Instructional Leadership Practices among Principals in Israeli and US Jewish Schools

Jeffrey Glanz
Haim Shaked
Chanina Rabinowitz
Shmuel Shenhav
Rachel Zaretsky

ABSTRACT: Extant research indicates that principals are expected to serve as instructional leaders. Instructional leadership practices of principals in Israeli and US Jewish schools have, until recently, been unexplored. Therefore, this mixed-methodological study explores instructional leadership perceptions and behaviors among Israeli and US principals. Data, via questionnaires and interviews, were collected from 90 principals from each country. Findings suggest that US principals demonstrated significantly higher levels of instructional leadership. In both groups, women principals demonstrated higher levels of instructional leadership. Our interviews provided unique insights leading to our suggestions for ways of promoting greater attention to instructional leadership by principals of both countries.

KEYWORDS: instructional leadership, principal preparation, Israeli versus US schools

Introduction

High-stakes accountability is still very much with us (e.g., Carter, 2012; Comber & Nixon, 2011; Jacobs, Burns, & Yendol-Hoppey, 2015; Jennings, 2010). In today's prevalent outcome-based accountability environment, many schools are held accountable for promoting high student academic achievement. The school principal, particularly, is expected to lead the staff as an instructional leader in order to produce high student achievement (Glanz & Zepeda, 2016; Hess & Kelly, 2007; Ylimaki, 2014). Consequently, the role of school principals has changed dramatically. Not too long ago principals were mostly responsible for keeping students safe, for overseeing schedules, and for enforcing school policies. Managerial tasks such as ordering supplies and creating bus schedules were common daily tasks. Today, principals are expected to act as instructional leaders of the school by promoting best practices in teaching and learning so that students achieve academic success. Even though principals are involved in many tasks that tend to distract from this important task, effective principals focus on

instruction becau
(Ärlestig & Törn
shall, 2009; Marz
Given the fact
cates that princip
dered whether or
affiliations with.
pal's role as instru
of principals in Is
plored. Therefor
leadership percep
principals.
Questions that
ership practices a
principals know a
see themselves as
compare with thei
tional leadership i
that no study her
schools and Israeli
influence on Israel
about the degree
instructional leade
education system.
differences betwee
the extent to whic
Jewish schools.
Before we provi
is in order to unde
ern American edu
schools. While son
studies, others may
language, secular Je
these schools recei
private network of
local initiatives in
States. There is no
these US schools, u
A broad consens
schools view Jewish
of assimilation. Yet,
education system c
commitment to a J

instruction because they know that such focus will impact students the most (Ärlestig & Törnsen, 2014; Author, 2006, 2012; Hallinger, 2011, 2014; Marshall, 2009; Marzano, 2011; Sullivan & Glanz, 2013; Zepeda, 2012).

Given the fact that extant research in the field of school leadership indicates that principals are expected to serve as instructional leaders, we wondered whether or not such advocacy affected schools in which we have close affiliations with. Research outside US public school settings into the principal's role as instructional leader is limited. Instructional leadership practices of principals in Israeli and US Jewish schools have, until recently, been unexplored. Therefore, this mixed-methodological study explores instructional leadership perceptions and behaviors among Israeli and US Jewish school principals.

Questions that initially intrigued us include, "Which instructional leadership practices are prevalent in Israeli schools?" "What do Israeli school principals know about instructional leadership?" "To what extent do they see themselves as instructional leaders?" and "How do Israeli school leaders compare with their US counterparts in Jewish schools?" Research on instructional leadership in Israeli schools is virtually non-existent. Moreover, given that no study heretofore has explored the relationship between US Jewish schools and Israeli schools, we believe this study is important. Since the US influence on Israeli society is marked (Rebhun & Levy, 2006), we wondered about the degree to which Israeli schools are indirectly affected by the instructional leadership trend, which has a great influence on the US public education system. Findings of this study will help us understand the nuanced differences between schools in both countries as well as provide insights into the extent to which instructional leadership is a priority in Israeli and US Jewish schools.

Before we provide the theoretical background to our study, a brief word is in order to understand the educational contexts of both countries. Modern American educational institutions include privately funded Jewish day schools. While some of these schools may stress Judaism and Torah (Bible) studies, others may focus more on Jewish history, Hebrew language, Yiddish language, secular Jewish culture and Zionism. However, students who attend these schools receive a rich Jewish cultural heritage (Schick, 2007). This private network of autonomous schools is primarily governed and funded by local initiatives in hundreds of Jewish communities throughout the United States. There is no one board or ministry that dictates education policy for these US schools, unlike Israeli schools.

A broad consensus of parents who send their children to private Jewish schools view Jewish education as the final bulwark against powerful tides of assimilation. Yet, the high tuition fees parents must pay for this private education system creates a financial burden that challenges some parents' commitment to a Jewish education (Wertheimer, 1999). Parents who are

orthodox (i.e., observe religious Torah precepts) are less likely to eschew a Jewish education in favor of economic considerations.

The Israeli-Jewish educational system, mostly public, reflects the divisions of different population groups, including ethnically heterogeneous immigrants, and is divided into public schools, religious public schools, and ultra-Orthodox independent schools. In Israel, the Ministry of Education (Misrad HaChinuch) is responsible for school curricula, educational standards, and professional development. Local authorities are charged with school maintenance. In Israel, public schools receive funding from the Ministry of Education according to the size of the student population, for purposes of national cohesion (Wolff & Breit, 2012). In contrast to their American counterparts, Israel school tuitions are much less. Given the fact that most US schools are private, they tend to have more financial resources at their disposal than Israeli schools. Moreover, class size is much lower in US Jewish schools than in most Israeli schools. The lack of resources also precludes the hiring of additional teachers to reduce teacher—student ratios.

Theoretical Background

Instructional Leadership

The accountability movement, a worldwide phenomenon (Levinson, 2011; West, Mattei, & Roberts, 2011), has led to a change of emphasis in school leadership. Student improvement and achievement require high-quality instruction, and high-quality instruction requires constant instructional leadership. Many researchers have demonstrated the importance of instructional leadership as a necessary component of high-quality instruction (Brazer & Bauer, 2013; Neumerski, 2012; Rigby, 2014). Thus, school principals are not seen as simply managerial or organizational administrators any longer; instructional leadership is today one of their most chief responsibilities (Glanz, 2006, Marzano, 2011; Sullivan & Glanz, 2013). School principals today must combine traditional school leadership duties—such as budgeting, scheduling, and facilities maintenance—with the additional challenge of deep involvement in teaching and learning that directly affects student achievement (Cotton, 2003). In fact, current school principals have to see instructional leadership and school improvement as their primary responsibility (DiPaola & Hoy, 2008; Klar, Huggins, & Roessler, 2016; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

The priorities of the principal are felt throughout the school and become the priorities of the entire staff and school. The degree to which the principal pays attention to teaching and learning sends a message about its importance to the staff. Thus, instructional leadership is a key part of the principal's job and principals are central figures in school efforts to improve teaching (Mitchell & Castle, 2005; Printy, 2010). O'Donnell and White (2005)

found that higher teacher perceptions of principal instructional leadership behaviors related to higher achievement in students and vice versa. Devos and Bouckenoogh (2009) discovered that principals who work in climates that stimulate professional learning are strong leaders and prefer their role of instructional leader rather than that of administrator. On the other hand, those administrative-minded principals who considered organizational tasks more important and not instructional leadership tasks were in schools with weaker climates.

Instructional Leadership Practices

Early descriptions of instructional leadership included behaviors such as communicating the vision of the school's purposes and standards, monitoring student and teacher performance, recognizing and rewarding good work, and providing effective staff development programs (DeBevoise, 1984). Dwyer (1984) stressed that effective principals viewed school culture as something they could "monitor and change." In addition, he found that some commonalities between successful leaders were their visibility and the predictability of their daily and yearly actions. Building on this and other research, Hallinger and Murphy (1985) proposed a model of instructional leadership that included three dimensions of the instructional role of a school leader. These are defining *the school's mission*, *managing the instructional program*, and *promoting a positive school climate*. Within these three dimensions are several behaviors that principals who are instructional leaders would be involved in throughout the school year.

Two mixed-method multiyear longitudinal instructional leadership studies using very large samples and both qualitative interviews and observations and responses to survey and questionnaires showed that leadership has a moderate but indirect effect on student achievement through its influence on teacher motivation and workplace conditions. Workplace conditions refer to class size, teaching load, teaching subjects that the teacher is familiar with and prepared for, and classroom student grouping practices (Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Wahlstrom et al., 2010). Although leadership defined in this study was collective leadership, teachers indicated that the largest perceived leadership influence was from those people identified formally as the leader such as the principal, so we can infer that these findings in reality refer to the principal's behaviors.

Other instructional leadership practices perceived by teachers to effect student achievement are intellectual stimulation defined as continually exposing staff to cutting-edge ideas about how to be effective, systematically engaging staff in discussion about current research and theory, involving staff in reading articles and books about effective practices, and the principal keeping himself informed about current research as well as creating structures and opportunities for teachers to collaborate (Wahlstrom et al., 2010).

Supervision of instruction is a part of an instructional leader's responsibilities. Instructional supervision inducts novice teachers and provides professional development opportunities. It also supports experienced or veteran teachers' growth in their teaching practice and prevents burnout. Classical clinical supervision is based on expectations for the principal to observe classrooms, understand quality teaching, have knowledge of the curriculum, and have the skill to provide constructive feedback to teachers. However, although "classroom leadership is often advocated by the instructional leadership literature" (Leithwood & Janzi, 1997, p. 7), direct supervision of classroom practice had weaker effects on achievement than leadership actions that focused on the organization as a whole (Ing, 2008). The leadership practices in the Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003) model, which were most similar to supervision, had only a very small correlation to student success. These principal behaviors include the following: the principal being directly involved in design, implementation of curriculum, instruction and assessment practices, and the principal having quality contact with teachers (Waters et al., 2003).

Recent studies demonstrate that professional community makes a unique contribution to teachers' instructional practice (Wahlstrom et al., 2010), to which principal leadership contributes (Marks & Printy, 2003). This finding is consistent with previous research that showed that professional community is related to instructional improvement and is correlated with teachers' adoption of new practices (Smylie & Wenzel, 2003). "When the focus of the teachers' conversations is on the quality of student learning . . . teachers adopt pedagogical practices that enhance students' learning opportunities" (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008, p. 463).

Other instructional leadership practices that are discussed in the instructional leadership literature include ensuring that teachers have the necessary materials and equipment, being involved with teachers to address instructional and assessment issues in their classrooms, and providing teachers with the professional development necessary for the successful execution of their jobs (Marzano et al., 2005; Waters et al., 2003). Professional development provided to teachers has also been shown to have a relationship with changes in instructional practice (Rous, 2004). Case study data, for example, from 20 schools similar to the study under discussion in this article, indicated that when principals wanted to develop teaching capacity, instead of working directly with teachers, they provided strategic professional learning programs (Penlington, Kington, & Day, 2008).

Instructional Leadership Practices in US Jewish Schools

Heads of Jewish community day schools felt challenged by time management, micro-political issues, attending to multiple constituencies, and parent education (Kramer, 2000). Schick (2007) and others (Deitcher & Pomson,

2012) stated that the job of principal in US Jewish day schools has gotten more difficult over the years. He describes some of the pressures listed above, but adds that the advancement of technology created a demand on instant communication. Moreover, mandated reporting to government and fundraising responsibilities are added pressures for the principal. Perl (2011) pointed out that some principals or heads of schools are expected to do all the tasks of principal and in addition be the spiritual leader of the school community, an overwhelming load. Principals may also be responsible for overseeing *Midot* (character development) programs or *Chesed* (volunteer) programs as well.

In this reality, it is not surprising that teachers in many Jewish schools tell stories of little or no curriculum and instructional oversight in their schools (Glanz, 2012). Novice teachers are left to "sink or swim" and figure things out on their own. Experienced or veteran teachers feel ignored, since the principals feel they "don't have to worry" about what is going on in their classrooms. In fact, Stodolsky, Dorph, and Feiman-Nemser (2006) found that only 40% of teachers in Jewish day schools and congregational schools were observed at least once a year. Teachers often acknowledge that their principals are unaware of what and how they teach. In addition, teachers agreed that their principals recognized their good work in only half of the schools surveyed.

Professional development, a key part of instructional supervision and an important part of the dimension *managing the instructional program* (Hallinger, 2011), also seems to fall short in many Jewish schools. Teachers report that aside from a once or twice yearly lecture or workshop, they usually do not take part in meaningful, ongoing professional development (Stodolsky et al., 2006). Teachers often have no input in the topics chosen for the once-yearly workshop, and so at times the teachers tend to perceive the sessions as "a waste of time" or "not relevant to me." Ideally, professional development should be ongoing, and should be linked to clinical supervision or coaching throughout the year (Glanz, 2012).

Recently, a comprehensive study of Jewish school leadership in the United States (Kidron, Greenberg, & Schneider, 2015) was conducted that underscores leaders' lack of attention to important factors that promote instructional improvement. Although this study addressed areas other than instructional leadership, a key finding (in fact, its second most prominent one) was the lack of attention to data-driven instructional decision-making, which according to the authors, was an impediment to instructional improvement.

The most recent study completed about instructional leadership in US Jewish schools was conducted as a doctoral dissertation entitled "Principals' Perceptions of their Instructional Leadership Behaviors in Jewish Day Schools" (Grosser Sasson, 2016). Her mixed-methodology study found that principals of Jewish schools in America were only "moderately involved in instructional leadership" but, similar to our study, "women principals

perceived more involvement" (p. 3). Interestingly, for further research she mentioned that a study comparing Israeli principals to their American counterparts is needed.

Instructional Leadership Practices in Israeli Schools

The literature about instructional leadership practices in Israeli schools is minimal. There is a recent trend, however, to focus more on the responsibilities of Israeli principals on instructional or pedagogical leadership prompted, in large measure by the Avney Rosha report (2008). Our study attempts, in part, to fill this gap in the literature.

Principal Preparation in Israel and the United States

In recent years, researchers and practitioners alike have criticized principal preparation programs for failing to adequately prepare prospective educational leaders for their roles, claiming that these programs do not produce qualified principals who are capable of running schools successfully (e.g., Darling-Hammond et al., 2007; Fossey & Shoho, 2012; Hernandez et al, 2012). More recently, lack of attention to instructional leadership skills of principals has been raised as a concern. Most authorities agree that principals are responsible for acting as instructional leaders of the school by promoting "best practices" in teaching and learning so that students achieve academic success. Many researchers have shown the importance of high-quality instruction as a necessary component of student improvement and achievement. Instructional leadership plays a key role in this goal (Hallinger & Murphy, 2005; Hallinger, 2011; Marzano, 2011).

Research on principal preparation policy in Israel, including a focus on instructional leadership, is virtually non-existent. Two decades ago, Chen (1996) described the preparation of principals in Israel, noting that "academic preparation of principals in Israel is a fairly new commodity" (p. 287). A decade ago, Gutterman (2004) noted that principal preparation in Israel is undergoing change, since the Ministry of Education requires principal candidates to participate in preparation programs. In the intervening years, many changes have occurred. A few years ago, Oplatka and Waite (2010) described the new construction of principal preparation programs in Israel raising some questions as to their applicability and quality. Shaked (2014) has explored principal preparation in Israel, with an emphasis on instructional leadership. He draws from goals of the Israeli Ministry of Education's institute named 'Avney Rosha' ('Capstones'). The institute published an initial document entitled 'Perception of the Principal's Role in the State of Israel' (Avney Rosha, 2008), defining a conceptual and practical framework for the role of school principals in Israel and clarifying principals' key areas of responsibility as educational leaders. A major emphasis was, and remains, instructional leadership.

The majority of principals in US Jewish schools do not have formal training compared to secular school principals (Holtz, Dorph, & Goldring, 1997). Schick (2007) pointed this out as well in his survey of Jewish day-school principals. More than half of the principals surveyed said they had never participated in a formal principal training program. Only 36% of day-school leaders had certification in administration and only 19% had completed a degree in education administration. Fox (2003) lamented the lack of pre-service and in-service education of principals. Perl (2011) pointed out that while public school principals are required to have appropriate degrees in their supervisory fields, Jewish day schools do not necessarily require their principals to do so. Many principals may achieve their role by "rising through the ranks" in the school or by gaining access to a mentor. Some principals, though not most, will achieve their job by attaining an advanced degree in administration (Kramer, 2000).

While on the job, the situation regarding focusing on instructional leadership is a concern (Glanz, 2012). Schick (2007) wrote (in his survey of Jewish day-school principals) that more than half of the principals reported that fundraising was part of their responsibilities. Several principals were responsible for non-educational activities as well, such as office work and building maintenance. Eighty-two percent of principals agreed that their job had gotten harder.

Research Questions/Hypotheses

1. To what extent do Israeli and US Jewish school principals perceive themselves as instructional leaders of their schools?/ Israeli and US Jewish school principals do not perceive themselves as instructional leaders.
2. Based on reports from study participants, which instructional leadership practices are prevalent (being used) among Israeli and US Jewish school principals?/ Israeli and US Jewish school principals act as instructional leaders to a small extent.
3. What influence, if any, has principal preparation programs played in a principal's ability to serve as an instructional leader?/Israeli and US Jewish school principals will report that their leadership preparation programs did not sufficiently address instructional leadership.

Method

Study Design

We used a mixed-methodological research approach in this study. A questionnaire was constructed based on the Avney Rosha (2008) Capstones Institute—Perception of the Principal's Role in the State of Israel document. This document details areas of management that enable and support instructional

leadership that focuses on developing vision, bringing about change, leading the staff, and nurturing professional development. We also conducted a total of twenty semi-structured interviews.

Our mixed-methods approach avoids paradigmic loyalty and aims to obtain a more complete picture in order to best understand the perceptions of principals of both countries (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2002). Use of interviewing (Merriam, 2009) creates a nuanced description about the manner in which study principals put instructional leadership into practice, particularly paying attention to contextual factors that influence principal behavior (Hallinger, 2011).

More specifically, we incorporated a sequential explanatory strategy for our research design. Such an approach is characterized by the collection and analysis of quantitative data followed by the collection and analysis of qualitative data that build on the results of the former. This design is usually used to explain and interpret the quantitative results, particularly if something unexpected arises from it. The opposite strategy, collecting the qualitative data first and then conducting the quantitative research second was considered, but then rejected, since this type of approach is often used when a researcher needs to develop an instrument when there is none available or appropriate (Creswell, 2009).

Data Collection & Participants

Samples for this study were culled from the general population of US and Israeli principals. Two of the authors had access to a database consisting of most Jewish and Israeli school principals. Data were collected through a stratified random sampling design to ensure sample diversity regarding demographic characteristics, including gender, level of the school (elementary, middle, high), and geographical district. Databases were used to disseminate questionnaires to possible Israeli and US Jewish school principal respondents. We received 93 and 94 completed questionnaires from US and Israeli principals, respectively. Interview participants were selected in two ways: (1) those who volunteered by noting so on the questionnaire; and (2) personal requests by the researchers to selected principals that would enhance the diversity of the sample.

Among the Israeli principals who submitted completed questionnaires were 43 females and 51 males with a mean of 23 years of teaching experience (range: 9-38), and a mean of 10 years of experience as principals (range: 2–27). The US Jewish school principals included 44 females and 49 males with a mean of 21 years of teaching experience (range: 6–41), and a mean of 11 years of experience as principals (range: 1–30). For the interviews, ten from each country, there was an even breakdown by gender with a mean of 20 years of teaching experience and 10 years of experience as principals for both groups, respectively.

Research Variables

Independent variables related to personal characteristics of the respondent: gender, age, years of experience as teacher, years of experience as school principal, and school level. The dependent variables related to various aspects of instructional leadership as reflected in the literature and based on the constitutive document of Avney Rosha (2008) mentioned above: ability of principal to establish an emphasis on learning and instructional excellence in general. More specifically, the variables focused on these activities: (1) supervision of instruction, (2) curriculum development, (3) mentoring and instructional support for new and experienced teachers, and (4) professional development.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data analysis focused on the use of descriptive statistics, t-Tests, and correlation. The alpha coefficient for the survey is .89, suggesting that the items have relatively high internal consistency.

Qualitative data analysis included a four-stage process—condensing, coding, categorizing, and theorizing. Following collection, the necessary sorting and condensing was done (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014) where the researchers examined data that were related to systems thinking in school leadership. In the second stage, coding, each segment of data (utterance) was coded by the aspect of systems thinking it expressed (Gibbs, 2007). In contrast to the previous stage, this stage was data-driven and not theory-driven because the researchers did not use *a priori* codes but rather inductive ones, developed by direct examination of the perspectives articulated by participants (Flick, 2009; Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Rossman & Rallis, 2012). After capturing the essence of utterances in the second stage, in the third stage, categorizing, similar utterances were clustered in order to generalize their meanings and derive categories. Finally, the theorizing stage aimed at reaching a conceptual construct of the categories derived in the previous stage, and seeing how they are interconnected and how they influence each other as parts of one abstract construct (Richards & Morse, 2013).

Limitations

This study is unique in that heretofore both groups, Israeli and US Jewish school principals, were never compared regarding their perceptions of instructional leadership. The study has several limitations, however. First, this study is obviously based on participants' self-report. As with any self-report, there is little control over the possibility that respondents provide socially desirable responses. In addition, the survey only serves as a method of learning the perceived frequency of the instructional behaviors, not the quality

of them. However, the qualitative portion of the study aimed to offset this limitation somewhat.

Findings

Significant correlations were found among the three areas investigated. There was a high correlation between the area of leading processes of teaching and learning and the area of developing the staff ($r = 0.707$, $n = 187$, $p = 0.000$); there was also a correlation between the area of leading processes of teaching and learning and the area of formulating a vision ($r = 0.442$), and between the area of developing the staff and the area of formulating a vision ($r = 0.490$). Among the US Jewish school principals the correlations ($r = 0.785, 0.543, 0.535$) were higher than among the Israeli school principals ($r = 0.710, 0.370, 0.417$).

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare instructional leadership in principals of Israeli and US Jewish schools. Regarding leading processes of teaching and learning, there was a significant difference in the scores for Israeli school principals ($M = 3.94$, $SD = 0.43$) and US Jewish school principals ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 0.49$); $t(8) = 2.89$, $p = 0.20$. These results suggest that US Jewish schools demonstrated significantly higher levels of instructional leadership, especially regarding leading processes of teaching and learning. Interview results revealed that US Jewish school leaders are probably more influenced by the instructional leadership trend prevalent in the US public education system.

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare instructional leadership among females and males. As regards the leading processes of teaching and learning, there was a significant difference in the scores for females ($M = 3.94$, $SD = 0.43$) and males ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 0.49$); $t(8) = 2.89$, $p = 0.20$. In addition, regarding formulating school vision, there was also a significant difference in the scores for females ($M = 3.94$, $SD = 0.43$) and males ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 0.49$); $t(8) = 2.89$, $p = 0.20$. We surmise that given the data, women principals demonstrated higher levels of instructional leadership because they had more teaching experience before they were appointed as

Table 1. Differences between Israeli and US Principals: Leading Processes of Teaching and Learning

	N	*Mean*	*Std. Deviation*
Israeli Principals	94	3.94	0.43
US Principals	93	4.19	0.49

t-test for Equality of Means

t	*Df*	*Sig. (2-tailed)*
-3.63**	184	.000

*P <.05; ** P <.01

Table 2. Gender Differences between Israeli and US Principals: Leading Processes of Teaching and Learning; Formulating a School Vision

		N	*Mean*	*Std. Deviation*
Leading processes of teaching and learning	Female	87	3.98	0.50
	Male	100	4.16	0.42
Formulating school vision	Female	87	3.81	0.79
	Male	100	4.05	0.68

t-test for Equality of Means

	T	*df*	*Sig. (2-tailed)*
Leading processes of teaching and learning	-2.40*	185	.017
Formulating school vision	-2.10*	185	.037

* P <.05; ** P <.01

principals. The women's years of experience averaged 14.79 (SD = 6.88), and the men's years of experience averaged 10.74 (SD = 8.01).

Among Israeli principals, there was a negative correlation between years of experience and leading processes of teaching and learning: as the principals were more veteran—leading processes of teaching and learning had a lower score ($r = -0.221$, $n = 94$, $p = 0.033$). It became apparent from perusing the interview data that veteran Israeli principals find it difficult to embrace the new ideas of instructional leadership. We discovered during our interviews that some veteran Israeli principals indicated, "Probably a major reason for my lack of attention to instruction has to do with the fact that my preparation years ago did not emphasize such practice."

We conclude, therefore, that principals of US Jewish schools perceived instructional leadership, especially when it came to leading processes of teaching and learning, as more important than their Israeli colleagues. In both groups, women principals demonstrated higher levels of instructional leadership. Veteran Israeli principals demonstrated lower levels of interest and involvement in instructional leadership.

The interviews reinforced the quantitative findings, but provided unique insights that led to our suggestions for ways of promoting greater attention to instructional leadership by principals of both countries. Six themes emerged from the interviews.

Theme 1: Inspection, not Growth/Growth, not Inspection: Among those US and Israeli principals who admitted a lack of time to work extensively with teachers on pedagogy a common theme emerged that their involvement in the classroom focused more on ensuring compliance to school policies than devoting inordinate time on promoting teacher professional growth in teaching. One US principal reported: "Listen, many of these teachers have been teaching longer than I. When I enter the classroom I make sure they are teaching the approved curriculum and adhering to established teaching

protocols." An Israeli veteran principal stated, "I have little time to spend on developing growth plans that you asked me about. I have someone else on staff talk to teachers about ways to improve teaching. Most of my time involving instruction is making sure we are teaching to the curriculum." One other male principal said he was most concerned with "keeping our building clean." On the other hand, more US principals spoke about their concern for teacher growth than did Israeli principals (and, overall, including Israeli principals, more women who were interviewed emphasized growth than did their male counterparts). "I don't simply observe my teachers and then write them up," said a US female principal. "I work with each one to develop a professional growth plan centered on some aspect of their teaching. We work together to develop one area for improvement over the course of an academic year." An Israeli female principal said, "My teachers know I was a teacher for many years and that I love to work with them on pedagogical improvement."

Theme 2: Autocracy, not democracy: Although not all principals we interviewed indicated that they acted autocratically, many bluntly asserted that they perceive their role as "boss," above all else, even regarding instructional practices that "teachers need to follow." A US principal admitted, "I also peek as I walk down the corridor. I remind them that the boss is watching. When I don't walk in, teachers misbehave, uh, you know what I mean. . . . Teachers know I see things. I am a taskmaster." An Israeli male principal stated, "I don't do official visits. . . I only visit some classrooms . . . I just run in for a minute to see what's going on . . . ." Implied in this principal's tone and comments was that he viewed his role as ensuring teachers were addressing his expectations for effective instruction. A senior female Israeli principal stated emphatically, "If I see a problem, then I will tell the department chair to make sure it improves." An Israeli male principal was even more emphatic, "If a teacher isn't good, we fire him. . . . We can't afford to keep him . . . I'm in charge." He admitted he has no mentoring program in place to assist new teachers. About involving teachers in decision-making, he said, " . . . have no time for that." When asked more about his role as principal, he said "Usually, I don't interfere with teachers when they teach . . . I sit in my office and give orders when appropriate." Another Israeli principal stated, "I would never take a day off . . . why? Because I like to be in control all the time." Still another Israeli principal stated, "If a teacher doesn't want to change, I'll tell him the gate of entry is small, but the gate of exit is large."

Theme 3: Wish I had the time: Among the most frequent responses by principals from both countries was the common refrain of "Wish I had more time." "Sure, I'd like to visit classes and work with teachers one-on-one," said one US Jewish school male principal, "but who has the time?! There is so much going on, uh, you know, emergencies . . . gotta deal with them." Another US male principal said, "I know what Covey said about understanding the difference between what is urgent and important. . . . seems my day is filled with urgent stuff . . . can't seem to find enough time for what is really important,

like you're asking me about." One US male principal reported that he finds the time, though, because "I keep a time diary!" Although another principal, female from Israel, stated she "makes the time because she believes it's too important not to [do so]," most (eight) of the other principals from both countries reported that time was a major impediment to effectively address their role as instructional leaders. One US principal put it concisely, "Who has the time . . . Most of the time I'm taking care of discipline problems." Almost all Israeli principals who were interviewed echoed the fact that dealing with discipline matters "takes away time from devoting to instruction." A US principal reported that "I prioritize; that's how I do it. . . . I leave all administrative work for after hours, holidays, evenings, weekends. I walk into classrooms . . . I am there for them . . . I talk instruction. . . . But to tell you the truth, I am somewhat unique. Most of my [principal] colleagues avoid the classroom and teachers' work." When we asked why, he said "I can't say . . . it's an attitude. I care about it." This US principal sums up the feelings of most we interviewed, "Everything falls on me. If I had a 14-hour workday, I'd still have more work to do at the end of the day."

Theme 4: It ain't in the budget: Among the most curious findings of our study was the inability for the interviewed principals to come up with a sound response to the question "Is there a budget line for instructional leadership?" We also followed this question with another "If so, what is included in the budget?" One US principal of a large school reported bluntly, "I have no PD budget . . . . I make my own." Curiously, another US principal pointed to the letters "Misc." in the budget to indicate that is where his budget is for improving instruction. Another US principal stated that "everything is under Professional Development (PD)," but nothing specific for mentoring, professional growth plans, peer coaching, intervisitations, etc. Another admitted, "There probably should be a line in the budget." Most Israeli principals stated that there was no specific budget for PD. Israeli principals receive their annual budgets from the Ministry of Education. An Israeli principal explained, "if I am interested in a particular curricular or instructional initiative, then I must put in a special request with a rationale to the Ministry." A few Israeli principals admitted that they do not bother but rather "use what I get." More fundamentally and also revealing was when Israeli principals were asked what they would do with additional monies, no one responded by saying they'd use the money for PD or any instructional strategy specifically linked to teacher development. Rather, comments included, "I'd buy an aquarium for the kids to peek their interest in science," or "I'd refurbish the physical plant of the building . . . plant a new garden."

Theme 5: Confusing Improving Instruction (Supervision) with Evaluation: Our interviews, unlike the data we culled from the questionnaires, revealed a lack of understanding of the modern conception about supervision versus evaluation. Most interviewed principals confused the two. One US principal who claimed he valued instructional leadership, "as an integral part of my

responsibility," represents many statements made by the interviewees: "I certainly value helping teachers teach . . . . I formally and informally observe teachers . . . . I evaluate them." All the other US principals we interviewed confirmed that they "evaluate teachers . . . and point out ways they can improve." Israeli principals similarly conceived of supervision (i.e., improving teaching) and evaluation synonymously. One male Israeli principal stated, "I do observe teachers . . . I evaluate them." Interestingly, very few of all the principals from both countries we interviewed alluded to anything beyond observation and evaluation. No Israeli principal and only two US principals mentioned instructional leadership strategies we highlighted in the literature review such as use of data-driven decision-making or specific types of professional development to enhance teacher growth.

Most scholars of instructional supervision (Glanz & Zepeda, 2016) agree, that the purpose of supervision is "the enhancement of teaching, with the ultimate aim of improved student learning" (Gordon, 2016, p. 40). Research into the supervision–evaluation confusion indicates that ". . . contemporary discourse about the relationship between educational administration and instructional supervision suggests a stark difference, in practice supervision is often an administrative function . . . focusing on performance evaluation using students' testing results as metrics" (Duffy, 2016, p. 122). Although teacher evaluation has been perceived by many as the dominant model of instructional improvement, scholars in the field have continuously insisted that ". . . the purpose of supervision is to help increase the opportunity and the capacity of schools to contribute more effectively to students' academic success" (p. 7). Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007) continue:

> We believe that the heart of supervisory leadership is designing opportunities for teachers to continuously expand their capacity to learn, to care, to help each other, and to teach more effectively. We view schools as learning communities where students, teachers, and supervisors alike are learners and teachers depending upon the circumstances. (p. 9)

Without belaboring the point, the principals from both countries we interviewed did not distinguish between supervision and evaluation.

Theme 6: Principal preparation in instructional leadership is severely lacking: Principals in both countries, by and large, indicated that they "received training on the job" for the principalship. Those who said they received more formal preparation as a principal indicated that their coursework in leadership programs at the university level either did not sufficiently address instructional leadership responsibilities or did not include anything of substance about it. One principal from the United States reported, "You learn on the job. . . . I mean, you get a feel to what teachers need." One US principal, though, reported, "My MA course in teacher supervision was helpful." A representative Israeli principal stated emphatically, "I learn most on the job."

No Israeli principal referred to anything they had learned in any principal preparation program.

Discussion and Implications

Findings of this study implied that even though US Jewish principals were more attentive to instructional leadership practices than their Israeli counterparts, both sets of principals devoted less time to instruction than suggested in the literature. We offer the following concise conclusions with possible explanations, aligned to our three basic research questions:

1. Regarding our first research question, US Jewish school principals perceived themselves as instructional leaders more than their Israeli colleagues. US Jewish school principals were more inclined to attend to instruction because they have been influenced by the burgeoning literature on the import of instructional leadership in the states. Efforts to highlight instructional leadership in Israel have only fairly recently become a focus of interest and expectation for principals by the Ministry of Education. Israeli principals, especially males, perceived themselves more as managers than as instructional leaders. The fact that women of both countries attend to instruction more than males leads us to our second point.
2. Gender seems to be a predictor for involvement in instructional leadership in both countries. We say "seems" to be a predictor since we found that women had much more experience as classroom teachers than males did. Such exposure and preparation in teaching we conclude is a factor for greater involvement in instructional leadership practices. Hence, "prior years of teaching experience" is more likely the factor. The fact that women, in our study, had much more teaching experience may only be an idiosyncratic difference, however. Other studies need to examine if such differences in attentiveness to instructional leadership would be such a factor if male principals possessed an equal number of prior years of teaching.

   Another interesting explanation came from one of the female US principals whom we interviewed. She explained the difference between female and male principals as follows: "Women come through the ranks as university graduates with lots of teaching experience, and then become principals." She continued, "Male principals, on the other hand, started out as rebbes (Hebrew studies teachers) then became student activities directors then . . . principals." She concluded that such a career path may explain the reason for women "being more involved in instructional matters."

   In our study we also found that veteran principals generally possessed less teaching experience because in the words of one representative US

principal, "years ago Jewish schools sought male managers for their schools. . . . Having expertise in instruction was not highly valued."

3. Regarding our second research question, very few Israeli principals discussed specific instructional leadership strategies that undergird their work as instructional leaders. US Jewish school principals were more inclined to discuss specific leadership practices that went beyond the traditional practice of observing and evaluating teachers. Women of both countries, however, were more inclined to do so. We conclude that principals of both countries need additional professional development in a variety of instructional leadership practices such as the use of action research, peer coaching, curriculum development, etc.
4. Findings imply that if indeed, as the research literature suggests, instructional leadership is of critical importance, then schools in both countries need to attract principals who are not only verbally committed to instructional improvement but also possess the requisite classroom teaching experience that may predict attention to instructional leadership. Boards, too, often comprised of non-educators, need to be educated about the critical importance that having a principal who is attentive to instructional leadership is necessary to ensure academic success of students. Additionally, schools of higher education that prepare future principals need to address the import of instructional leadership in their curricula. Regarding our third research question, very few of our study participants reported that their preparation programs for the principalship adequately prepared them for the job. Clearly, principal preparation programs in both countries need to provide more emphasis in instructional leadership. Parenthetically, it is important to note that, at least in the United States, it is possible to become a principal in a Jewish school without any formal background in education or the principalship. A majority of study participants from US Jewish schools did, however, attend a principalship preparation program, although several did not. In Israel, under most circumstances, one cannot assume the principalship without prior preparation. It thus becomes problematic why so many of those we interviewed and studied were not familiar with instructional leadership practices, nor perceived themselves as instructional leaders.
5. An important implication of our study is that principals need to seek additional professional development in instructional leadership so that they may more effectively improve teaching and learning in their schools, as indicated by the research literature.

Contributions of the Study & Future Avenues for Research

This study may contribute to the existing knowledge base available regarding the application of instructional leadership concepts and procedures by school

leaders in Israel and in US Jewish schools. The research is clear: instructional leadership is very important. Without adopting instructional leadership behaviors, school leaders will be hard-pressed to further promote student achievement in the 21st century. We hope the study can benefit educational agencies, policy makers and principal preparation program designers to emphasize the importance of instructional leadership theories and strategies. We intend to expand our study by comparing Israeli and US principals to Arab principals in Israel as well as principals from selected countries in Europe. IJER

References

Ärlestig, H., & Törnsen, M. (2014). Classroom observations and supervision: Essential dimensions of pedagogical leadership. *International Journal of Educational Management, 28*(7), 856-868. doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-01-2014-0001

Avney Rosha – The Israel Institute for School Leadership (2008). *Perception of the principal's role in the state of Israel: Report by the professional committee to formulate policy recommendations for the Ministry of Education*. Jerusalem, Israel: Avney Rosha.

Brazer, S. D., & Bauer, S. C. (2013). Preparing instructional leaders: A model. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 49*(4), 645–684. doi: 10.1177/0013161X13478977

Carter, H. M. (2012). Institutionalization of caring in an era of accountability: Creating a supportive environment for at-risk students' retention in high school and access to college. *New Educator, 8*(2), 177–193. doi: 10.1080/1547688X.2012.670568.

Chen, M. (1996). Academic preparation of principals in Israel: Empowering dynamic school leadership. *International Journal of Educational Reform, 5*(3), 287–296. doi: 10.1007/s13384-011-0022-z

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Comber, B., & Nixon, H. (2011). Critical reading comprehension in an era of accountability. *Australian Educational Researcher, 38*(2), 167–179. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/journal/13384.

Cotton, K. (2003). *Principals and student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage.

Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., Orr, M.T., & Cohen, C. (2007). *Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Lessons from exemplary leadership development programs*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.

DeBevoise, W. (1984). Synthesis of research on the principal as instructional leader. *Educational Leadership, 41*(5), 14–20. doi: 10.1177/0013124588020003005.

Deitcher, H., & Pomson, A. (2012). *Jewish day schools worldwide: Achievement, challenges and aspirations*. New York, NY: The Azrieli Papers, Yeshiva University.

Devos, G., & Bouckenoogh, D. (2009). An exploratory study on principals' conceptions about their role as school leaders. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 8*(2), 173–196. doi: 10.1080/15700760902737196.

DiPaola, M. F., & Wayne, K. H. (2008). *Principals improving instruction: Supervision, evaluation, and professional development*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Duffy, F. M. (2016). Organizational arrangements: Supervision and administration: Past, present, and future. In Glanz & S.J. Zepeda (Eds.), *Supervision: New perspectives for theory and practice*. (pp. 81-96). New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.

Dwyer, D. C. (1984). The search for instructional leadership: Routines and subtleties in the principal's role. *Educational Leadership*, *41*(5), 32–37. doi: 10.1177/0013161X03253412.

Flick, U. (2009). *An introduction to qualitative research*. (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fossey, R., & Shoho, A. (2012). Educational leadership preparation programs. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership*, *9*(3), 3-11. doi: 10.1177/1555458906297707.

Fox, S. (2003). The art of translation. In S. Fox, I. Scheffler & D. Marom (Eds.). *Visions of Jewish education* (pp. 253-295). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gibbs, G. R. (2007). *Analyzing qualitative data*. London, UK: Sage.

Glanz. (2006). *Instructional leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Glanz. (2012). *Improving instructional quality in Jewish Day Schools and Yeshivot*. New York, NY: The Azrieli Papers, Yeshiva University.

Glanz, & Zepeda, S. (Eds.). (2016). *Supervision: New perspectives for theory and practice*. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.

Grosser Sasson, D. (2016). *Principals' perceptions of their instructional leadership behaviors in Jewish day schools*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Yeshiva University, New York, NY.

Gutterman, J. (2004). On the way to desirable preparation: Trends and changes in school principals' preparation (Hebrew). *Education and Related Issues*, *26*, 139–149.

Hallinger, P. (2011). A review of three decades of doctoral studies using the principal instructional management rating scale: A lens on methodological progress in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *47*(2), 271–306. doi: 10.1177/0013161X10383412.

Hallinger, P. (2014). Reviewing reviews of research in educational leadership: An empirical assessment. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *50*(4), 539–576. doi: 10.1177/0013161X13506594.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, *86*(2), 217–247. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.331.

Hallinger P., & Murphy, (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *4*(3), 221–239.

Hernandez, R., Roberts, M., & Menchaca, V. (2012) Redesigning a principal preparation program: A continuous improvement model. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 7(3). Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/.

Hess, F. M., & Kelly, A. P. (2007). Learning to lead: What gets taught in principal preparation programs. *Teachers College Record*, *109*(1), 244–274. doi: 10.1080/00405840802329425.

Holtz, B. W., Dorph, G. Z., & Goldring, E. B., (1997). Educational leaders as teacher educators: The teacher educator institute—a case from Jewish education. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 72(2), 147–166.

Ing, M. (2008). *Using informal classroom observations to improve instruction: Describing variability across schools*. School Leadership Research, Working Paper 08-1. Stanford, CA: Institute for Research on Education Policy and Practice.

Jacobs, J., Burns, R.W., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2015). The inequitable influence that varying accountability contexts in the United States have on teacher professional development. *Professional Development in Education, 41*(5), 849–872. doi: 10.1080/19415257.2014.994657

Jennings, J. L. (2010). School choice or schools' choice? Managing in an era of accountability. *Sociology of Education, 83*(3), 227-247. doi: 10.1177/0038040710375688.

Kidron, Y., Greenberg, A., & Schneider, M. (2015). *Educational leadership in Jewish day schools.* Report commissioned by the Consortium for Applied Research. Retrieved from www.casje.org.

Kramer, M. N. (2000). *The pathway for preparation: A study of heads of Jewish community day schools affiliated with the Jewish community day school network, 1998-1999.* Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 9959342).

Klar, H.W., Huggins, K.S., &. Roessler, A.P. (2016). Fostering distributed instructional leadership: A strategy for supporting teacher learning. In Glanz & S. J. Zepeda (Eds.), *Supervision: New perspectives for theory and practice.* (pp. 7–22). New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.

Leithwood, K. A., & Jantzi, D. (1997). Explaining variation in teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership: a replication. *Journal of Educational Administration, 35*(4), 312-331. doi.org/10.1108/09578239710171910.

Leithwood, K. A., Seashore-Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, S. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

Levinson, M. (2011). Democracy, accountability, and education. *Theory and Research in Education, 9*(2), 125-144. doi: 10.1177/1477878511409622.

Marks, H. M., & Printy, S. M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*(3), 370–397. doi: 10.1177/0013161X03253412.

Marshall, K. (2009). *Rethinking teacher supervision and evaluation.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Marshall, C., & Rossman G. B. (2011). *Designing qualitative research* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Marzano, (2011). *Effective supervision: Supporting the art and science of teaching.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results.* Aurora, CO: McREL.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, M. A., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mitchell, C., & Castle, J. B. (2005). The instructional role of elementary school principals. *Canadian Journal of Education, 28*(3), 409–433. doi: 10.2307/4126477.

Neumerski, C. M. (2012). Rethinking instructional leadership, a review: What do we know about principal, teacher, and coach instructional leadership, and where should we go from here? *Educational Administration Quarterly, 49*(2), 310–347. doi: 10.1177/0013161X03253412.

O'Donnell, R. J., & White, G. P. (2005). Within the accountability era: Principals' instructional leadership behaviors and student achievement. *NASSP Bulletin, 89*(645), 56–71. doi: 10.1177/019263650508964505.

Oplatka, I., & Waite, D. (2010). The new principal preparation program model in Israel: Ponderings about practice-oriented principal training. *Advances in Educational Administration*, *11*, 47–66. doi: 1479-3660(2010)0000011.

Penlington, C., Kington, A., & Day, C. (2008). Leadership in improving schools: A qualitative perspective. *School Leadership & Management*, *28*(1), 65–82. doi:10.1080/13632430701799718.

Perl, L. B. (2011). *Connecting leadership, professional development and school improvement: A principal's journey at a modern orthodox Jewish elementary school.* Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 3484219).

Printy, S. (2010). Principals' influence on instructional quality: Insights from US schools. *School Leadership and Management*, *30*(2), 111–126. doi: 10.1007/s12564-009-9013-4.

Richards, L., & Morse, J. M. (2013). *Readme first for a user's guide to qualitative methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rigby, J. G. (2014). Three logics of instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *50*(4), 610-644. doi: 10.1177/0013161X13509379.

Rossman, G. B., & Rallis, S. F. (2012). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rous, B. (2004). Perspectives of teachers about instructional supervision and behaviors that influence preschool instruction. *Journal of Early Intervention*, *26*(4), 266–283. doi: 10.1177/105381510402600403.

Rebhun, U., & Levy. S. (2006). Unity and diversity: Jewish identification in America and Israel 1990-2000. *Sociology of Religion*, *67*(4), 391–414. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2009.00746.x.

Schick, M. (2007). *A survey of day school principals in the United States.* New York, NY: Avi Chai Foundation.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (2007). *Supervision: A redefinition* (8th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Shaked, H. (2014). Israel's principal preparation policy. *World Journal of Education*, *4*(6), 78–89. doi: 10.5430/wje.v4n6p78.

Smylie, M. A., & Wenzel, S. A. (2003). *The Chicago Annenberg Challenge: Successes, failures, and lessons for the future.* Chicago, IL: Final Technical Report of the Chicago Annenberg Research Project.

Stodolsky, S. S., Dorph, G. Z., & Feiman-Nemser, S. (2006). Professional culture and professional development in Jewish schools: Teachers' perceptions and experiences. *Journal of Jewish Education*, 72(2), 91–108. doi: 10.1080/00216240600561866.

Sullivan S., & Glanz. (2013). *Supervision that improves teaching and learning: Strategies and techniques* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA. Corwin Press.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in the social and behavior sciences.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wahlstrom, K. L., & Louis, K. S. (2008). How teachers experience principal leadership: The roles of professional community, trust, efficacy, and shared responsibility. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *44*(4), 458–495.

Wahlstrom, K.L. et al. (2010). *Learning from leadership: Investigating the links to improved student learning.* University of Toronto: Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement.

Waters, T., Marzano, R.T., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement: A working paper.* Aurora, CO: Mid-Continental Regional Educational Lab.

Wertheimer, J. (1999). Jewish education in the United States: Recent trends and issues. *American Jewish Year Book, 99*, 3–115.

West, A., Mattei, P., & Roberts, J. (2011). Accountability and sanctions in English schools. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 59*(1), 41–62. doi: 10.1080/00071005.2010.529416.

Wolff, L., & Breit, E. (2012). Education in Israel: The challenges ahead. Research Paper 8. The Gildenhorn Institute for Israel Studies (GIIS). University of Maryland.

Ylimaki, R. M. (Ed.). (2014). *The new instructional leadership: ISLLC Standard Two.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Zepeda, S. J. (2012). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts* (3rd ed.). Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

~

Jeffrey Glanz is program director in educational administration at Michlala-Jerusalem College, Bayit Vegan, Israel. All correspondence to: yosglanz@gmail.com.

Haim Sheked is lecturer in educational administration at Michlala-Jerusalem College, Bayit Vegan, Israel.

Chanina Rabinowitz is lecturer in educational administration at Michlala-Jerusalem College, Bayit Vegan, Israel.

Shmuel Shenhav is lecturer in educational administration at Michlala-Jerusalem College, Bayit Vegan, Israel.

Rachel Zaretsky is research statistician at Michlala-Jerusalem College, Bayit Vegan, Israel.

**This research was supported by a grant from the MOFET Institute: Tel Aviv, Isreal.*