DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 271 EA 004 455

AUTHOR Cronin, Joseph M.; Horoschak, Peter P.
TITLE Innovative Strategies in Field Experiences for Preparing Educational Administrators. ERIC/CEM State-of-the-Knowledge Series Number Twenty-One. UCEA Monograph Series Number Eight.
INSTITUTION Oregon Univ., Eugene. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.; University Council for Educational Administration, Columbus, Ohio.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 73
CONTRACT OEC-0-8-080353-3514
NOTE 49p.
AVAILABLE FROM University Council for Educational Administration, 29 West Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210 ($2.00, Quantity Discounts)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel; *Administrator Education; Clinical Experience; *Educational Administration; *Educational Strategies; *Field Experience Programs; Human Relations; *Innovation; Internship Programs; Questionnaires; School Surveys; Social Sciences; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

In this monograph, the authors identify four different strategies for field experiences that offer administrative trainees positive applications of theory to practice in educational planning, management, and supervision. In historical perspective, a case study comparison of field experiences conducted at Harvard University and the University of Chicago precedes a report on the current status of field programs as shown by the survey returns of a UCEA questionnaire regarding issues involved in training school administrators. The four strategies -- the traditional school system survey, the human relations approach, the clinical/political action strategy, and the anthropological or sociological research approach -- vary according to the study focus, the type of involvement of students and faculty, and the product or outcomes. Descriptions of specific field training experiences illustrate innovative approaches in the application of the four strategies. (ER)

Innovative Strategies in Field Experiences for Preparing Educational Administrators

Joseph M. Cronin and Peter P. Horoschak

1973

Commissioned by
ERIC Clearinghouse on
Educational Management

Published by
University Council for
Educational Administration

ERIC/CEM–UCEA SERIES ON
ADMINISTRATOR PREPARATION

Under the editorship of

PHILIP K. PIELE, Director

ERIC Clearinghouse
on Educational Management
University of Oregon

and

JACK CULBERTSON, Executive Director

University Council
for Educational Administration
The Ohio State University

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management operates under contract with the National Institute of Education of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This publication was prepared pursuant to that contract. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official National Institute of Education position or policy.

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 72-86754
ERIC/CEM Accession Number: EA 004 455

ERIC/CEM State-of-the-Knowledge Series, Number Twenty-one
UCEA Monograph Series, Number Eight

Manuscript edited by Ellen Rice

Printed in the United States of America
Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc.
19 North Jackson
Danville, Illinois 61832

TITLES IN THIS SERIES

1. Preparing Educational Leaders: A Review of Recent Literature, by Robin H. Farquhar and Philip K. Piele

2. Unconventional Methods and Materials for Preparing Educational Administrators, by Richard Wynn

3. Emergent Practices in the Continuing Education of School Administrators, by Frank W. Lutz and Reynolds Ferrante

4. Training-in-Common for Educational, Business, and Public Administrators, by Erwin Miklos

5. New Approaches to Recruitment and Selection of Educational Administrators, by Robert T. Stout

6. Quantitative Analysis in Educational Administrator Preparation Programs, by James E. Bruno and James N. Fox

7. The Use of Computers in Administrator Preparation, by E. Wailand Bessent

8. Innovative Strategies in Field Experiences for Preparing Educational Administrators, by Joseph M. Cronin and Peter P. Horoschak

Copies, at $2.00 each, can be purchased from the University Council for Educational Administration, 29 West Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210. Quantity discounts as follows: 2 to 24 copies, $1.80 each; 25 or more copies, $1.60 each.

ERIC/CEM

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a national information system operated by the National Institute of Education. ERIC serves the educational community by disseminating educational research results and other resource information that can be used in developing more effective educational programs.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, one of eighteen such units in the system, was established at the University of Oregon in 1966. The Clearinghouse and its seventeen companion units process research reports and journal articles for announcement in ERIC's index and abstract bulletins.

Research reports are announced in *Research in Education (RIE)*, available in many libraries and by subscription for $38 a year from the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Most of the documents listed in *RIE* can be purchased through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, operated by Leasco Information Products, Inc.

Journal articles are announced in *Current Index to Journals in Education*. *CIJE* is also available in many libraries and can be ordered for $44 a year from Macmillan Information, 866 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10022. Annual and semiannual cumulations can be ordered separately.

Besides processing documents and journal articles, the Clearinghouse has another major function—information analysis and synthesis. The Clearinghouse prepares bibliographies, literature reviews, state-of-the-knowledge papers, and other interpretive research studies on topics in its area.

UCEA

The mission of the University Council for Educational Administration is to improve the preparation of administrative personnel in education. Its membership consists of major universities in the United States and Canada. UCEA's central staff works with and through scholars in member universities to create new standards and practices in administrator preparation and to disseminate the results to interested institutions.

UCEA's interest in the professional preparation of educational administrators includes both continuing education and resident, preservice programs. Interinstitutional cooperation and communication are basic tools used in development activities; both administrators and professors participate in projects.

The Council's efforts currently are divided into six areas: developing and testing strategies for improving administrative and leadership practices in school systems; encouraging an effective flow of leaders into preparatory programs and posts of educational administration; advancing research and its dissemination; providing information and ideas helpful to those in universities responsible for designing preparatory programs; integrating and improving preparatory programs in specific areas of administration; and developing and evaluating the Monroe City URBSIM simulation and support materials.

Contents

Foreword

During the last decade, programs to prepare educational administrators have undergone considerable change. Growing specialization in the field of educational administration resulting from new knowledge production (for example, operations research) is one reason for the program change. Another is the continuing search for more effective patterns of field experience, instructional method, and content in preparatory programs.

Because of the varied changes achieved in preparation in different universities, those interested in designing or updating programs today are faced with a greater number of options than was the case ten years ago. A major purpose of this monograph series is to shed light on the various options now available to those interested in administrator preparation. A second purpose is to advance general understanding of developments in preparation during the past decade. The series is directed to professors, students, and administrators interested in acquiring information on various aspects of preparation.

Each author in the series has been asked to define the parameters of his subject, review and analyze recent pertinent literature and research, describe promising new practices emerging in actual training programs across the country, and identify knowledge gaps and project future developments. The papers in the series were planned and developed cooperatively by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management and the University Council for Educational Administration. The editors of the series hope that the monographs will prove valuable to those interested in understanding and assessing recent and projected developments in preparation.

In this monograph, the eighth in the series, Joseph M. Cronin and Peter P. Horoschak expound the use of field training to give administrative trainees practical experience in educational planning, management, and supervision. The authors identify four different strategies for field experiences and then describe programs that illustrate the strategies.

Dr. Cronin is secretary of educational affairs of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Before coming to that position in 1972, he served as associate dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education. He has also been a public school teacher, assistant principal, and principal. He holds a bachelor's degree from Harvard College (1956), a master's degree from Harvard University (1957), and a doctor's degree from Stanford University (1965).

Dr. Horoschak is administrative assistant to the superintendent of the Boston Public Schools. From 1968 to 1970 he was a research associate for the American Institutes for Research, and on three occasions he has served as a consultant to state education agencies. He received a bachelor's degree in 1962 from the United States Military Academy, a master's degree in 1970 from Boston University, and a doctor's degree in 1973 from the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

PHILIP K. PIELE
JACK CULBERTSON

1

Introduction

What is an operational definition of a field training experience? A field experience is defined as a training activity for one or more students in a setting usually outside the university but supervised by the university faculty. It may be designed to serve the needs of a specific educational system, organization, agency, or the community at large. Practitioners in the field may either sponsor or collaborate with a field study team.

How does field experience compare with other examples of training that take the students out in the field? The field training exercise is more than a work experience. It is an integral component of the students' formal academic program, supervised by university faculty and intended to provide experience in planning and analytical skills.

In contrast, the internship is an actual work experience that supplements the students' formal academic program. The internship is supervised by practitioners and intended to provide an opportunity to apply newly acquired skills and gain experience in

an administrative role. Although the university faculty is still held accountable for the training, the intern is usually under the direct supervision of practitioners. In practice, the role defined for the intern is often too constrained to offer a chance to develop planning or analytical skills.

Programs that include a field component usually also offer internships or school survey work. Lazarsfeld and Sieber (1964, p. 5) define surveys as "social bookkeeping" projects—the collection of statistics required to assess the ability of a particular educational system to serve its public. Typical projects include surveys of school building needs, enrollment projections, cost estimates, and the like. The authors point out that the term "social bookkeeping" need not be derogatory, since it is a vital task to compile proper records or make projections. It is clearly noted, though, that the typical school system survey does not completely fulfill expectations of what a field experience ought to be with respect to the training of school administrators.

It is useful to distinguish between the field experience desirable for the student in educational research and the field experience for training school administrators. According to Lazarsfeld and Sieber, the educational researcher is a social scientist who is primarily interested in gaining basic insight into social processes. Field training in research should provide opportunities to participate in the exacting procedures of research design, collection of data, and data analysis.

The administrator, on the other hand, needs to know what research is applicable to his area of interest but needs less exposure to the tools of the research scientist. A field experience for administrative trainees might yield data of interest to the researcher but is concerned with the application, rather than the discovery, of sound research findings.

The essential purpose of the field experience in either preservice or inservice training for school administrators is to provide training for students that allows them to gather facts, develop plans, and test alternatives with the university staff and with each other. Putting theory into practice in the "real world," checking out perceptions of how the educational system "really" works, and having the freedom to develop plans or proposals and to receive constructive feedback—these are but a few of the advantages of participating in a field experience. When questioned about the

value, professional educators usually stress the practical benefits derived from a training program that gets students out in the field.

Field training ought to provide the student in educational administration with practical experience in dealing with difficult policy and planning issues. It should provide a disciplined exercise in systematic analysis. However, the focus is first on training the student, with service to clients or a school system given a secondary priority. As such, the design of the field exercise must be open enough and flexible enough to accommodate fledgling technical skill and provide feedback that will help the student gain insight into his own strengths and weaknesses. This report describes the state of the art in developing innovative strategies for field experiences that meet these conditions.

2

Historical Perspective

To understand what is innovative in the area of current field experiences, one must first review the past. Unfortunately, as the UCEA study *Preparing Educational Leaders for the Seventies* (Culbertso and others 1969) accurately reports, there is little in the literature regarding field experiences other than traditional internships. To gain a historical perspective we turn to a case study comparison of field experiences conducted at two prominent universities with programs in educational administration.

The Harvard and Chicago cases are presented in detail on the following pages, because they illustrate the development of the field experience as an integral part of a leadership training program. Both programs provide all the ingredients of a field experience. Emphasis is placed on training students to apply theory to practice. Students are required to find out how the system really works and thereby develop their technical competence. The field studies, under the direct supervision of the university faculty, offer ample opportunity to generate feedback on students' performance.

ROLE OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

During the past twenty years the social sciences have played an increasingly important role in the planning and implementation of doctoral programs in educational administration. Cronin and Iannaccone (1973) describe this role by comparing the programs in educational administration at Harvard University and the University of Chicago.

As pointed out by these authors and documented in The W. K. Kellogg Foundation (1961) report,* the two universities share a common commitment to integrating contributions from social science disciplines into their programs.

> At the University of Chicago, the Department of Education is part of the Division of Social Sciences, and the social sciences at that institution have played a part in the training of educators for many years. In the sequence of basic seminars and courses which constitute the core of the doctoral program in educational administration, insights from sociology, psychology, political science, and other disciplines are integrated into the work.
>
> Somewhat similar to this approach is the plan followed at Harvard University, where the social scientists are ultimately related to the total program rather than merely teaching discrete courses, and where these teachers are members of the Faculty of the Graduate School of Education. This method seems to provide an integration of relationships and a continuity of point of view which might not be possible if the students simply took courses in other disciplines.

Cronin and Iannaccone indicate that, from the start, there were some differences between the Harvard and Chicago statements of plans for training administrators.

First, the University of Chicago's major goal initially was to prepare administrators to test emerging theories of administration and then effectively translate them into practice. However, the Chicago emphasis introduced a concern for adding knowledge and understanding to the field of school administration—a concern engendered by scholars with an orientation toward training other scholars.

---

*The Kellogg Foundation invested seven million dollars in educational administration programs, of which Harvard received $575,864 for staff and its programs in New England, and Chicago received $898,967 for the Midwest Administration Center and its programs.

Second, the University of Chicago's plan was to continue a Ph.D. program within the structure of the university's social science division. This implied a context with constraints tending to maximize a concern for the production of knowledge and understanding in school administration. Within this context, field training necessarily followed the research model with the exacting requirements for design, data collection, and analysis leading to the discovery of grounded theories.

In contrast, at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, emphasis was on strengthening the Ed.D. program, rather than developing the Ph.D. This focus enabled a move away from the often ritualistic scholarship demands of the faculty of arts and sciences and toward a greater concern for the immediate usefulness of the social sciences to the clinical practitioner. It was in their contribution to the practitioner's work that the role of the social sciences was found for the Harvard program. As such, the field experiences that evolved with the program were more pragmatic and action oriented (for example, school building surveys and plans for implementing school district reorganization). Opportunities were also provided to apply some of the social science perspectives and methodology.

The implications probably not seen at the very early stages of the two programs were that in the case of Chicago the role of the social scientists in the program (within the context of the social science division controlling the Ph.D.) would be dominant, whereas at Harvard the role of the social scientists would be that of junior partner in the program. But initially, at least, the differences between the two programs did not appear to be that great. The Cronin and Iannaccone paper describes in detail how the operations of the two training programs resulted in their divergence from each other, until after twenty years they seemed to be almost 180 degrees apart.

This has led to an oversimplified point of view: Harvard trains practitioners and works on school improvement in the field directly; Chicago trains professors and is committed to the production of knowledge about schools as an indirect means of improving schools. Specifically, the explicit commitment of Harvard was that "students will be encouraged more strongly to work with the problems of educational administration rather than merely contemplate them" (Harvard University 1952). The Chicago plan emphasized understanding the purposes and functions of educational admin-

istration. Looking back, one can now identify two competing views on administration as an object of study. Yet leaders of both programs worked with the field much of the time and both incorporated field experiences for students.

Emphases of Field Experiences

At Harvard in the early 1950s, along with an increased emphasis on the social sciences in the training of administrators, the faculty planned for increased guided experiences in field or clinical situations. In their first semester, inexperienced candidates engaged in a field experience in a community observation post (city hall or community service agency) as well as in a school system. They also completed an eight-week internship with some administrative responsibility, typically during the summer between the second and third year of study.

All candidates in the Ed.D. program for practicing administrators took one course in "Problems of Administration and Related Research Methods" and then took fieldwork of both the "contractual" and "social science research" types. The former was a school survey with a strong service orientation; the latter a community study, perhaps such as the Bay City studies of public opinion and political leadership.

Students of the Administrative Career Program (ACP) gathered for seminars, faculty consultation, and work on field studies. The development of new courses added up to intense pressure on the several instructors, a situation that the faculty later judged "could scarcely be considered optimum" (Harvard University 1952, p. 3). The field study was too insatiable a master; it could consume all faculty and student time, allowing no opportunity for reflection and for generating knowledge of social science that might not rise out of a specific setting.

The central problem was the success of the field study, which in 1952-53 so powerfully attracted the students that they devoted most of their time to solving Boston's school building problem and neglected other studies. In fact, the experience "led them to ask why the social science disciplines represented by the faculty cannot be 'taught' by involving the total faculty in those aspects of the contract study which might draw upon the various disciplines" (Harvard University 1954, p. 32). It was also clear that

faculty-student relations were less formal and based more on mutual contributions than were staff-student relations in the usual course offerings. The faculty recognized that the roles played by students as university field workers threatened the sharply differentiated status lines characterizing the rest of higher education. Solving real problems in the field created a few at the university.

Could such a program give equal weight to social science disciplinary research and the more problem-oriented school surveys? By 1954, the faculty concluded that "we fell into an error in separating too sharply community studies designed by social scientists to obtain knowledge relevant to the understanding of communities and their attitudes towards education from contractual studies entered into by the Center for Field Studies and communities which sought the aid of the University in solving problems defined by the communities themselves" (Harvard University 1954, p. 41).

The belief in social science remained undiminished, but the solution was to try to merge the two types of studies with more than a leaning toward the contractual relationship with responsibilities for an actual set of recommendations. The faculty felt fewer studies of greater depth over large periods of time (several years, if possible) would allow more use of social science resources. But the studies *would not* be those more logically undertaken by a unit whose primary function is social science research rather than educational administration..

So the faculty decided to set aside the first and last six or eight weeks for formal course instruction and to conduct a field study of Lawrence, Massachusetts, between November 15th and March 15th, with any course meetings clearly subordinate during this time. Such was the pattern from 1954 through 1960. Formal course work in the social sciences simply had to stay out of the way of the contracted study.

CHICAGO IN THE 1950s

At the same time, faculty members at the University of Chicago thoroughly revised the program for preparing educational administrators. In the process, assistance was given by administrators in the area, graduate students, and consultants from public administration, economics, sociology, and psychology. The new program provided an increased emphasis on the human relations aspects of adminis-

tration, a greater provision for field experiences, and a review of procedures for selection of candidates and evaluation of progress (University of Chicago 1952, p. 4).

Students were learning mainly from what were called "cooperative studies." The emphasis was on how to conduct field investigations to gain the facts and understanding necessary for policy decisions. By 1953, the university's Midwest Administration Center was moving away from more action-oriented research in a quest for more basic kinds of knowledge:

> New concepts and techniques are being applied to the study of administration. Progress is being made in developing a theory of administration which will focus on the elements of human interaction in planning and cooperative activity for the accomplishment of purposes . . . to clarify role functions and role expectation. Particular attention is being given to the effects of various kinds of communication and various types of leadership on understanding, morale, and effectiveness of operation. (University of Chicago 1953, p. 39)

There was also mention of the use of research techniques developed by psychologists and sociologists, instruments such as "critical incident" studies, Q-sort, interaction analysis scales, and projective tests.

Student associates of the Midwest Administration Center had the opportunity to engage in field studies "designed to test emerging theories of administrative functions, roles and relationships" (University of Chicago 1955, p. 4). They could also help to evaluate other university preparation programs and to plan a new round of clinics and conferences, including one for faculties in administration in other universities.

Thus, a major revolution had taken place, not in the already substantial commitment to research but in the more sophisticated approach to research on administration. In a few years the ideal of theory-based research supplanted the kinds of status surveys and tabulations that previously characterized administrative research around the country. Not only was the new research planned with the assistance of social scientists, but it was also conceptualized and designed with a theoretical framework derived from one or several of the social sciences. Graduate students in administration were expected to learn how to use a theoretical framework and to carry out fieldwork planning the data collection for their own dissertations.

HARVARD IN THE 1960s

Throughout the 1960s the Harvard Administrative Career Program's field study retained its position of importance. Changes in the program resulted in making greater use of resources outside the faculty of educational administration. Early in the decade, field studies shifted from studying "sick school systems" to helping systems develop a collaborative school-university relationship. Near the end of the decade, though, there was a strong emphasis on studies in urban areas, including a Danforth Foundation grant to study educational decision-making in urban school systems, including Boston.

The decade found some dissatisfaction among the ranks of sociologists connected with the administrative program at Harvard. The sociologists attempted to exert greater pressure on students to apply sociological methods to their fieldwork. Field studies often involved community opinions and aspirations about the schools. The sociologists on the faculty usually worked with student "community committees" on the design, data collection, analysis, and interpretation of the data.

In a 1963 study of Brockton, Massachusetts, the "Task of Public Education" instrument developed at the University of Chicago was used to survey public values and expectations. In many other communities, students under faculty direction tried to discover a "community power structure" as a source of insight on how much the study could recommend, how, and why.

Not much of this analysis appears in the texts of field studies, but a few reports couch the arguments for greater investment in education in such terms as economic development, industrial growth, and increased individual economic returns.

However, the coalition of social scientists and educational administrators was in no sense permanent. Willard Spalding (1961) noted the problem of replacing social scientists at the end of a term of years, defensible financially but not conducive to the long-term goal.

> Each social scientist must work with at least one eye upon the chance for advancement elsewhere, shaping his writing and research to this end. Since his next post is far more likely to be in an academic department than with a school of education, each social scientist must be guided more by the expectancies of his academic colleagues than by those of

> the Administrative Career Program: Commitment to the preparation of school administrators is not likely to occur frequently under these circumstances. (p. 4)

CHICAGO IN THE 1960s

At the University of Chicago, in a program dominated by social scientists, the decade of the 1960s saw a movement toward greater concern for preparing administrators rather than for concentrating largely on preparing professors of educational administration. The Midwest Administrative Center continued to sponsor research, but the subjects grew quite diverse. Social science remained the base, but faculty interests were clearly problem-oriented. Studies of team teaching, community school board decisions, educational productivity and school finance, and the nationalizing influences on American schools shaped the field experience.

In the late 1960s, the urban crisis created a concern on the part of the faculty as a whole. Summer workshops were conducted in the Chicago ghetto schools. Research on big city school boards was conceptualized and support obtained from the Danforth Foundation. By the end of the 1960s attempts to recruit activist students from minority groups and from the inner city were successful.

Thus, the faculty decided that the need was for urban educational administrators, especially black administrators. In 1968-69, the University of Chicago Department of Education, Committee on Administration decided to recruit and train from twenty to thirty individuals for high-level leadership positions in urban schools. Starting in 1969-70, eight to ten new students a year were supported with federal funds under the Education Professions Development Act.

COMMITMENTS AND CONCERNS

In summary, the Harvard proposal of 1952 represented a dramatic shift away from conventional courses in the technical function of administration, that is, school supervision, business management, school buildings, personnel management, school law, and elementary and secondary school administration. Instead, the faculty proposed that blocks of time be used in different ways and that a more conceptual approach be developed with the social sciences providing the frames of reference.

Besides problems and methodology courses, and a sequence in "cases and concepts," the program stressed systematic immersion in communities through a series of field encounters. First the student would observe, then participate in a field study, and eventually complete an administrative project. The focus clearly centered on applied problem-solving.

As described in the Cronin and Iannaccone report, the sociologists eventually became dissatisfied with their role in the Harvard Administrative Career Program. It is difficult enough to apply the social sciences well to a field study where the problems are determined by the contract. There are also great difficulties in determining how much of the conceptualization and methodology should go on paper in the final report. But, above all else, the problem of finding sufficient time simultaneously to train people, collect data with them, make difficult decisions including value judgments necessary in such surveys, and then work effectively with the client, may indeed preclude the possibility of using the field study as a major and central vehicle in a program.

An alternative is a field study carefully preceded by intensive work both in the concepts to be used during the course of the study and in the methodologies of field data collection, hypothesis formation, change and development, and analysis of field data. However, there was no room for this in the Harvard program as it developed.

The Harvard program and field training strategy have produced an important and impressive group of school administrators operating particularly in urban settings. The program's contribution to the intellectual understanding of school administration is considerably more modest. The concern at Harvard cannot be described as a concern either with developing knowledge or even with answering the question, "What are the concepts which are most useful for understanding the problem?" Instead it is a concern about how to deal with the social problems in our society and how to prepare leaders to make substantial contributions in providing solutions.

At the University of Chicago, the early commitment to research and theory was later reinforced by the interdisciplinary approach. It may be questioned if the theories are useful and relevant to the applied setting or if administrative theory really generates research that will make schools more responsive and innovative. R. Jean

Hills (1968) quotes readers of administrative theory as saying in effect, "It's interesting, but I don't know what to do with it," and, "It doesn't make any difference in the way I think about organization." This may be too harsh a criticism of the theory movement as a whole.

As noted in the Cronin and Iannaccone report, the University of Chicago program led to a development of students who went into higher education and became professors of school administration, some of them moving into the administration of higher educational institutions. These graduates have an influence out of proportion to their numbers as the ripple effect between their work and their students may be seen. Unlike Harvard, Chicago has had less direct impact on large-city administrative situations. The University of Chicago's decision to turn to more direct ways of wrestling with urban education is not a repudiation of the past but rather recognition of the validity of claims for a problem-oriented approach to the preparation of school administrators.

The social sciences have influenced programs to prepare educational administrators in two different ways—either as the primary focus in a theory-based program, as at the University of Chicago, or less directly as a frame of reference for more problem-oriented programs, as at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. In either case, though, the social sciences provide an orientation for the student to question his own value structure, the values of the community, and the values of the culture in relation to the administrative role. In turn, the perspective of the student engaged in a field experience is much broader by virtue of having the theoretical constructs of the social sciences at his fingertips.

3

Current Status of Field Experience Programs

Despite positive sentiment for the practical benefits of field training, the field experience is not yet established as an integral component of preparatory programs for school administrators. This is the verdict of the American Association of School Administrators as reported in the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) study *Preparing Educational Leaders for the Seventies* (Culbertson and others 1969). This comprehensive report deals with the full range of issues involved in training school administrators. Even so, only limited space is allocated to a discussion of field experiences other than the traditional internship. The omission is acknowledged by the authors, who indicate that their review of recent literature yielded substantial information on only one type of field experience—the internship.

UCEA QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Besides searching the literature for information regarding current trends in the training of administrators, Culbertson and his col-

leagues circulated questionnaires to faculty members of university programs in educational administration and to practicing school administrators as well. One questionnaire form went to the faculties at fifty-six universities, and another form to almost three hundred fifty school administrators. The survey returns yield information pertaining to many aspects of preparatory programs.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

One area attracting considerable response related to the perceived strengths and weaknesses of field-related experiences. Most respondents felt such experiences were useful components of any training program, but only a limited number felt the typical field experiences offered were of sufficient variety, tailored to the students' needs, or adequately integrated with other components of the training program (Culbertson and others 1969).

More specifically, the survey of both university faculties and practicing school administrators pointed out several weaknesses in the field-related experiences of the typical program in educational administration. At least one-third of the respondents from each group stated that field training in educational administration doctoral programs was generally deficient or at least underemphasized. This fact was evidenced by the lack of field training opportunities, the number of graduate students neglecting to take advantage of field-based learning experiences, and the observation that insufficient time is allocated to the field training being offered.

A significant number of the practicing administrators and at least a few faculty members were highly critical of field training as it is usually offered. They felt that a haphazard, variable approach was used in coordinating it with the academic program. The survey results indicated that current attempts to get the student into the field were, for the most part, poorly planned and supervised, allowed only fragmentary participation, and rarely were individualized or geared to the individual student's needs. Some faculty members claimed that the lack of sufficient funds to carry out field training was a major contributor to the poor showing of such efforts.

SIGNIFICANT INNOVATIONS

Several respondents to the questionnaire classified the following as significant innovations in designing field experiences:

- internships in regional, state, and federal education agencies
- use of a "field station" approach in urban areas
- periodic visits to national education organizations or big-city school systems for the purpose of observation
- opportunities for students to complete school surveys
- field experience as a requirement for doctoral programs in educational administration

DESIRABLE CHANGES

At least 10 percent of the respondents in each group agreed on the following changes as desirable:

- general increase in the number and variety of field experiences available
- expansion and improvement in those opportunities already offered, including availability to more students, wider variety, and more concentrated experiences as well as better supervision
- increase in usefulness to individual students through better design and direction, more care in making assignments according to student interest, and more indepth studies

OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES

It is generally agreed by members of faculties of educational administration and by experienced practitioners in the field that the field training experience is a useful, if not essential, component of programs in educational administration. However, their suggestions for improvement, as reported through the UCEA questionnaire, speak to the mechanics of running a field experience, not to the underlying strategy for including it in an academic program. Considerations of strategy are totally dependent on the objectives to be achieved in a field training exercise.

The objectives of a typical field training component are often unclear or even conflicting. The question is whether the number one priority of a field experience is to advance the level of knowledge in the field of educational administration or to acquaint students with the "real life" experiences of the profession of educational administration. Faculty members in charge of the field experiences may feel the first priority is to advance research in educational administration. Thus they may take advantage of the field training exercise to send students out into the community to

collect data. However, students who anticipate careers as practitioners will most likely place first priority on becoming familiar with the requirements of the administrator's role.

The fact of the matter is that these objectives need not be conflicting. The primary focus can be to give students the desired practical experience through the application of theory to practice. In the process, the experience will provide the researcher with data that may be used to advance the level of understanding of the field of educational administration.

4

Strategies for Field Experiences

A review of the literature of past and current practices in programs for training educational administrators indicates that field study components vary according to the *focus of the study*, the *type of involvement of the students and faculty* in the system being studied, and the *product or outcomes* of the study.

A field study may focus on specific activities and elements of the educational system or on the system in its entirety. Students may remain detached in the role of objective observers or become intimately involved in a deliberate change process. Products of the study may range from an objective analysis of the current status of the system to active involvement in seeing a change through to completion.

Four very different strategies for field experiences have been identified. They are the traditional school system survey, the human relations approach, the clinical/political action strategy, and the anthropological or sociological research approach. The strategies differ according to the focus of the field study, the type of

involvement of individual students or the field study team, and the expected outcomes of the field study experience.

TRADITIONAL SCHOOL SYSTEM SURVEY

The school system survey is considered the "traditional" field study experience because it is the strategy most often pursued where field studies have been incorporated into programs for training educational administrators. The scope of school system surveys ranges from limited (such as building surveys) to comprehensive (consideration of all aspects of school operations and facilities).

Regardless of the scope of the survey, the study focuses on data collection and analysis with a view to making recommendations for improvements. Many surveys take on the characteristics of "social bookkeeping" projects in which data are collected on enrollment trends, adequacy of physical plants, scope of curriculum offerings, availability of supporting facilities such as laboratories and libraries, and the utility of the organizational structure.

In a school system survey, both faculty and students are usually viewed as consultants and educational authorities. Involvement in the educational system and the community it serves is limited to the roles of observer and interviewer. The students collect and analyze data, often in teams responsible for documenting specific aspects of system components or activities. Supervising faculty usually assume responsibility for validity of the analysis, determining that all critical factors are considered and that the final recommendations are compatible.

The school system survey is likely to be a contractual arrangement between the university and the system being surveyed. The terms of the contract spell out the products expected from the field study effort. In almost every case, the product is in the form of a prepared report intended to serve as a "blueprint" for action in the immediate future. Sometimes followup activities are specified, usually with the objective of explaining the report to educational practitioners, the clients of the school system, and interested community groups.

The most apparent shortcoming of a traditional survey strategy is that the final report is often shelved indefinitely, with only piecemeal implementation of the recommendations. From the training exercise, students may gain ample experience in assessing

the quality of the educational system's efforts and comparing that quality with current developments in the educational process. All too frequently, though, the students become engrossed in a "social bookkeeping" activity with little consideration of basic theory. Judgments are made about current practices, but the underlying theoretical considerations are often overlooked.

On the more positive side, students gain from the experience of applying analytic skills to working systems and learn to isolate critical factors that operate in the educational environment. The contract between the system being studied and the field study team furnishes incentive to complete a thorough analysis. Also, the educational system and the community it serves are provided a plan for change based on an objective analysis.

Human Relations Approach

The human relations approach to field studies focuses on individual and peer group relations. Although there is no single human relations approach to organizational development, Baldridge (1972) describes the cumulative concern of theorists in this field to be with protecting personal values, solving problems of interpersonal relations, reducing tension between groups, and developing better methods of resolving conflicts.

As applied to a field experience for training educational administrators, the human relations approach emphasizes working with practitioners and clients to improve interpersonal sensitivity, developing goal-setting techniques and planning processes, and learning how to manage conflict. The spotlight is on the behavior of people rather than on the status of system components such as buildings, curriculum, or school services.

The role of the students and faculty involved in the field experience is that of consultant to the system. The students may be involved in conducting sensitivity groups, providing onsite consulting services, or gathering data on the behavioral aspects of the system to be fed back to the organization. Ample use is made of technology, such as audio recordings and video tapes, to collect data on human interactions.

The products of a field experience using the human relations strategy are a change in the attitudes of the individuals working in the system and a change in the way they view their jobs, their

colleagues and clients, and themselves. Another hoped-for outcome, from the standpoint of students and faculty, is a contribution to the research in human relations theory and its application.

Certain problems are encountered in applying the human relations strategy to field experiences in training educational administrators. The approach focuses on the behavioral interactions within the educational system with little regard for environmental factors, except indirectly through the consideration given them by the clients. Political and economic constraints receive little attention in an analysis of the behavioral interactions between individuals within a system. The outcomes of an intervention in an educational organization using this strategy are likely to be disappointing in the long run. There is no assurance that changing the attitudes of individuals will lead to real change in the way the organization operates or in the services it provides. On the other hand, it can be argued that sustained change in the operation of an educational system is not likely unless there is an accompanying change in the attitudes of the people who operate the system. Otherwise, people will slip back to the practices with which they feel most comfortable and secure.

Through involvement in a field experience incorporating the human relations strategy, the students themselves are certain to become more aware of the behavioral aspects of organizations that will affect them in their professional careers. Only time will tell whether this awareness will have a profound effect on their own work situations and, more importantly, whether it will favorably affect the educational systems they eventually expect to manage.

Clinical/Political Action Strategy

A field experience using the clinical/political action strategy focuses on seeing change through to its completion, or at least setting up the process by which change will take place. The field experience involves development of a set of recommendations for change or adoption of recommendations produced by others, analysis of the political system operating in the organization, and planned intervention to ensure that the recommendations are carried through to their implementation.

The political systems analysis considers both internal and external forces operating on the system. For example, Baldridge's

(1972) political systems approach requires an analysis of the special interests operating on the organization both within the system and from the environment, a study of interest articulation or the process by which the special interest groups exert pressure on decision-makers, and the decision-making process itself.

Involvement of students and faculty using the clinical/political action strategy is often quite direct and less objective than other field experience strategies. The analytic aspects of the field experience utilize the full range of systems-analysis skills, including setting goals and objectives, considering alternative approaches to achieving the goals, selecting a course of action, and hopefully evaluating the results. The political action aspect of the experience involves working to bring about change by enlisting members of the educational enterprise in a concerted effort to implement the change. This effort likely includes persons both inside and outside the organization, requires active participation in negotiations and bargaining, and involves a substantial public relations effort.

The anticipated outcome of a political action field experience is change that is viable to the educational system and sustained over time. If carried through to completion, the field experience produces a comprehensive evaluation of the actions taken and possibly adds to the body of knowledge about deliberate organizational change or even evaluative research. The latter two outcomes, though, are too often seen as secondary in importance to the specific changes that take place in the educational system being acted on.

The inherent danger in embarking on a field experience using the clinical/political action strategy is that the educational system will become dependent on the field study team. The appropriate role of the faculty and students is that of consultants who are available to the practitioners and clients of the system but who plan to withdraw completely from the change process, leaving implementation of changes to the parties who must live with the results. To accomplish this, the field study team members must never find themselves in a position where they become decision-makers in the system, nor should they be viewed as a special interest group in their own right. They should remain resources for those who will carry out the change and then they should take on the role of objective evaluators of what takes place.

The implementation of innovation, according to Lazarsfeld and

Sieber, involves three phases: design, evaluation, and dissemination. Believing that lack of clear definitions of these phases has caused confusion, they point out the distinctive conditions required for the fulfillment of each phase. Furthermore, they feel that, though practitioners are less likely to focus on the design phase, the evaluation and dissemination phases are important to them and should involve their participation. Accordingly, these authors envision two field service roles for practitioners that concentrate on these phases of innovation and that can be incorporated into field training experiences for students of educational administration.

The evaluation phase of innovative change can be accomplished by field service teams that assess the change under natural conditions. The evaluation should ascertain as precisely as possible the utility of an innovation under conditions that will characterize the innovation when it is in general use. This sort of field experience should be viewed as an experiment and be subjected to the variety of field conditions expected in implementation. Such field tests provide the only means of systematic feedback to researchers; unfortunately, field tests are quite rare in education.

The dissemination phase of the innovative sequence can be accomplished through demonstration of the innovation in a typical school setting. It is recommended that sites be shifted frequently to avoid creating an artificial situation in any one school. The field training experience applicable in this phase leads to an action strategy of seeing the change put into effect and making certain the outcomes are made available to evaluators, researchers, and practitioners alike.

Anthropological or Sociological Research Approach

The use of the term "research" in the anthropological or sociological research approach denotes applied, as opposed to basic, research. It is the type of research that a practitioner trained in those techniques might apply in a future managerial role.

The focus is on understanding the culture and community and their effects on the educational system. The research effort is situational, possibly leading to the generation of grounded theory (theory that evolves from the data collected) rather than collecting data to prove or disprove a hypothesis arrived at previously.

The field study team composed of students and faculty try to

remain objective observers of the situation studied. As such, they develop a research design, collect and analyze data, revise their plans as need be, and repeat the data-collection and data-analysis cycle until they are satisfied with their own conclusions. The team experiences little involvement with the actual educational process taking place in the community except for the purposes of observation and interviewing. The team neither makes recommendations for change nor participates in a change process.

The product of a field experience using this strategy is an empirical study of the results of the educational process. Practitioners and clients may or may not find they can use the study for better understanding of where the ongoing educational system is leading them. It is up to them to determine what actions should be taken, based on the evidence presented and the conclusions drawn.

This approach to a field experience requires substantial advance preparation prior to designing the study and beginning data collection. Well-trained investigators under the guidance of skilled social scientists can make an important contribution to understanding the outcomes of the educational system operating in a given community. However, if the research design is faulty or data collection and analysis are sloppy, the results will produce nothing more than what has been vividly termed "dust-bin empiricism."

From the educational researcher's viewpoint, the field training experience for practitioners ought to be more supportive of research endeavors. Evaluation and dissemination of innovative experiments and demonstrations should conform with research designs. The student of educational administration then gains a respectful awareness of the role of applied research in dealing with the clinical problems likely to be encountered throughout a career in educational administration. The researcher feels that the practitioner must share in the responsibility of discovering basic knowledge applicable to the educational process. That responsibility is primarily the area of observing new processes as they are applied, reporting back results, and disseminating research findings.

These strategies are the four primary identifiable links along the continuum of field training experiences characterized by objectivity and complete detachment by students and faculty at one end, and emotional attachment and total immersion in the clinical/political process at the other end. All field training components fall somewhere on this continuum.

5

Innovative Approaches

Innovation in field training experiences is a result of evolutionary changes in the application of the four strategies described earlier. Traditional school surveys continue to be contracted between universities and local school districts, but greater interaction takes place between the "experts" from the university and practitioners and citizens of the district. The human relations approach is gaining prominence through concerted attempts to operationalize the findings of applied behavioral science research.

The clinical/political action strategy is gaining respectability through increased attention to finding effective ways to make the change process mutually beneficial to the university and the educational agency where the intervention is taking place. The sociological or anthropological research approach is being expanded to produce more definitive conceptual maps of the full range of behavioral and social science disciplines in an attempt to describe the critical factors at work in the educational systems being studied.

The remainder of this chapter focuses on descriptions of specific

field training experiences that illustrate new approaches to the application of these four primary field experience strategies.

Surveys of Educational Systems

Since the time of Horace Mann and lay boards, educators have called on outside teams of evaluators. The school survey movement became very popular in the 1910-1920 era when the efficiency movement enveloped public administration and school district administration. Ellwood Cubberley, Franklin Bobbitt, George Strayer, and dozens of deans and professors developed ways to use school surveys as laboratory experiences for students in curriculum development, local and state financing, and related practical topics.

During the 1960s, faculty at several major institutions such as the University of Chicago and New York University developed ways for students to test theories of administration and organization through field experiences. Another variation attempted to blend a comprehensive study of a city school system with the newer techniques of organizational development and process consultation. An example is the study of the Boston School Department entitled *Organizing an Urban School System for Diversity* (Cronin and Hailer 1972).

This study team of faculty and students employed survey feedback, action research, and group problem-solving techniques based on the work of Warren Bennis, Robert Chin, David Berlew, and Brooklyn Derr (the last three participating as consultants). City school officials, singly and in workshops, reacted to data during the course of the study, formed task forces, and formulated recommendations and implementation plans. The students learned more about the readiness of bureaucrats to change and also had a chance to receive more feedback on their ideas.

Field surveys fail to represent adequate training when they are routine, as repetitive as those of some consultant firms, and when they exploit students as an inexpensive labor pool. Many surveys rest on little if any theory. Many fulfill the letter of a contract but reach a low level of creativity and scholarship.

Other surveys examine frontier issues such as the role of cable TV, responses to confrontations, and other kinds of genuine unknowns. Some argue that faculty leadership of such studies is

concomitant with a need for faculty growth and development. Surveys also support other kinds of training and provide entrees to internships and jobs for student members. Yet few surveys rank well as scholarly research documents.

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY PROGRAM

However, some institutions of higher learning are attempting to provide field training that involves students in a more disciplined approach to surveys in a technical sense. A good example is the application of operations research techniques to field surveys at Florida State University. The field component of the preparation program at the Florida State University Educational Systems and Planning Center is described as problem-oriented. At least one project is contracted yearly to train students in systems analysis techniques that emphasize the collection of quantitative data. The field experience gives students the opportunity to assess resource needs, perform cost analysis, produce cost-effectiveness studies, recommend resource allocations, and make manpower projections.

A special type of student is recruited for the program at the center. Although candidates are expected to display an interest in careers in educational administration, there is heavy emphasis on mathematical or engineering backgrounds. During the two-year program, each student must complete six quarters of course work that integrates education subjects—heavy in quantitative analysis—with courses in business, urban planning, and computer science. Concurrently, the student is assigned to field exercises requiring the application of operations research methodologies.

Examples of surveys completed in the Florida State University program include the automation of physical inventories of all Florida school systems, a study of the feasibility of applying FM radio to instruction throughout the state, and development of cost-effectiveness analysis of educational programs or business-related services in individual school systems. Besides training students in appropriate analytical techniques, the objective of such surveys is to provide the contracting agency with a comprehensive technical analysis that benefits its decision-making processes.

HUMAN RELATIONS-ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT MODEL

There is a growing concern that field studies limited to observing and recording data on educational operations are hardly adequate

for preparing future administrators for real-world experiences. Indeed, such an approach to field training can completely ignore the interpersonal relationships that greatly affect the operations being studied. The organizational development (OD) approach to analyzing the educational environment provides an alternative view that concentrates on human relationships within organizations.

Chris Argyris, a leading proponent of the human relations viewpoint, has developed a theory and methodology for improving the effectiveness of organizations by improving interpersonal relations. His view of administrative training is to prepare the future administrator in behavioral science theory and to provide him with the skills necessary to change organizations from operation in a traditional manner that assures psychological failure to operation in an improved climate that provides for psychological success. The clinical aspects of such a program prepare the student to become an interventionist. Argyris' text on theory and method describes the necessary conditions that must be developed in the client organization:

- generation of useful and valid information
- free and informed choice
- internal as opposed to external commitment (1970, pp. 16-17)

Without describing in detail how such conditions might be created, suffice it to say that the process involves changing the operating norms of any traditional organization. Valid information can be generated only in an organization where people are free to be open with one another. Free and informed choices allow people to define and work toward goals they set themselves. Internal commitment implies motivation to work for the sake of achieving goals rather than for the sake of collecting compensation in the form of salary or other benefits.

The theoretical considerations are complex and require considerable grounding in the behavioral sciences. Much research is still needed to test the theories that form the basis for the intervention methodology. The proponents of the OD approach would be the first to suggest a great need for continuing research. The primary distinction between OD research and traditional educational research is that the participants must necessarily know the variables being studied in OD, whereas they are usually unaware of them in

traditional research studies. The clinical aspects of the OD methodology require knowing how to train individuals and groups of people to interact openly and in a manner that creates psychological success in the individual.

CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

A clinical program for educational administrators, funded by the Ford Foundation, was planned to test a field experience based on organizational development theory and interventionist methodology. The program, heavily influenced by Argyris' work, was to be operated by the Center for Educational Leadership (CEL) in Newton, Massachusetts, as a component of a consortium of seven universities that offer programs in educational administration. Unfortunately, because of policy disagreements within the consortium, CEL never had an opportunity to implement this ambitious field training effort. Nevertheless, the planning that went into it may well serve as the model for future field experiences using the OD approach.

The Center for Educational Leadership program provided for a full semester of field training. Students from the seven universities were to move to Newton for the duration of the training period. The first five weeks were to be spent in preparation for the field experiences, learning the skills required of the organizational development model. Eight weeks were to be spent in the field at a host educational agency. The final three weeks of the program were set apart as an evaluation and debriefing period.

During the se.. ter students and faculty were to work with clients (members of the host organizations) who were willing to participate in the program. The field experience was to include intensive encounters between the students and the staff members of the cooperating agency or school system. Under no circumstances, though, was there to be a direct attempt to influence change in the host organizations. Rather, the emphasis was to be on providing the students with a theoretical base in the OD approach, broadened by the experience of observing interpersonal relationships in an organization. The combination of theory and practice was expected to give insights into approaching future administrative situations.

It was planned that students, faculty, and clients would work together at the center to provide training in two broad fundamental areas and four specific clinical areas.

First, the fundamental concerns:

1. Help students to develop their own theories about alternative futures in education
2. Question the nature of man and what he is trying to do through his organization

Second, the specific skills:

1. Develop interpersonal and intrapersonal competencies
2. Acquaint students with theories of the behavior of organizations
3. Provide experience in data collection through analysis of tapes and other reproductions of group encounters
4. Build competence in intervention theory to facilitate bringing about change in complex organizations

The field experience plan involved extensive observation of educational practitioners interacting with one another, planning together, and making decisions. The student was to apply a variety of methodological skills in diagnosis, collection of relevant data, analysis and evaluation of roles, and development of data sources. To prevent spotty data collection (often leading to incomplete analysis), videotape and audio tape recorders were to be used in observation and data collection. By analyzing the tapes after the fact, students should be able to describe in detail the interpersonal events observed in the field.

The final three weeks of the CEL field experience were to be devoted to evaluation of the student, the client, and the faculty. Emphasis was on how the individual student had changed during the field experience. The plan called for the student to share fully in the evaluation procedure, hopefully specifying ways in which the program could be improved.

The CEL staff was expected to provide a continuing dialogue between themselves and students who completed the training. The first task was to help the graduate find a job appropriate to his talents and interests. After that, the staff was to identify and provide resources that would aid the graduate in his work.

One important aspect of this model field experience is the contribution to original research as a byproduct of the data-collection effort. It is definitely an example where clinical training produces information that is invaluable to behavioral science research. The

focus of the field experience, however, is on clinical applications. The student of educational administration is expected to learn how to intervene in a formal organization and to guide others in their search for psychological success, thereby assuring success for the organization as a whole.

CLINICAL AND POLITICAL ACTION APPROACHES

Ideally, the field training components of programs in educational administration provide an opportunity to apply the theoretical concepts learned in the classroom to problem-solving in the field. When a concerted attempt is made to place the student in a role approximating real-life administrative responsibilities, it is often difficult to make a clear distinction between a field study and an internship.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN PROGRAM

The program of the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Wisconsin offers a field component, described as a "marriage of theory and practice," that is not easily distinguished from an internship (Moser 1971). In this program, the student serves a full year in an administrative role under the joint supervision of an experienced practitioner and a university faculty sponsor. However, in addition to administrative duties, the student is responsible for completing an indepth study relevant to the operation assigned. This aspect of the program may involve an evaluation of administrative practices, appraisal of operating policies, or the development of a planning process. Emphasis is placed on the student's academic development, with the expectation of making "a worthwhile contribution to the improvement of the enterprise" (Moser 1971, p. 1).

The field study component of this one-year experience requires that the student maintain a daily log of activities, an evaluation of the operation and his own experiences, and an appraisal of his own job performance. A series of seminars is organized to focus on these aspects of the field study.

When preparing for the field training experience, the student is "encouraged" to set precise objectives for his own performance. In the daily activity log he is expected to record progress made toward achieving his own stated objectives. Regular visits by the

university sponsor focus on helping the student evaluate his own performance and generally guide him in the achievement of his goals. The monthly seminars are intended to provide a forum to discuss the theoretical aspects of the administrative role and to foster interaction between students and the supervising practitioners. Formal evaluation of each student's performance requires input from both the supervisor and the university sponsor and is used in conjunction with the student's self-appraisal.

This relatively new program has been evaluated by the first group of students to go through it, as well as by their supervising administrators and university sponsors. A three-part evaluation instrument was used to judge success in achieving individual objectives, recording attitudes toward each component of the internship, and making recommendations for improving the program.

In general, the students were quite satisfied that the experience gained was worthy of the time put into the field training and that the seminars were of value. Especially high value was placed on the relationships developed with the administrators in the field.

Improvements suggested in the first evaluation include reexamining the purpose and value of the daily log, exerting more university control over the program, and working to develop better communications between the university and the communities served by the program (Moser 1971).

The university faculty who offer this program look to the potential of such a field experience for improving the operations of the agency served through contributions from teaming graduate students, university faculty, and administrators on the job. Time will tell if the team efforts of such groups can successfully be brought to bear on the specific problems of an agency and to alleviate fears that the internship will serve merely as a cheap source of qualified labor for local school districts or other educational agencies.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA PROGRAM

In 1967 the restructuring of the University of Florida doctoral program in educational administration led to the evolution of another action-oriented approach to the field experience. The following report from an October 1969 *UCEA Newsletter* (Nunnery and Kimbrough) describes how this approach has been put in practice through the mechanism of field stations.

From the Department of Administration's point of view, the field station may be viewed as a system-spanning or system-linking mechanism. As such, it may offer a means to

1. link theory and practice for students, professors, and practitioners
2. provide a major integrating experience for doctoral study
3. find more effective ways for the department and the field to provide services mutually beneficial to each other

In an effort to focus initially on theory-practice linkage and the integrating experience for students, the field-station concept was chosen in lieu of the often-used internship. This choice was made because in an internship the theory-practice linkage is generally confined to problem-solving and administrative decision-making. In addition, program integration opportunities may or may not be present, and group reinforcement provided by the field-station subsystem is missing.

The field-station concept has its roots in the social science of anthropology. The purpose is to establish a base of operation in the community whereby students can directly interact with local residents. In the University of Florida developmental program, the concept is used to establish within certain large urban school districts a small social system that bridges communication between the school and university systems and serves as an instructional agency for the students. Field-station participants receive inputs from the world of practice, the university, and independent consultants. For example, professors from the university visit and engage in dialogue with the students through the field station. Likewise, field-station participants generate outputs to the university and the practitioners.

Besides working as a group, students take part in a variety of activities consistent with individual interests. For example, one student conducted a study of internal communication for one host district; another developed an implementation proposal for a four-quarter school year at the elementary level in a host district; a third served as a member of a four-man leadership team for a geographic area in a decentralized host district; and a fourth, working directly with the general superintendent of a host district, had primary responsibility for conducting a study of the district's organization.

To the extent that students need expert assistance in carrying out their assignments, this assistance is provided. For example, if a sociologist is needed to assist on a given project, the best-qualified person available is secured.

In addition to individual activities, each student participates in a weekly seminar conducted by the university professor and the onsite coordinator for the field station. The seminar is intended to provide an opportunity for sharing experiences, analyzing practice in light of theory, and gaining insight into other facets of the host district's operation. Thus, the student should develop some perspective of a complex urban school district in its totality.

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS PROGRAM

As a final example of the action-oriented approach, recent fundamental changes in the structure and program of the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts provided opportunity for the faculty in the Center for Leadership and Administration to develop program plans and strategies uniquely innovative in their net effect. An article in the April 1972 *UCEA Newsletter* describes the program setting, assumptions behind the program, and program elements of an "administrator-leadership course of study which takes advantage of a high degree of flexibility gained by eliminating usual educational administration program elements" (Flight 1972, pp. 10-12).

Admission criteria no longer need include Graduate Record Exam scores or the university minimum grade point average of 2.75. Neither core requirements nor a minimum number of semester hours must define a course of study. With rare exception, a pass/fail grading system is used for all education courses and modular offerings. The form and content of the university-required "comprehensive" examination for the Ed.D. is individually negotiated by each doctoral student with his faculty committee. Curricular offerings, less than a semester long, are available to students for credit at semester registration time as well as on a post-hoc basis throughout each term. A residency requirement of two consecutive semesters on campus is mandated for all doctoral students.

The program is based on the following rationale:

1. The heart of professional preparation is the clinical experience, where the practitioner's own theory of action is made explicit, elaborated, and rendered operational.

2. Leaders must develop explicit values providing the context within which they give direction to their organizations.
3. Students learn best when they are helped to diagnose their present training needs in relation to their career objectives and are required to prescribe and seek out learning experiences relating the two.
4. The skills and experiences of the learners themselves are basic resources underutilized explicitly or programmatically within most student groups.

Course options for students of educational administration provide an ample selection across many disciplines. In addition, wide flexibility is offered to students in their individual program development tasks through a modularized curriculum. Flexibility, in fact, extends to the field experience element of the program. Faculty and students benefit from traditional and nontraditional field activities in schools and school-related agencies as well as in noneducational organizations. The program also provides a full continuum of time and intensity, from short-term shadowing experiences to year-long major problem-solving activities.

A wide variety of field projects has been cultivated in nearby communities as well as farther afield. In these and in projects developed by students themselves, a full range of participation is available from complete involvement in project directing, for example, to short-term consulting on student/faculty teams, to providing advisory or sounding board functions on campus for those actually engaged in onsite experimental learning somewhere.

This approach to clinical education includes the following hallmarks:

1. pervasive group orientation, that is, groups of university personnel, faculty, and students from several centers or departments working together with teachers, administrators, and students in schools, or with other personnel groups in nonschool institutions
2. emphasis on continuous interplay of theoretical and practical experience, that is, ongoing experiential activity throughout a two-year doctoral program concurrent with course work and extending the variety of experience for even the "most experienced" student
3. wide-ranging opportunities for clinical experience within the governance and administration of the School of Education and the leadership center, that is, from service on the policy-forming school council or center steering committee, to administration of school and faculty evaluation systems and institutional study projects, and to participation in student recruitment and selection and in faculty personnel actions at the decision-making level.

Guidelines for the Massachusetts field experience (Kesselheim 1971) assume that it will occupy 20 to 35 percent of available time; that the nature of the experience ought to be based on a thoughtful appraisal of a person's previous experience and training, made in awareness of that person's career aims; and that the most productive field experiences are those that are self-defined and self-initiated.

Situational Analyses in Faculty-Student Research

In a *UCEA Newsletter* column on innovations in the preparation of educational administrators, Cresswell and Goettel (1970) offer the following description of a field experience incorporated into the Program for Educational Leadership (PEL) at Teachers College.

The principal goal of PEL is to identify, recruit, and place in positions of educational leadership individuals who have firsthand familiarity with the problems of discrimination and poverty in urban schools and communities. The program emphasizes work in the behavioral and social sciences, with a concentration in an area of special competence. Incorporated into the program are practice-centered field experiences and faculty-student research.

One innovative aspect of the program is a multiagency rotating internship. A second innovation, described in detail here, is the use of situational analyses as a means of relating theory to practice and research to instruction.

The situational analyses program element is intended to combine behavioral science research in the operations of urban school systems with the curricular experiences of the program fellows. It is designed to provide the following:

- research experience for PEL fellows both as participants in and students of projects carried out within the program
- improved understanding of the nature and operations of urban schools as social systems through disciplinary research
- experiences in the application of research and analytical tools to administrative decision-making in a simulated school situation

Under the general conceptual framework of systems analysis a series of investigations was conducted in an operating urban school. Three such efforts were launched in the public schools of East Orange, New Jersey:

1. a sociological analysis of the processes and patterns by which students, particularly minority group students, are allocated among the various groupings and programs within the school
2. a study of race as a determinant in the superintendent's decision-making role
3. a linear programming analysis of decision-making for the allocation of instructional resources

The approach of these studies to the understanding of a school situation took into account the various components of the school as a social system. Each of these investigations represented a new application of the tools of the behavioral sciences to the problems of urban school administration. The PEL fellows participated in both the design and the execution of the investigations. Further, the reports of the research were to become curricular materials for PEL and departmental courses.

To serve as a basis for the research design and to relate the social science disciplines to the public school situation, the concept of a system map was developed. Behavioral scientists were commissioned to prepare descriptions, from the viewpoint of their respective disciplines, of the typical public school system and the decision-making situation of the superintendent. System maps have been prepared for the fields of sociology, anthropology, social psychology, economics, and political science. The maps, in addition to the research itself, are integral parts of the PEL curriculum.

The situational analyses component of the Teachers College Program for Educational Leadership is a good example of the anthropological or sociological research approach to field experiences. The program at Teachers College, however, does not confine the research effort to those two disciplines but offers the opportunity to conduct investigations using the full range of social and behavioral sciences to structure an analytic framework.

The total situational analyses program element allows the students to proceed beyond the purely objective analytic training experience inherent in this applied research strategy through the medium of computer simulation. The simulation aspect of the program allows students to use their improved analytic capabilities for making decisions required of an urban school superintendent. The simulation is designed to replicate the important features of a school system and to place the participants in a realistic problem situation.

Based on a systems-analytic model of the superintendency, the simulation requires the student to solve a series of varied problems in such a way as to achieve a set of long-range goals. At each decision point the player chooses a course of action that is dependent largely on his previous decisions. The simulated school system responds to each decision and, as a result of various strategies, each player faces a different set of circumstances. After a series of twenty problem situations, the overall performance is evaluated in terms of achievement of present long-range goals. It is intended that the results of the studies currently underway will be incorporated in the simulation to make the responses to the system even more realistic.

The total package that makes up the situational analyses element of the Program for Educational Leadership provides for an innovative training experience integrating applied research and practical decision-making relevant to the urban school situation. The results of the field study are incorporated in the program curriculum and provide reasoned guidance to the simulated decision-making experience.

6

Conclusion

Universities and colleges still rely heavily on a standard pattern of apprenticeship and contractual studies in the field with local school districts. The state of the art of field training in educational administration remains rather primitive, with a reliance on field techniques that lead to normative or prescriptive studies. However, more promising programs offer field components requiring greater attention to empirical techniques grounded in the disciplines of the social and behavioral sciences.

In planning for a field training component to complement the academic aspect of a graduate program in educational administration, the primary focus must be on the benefits to the students' professional development. This central focus, though, can be quite compatible with producing a product or engaging in an activity that is beneficial to the system studied and that meets the requirements to advance the state of the knowledge in educational administration. Such compatibility can be achieved through careful attention and guidance by the supervising faculty.

The four primary strategies for conducting field training experiences described in this monograph differ in the type of involvement expected of the students and faculty and in the product or outcomes of the field study. In the survey approach and the research approach, the involvement of the field study team remains objectively divorced from the day-to-day operations of the system being studied, and the final product is usually in the form of a report. In the human relations approach and the action-oriented strategy, the field study team may well become intimately involved in the functioning of the system and may serve to encourage change in interpersonal relationships or in the operations of the educational organization acted on.

The more innovative approaches in applying these strategies offer the student flexibility in choice of tasks and settings. More importantly, though, they call for a closely supervised and disciplined approach to analyzing the system, recommending courses of action, and evaluating results. The field training experience serves as an extension of the classroom into the real world of educational planning, management, and supervision. Students are best served when they experience a positive application of theory to practice in a situation that exposes them to the realities of the educational environment.

Bibliography

Argyris, Chris. *Intervention Theory and Method.* Reading, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley Publishing Co., 1970.

Baldridge, J. Victor. "Organizational Change: The Human Relations Perspective versus the Political Systems Perspective." *Educational Researcher* (February 1972).

Cresswell, Anthony M., and Goettel, Robert F. "Rotating Internships and Situational Analyses." *UCEA Newsletter*, 11, 3 (February 1970).

Cronin, Joseph M., and Hailer, Richard M. *Organizing an Urban School System for Diversity.* Boston: Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education, 1972.

Cronin, Joseph M., and Iannaccone, Lawrence. "The Social Sciences and the Preparation of Educational Administrators at Harvard and Chicago." In *Social Science Content for Preparing Educational Leaders*, edited by Jack A. Culbertson, Robin H. Farquhar, Bryce M. Fogarty, and Mark R. Shibles. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, 1973.

Culbertson, Jack A.; Farquhar, Robin H.; Gaynor, Alan K.; and Shibles, Mark R. *Preparing Educational Leaders for the Seventies.* Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1969.

Flight, Dave. "University of Massachusetts Program Seeks Maximum Flexibility, Individualization, and Involvement." *UCEA Newsletter*, 13, 4 (April 1972).

Harvard University. "Proposal for a Revised Doctorate Program in Educational Administration." Submitted to the faculty. Mimeographed. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Graduate School of Education, 1952.

———. *Five Year Report*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Graduate School of Education, 1954.

Hills, R. Jean. *Toward a Science of Organization*. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1968.

Kesselheim, Donn. "Field Experiences for Center Members: Proposed Guidelines." Memorandum, University of Massachusetts, June 3, 1971.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F., and Sieber, Sam D. *Organizing Educational Research*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Moser, Robert P. "The Administrative Internship: The Marriage of Theory and Practice." Draft for publication in *Wisconsin School News* (December 1971).

Nunnery, Michael Y., and Kimbrough, Ralph B. "Concept Seminars and Field-Stations." *UCEA Newsletter*, 11, 1 (October 1969).

Spalding, W. B. Memorandum, June 14, 1961.

University of Chicago. *The Midwest Moves Forward. Annual Report, 1951-52*. Illinois: Midwest Administration Center, 1952.

———. *The Third Year of CPEA in the Midwest. Annual Report, 1951-52*. Illinois: Midwest Administration Center, 1953.

———. *Fifth Annual Report*. Illinois: Midwest Administration Center, 1955.

The W. K. Kellogg Foundation. *Toward Improved School Administration*. Battle Creek, Michigan: 1961.