Mexico, all six participants were appointed as principal of their school through a process called *escalafón*, which awards points to educators for years of experience, professional courses, and teaching evaluations. Applications for director (principal) are reviewed by a commission of state-level administrators and representatives of the teacher union. The commission selects directors based on the applicants with the highest total scores. Interestingly, the coursework which is considered in this process does not have to be directly related to educational administration because there are few educational administration programs available in most regions of the country.

One of the participants cautioned that there is little trust in the *escalafón* because no one really knows if the people hired are the most qualified or really have the greatest number of points. One participant said that people know of many incidents of malpractice when positions are directed away from the person with the most points. Others made informal comments after the interviews about their mistrust of the system.

*U.S.* In Texas, five out of the six participants were appointed as principals of a campus after having been an assistant principal. Their experience as an assistant principal varied from three to eight years. One of the participants had no prior experience as an assistant principal before being named principal of a campus but worked in central office as an assistant to an associate superintendent. This position allowed him to meet several principals in the district, which inspired him to apply for a principal position the following year. All of the Texas participants with the exception of one had to go through an interview process to be selected as principal of their schools.

An interview committee is made up of teachers, administrators, and community members in the school. The size of the committees varies and can be made up of all or some of the above stakeholders. The applicant is asked a series of questions by the committee or is asked to respond to scenarios. The committee members make a collaborative decision on who they feel is the best fit for the school based on the applicant interviews.

There is also a considerable body of law that governs these interviews. Committee members must use a uniform procedure with all candidates and refrain from asking questions that would discriminate by race, gender, age, sexual orientation, or handicapping condition.

### ***Most Significant Challenge***

Each participant was asked to describe the greatest challenge that he or she faced in the first year of the principalship. Not surprisingly, most of the participants had difficulty limiting their responses to a single challenge and instead named several. While there were commonalities in their responses, each participant also described at least one unique challenge.

*Mexico.* When asked what had been most challenging to her as a first year director, Cecilia replied simply, "Time." Cecilia was frustrated that she had responsibilities without the time to complete them. She shared her frustration of how her superiors require a lot of documentation and give her little time to



complete it. She received notices of documentation several days after the due date and had to explain why she had not submitted the paperwork on time.

She stated time affects everything: the quality of education, the projects she is expected to carry through, and her work with teachers. She teaches a *doble turno* or second shift. Teachers and directors work two shifts, most often at different schools to earn a full-time salary and retirement benefits.

Cecilia spoke about projects she is expected to implement, but does not because she cannot implement them in the manner in which they are intended, due to limited time. She shared her frustration in not being able to work with teachers, knowing the teachers are in need of assistance, but instead she is busy filling out paperwork.

Cecilia wished that she had more time to teach teachers how to identify students in need of assistance. They were not able to identify students in need of extra help or students who may need evaluation. Teachers said that not a single student on campus was in need of assistance even though students were working below their level according school examinations.

Samuel shared several problems that he faced during his first year. The administration did not allow him to dedicate his labors to what he considered most important, such as orienting teachers, attending student events, and communication. He felt limited in his ability to do what he felt was necessary. Samuel's biggest frustrations came from the limits placed on him by others.

Samuel also mentioned the roles and responsibilities of school employees. Teachers used him to resolve discipline cases with students. Teachers sent students to him so that he could keep them, which Samuel felt was taking away from what he should be doing as a school director. He pointed out that many of the teachers lacked the vision and commitment necessary to work with him.

He also mentioned lack of educational equipment at his school. He struggled to provide the resources that teachers and students need in the classroom. They had a copy machine, but it was not used as often as they would like because of the cost to maintain and operate it.

As part of his initiative to improve the school, Samuel implemented a series of strategies for resolving problems. He designated what was expected of teachers by creating a list of duties that pointed out responsibilities for each teacher. He designed tools to evaluate and measure the quality of teacher

work. Also, he met with parents to get them involved with the school and established a system of motivation for good student behavior.

Maria said that she had the benefit of coming from a large school. The previous director had quit due to ongoing conflicts with parents who had complained about certain teachers. These complaints originated with their unhappiness with teachers' work styles and this fueled their mistrust for the school. Due to this ongoing turmoil the director and teachers involved left the campus. This history of conflict affected how the parents accepted Maria as the new director and they were reluctant to trust her judgment. She mentioned how this was no longer a problem and said, "Those complaints are now out of the jurisdiction of the school."

Maria went on to mention that some of the children have family and economic problems. She said, "They are on the edge." At the beginning of her appointment she felt insecure in her ability to deal with the school population and said, "Sometimes I am not prepared for this type of situation or these physical aggressions."

Her main challenge was assessing the pedagogy of the school. She explained that she has experience in technical and pedagogical assessment that has improved her expertise in curriculum and proclaimed, "I know how it should be done. I want the opportunity to work on the methodology aspect, to develop reading and to propose the reforms of the Elementary Study Plan of 1993." She emphasized the need for curriculum improvement and felt that teacher trainers were not capable of preparing good teachers. Her goal as director was to be able to help her teachers improve instruction. She believes this type of support is possible with direct interaction with teachers through "informal staff development, frequent classroom visits, and suggestions for improvement without imposition on the teachers."

Although Sandra recognized her lack of experience for this job, she felt capable as a leader. She mentioned that her 22 years of expertise in the field of education helped her to accomplish her objectives as a school principal. Nevertheless, Sandra experienced several challenges regarding teachers and staff who resisted the change in administration. Her administrative style was much more strict than the previous administrator who had served for ten years. She imposed deadlines and expected things to get done:

I went ahead to get my work done and the teachers asked me why I was not helping them with their work. I was helping them, but not the way

they were expecting. I was very frank with them and told them that I had to fulfill my responsibilities including meeting the deadlines, which was my first priority at the moment... This is a process of adaptation as much for them as for me, and I tell them that we must be open to the challenges of change and respect each other because I also have supervisors that request things from me, and I must accept those requests whether I like it or not.

Since Sandra started this position, she has had conflict with the teachers and staff. She had the most trouble with a teacher and the office manager who both had been working in the school for ten years. She transferred the office manager to another campus. She concluded, "I can't predict what will happen in the future but I am sure that communication and hard work in both ends of the organization (principal/staff) are essential in order to succeed in my job as a principal."

Pilar's school is in need of money for building maintenance, equipment, materials and supplies. She expressed concern because the system did not adequately pay teachers or administrators. Everyone in the school worked long hours. She used herself as an example when she mentioned that she did not get home until 8:00 P.M. Teachers and administrators usually work two shifts in different schools or one shift and another job to make ends meet.

Pilar reported that her relationship with parents was improving, but still needed work. At first they saw her as someone "superior, even though I repeatedly told them my office was open to help." Opportunity came in the form of a problem.

The bathrooms in the school were in terrible disrepair and unusable. Students could not wash their hands after going to the bathroom or before meals. "I really care if the students go to dirty restrooms," Pilar exclaimed. She took it upon herself to organize the renovation and cleaning of the restrooms. She gave visitors tours through the restrooms as well as the fountain on the playground where children can cool off and play on hot days.

She added that another challenge is to make people, including her supervisor, conscious of their responsibilities. "We are here to do a job and people need to be aware of their job functions," she reminded. She stressed that it is important to motivate teachers to work collaboratively in groups. She believed it was her responsibility to have them share ideas and become more proficient.

Gabriela reported that the biggest challenge she faced was the condition of the community in which the families live. The area was extremely poor and was afflicted by prostitution and alcoholism. Mothers often left their children alone. Gabriela described the community as an *invasión*, a piece of land that is invaded by people without any other home. The government eventually placed a school there, but there was no electricity or running water.

Gabriela painted a picture of houses made of cardboard boxes and tin roofs. Windows and doors are holes cut in the cardboard. Inside mothers are cooking, visiting with neighbors or sweeping the dirt floor. Some children run freely around the neighborhood and others do not go to school so that they can work to help support the family. By contrast she described a school where children were smiling and happy. She said that they were excited to share and loved coming to school everyday.

*U.S:* Adam's major challenge since taking the helm as principal at Patton Elementary has been adjusting to the change from middle school to elementary. He had not had any elementary experience except a few months as an assistant principal at an elementary school five years ago. He talked about not knowing the curriculum, but how fortunate he was to have a staff to guide him in this area.

Adam stated he has a very experienced staff, with the least experienced teacher having five years of experience on the campus. He stated the teachers do not leave and that he has an over-abundance of interest from experienced teachers who want to join his campus.

He stated that he created leadership teams and that he does not make any major decisions without their input. He continued by stating that other than not knowing the elementary curriculum or having experience on an elementary campus, he found himself in a good position, and concluded, "I feel like I inherited a Cadillac and am just enjoying the ride."

Jose had previous experience at the junior and senior high levels, but this was Jose's first year at the elementary level. He felt that the problems that he faced were "not as big as problems at the secondary level" where he had to deal with issues of drugs and weapons. At the elementary level, his biggest problem was dealing with parents, but on the secondary level they were not as involved. He speculated that older students were not as dependent as the children at the elementary level. One of the critical issues Jose faced during his first year as principal was having to let a teacher's aid go. She was well

liked but was not doing her job. He said he put some pressure on her by giving her a list of duties. She later resigned because she did not want to follow the growth plan.

His best experience as a first-year principal was the ability to have some control of money and being able to manage and move it around, something he says principals should be very cautious in doing. A suggestion he has to improve the financial situation in his district is for the campus rather than the central office to manage money for substitute teachers.

Daniel laughed when asked about the challenges that he has faced during his first year as principal. He said that his “challenges have been unique.... I have been on TV a lot more than I had expected.” His challenges stem from two major events that affected his campus experience. His first major challenge was a natural disaster caused by the devastation of Hurricane Katrina along the Louisiana coastline. Daniel’s campus received 50 unexpected students who were evacuated from New Orleans.

Daniel’s campus is located near the local Convention Center where several of the evacuees were temporarily housed. His campus was not prepared to receive a large number of traumatized students. He had to, “handle the triage and meet the needs of the new kids.” This meant making changes in professional development and changing faculty meetings. He concluded, “These teachers rose to the challenges.”

However, this was not the only major challenge that this new principal encountered during his first year. The superintendent informed Daniel that the district would be closing the campus the following school year. This decision by the district upset the community, parents, and staff. This presented Daniel with some challenges and caused him to reconsider his vision and his focus became the “reconstruction” of the school.

According to Sarah, her greatest challenge this first year was personnel. She felt it was important for teachers on her campus to do what was best for children. She put it this way:

There is a saying that you want the right people on the bus. When people are on the bus who should not be on the bus you need to gently persuade them to get off the bus. This year our main concern is to have the best teachers on the bus.



During her first year as principal, she had to persuade people to get off the bus. She spoke of a teacher who was a very nice person, but who just was not teaching and she had to remove her. “They are hurting the kids. They are not teaching anything and I can’t have them here.” She wanted people in their area of strength and if she needed to move people around she was willing to make those changes. “From last year to this year, we made some changes with some people. Now that they are the right people, we need to get them in the right seat.”

She mentioned the need for more explicit instruction about documentation. She wanted a class on “how to write directives, how to follow through with directives, how to establish insubordination, how to put a teacher in a growth plan.” She wanted teachers to seek professional development that would help them grow as professionals.

I told the staff at the very beginning of the school year that my expectations for you as a teacher is for you to be the best teacher here, and if you feel that you cannot fill my expectations then you are not in the right school then you need to go somewhere else. And my expectations are that we will be an exemplary school and that is our goal.

Barbara found that among her greatest challenges was working around the politics involved with the being a principal. Her school is old and has several needs. She said:

I have been compared to the old principal, he was more laid back. I had a difficult time with the PTA president who was a very good friend of the previous principal, the transition was hard, and I am now in a good place with him.

She had to make changes in the staff and around campus.

I feel it’s better up front to deal with some problems; teachers have been supportive with some of the changes. I find it stressful having to deal with staff issues. I dislike having to deal with staff that is not working out for the best of the children or campus. It is critical to deal with parents, but the hardest part is the paperwork involved with problematic staff, writing a plan, following up, and hoping they will grow, but it does not work out. I have been able to set boundaries with teachers and have a professional relationship with staff.

She tried to build trust with the staff and parents.

I made mistakes this year with hiring; you never know what you are going to get. We hired a teacher that we had to get rid of midyear and it was stressful dealing with problematic staff. However, it lifted staff morale, when they see that someone that was not seen as good for kids is finally gone and something was finally done. Every campus is going to need to have some of the staff move along when it is time for them to move forward.

She concluded:

It is also difficult to manage people that are negative. I try to be consistent, upfront and honest by making them realize it's not personal but professional.

During the interview, when Vivian was asked to discuss her biggest challenge, she quickly stated, "Parents." Vivian felt that parents could eat you alive. The clientele expected the school to be perfect 100% of the time. The school received an exemplary rating; the families were upper middle class. Vivian stated that the families were great, but there were 650 families and out of those, five took up 50% of the time. "You are not revered at this campus. They are quick to say, 'My lawyer will be here in an hour.'" Parents were known to write three-page letters to the superintendent, and Vivian explained that was important never to lose your cool with parents and not to let their threats scare you.

In order to deal with this challenge, Vivian believed in a program called Raving Fans. The philosophy is customer service. Everyone on the campus was trained and listened to a tape of the program. The key points are to treat parents with respect, control anger, repeat what parents say when they are talking, and be extremely proactive in communicating with families. She concluded, "We go out of our way to accommodate parents. We want them to have ten positive experiences so that when there is a run in, parents are much more likely to be forgiving."

## **Discussion**

In this section, we first discuss the challenges that are common to directors in both countries: parental expectations and teacher relationships. Then we look at the differences that point to cultural issues: the system for appointment of directors and the structure of the school day.

### ***Parental Expectations***

Parental expectations and conflicts with teachers were issues mentioned in both Sonora and Texas. These deserve attention in educational administration preparation programs and should be investigated more thoroughly to look at cultural differences in the nature of the expectations and conflicts. The problems with parents stemmed from poverty in the Mexican communities and paradoxically, from wealth in the Texas communities. Wealthy parents had high expectations of the school and advocated so stridently for their children that it became hard for principals and teachers to handle.

In Texas, parental expectations were strong. One school director said, “Parents can eat you alive.” The expectations ranged from the school needing to be “perfect 100% of the time” to having to live up to the standards of the previous principal, who was well liked by parents and teachers. One principal spoke of the pressure she felt from the expectation she had that the school would become a highly-rated school within the state accountability system.

### ***Relationships with Teachers***

Relationships with teachers were a frequently mentioned challenge for both groups of participants. A Texas principal indicated that much of her time was spent “dealing with the politics” of parent and teacher relationships. Mexican school directors expressed concern for relationships in terms of roles or time. One director did not have the time to show teachers how she wanted them to identify students in need. Another complained that teachers expected him to carry out too much discipline.

The participants used language more characteristic of managing relationships rather than developing relationships. Each of the participants who discussed this challenge suggested that a primary approach to relationships was to employ management strategies such as clearly defining boundaries, documenting poor performance, and implementing standardized customer service programs. Only one participant in each group alluded to the importance of developing relationships.

The approach to relationships has important implications for preparation programs. Principals may not be aware of alternative ways of interacting with teachers, or there may be a gap between abstract understanding and the reality of facing people in conflict situations under stress.

In both countries, school directors had problems with teachers. They encountered resistance from seasoned teachers and in some cases, teachers

who were not fulfilling the minimum expectations of their positions. In both Mexico and the U.S., school directors struggled with the challenges of supervising and occasionally having to fire employees.

In Mexico, one school director was stricter than the previous director and imposed deadlines that were not popular with the teachers. She had to transfer an office manager to another school. In Texas, a school director followed a more lenient principal and met resistance from teachers. She had to evaluate and dismiss one teacher.

### ***The Escalafón***

The process in which principals are appointed in Mexico and Texas is vastly different. In Mexico, a principal is appointed to a campus through the *escalafón*, a point system based on years of experience, courses, and evaluation of teaching. Applicants do not trust the system and suspect favoritism. Teachers have a right to see their own files, but not the files of others. Some of the participants complained that the performance evaluations given by school directors were all uniformly positive.

Parents and teachers have no input as to who is appointed to the campus. The principal does not meet parents, teachers and students until the first day of work. In Texas, applicants are interviewed on the campus by school staff and community members, who decide which applicant is the best fit for the campus.

The differences between Sonora and Texas served to highlight cultural differences. The *escalafón* seems to be a perfectly rational system for selecting the best school directors, but participants said that no one trusts the system. What is going on here? The process for appointment may not engender trust in the applicants and may raise questions of credibility in the constituents. More fundamentally, is the school director selecting the one who is most likely to succeed in a particular school, and does the process give directors the necessary authority to lead?

Principals can gain legitimacy in a variety of ways. They can be blessed by a higher authority, chosen by the people, recognized for special talent or lineage, or some combination of all of these. The Catholic Church appoints its pastors; the Baptists elect them. Kings claimed their authority from God; presidents are chosen by the people.

In theory, the *escalafón* may be consistent with Mexican views of authority. Hofstede (1980) reported a higher level of power distance in

Mexico than the U.S. In other words, Mexicans are more likely to acquiesce to the decisions of authorities. In the case of the *escalafón*, a commission of authorities outside of the school appoints the school director and lends the credibility needed to lead. In the U.S., teachers would want more control and would be less likely to accept the imposition of an outside authority.

The *escalafón* is consistent with a hierarchical system of power and could confer legitimacy if people had faith in the process. Instead, they suspect corruption and become cynical. Instead of entering a school with special authority, the new director must win over the teachers and parents.

In the U.S., the appointment process is more consistent with democratic traditions. However, expectations are often high for one person to turn around a school. The culture may be ambivalent and look for an all powerful leader, but not convey the symbols to allow the exercise of authority. The audience may be programmed to want a savior on the one hand, but also a person who is equal to everyone else.

### ***The Doble Turno***

The context of a teacher's first appointment to become a school director is often to a poor, rural school. When directors gain more seniority, they become eligible to move to a wealthier school in a more central location. The state or federal government pays salaries, but any supplies come from a *cuota* or fee that is established at each school for families to pay. The school director is often faced with an inadequate facility and must seek community help to help to improve it. In one school the director took the lead in repairing and replacing an unusable bathroom. She felt it was a high priority for the immediate well-being of students and for what it taught them about health habits in the long run.

The directors say that they are overwhelmed with paperwork and prevented from doing what they think is important. Paperwork may get in the way, but more fundamentally, directors have little time because most work a *doble turno*, two shifts, the first in morning at one school and the second in the afternoon at another.

There are, of course, issues with parents and teachers that are similar to those in Texas, but the *escalafon* and the *doble turno* are unique to Mexico. To become a school director, a teacher must play the game of earning points and let time pass to gain seniority. The new director has to be creative to find



resources to make a safe and healthy physical plant. They have to somehow manage time to work in two schools each day, and they have to manage teachers who are doing the same.

A cultural traveler would be amazed by the *doble turno*. How do teachers get any work done? Do they feel lost and without a home base? One might have thought that Mexicans would be more relaxed about time, but they seem to have adopted an industrial model of schooling. The school day can be divided in half for efficiency with one group of students in the morning and another in the afternoon. Teachers and directors are interchangeable from one school to the other.

I visited one of these schools as a cultural traveler and share this report to offer some detail:

We drove over a hill back up behind the Holiday Inn by a Yaqui ceremonial area through a very poor neighborhood (The Yaqui are indigenous people who trace their ancestry to pre-Columbian times). The school was just on the other side. We went through the gates. There was a booth with food for sale. Two long buildings made up the main part of the campus. There was a covered area in between. The campus extended beyond the buildings across open recreational areas with trees. We were directed to an office and found the director seated behind her desk with a coat on over her dress and wearing high platform shoes. The room was sparsely furnished with few personal affects. A man was seated at a desk in the corner. He worked the morning shift, but in the afternoon he went home so that his wife could work an afternoon shift. The director works the morning in this school and in the afternoon, she is a teacher at another school...During our visit, a student entered and spoke with the director. She handed him a piece of chalk and he left... The school is rated "standard." I asked the director what her plans were. She said that she would like to make application to become a Quality School. Now there is no longer money attached, but it still provides direction...I mentioned that I would like to stay in touch, but she does not have an email address. She has a Master's degree and is interested in pursuing her doctorate. We said good-bye and headed to the next school.

Reflecting about this school director, I realized that she did not meet us outside her office, did not explain music or other activities that were going on,

did not offer to give us a tour, and did not volunteer her plans for the school. It was as though she were just a visitor to school as we were. She did not exhibit what we might call the characteristics of ownership. This was not true of other school directors, but it illustrates a degree of alienation that might exist in some schools.

I wondered if conceptions of time might be related to the structure of the school day. Our conceptions of time have developed over history. Initially they were based on natural phenomena such as day and night, the recurring seasons, the cycle of the moon, and the human life span. In the middle ages, the clock tower bell called farmers and villagers to prayer or to dinner. The nineteenth century factory made time a commodity and regulated life in measured units (Boorstin, 1985).

These conceptions of time are formed and passed on through culture. Different cultures have inscribed different time orientations: synchronic or polychronic time (Trompenaars, 1993); on time or late; past, present or future time orientation; hopeful or pessimistic (Paz, 1960); active or passive.

## **Conclusion**

The foregoing discussion suggests two cultural issues in Mexico. The appointment of school directors is consistent with a hierarchical culture, but the system has broken down for lack of trust. Directors have difficulty leading if they do not begin with credible authority.

The other cultural issue is the factory model of school imposed on people with more of an agrarian sense of time. The question for Mexico may be whether there is a way to modernize to meet the demands of globalization without depersonalizing time and space?

The U.S. system of appointment appears to be more consistent with democratic traditions. However, the demands of a high stakes accountability system revolve around the director who is expected to make the critical leadership difference. This may not be realistic if no symbols of authority are conveyed and the audience is not predisposed to accept authority.

The U.S. school day could also be characterized as industrial with prescribed units of time and required daily attendance. Until recently, this model may have matched the needs of the economy for compliant workers. The questions for the U.S. are whether something has been lost in moving

from agrarian to industrial schedules and whether, in any event, the industrial model will serve the economy in an era of globalization.

Stevenson (1994) was another cultural traveler who compared U.S. schools with those in Japan. Japanese teachers were incredulous that U.S. teachers spent five to six hours a day with students. They asked: when do they plan, when do they work with other teachers, when do they tutor students?

Time is a structural issue that is played out in different ways in schools across the globe, and it is also part of mental processes. School directors and teachers take for granted an internal sense of time that comes from culture.

Taken together, school appointment and sense of time are important issues to consider in the preparation of school leaders. They need to be conscious of the authority they will need to enter a school and the challenges of managing under the pressure of a confining school day. They need to be aware of the shortcomings and contradictions in the culture.

Future research could use culture as a tool to extend understanding of school director appointment, the structure of the school day and how these issues relate to the challenges of that school directors face in working with parents and teachers.

## References

- Alvarez Garcia, I., De Los Santos, R., Trejo Cazares, C., Cutberto, J., Vasquez, E., De Luna, J., et al., (2003). Experiencias, logros y desafíos en la formación de directivos para la educación básica: Informe Técnico Resumido. Subsecretaría de Educación Básica y Normal.
- Begley, P. T. (2000). Values and leadership: Theory development, new research and an agenda for the future. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 46(3), 233-249.
- Barnett, B. G. (2003). *Catching the tiger by the tail: The illusive nature of principal preparation*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Barnett, B. G., & Shoho, A. R., (2005). *The challenge of novice school administrator preparation: Implications for preparation, induction, and professional support*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the University Council for Educational Administration, Nashville, TN.

- Bloom, B. G. Barnett, A., & Strong, M. (2003). *Supporting the new principal: Managerial and instructional leadership in a principal induction program*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Boorstin, D. J. (1985). *The discoverers*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Braslavsky, C., y Acosta, F. (2001). (Eds.). *El estado de la enseñanza de la formación en gestión y política educativa en América Latina*. Buenos Aires: UNESCO: Instituto Internacional de Planeamiento de la Educación, disponible en <http://www.iipe-buenosaires.org.ar/>
- Browne-Ferrigno, P., & Shoho, A. R. (2002). *An exploratory analysis of leadership preparation selection criteria*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh, PA (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED472145)
- Chapko, M. A., & Buchko, M. (2002). What Principals should know and be able to do: Some serious (and not so serious) suggestions. *Principal*, 82(1) 42-44.
- Clark, S., & Wildy, H. (2004). Context counts: Viewing small school leadership from the inside out. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(5), 555-572.
- Daresch, J. C. (2002). *What it means to be a principal: Your guide to leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Daresch, J., & Male, T. (2000). Crossing the border into school leadership. *Educational Management and Administration*, 28(1), 89-101.
- Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., & Dorfman, P. W. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 219-256.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.) (1998). *Strategies of qualitative inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Diaz Loving, R. (1999). The indigenization of psychology: Birth of a new science or rekindling of an old one? *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48(4), 433-449.
- Dimmock, C., & Walter, A. (2005). *Educational leadership: Culture and diversity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Dimmock C., & Walker A. (2000). Developing comparative and international educational leadership and management: A cross-cultural model. *School Leadership and Management*, 20, 143-160.
- Ferrandino, V. L. (2001). Challenges for 21st-century elementary school principals. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(6), 440-442.
- Fidler, B. (1997). School leadership: Some key ideas. *School Leadership & Management*, 17(1), 23-37.
- Flanary, R. A., & Terehoff, I. I. (2000). The power of leadership in a global environment. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84(617), 44-50.
- Garcia, J. M. (1999). ¿Cuáles son las Características del Liderazgo del Director y del Supervisor de Educación Básica Efectivo? Una Revisión de la Literatura Internacional y la Investigación Generada en México. What are the leadership characteristics of the director and supervisor in effective basic education? *A Review of the international literature and an investigation generated in Mexico*. In A. Rivera, C. Aramburu, M.C. Ortega & C. Pérez (Eds.), *Psicología educativa: programas y desafíos en educación básica* (pp. 109-124). México: Universidad Pedagógica Nacional.
- Garcia, J. M. (2004). Educational Administration and Management: Some lessons in the U.S. and Mexico. *Revista Interamericana de Educación de Adultos*, 26(1), 11-52.
- Getzels, J. W., & Guba, E. G. (Winter, 1957). Social behavior and the administrative process, *The School Review*, 65, 423-441.
- Hale, E., & Moorman, H. (2003). *Preparing school principals: A national perspective on policy and program innovations*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Hall, G. E., Berg, J. H., & Barnett, B. (2003). *Beginning principal studies in America: What have we studied and what have we learned?* Paper Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Hallinger, P., & Leithwood, K. (1996). Culture and educational administration: A case of finding out what you don't know you don't know. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 34(5), 98-116.
- Hallinger, P., & Leithwood, K. (1998). Unseen forces: The impact of social culture on school leadership. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 73(2), 126-151.



- Hart, A. W. (1993). *Principal succession: Establishing leadership in schools*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Heck, R. H. (1998). Conceptual and methodological issues in investigating principal leadership across cultures. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 73(2), 51-80.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work - related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Huber, S. G. (2004). *Preparing leaders for the 21<sup>st</sup> century: An international comparison of development programs in 15 countries*. London: Routledge/Farmer.
- Jackson, B. L., & Kelley, C. (2002). Exceptional and innovative programs in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 192-212.
- Leithwood, K., & Duke, D. L. (1998). Mapping the conceptual terrain of leadership: A critical point of departure for cross-cultural studies. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 73(2), 31-50.
- Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. Washington, D.C.: The Education Schools Project. Accessed March 12, 2006 from <http://www.ed-schools.org/Pdf/Final313pdf>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Louis, M. R. (1980). Surprise and sense making. What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25(2), 226-251.
- Martin, C., & Solórzano, C. (2003). Mass education, privatization, compensation and diversification: Issues on the future of public education in Mexico. *Compare*, 33(1), 15-30.
- Merriam, S. B., & Simpson, E. L. (2000). *A guide to research for educators and trainers of adults* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Malabar, FL: Krieger.
- Miles, B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Murphy, J. T. (2006). Dancing lessons for elephants: Reforming ed school leadership programs. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(7) 489-491.
- Nathan, L. (2004). A day in the life of a school leader. *Educational Leadership*, 6(1), 82-85.

- New Leaders for New Schools. (2005). Accessed March 9, 2006 from <http://www.NlIns?NLWeb?Index.jsp>
- Normore, A. H. (2004). Socializing school administrators to meet leadership challenges that doom all but the most heroic and talented leaders to failure. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, Theory and Practice*, 7(2), 107-125.
- Oplatka, I. (2004). The principalship in developing countries: Context, characteristics, and reality. *Comparative Education*, 40(3) 427-448.
- Orr, M. T. (2006). Mapping innovation in leadership preparation in our nation's Schools of Education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(7) 492-499.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Paz, O. (1961). *The labyrinth of solitude: Life and thought in Mexico*. (L Kemp, Trans.). New York: Grove Press.
- Ramírez, R. (1963). *Supervisión de la escuela rural*, México, SEP, Instituto Federal de Capacitación del Magisterio, (Biblioteca Pedagógica de Perfeccionamiento Profesional), 1.
- Ramirez, R. (1963). *Organización y administración de las escuelas rurales*, México, SEP, Instituto Federal de Capacitación del Magisterio, (Biblioteca Pedagógica de Perfeccionamiento Profesional), 5.
- Slater, C. L., Boone, M., De La Colina, M. G., Nelson, S., Esparza, E., Peña, R. M. et al. (2005). The future of educational administration in México: What path will it take? *Revista de Educación y Ciencia de Yucatán*, 9(18), 81-95.
- Slater, C. L., Boone, M., Alvarez, I., Topete, C., Iturbe, E., Munoz, L. et al. (2005). School leadership Preparation in Mexico: Metacultural considerations. *Journal of School Leadership*, 15(2), 196-214.
- Slater, C. L., Esparza, E., Peña, R. M., Topete, C., Álvarez, I., Cerecedo, T. et al. (2005). School Administrator Preparation in Baja California. *Revista Electrónica Iberoamericana sobre Calidad, Eficacia y Cambio en Educación*, 3(1). Retrieved May 21, 2005 from [http://www.ice.deU.S.to.es/rinace/reice/vol3n1\\_e/Slateretal.pdf](http://www.ice.deU.S.to.es/rinace/reice/vol3n1_e/Slateretal.pdf)
- Slater, C. L., McGhee, M. W., Capt, R. L., Alvarez, I., Topete, C., & Iturbe, E. (2003). A comparison of the views of educational administration students in the United States and Mexico. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 6(1), 35-56.

- Stevenson, H. (1994). *The learning gap: Why our schools are failing and what we can learn from Japanese and Chinese education*. Simon and Schuster.
- Strauss A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Trompenaars, A. (1994). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business*. Burr Ridge, Ill.: Irwin Professional Pub.
- Whitaker, K. S., & Barnett, B. G. (1999). A partnership model linking K-12 school districts and leadership preparation programs. *Planning and Change*, 30(3/4), 126-143.
- Young, M. D., Crow, G., Orr, M. T., Ogawa, R., & Creighton, T. (2005). *An Educative look at "Educating School Leaders."* Retrieved March 19, 2006, from <http://www.ucea.org>