

Chapter 41

Traditional Educational Leadership: Instructional Leadership Revolving Around Ralph Tyler's Four Fundamental Questions

Victor C. X. Wang
Florida Atlantic University, USA

ABSTRACT

This article addresses the traditional instructional leadership (characterized with Tyler's four questions; teachers prescribe a curriculum; learners assume a submissive role of following instructors) in comparison with the andragogical or innovative instructional leadership. As more and more scholars cast their doubt on this particular instructional mode (traditional instructional leadership) especially when compared with the innovative instructional leadership, this article seeks to draw on traditional instructional leadership that revolves around Ralph Tyler's model. In doing so, instructors and practitioners will see clearly what the traditional instructional leadership may bring to most education settings and above all, they may rely on a ready-made formula when planning curriculums, instruction, program planning, or evaluation. While traditional instructional leadership may have come under much criticism lately, there is much to learn from it.

INTRODUCTION

Educational leadership can be divided into two areas: administrative leadership and instructional leadership. Administrative leadership deals with

leaders leading followers in a certain organization or institutions of learning whereas instructional leadership deals with teaching learners or helping learners learn in classroom settings. In actuality, scholars tend to focus more on instructional leadership than administrative leadership because the majority of educators, teachers, or trainers serve

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-61350-068-2.ch041

as classroom instructors or teachers in the virtual environment. A small number of educators are chosen as administrative leaders, such as university presidents, school principals, superintendents. Researchers spend years trying to discover the most effective forms of instructional leadership, and the answer changes with the context.

Researchers have been innovative, trying to determine what prescribed instructional leadership may lead to the desired learning outcomes, or student performance objectives as termed by some scholars and educators in some school settings. Indeed, teachers are classroom leaders. They are just like drivers of cars or busses. Learners are, in a way, passengers. They do not know where to go until their teachers tell them where to go. This is especially true when learners are traditional age students or children. Teachers provide the direction and structure regarding how learners can embark on their learning journeys. Teachers prescribe curriculums, and they know what ought to happen in their classroom settings, given their prescribed curriculum's approval by experts in their field and stakeholders in their community. Teachers conform to their school's mission and goals. They have a clear idea of what is expected of them based on a school's mission and goals. Once a curriculum is prescribed, they will go about selecting the means for attaining the school's mission and goals. Then, teachers select the specific instructional methods that will work for a particular class. Finally, teachers have the responsibility of choosing evaluation methods to evaluate student learning. Teachers are driving the bus; they know where they need to go and when they should arrive. However, the route the bus takes to arrive at the final destination is flexible, but the driver, or teacher, needs to assess which route is the best and why.

In recent years, this traditional model of the teacher as the bus driver has come under criticism. Some scholars argue that traditional instructional leadership may lead to docile learners, learners who are high in scores and low in abilities (Ross,

1992). In the Western Hemisphere, researchers focus on critical thinking skills or problem solving skills rather than on rote learning or how much learners can regurgitate information or knowledge (Mezirow, 1991, 2000). Some scholars focus on learners' "cognitive metamorphosis" rather than on psychomotor skills when the majority of their learners are adult learners. Another movement is that scholars focus more on higher order thinking skills than on the lower order thinking skills based on Bloom's Taxonomy (1956).

Regardless of the movements or debate regarding what instructional leadership may lead to the right learning outcomes, all instructional leadership leads to three kinds of educational objectives. In other words, instructional leadership is bound to change learners in three domains of educational objectives: cognitive domain, psychomotor domain and affective domain. In plain language, educators and teachers are concerned with whether their learners will be able to think, act, and feel differently at the end of their instruction in a classroom setting or in a virtual classroom environment (Wang, 2008). Clearly, being able to think, act, and feel differently by the end of a teacher's instruction indicates that learners have achieved cognitive change not only through instruction by also via their own learning or efforts. As researchers and scholars focus on the aforementioned movements or debate focused around educational objectives, less attention has been paid to the differences between traditional instructional leadership and innovative instructional leadership. Because more attention has been given to innovative instructional leadership, such as higher order thinking skills (Wang & Farmer, 2008) or transformative learning, some instructors may not even know the theories behind traditional instructional leadership.

Traditional instructional leadership is more akin to pedagogy, which deals with the art and science of teaching children whereas innovative instructional leadership is more akin to andragogy, which deals with the art and science of helping

10 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/traditional-educational-leadership/58463

Related Content

The Post-COVID-19 Impact on Distance Learning for New Zealand Teachers

David Parsons, Tim Gander, Karen Baker and Darcy Vo (2022). *International Journal of Online Pedagogy and Course Design* (pp. 1-16).

www.irma-international.org/article/post-covid-impact-distance-learning/295955

Open Educational Resources and Prior Learning Assessment: Online Educational Programs

Peter McCarthy, Karleah Harris and Alec Sithole (2018). *Enhancing Education Through Open Degree Programs and Prior Learning Assessment* (pp. 1-21).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/open-educational-resources-and-prior-learning-assessment/204023

Universal Design for Learning: Culturally Responsive UDL in Teacher Education

James Cressey (2020). *Next Generation Digital Tools and Applications for Teaching and Learning Enhancement* (pp. 137-158).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/universal-design-for-learning/242845

Motivators of Student Contribution in Peer-Facilitated Online Discussion Environments: Additional Findings from Three Case Studies

Hew Khe Foon (2015). *International Journal of Online Pedagogy and Course Design* (pp. 45-57).

www.irma-international.org/article/motivators-of-student-contribution-in-peer-facilitated-online-discussion-environments/120664

A Proposed Cohesive Use of Online Discussion Board from the Aspects of Instructional and Social Interactions in Engineering Education

Yaming Tai, Yu-Liang Ting and Teng-Hui Tseng (2018). *International Journal of Online Pedagogy and Course Design* (pp. 33-44).

www.irma-international.org/article/a-proposed-cohesive-use-of-online-discussion-board-from-the-aspects-of-instructional-and-social-interactions-in-engineering-education/204982