I recently attended a conference at the Institut Ahmuddin Baki in Malaysia on the topic, Building an Indigenous Body of Knowledge in Educational Administration. The audience consisted of over 400 educational administrators, trainers and professors from throughout Malaysia. That an audience of this size and composition would be attracted to a seminar on this particular topic was surprising, to say the least. This phenomenon is indicative of two recent trends in educational administration. First, it highlights renewed interest in the nature of the knowledge base that underlies our field of practice (Murphy, 1994). In the United States this interest was stimulated anew by the National Policy Board in Educational Administration (1989). Subsequently the UCEA extended their effort, translating conceptual discussions into practical ends.

Second, though perhaps less obvious to North American scholars, is that interest in the intellectual underpinnings of the field is international in scope. Assumptions that underlie the knowledge base in educational administration are being closely scrutinized, not only in the traditional centers of 20th century scholarship, but also in the Asia-Pacific region. Our debates over the implications of multi-culturalism on the nature of knowledge are being recapitulated by Asian scholars. However, with their grounding in wholly different cultural and national contexts, they are taking issues of cultural salience and relativity a step further. They are questioning the portability of much of the North American-European knowledge base as it concerns professional practice.

A cultural perspective on leadership and administration reframes our current attempts to develop a knowledge base for professional practice in North America. This perspective opens to question the extent to which any social science knowledge base is valid beyond the boundaries of its originating culture (Hofstede, 1980). While no a priori answer is proposed, proponents of a cultural perspective assert that it remains for scholars to test and prove the validity of knowledge across cultures, rather than simply assume its validity until proven otherwise. The importance of cultural context for theory and practice in administration, though generally overlooked, should not be underestimated.

In practical terms, as the world shrinks organizational leaders are becoming key linking agents among countries. The increasing interdependence of nations combined with greater ease of international travel is bringing leaders into more frequent personal interaction. This is as true in education as in other sectors. Reflect on the rapid increase in the incidence of international visitations of scholars and school administrators from abroad.

(continued on page 4)
Mark A. Smylie (U. of Chicago-Illinois), Robert L. Crowson (Peabody College of Vanderbilt U.), Victoria Chou (U. of Illinois-Chicago), and Rebekah A. Levin (U. of Illinois-Chicago) have been awarded the 16th annual William J. Davis Memorial Award for their article "The Principal and Community-School Connections in Chicago’s Radical Reform," which was published in the August 1994 issue, Volume 30 of the Educational Administration Quarterly.

Using theory examining persistence and change in organizations, the four co-authors examined the case of a coordinated children’s service project in Chicago’s decentralizing school system. By identifying issues, problems, and lessons concerning school-site administration, the case focused specifically on how principals shape an array of community-school connections.

Smylie and his colleagues found that four schools engaged in a reform-within-a reform that involved bringing the community into school governance and improvement activities while simultaneously fostering a reaching out of child and family services to the community.

Mark A. Smylie is associate professor of education and full member of the graduate college at the University of Illinois at Chicago. His research interests include school organization, leadership, change, urban education, school desegregation, teacher learning, and professional development. Some of his recent publications include "Teacher Leadership" in the Elementary School Journal (in press), "New Perspectives on Teacher Leadership" in the Elementary School Journal (in press), "Reconstructing Teachers' Work: Connections to the Classroom" (1994), and "Understanding School Restructuring and Improvement in Educational Researcher" (1994).


Victoria Chou is associate dean for academic programs and student affairs at the University of Illinois-Chicago.

Rebekah Levin is visiting assistant professor of education at the University of Illinois-Chicago.

The Davis Award is given annually to the author(s) of the most outstanding article published in the Educational Administration Quarterly during the preceding volume year. The Davis Award was presented in April at the AERA Division A business meeting in San Francisco. The article selection is made by a three-member panel chosen from EAQ editorial board members who have not published in the EAQ volume being reviewed. Past recipients of the Davis Award include Donald J. Willower (Penn State), Cecil G. Miskel (University of Michigan), Robert A. Cooke (Institute for Social Research), Denise M. Rousseau (University of Michigan), David L. Clark (University of North Carolina), Linda S. Lotto (deceased), Terry A. Astuto (New York University), Tim L. Mazzoni (University of Minnesota), Betty Malen (University of Maryland), David P. Crandall (NETWORK), Jeffrey W. Eisman (University of Massachusetts), Karen Sea-shore Louis (University of Minnesota), James G. Cibulka (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee), Joseph J. Blase (University of Georgia), Kenneth A. Leithwood (OISE), Mary Stagen (University of Toronto), Ronald H. Heck (University of Hawaii), George A. Marcoulides (California State University-Fullerton), and Terry J. Larsen (Alhambra School District), Robert J. Starratt (Fordham University), Jennifer Elser Reeves (University of Central Florida, and Ulrich C. Reitzug (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee) Brian Rowan (University of Michigan), Stephen W. Raudenbush (Michigan State University), and Yuk Fai Cheong (Michigan State University).

The Davis Award was established by contributions in honor of the late William J. Davis, a former associate director of UCEA and assistant professor at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Contributions to the Davis Award fund are welcome. Send to UCEA, 212 Rackley Building, University Park, PA 16802-3200.
On April 21-22, forty top graduate students in educational administration gathered in San Francisco to attend the 16th Annual Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration. The Seminar, following the AERA annual convention, was held at the Grand Hyatt in San Francisco. The forty participants in the seminar are chosen from a pool of candidates nominated by universities offering advanced degrees. Selection is based on the quality and relevance of the students’ research proposals and their readiness to contribute to the seminar. The seminar offers the graduate students a unique opportunity to test their research ideas with a group of experienced faculty and form a network with junior colleagues from across North America.

The four distinguished faculty presenters at this year’s seminar were Lynn G. Beck (UCLA), Cynthia J. Norris (University of Houston), Philip Selznick (UC-Berkeley), and Robert J. Starratt (Fordham University).

Two sessions of the seminar were devoted to student participants presenting some aspect of their own research to a small group. The theme of the seminar was “The Moral Dimensions of Leadership.”

The 40 participants in the 1995 National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration were: Vincent A. Anafara, Jr. (University of New Orleans), George J. Bedard (Ontario Institute for Studies in Education), Michael Blakeney (New York University), Gail Bowen (University of North Texas), Franklin Nicholas Caesar (Fordham University), Richard Dierkhising (University of Nebraska at Omaha), Lynn H. Doyle (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee), Frank Engert (SUNY-Buffalo), Priscilla L. Feir (The Pennsylvania State University), Alicia Fernandez (Ontario Institute for Studies in Education), Abra N. Feuerstein (University of Virginia), Jeanne R. Fiene (University of Missouri), John A. Freeman (Louisiana State University), Lance D. Fusarelli (University of Texas at Austin), Hatti Gilmore (University of Kansas), J. Timothy Goddard (University of Alberta), Kubulay Gok (University of Wisconsin-Madison), Rob Greenwald (University of Chicago), Nettie Collins Hart (University of Kansas), Fumie K. Hashimoto (Washington State University), Deloris L. Jerman-Garri-son (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill), Kuzyo Kuroda (Cornell University), Marci Larsen (University of Washington), Kerstin A. Carlson Le Floch (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill), Coral Mitchell (University of Saskatchewan), Jerome Ellis Morris (Vanderbilt University), Mary Murphy (Boston College), Janie L. Nusser (Cornell University), Darleen Opfer (University of Virginia), B. Anna Pedroza (University of Texas at Austin), Leo Patrick Philbin (Purdue University), Geoffrey Riordan (University of Alberta), John W. Sipple (University of Michigan), Kay Thomas (University of North Texas), Carl E. Treuter (Hofstra University), Kathy Wood (SUNY-Buffalo), Sara Woolverton (University of Washington), Debra J. Wright (University of San Diego), Kay Wright (Oklahoma State University), and Lynn F. Zinn (University of Northern Colorado).

This year financial support for the event was provided by UCEA, AERA (Division A), Corwin Press, interested professors of educational administration, and past participants. UCEA coordinates the National Graduate Student Research Seminar along with the Planning Committee formed by the three sponsoring institutions. This year’s Planning Committee members were Bruce G. Barnett (Northern Colorado), Lynn G. Beck (UCLA), Nancy A. Evers (University of Cincinnati), Patrick B. Forsyth (UCEA) Larry McNeal (Illinois State University), Hunter N. Moorman (U. S. Department of Education, OER), Joseph F. Murphy (Division A Vice President, AERA), Robert O. Slater (Texas A & M), and C. John Tarter (St. John’s University).

For several years, funding for the Seminar has been problematic. AERA Vice President Joseph Murphy (Vanderbilt University) and UCEA Director Patrick Forsyth have appointed a joint committee, chaired by David L. Clark (U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill), to seek a permanent solution to the funding difficulties. The committee has adopted several strategies to address both short-term and long-term funding. AERA has generously raised its future contribution to $5,000 a year. Some publishers have been approached to act as sponsors. The committee will have a general solicitation of professors of educational administration to raise funds. Moreover, the committee will seek matching funds from private sources to establish an endowment in support of the seminar.

Diana G. Pounder (University of Utah) is the feature editor for this publication. If you have ideas or suggestions for substantive feature articles, she will be happy to hear from you.

Diana G. Pounder
University of Utah
339 Milton Bennion Hall
Salt Lake City, UT 84112
e-mail: pounder@gse.utah.edu
FAX: 801-585-6756
Increased access internationally to information and communication technology has also had an impact on administration of organizations. In real terms, it means that policies and solutions to problems employed in one national context stand a far greater likelihood of being known and considered for use in other nations. Thus, an understanding of how culture shapes both the nature of leadership and the portability of knowledge is increasingly salient to both scholars and professionals throughout the world.

This brief article begins to outline some of the issues involved in conceptualizing the cultural foundations of educational administration. First, I will discuss limitations of current theory concerning the nature of leadership. Then I will present an argument for adopting a cultural perspective on educational administration. The article concludes with some preliminary thoughts concerning issues that are raised when we adopt a cultural perspective towards educational leadership.

Culture: A Missing Variable in Educational Leadership Theory

Theoretical discussions of the knowledge base in educational administration that explicitly address the cultural foundations of leadership and administration are surprisingly scarce. Of course, the notion that leadership is contingent upon the context in which it is exercised is by no means a new idea (Fiedler, 1967; Gardner, 1990; Getzels, Lipham, & Campbell, 1968). However, most theory and empirical research in educational administration assume that leadership is being exercised in a Western cultural context. While exceptions to this characterization exist, they generally appear outside of the educational literature (e.g., Black & Mendenhall, 1990; Gerstner & Day, 1994; Hofstede, 1976, 1980; Pye, 1985; Ralston, Elissa, Gustafson & Cheung, 1991). This is, to some extent, an accident of history. The 19th and 20th centuries have been dominated by Western intellectual paradigms (Greenfield, 1984). The tendency for Western knowledge to overshadow the intellectual traditions of other cultures has become even more acute in recent decades. Rising educational levels and new technologies have led to the proliferation of academic and professional information in the fields of education and management. Consequently, we find few modern discussions of leadership or administration grounded in non-Western cultural contexts, such as those of the Asia-Pacific.

Equally true is that Western treatises on the nature of leadership — in education and other fields of management — are often transferred across cultures with relatively little concern for cultural validity. This often reflects an unwitting collusion between our own ethnocentrism and the ritualistic approach that graduate students from Asian countries — future academic and professional leaders — often take towards education (Hall & Hall, 1987; Hallinger, Chantarapany, Siriboonna, Taraseina, & Bridges, 1994). This results in the transfer of our knowledge base to their societies, too often without sufficient critique concerning its cultural salience and validity (Gerstner & Day, 1994).

The rising economic and political fortunes of Asia-Pacific countries are, however, fostering greater interest and confidence among scholars in their own intellectual traditions. Notably, the current mood is not one of reaction. Instead, these scholars are searching for the best of past and present practice, from East and West, as their societies work to reform themselves economically while maintaining cohesion socially, culturally and politically (Bajunid, 1994). The resulting effort has the potential to enrich the occidental knowledge base in educational administration as well as their own. It will cause us both to question key assumptions about education and administration, and to consider alternative theoretical perspectives towards administrative practice (Bajunid, 1994; Habana, 1994; Hallinger et al., 1994; Ribbons, 1994).

The Role of Culture in a Theory of Educational Leadership

Going back to the work of Getzels, Lipham and Campbell (1968), administrative theorists have sought to develop comprehensive conceptualizations of educational leadership. By comprehensive, I refer to models that account for personal antecedents of leadership, contextual factors that impinge on leadership behavior, the leader’s thinking and behavior, mediating variables subject to the leader’s influence, and organizational outcomes (Bossert et al., 1982; Hallinger & Heck, in press). For example, Getzels and his colleagues (1968) located the administrator and the educational institution in a cultural context and discussed at length the varying impact that different cultural values exert on the thinking and behavior of leaders and other organizational members. However, despite the potent theoretical conceptualization offered by Getzels et al. (1968), few scholars in educational administration have subsequently explored culture as a contextual determinant in understanding the exercise of educational leadership. This holds true both in terms of conceptual development and empirical research. Let me briefly illustrate this point.

Among the best known attempts to develop a comprehensive conceptualization of educational leadership in the recent past is represented by the work of Bossert and his colleagues at the Far West Lab for Educational Research and Development (Bossert et al., 1982). In their conceptualization, this group of scholars gave great weight to the impact of context on administrative leadership. Adopting a contingency approach, they were explicit in asserting that successful leaders must adapt to their particular context (e.g., the community, institutional characteristics) as they seek to shape the internal processes of schools towards desired ends.

Yet, the notion that the leader, the organization, and even the institutional system are embedded in a cultural context is notably absent from this and other respected theoretical treatises (e.g., Leithwood, Begley & Cousins, 1990, 1992). The closest that researchers in educational administration have come to employing a cultural construct for analytical purposes is the exploration of organizational cultures as contexts for leadership (Bolman & Deal, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1984).

Yet, as Getzels and colleagues (1968) theorized and researchers outside educational administration have empirically investigated, the construct of organizational culture reveals only a portion of a larger cultural variation of interest to students of administration...
Getzels et al.'s (1968) proposition that cultural values shape followers' perceptions of leaders and that these perceptions will vary across cultures (Hofstede, 1976, 1980; Ralston et al., 1991). Gerstner and O'Day (1994) assert: "Because leadership is a cultural phenomenon, inextricably linked to the values and customs of a group of people, we do not expect differences in leadership prototypes to be completely random. Rather they should be linked to dimensions of national culture" (p. 123). Their own cross-cultural research in the business sector found significant differences in how different nationalities perceived the traits of leaders. Additional analyses found that these perceptual differences were also significant when countries were grouped as being an Eastern or Western culture. Unfortunately, less empirical data is available concerning the impact of culture on the behavior, as opposed to perceptions of managers.

Third, although the research here is less developed, there is also support for the proposition that different cultural values and norms distinguish, at a gross level, Eastern versus Western cultures (e.g., Ralston et al., 1991). How people approach space, time, information, and communication are shaped by the cultural context and broadly differentiate Eastern (high context) and Western (low context) cultures (Hall & Hall, 1987).

Application of the culture construct involves a subtle interplay of foreground and background. Normally we operate without an awareness of our own culture — it's just there. Thus, our theories typically make little or no reference to the cultural context in which leaders work. A cultural context exists, but our "cultural lens" blinds us to its effects. Consequently, most scholars implicitly ask the reader to "hold the cultural context constant" while they conceptualize how leadership is exercised within a particular context.

Current conceptualizations of administrative practice represent a useful point of departure. Frameworks such those proposed by Bossert and his colleagues (1982) point to important antecedents of leadership — variables that shape the needs and requirements of leadership within the organization — as well as paths by which leaders may achieve an impact on the organization (see also Hallinger & Heck, in press; Leithwood et al., 1990, 1992).

What remains is to make the cultural context explicit so we can explore its impact on the social and institutional system in which leadership is exercised. Earlier theoretical work in educational administration (Getzels et al., 1968) and research in the general leadership literature provide useful direction in this quest (e.g., Brislin, 1993; Hofstede, 1976, 1980).

The Cultural Foundations of Leadership

If we wish to make the cultural context explicit in a conceptualization of educational leadership, it is first necessary to define what we mean by culture. From a macro-perspective, the societal culture represents the values, norms, expectations, and traditions that define a society. Kluckhorn and Kroeberg (1952) referred to culture as "patterns of behaviors that are acquired and transmitted by symbols overtime, which become generally shared within a group and are communicated to new members of the group in order to serve as a cognitive guide or blueprint for future actions" (cited in Black & Mendenhall, 1990, p. 120). As noted, this conception is distinct from though related to the organizational culture in which the administrator operates.

Human interaction within social systems reflects the values and behavioral norms that underlie the surrounding culture (Getzels et al., 1968; Hofstede, 1976). Although research on values, culture and administration remains relatively sparse, studies conducted to date point towards several interesting directions for researchers. Both theory and empirical research suggest the hypothesis that between-society variation in predominant values and norms is larger than within-society variation (e.g., Brislin, 1993; Gerstner & Day, 1994; Hofstede, 1976, 1980).

Second, evidence has begun to accumulate in support for Getzels et al.'s (1968) proposition that cultural values shape followers' perceptions of leaders and that these perceptions will vary across cultures (Hofstede, 1976, 1980; Ralston et al., 1991). Gerstner and O'Day (1994) assert: "Because leadership is a cultural phenomenon, inextricably linked to the values and customs of a group of people, we do not expect differences in leadership prototypes to be completely random. Rather they should be linked to dimensions of national culture" (p. 123). Their own cross-cultural research in the business sector found significant differences in how different nationalities perceived the traits of leaders. Additional analyses found that these perceptual differences were also significant when countries were grouped as being an Eastern or Western culture. Unfortunately, less empirical data is available concerning the impact of culture on the behavior, as opposed to perceptions of managers.

Third, although the research here is less developed, there is also support for the proposition that different cultural values and norms distinguish, at a gross level, Eastern versus Western cultures (e.g., Ralston et al., 1991). How people approach space, time, information, and communication are shaped by the cultural context and broadly differentiate Eastern (high context) and Western (low context) cultures (Hall & Hall, 1987).
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**Program Chairs**

**Getting Ready for Salt Lake City**

UCEA will hold its ninth annual convention in Salt Lake City, October 27-29, 1995 at the Red Lion Hotel. This year’s theme is “Challenging the Paradoxes: Reexamining Leadership for Community, Diversity, and Learning.” The Convention will again include the traditional paper sessions in addition to new formats, debates and charlas, added to stimulate interaction. The program co-chairs for Convention '95 are Paula A. Cordeiro (University of Connecticut) and Gary M. Crow (University of Utah).

The Convention '95 Planning Committee met in Salt Lake City last December to discuss details of the October gathering.

Salt Lake City lies between two mountain ranges with peaks reaching 11,000 feet covered with "The Greatest Snow On Earth." City bus transportation is available to many first-class ski resorts: Alta, Snowbird, Brighton, Solitude, Park City, Park West, and Deer Valley. The ski season lasts from November to May with average annual snowfall of 500 inches.

Historic Temple Square, located four blocks from the Red Lion Hotel, encompasses The Salt Lake Temple, two visitors centers, The Tabernacle, home of the world famous Mormon Tabernacle Choir, Assembly Hall, and several monuments including The Seagull Monument. Free one-hour tours are conducted at 15-minute intervals from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. The Mormon Tabernacle Choir rehearses Thursday nights and performs Sunday mornings. Next to Temple Square is The Family History Library, the world's largest and most complete collection of genealogical information.

Trolley Square, a unique shopping and entertainment center located in renovated 1908 trolley barns, contains more than 100 shops, restaurants, night spots and a farmer's market. Crossroads Plaza, in the heart of the city, is the largest downtown covered shopping mall in the U.S. Triad Center includes a 1,500-seat amphitheatre and outdoor ice rink.

The Great Salt Lake is located only 17 miles west of the city. Its enormous size and salinity, exceeded only by The Dead Sea, draw visitors from around the world. South of Salt Lake is the Bingham Canyon Copper Mine, the world's largest man-made excavation and "The Richest Hole in the World."

While attending UCEA Convention '95, take a few hours to discover and enjoy Salt Lake City's many attractions.
Mary Catherine Bateson, Karl E. Weick, and David B. Tyack

The UCEA Convention '95 will be held on October 27-29 at the Red Lion Hotel in Salt Lake City, Utah. The theme for the 9th annual convention is "Challenging the Paradoxes: Reexamining Leadership for Community, Diversity, and Learning." Mary Catherine Bateson (George Mason University), Karl E. Weick (University of Michigan), and David B. Tyack (Stanford University) have accepted invitations to speak. Bateson will speak at the Convention's opening general assembly on Friday, October 27. Karl Weick is The Pennsylvania State University Mitsitfer lecturer and will be the banquet speaker on Saturday, October 28. David B. Tyack will address the closing general session on Sunday, October 29.

Bateson is Clarence Robinson Professor of Anthropology and English at George Mason University in Virginia. She is a cultural anthropologist who has taught at several colleges and universities including Northeastern, Amherst, and also in Iran. Her books include: With a Daughter's Eye: A Memoir of Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson (1984), Angels Fear: Composing a Life (1989), and Peripheral Visions: Learning Along the Way (1994).

The fifth Pennsylvania State University Mitsitfer lecture will again be given following the banquet on Saturday evening. The past four years have featured Herbert A. Simon, the late James S. Coleman, Charles E. Lindblom, and Dan C. Lortie. The Convention '95 address will be given by Karl E. Weick. Weick is Rensis Likert Collegiate Professor of Organizational Behavior and Psychology at The University of Michigan. He is also the former Editor of Administrative Science Quarterly, the leading research journal in the field of organizational studies. Professor Weick was trained in psychology at The Ohio State University, where he received his Ph.D. in 1962. In 1990 he received the highest honor awarded by the Academy of Management, the Irwin Award for Distinguished Lifetime Scholarly Achievement. His studies include such topics as how people make sense of confusing events, the social psychology of improvisation, high reliability systems, the effects of stress on thinking and imagination, indeterminacy in social systems, social commitment, small wins as the embodiment of wisdom, and linkages between theory and practice. Weick's writing about these topics is collected in four books, The Social Psychology of Organizing, In Search of Excellence, Managerial Behavior, and Performance and Effectiveness.

City Schools: Leading the Way
Editors: Patrick B. Forsyth, UCEA and Marilyn Tallerico, Syracuse University

1. Understanding the Urban Context and Conditions of Practice of School Administration, Richard M. Englert
2. Motivating Urban Children to Learn, Patrick B. Forsyth
3. Managing Instructional Diversity, Linda F. Winfield, Ruth Johnson and Joanne B. Manning
4. Building Open Climates in Urban Schools, James R. Bliss
5. Collecting and Using Information for Problem Solving and Decision Making, Robert O. Slater
6. Acquiring and Using Resources, Laurence Parker
7. Governing Urban Schools, Marilyn Tallerico
8. Effecting Change in Urban Schools, William J. Kritek

City Schools: Leading the Way has been adopted as a text in graduate courses on the principalship, urban education, and urban school leadership. City principals need an integrated and informed command of these focal issues and tasks to improve the education of urban youth. The authors review, organize, and integrate information around these critical issues, and provide examples of possible interventions appropriate to the unique context of urban schools. By understanding the current realities, complex relationships, and key conditions of practice that influence urban schooling, principals can both better cope with the obstacles and take better advantage of the opportunities that urban settings present.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Children at the Center: Implementing the Multilege Classroom, by Bruce A. Children at the Center: Implementing the Multilege Classroom, by Bruce A. Miller. Available from the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1787 Agate Street, Eugene, OR 97403.

Facilitative Leadership: How Principals Lead Without Dominating, by David T. Conley and Paul Goldman. Available from the Oregon School Study Council, 1787 Agate Street, Eugene, OR 97403. $7.00/ copy plus $3.00 shipping and handling.

School-Site Councils: The Hard Work of Achieving Grassroots Democracy, by David Peterson-del Mar. Available from the Oregon School Study Council, 1787 Agate Street, Eugene, OR 97403. $7.00/copy plus $3.00 shipping and handling.

Violence in Schools: How to Build a Prevention Program from the Ground Up, by Dean Walker. Available from the Oregon School Study Council, 1787 Agate Street, Eugene, OR 97403. $8.00/copy plus $3.00 shipping and handling.

UCEA Sponsors Its 6th Annual Graduate Student Symposium

The 6th annual Graduate Student Symposium will be held in conjunction with the UCEA Convention at the Red Lion Hotel in Salt Lake City. The usual four-hour session will be divided into two two-hour sessions, one on Friday, October 27 and one on Sunday, October 29.

This year’s symposium will be organized around the topic “From Policy to Practice: Issues in the Interpretations of Policy and Change in the Public School.” More specifically, the focus will be on how those who implement policy in schools -- i.e., district office personnel, principals and teachers -- interpretation for initiating and maintaining change in the school organization. More information will be forthcoming as the symposium draws near.

Each UCEA institution is invited send as many students as they wish to participate in the symposium. The program co-chairs for this year’s seminar are Paula M. Cordeiro (University of Connecticut) and Gary M. Crow (University of Utah). Bob L. Johnson, Jr. (University of Utah) is coordinating the planning for the Graduate Student Symposium.

The Graduate Student Symposium will provide the opportunity for students to work closely with symposium faculty and discuss important, contemporary educational issues with colleagues from other institutions. The symposium is always one of the highlights of the UCEA Convention and it promises to be an exciting opportunity for graduate students.
Cultural Values and Educational Leadership

Culture is the source of values that people share in a society. As such culture can be viewed as having effects on multiple features of the school and its environment. Culture shapes the institutional and community context within which the school is situated by defining predominant value orientations and norms of behavior (Getzels et al., 1968). It influences the predilections of individual leaders as well as the nature of interactions with others in the school and its community. Moreover, it determines the particular educational emphasis or goals that prevail within a cultures system of schooling.

Since cultural values vary across nations, we would expect cross-cultural variation in the educational goals of societies as well as the normative practices aimed towards their achievement (Getzels et al., 1968). For example, American society places a high normative value on cognitive reasoning. The assumptions that underlie our notions of best practice reflect the heavy value placed on individual achievement and mastery of cognitive goals.

In contrast, Asian societies still approach education primarily as a vehicle for cultural transmission. They are far more likely than Americans to define non-cognitive outcomes such as community, spirit, and heart as educational priorities. Take, for example, the case of Malaysia where at the national level the educational system pays close attention to the development of community spirit via the schools.

Bergotong-royong or ‘community-effort’ is a time-honoured custom practiced by Malaysians... It is therefore important for the spirit of community effort to be instilled in the consciousness of all Malaysians, particularly the young. The spirit of goyong-royong sows the seeds of neighborliness and the strengthening of unity (Tun Uda, 1990).

In this sense, spirit refers to our feeling of being part of a larger community. Spirit reflects a sense of being connected and committed to the well-being of others who share a common past, present and/or future. The cultural value of community spirit is apparent in Malaysia’s basic educational system as well as in the tertiary system of universities and training institutions.

Moreover, an examination of societal traditions and practices reveals community and spirit as important goals in other Asian cultures as well. For example, in Thai society, spirit is a fundamental aspect of virtually all social relationships. Not a day passes without a newspaper account of people visiting some leader who is experiencing a problem in order to offer gumtung jai (i.e., spirit). Followers generally come in a group bearing flowers as a public and visible expression of their moral support for someone in a senior position. The explicit sharing of spirit takes place daily among people in all walks of life as a common ritual expected of members in the community.

These values and normative expectations form a context for educational leadership in two ways. First they shape what leaders and followers perceive as desired outcomes for schools in the society. Second, they influence the nature of the interactions that occur between the leader and followers. As noted above, this extends to how people within a given culture conceive of leadership (Brislin, 1993; Gerstner & Day, 1994; Hofstede, 1976; Ralston et al., 1992).

Cultural Norms and the Exercise of Educational Leadership

Culture not only influences the ends towards which educational leaders strive, but also the norms that describe the bounds of what is perceived as appropriate leader behavior. Let me elaborate with two mundane examples in which the actions taken by a principal are reframed using an American cultural lens and an Asian lens.

Suppose a student cuts his arm in front of a large comprehensive high school. The student is not seriously hurt but does require minor medical attention. Who responds to help care for the student?

If we examine this incident with an American lens, we might conclude that this is not a problem that required the principal’s personal attention. Is rushing out to help a student who is not seriously injured an appropriate way for the principal to use her time? From an American viewpoint towards administration, the problem is urgent, but is it important? Many would consider this a reactive and unnecessary response — an inefficient use of the principal’s time.

In Asia, the same situation takes on a different perspective and importance in terms of the principal’s leadership role. In Asia, leadership is viewed very much in terms of personal agency. The principal has no choice but to provide personal assistance. As leader of the community, the principal has an obligation to those who are lower in status. For the principal not to respond would convey a lack of caring on his part — a wholly unacceptable response in the cultural context.

Or take a case in which a teacher’s performance has declined. No direct harm is being done to students but everyone knows the results — learning — are lacking.

In this situation, using a Western lens we would tend to view this as a performance problem that requires the principal’s action. Of course political and human facets of the situation also impinge on what an American principal would actually do. At the same time, many of our normative theories would suggest that the proper course of action would be to confront the individual in some fashion by specifying standards of behavior and offering assistance. Uncomfortable though it may be, some form of confrontation of the problem would be recommended with the assumption that we wish to improve performance.

In the Thai culture, for example, everyone including the principal would likely “look the other way.” In fact, not only would they look the other way, but the principal might unabashedly suggest a variety of reasons for the performance decline. “He might be having problems at home.” Or, “maybe he’s bored with his subject.” Whatever the reasons proposed, that is the end of the subject. No action is contemplated or taken. In the scheme of things, the performance deficit is neither considered overly important nor a cause for the principal’s persisting concern. Moreover, the institutional system itself does not even focus on measuring or assessing individual performance.
In Asian cultures, leadership is aimed primarily at creating and sustaining group cohesiveness. The principal's desire to sustain group cohesiveness would outweigh any concerns over individual performance. Actions taken by the leader to address the individual would be taken with this in mind. A confrontational approach might well be seen as an abuse of the leader's trust and responsibility, rather than responsible action taken for the improvement of the organization.

For example, as Redmond has observed, in Thailand: “Responsibility is a proud and cold word, capable of causing abysmal rents in the social fabric and frayed edges of tender feelings. An ethic of compassion, the inculcation of deference to superiors (kreng jai) and an ingrained desire for harmony and familiarity have created a communal security blanket” (1994, b2). The application of a Western conception of results-oriented leadership would likely produce the wrong results. Avoidance would be a course of action aimed towards maintaining group cohesiveness, despite the consequences for students or logical arguments to the contrary.

Or as Hall and Hall (1987) have observed with respect to leadership in Japanese culture:

In the United States, a leader is usually someone with a strong ego, often with personal charisma, selected for his ability to make decisions, and to take responsibility with or without consulting his associates. This kind of ‘take charge’ leader who wants to put his stamp on the organization can be devastating to the Japanese because he destroys the sense of harmony and consensus that is vital to their performance (p. 79).

In terms of normative practices, Asian cultures have traditionally been willing to accept trade-offs in the attainment of cognitive and skill performance against goals of spirit and community. The result of these culturally-based variations is a fundamentally different approach to human relationships in Eastern societies. The quite different importance attached to reason and logic has manifest implications for how leaders relate to followers. For example, as suggested above, a leader’s efforts to improve performance outcomes in schools may require increased accountability for results. Yet, in Thai culture, for example, the very notion of taking responsibility or being accountable is quite different from how we conceive of it in the West.

[Responsibility] signifies ‘being the source or cause of something.’ It means that one is ‘capable of making moral or rational decisions on one’s own . . .’ These, in fact, are what it means to be a person in Western terms. Westerners are more committed to taking responsibility because it automatically brings with it the recognition and respect, regardless of consequent profit or loss, accorded to ‘real persons’. . . . But in Thailand, it is rank and its rewards that give a faint reading of responsibility into the bargain. The honour is not in the responsibility itself (let alone its fulfillment) but in the position that allows it to be borne (Redmond, 1994, b2).

The cultures of Asian countries address the subordinate-superordinate relationship in a manner very different from the West. In Chinese-oriented societies, the term kowtow is used to signify the need of the subordinate to show deference to superordinates based simply on rank. “For the Japanese, order depends on people’s knowing and accepting their proper place or rank and on not disturbing ‘the proper order’ of things” (Hall & Hall, 1987, p. 45).

In Thailand, educational administrators spend significant amounts of their time in efforts to kreng jai (show consideration for) their seniors. This includes associates within the school community and in the larger educational system. It is quite common for groups of 20 or more school principals to travel considerable distances to greet visiting administrators from the Ministry of Education at the local airport or bus station with flowers. In fact, a significant portion of the Thai principal’s day is spent outside the school building in community-building activities. Thai educational administrators report that such symbolic activities are critical to maintaining both vertical and lateral relationships within the institutional system and the community at-large. Thus, the predominant norms of the society create a context that influences what is seen as desirable or appropriate administrative behavior on the part of the principal.

Asian educators are now struggling to find a balance among the educational goals they hold for students. Global economic forces, shifting values, and the desire for better living standards are pressing these societies to adopt Western practices designed to improve efficiency and performance. The trade-offs against other traditional educational goals such as community that are made in the name of improved cognitive performance often go unnoticed. The desire to retain a sense of social cohesion and community, however, remains a stated priority in Asian nations.

Conclusion

In this brief article, I have tried to outline the rationale for approaching leadership as a culturally dependent variable. The argument asserts that our broader conceptualization of the leader’s role must be framed in light of the culture in which the administrator and the organization are situated (Getzels et al., 1968; Hofstede, 1976, 1980). The powerful impact of culture on the institutional system within which educational administrators operate and the social interaction in which they engage is only revealed if one steps far enough back from the subject of study. In this case that may mean stepping outside of the culture.

The societal culture is the source of the values that shape the goals of the educational system. Moreover, interactions between the educational leader and others who inhabit the school and its community reflect the normative values concerning human relationships that characterize a given culture. In a broad sense, this translates into what come to be perceived as desirable normative practices within the institutional culture in which the school is located.

Cross-cultural contrasts in societal values lay the groundwork

(continued on next page)
for understanding the varying normative practices that emerge among leaders, followers and institutions across societies. The existence of culturally-based differences in values have been established empirically. Their effects on leadership behavior are supported by experience and theory, if not yet by empirical research. Given the theoretical and practical significance of this perspective, scholars in our field should focus greater attention on the cultural dimensions of educational administration.

This article is too brief to even outline the components of a culture-based theory of leadership. It is intended primarily as a stimulus for further discussion, not in anticipation of having cracked this hidden set of relationships wide open. If, however, culture is accepted as a key influence on the relationship between leaders and followers, then we must begin to unpack its component variables. For example, it is not immediately apparent just where the leverage points lie in a theoretical conceptualization of culture and leadership. Stated differently, where within the culture construct do we look to find the variables that influence leadership within a given culture?

This article has also been too brief to explore the implications of this perspective for thinking about a knowledge base for the field. If, however, the thesis offered here is accepted, it is readily apparent that the degree to which knowledge can be treated as general versus local hinges in no small part on features of the culture (Black & Mendenhall, 1990). Again, however, it remains unclear just how differences in cultural context influence the portability of knowledge in professional practice. This issue will also command greater attention in the future.

In the coming decades there will be increasing interdependence among countries throughout the world. This globalization of societies will, without doubt, highlight the cultural relativity of some portion of our knowledge base in the social sciences and humanities. It is my hope that scholars in educational administration in North America will exercise intellectual leadership by reframing consideration of a knowledge base for our field in light of the cultural variation that characterizes the practice of administrative leadership internationally.

Endnotes

1 For the purposes of this article, I will use the term leadership since that construct is the focus of my argument. At the same time, the general thesis that I propose is equally salient to the broader topic of administration. This will be more fully developed in a forthcoming paper.

References


Philip Hallinger is Associate Professor of Educational Leadership in Peabody College, Vanderbilt University and Senior Research Associate in the Center for Leadership Research and Development at Chiang Mai University in Thailand. His research interests are in the areas of administrative leadership, leadership development, and international issues in educational administration and school improvement.

The author wishes to thank Larry Cuban, Clive Dimmock, William Greenfield, Ron Heck, Ken Leithwood, Bill Mulford for their comments on drafts of this article. He would like to acknowledge contributions made by colleagues at the Center for Leadership Research and Development, Chiang Mai University, Thailand (Panomporn Chantarapanya, Patchanee Tarseina, Umporn Siriboonma) and at the Institut Ahmuddin Baki, Ministry of Education, Malaysia (Ibrahim Ahmad Bajunid) to the ideas presented in this article.
The first year of operation for the International Development Center in Educational Administration has been a time for strategic planning and initiation of high-priority activities. So far, the work of the Center has been carried out by students and faculty at the University of Minnesota. However, important cooperative agreements have been put in place which hold significant promise for UCEA member institutions. These opportunities are clearly evident in the following three ways:

• Leadership Development for International Schools:
  In cooperation with the Association for Advancement of International Education, the Center has developed a Doctoral program in Educational Leadership. This is a cohort-based program housed in the Department of Educational Policy and Administration at the University of Minnesota. It will enroll its first group of international educators in Summer, 1995. Program participants will be drawn from international schools who are members of the Near East/South Asia (NE/SA) consortium. At the same time, the Center will be offering a program of study in Teacher Leadership leading to the Master of Education degree. This program will also serve NE/SA member school and will begin in Spring, 1995.

  In planning these offerings, Center staff has made use of UCEA curriculum designs and learning materials. These decisions were taken in the hope that faculty in UCEA member institutions will be interested in participating as instructors or otherwise engaging in research and development activities associated with international schools.

• Internet Presence
  The Center has established a “presence” on the Internet where staff is reaching out to international educators. This currently takes the form of a list server which may be accessed at: http://www.coled.umn.edu/EPA/. List participants are beginning discussions of topics of interest to persons teaching and managing in international schools. An electronic journal is planned for the future to collect and disseminate information concerning the organization and administration of international education.

• New Designs for Higher Education
  The National Center for Research in Vocational Education has funded a project whereby the UCEA Center will develop new designs for higher education. This project is based on earlier work at Minnesota which resulted in new designs for the comprehensive high school - work project will begin early in 1995 and will continue for two years. As the first step in this project, Center staff plans to enlist contributions from UCEA members interested in post-secondary education.

Summary
The UCEA Center for International Development in Educational Administration is clearly a timely idea. The response to Center initiatives has been enthusiastic and has already resulted in productive projects and exchanges among international educators. Over time, these relationships will build to a virtual community of scholars and practitioners sharing ideas and experiences across cultures. This is indeed a rich opportunity for UCEA member institutions who are invited to explore the work of the Center in more detail by emailing Bill Ammentorp at billa@maroon.tc.umn.edu.
MARK YOUR CALENDAR!!

TECHNOLOGY PRECONFERENCE

SALT LAKE CITY
OCTOBER 26 - 27, 1995
(Prior to UCEA Convention '95)

SPONSORED BY

AERA Division A, UCEA, National Policy Board, and Danforth Foundation

FOCUS: Use of Technology in Educational Administration in Teaching, Research, and Professional Collaboration

PLANNING TEAM:
Paula M. Short, Chair, AERA Division A Technology Committee
Kenneth Lane, Professor of Educational Administration, California State University-San Bernadino
Clifford Drew, Associate Dean - College of Education, University of Utah

TENTATIVE TOPICS:
Distance Learning
Internet
Computer Simulations in Educational Administration
Other Technologies in Classroom Instruction

The preconference will begin on Thursday morning, October 26, 1995 and end at noon on Friday, October 27, 1995. Additional information will soon become available from:

Scott D. Thomson
NPBEA
440 University Drive
Fairfax, Virginia (703) 993-3644

UCEA introduces:

Building Bridges:
UCEA’s First Two Decades

by Jack Culbertson

© UCEA, 1995 • 353 pages
ISBN 1-55996-159-7

“UCEA’s formation and early programs were influenced by American and European ideas. Views expressed in the late 1940s by officers of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation and by members of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), for example, helped shape UCEA’s mission statement. On the other hand, adapted versions of ideas generated by a group of scholars in Vienna, Austria, provided essential content for UCEA’s first Career Development Seminar. The seminar’s content in turn influenced some of UCEA’s future programs.” (from Chapter 2: “Roots”)

Contents:
1. Preface
2. An Unexpected Choice
3. Roots
4. Beginnings
5. Transference
6. Adaptations
7. Crosswinds
8. Reach Across the Seas
9. The Monroe City Simulation
10. The Partnership
11. The Renewers
12. Governance
13. Lessons Learned
14. Indices

“During the 1959-81 period UCEA’s governance was affected by a lengthy struggle for power, considerable discontent among some professors, a major change in decision structures, and potent paradoxes. The struggle for power was rooted largely in UCEA’s two unequal governance structures: the UCEA Board of Trustees and the Plenary Session. As the 1960s unfolded, some Plenary representatives became increasingly dissatisfied with the centralized decision-making of the ‘strong’ UCEA Board.” (Chapter 11: “Governance”)

The cost for the volume is $26.95, plus $2.50 shipping and handling fee. Send check to UCEA at 212 Racheley Building/University Park, PA 16802-3200, or call (814) 863-7916.
### SCHEDULE OF COMING EVENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Deadline for Culbertson Award nominations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Campbell Award nominations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| June  | 16-18   | UCEA Executive Committee  
(Salt Lake City: Red Lion Hotel) |
| October | 25-26  | UCEA Executive Committee  
(Salt Lake City: Red Lion Hotel) |
|       | 26-27   | UCEA Plenum  
(Salt Lake City: Red Lion Hotel) |
|       | 26-27   | Technology Pre-Conference  
(Salt Lake City: Red Lion Hotel) |
|       | 27      | Graduate Student Symposium  
(Salt Lake City: Red Lion Hotel) |
|       | 27-29   | UCEA Convention ’95  
(Salt Lake City: Red Lion Hotel) |
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