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ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to investigate landmark federal inclusive policies in relation to leadership styles, specifically characteristics related to Sergiovanni’s (1992) professional and moral leadership authorities. Research is markedly limited regarding what federal inclusive education policies say about school and district leadership. This enlightenment concerning the lack of guidance in the field of educational leadership practice, federal education policy, and inclusive learning methods is significant.

Current literature supports the examination of federal education policies in relation to educational leadership. There is currently a gap in research involving leadership and policy. It is important to uphold continued research in relation to examining the treatment of educational leadership within federal policy (Young, Winn, & Reedy, 2017). My study has followed suit and determined the extent professional and moral authorities are evident in inclusive federal policy. School and district leaders are responsible for ensuring an equitable education for all students. This study focuses on determining the extent Sergiovanni’s (1992) professional and moral leadership authorities are evident in federal educational policies focusing on inclusive practices spanning from 1965 through 2016.

Six federal landmark inclusive policies were analyzed in this study. The policies spanned over 50 years, 1965-2016. Policies were analyzed through the conceptual framework of Sergiovanni’s (1992) five leadership authority to determine the extent
professional and moral authorities were evident. Policy statements referencing leadership were analyzed and coded according to the framework.

Through the examination of federal policy I determined that together, professional and moral authorities were evident in over half of all the coded statements. Though professional authority is the highest noted in policy, moral authority was actually third. Coming in second was technical-rational authority. The least noted authority was psychological and bureaucratic authority was fourth.

The findings of the study will assist school and district leaders as they respond to the need of diverse learning needs and providing quality inclusion settings. For policy writers, the enlightenment of knowledge regarding the consequences of the five types of leadership authorities and how to ensure language in future policies encourage moral and professional authority. For higher education, and contributors of professional development the results of my research provide an understanding on best practices for effective leadership when leading inclusive learning environments.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

This study examines landmark federal inclusive education policies and the extent Sergiovanni’s (1992) professional and moral leadership authorities are present. Since the beginning of public education policy in America, it has charged district and school leaders with providing an equal education to all students, regardless of learning ability. It was in 1965 when President Lyndon B. Johnson signed off on the first federal policy, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which governed public school K-12 education in the United States. The main focus within this landmark policy was ensuring an equal opportunity for access to the general education curriculum for all students, ultimately calling for inclusive learning environments. In updated versions of ESEA there continues to be calls for inclusive learning environments that leaders are directly responsible to lead and ensure equity for all learners. Another landmark federal policy, Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142), promotes students with disabilities to educated within the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). The intention of the inclusive learning models and the LRE is to help ensure all students, regardless of their learning ability, have equal access to the general education curriculum. Students with disabilities benefit from inclusive learning and per federal policy, it is their right to be educated with their general education peers.
Over the course of the past 50 years, federal policies have been adopted that protect students with disabilities. These policies direct schools to ensure all students who qualify for special education, to the fullest extent possible, are included in the general education environment. Policies require leaders to establish inclusive learning environments and ensure students receiving special education services are educated in the LRE. All major federal policies including those in place to protect students with disabilities, are considered in this study in order to determine the extent professional and moral authorities as described by Sergiovanni (1992) are present. Policies used in this study will be discussed further in forthcoming sections of this paper.

It is important to realize the extent of diverse learning abilities in our public school system to understand the high level of responsibility leaders have. Approximately 50.7 million students enrolled in public schools in the Fall of 2018 (National Center for Education Statistics, n.d.). During the 2017-2018 school year, 14% or 7 million students received special education services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (Children and Youth With Disabilities, 2019). To help create equitable learning opportunities for all students, federal educational policy mandates public schools consider and implement strategies that gear learning environments to be inclusive. Ensuring an equitable education for all students is a significant undertaking and requires educational leaders who are compelled to embrace diverse learner needs. However, to what extent does inclusive educational federal policy prescribe leadership styles or authorities that possibly should be practiced by district and school leaders? Specifically, to what extent are professional and moral authorities as written about by Thomas Sergiovanni (1992), evident within inclusive educational federal policies?
Statement of the Problem

The role of administrators is as important as it is vast with many assigned roles, responsibilities, and duties. In alignment with the increased number of students attending our public schools, is the escalation of diverse learner ability. The percentage of students receiving special education services increased from 13% in 2012 to 14% in 2017 (Characteristics of Public School Teachers, 2018). Federal policies charge educational leaders with providing equitable and inclusive learning opportunities that help support all students, regardless of their learning ability. Yet, research is markedly limited regarding what federal inclusive education policies say about leadership styles, specifically characteristics related to Sergiovanni’s professional and moral leadership authorities. This enlightenment concerning the lack of guidance in the field of educational leadership practice, federal education policy, and inclusive learning methods is significant.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine the extent Sergiovanni’s professional and moral leadership authorities are evident in federal educational policies focusing on inclusive practices spanning from 1965 through 2016. Diverse learner ability is prevalent within our nation’s schools with 14 percent of students enrolled in public schools receiving services under The Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) (Children and Youth With Disabilities, 2019). The overall intention of IDEA is to provide students with disabilities a free and appropriate education (FAPE) (Hardman, 2006) in the most inclusive learning environment possible (McLeskey, Waldron & Redd, 2014). The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142) of 1975, No Child Left Behind (NCLB) of 2001, and most recently, Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015 are
additional legislation calling for the rights for all K-12 learners, regardless of their ability (Khazima, Doelger, & Hynes, 2019).

School leaders play an important role in creating and carrying out a vision for inclusive schools. Knowing how to create an inclusive learning environment to address the needs of all learners, regardless of ability is essential (Theoharis & Causton, 2014). In accordance with federal policy, educational leaders are charged with addressing the needs of all students within their districts and schools, helping to ensure learner success for all children, regardless of their ability to learn. I conducted a comprehensive document analysis to determine the extent professional and moral leadership authorities are referenced in landmark federal inclusive education policies ranging over 51 years, 1956 through 2016. Sergiovanni’s (1992) five sources of authority for leadership will be utilized as the conceptual framework to analyze inclusive federal education policy commencing with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and continuing through the ratification of Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2016. A detailed explanation of Sergiovanni’s sources of leadership authority is found in the literature review.

**Research Question**

The research question for this qualitative study will focus on landmark federal inclusive education policy and leadership authority, specifically Sergiovanni’s (1992) five leadership authorities with an emphasis on professional and moral authorities. The research question that will guide this study is:
● To what extent are the Sergiovanni’s professional and moral leadership authorities evident in inclusive educational policies spanning from 1965 through 2016?

**Significance of the Study**

Our public school and district leaders have extensive responsibilities, obligations, and roles throughout the course of every school day. Our country is growing and becoming increasingly more diversified, which includes a wide array of learner abilities. Public elementary and secondary school enrollment increased from 47.2 million to 50.4 million between fall 2000 and fall 2015 and is projected to continue increasing to 52.1 million in fall 2027 (Indicator 6: Elementary and Secondary Enrollment, 2019). The percentage of students enrolled in our public schools served by federally supported special education programs was 7.0 million, or 14% of all public school students. This is an astronomical number and an extensive undertaking for our educational leaders. Federal policies mandate public schools to offer inclusive learning environments and opportunities equal access to the general education curriculum for all students, regardless of ability. Leadership has a significant impact on student learning and leaders are tasked with ensuring every student receives an equitable opportunity to learn in meaningful ways, regardless of learner ability.

Present day district and school leaders must hold the skill set on how to lead inclusive learning environments. I am seeking to determine the extent Sergiovanni’s (1992) professional and moral leadership authorities are evident in federal educational policies focusing on inclusive practices. This will help enlighten school and district leaders regarding leadership virtues required to serve diverse learning environments. The
findings of this research study will also inform professional development, higher education, and formulation of educational policy pertaining to inclusive learning environments and needed leadership qualities. The timeliness of this research study is noteworthy given that research as recently as 2017 is bringing attention to the connection between policy and leadership. Young, Winn, and Reedy (2017) claim the time is ripe for examining the treatment of educational leadership within federal policy. I believe gaining knowledge of what policy is saying about leadership authorities in relation to inclusive learning environments will ultimately benefit all learners, regardless of their ability to learn. Currently there is limited research in the combined areas of leadership authority, specifically professional and moral and federal inclusive educational policy. However, this gap in research is an opportunity for new areas of study that could help guide leadership practices supporting inclusive learning environments for all students, regardless of ability. Thus, making this research project significant in the area of inclusive policy and school and district leadership.

**Conceptual Framework**

Sergiovanni’s (1992) five sources of authority for leadership is being utilized as the conceptual framework for this study. Mullen (2009) identifies Sergiovanni the shepherd, “exercises spiritual care over a community.” His theories of school community, moral leadership, and school improvement are world renowned. I will analyze federal inclusive policies through the lens of bureaucratic, psychological, technical, professional and moral authorities then determine the extent professional and moral authorities are evident. What I like in particular about them is the wide-ranging leadership styles and practices found within the framework. Each source of authority
presents strategies for school leadership. All five sources of authority render a variety of assumptions regarding teachers’ capacities, upholds implications for supervisory practices, and predicts potential consequences for leadership practices. A more comprehensive explanation of Sergiovanni’s authorities is found in Chapter II and in Chapter III I will explain how they will be utilized in data analysis for this study.

**Overview of Methodology**

Researchers must identify methods for collecting data that are efficient, practical, feasible and ethical (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). In reviewing the research question formulated, reflection was lent to the types of data that would be collected, analyzed, and interpreted. Hence, a qualitative study of conducting a comprehensive document analysis of inclusive education policies served to guide the methodology. According to Bowen (2009, as cited in Miller & Salinas, 2019), a document analysis is a procedure in which both paper and electronic documents are analyzed. A document may contain words and varies in format from websites, agendas, and journals. Document analysis is a research method that is straightforward, efficient, cost-effective, and manageable. Researcher availability to documents usually at little or no cost, is its major advantage. Since contact with human subjects is avoided, processes for ethical approval that can sometimes cause delays is avoided (Cardno, 2018).

Leadership capability includes the skill set of document analysis and it is critical for educational leaders to develop and refine the skills of practical policy analysis. Educational leaders need to be able to look behind the policy to know what forces brought it into being; review the history of the policy to know how it was constructed; and most importantly, evaluate the way it is working to achieve its stated purposes.
(Cardno, 2018). For the current study, I analyzed federal inclusive education policies for leadership qualities related to Sergiovanni’s (1992) five sources of leadership authority, particularly professional and moral authorities.

Document analysis is best suited for qualitative research to “elicit meaning, gain understanding, and develop empirical knowledge” (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 377, as cited in Miller & Salinas, 2019). The utilization of document analysis for this study included analyzing landmark federal inclusive educational policies to determine the extent leadership practices are mentioned, specifically related to Sergiovanni’s (1992) professional and moral authorities. A systematic approach to the document analysis in this study included a four step process: (1) confirm which federal educational policies would be examined; (2) determine keywords linked to district and school leadership to be used for analyzing policies; (3) scan policies for pre-determined keywords and transcribe statements; (4) code policy statements by comparing and contrasting the leadership statements to Sergiovanni’s five sources of leadership authorities. Details on the coding process is presented in Chapter IV.

Limitations

This study attempts to gather data on the extent Sergiovanni’s (1992) professional and moral leadership authorities are evident in federal inclusive educational policies spanning from 1965 through 2016. However, there may be potential limitations to this study. The first conceivable limitation may exist in relation to this study being monoperational with document analysis used as the exclusive research method. Document analysis, a qualitative research method adds rigor to a study and is frequently chosen as a second or supplementary means of data collection but is seldom the sole method unless it
is utilized in ethnographic, linguistic or historical research (Cardno, 2018). However, document analysis lies in its usefulness as a stand-alone method for specialized forms of qualitative research (Bowen, 2009, p. 29, as cited in Cardno, 2018). Since I is interested exclusively in the review of federal policies starting in 1965 and spanning through to 2016, document analysis is relevant used as a solitary method. This study could be replicated using Sergiovanni’s (1992) five sources for leadership as a conceptual framework to analyze additional government documents pertaining to leadership, policy, and inclusion. This same method can be applied to other topics where evidence is extracted from public documents, consequently validating the limitation is slight.

The final limitation is that there is an overwhelming amount of research in the area of educational leadership including broad topics, theories and concepts regarding best practices and styles. The positive side of having such a large amount of research is one can find almost any topic out there relating to educational leadership. The literature can be cumbersome without a particular framework to guide one’s research. When researching educational leadership I found that Sergiovanni’s (1992) five sources of leadership authorities encompass many aspects of other leadership theories and concepts found in literature. The conceptual framework categorizes leadership practices under the source, assumptions, strategies, and consequences. Sergiovanni’s five sources of authority as a conceptual framework identifies key dimensions for educational leadership practices. It allows direction to guide inquiry on the types of leadership styles federal inclusive educational policy may call for.

Although there are plausible limitations to this study, it is a well-timed examination of educational leadership in relation to inclusive federal policy. Leadership
plays a critical role in supporting one of the key goals of ESSA: educational equity (Young et al., 2017). Studies have shown that one of the most critical school-level factors impacting students’ education is leadership (Coelli & Green, 2012; Grissom & Loeb, 2011; Leithwood, Seashore, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008, as cited in Young et al., 2017). Part of achieving federal educational policy goals involves spotlighting the importance of addressing leadership within the policies (Young et al., 2017).

To help determine the extent professional and moral leadership authorities are called for within landmark educational policies, a document analysis will be completed. Cardno (2018) shares that document analysis lends itself in being straightforward, efficient, cost-effective and manageable. Document analysis is appropriate for my research study of determining the extent Sergiovanni’s (1992) professional and moral leadership authorities are evident in inclusive educational policies spanning from 1965 through 2016.

**Organization of Dissertation**

The proposed organization of the dissertation will be laid out as follows:

In Chapter I, I introduce my topic and present the blueprint for my dissertation. It provides the reader with the focus and the context in which it is framed. The research question is presented and the content of the overview provides the rationale for the study. I give insight into my methodology including steps in data analysis.

In Chapter II, I present a review of the relevant literature related to my research question. An overview of federal educational inclusive policy is provided so that a comprehensive understanding of each one is attained. A review of the intersection of
leadership authority and inclusive policy is given. Also, an examination of what is currently known about the intersection of leadership authority and inclusive learning environments is presented. Finally, information on Sergiovanni’s (1992) five leadership authorities as a conceptual framework is provided.

In Chapter III, I present the methodology I will utilize to collect and analyze data for this study. I describe the research design and sources that will be used in the study. Policies used in the document analysis are explained in regards to their guidance on inclusive learning environments. The conceptual framework will be explained including how it will be utilized as a lens to systematically and meaningfully sort through data retrieved from federal policies. In conclusion, validity will be discussed and what aspects make this research study valid.

In Chapter IV I present the finding of my study. The importance of this study is revealed by the findings of leadership authority and the impact policy has on determining what type is practiced in our public schools. I summarize the data collection process and how contextual evidence from federal policies was coded in accordance to Sergiovanni’s five leadership authorities.

Finally, in Chapter V I provide interpretation and recommendations of the findings of my study. I also discuss the relationship of the findings to the research question, the conceptual framework. I also present an analysis of the strengths and limitations of my study. I conclude with recommendations for future research, offering a rationale why my study is an important contribution to new knowledge and how it advances practice.
Key Terms

Accommodation: An alteration of the environment, curriculum format, or equipment that allows an individual with a disability to pursue a regular course of study and/or complete assigned tasks. Within a classroom, accommodations take the form of physical or environmental changes, such as changing the timing, setting, formatting, response, or presentation of material.

Differentiation: Refers to a wide variety of teaching techniques and lesson adaptations that educators use to instruct a diverse group of students, with diverse learning needs, in the same course, classroom, or learning environment.

Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE): According to IDEA (2004), a FAPE must (a) be provided at public expense, (b) meet the standards of the state educational agency, (c) include an appropriate preschool, elementary, or secondary school education, and (d) conform with the individualized education program (IEP).

Inclusion: Is when all students, regardless of any challenges they may have, are placed in age-appropriate general education classes that are in their own neighborhood schools to receive high-quality instruction, interventions, and supports that enable them to meet success in the core curriculum (Alquraini & Gut, 2012).

Least Restrictive Environment (LRE): Is part of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). IDEA says that children who receive special education should learn in the least restrictive environment. This means they should spend as much time as possible with peers who do not receive special education.

Modifications: Describe very fundamental changes in the curriculum. They may include altering the standard expectations for a course or assessment, as the student may
be unable to learn all of the material, or particular portions of the material presented.
Within the classroom, modifications can include shortening assignments or providing texts that are easier to read.

Multiple Tiered Support Services (MTSS): is an umbrella framework that includes Response to Intervention (RTI) and Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS) frameworks. All students receive core instruction, otherwise known as Tier One. There is the likelihood that some students need supplemental instruction, which is referred to as Tier Two, and a small number of students may receive the most intensive intervention and supports, known as Tier Three. This tiered system is used for academic support as well as behavioral (Utley & Obiakor, 2015).

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS): is an evidence-based three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day. PBIS creates schools where all students succeed (Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, 2019).

Response to Intervention (RtI): “Response to Intervention (RtI) is the practice of providing high-quality instruction and interventions matched to student needs, monitoring progress frequently to make decisions about changes in instruction or goals and applying child response data to important educational decisions” (NASDSE, 2005).

Special Education: A broad term that describes the education of students who have intellectual, physical, behavioral or emotional disabilities. Special education involves specially designed instruction tailored to the unique needs of each child, and is provided at no cost to parents.
Universal design for learning (UDL): Universal design for learning (UDL) is a framework to improve and optimize teaching and learning for all people based on scientific insights into how humans learn (CAST: About Universal Design for Learning, 2018).
CHAPTER II
INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter II presents a literature review related to landmark federal inclusive education policy and leadership authority. Leadership matters and today’s educational leaders more than ever, are tasked with providing inclusive learning opportunities for all students, including those with disabilities. Federal education policies guide public school leaders as to what requirements must be adhered to in regards to inclusive practices. Federal policies with an emphasis on special education require student placement be within the least restrictive environment (LRE). Inclusive environments may be structured through a framework that promotes flexible learning so that learner variability is addressed. These inclusive practices will be examined in this lit review.

School leaders play a critical role in creating safe and accepting environments as well as directing the learning for all students (Minkos et al., 2017). What is unknown are the desired leadership strategies, practices, and actions called for within federal inclusive educational policy spanning from 1965 through 2016. This literature review examines sources related to inclusive educational policy during this time period and Sergiovanni’s (1992) five leadership authorities. Sergiovanni’s leadership authorities serves as the conceptual framework for this study. Analysis of Bureaucratic, Psychological, Technical Rational, Professional, and Moral authorities will provide the reader with a better understanding of each.
Inquiry into our country’s educational learner variability reveals we currently have approximately 7.0 million students in our public schools with a disability that impacts their learning. This number is up from 6.3 million in 2000-01 (Children and Youth With Disabilities, 2019). Confirmation of the vast number of students requiring flexible inclusive learning opportunities reinforces why it is important for leaders to possess the knowledge, skills, and strategies for adapting their leadership practices. Given we have more than 14% of students attending public schools who qualify for special education, the time is now to determine what leadership practices policy asserts educational leaders need for leading inclusive learning environments.

This literature review presents an inquiry into previous research that is directly related to the research question for this study, “To what extent are the Sergiovanni’s professional and moral leadership authorities evident in inclusive educational policies spanning from 1965 through 2016?” An overview of federal educational inclusive policy including history, major policies, significance, and inclusive learning models is provided. To gain a better understanding of leadership authority, including history, significance, and Sergiovanni’s (1992) leadership authorities an examination of these will be presented. Next, an exploration into the intersection of leadership authority and inclusive policy is investigated. This review provides an examination of what is currently known about the intersection of leadership authority and inclusive learning environments. More detailed information on Sergiovanni’s five leadership authorities as a conceptual framework will be offered. To conclude Chapter II, a summary of the literature review will be presented.
Federal Educational Inclusive Policy

History of Inclusive Policy

Although education is primarily a state and local responsibility in the United States (U.S.), federal policies drive the functions of our public schools. In 1876 the U.S. Department of Education (Department) was created in order to collect information on schools and teaching related to what works, and help States establish effective school systems. Since that time to the present, the Department has remained committed to its official mission: “to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access” (Federal Role in Education, 2017).

Since the federal government had no direct authority to govern the area of the K-12 education system for America’s first 176 years, the governing of public education was left to the individual states and local governments. The federal government’s role was seen more as a “junior partner” one, merely assisting with financing and the operation of public schools (Wirt & Kirst, 2005 p. 282, as cited in Mavrogordato, 2012). During the 1950’s and 1960’s the federal government started to play a more active role in policy development to guide the education for all students, particularly those traditionally underserved and those with special educational needs (Mavrogordato, 2012). On April 11, 1965 the first federal law governing education was signed by President Lyndon B. Johnson. In response to growing poverty and inequity in our education system, President Johnson, a former Texas teacher, endorsed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) into law (El Moussaoui, 2017). The 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was one of the most significant legislative accomplishments in twentieth-
century American politics (Casalaspi, 2017). In 1975 another groundbreaking policy, The All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142), was passed and it broadened the commitment to students with disabilities (Thirty-five Years of Progress in Educating Children With Disabilities Through IDEA, 2010). PL 94 142 sought to meaningfully include students with disabilities in general education classrooms helping to ensure equal access to an education (S. 6 (94th): Education For All Handicapped Children Act). Both ESEA and P.L. 94-142 are landmark policies that have been renewed over the years and will be discussed in greater detail in forthcoming sections.

The federal government continues today to have a tremendous impact on school funding and policy. They have become keepers of data related to most aspects of education including learning, student demographics, teachers, leaders, and special education. It is through federal policy that guides each state to adhere to the regulations that help to ensure an equitable education for all students, regardless of learner ability. From 1965 to the present, federal education policies are in place to help ensure underserved student populations obtain the proper resources and special attention so they receive equitable educational opportunities (Young et al., 2017).

**Landmark Educational Inclusive Policies**

Each landmark policy upholds their own particular level of mandates related to inclusive practices that leaders are responsible for. Major educational policies such as ESEA, PL 94-142 and their renewed versions relating to inclusive learning environments have played a significant role in helping to ensure all students have equal access to their education. Table 1 presents a timeline of the landmark federal inclusive educational policies examined in the literature review and utilized in the current study.
Table 1

Timeline of Landmark Federal Inclusive Educational Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>No Child Left Behind (NCLB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEIA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It all started in 1965 with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that authorized grants for elementary and secondary school programs for children of low-income families; school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials for school children; supplementary educational centers and services; strengthening state education agencies; and educational research and research training. This included the call for educational equity for all students including those with disabilities. ESEA was the first federal law requiring that students with disabilities (SWD) be provided an opportunity to participate in educational programming and services available to nondisabled peers (Scalise et al., 2018). ESEA was a landmark educational policy that extended the pursuit for learner equity in the United States.

Title I of ESEA was key in “securing additional funding to provide financial assistance… to expand and improve… educational programs by various means… which contribute particularly to meeting the special education needs of educationally deprived children” (Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 1965, as cited in Mavrogordato, 2012). Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act of 1966 allocated $25 million to
the states to help with programming for the handicapped children. Funds were also provided for research, teacher training, and other purposes brought the total to about $37 million (Boyer, 1979). Title VI, Part A of ESEA, allowed for states to receive federal grants in order to aid in the extension and improvement of programming for the education of handicapped children and related services at the preschool, elementary, and secondary school levels (Irvin, 1968).

To help ensure students with disabilities were granted access to a Free Appropriate Education (FAPE), the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142) was passed in 1975. FAPE within this context was measured by the Rowley decision. Rowley’s holding required students to receive a FAPE when “personalized instruction with sufficient support services to permit the handicapped child to benefit educationally from that instruction” (Rowley, 458 U.S. at 206, as cited in Kaufman & Blewett, 2016). Rowley says a school is not required to maximize a disabled student's educational outcome, but merely to provide and education “reasonably calculated” to provide “some educational benefit” as a baseline of educational services and instruction in order for the student with disabilities to advance from one grade to the next in a regular classroom setting (Kaufman & Blewett, 2016).

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142) provided that all handicapped children have available to them a free appropriate education (FAPE) designed to meet their unique needs. It mandated that each handicap student be educated in the least restrictive environment (LRE) whether that be a hospital, a state institution, private day, a public special education program, or a general education program (Boyer, 1979). The LRE concept within the discipline of education, is founded in the Education
for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142) (Stone, 2019). The language in P.L. 94-142 referencing students with disabilities being educated with general education peers read:

to the maximum extent possible, handicapped children ... are educated with children who are not handicapped, and ... removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. [20 U.S.C. 1412(5)(B)]

This section of the policy is referred to as the Least Restrictive Environment, or LRE, provision (McNulty, Connolly, Wilson, & Brewer, 1996). Section 612(5)(a) of IDEA when referencing the LRE asserts that students should be removed from the “regular educational environment” only when their needs cannot be met in that setting, even with the use of supplementary aids and services (Kurth et al., 2019). A provision of PL 94-142 related to this study is that students with disabilities are to be placed in the least restrictive environment- “one that allows the maximum possible opportunity to interact with non-impaired students.” Only when the severity of the disability is significant in that instructional goals cannot be achieved in the regular classroom, should separate schooling occur (Education For All Handicapped Children Act, 2019). PL 94-142 elaborates and gives detailed information regarding Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the educational guarantees for school-aged children. Boyer (1979) shares the law’s requirements that all public funded school districts must follow regarding children 6-17:
• Make all reasonable efforts to locate handicapped children and give the most severely disabled priority.

• Evaluate the learning needs of each child, in consultation with parents and special education advisor, and develop an individual education program to meet the needs of each child.

• Each child should be placed in the least restrictive environment possible, regardless if this is a hospital, a state institution, a private day school, a public school special education program, or a regular classroom of the setting needed.

• The child’s progress will be evaluated periodically and changes in programming will be changed upon agreement with the help of parents and specialists.

• In order for parents to challenge the school decisions procedures for impartial hearing, appeal, and other due process will be set up.

Our quest for equity and quality is about helping every child - the handicapped, the disadvantaged, the gifted, and the average - develop to the fullest his or her interests and abilities (Boyer, 1979). Boyer stresses that the critical aspect of PL 94-142 is the intention to support schools equity and quality in education to the students requiring extra care, attention, and understanding than others.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1997 (IDEA) contains several key amendments to PL 94-142 that emphasized providing all students with access to the same curriculum (Timeline of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, n.d.). Two major principles were emphasized in IDEA 97: Educational outcomes for students with
disabilities should be akin to those students without disabilities, and students with disabilities should be educated with their nondisabled peers (Lipsky & Gartner, 1998).

The goals of inclusion are driven by the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) requirement within IDEA and is defined as:

to the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities . . . are educated with children who are not disabled; and special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability of a child is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. (IDEA, 2004, Sec. 300.114)

As in PL 94-142, IDEA 1997 requires that a student’s removal from general education into a more restrictive learning environment must be justified. However, the IDEA 1997 goes even further by emphasizing that the general education curriculum is presumed to be the appropriate beginning point for planning an IEP for a student (Yell & Shriner, 1997).

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) amendments of 1997 indicate the right of children with disabilities to receive a free appropriate public education (FAPE). IDEA also placed responsibility on the school systems to build their capacity to respond to student diversity (Crockett, 1999). The review of research regarding the IDEA 1997 leaves no doubt the importance of inclusive education and the fact schools are required to ensure students with disabilities are to be educated in the LRE.

In 2002 No Child Left Behind (NCLB) provided for the comprehensive re-authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, incorporating specific proposals in such areas as testing, accountability, parental choice, and early
reading (Legislation - General - Policy, n.d.). The NCLB Act was significant in moving our nation forward in support of children in many respects. NCLB changed the focus on where students were making progress and where they needed additional support, regardless of race, income, zip code, disability, home language, or background [Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) | U.S. Department of Education, n.d.].

According to Kaufman and Blewitt (2012), NCLB marked a major shift in educational policy. Districts and schools were now being held accountable for student growth measured by standards. This new accountability requirement was directly tied to federal and state funding. Public schools were mandated to create “statistically valid and reliable” reports of “adequate yearly progress” (AYP), part of a process that “results in continuous and substantial academic achievement for all students” (Kaufman & Blewitt, 2012). Statistical disaggregation was required for students who were economically disadvantaged, from major racial and ethnic groups, with limited English proficiency, and with disabilities. These groups, like the general education student population must make AYP on a state exam or the district risked losing federal funding to some degree (Kaufman & Blewitt, 2012). Assessment and accountability provisions in NCLB explicitly sought out increased attention to groups of students who traditionally were underperforming, specifically taking into account those with disabilities. Schools were held accountable for how well students with disabilities performed in relation to the goals on their Individual Educational Plan (IEP) as well as their performance in the general education curriculum (Darrow, 2016).

In 2004 the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act was renewed and the word “improvement” was inserted, making the official title of the legislation the
“Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act.” However, the law is still referred to as IDEA. Several significant changes were included in the reauthorization (Smith, 2005). Consistent with NCLB, IDEA 2004 puts an emphasis on increasing educational outcomes for students with disabilities. This should be achieved through greater opportunity for receiving instruction within general education classes (Handler, 2006). IDEA 2004 states:

*that the education of children with disabilities can be made more effective by having high expectations for such children and ensuring their access to general education in the regular classroom to the maximum extent possible to meet the developmental goals and, to the maximum extent possible, the challenging expectations that have been established for all children.* (IDEA 04)

It is apparent that a key factor of IDEA is the extension into general education, thus raising the level of inclusive environment within our public schools.

ESSA was a long overdue reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), which was our nation’s original federal legislative effort to demonstrate a “longstanding commitment to equal opportunity for all students” (Sharp, 2016). The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was signed by President Barack Obama on December 10, 2015, reauthorizing the 50-year-old Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) which ensures a commitment to equal opportunity for all students. ESSA replaces the most recent version of the law, the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, which was enacted in 2002 (“Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) | U.S. Department of Education,” n.d.-c). The U.S. Department of Education (Department) collaborated with State educational agencies (SEAs) from all states to develop a consolidated plan
template. This template was designed to ensure the plan’s fidelity and give guidance to the SEAS for implementation. State plans were to be submitted to the Department by either April 3, 2017, or September 18, 2017.

ESSA was a bipartisan measure that reauthorized the 50-year-old Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the nation’s national education law and longstanding commitment to equal opportunity for all students. ESSA includes provisions that will help to ensure success for students and schools [“Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) | U.S. Department of Education,” n.d.-b]. Hirsh (2010) shared President Obama’s Blueprint for Reform, which detailed the President’s vision for the reauthorization of ESEA. His plan included five pillars of reform:

1. College and career-ready students
2. Great teachers and leaders in every school
3. Equity and opportunity for all students
4. Raise the bar and reward excellence
5. Promote innovation and continuous improvement

**Significance of Inclusive Policy**

All students, regardless of their ability to learn deserve a high quality education and have the right to be educated within inclusive environments. Mavrogordato (2012) argues that the surge of federal government involvement in the 1950’s and 1960’s was the result of courts embracing the belief that all students should have equal access to educational resources. Congressional legislation asserted some students require additional resources to compensate for inequalities among individuals (Yudof, 1984). Schools are held accountable through the governing laws put in place to protect students with
disabilities. Federal policies are the avenue that school districts across our nation must follow and mandate service all students within inclusive learning environments.

Throughout the years educational policies have proven to be significant in that they place equity at the forefront and assure students have equal access to an education (Nelson, 2016).

**Inclusive Learning**

The learner variability in our schools is vast. Over the course of the past 50 or so years policy has named inclusive practices meant to meet the learning needs for all students, even those with disabilities. Inclusive learning models have emerged to help schools provide equitable access to the curriculum for all students. To understand the vast responsibility leaders have in relationship to inclusive learning it helps to realize the wide-range of learner ability in our public schools.

Most recently, statistics show that in 2017-18, the number of students, ages 3-21 who received special education services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) was 7.0 million, or 14 percent of all public school students (Children and Youth With Disabilities, 2019). To help support the diverse learning needs of all students, models for inclusive learning environments play a major role in our public schools. An examination of three inclusive practices educational leaders may be responsible is presented.

**Universal Design for Learning**

The roots of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) are in architecture and urban planning. Ramps, automatic doors and elevators were designed to provide access for people with physical disabilities, but they actually make it easier for all people. All
learners can benefit from UDL by teachers planning for a variety of ways learners’ minds are stimulated and how they learn (Hunt & Andreasen, 2011). UDL is about improved access for everyone, and now this framework has come to teaching and learning. UDL improves educational outcomes for all students by ensuring meaningful access to the curriculum within an inclusive learning environment. The goal of UDL is to use a variety of teaching methods to remove any barriers to learning and give all students equal opportunities to succeed. It’s about building in flexibility that can be adjusted for every student’s strengths and needs (Hunt & Andreasen, 2011).

UDL has been referenced in policy, including the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA; 2004), Higher Education Opportunities Act (HEOA; 2008), and most recently in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA; 2015). For example ESSA calls for using UDL as a framework for the development and application of alternate assessments, for comprehensive literacy instruction, and when utilizing technology options to support the learning needs of all students. (Smith et al., 2019). When studying technology for students receiving special education services Edyburn (2013) noted that the Obama administration required states to include UDL in their implementation plans of ESSA as a means to close the achievement gap. Pisha and Stahl (2005) point out the increased accountability called for in NCLB has prompted educators to seek solutions to rigidity in core instructional materials so that they are able to reach a wide range of learners. One way to do this is through the use of Universal Design for Learning. UDL accentuates intentional and proactive design that takes into account learner variability. When educators design learning with UDL in mind, curriculum and instruction are more accessible to students with and without disabilities (Smith et al., 2019).
Response to Intervention

Initially, the Response to Intervention (RtI) process starts with applying best practices in instruction and universal screening of all children in the general education classroom. Students who fail to meet the local norms are to receive interventions at increasing levels of intensity to accelerate their rate of learning. The students’ progress in then carefully monitored to assess both the learning rate and level of performance of individual students. The intention of RTI is to support educational decisions in both regular and special education by using a well-integrated instructional approach and intervention guided by child outcome data (National Center for Learning Disabilities, Inc., 2008). The following components are necessary for RTI to be successful:

- High-quality, scientifically based classroom instruction
- Ongoing student assessment
- Tiered instruction
- Parent involvement

RtI is a multi-tiered approach to help struggling learners. Students’ progress is closely monitored at each stage of intervention to determine the need for further research-based instruction and/or intervention in general education, in special education, or both (National Center for Learning Disabilities, Inc., 2008). The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA, 2004) supports “Response to Intervention” (RtI) which is a method of providing early intervention to all children at risk for school failure. Preceding practice promoted practitioners using an IQ-achievement discrepancy to identify children with learning disabilities (LD) (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006).
**Multiple Tier System of Support**

Multiple Tier System of Support (MTSS) is defined as a framework for continuous improvement that is systemic, prevention-focused, and data-informed, providing a coherent continuum of supports responsive to meet the needs of all learners (Smith et al., 2019). Educational leaders agree that district level leadership is absolutely necessary in order for a MTSS to be successful (Freeman, Miller, & Newcomer, 2015). Maras, Thompson, Lewis, Thornburg, and Hawks (2015) shared that school context is extremely important with any change efforts. Awareness of the unique context of the leader’s role of learning communities, putting MTSS into practice will allow educators, both teachers and administrators to enhance their knowledge of successful implementation. MTSS is derived from RtI therefore, it is vital to understand the background and its origin.

Multiple Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is an umbrella framework that includes Response to Intervention (RtI) and Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS) frameworks. Where every student receives core instruction, known as Tier One. Some students need supplemental instruction, which is referred to as Tier Two, and a small cohort of students receive the most intensive intervention and supports, known as Tier Three. This tiered system is used for academic support as well as behavioral (Utley & Obiakor, 2015)

**Leadership Authority**

**History of Leadership Authority**

In my investigation into leadership authority I traced literature as far back as the 1930’s. According to Freud (1939) as cited in Velasco (2012) it is during childhood that
the need for authority figures develops from the deep desire for a father. Throughout the years upon examination of authority the foundations have evolved depending the type of relationship between leaders and followers within the organization. According to Burns (as cited in Sergiovanni, 1990), authority is the power validated by tradition, law, agreements, religion, and the rights of succession.

Authority can be discerned in levels in a sense ranging from force to coercion. For example, Kelley, Thornton, and Daugherty (2005) established that school principals use their authority by maintaining a positive school climate then in turn impacting academic performance. They assert that school leaders must anticipate the teachers’ needs and use their authority to empower them to be effective.

A successful leader seeks to empower others and be a leader of leaders. They are good followers also and are committed to ideas, values, and beliefs. Once followship is established moral authority becomes precedence over bureaucratic and psychological authorities (Sergiovanni, 1990). Sergiovanni believes that adding moral authority to your leadership practice will generate a remarkable commitment and performance in schools.

**Significance of Leadership Authority**

James and Hopkins (2003) present thoughts on leadership authorities and believe many factors can enhance or diminish leadership authority. In their study of determining the authority levels of subject leaders, commonly known as department chairs, assert that their leadership authority was significant when leading. Leithwood, Jantzi and Steinbach (2001) contend the essence of leadership is to influence others. Leadership also encompasses responsibility lending then towards a level of authority. Knowing and understanding what level of authority to use by leaders is important and may play a factor
Obholzer (as cited in James & Hopkins, 2003) believes that full authority is not achievable because of the extensive amount of varied interests of the involved stakeholders. It is believed that full authority would not support autonomous actions, impair organisational functioning and reduce the scope for both individual and community learning and would be undesirable. There will always be competing interactions between accountability and authority (Jams & Vince, 2001, as cited in James & Hopkin, 2003). This is where the delicate balance exists of knowing the level of authority a leader should exhibit.

**Overview of Sergiovanni’s Five Leadership Authorities**

Sergiovanni (1992) shares that many educational leaders lead by sense experience and intuition. However, these bases for leadership are not considered acceptable as sources of official management values. He believes that in the general practice of leadership sacred authority and emotion is common, but have no clout within educational perceptions of management. Leadership based on values is strictly unofficial in the field of education. Sergiovanni deemed sacred authority to be based on a covenant of shared values bonding people together in a common cause, transforming an organization into a community. If sense experience, intuition, acceptance of sacred authority, and emotion had greater value within the arena of educational leadership and equal to secular authority, science and deductive logic value systems supporting management theory and practices of leadership would blossom into a new kind of leadership, one based on moral authority. Moral authority can transform schools into communities where stakeholders hold a high level of devotion and schools will be held in high regard (p. 16).
The basic method of getting things done in a school is by means of bureaucratic authority. Bureaucratic authority is based on the use of mandates, rules, regulations, and expectations. Teachers respond by complying or they will face the consequences (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 30). An alternative leadership style described by Sergiovanni is psychological authority, based on the concept of “follow me because I will make it worth your while if you do.” Leaders want teachers to respond to their personality and perhaps the comfortable environment provided, thus demonstrating desired behavior then receiving rewards made available. Another source of authority, technical-rational, relies on “follow me because I have been trained in the research and know what is best, as determined by this research.” Leaders expect teachers to conform to what is considered to be true (p. 31). These three authorities are considered by Sergiovanni to be forms of “follow me” leadership and are essentially management-intensive. Under these leadership authorities people are compliant but are not committed thus schools will not work well. Instead Sergiovanni indicates two other sources of authority, professional and moral, as bases for leadership practice. Both authorities motivate people intrinsically verses from external rewards leading to schools working well and providing a high quality education to all students.

When a leader possesses seasoned craft knowledge and personal expertise professional authority is established. Teachers will respond to common socialization, accepted tenets of practice, and internalized expertise (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 31). The final source of authority Sergiovanni presents is moral authority. There is a deep sense of commitment to obligation and duties based on genuinely shared values, ideas, and ideals. Thus when moral authority is practiced teachers will respond to shared commitments and
felt interdependence (p. 31). Sergiovanni attests that when the latter two leadership authorities, professional and moral are primary, teachers follow the shared values and beliefs that define the school as a community and the ideals that define them as professionals. This is essentially because it is the moral thing to do because community and professional memberships are morally understood as duties and obligations. Instead of relying on expect and inspect forms of leadership, embracing a strong sense of professionalism and moral authority will guide schools reach their aspirations. The lens of Sergiovanni’s five leadership authorities are used as the conceptual framework for this study to identify the extent professional and moral authorities are evident in inclusive education policies.

**Leadership Authority and Inclusive Policy**

Since the passage of ESEA in 1965 leadership is referenced within inclusive educational policies. For example funds under Title VI of ESEA targeted supporting salaries and related costs of a variety of professional, technical, and supportive personnel that included qualified leadership personnel to assist in the extension and improvement of special education programs for the handicapped (Irvin, 1968). What is not known is what kind of leadership authority policy calls for. Educational leaders are to implement the various federal policies that include inclusionary language. For example, IDEA 1997 mandated that all students, regardless of ability should be learning in the least restrictive environment (LRE). Mandates of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 required that all students, even those with disabilities, to meet annual benchmarks. NCLB 2002 mandated all students to achieve proficiency by 2014 and that all core subject teachers be highly qualified. These legal demands combined with potential sanctions for failing schools
changed the role of school administrators and more than ever required them to be effective leaders. These mandates along with other job demands have brought about much complexity to school leadership positions sometimes causing high levels of stress (Reynolds & O’Dwyer, 2008). Randall (1980, as cited in Reynolds and O’Dwyer, 2008) founded that school leaders with high levels of stress tend to create negative work environment, limiting the positive outcomes from the entire school. This research was conducted prior to the NCLB mandates, and it is felt that government accountability systems have only increased (Reynolds & O'Dwyer, 2008).

Educational leaders are assigned to creating inclusive learning environments helping to ensure equal access to learning. Federal educational policies generated a remarkable shift toward increased accountability for states, districts, schools, leaders, and teachers to ensure academic growth for students with disabilities. Also, policy has ensured students with disabilities were granted access to the general education curriculum. Danforth (2016) believes these federal mandates influence the thoughts and actions of educational leaders and leave them in peril on how to move forward.

Educational leaders are charged with implementing policy requirements calling for inclusive learning environments. However, what remains unknown is the type of leadership authority federal educational policies are calling for when leading inclusive learning environments. Sergiovanni (1992) asserts that leadership authority matters and it highly influences the workings of an organization, thus shaping what and how people think and feel.
Young et al. (2017) conducted a policy analysis using ProQuest Congressional to determine which flagship federal education legislation referenced school leadership. The following are the pieces of federal legislation they found to reference school leadership:

- Every Student Succeeds Act
- High higher Education Opportunity Act
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)
- No Child Left Behind Act
- Higher Education Amendments of 1998
- Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act
- Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988
- Higher Education Amendments of 1986

For each piece of federal educational legislation the researchers had a particular reference related to leadership. Please refer to Young et al. (2017), Table 2 for details on educational leadership focus of each piece of legislation including the legislation type and the year it was passed. The authors also noted that ESEA and subsequent reauthorizations and reauthorizations of the HEA and IDEA were the most relevant and carried the most substance with regards to pieces of federal legislation referencing school leadership.
### Table 2

**Flagship Federal Legislation Referencing School Leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation Type</th>
<th>Legislation Name</th>
<th>Year Passed</th>
<th>Educational Leadership Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every Student Succeeds Act</td>
<td>ESEA reauthorization</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>Optional “3% set aside” of Title II A funds for state-level activities and funding for “evidence-based” interventions around leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Opportunity Act</td>
<td>HEA reauthorization</td>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>Funding for partnership grants for the development of leadership programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)</td>
<td>IDEA reauthorization</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Providing personnel development grants and interdisciplinary training to support school leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Child Left Behind Act</td>
<td>ESEA reauthorization</td>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>SEA grants and LEA subgrants to support leadership (reform certification, induction/mentoring, professional development) and support for establishing a national principal recruitment program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Amendments of 1998</td>
<td>HEA reauthorization</td>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>Sense of Congress Declaration that leadership is important and support for partnerships between IHEs and K-12 schools to identify strong candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act</td>
<td>HEA reauthorization</td>
<td>1991-1992</td>
<td>Support for establishing state leader academies and professional development academies in each state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988</td>
<td>ESEA reauthorization</td>
<td>1987-1988</td>
<td>SEA grants and LEA subgrants to support leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Amendments of 1986</td>
<td>HEA reauthorization</td>
<td>1985-1986</td>
<td>Grants to “collect information on school leadership skills”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. From Young et al., 2017.*

Young et al. (2017) examine the attention federal policy has devoted to educational leadership. Even though the main focus of their study included ESSA, the
most recent update of the original ESEA, they gave an overview of flagship federal educational policies. They were interested in the level of importance these policies were to leadership and the influence they had on leaders achieving the goals laid out within policy. Upholding educational leadership and the development of leaders is essential for one very important reason, leadership matters. Young et al. believe noting leadership within federal policy is vital to achieving federal education policy goals. They believe the time is now for determining the treatment of educational leadership within federal policy in order to emphasize its importance. They assert that federal education legislation has left out the important topic of educational leadership. However, they allege that more recent federal policy such as ESSA has more of an emphasis on educational leadership and it is gaining appreciation therefore, more attention is necessary. This revelation gives even more credibility to my current study of analyzing more comprehensively federal educational policy and determining the type of leadership authorities called for to lead inclusive learning environments.

**Leadership Authority and Inclusion Learning**

Searches for peer reviewed material via Education Research Complete were performed using key words related to inclusion and leadership authority. Literature related specifically to leadership authority and inclusive learning environments was unfounded in my review. However, to gain a better understanding in general of leading inclusive environments a review of literature was conducted on leadership and inclusive learning. Special attention was given to any suggestion of leadership style that may be attributed to inclusive learning for students.
Lipsky and Gartner (1998) shared a study conducted by the National Center on Educational Restructuring and Inclusion (NCERI) that identified seven factors for the successful implementation of inclusive education. One of the factors is there must be visionary leadership. This leadership can originate from various positions such as school superintendents, building administrators, teachers, parents, school board members, disability advocates, and universities. It is essential that all stakeholders associated with inclusion must ultimately take responsibility for the outcome.

Literature conveys that various leadership strategies are used by leaders when setting up and maintaining an inclusive environment. DeMatthews and Mawhinney (2013) discuss how some school districts with vocal educational leaders promote inclusive policy through advocacy work, publicly promoting the vision and the importance of inclusion. Leaders may establish organizational expectations and structures that support the implementation of effective inclusion programs in schools. A study by MacKenzie et al. (2011, as cited in DeMatthews & Mawhinney, 2013) found that the role of the superintendent played a vital role in stimulating inclusive learning for students with disabilities by developing relationships with stakeholders, sharing personal values publicly, and protecting school from political pressure. It was also found that it is important for other district leaders to maintain high learning expectations for all students, hold principals accountable for the learning of all students within their schools, and reorganize the central office administrative roles in order to better support schools. Other means of creating and leading inclusive learning environments include allowing higher autonomy for schools to create their own personalized inclusion plan instead of having to follow a mandated district plan. Finally, the researchers found that it was important for
leaders to recognize that quality inclusion requires effective teachers. Therefore, leaders need to provide both professional development and instructional support for teachers.

As the leader of a school, the building principal is the key person in the mainstreaming process (Davie, 1980, as cited in Schuster, 1985). When reviewing literature about PL 142-94 and the integration of handicapped students in the mainstream, one commonality shows that regular education administrators need to exhibit participative leadership (Ballard & Zettel, 1978; Bensky et al., 1980; Galloway, Schipper, & Wilson, 1978; Herda, 1980; McCoy, 1981; Rebore, 1979, as cited in Schuster, 1985).

Participative leadership is most congruent with the needs and knowledge of the involved individuals and will be most beneficial for open communication and mainstreaming (Schuster, 1985).

**Conceptual Framework**

I am seeking to discern to what extent leadership authority practices are evident in inclusive educational policy. For the purposes of this study Sergiovanni’s (1992) Five Leadership Authorities will serve as the lens to determine the meaning of leadership language in inclusive policy. Sergiovanni’s five sources of authority will serve as the conceptual framework for the document analysis which will be described in greater detail in Chapter III of this study.

As previously discussed, Sergiovanni (1992) established five sources of leadership authority including:

1. Bureaucratic Authority
2. Psychological Authority
3. Technical-Rational Authority
4. Professional Authority

5. Moral Authority

Bureaucratic authority exists in the form of mandates, rules, regulations, job descriptions, and expectations (p. 30). Table 3 shows the sources, assumptions, strategies, and consequences for Sergiovanni’s (1992) bureaucratic authority.

Table 3

**Bureaucratic Authority for Leadership**

| Bureaucratic authority sources | ● Hierarchy  
|                              | ● Rules and Regulations  
|                              | ● Mandates  
|                              | ● Role Expectation  
|                              | ● Teachers comply or face consequences  
| Assumptions When Use of this Source is Primary | ● Teachers are subordinates in a hierarchically arranged system  
|                              | ● Supervisors are trustworthy, but subordinates are not  
|                              | ● Goals and interests of teachers and supervisors are not the same, and supervisors must be watchful  
|                              | ● Hierarchy equals expertise, and so supervisors know more than teachers do  
|                              | ● External accountability works best  
| Leadership/Supervisory Strategy | ● “Expect and inspect” is the overarching rule  
|                              | ● Rely on predetermined standards, to which teachers must measure up  
|                              | ● Identify their needs and “inservice” them  
|                              | ● Directly supervise and closely monitor the work of teachers, to ensure compliance  
|                              | ● Figure out how to motivate them and get them to change  
| Consequences | ● With the proper monitoring, teachers respond as technicians, executing predetermined scripts, and their performance is narrowed  

Psychological authority is expressed in the form of motivational technology and human relation skills (p. 31). Table 4 shows the sources, assumptions, strategies, and consequences for Sergiovanni’s psychological authority.

Table 4

*Psychological Authority for Leadership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological Authority</th>
<th>Assumptions When Use of this Source is Primary</th>
<th>Leadership/Supervisory Strategy</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Motivation technology</td>
<td>● The goals and interests of teachers and supervisors are not the same but can be bartered so that each side gets what it wants</td>
<td>● Develop a school climate characterized by high congeniality among teachers and between teachers and supervisors</td>
<td>● Teachers respond as required when rewards are available, but not otherwise; their involvement is calculated and performance is narrowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>● Teachers have needs, and if they are met at work, the work gets done as required</td>
<td>● “Expect and reward”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Human relations</td>
<td>● Congenial relationships and a harmonious interpersonal climate make teachers content, easier to work with and more apt to cooperate</td>
<td>● “What gets rewarded gets done”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Leadership</td>
<td>● Supervisors must be experts in reading needs and in other people-handling skills, to barter successfully for compliance and increases in performance</td>
<td>● Use psychological authority in combination with bureaucratic and technical-rational authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical-rational authority focuses on “what is considered to be true” (p. 31).

Table 5 shows the sources, assumptions, strategies, and consequences for Sergiovanni’s (1992) technical-rational authority.

Table 5

*Technical-Rational Authority for Leadership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical-rational authority</th>
<th>Assumptions When Use of this Source is Primary</th>
<th>Leadership/Supervisory Strategy</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Evidence defined by logic and scientific research ● Teachers are required to comply in light of what is considered to be the truth</td>
<td>● Supervision and teaching are applied sciences ● Knowledge of research is privileged ● Scientific knowledge is superordinate to practice ● Teachers are skilled technicians ● Values, preferences, and beliefs do not count, but facts and objective evidence do</td>
<td>● Use research, to identify best practice ● Standardize the work of teaching, to reflect best way ● “Inservice” teachers in the best way ● Monitor the process, to ensure compliance ● Figure out ways to motivate and change them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions When Use of this Source is Primary</td>
<td>● Supervision and teaching are applied sciences ● Knowledge of research is privileged ● Scientific knowledge is superordinate to practice ● Teachers are skilled technicians ● Values, preferences, and beliefs do not count, but facts and objective evidence do</td>
<td>● Use research, to identify best practice ● Standardize the work of teaching, to reflect best way ● “Inservice” teachers in the best way ● Monitor the process, to ensure compliance ● Figure out ways to motivate and change them</td>
<td>● With proper monitoring teachers respond as technicians, executing predetermined steps; performance is narrowed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sergiovanni (1992) describes these first three authorities as “follow me” or management-intensive leadership. He recommends the final two sources of authority, professional and moral be used to base leadership practice (p. 31). Professional authority is comprised of seasoned craft knowledge and personal expertise (p. 31). Table 6 shows the sources, assumptions, strategies, and consequences for Sergiovanni’s professional authority.
### Table 6

**Professional Authority for Leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional authority</th>
<th>Assumptions When Use of this Source is Primary</th>
<th>Leadership/Supervisory Strategy</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Informed craft knowledge and personal expertise  
  • Teachers respond in light of common socialization, professional values, accepted tenets of practice, and internalized expertise | • Situations of practice are idiosyncratic, and no one best way exists  
  • Scientific knowledge and professional knowledge are different, with professional knowledge created in use teachers practice  
  • The purpose of scientific knowledge is to inform, not prescribe, practice  
  • Authority cannot be external but comes from the context itself and from within the teacher  
  • Authority from context comes from training and experience  
  • Authority from within comes from socialization and internalized values | • Promote a dialogue among teachers that explicitly states professional values and accepted tenets of practice  
  • Translate them into professional standards  
  • Give teachers as much discretion as they want and need  
  • Require teachers to hold one another accountable for meeting practice standards  
  • Make assistance, support, and professional development opportunities available | • Teachers respond to professional norms; their practice becomes collective, they require little monitoring, and their performance is expansive |

Moral authority, in the form of obligations and duties derived from widely shared values, ideas, and ideals. When leadership practice is based on moral authority, teachers can be expected to respond to shared commitments and felt interdependence.
(Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 31). Table 7 shows the sources, assumptions, strategies, and consequences for Sergiovanni’s moral authority.

Table 7

**Moral Authority for Leadership**

| Moral authority | ● Felt obligation and duties derived from widely shared community values, ideas and ideals  
|                 | ● Teachers respond to shared commitments and felt interdependence |
| Assumptions When Use of this Source is Primary | ● Schools are professional learning communities  
|          | ● Communities are defined by their centers of shared values, beliefs, and commitments  
|          | ● In communities, what is considered right and good is as important as what works and what is effective; people are motivated as much by emotion and beliefs as by self-interest; and collegiality is a professional virtue |
| Leadership/Supervisory Strategy | ● Identify and make explicit the values and beliefs that define the center of the school as a community  
|          | ● Translate them into informal norms that govern behavior  
|          | ● Promote collegiality as internally felt and morally driven interdependence  
|          | ● Rely on the ability of community members to respond to duties and obligations  
|          | ● Rely on the community’s informal norms to enforce professional and community values |
| Consequences | ● Teachers respond to community values for moral reasons; their practice becomes collective, and their performance is expansive and sustained |

Sergiovanni (1992) advises in order to operate as a successful learning community and realize shared goals, new bases of authority for leadership are required. The use of bureaucratic and psychological authority is not adequate. Instead he asserts leadership practices should reflect professional and moral authorities.
This study concentrates on examining major inclusive educational policies meant to help all students learn, regardless of ability. I am interested in determining the extent Sergiovanni’s (1992) professional and moral authorities are evident within inclusive policy. The lens of Sergiovanni’s five leadership authorities will be used in this study as the conceptual framework because it provides comprehensive descriptions of a wide range of leadership practices.

**Summary of the Literature Review**

Examination of the literature related to inclusive policy and leadership authority has confirmed the importance of this current research study. It is with confidence I can say policy impacts leadership responsibility and guides the work they must accomplish, which includes providing inclusive learning environments. Providing inclusive environments becomes even more urgent knowing the vast amount of diverse learners in our school and ensuring their individual learning needs are met in the LRE. I proclaim that leading inclusive learning environments is the new norm, thus making it essential to investigate what policy says about leadership authority. Though literature is plentiful related to education policy, it is scarce when leadership authority is included. This gap in literature may be attributed to the lack of research in this area. This research project may be able to provide meaningful data to fill that void.

Schools of every type should work to move forward and re-invigorate themselves. It is best for the managers and leaders of our educational agencies to remember that the world moves; that the former things are passing away, and that some things connected, even with our schools are, as they ought to be, assuming new
forms, and taking upon themselves, new tendencies. And it is high time that they should do so. (Author unknown, *The Journal of Education*, 1884)

This statement from the 19th century still holds a lot of meaning in present day public schools. As the total number of students attending our public school increases so does the number of students with a disability that impacts their learning. Leaders of our public schools must be willing to adapt as the world evolves and as the faces of our students change.

Federal policies require public schools to use inclusive learning practices in order to support all students, regardless of their learning ability. Educational leaders must move with the times and ensure all kids learn, regardless of their ability. But what type of leadership authority does federal educational policy advocate for that is advantageous to inclusive learning environments?

Chapter III describes the methodology used to find the answer to this important question. The conceptual framework of Sergiovanni’s (1992) five sources of authority will be used to examine inclusive education policy to determine the extent professional and moral authorities are evident.
CHAPTER III
METHODS

Introduction

Chapter III describes the research methodology and procedures used in this study. Document analysis as a qualitative method of inquiry is explained along with the rationale for utilizing it in this study. This chapter provides detailed information on the data sources including a thorough description of the federal education policies and the rationale for using them. An explanation is provided on the conceptual framework and how Sergiovanni’s (1992) five sources of authority for leadership will aid in data analysis. Finally, the validity regarding this current study is presented.

Document Analysis

The method I selected for this investigation is a qualitative document analysis design. Because the study proposes to investigate the extent professional and moral authorities are evident within inclusive policy, examining policy language in reference to leadership is necessary. Document analysis is a qualitative study method where the researcher examines documents or records relevant to a particular study. Public and private documents are sources of data that can be included in a document analysis (Schwandt, 2007). This study will be utilizing policies which are categorized as public documents to look for specific language related to educational leadership. Qualitative research methodology is often conducted through interviews, observations, and document
analyses. Interviews and observations would not be suitable to gain the primary information wanted in this study. However, to understand what policies say about leadership authority, document analysis is a highly appropriate source of data collection in relation to the research question in this study. The rationale for document analysis lies in its usefulness as a stand-alone method for specialised forms of qualitative research. (Bowen, 2009, p. 29, as cited in Cardno, 2018). Educational leaders must understand the extent of documentation that radiates from policy in the form of procedures and guidelines for implementation, all of which must be included in effective reviews of policy (Cardno, 2018). This information confirms the rationale of using document analysis in solitude as a form of qualitative research for this study of policy content.

**Data Sources**

Documents utilized for this study were retrieved online from public accessible Websites. To ensure only original policy documents would be used in this study and that they were authentic, I submitted an inquiry to the librarian at Loyola University Chicago asking for guidance on which Websites to use. The librarian confirmed that since public policies are public, they are freely available to everyone. She guided me to exploring Websites such as ProQuest Congressional and the Department of Education and locating links to the documents I am interested in. So I conducted a Google search for the federal policies used in my study and explored Websites that referenced them in any context. I then searched the Websites for the citation to the federal document and clicked on the link that directed me to the original policy.

The documents to be analyzed in this study include landmark federal inclusive education policies spanning from 1965 through 2016. The selection of policies honed in
on the current research question related to inclusive educational policy and leadership authority. To establish which policies would be analyzed in this study I first determined my criteria:

1. Solely K-12 policies
2. Landmark federal
3. Reference to inclusive learning environment

My study is exclusively on K-12 education. Therefore, it was a prerequisite that the policies utilized for this document analysis were solely associated with K-12 public education with a reference to inclusive learning environments. It is important to note that each federal policy chosen for this study referenced inclusive learning in some manner. Inclusive learning is necessary for approximately 14% of students with a disability impacting their learning. Per federal policy, public school leaders are charged with ensuring these children receive equitable access to their education within the general education setting.

The research question for this study included policies calling for inclusive learning environments. Therefore only landmark federal education policies with a reference to inclusive learning environments were the basis for analysis in this study. The final list of K-12 federal major inclusive policies to be reviewed in this study was established based references to:

1. Students with disabilities
2. Handicap children
3. Mainstream
4. Inclusion or inclusive
5. Equity for learning
6. Least restrictive environment or LRE
7. Universal design for learning or UDL
8. Multiple Tiered Support Systems or MTSS
9. Response to intervention or RtI

Table 8 shows an overview of landmark inclusive education policies utilized in this study and their references to inclusive learning environments. A more comprehensive explanation of each policy comes thereafter.

**Table 8**

*Landmark Federal Policies and their References to Inclusive Learning Environments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Policy</th>
<th>Reference to Inclusive Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESEA 1965</td>
<td>A billion dollars a year was granted to aid disadvantaged students in K-12 public schools. Federal Aid was given to strengthen (1) school libraries, (2) state departments of education, and (3) education research … and subsequent amendments gave aid for (4) bilingual education, and (5) students with disabilities (Nelson, 2016).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA) or Public Law (PL 94-142) 1975</td>
<td>PL 94-142 requires any state or district receiving federal funds to find and educate all handicapped children, regardless of the nature of severity of a child’s handicap, at the public’s expense (Boyer, 1979). A key provision of PL 94-142 mandates mainstreaming, which means to the “maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children … are to be educated with children who are not handicapped, i.e., in a mainstreamed environment” (Lietz &amp; Kaiser, 1979, p. 31, as cited in Schuster, 1985).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IDEA 1997

A major focus for IDEA 1997 was that students with disabilities should be educated alongside their general education peers (Lipsky and Gartner, 1998).

### NCLB 2002

Schools were held accountable for how well students with disabilities performed in relation to the goals on their Individual Educational Plan (IEP) as well as their performance in the general education curriculum (Darrow, 2016).

### IDEA 2004

Emphasis on increasing educational outcomes for students with disabilities. Whenever possible, students with disabilities should receive instruction within general education classes (Handler, 2006).

### ESSA 2016

ESSA has two key goals: 1. States must align their educational programs with college and career ready standards, 2. Expand the federal focus on equity by securing resources for poor students, students of color, English learners, and students with disabilities (Young et al., 2017)

---

### ESEA 1965

It was not until April 11, 1965 that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was passed, 176 years after we were united as a country. The fact that the federal government became extensively involved in the nation’s K-12 education system is significant. Prior to 1965 much of the responsibility for schooling was deferred to the various state and local governments. However, data revealed a miserable academic record with the great majority of low-income children and children of color specifically (Scheurich, Skrla, & Johnson, 2000). The 1965 ESEA marked an important shift in American federalism—one that established a pattern of federal involvement that today
continues to have an enormous impact on school funding and policy geared toward the education of all students (Casalaspi, 2017).

On April 11, 1965, standing outside of the one room school house he attended in Texas, President Lyndon Johnson signed into effect the ESEA. Johnson noted it “represents a major new commitment of the Federal Government to quality and equality in the schooling that we offer our young people” (Nelson, 2016). A billion dollars a year was granted to aid disadvantaged students in K-12 public schools. Federal Aid was given to strengthen (1) school libraries, (2) state departments of education, and (3) education research and subsequent amendments gave aid for (4) bilingual education, and (5) students with disabilities (Nelson, 2016).

**The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142)**

PL 94-142 was a first step in ensuring students with disabilities had equal access to an education. The United States Congress forced school districts to educate special needs students. Many districts at that time were only starting with the process to ensure the education of these students. Deaf or blind students were being segregated and many times education for children with Down syndrome or other cognitive impairments were denied (Reed, 2015, as cited in Nelson, 2016). The new law calling for equitable education for the handicapped has led to major changes in schools (Boyer, 1979). Administered by the U.S. Office of Education’s Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Public Law 94-142 is an amendment to the original legislation, Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act, enacted in 1966 (Boyer, 1979). Though there was much apprehension and concern about PL 94-142, on September 1, 1978, as required by
the act, all students six to 17 identified as physically, mentally, or emotionally disable had a right to a free appropriate public education (Boyer, 1979).

PL 94-142 requires any state or district receiving federal funds to find and educate all handicapped children, regardless of the nature of severity of a child’s handicap, at the public’s expense (Boyer, 1979). Prior to PL 94-142 many times families were financially responsible for their child’s education. Under the first year of PL 94-142 OE funded $245 million and in his 1979 budget, President Carter requested a significant increase to $804 million. The OE is to help states and communities spend the federal dollars appropriately and provide the best possible education for these children. Giving handicapped children a broader world and live successful lives is at the core of PL 94-142 (Boyer, 1979). Other policies such as Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) meant to improve equal access to quality education for minority students, however PL 94-142 protects perhaps the most underserved minority of all (Boyer, 1979).

Schuster (1985) shares that mainstreaming is a major concern of regular educators. A key provision of PL 94-142 mandates mainstreaming, which means to the “maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children are to be educated with children who are not handicapped, i.e., in a mainstreamed environment” (Lietz & Kaiser, 1979, p. 31, as cited in Schuster, 1985). The implementation of the requirements of PL 94-142 is very challenging, yet an effective, successful mainstreaming program is not an impossibility (Schuster, 1985).

**IDEA 1997**

IDEA 1997 shifted the focus from the actions and procedures of a school to impacts on student outcomes and performance. The reauthorization called for students
With disabilities to participate in statewide testing (Kaufman & Blewett, 2012). Also, IDEA 1997 required performance indicators for students with disabilities to assess the educational progress [Pub. I. No. 105-17, III Stat, 37 601(b) (1)-(4), 1997, as cited in Kaufman & Blewett, 2012]. A second major focus for IDEA 1997 was that students with disabilities should be educated alongside their general education peers (Lipsky & Gartner, 1998).

**NCLB 2002**

George W. Bush, our 43rd President, published his plan for education No Child Left Behind (NCLB) just two days after being sworn in as our 43rd president. This plan was his blueprint for educational reform for America. Two years later Congress passed the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Hirsh, 2010). The statute, No Child Left Behind, is derived from the goal of “helping every child reach his or her academic potential and aiding each child to self-actualize into smart and effective adults no matter how disadvantaged by discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, economic circumstance, and disability” (Kaufman & Blewitt, 2012). NCLB had four pillars of reform: Accountability, a focus on what works, flexibility and the empowerment of parents.

Students with disabilities were to be monitored on their annual Individual Educational Plan (IEP) goals and on their progress in the general education curriculum (Darrow, 2016). The passing of NCLB in 2002 for the first time held schools and districts accountable for closing achievement gaps including the sub group of students with disabilities. States and local school districts were required by law to follow the mandates of these federal policies or they could risk sanctions including loss of federal funding.
The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) ensures students with disabilities receive special education services. IDEA governs how educational agencies provide more than 6.5 million eligible infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities with early intervention, special education and related services. IDEA Part C ensures early intervention services for infants and their families through the age of 2 and IDEA Part B assures special education and related services for children ranging from three through 21 years old (Building the Legacy: IDEA 2004, 2018). For the interest of the current study only IDEA Part B will be analyzed.

IDEA 2004 emphasizes student achievement as measured with a rigorous standards-based assessment. Additionally, though not limited to, Kaufman and Blewett (2012) conclude the key breakthroughs with the reauthorization of IDEA encompass:

- Alignment of IDEA 2004 and NCLB
- Allocation of funds for serving students with disabilities who have yet to be identified as children with disabilities
- Changing eligibility determinations for students with learning disabilities
- Reforming due process hearing procedures
- Altering the rules for discipline of students with disabilities
- Requiring special education teachers to be highly qualified as general education teachers are per NCLB

IDEA 2004 expanded the roles and responsibilities of the principal to encompass special education leadership including progress of students with disabilities (Sumbera, Pazey, & Lashley, 2014).
ESSA 2016

Passed with strong bipartisan support, ESSA emphasizes and is committed to helping to:

- Ensure states set high standards so that children graduate high school ready for college and career.
- Maintain accountability by guaranteeing that when students fall behind, states target resources towards what works to help them and their schools improve, with a particular focus on the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools, high schools with high dropout rates, and schools where subgroups of students are struggling.
- Empower state and local decision-makers to develop their own strong systems for school improvement based upon evidence, rather than imposing cookie-cutter federal solutions like No Child Left Behind (NCLB) did.
- Preserve annual assessments and reduce the often onerous burden of unnecessary and ineffective testing on students and teachers, making sure that standardized tests do not crowd out teaching and learning, without sacrificing clear, annual information parents and educators need to make sure our children are learning.
- Provide more children access to high-quality preschool, giving them the chance to get a strong start to their education.
- Establish new resources to test promising practices and replicate proven strategies that will drive opportunity and better outcomes for America’s
students. ("WHITE HOUSE REPORT: The Every Student Succeeds Act,"
2015)

ESSA mentions the practice of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) several times. Each state must incorporate the principles of UDL within its plan (The Every Student Succeeds Act of 2016). For the first time, federal education law governing general K-12 education includes a definition and endorsement of UDL ("CAST: UDL in Public Policy," 2018).

Data Collection

Upon the final determination of the landmark educational policies used in this study, I retrieved each document online. I then scanned each document for language related to leadership. Both district and school levels of leadership were considered within the landmark educational policies. A simple keyword search list was generated referencing district and school leadership terms and were used for searching educational policies:

1. administrator  
2. school leader  
3. district leader  
4. leadership  
5. principal  
6. director  
7. superintendent

Leadership statements discovered within each of the selected policies were transcribed onto a designated Google Sheet. See Table 9 for an example. A sheet was developed for each individual policy document used in the current study. Individual policy statements
were then reviewed and it was established whether or not any there was any reference to leadership at the district or school level. If a statement did not relate to school or district leadership it was not applicable data for the current study. The statements not applying to the current study were then removed from the Sheet. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) recommend this step-by-step process where data analysis is best completed in conjunction with data collection. There was a period of intense analysis in which my tentative findings were substantiated, revised, and reconfigured. The policy statements referencing school or district leadership were later coded in accordance with key terms and phrases found in Sergiovanni’s (1992) leadership authorities. Throughout this process I was consulting with a peer, Dr. Denise Hildebrand, about the process of data collection and analysis. A description of the analysis and coding of policy statements in relation to leadership authority is forthcoming.

Table 9

*Table Used to Record Policy Statements Referencing Leadership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keyword</th>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Leadership Statements from IDEA 2004</th>
<th>School/District Leadership Present Y/N/I</th>
<th>Notes/Comments</th>
<th>Document Link</th>
<th>Date Retrieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Application of Conceptual Framework

I am attempting to determine the extent professional and moral leadership authorities are evident in landmark federal inclusive education policy. Sergiovanni’s (1992) five leadership authorities will be the conceptual framework for this study and will assist in interpreting the meaning of the data. Leading inclusive learning environments is essential so that all students, regardless of ability, have equitable access to their education. The literature review established that policies are calling for inclusive learning environments, but what are they saying about leadership authority? Sergiovanni’s five leadership authorities will be used as a lens to analyze major inclusive educational policies to determine the extent professional and moral authority are evident.

Data analysis is a process of interpreting and making sense of data. Researchers many times develop categories and themes that support the interpretation and the meaning of the data (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 221). The policy statements related to school and district leadership will be copied from the Google Sheet where they were originally transcribed and pasted onto a table according to their relationship with each authority. I then analyzed policy statements for evidence of professional and moral authorities using Sergiovanni’s (1992) five leadership authorities. Descriptive key terms from each authority were used as indicators to systematically code leadership language from the major policies. The five leadership authorities provided the lens to categorize policy language related to leadership and guided the process of analysis. Multiple tables were used for the study, one for each landmark policy utilized in the document analysis. To determine the extent professional and moral authorities were evident, policy statements related to leadership found within each major policy were systematically
coded in accordance with Sergiovanni’s leadership authorities. Table 10 presents Sergiovanni’s five leadership authorities and descriptive key terms associated with each one. These key terms were used to analyze and code the gathered data in relation to the authorities.

Table 10

*Five Leadership Authorities and Descriptive Key Terms Used for Coding Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureaucratic Codes</th>
<th>Psychological Codes</th>
<th>Technical-rational Codes</th>
<th>Professional Codes</th>
<th>Moral Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinates</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Science Logic</td>
<td>Informal craft</td>
<td>Felt obligation(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>Human relations</td>
<td>Best practice(s)</td>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td>Community values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Barter/trade</td>
<td>Research-based</td>
<td>Contextual</td>
<td>Ideals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandates Rules</td>
<td>Meeting needs</td>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td>Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations</td>
<td>Congeniality</td>
<td>Fidelity Standards</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Right and good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss Monitor</td>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>In-service needs</td>
<td>values Internal</td>
<td>Collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expect/inspect</td>
<td>Interpersonal skill</td>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>expertise</td>
<td>commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comply</td>
<td>Charisma</td>
<td>Evidence Need to change</td>
<td>Idiosyncratic</td>
<td>Professional community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Positive climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>practice(s)</td>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Humor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge in</td>
<td>community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tradeoff(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>practice Data</td>
<td>Moral and collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>informed</td>
<td>Interdependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Internalized</td>
<td>Shared duty(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>values</td>
<td>Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal expertise</td>
<td>obligation(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Community values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>discretion</td>
<td>Morally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Common values</td>
<td>Professional virtue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 presents Sergiovanni (1992) bureaucratic leadership authority and descriptive key terms associated with it. Key terms were used to analyze and code the gathered data in relation to psychological authority.

Table 11

*Codes for Bureaucratic Source of Authority for Leadership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Authority</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Related Policy Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic Authority Key Terms</td>
<td>Subordinates Hierarchy Compliance Mandates Rules Regulations Boss Monitor Expect/inspect Comply Compliance Accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 presents Sergiovanni (1992) psychological leadership authority and descriptive key terms associated with it. These key terms were used to analyze and code the gathered data in relation to psychological authority.

Table 12

*Codes for Psychological Source of Authority for Leadership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Authority</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Related Policy Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Authority Key Terms</td>
<td>Motivation Human relations Barter/trade Meeting needs Congeniality Rewards Interpersonal skill Charisma Positive climate Congeniality Humor Tradeoff(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 presents Sergiovanni (1992) technical-rational leadership authority and descriptive key terms associated with it. These key terms were used to analyze and code the gathered data in relationship to technical-rational authority.

Table 13

*Codes for Technical-Rational Source of Authority for Leadership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Authority</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Related Policy Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical-Rational Authority Key Terms</td>
<td>Science Logic Best practice(s) Research-based Technicians Fidelity Standards Privileged In-service needs Objectivity Evidence Need to change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 presents Sergiovanni (1992) professional leadership authority and descriptive key terms associated with it. These key terms were used to analyze and code the gathered data in relationship to professional authority.

Table 14

*Codes for Professional Sources of Authority for Leadership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Authority</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Related Policy Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Authority Key Terms</td>
<td>Informal craft knowledge Contextual knowledge Professional values Internal expertise Idiosyncratic practice(s) Knowledge in practice Data informed Internalized values Personal expertise Professional discretion Dialogue Common values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15 presents Sergiovanni (1992) moral leadership authority and descriptive key terms associated with it. These key terms were used to analyze and code the gathered data in relation to moral authority.

Table 15

*Codes for Moral Sources of Authority for Leadership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Authority</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Related Policy Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral Authority Key Terms</td>
<td>Felt obligation(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community values Ideals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beliefs Right and good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective commitments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning community Moral and collective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interdependence Shared duty(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared obligation(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community values Morally driven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional virtue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document analysis requires that data be examined and interpreted in order to elicit meaning, gain understanding, and develop empirical knowledge (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, as cited in Miller & Salinas, 2019). For the current study data analysis consideration was given to how fundamentally and in what capacity the leadership policy statements were related to the terms describing Sergiovanni’s (1992) professional and moral authorities. The five authorities imparted discernment of the language found within federal policies that is related to district and school leadership.
Validity

Given the fact that federal policy regulates the responsibilities of district and school leaders and the high percentage of students requiring inclusive learning environments, this research is highly interested in what policy conveys about leadership authority. Schwandt (2007) describes validity in terms of social science as an epistemic criteria that conventionally serves as a benchmark for inquiry. The findings of the inquiry must be true and certain. In this case, “true” means the findings of the study accurately characterize the phenomena to which they refer and “certain” means the findings are supported by evidence. Essentially for the current study, there was no basis for doubting the findings because the research process was honest, factual, and transparent. To confirm validity when conducting qualitative research being ethical throughout the investigation is crucial. It is essential that readers trust and have confidence in the study including the process, findings, and the researcher (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). To ensure confidence in this study I shared detailed explanations of the process and about the documents used. Analysis of the data was clear and transparent therefore giving lending credibility to the findings. Finally, as a researcher I present with integrity and knowledge in the area of research helping to secure the confidence in the current study.

Merriam and Tisdell (2016) refer to internal and external validity. Internal validity correlates to reality, such as are the findings authentic? External validity refers to being able to transfer the findings to other situations, being able to generalize the results. To ensure validity in the current study I applied various strategies involving both internal and external validity. First, I devoted adequate engagement in data collection. Similar to
Merriam and Tisdell’s view of the forest and the trees, I considered my findings both as inductive and deductive processes. Inductive in that I strategically moved from specific raw data to abstract categories and concepts. At the point I reached a sense of saturation, meaning when no new information is coming forth, I was in a deductive mode. Secondly, I used peer review/examination to uphold validity (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). I engaged in rich discussions with my colleagues, Dr. Denise Hildebrnd and Dr. Jenel Mroz, regarding my process, coding, congruency of emerging findings with raw data, and tentative interpretations. Additionally, I sought tentative check-ins with dissertation chair about the process of my study including the findings, raw data, and tentative interpretations. Another strategy I employed was rich, thick descriptions. I was meticulous about providing details and rich explanations of documents and processes used in the study so that my findings can be generalized. By exercising these strategies described by Merriam and Tisdell, I helped to ensure the validity of my study. Ample information, rationale for the processes, and adequate evidence was provided so readers would have trust in the findings.

Researcher competency is important when helping to determine the validity of the study. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) list the following research competencies as desirable:

- A questioning stance with regard to your work and life context. As a researcher it is important to first look with a questioning eye. Why are things the way they are?
- High tolerance for ambiguity. The researcher demonstrates flexibility and remains open on findings inductively derived from the data analysis. One
must be comfortable with the ebb and flow of a qualitative investigation and have faith in the process

- Being a careful observer. The researcher cannot be casual in collecting data, instead one must have a well thought out systematic process

- Asking good questions. When conducting interviews, questions are well thought out and open-ended that can be extended to requests for more detail.

- Thinking inductively. One must be able to move from specific raw data to abstract categories and concepts.

- Comfort with writing. Enjoy the thought process and writing the story of the study.

As with all qualitative research, as a researcher I focused on obtaining information that is credible, transferable and generalizable. I hold a sincere interest in knowing the extent professional and moral authorities are found in inclusive policies. This process is explicit about my role in examining public documents in order to answer the research question as to the extent professional and moral authorities are found within federal inclusive policies. My research design was thoroughly thought through and I was always conscientious about validity throughout the study. I present a transparent, sincere and credible pursuit of inquiry to learn more about what federal inclusive education policy says about leadership authority according to Sergiovanni’s (1992) five leadership authorities.

The documents used in this study allow for stability. Retrieving language straight from a primary source is the only reliable method for this research study. Unlike interviews and observations, the presence of the investigator does not alter what is being
studied. A systematic procedure of locating the original policies through known websites such as gov.edu, the Congressional Record, and ProQuest Congressional will ensure the authenticity of the documents examined in this study (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). As recommended by Merriam and Tisdell, rich and descriptive comments about the document analysis was provided supporting the validity of this study.

I am meticulous about providing details and rich explanations of documents and processes used in the study so that my findings can be generalized. The federal policies analyzed to determine the extent professional and moral leadership authorities may be accessed by anyone therefore open to anyone’s scrutiny. This is not the case with personal documents (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Educational leaders must understand the extent of documentation that radiate from policy in the form of procedures and guidelines for implementation, all of which must be included in effective reviews of policy (Cardno, 2018). Other methods could potentially widen the type information collected, but ultimately would not provide the data I am currently seeking. This confirms the validity of using document analysis in solitude as a form of qualitative research for this study of policy content.

On a final note, I approached this study with a high interest in professional and moral authority for leadership. I have a personal belief in the tenets of these leadership authorities for school and district leaders. As a public school educator it sometimes seems that bureaucratic and psychological are prominent authorities used. Though I have no known conflicts of interest in relation to this study, my personal bias towards the particular authorities and experiences as a public educator could project onto the research process. Through my own critical self-reflection regarding potential biases I practiced
reflexivity, the process of critical self-reflection on one’s biases (Schwandt, 2007). To ensure validity through the study including data collection and data analysis, I monitored my biases through the conceptual framework of Sergiovanni’s (1992) five leadership authorities. I engaged in discussions with a peer, Dr. Denise Hildebrand, about raw data collection, categorizing data, and tentative interpretations of data. Lastly, to ensure the findings of this study are valid in regards to any influences from myself I have provided an audit trail. The audit trail consists of a detailed account of my methods, procedures, and decision points in carrying out this study. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) provide these suggestions to ensure validity against any biases the research may bring to the study.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Introduction

Chapter IV presents the findings from this study. The purpose of the current study is to determine the extent Sergiovanni’s (1992) professional and moral leadership authorities are evident in federal educational policies focusing on inclusive practices spanning from 1965 through 2016. I conducted a comprehensive document analysis to determine the extent professional and moral leadership authorities are evident in six landmark federal inclusive education policies. Leadership matters and today’s educational leaders more than ever are tasked with providing inclusive learning opportunities for all students, including those with disabilities. Keyes (1999) alleges administrative leadership is considered critical to successful implementation of inclusive learning environments that include students with disabilities. Federal education policies guide public school leaders as to what requirements must be adhered to in regards to inclusive practices. Sergiovanni’s (1992) five sources of authority for leadership was utilized as the conceptual framework in analyzing inclusive federal education policy. School leaders play an important role in creating and carrying out a vision for inclusive schools. Theoharis and Causton (2014) assert that knowing how to create an inclusive learning environment to address the needs of all learners, regardless of ability is essential.
An explanation is provided regarding using document analysis to collect meaningful data and answer the research question for this study. Once the data was collected it was analyzed using a step-by-step process, which essentially aids in making sense out of the data (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). To determine the extent professional and moral authorities were evident, policy statements related to school or district leadership found within each major policy were systematically coded in accordance with Sergiovanni’s (1992) five sources of authority for leadership. I describe the steps used in the current study in greater detail in the sections below.

Organizing the Findings

The findings of this study are presented in response to the research question that guided this study:

- To what extent are the Sergiovanni’s professional and moral leadership authorities evident in inclusive educational policies spanning from 1965 through 2016?

I analyzed federal inclusive policies through the lens of bureaucratic, psychological, technical-rational, professional, and moral authorities to determine the extent professional and moral authorities are evident. Results that emerged from the analyses of the six landmark inclusive policies in relation to leadership authorities are presented in relation to Sergiovanni’s (19920 five sources of authority. The results are presented in six major sections, one for each landmark policy. In the summary of findings section I present an overall summary conveying the salient findings. The chapter will end with a summary and transition to Chapter V.
An overview of the data collection process is provided in the next section, Methodology Summary. I used Merriam and Tisdell’s (2016) step-by-step process of analysis to code and analyze the data collected in this study through the lens of Sergiovanni’s (1992) five sources of authority for leadership.

**Methodology Summary**

The rationale for using document analysis for this study lies in its usefulness as a stand-alone method for specialised forms of qualitative research (Bowen, 2009, p. 29, as cited in Cardno, 2018). In reviewing the research question formulated, reflection was lent to the types of data that would be collected, analyzed, and interpreted. Accordingly a qualitative methodology using a comprehensive document analysis of inclusive education policies served to guide the study. According to Bowen (2009, as cited in Miller & Salinas, 2019), a document analysis is a procedure in which both paper and electronic documents are analyzed. The utilization of document analysis for this study included analyzing six landmark federal inclusive educational policies to determine the extent Sergiovanni’s (1992) professional and moral leadership authorities are evident.

As noted earlier I engaged in a step-by-step approach to gathering and coding data. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) describes the step-by-step process of data analysis for making sense out of data. They present five steps for analysis:

- Category Construction
- Sorting Categories and Data
- Naming the Categories
- Number of Categories
- Becoming More theoretical
I used this step-by-step process to deeply analyze data by developing categories, themes, or other taxonomic classes that decipher the data helping to formulate its meaning. For this study I started with category construction also referred to as open coding, which is a process of making notations on each policy document (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). For example I made notations if the policy statements referenced federal and state leadership, since I was solely interested in school and district leadership. Statements referencing leadership at the federal or state level were not used in the data analysis. This is related to what Merriam and Tisdell call sorting categories and data, which is the process of refining and revising themes and data. It is highly inductive, starting with detailed bits of data, cluster data unit, then name the cluster. For my study, the categories were Sergiovanni’s (1992) five sources of authority for leadership, which is equivalent to Merriam and Tisdell’s (1992) naming the categories and determination of how many categories. The final step is becoming more theoretical and this is when I moved from a more concrete description of data to a more abstract level. Description of each policy’s school and district leadership theme is presented through the conceptual framework of Sergiovanni’s (1992) five leadership authorities.

I began my document analysis on December 28, 2019 and completed analyzing data on January 31, 2020. Throughout the entire month I collected and analyzed the data by searching for keywords, consolidating, reducing, and interpreting, resulting in the final findings and the answer to the research question:

To what extent are the Sergiovanni’s professional and moral leadership authorities evident in inclusive educational policies spanning from 1965 through 2016?
During this process I observed statements with more than one of the keywords or phrases. Any duplicate statements that were transcribed during data collection were eliminated. Finally, each remaining statement was read and determined if it referenced district or school leadership. The statements used in the study were further investigated through contextual evidence to gain a better understanding of any reference to leadership authority. References to other sections of the policy were explored to determine any relevance. If any of these other sections were found to contain relevant statements they were used in coding. Consultation with Dr. Hildebrand took place throughout the data collection process. Phone conversations about data codes, data collection, findings, transitioning concrete data into contextual meaning, and validity took place throughout the course of collecting data. Once all the data was organized and sorted it was systematically coded in accordance with Sergiovanni’s (1992) five leadership authorities. Data was color coded as it related to the five authorities. Key concepts from each of the five leadership authorities were used to support in determining which authority policy statements best fit under. The findings to this qualitative document analysis are presented below. The conceptual framework for this study were the categories and themes that supported the interpretation and the meaning of the data (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

**Findings**

This section presents the findings as they are related to the research question used in the current study. Federal inclusive policies were analyzed through Sergiovanni’s (1992) framework of bureaucratic, psychological, technical-rational, professional, and moral authorities. Sergiovanni’s framework offers wide-ranging leadership styles and practices used by school and district leaders. All five sources of authority render a
variety of assumptions regarding teachers’ capacities, upholds implications for supervisory practices, and predicts potential consequences for leadership practices.

Overview of the initial raw units of data collected for this study is presented in Table 1 and includes the name of each policy, its length in pages, and total number of keyword or phrase matches. Given the minimal matches in ESEA 1965 and PL 94-142 1975, I investigated the documents further looking for references to leadership. I searched the Table of Contents of each document, as well as headings and tables for any indications referencing leadership of schools or school districts. However, no phrases outside what had already been collected and reviewed were found. Over the past 50 years federal inclusive policy has lengthened with PL 94-142 being the shortest at 24 pages and NCLB the longest at 670 pages. Keyword and key phrase matches increased dramatically over the years with ESSA at total of 483 and PL 94-142 1975 at 2. Which is an indication that the emphasis on leadership has grown.

Table 16

*Overview of Initial Raw Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Total of Keyword/Phrase Matches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESEA 1965</td>
<td>32 pages</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL 94-142 1975</td>
<td>24 pages</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA 1997</td>
<td>121 pages</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB 2002</td>
<td>670 pages</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA 2001</td>
<td>162 pages</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSA 2016</td>
<td>392 pages</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17 summarizes the keyword and phrase search results for each document. It shows the number of matches for each keyword within individual documents. There was a noticeable increase of references to leadership starting with NCLB in 2002. It is noted that the key phrase district leader was not found in any of the six documents analyzed. A total of 840 policy statements referencing leadership were collected and analyzed from the six landmark policies used in this study.

Table 17

Summary of Number of Keyword or Phrase Matches for Each Document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School leader</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District leader</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To ensure relevant and reliable codes and eventually transforming into themes, the coding process included multiple steps. Throughout the process of collecting and analyzing data, statements were eliminated for various reasons. Keywords found within titles were not coded because of the lack of contextual meaning. Sections under titles contained the relevant context that already included at least one, sometimes more key
term or phrase. There were some units of data when analyzed and coded contained more than one authority, sometimes three. When I could not determine the meaning of a unit of data, even using contextual evidence it was considered unreliable therefore rejected. The total units of data used in this study was 288 and all were analyzed and categorized through the Sergiovanni’s (1992) conceptual framework of leadership authorities, transforming the numbers to meaningful contextual themes. Table 18 shows a summary of the findings in relation to leadership authority types within each landmark policy. The highest two authorities are highlighted for each policy.

Table 18

*Summary of Authorities Types within Each Policy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic Codes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Codes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical-rational Codes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Codes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Codes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy statements were coded and sorted according to Sergiovanni’s (1992) five leadership authorities to gain an understanding of the extent professional and moral authorities were evident within landmark federal inclusive policies. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) describe the process of going between inductive and deductive reasoning. It means the researcher is going to and from the concrete bits of data and abstract concepts.
In this document analysis I bring the “bits” together in a novel way ultimately answering the research question: To what extent are the Sergiovanni’s professional and moral leadership authorities evident in inclusive educational policies spanning from 1965 through 2016?

Findings showed that professional and moral leadership together, as they relate to school or district leadership were evident 58.7% within landmark federal policies. Figure 1 below shows the percentages for each leadership authority found in the six landmark policies. Professional authority is noted as being the highest single authority and psychological authority is noticeably the lowest. Collectively, bureaucratic, psychological, and technical-rational authorities are evident 41.3%. Technical-rational comes in second at 22.2%, only slightly higher than moral authority at 21.5%. The top two are considered the primary sources of authority for leadership which are professional and technical-rational at 59.5%. This is only .7% higher than professional and moral combined.

Figure 1. The percentages for each leadership authority found in the six landmark policies
A theoretical description of the extent moral and professional authorities are evident in inclusive policy is presented below. Units of data for each policy were analyzed through the conceptual framework of Sergiovanni’s (1992) five leadership authorities using key phrases and contextual evidence relating to each authority.

**ESEA and Sergiovanni’s Sources of Authority for Leadership**

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) 1965 document was 32 pages long, relatively short when compared to more recent landmark policies. It was obvious any references to leadership, particularly school or district, were limited. Nonetheless, content meeting the criteria was reviewed and analyzed through the lens of Sergiovanni’s (1992) five sources of authority for leadership. Themes emerged in relation to bureaucratic, technical-rational, and professional leadership authority. Evidence of psychological and moral were absent in relation to district and school leadership.

Included in Figure 2 below are the total coded occurrences of each of Sergiovanni’s (1992) sources of authority within ESEA 1965. As one can see the evidence reveals 20% of this policy when it comes to school or district leadership, show a relationship to professional authority and moral leadership is nonexistent. A bureaucratic theme emerges within ESEA 1965 when it refers to “administrative control” in reference to school or district leadership. For example,

*Administrative control or direction of, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts* (ESEA, 1965).
Sergiovanni asserts that bureaucratic leadership has a clear hierarchy where the administrators are in charge and possess predetermined standards for staff. This type of authority is evident within ESEA 1965.

**Figure 3.** Breakdown of Final Coded References for the Five Sources of Authority for ESEA 1965

Though still minimal other references to school or district leadership within the technical-rational and professional authorities were distinct. ESEA 1965 declares that vital information will be disseminated to teachers and administrators derived from educational research. For example, the following excerpt from ESEA reveals the importance of research based information being shared with staff and administrators.

*Effective procedures will be adopted for acquiring and disseminating to teachers and administrators significant information derived from educational research* (ESEA, 1965).

According to Sergiovanni technical-rational and professional leadership have similarities, for example both rely on expertise. However, technical-rational authority deems that the expertness of knowledge itself is primary, and therefore knowledge exists apart from the
context of teaching. Meaning the teacher’s job is to apply knowledge to practice, however they are subordinate to the knowledge base of teaching. Knowledge comes directly from research, not craft knowledge. On the other hand professional authority as a basis for leadership assumes the expertise of the teacher is most important. In this instance ESEA is declaring the research is primary over the teacher’s professional knowledge.

Finally, one citation was associated with professional leadership authority. Sergiovanni (1992) describes professional authority as a basis for leadership that believes the teacher’s expertise is what counts most. Knowledge informs but does not prescribe their practice. What counts is what is right and good. A reference in ESEA to adopting promising educational practices as appropriate developed through training or projects is correlated to professional authority because it is suggested that the scientific knowledge is informing but in this case not prescribing teachers’ practice.

**PL 94-142 1975 and Sergiovanni’s Sources of Authority for Leadership**

Included in Figure 3 below are the total coded occurrences of Sergiovanni’s (1992) sources of authority within Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142). Note the total number of codable data is actually slightly higher than the original raw data shown on Table 10. The explanation is really simple, the policy statement referencing school or district leadership contained contextual evidence including more than one authority, therefore coded accordingly.
Figure 3. Breakdown of Final Coded References for the Five Sources of Authority for PL 94-142

As with ESEA 1965, the length of PL 94-142 is relatively shorter in length to policies such as NCLB or ESSA. Actually, PL 94-142 with a total of 24 pages is the shortest of the six landmark policies used in this study. It is apparent that in 1975 leadership language was markedly absent from educational policy. The few statements with contextual evidence referencing school or district leadership are related to bureaucratic, technical-rational, and professional authorities. Psychological and moral authorities are again absent. PL 94-142 promotes personal training that supports carrying out the demand of the policy. This is in line with bureaucratic authority which upholds following mandates and staying in compliance. Technical-rational authority is evident when it calls for training of staff that is derived from educational research, which promotes the knowledge as more valuable than teachers’ expertise and craft knowledge from experience. There is a hint of professional authority in the following policy statement:
Adopting, where appropriate, promising educational practices and materials development through such projects (PL-94-142, 1975).

This statement shows teachers are to be informed of the scientific knowledge but may adopt the practice if it is appropriate, allowing for professional idiosyncratic practice.

**IDEA 1997 and Sergiovanni’s Sources of Authority for Leadership**

Included in Figure 4 below are the total coded occurrences of Sergiovanni’s (1992) sources of authority within IDEA 1997. What is noticeably different with IDEA 1997 is not only the length of the policy, but also the increase in the references to leadership. Leadership plays a more significant role than in previous federal landmark policies. Collectively, professional and moral leadership authorities were evident in over 42% of the data analyzed in IDEA 1997. Technical-rational authority is prominent within the context of this policy. Over 46% of policy statements that were analyzed had indicators of technical-rational authority. Knowledge and training stem from research then is disseminated to administrators who are then charged with ensuring all staff apply the research to their practice. This goes hand in hand with what Sergiovanni claims on technical-rational authority. He stresses that under this type of leadership that teaching is an applied science, knowledge of research is privileged, and that scientific knowledge is superordinate to practice. It is important to remember that teachers are required to comply based on what is considered to be the truth when leadership uses technical-rational authority. No evidence of psychological authority for leadership was obtained within the context of IDEA 1997.
Professional authority is highlighted as being important in IDEA 1997. According to Sergiovanni (1992), it is notable to possess informed craft knowledge and personal expertise. Teachers respond to professional authority based on values, accepted tenets of practice and internalized expertise. Leaders practicing professional authority provide professional development opportunities helping to expand staff’s performance. Below is an example of contextual evidence from this landmark policy eluding to professional authority:

Provide professional development that addresses the needs of children with disabilities to teachers or teams of teachers (IDEA, 1997).

This example is directly related to Sergiovanni’s claim that professional authority as a source for leadership assumes that teachers’ expertise is what is most important. Teachers use their learned knowledge metaphorically, to inform but not prescribe their practice.

Also, within the context of IDEA 1997 are hints of bureaucratic and moral authorities. Bureaucratic authority is minimal, basically addressing state identified
mandates administrators must adhere to ensuring qualified personnel in special education related services, early intervention, and regular education working with children with disabilities. Sergiovanni (1992) refers to this aspect of bureaucratic authority as rules, regulations, and mandates. Leaders rely on predetermined standards to which teachers must measure up to. He also believes that this type of leadership is legitimate practice, but not as a primary authority.

An illustration of moral authority found in IDEA 1997 references projects to improve the ability of general education teachers, principals, and other administrators to meet the needs of children with disabilities. Moral authority promotes collegiality and morally focused interdependence, relies on the learning community to respond to obligations, and the team’s norms to oblige to professional standards. In this case the leader and all team members are responding to the moral reasoning that practice is vital to meet the needs of students with disabilities and collectively respond to the shared commitment of teaching all students.

**NCLB 2002 and Sergiovanni’s Sources of Authority for Leadership**

Included in Figure 5 below are the total coded occurrences of Sergiovanni’s (1992) sources of authority within NCLB 2002. NCLB is the lengthiest policy to date with a grand total 670 pages. Also increasing significantly, is the number of references to leadership with a total of 263 initial keyword or phrase matches. Data analyzed indicated that NCLB put more emphasis on leadership than any other landmark policy previous to 2002.
Figure 6. Breakdown of Final Coded References for the Five Sources of Authority for NCLB 2002

It is evident that nearly 61% of the references to school or district leadership within NCLB are towards professional and moral authorities. These two sources of leadership authority motivate staff intrinsically in preference to being imposed. Seasoned craft knowledge and personal expertise are valued and staff can be expected to respond to shared commitments and felt interdependence (Sergiovanni, 1992). This is a theme in NCLB with language indicating moral obligations to all students and the importance of the expertise of teachers.

NCLB contains many references to high-quality professional development and sustained professional development programs. Local authority is allowed in which leaders and community members can determine what is needed in the way of professional development that would best serve their school or district. Leadership development along with continuous growth opportunities is emphasized in NCLB. The below excerpt provides an example of how NCLB (2002) emphasized professional authority:
The development and support of school leadership academies to help exceptionally talented aspiring or current principals and superintendents become outstanding managers and educational leaders.

Not only does NCLB put emphasis on administrator learning and growing but also for teachers. Here is another policy statement in reference to technology that signifies the importance of professional authority within NCLB (2002):

Provide ongoing, sustained professional development for teachers, principals, administrators, and school library media personnel serving the local educational agency, to further the effective use of technology in the classroom or library media center.

Professional authority as a basis for leadership assumes teachers’ expertise is what is most important. This authority is an extremely compelling force for governing what teachers do. However, to be effective teacher preparation, professional development, and other efforts to upgrade teaching must be a priority (Sergiovanni, 1992). Sergiovanni believes when we embrace professionalism, professional authority will become the driving force for leadership practice. Leadership itself transforms from being direct and intense as standards and norms become the stronger influence.

Sergiovanni (1992) describes moral authority as felt obligation and duties originating from universally shared professional and community values, ideas, and ideals. It is the shared values and beliefs that define a staff as learning community, and the ideals define them as professionals. The why becomes because it is morally right to do so. This is apparent in NCLB with references to foster increased collaboration with teachers, administrators, parents, and the community coming together to what is right for students.
In the example policy statement below there is an emphasis NCLB puts on collaboration and coming together to do the right thing for kids.

*Strengthen partnerships among parents (including parents of children from birth through age 5), teachers, principals, administrators, and other school personnel in meeting the educational needs of children.*

This theme of collaborative partnerships among stakeholders is found throughout NCLB 2002. Excerpts from this policy fostering increased collaboration with staff members from various positions coming together for a shared purpose include calls for professional development for school library media specialists, teachers, and administrators. NCLB also calls for increased communication, planning, and collaboration between administrators and all stakeholder groups to do the right thing for kids in the area of academics, technology, safety, and improving teaching. Moral authority themes found in NCLB are directly in line with what Sergiovanni (1992) maintains, which is this kind of leadership can transform schools into communities that promote commitment, devotion, and service for the reason of educating kids.

There are instances of where professional and moral authority come together as one in NCLB. Professional development for administrators and other stakeholders are promoted throughout the policy with references to the *why*, the moral obligation to providing a quality education to kids. Below is an example of this union:

*Provide training to school administrators, faculty, and staff, with respect to issues concerning children who experience domestic violence in dating relationships or who witness domestic violence, and the impact of the violence on the children* (NCLB, 2002).
School and district leaders hold the responsibility of leading the implementation of policy. Teachers follow the *what*, which are the shared values and beliefs that define the educational team as a community along with the ideals that define them as professionals. The *why* is because it is morally right to do. The community and professional membership are morally understood as duties and obligations (Sergiovanni, 1992). Both professional and moral authorities are evident in the above policy statement from NCLB.

Language pertaining to school and district leadership within NCLB 2002 in relation to psychological, bureaucratic, and technical-rational authorities collectively was evident at 39.3%. Though minimal, NCLB encompasses indicators of psychological leadership authority. Psychological authority leadership strategies include the development of a school climate of “expect and reward” where staff will want to comply because of the congenial climate and the rewards (Sergiovanni, 1992). All staff are encouraged through rewards or potential incentives as in the policy statement below:

*Providing incentives that are appropriate for teachers or individuals from other fields who want to become principals and that are effective in retaining new principals* (NCLB, 2002).

So in other words, if one is a teacher and is willing to become a principal one is rewarded with an incentive. It is important to note in relation to Sergiovanni the incentive or reward is an external motivator versus an internal satisfaction of doing good, which is in line with professional and moral leadership authority.

Bureaucratic leadership authority represented 20.3% of language within NCLB in relation to school or district leaders. Bureaucratic authority is represented in forms of mandates, rules, regulations, job description, and expectations. Teachers respond
appropriately or face the consequences when leadership practice is based on bureaucratic authority (Sergiovanni, 1992). Attributes emerged from the data aligning with Sergiovanni’s concept of bureaucratic authority.

Recurring patterns of the data revealed NCLB signified district and school leaders’ requirement of holding teachers accountable for ensuring students meet challenging state academic achievement standards. Administrators are to partake in professional development directly related to ensuring students meet required state standards. NCLB requires school principals to attest annually in writing proving the school is in compliance. Provisions of NCLB asserts bureaucratic authority into school and district leadership roles. A hierarchical arranged system that is being monitored putting the responsibility of compliance onto leaders who then may rely on “expect and inspect”, predetermined standards, inservice, and direct supervision (Servgiovanni, 1992).

Themes from data I analyzed emerged in relation to Sergiovanni’s (1992) beliefs about technical-rational leadership authority within NCLB. Sergiovanni imparts leaders who practice technical-rational authority base their practice on research related to teaching or school effectiveness. Teachers are expected to respond to what is considered to be true. NCLB requires district and school leaders adopt and oversee programs and materials that are grounded in scientifically based research. Teachers must be provided with the knowledge and skills to provide students with the opportunity to meet challenging state academic content standards and student academic achievement standards. They must respond to the learning standards since they are considered to be “true.” Finally NCLB asserts professional development strategies and activities must be
based on scientifically based research, putting the responsibility on school and district leaders.

**IDEA 2004 and Sergiovanni’s Sources of Authority for Leadership**

Included in Figure 6 below are the total coded occurrences of Sergiovanni’s (1992) sources of authority within IDEA 2004. Combined, moral and professional leadership authorities are evident in over 65% of the data analyzed in IDEA 2004. Though minimal, once again there is indication that a landmark policy supports the practice of psychological authority. Collectively, bureaucratic, psychological, and technical rational leadership authorities are apparent within almost 36% of the data collected from IDEA 2004.

![Figure 6. Breakdown of Final Coded References for the Five Sources of IDEA 2004](image)

Data collected and analyzed from IDEA 2004 shows nearly 36% were in relation to professional authority promoting responses from teachers that come from within versus an external force. Seasoned craft knowledge and personal expertise is recognized under professional leadership and teachers are expected to respond to common
socialization, accepted tents of practice, and internalized expertise (Sergiovanni, 1992). Professional leadership authority themes that emerged in IDEA 2004 emphasize the importance of professional development for principals and superintendents. Providing activities to promote instructional leadership and improved collaboration between general educators, special education teachers, and related services personnel is implicated. There is a call for high-quality professional development for principals, superintendents, and other administrators, in the areas of instructional leadership and behavioral supports in the school and classroom. IDEA 2004 requires personnel development, including activities for the preparation of personnel who will serve children with high incidence and low incidence disabilities. Common training for administrators, parents, teachers, related services personnel, behavioral specialists, and other school staff on effective strategies for positive behavioral interventions and behavior management strategies that focus on the prevention of behavior problems is called for. This call for personal expertise is in direct line with Sergiovanni’s view on professional leadership authority. Teachers need to create knowledge in use as they practice, becoming highly skilled practitioners. It is the teacher’s experience that counts most. Professional authority is powerful when it comes to determining what teachers do and they need quality preparation, professional development, and other means to improve teaching (Sergiovanni, 1992).

Over 28% of the data analyzed from IDEA 2004 referenced moral leadership authority. Sergiovanni (1992) promotes moral leadership as teachers coming together believing in and feeling obligated to the work therefore, it gets done. The motivation is intrinsic instead of a consequence or incentive. Themes within IDEA 2002 related to
moral authority are comprised of references to collaboration between all stakeholders for
the purpose of providing a quality education for all students, regardless of ability.
Promotion of improved collaboration between special education and general education
teachers is a common emphasis throughout IDEA 2004. This is directly related to
Sergiovanni’s belief in learning communities as part of moral leadership. Learning
communities promote a type of connectedness among members that bear resemblance to
what is found in a family, a neighborhood, or other closely united group, where bonds
lean toward being familiar or even perhaps sacred. IDEA 2004 upholds effective
learning environments and fostering positive relationships with parents.

The promotion of effective case management and collaboration among parents,
teachers, physicians, related services personnel, behavioral specialists, principals,
administrators, and other school staff is a common theme within IDEA 2004. Data
collected demonstrates that ensuring effective learning environments and fostering
positive relationships with parents is upheld in IDEA 2004.

Bureaucratic, psychological, and technical-rational encompass the remainder of
the data pulled from IDEA 2004 related to leadership authority. References to
bureaucratic authority within IDEA 2004 are in the areas of paperwork burden that
accompanies bureaucracy, hierarchy protocols, and leadership responsibility of
assessment and accountability. When leaders are laden with paperwork, many times
related to compliance reporting, supervising those under them in the hierarchy, and
inspecting teachers on their given expectations they are practicing bureaucratic authority
for leadership. According to Sergiovanni (1992), they are relying heavily on
predetermined standards for teachers to measure up to and closely supervising the work
of teachers and checking for compliance that many times has to be reported to a third party.

One unit of data was obtained during my analysis of IDEA 2004 referencing Sergiovanni’s (1992) psychological authority for leadership:

*Developing and implementing initiatives to promote the recruitment and retention of highly qualified special education teachers, particularly initiatives that have been proven effective in recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers.*

Rewards are made available to those who behave appropriately and supervisors must navigate bartering successfully for compliance and increases in performance (Sergiovanni, 1992). What is rewarded gets done, this may include financial incentives. Sergiovanni asserts teachers and other staff will respond as expected when awards are made available however, without the incentives their dedication is calculated and performance is narrowed.

Data collected from IDEA 2004 referencing technical-rational leadership authority comprised nearly 18% of the data. Associations between IDEA 2004 and Sergiovanni’s (1992) view on technical-rational leadership are based on knowledge grounded on scientific based research. IDEA 2004 calls for parents, teachers, administrators, and related services personnel receive technical assistance and information in a timely, coordinated, and accessible manner. They are not provided the opportunity to choose what training or professional development they receive instead their in-service is determined for them. Leaders must ensure best practices and scientifically based research knowledge and skills to effectively support students with
disabilities are provided and where applicable. This includes special education and general education teachers, principals, administrators, and related services personnel.

**ESSA 2016 and Sergiovanni’s Sources of Authority for Leadership**

Included in Figure 7 below are the total coded occurrences of Sergiovanni’s sources of authority within ESSA 2016. Jointly, moral and professional leadership authorities are evident in 59.1% of the data analyzed in ESSA 2016. Collectively, bureaucratic, psychological, and technical-rational comprised 40.9% of data analyzed in relation to ESSA 2016 leadership authorities. The highest single authority present within ESSA 2016 is professional at 38.3%. ESSA 2016 is the current landmark policy guiding our public schools in the area of education, including leadership.

![Figure 7. Breakdown of Final Coded References for the Five Sources of ESSA 2016](image)

Professional leadership attributes found within ESSA related to professional leadership authority encompassed themes related to providing effective professional development designed to enhance the ability of teachers, principals, and other school leaders to understand and implement curricula, assessment practices and measures, and
instructional strategies for all students. Principals or other school leaders are to have the instructional leadership skills to help teachers teach. ESSA calls for implementation of high-quality professional development programs for principals that enable them to be effective. The importance of leaders and teachers to be able to interpret and address the specific academic needs of students is emphasized in this landmark policy. Increased autonomy and flexibility for teachers, principals, or other school leaders, such as by establishing innovation schools. Improvement of teaching and learning is accentuated throughout ESSA 2016. Below is a policy statement demonstrating this concept:

*Providing educators, school leaders, and administrators with the professional learning tools, devices, content, and resources to personalize learning to improve student academic achievement and discover, adapt, and share relevant high-quality educational resources.*

Teachers, principals, and other school leaders who are effective in improving student academic achievement in schools are called on sought so to improve learning for all kids. These attributes fully aligned with what emerged from my data are related to Sergiovanni’s (1992) beliefs surrounding professional authority for leadership. Professional authority is a basis for leadership assumes that the expertise of teachers is what counts most. Sergiovanni emphasizes professional development, teacher preparation, and other efforts to improve teaching a top priority. This professional leadership strategy of supporting and providing professional development for teachers is evident throughout ESSA. Autonomy with professional learning is granted to teachers, which Sergiovanni relates to their personal expertise and seasoned craft knowledge resulting in expanding their performance.
Sergiovanni’s (1992) moral leadership authority emerged in nearly 21% of the units of data obtained from ESSA 2016 and analyzed under the lens of his five leadership authorities. Throughout ESSA 2016 there are remnants of Sergiovanni’s moral leadership authority. For example ESSA accentuates the significance of moral authority and shared obligation and duties derived from widely common community values, ideas, and ideals. Policy context related to this includes how teachers and school leaders, in consultation with parents, administrators, paraprofessionals, and specialized instructional support personnel, will meet the educational needs of all children. As a collective team they will develop and enhance their capacity to provide effective instructional programs for all students, regardless of learning ability. Moral leadership assumes learning communities are defined by their centers of shared values, beliefs, and commitments. What they consider right and good is just as important as what works and what is effective. Staff are motivated by their emotions and beliefs as well as self-interest, and collegiality is a professional virtue (Sergiovanni, 1992). ESSA 2016 proclaims moral obligations for students that school and district leaders must lead by. Policy content refers to moral commitments of leading and teaching to improve academic outcomes for all students including children with disabilities, English learners, and low socioeconomic status. ESSA 2016 attests there must be cohort-based activities that build effective instructional and school leadership teams and develop a school culture, design, instructional program, and professional development program to help meet the needs of all kids. Sergiovanni’s moral authority is apparent in the aspect of his belief in learning communities where collegiality is a professional virtue based on a morally driven interdependence.
Technical-rational authority for leadership encompasses almost a quarter of the data analyzed for ESSA 2016. Contextual evidence within this policy revealed concepts in relation to technical-rational authority for leadership. When leadership is based on technical-rational authority, factors such as training, knowledge, and practice are grounded in scientific research. The work of teaching is standardized to reflect the best way. The expectation is that staff respond based on what is considered to be true (Sergiovanni, 1992). ESSA 2016 establishes that an integral part of school and district leaders is ensuring educators including all staff members, with the knowledge and skills necessary to enable students to succeed in a well-rounded education and to meet the challenging state academic standards. Leaders must ensure the development and implementation of a school-level targeted support and improvement plan to improve student outcomes based on the indicators in the statewide accountability system. Tied directly to teaching based on standards, ESSA 2016 drives school and district leaders to provide evidence-based professional enhancement activities. According to this policy design and implementation of teacher, principal, or other school leader evaluation and support systems that are based in part on evidence of student academic achievement. Also tied to student achievement is the design and implementation of teacher, principal, or other school leader evaluation and support systems based in part on evidence of student academic achievement.

Promotion of new and existing evidence-based strategies is a theme throughout ESSA 2016. Part of teaching includes examination of itemized score analyses, being able to interpret the information, and address the specific academic needs of students as indicated by the students’ achievement on assessment items. ESSA declares teaching
must include the study of student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports regarding achievement on such assessments. Then in collaboration with parents, principals, and other school leaders to understand and address the specific academic needs of students. This is in direct relation to technical-rational authority. Sergiovanni (1992) asserts that supervision and teaching are applied sciences that scientific knowledge is superordinate to practice, and that teachers are skilled technicians.

ESSA 2016 promotes school and district leaders using elements such as data on decisions regarding school resources, staffing patterns, school environment, educator support systems, and other school-level factors. Per this policy, leaders are to use evaluation results including student growth measures on challenging state academic standards, to inform decision making about professional development, improvement strategies, and personnel decisions. Training is provided, but it is professional development that is evidence-based. According to Sergiovanni (1992), when leaders standardize the work of teaching it reflects the “best way” so teacher inservice will be based on the “best way.” What counts are facts and objective evidence, not values, preferences, and beliefs.

Bureaucratic leadership was the least evident authority within ESSA 2016 with almost 8% of policy statements analyzed reflective of bureaucratic authority for leadership. ESSA 2016 requires school and district leaders to oversee the creation of an educational agency a plan that does not compromise the intent or essential components of the policies, and it must be approved by the state educational agency. Funding is based on bureaucratic factors for instance school and district leaders:
Shall submit an application to enter into a local flexibility demonstration agreement with the Secretary in order to develop and implement a school funding system based on weighted per-pupil allocations that meets the requirements.

School leaders, school administrators, and other educators are charged with ensuring these requirements are met. This is in line with what Sergiovanni (1992) describes as bureaucratic authority in that leadership is based on rules, regulations, and mandates. There is a sense that external accountability works best, therefore leaders are tasked with ensuring compliance.

Bureaucracy shows up in this statement from ESSA 2106:

*It is the sense of Congress that a student, teacher, school administrator, or other school employee of an elementary school or secondary school retains the individual’s rights under the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States during the school day or while on the grounds of an elementary school or secondary school.*

This is the first time the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States was seen in landmark educational policy. This puts the onus on school and district leaders to protect and enforce. Reinforcing the use of rules, regulations, and mandates creates a foundation for bureaucratic authority that demonstrates a commitment and capacity to implement or continue to implement them.

Nearly ten percent of ESSA’s content analyzed relating to Sergiovanni’s (1992) five leadership authorities was in relation to psychological authority. Policy statements reference incentives for promoting the retention of effective teachers, principals, and school leaders who have a record of success. ESSA calls for differentiated levels of
compensation, which may include bonus pay, on the basis of the employment responsibilities and success of effective teachers, principals, or other school leaders in hard-to-staff schools or high-need subject areas. Performance-based compensation system means a system of compensation for teachers, principals, or other school leaders. According to Sergiovanni, in this case, staff will want to comply because of the rewards. Leaders need to be able to barter successfully for compliance and increases in performance. In the case of ESSA 2016 this is done by offering bonuses or higher salaries to effective educators. There may also be a comprehensive performance-based compensation system, a differentiated salary structure, which may include bonuses and stipends to teachers who teach in high-need schools, high-need subjects, raise student academic achievement, or take on additional leadership responsibilities. The same applies to principals or other school leaders who serve in high-need schools and raise student academic achievement in the schools. Sergiovanni signifies this with expert and reward, where in staff responds when rewards are available, otherwise they may not.

**Summary of Findings**

In summary, this qualitative research study sought to determine the extent Sergiovanni’s (1992) professional and moral leadership authorities are evident in inclusive educational policies spanning from 1965 through 2016. This study provided some significant results that will in turn assist in further understanding of the relationship between inclusive landmark educational policy and types of leadership authority. A document analysis was useful in analyzing policy content to determine the extent professional and moral authorities are evident. The aim was to determine what federal inclusive education policies say about leadership styles, specifically characteristics
related to Sergiovanni’s professional and moral leadership authorities. This enlightenment concerning the lack of guidance in the field of educational leadership practice, federal education policy, and inclusive learning methods is significant.

To deeply and meaningfully analyze data I utilized Merriam and Tisdall’s (2016) step-by-step process of data analysis. This allowed for discovery of meanings, understandings, or insights into the findings of this study. Figure 8 illustrates overall that together, professional and moral authorities were evident in landmark educational policies 58.7%.

The purpose of this qualitative research study was to determine the extent Sergiovanni’s (1992) professional and moral leadership authorities are evident in federal educational policies focusing on inclusive practices spanning from 1965 through 2016. In accordance with federal policy, educational leaders are charged with addressing the needs of all students within their districts and schools, helping to ensure learner success for all children, regardless of their ability to learn.

*Figure 8. The Extent Sergiovanni’s Professional and Moral Leadership Authorities are Evident in Inclusive Educational Policies*
Summary and Transition to Chapter V

In conclusion, professional and moral authorities were relatively highly evident within landmark inclusive educational policies. Data was analyzed through the lens of Sergiovanni’s (1992) five leadership authorities. Sergiovanni’s lens provided insight into the extent professional and moral authorities are evident within policy. Gaining knowledge of what policy is saying about types of leadership authorities practiced in school and districts will ultimately benefit students. Information learned from policies about leadership authorities will enlighten school and district leaders regarding needed leadership virtues and practices. The findings of this research study will also inform professional development, higher education, and formulation of educational policy pertaining to inclusive learning environments and needed leadership qualities. Chapter V presents a discussion of the findings as well as conclusions and implications of the findings. This study will conclude with recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER V

INTERPRETATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This study is to determine the extent Sergiovanni’s (1992) professional and moral leadership authorities are evident in federal educational policies focusing on inclusive practices spanning from 1965 through 2016. Diverse learner ability is prevalent within our nation’s schools with 14% of students enrolled in public schools receiving services under The Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) (Children and Youth With Disabilities, 2019). The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142) of 1975, No Child Left Behind (NCLB) of 2001, and most recently, Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2016 are additional legislation calling for the rights for all K-12 learners, regardless of their learning ability (Khazima et al., 2019).

School leaders play an important role in creating and carrying out a vision for inclusive schools. Knowing how to create an inclusive learning environment to address the needs of all learners, regardless of ability is essential (Theoharis & Causton, 2014). In accordance with federal policy, educational leaders are charged with addressing the needs of all students within their districts and schools, helping to ensure learner success for all children, regardless of their ability to learn.

I conducted a comprehensive document analysis to determine the extent professional and moral leadership authorities are referenced in landmark federal
inclusive education policies ranging over 51 years, 1956 through 2016. Sergiovanni’s (1992) five sources of authority for leadership are utilized as the conceptual framework to analyze inclusive federal education policy commencing with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and continuing through the ratification of Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2016.

The role of administrators is as important as it is vast with a wide-range of varied duties and responsibility. In alignment with the increased number of students attending our public schools, is the escalation of diverse learner ability. Federal policies charge educational leaders with providing equitable and inclusive learning opportunities that help support all students, regardless of their learning ability. Yet, there is limited guidance from research regarding what federal inclusive education policies assert regarding leadership styles, specifically practices related to Sergiovanni’s (1992) professional and moral leadership authorities. This enlightenment of a gap in research in this area is significant.

The research question for this qualitative study focused on landmark federal inclusive education policy and leadership authority, specifically Sergiovanni’s (1992) five leadership authorities with an emphasis on professional and moral authorities. The research question that will guide this study is:

- To what extent are the Sergiovanni’s professional and moral leadership authorities evident in inclusive educational policies spanning from 1965 through 2016?
I analyzed federal inclusive policies through the lens of bureaucratic, psychological, technical-rational, professional, and moral authorities then determined the extent professional and moral authorities were evident.

The methodology for this study was qualitative document analysis. Because the study proposed to investigate the extent professional and moral authorities are evident within inclusive policy, examining policy language in reference to leadership was necessary. Document analysis is a qualitative study method where the researcher examines documents or records relevant to a particular study. This study utilized policies which are categorized as public documents to look for specific language related to educational leadership.

The results of my research are summarized in the next section. Following the summary, the findings are discussed including interpretations and conclusions drawn from the study. Afterwards, a summary statement is provided, implications for practice, and implications for further research, limitations that emerged during the study, and finally a summary and conclusion. In bringing this research study to an end, I am optimistic research will continue in the area of leadership and federal educational policies, ultimately benefiting students.

**Summary of Findings**

The present study focused on determining the extent professional and moral authorities are evident in inclusive federal educational policy. Using document analysis, I examined language related to school or district leaders within policy through the lens of Sergiovanni’s (1992) five sources of authority for leadership. Analyses of six landmark policies indicated that when combined together, professional and moral authorities were
evident in 58.7% of language referring to school or district leadership. Overall, professional authority is noted as being the highest single authority with 37.2% of language referencing school or district leadership. Technical-rational authority came in second at 22.2% with moral authority close behind at 21.5%. Bureaucratic authority was evident at 12.8% and lastly psychological authority was noticeably the lowest at 6.3%.

Table 19 highlights the two highest landmark policies for each individual authority. One discovery is that over time, the overall references to leadership within these landmark policies has increased considerably. Also, starting with NCLB 2002 there was a notable increase with reference to leadership within landmark federal policy. Professional and moral authorities are both increasing and actually doubled since NCLB 2002 to ESSA 2016. However, it is interesting to note that from NCLB 2002 to ESSA 2016 technical-rational authority more than tripled within policy. Consequently technical-rational appears to be growing at a higher rate than both professional and moral authorities.

Results from this study indicate that these six landmark policies tend to promote that leaders of inclusive learning environments lead using professional, technical-rational, and moral authorities. Yes, bureaucratic and psychological authorities are found within the policies but not to the extent as the other three. Sergiovanni (1992) believes if moral authority combined with professional authority were primary as a basis for leadership compels people to respond from within. He proclaims that leadership based on moral authority can transform schools into communities that will create great learning institutions.
Discussion of Findings

This discussion of findings provides insight about types of leadership language found within policy and how it could positively impact leaders of inclusive learning environments. A summary of the findings used to address the research question for this study is provided. Also included in this section is the rationale for interpreting the findings and drawing conclusions. Throughout the discussion I offer my personal insights and associations to those insights to the relevant literature examined in Chapter II. The findings are discussed throughout using the conceptual framework of Sergiovanni’s (1992) five leadership authorities.

The Numbers

The answer to the research question, how evident is professional and moral authorities in landmark federal inclusive educational policies, is 58.7%. Professional authority was noted as being the highest single authority at 37.2% and psychological
authority at 6.3% was noticeably the lowest. Second, was technical-rational authority at 22.2% with moral leadership authority a close follower at 21.5%. Bureaucratic authority came in fourth at 12.8, which was a surprise to me. I expected to see a much higher percentage of contextual evidence within the policies referencing bureaucratic leadership. This perception is based on my own personal experience as an educator in the public schools and feeling at times bureaucratic authority is prevalent. Also, the simple fact that these landmark policies come to us directly from the federal government I anticipated to see higher levels of bureaucracy come through. My discussion continues below as to how these findings were used to address my research question for this study.

Professional and Moral Authority

Minkos et al. (2017) assert school leaders play a critical role in creating safe and accepting environments as well as directing the learning for all students. My study indicated that the primary leadership strategies, practices, and actions called for within federal inclusive educational policy spanning from 1965 through 2016 are professional and technical-rational authority with moral authority a close third. I believe that if school and district leaders were guided by policy to engage in higher levels of professional and moral leadership practices, the work of inclusion would be implemented with high rates of fidelity. Perhaps RtI, MTSS, or UDL would serve as tools to help build inclusive learning environments, but moral leadership would provide the foundation for the work. Moral authority presents itself in the form of obligations and duties derived from widely shared values, ideas, and ideals. The expectation is teachers respond to shared commitments and felt interdependence (Sergiovanni, 1992). In respect to my study, under moral authority teachers would respond to the obligation of providing inclusive
learning environments based on a shared value of doing the right thing for all kids, regardless of learning ability. The team would share a moral bond that ultimately inspires and drives them to work hard and provide quality inclusive learning environments.

Professional authority for leadership brings with it seasoned craft knowledge and personal expertise. When practiced, teachers can be expected to respond to common socialization, accepted tenets of practice, and internalized expertise (Sergiovanni, 1992). Findings from this study suggest policy writers have respect for educators, something that was unexpected to me since their job is so distant from the classroom. Findings of this study show that overall, professional authority is evident in over 37% of policy language in relation to school and district leadership. Professional authority assumes that the expertise of teachers is what is most significant. It is a very influential force for leadership. Sergiovanni proclaims that in the professions, knowledge of theory and research is less esteemed over what is thought right and good based on experience. It seems policy writers, knowingly or not, are moving in the right direction by putting emphasis on professional authority. I would like to see an increase in language policy referencing professional authority in future federal landmark educational policies.

Sergiovanni (1992) asserts if moral and professional authority are the primary sources of authority for leadership being used, the what questions would be answered prior to why questions. We would first ask the question of what to follow: the shared values and beliefs defining us as a community and the ideals that define us as professionals. Next we would ask the question why: because it is morally right to do so. Finally whom should we follow? Sergiovanni says we should follow ourselves as
members and morally conscious, committed people. I profess Sergiovanni is right, if we increased professional and moral authority within policy our *what* would be our shared values and beliefs in relation to providing inclusion. Our *why* is because it is morally right to provide inclusive learning environments for kids. We would follow ourselves based on being morally conscious and committed to the sometimes challenging work of inclusion. The hard work of ensuring inclusive learning environments are accessible to all kids, would get done and done well under professional and moral authorities. Leaders would not have to constantly be hovering over staff and inspecting their work. The work would get done without rewards and staff’s motivation to get the work done would be intrinsic, directly related to moral reasons (Sergiovanni, 1992). The findings may not only influence school and district leaders, they may inform and influence professional development, higher education, and future formulation of educational policy.

**Work Gets Done Based on Motivation**

Staff become reliant on external rewards used by their organizations or leaders to motivate them (Sergiovanni, 1992). Sergiovanni asserts “what gets rewarded gets done” type of leadership discourages people from becoming self-managed and self-motivated. Sergiovanni believes this type of motivation has its place however, alone it does not provide the type of motivational climate needed in schools. Staff are involved in their work for extrinsic rather than intrinsic and moral reasons. For this study that would translate to teachers working on providing inclusion, however mainly for a reward of some type. The rewards could come in ways of a paycheck or perhaps rewards given from the leader for getting the work done. The findings show this type of leadership is evident at about 19% within the six landmark policies. This total is using the
combination of bureaucratic and psychological authorities. As an educator, unfortunately this type of leadership seems to be more evident in practice. Which leads to one contemplating whether the leadership authorities are as equally evident in the public schools as they are in policy. Perhaps that question could be answered in another study and will be discussed under Implications for Future Research.

Sergiovanni (1992) believes “what is rewarding gets done” comes into play when the motivation for people to do the work is embedded in the work itself. People will do the work when they feel satisfaction with their results. There is less direct supervision under this motivation rule. It is likely one would see this type of staff motivation under technical-rational authority. According to the findings this authority was found in policy slightly more than moral authority. I wonder if policy writers geared context to embrace moral authority and less of technical-rational there would be more moral leadership in our public schools and district.

Sergiovanni (1992) asserts that a second alternative to “what gets rewarded gets done” type of leadership is:

*What we believe in, and what we feel obligated to do because of a moral commitment gets done.*

Conceivably it is the third motivational rule if embedded into policy more, would ensure the work of inclusion gets done and gets done well. Perhaps, in lieu of providing external rewards for staff, a leader could schedule an informal learning session at a social establishment where people could build camaraderie, learning together and maintain their moral foundation, their “why”. I believe that camaraderie does not happen by accident. Teams must develop a strong sense of trust, accountability, and togetherness around
shared values and beliefs requires intentional effort. Continuously building and maintaining the foundation of shared moral beliefs for doing the work, ensures it gets done well and with minimal supervision or external control (Sergiovanni, 1992).

**From Policy to Practice**

Something discovered during my analysis was the consequence the sources of authority have on teacher performance. This realization gave meaning to the percentages each of the five leadership authorities found in the landmark policies analyzed in this study. Table 20 shows each of Sergiovanni’s (1992) five authorities for leadership and their consequences on staff performance. The differences between bureaucratic and moral authorities signify a dramatic distinction not only in leadership practices but the consequences of them both. This revelation may be able to inspire change in policy language and ultimately change in leading inclusive learning environments. The themes of leadership styles that run through policy should filter down into the schools.

Table 20

*Consequence of Sergiovanni’s Five Leadership Authorities on Teacher Performance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of authority for leadership</th>
<th>Teacher Performance is...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>Narrowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>Narrowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical rational</td>
<td>Narrowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Expansive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>Expansive and sustained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The consequence in relation to teacher performance under bureaucratic authority is “teachers respond as technicians, executing predetermined scripts, and their performance is narrowed.” Under psychological authority “teachers respond as required when rewards are available, but not otherwise; their involvement is calculated and performance is narrowed.” Teachers “respond as technicians, executing predetermined steps; performance is narrowed” under technical-rational authority. One can see that teacher performance is narrowed in all three of these authorities. This being said, this too would apply to leaders in charge of leading inclusive environments. The teachers’ impact would be narrowed under these three authorities. As a reminder, combined they encompass over 41% of policy language referencing school or district leadership. Sergiovanni (1992) contends that under professional authority “teachers respond to professional norms; their practice becomes collective, they require little monitoring, and their performance is expansive.” Teachers who work under leaders who practice moral authority “respond to community values for moral reasons; their practice becomes collective, and their performance is expansive and sustained. In relation to my study, if professional and moral leadership language within inclusive policy increased, leaders would be more apt to lead on the basis of professional and moral authority. This would then result in staff performance that would expand and sustain quality inclusive learning environments.

Transforming Leadership Practice Through Policy

Danforth (2016) believes federal mandates influence the thoughts and actions of educational leaders but may leave them in peril on how to move forward. However, the findings of this current study may help. Nearly 60% of contextual evidence from policy
related to leadership was in relation to professional and moral authority combined. This new knowledge can potentially have a significant impact on transforming leadership practice. I believe writers of policy are unmistakably on the right track. If school and district leaders engaged in higher levels of professional and moral authority strategies, the work of implementing inclusive policy mandates would be transformed. The findings from my research show that professional and moral authority are highly evident within federal educational policies calling for inclusion. Therefore, tenets of professional and moral authority should be used by school and district leaders to support inclusive learning environments. This will be discussed further under Implications for Practice.

**Summary Statement**

This study represents the meaning of contextual evidence related to school or district leadership and federal inclusive educational policy. I conducted a document analysis using Sergiovanni’s (1992) five authorities for leadership as the conceptual framework to determine the extent professional and moral authorities are evident in policy. It was found that together, professional and moral authority are present at nearly 60% in landmark federal inclusive educational policy. Perhaps the most discouraging finding was that solitarily moral authority is at 21.5% signifying policy does not put a strong emphasis on moral authority. Bureaucratic and psychological authorities are kept to a minimum in policy language relating to school or district leadership. Together they made up just over 19% of the policy language related to leadership. Only slightly higher than moral, technical-rational authority was the second highest of the five authorities at just over 22%. It is clear that policy is cueing school and district leaders to use professional, technical-rational, and moral leadership authorities over bureaucratic and
psychological. I believe my findings are encouraging for a call to shift leadership language in policy to include increased references to moral authority for leadership. My study indicates adding leadership language to educational policy related to moral authority would increase the commitment to providing inclusive learning environments. Therefore the work would get done and done well (Sergiovanni, 1992).

**Implications for Further Research**

Young et al. (2017) uphold it is important for studies to take place in relation to examining the treatment of educational leadership within federal policy. My study has followed suit and determined the extent professional and moral authorities are evident in inclusive federal policy. The findings indicate together, these two authorities are evident within policy at nearly 60%. Alone, moral leadership is evident in policy at 21.5%, third in place to technical-rational authority at 22%. Now new questions arise from these findings in relation to school and district leadership, educational policy, higher education, and professional development. What can researchers do to offer even more insight about policy and leading inclusive learning environments using moral and professional authority?

This current study advances future research so that to determine current practices being used in school and districts in relation to inclusion. Are professional and moral leadership practices being used by leaders responsible for inclusive learning? If so, to what extent? If we were to study schools or districts who have successful inclusion models, to what extent would professional and moral authority be evident? This could be attained through qualitative research studies using interviews, surveys, or document analysis. Are there schools or districts that apply leadership authorities to policy
mandates? If so, what are the outcomes? Under what leadership authority are successful schools or districts working under? Qualitative studies interviewing or surveying staff to determine the leadership authority they feel they work under and the success or inclusion would be another area of investigation.

Discovered from examining policy in relation to Sergiovanni’s (1992) five leadership authorities, is that moral authority is key to success when responding to shard commitments. What if moral leadership was more evident in landmark federal inclusive policies? What explicit language in policy is needed to guide school and district leaders to use moral authority? How can further research advance our knowledge in this area in order to apply it to practice? Findings reveal that when standing alone moral authority is evident in just over 20% of policy language referencing school or district leadership. To inform writers of policy we need research in determining the next steps and what contextual language is needed to increase moral authority for school and district leaders.

Primary sources within the six landmark policies analyzed in this study are currently professional and technical-rational authority. According to Sergiovanni (1992), we could advance leadership by moving moral authority that includes felt obligation and duties derived from widely shared values, ideas, and ideals to the forefront. Success is accomplished when the two primary sources of authority are professional and moral. Conducting studies to validate Sergiovanni’s assertion would add validity to the importance of moral authority for leadership in our schools and districts. This would also inform higher education institutions and professional development as to what leadership skills and practices our school and district leaders need to positively impact inclusive environments. Given the findings, how does one ensure that leaders are trained in
professional and moral leadership authorities? Examining more about how leaders develop as professional and moral leaders and how they maintain their focus when leading inclusion would be a basis for additional research. Also important, is how does the findings impact higher education institutions responsible for developing leaders for school and district leadership positions? Perhaps research studies comparing their curriculum to what federal educational policies are calling for in relation to leadership is valuable.

**Implications for Practice and Recommendations**

The implications of this study’s findings are important for school and district leaders, writers of educational policy, higher education, and professional development. Policy directs school and district leaders with leading inclusive learning environments, yet there is minimal awareness regarding what leadership practices should be exercised. According to the findings policy is guiding leaders to use professional, technical-rational, and moral authorities over psychological and bureaucratic. When combined, professional and moral authority is evident in nearly 60% of all policy language referencing school or district leadership. The findings from my research reveal that professional and moral authority are highly evident within federal educational policies calling for inclusion. Therefore tenets of professional and moral authority should be used by school and district leaders to support inclusive learning environments. Professional development should be built helping leaders transform to using professional and moral authorities as their basis for leadership. Additionally the findings from this study can guide policy writers, higher education, and professional development on best practices for effective leadership when leading inclusive learning environments.
Using Sergiovanni’s (1992) lens of moral authority the findings of this study indicate the foundation of getting the work done in schools is based on tenants of moral leadership. This emerged knowledge is significant in influencing writers of policy, higher education, and professional development in the area of inclusion and leadership. If evidence of moral authority were to increase in future policies, school and district leaders would be directed to change their practices to correspond to strategies related to moral leadership. Perhaps this enlightenment would have a significant impact on successful leadership of inclusive learning environments.

Throughout our nation we have leaders struggling with providing quality inclusive learning environments. They may even be using frameworks such as RtI, MTSS, or UDL but still are not successful. According to my findings, the field could benefit from more leadership training related to moral authority. Additionally, a shift in policy language with increased references to moral authority would positively impact school and district leader’s strategies.

**Limitations**

One limitation requiring attention is associated with interpretation of units of data in relation to coding contextual evidence referencing professional or technical-rational authority. One could assert a likelihood of slight variances in the percentages actualized in this study due to the occasional similarities between the two authorities. However, by using Merriam and Tisdall’s (2016) step-by-step process to deeply analyze data in relation to Sergiovanni’s (1992) explanation on how to help differentiate between professional and technical-rational authority minimizes this chance. Sergiovanni explains both authorities rely on expertise, however professional authority as a basis for leadership
assumes the teachers’ expertise is what matters most. Seasoned craft knowledge and personal expertise are representative of professional authority. Technical-rational as a basis for leadership depends on evidence derived from scientific research, expecting teachers to respond in view of what is considered to be true. In this study, the similarities of varied contextual evidence referenced either professional development or training for leaders or staff. Final coding determinations were based on how weighted research based was and whether staff was provided the opportunity to choose what training or professional development they receive instead of it being determined for them.

Another limitation that may restrict the generalization of results associated with ESEA 1965 and PL 94-142 1975. Both documents were relatively short in length, with minimal keyword/phrase matches. They were also scanned for alternative references to leadership to ensure a thorough examination. However, the evidence remained minimal from either policy. The truth of the matter is, leadership was not heavily emphasized within these two policies. Data was collected was coded through the lens of Sergiovanni’s (1992) five authorities. It is noted contextual evidence referencing leadership has increased and it evident in more current landmark policies. Overall, the lower number of references to leadership related to these two policies does not impact the fidelity of the findings.

**Summary and Conclusion**

This study is significant because there is a gap in research about what inclusive policies assert about leadership authorities within inclusive learning environments. In particular federal policies mandate public schools to offer inclusive learning environments and opportunities for equal access to the general education curriculum for
all students, regardless of ability. Educators gaining knowledge of what policy is saying about leadership authorities in relation to inclusive learning environments will ultimately benefit all learners, regardless of their ability to learn.

Sergiovanni (1992) avows that morally based leadership is important in its own right, however moral leadership is also important because it taps into what is important to the people and what motivates them. Sergiovanni asserts that professional authority as a basis of authority for leadership assumes it is the teachers’ expertise that counts the most. When leadership practice is based on both professional and moral authorities it creates a response in staff that comes from within rather than an external force or reward. In relation to the findings of my study, if policy language increased in relation to professional and moral leadership authorities it would accentuate to leaders their moral obligation of providing inclusive learning environments for all students, regardless of ability. Increasing professional and moral authorities for leadership will strengthen staff’s motivation and commitment to providing inclusive education. Self-guided professional development would grow based on the moral obligation of providing inclusive environments for all kids.

Thomas Sergiovanni (1992) offers a deep look into the practices of leaders and how they do or do not impact the staff getting the work done. He firmly believes that when leaders practice sources of professional and moral authority. But we are left with how to ensure policy is written to help guide leaders toward these leadership practices.

This research project has provided vital information for the field of educational leadership as well as for writers of policy, higher education, and professional development. Ultimately, determining the leadership authorities within policy that
support inclusive learning environments for all kids, regardless of learning ability is substantial. Our public schools educate millions of students including those with diverse learner abilities. Leaders must be successful in leading inclusive learning environments and policy must assert that the combination of professional and moral authorities should be the primary leadership. Sergiovanni (1992) proclaims:

\[ \text{Leadership based on moral authority can transform schools into communities and inspire the kind of commitment, devotion, and service that will make our schools unequaled among society's institutions.} \]

In conclusion this study investigated the relationship between leadership and landmark federal inclusive policies through a qualitative document analysis. Serving kids in inclusive learning environments is mandated by policy and one could argue it is morally correct to do so. Findings from this study confirmed that inclusive policy is promoting professional, technical-rational, and moral authorities upon school and district leaders. It is clear that policy is not prompting school and district leaders to engage in bureaucratic and psychological practices. Young et al. (2017) allege federal education policies are in place to ensure underserved student populations obtain the proper resources and special attention so they receive equitable educational opportunities. The findings in this study provide the basis for future studies relating to the impact inclusive policy has on leadership authority.
APPENDIX A

EXAMPLE OF RAW DATA COLLECTION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keyword/Date Retrived</th>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Leadership Statements from ESSA 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator -28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1) &quot;(A) developed by the State educational agency with timely and meaningful consultation with the Governor, members of the State legislature and State board of education (if the State has a State board of education), local educational agencies (including those located in rural areas), representatives of Indian tribes located in the State, teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders (if the State has charter schools), specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff, and parents;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matches 392 Page</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2) &quot;(xii) enable itemized score analyses to be produced and reported, consistent with clause (iii), to local educational agencies and schools, so that parents, teachers, principals, other school leaders, and administrators can interpret and address the specific academic needs of students as indicated by the students' achievement on assessment items;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>document Started</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3) &quot;(A) is developed with timely and meaningful consultation with teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, charter school leaders (in a local educational agency that has charter schools), administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), other appropriate school personnel, and with parents of children in schools served under this part;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data collection on</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4) &quot;(g) how teachers and school leaders, in consultation with parents, administrators, paraprofessionals, and specialized instructional support personnel, in schools operating a targeted assistance school program under section 1115, will identify the eligible children most in need of services under this part;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3/20.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5) &quot;(2) is developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals present in the school, administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), the local educational agency, to the extent feasible, tribes and tribal organizations present in the community, and, if appropriate, specialized instructional support per-sonnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students, and other individuals determined by the school;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6) &quot;(g) how teachers, principals, other school leaders, and administrators use assessment data to improve and differentiate instruction;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7) preparation and administration; &quot;(vii) the assessments that administrators, teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and students, if appropriate, do and do not find useful;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>8) &quot;(G) an assurance that the local educational agency developed and will implement the local flexibility demonstration agreement in consultation with teachers, principals, other school leaders (including charter school leaders in a local educational agency that has charter schools), administrators of Federal programs impacted by the agreement, parents, community leaders, and other relevant stakeholders;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>9) &quot;(G) State educational agencies, or nonprofit organizations in partnership with State educational agencies, to support the implementation, replication, or expansion of effective science, technology, engineering, and mathematics professional development programs in schools across the State through collaboration with school administrators, principals, and STEM educators;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>10) &quot;(G) the plan has been developed in consultation with local educational agencies, teachers, administrators of programs implemented under this subpart, parents of English learners, and other relevant stakeholders;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>11) &quot;(2) to provide effective professional development to classroom teachers (including teachers in classroom settings that are not the settings of language instruction educational pro-grams), principals and other school leaders, administrators, and other school or community-based organizational personnel, that is&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

CODED POLICY STATEMENTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Statements from IDEA 1997</th>
<th>Subordinated Codes</th>
<th>Psychological Codes</th>
<th>Technical-Rational Codes</th>
<th>Professional Codes</th>
<th>Moral Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) From P 98/121 (3) The State will acquire and disseminate, teachers, administrators, school board members, and related services personnel, significant information derived from educational research and other sources, and how the State will, when appropriate, adapt promising practices, materials, and technology.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) From P 98/121 (4) To prepare the research and evaluation findings and products from the project in formats that are useful or specific audiences, including parents, administrators, teachers, early intervention personnel, related services personnel, and individuals with disabilities.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) From P 104/121 (1) Providing interdisciplinary training for various types of leadership personnel, including teacher preparation faculty, administrators, researchers, superintendents, principals, and other personnel whose work affect special education, educational, and transitional services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) from P 106/121 (1) (b) Institutes that provide professional development that addresses the needs of children with disabilities to teachers or teams of teachers, and where appropriate, to school board members, administrators, principals, pupil personnel services, and other staff from individual schools.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) From P 110/121 (2) Provide technical assistance and information in a timely, coordinated, and accessible manner to and assist the State in local levels for children with disabilities and their families.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) From P 112/121 (2) To ensure the full participation of parents, teachers, administrators, early intervention personnel, related services personnel, and transition personnel receive coordinated and accessible technical assistance and information to assist them persons, through systematic change activities and efforts, to improve early intervention, educational, and transition services and results for children with disabilities.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) From P 98/121 (5) To assume leadership positions in administration and leadership positions.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) From P 104/121 (5) The Secretary shall support leadership in preparation activities that encourage students to the objectives described in subpart (a).</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) From P 104/121 (6) (b) LEADERSHIP PREPARATION; AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES (1) In general.—In serving the schools, the Board shall support leadership preparation activities that encourage students to the objectives described in subpart (a).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) From P 104/121 (6) (b) LEADERSHIP PREPARATION; AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES (2) In general.—In serving the schools, the Board shall support leadership preparation activities that encourage students to the objectives described in subpart (a).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) From P 104/121 (6) (b) LEADERSHIP PREPARATION; AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES (3) In general.—In serving the schools, the Board shall support leadership preparation activities that encourage students to the objectives described in subpart (a).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) From P 104/121 (6) (b) LEADERSHIP PREPARATION; AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES (4) In general.—In serving the schools, the Board shall support leadership preparation activities that encourage students to the objectives described in subpart (a).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) From P 104/121 (6) (b) LEADERSHIP PREPARATION; AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES (5) In general.—In serving the schools, the Board shall support leadership preparation activities that encourage students to the objectives described in subpart (a).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) From P 104/121 (6) (b) LEADERSHIP PREPARATION; AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES (6) In general.—In serving the schools, the Board shall support leadership preparation activities that encourage students to the objectives described in subpart (a).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) From P 104/121 (6) (b) LEADERSHIP PREPARATION; AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES (7) In general.—In serving the schools, the Board shall support leadership preparation activities that encourage students to the objectives described in subpart (a).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) From P 104/121 (6) (b) LEADERSHIP PREPARATION; AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES (8) In general.—In serving the schools, the Board shall support leadership preparation activities that encourage students to the objectives described in subpart (a).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) From P 104/121 (6) (b) LEADERSHIP PREPARATION; AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES (9) In general.—In serving the schools, the Board shall support leadership preparation activities that encourage students to the objectives described in subpart (a).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) From P 104/121 (6) (b) LEADERSHIP PREPARATION; AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES (10) In general.—In serving the schools, the Board shall support leadership preparation activities that encourage students to the objectives described in subpart (a).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) From P 104/121 (6) (b) LEADERSHIP PREPARATION; AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES (11) In general.—In serving the schools, the Board shall support leadership preparation activities that encourage students to the objectives described in subpart (a).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) From P 104/121 (6) (b) LEADERSHIP PREPARATION; AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES (12) In general.—In serving the schools, the Board shall support leadership preparation activities that encourage students to the objectives described in subpart (a).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) From P 104/121 (6) (b) LEADERSHIP PREPARATION; AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES (13) In general.—In serving the schools, the Board shall support leadership preparation activities that encourage students to the objectives described in subpart (a).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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