

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 951

EA 005 881

AUTHOR Higley, Jerry
TITLE Inservice Training for Staff and Administrators. School Leadership Digest Series, Number Eight. ERIC/CEN Research Analysis Series, Number Ten.
INSTITUTION National Association of Elementary School Principals, Washington, D.C.; Oregon Univ., Eugene. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 74
CONTRACT OEC-0-8-080353-3514
NOTE 32p.; A related document is EA 005 880
AVAILABLE FROM National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1801 North Moore Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209 (\$24.00 plus postage. Available only as part of series of 13 reports)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *Administrator Role; Educational Accountability; Educational Administration; Educational Change; Educational Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Individual Development; *Inservice Education; Literature Reviews; Management Development; Management Education; *Principals; *Professional Continuing Education; Professional Education; Professional Training

ABSTRACT

The individual growth brought about by a principal's informal reading, writing, consultation, and travel is simple to accomplish but hard to control and evaluate. The demand for accountability has made it necessary for the schools to engage in more formal methods of inservice training. In addition to being a means of keeping principals up-to-date and bailing them out of emergencies, inservice training can become a more radical force for changing the structure of the principalship. This paper presents the current range of opinion concerning the goals of inservice training, the skills necessary for effective leadership, the structure of training programs (including teaching methods and materials), and methods of designing, implementing, and coordinating inservice training programs. (Author/WH)

ED 099951

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

**Inservice Training for Staff
and Administrators**

School Leadership digest

Jerry Higley

EA005 881

Prepared by
ERIC Clearinghouse on
Educational Management

Published by
National Association of
Elementary School Principals

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 74-80572
NAESP School Leadership Digest Series, Number Eight
ERIC/CEM Accession Number: EA 005 881
ERIC/CEM Research Analysis Series, Number Ten

Printed in the United States of America, 1974
National Association of Elementary School Principals
1801 North Moore Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the National Association of Elementary School Principals for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the National Association of Elementary School Principals or the National Institute of Education.

CONTENTS

Foreword	v
Introduction	1
The Rationale and Purpose	3
Agreement on Need	3
Disagreement on the Purpose	4
The Methods	7
Informal Methods	7
Formal Programs	9
The Implementation and Coordination of Programs	15
School Districts	15
Professional Organizations	17
The Problem of Prestige	19
The Principal's Role	20
Conclusion	23
Bibliography	24

2

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 several clearinghouses in the system, was established at the University of Oregon in 1966. The Clearinghouse and its companion units process research reports and journal articles for announcement in ERIC's index and abstract bulletins.

Research reports are announced in *Resources 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 Computer Microfilm International Corporation.

Journal articles are announced in *Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE)*. *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 educational area.

FOREWORD

With the *School Leadership Digest* series, the National Association of Elementary School Principals adds another project to its continuing program of publications designed to offer school leaders essential information on a wide range of critical concerns in education.

The *School Leadership Digest* is a series of monthly reports on top priority issues in education. At a time when decisions in education must be made on the basis of increasingly complex information, the *Digest* provides school administrators with concise, readable analyses of the most important trends in schools today, as well as points up the practical implications of major research findings.

By special cooperative arrangement, the series draws on the extensive research facilities and expertise of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. The titles in the series were planned and developed cooperatively by both organizations. Utilizing the resources of the ERIC network, the Clearinghouse is responsible for researching the topics and preparing the copy for publication by NAESP.

The author of this report, Jerry Higley, is employed by the Clearinghouse as a research analyst and writer.

Paul L. Houts
Director of Publications
NAESP

Stuart C. Smith
Assistant Director and Editor
ERIC/CEM

56

INTRODUCTION

The inservice training of school principals is such an important issue at the moment that even the name one gives it takes on significance. Some groups would prefer to call it continuing education. Others would drop the terms "education" or "training" on the grounds that they suggest courses and degrees, and would call it something like "professional development." Whatever the designation, inservice training is important because it concerns not only individual professional growth but also the status and nature of the principalship itself as an educational institution.

The individual growth brought about by informal reading, writing, consultation, and travel is simple to accomplish but hard to control and evaluate. The demand for accountability has made it increasingly necessary for the schools to engage in more formal methods of inservice training.

In addition, principals themselves are growing more and more uneasy about their effectiveness, and especially about what is expected of them. And there is a general feeling in educational circles that the principalship isn't providing the leadership appropriate to its office. As Kuralt puts it, "The overriding reason for ineffective educational leadership, is lack of competent skills. Lack of competence is not the same thing as incompetence; it occurs when people don't know what they're supposed to do or haven't been properly trained to do it."

School districts, professional associations, state departments of education, and university educators are all tackling the problem of principal training. Each group has its own perspective and its own responsibilities. The success of inservice training programs for principals depends on the coordination achieved by these various groups.

In addition to being a means of keeping principals up-to-date and bailing them out of emergencies, inservice training

can become a more radical force for changing the structure of the principalship. What is the nature and status of the principal's role? Is the principal to be a master teacher primarily concerned with supervising and evaluating instruction, or a manager, coordinating the work of other professionals and concentrating on public relations and accounting? A disciplinarian or a visionary humanist? Some concerned parties would phase out the principalship altogether as an anachronism in the educational system.

This paper relates these different concepts of the principal's role to training theories and methods. Given that the underlying purpose of principal training is to develop competency skills, how is this training best achieved?

Three important issues underlie this question, and this report reviews recent efforts to resolve these issues: (1) What are the skills necessary to be an effective principal? (2) What are the most effective methods of teaching these skills? (3) How can these methods be designed, implemented, and coordinated to greatest advantage for the principal, the school, and the community?

THE RATIONALE AND PURPOSE

Nearly all principals now come from the ranks of teachers and are trained in graduate schools of education. The next step up the educational ladder of success is from the teacher's desk to the principal's office, and most graduate schools require teaching experience of their prospective administrators.

There are, in fact, more people trained and certified to be principals than there are jobs available. In New York State in 1969, five years before the "current" surplus, there were 15,000 certified principals available and only 203 openings. In spite of this surplus of academically qualified personnel, the need for inservice training is of high priority, according to most sources.

Agreement on the Need

In addition to the more obvious reasons for stressing such training, Brown offers others that are not so obvious. First, he claims that principals are not properly prepared. He cites two studies (by Goldhammer and Becker and by the University Council for Educational Administration) that demonstrate virtually no relationship between effectiveness on the job and formal preparation, and a third (by Gross) that shows a *negative* correlation between the quantity of formal preparation and leadership on the job.

Brown also believes that bringing principals up out of the ranks of teachers has not proved satisfactory, since those selected are likely to be the people who have been the most cooperative and least likely to have demonstrated leadership abilities. Sarason also makes this point very emphatically. "I am not only questioning the relevance of teaching as a preparation for becoming a principal. *What I am suggesting is that being a teacher for a number of years may be in most instances antithetical to being an educational leader or vehicle of change.*"

Nearly everyone agrees that it is harder to be a principal now than it used to be, and Brown summarizes this difficulty very well. "Parents want both the status quo and innovative programs; teachers associations and unions are more assertive; teachers must be evaluated with more humane, yet more legalistic procedures; confrontations often replace requests, and decisions must be both strong and wise, yet obtained by consensus."

Another reason why principals should be given long overdue attention is that they lack the mobility of other educational administrators. They are more tied to the local area to begin with, have less status, and now in the financial crisis are less likely to be moving on to better-paying positions.

Brown mentions that the position of the principalship has essential and fundamental importance because it can affect, in a way that no other position can, the day-to-day operation of the school, the actual behavior of teachers and students, and their relationships.

Brown further explains why more attention hasn't been paid to the principalship up to now. First, the importance of the position has not generally been acknowledged, and, because of this, it has had low priority in most budgets. In his view, there is little help currently available for principals to draw on. And finally, and perhaps most importantly of all, principals are reluctant to ask for help, fearing that such a request will be used as evidence of weakness and ineffectiveness and will eventually result in a negative evaluation from superiors.

Disagreement on the Purpose

Although there is widespread agreement that inservice training for principals is necessary, there is considerable disagreement over what such training is supposed to produce. Its purpose, clearly, is to improve the competence of principals, but what this competence consists of is hard to pin down.

Those groups (such as university education departments) taking the existing system for preparing principals for granted

tend to emphasize particular skills or competencies and suggest ways to teach those skills and test the effectiveness of that teaching.

Typical of this outlook is a monograph by Lutz and Ferrante: "In general, preservice education should stress the development of behavior that will permit and facilitate long-range and flexible administrative practice. Continuing education should stress behavior in specific situations limited by time and space, based on the general skills learned during preservice education."

From this point of view the major purposes of inservice training are covered in the four areas outlined by Pharis.

- *Keeping up with the profession.* The principal has to read as widely as possible and keep in contact with other principals, in addition to working within the expectations of his school and district. He should be aware of both the theoretical and practical considerations that will affect his position.
- *Translating theory into practice.* This area involves learning about the job, how to apply preservice training, and how to get the feel of leadership and its attendant responsibilities.
- *Filling in the gaps.* There are always circumstances and factors for which preservice training can never prepare the principal. Discovering them can often be as perplexing as learning how to deal with them.
- *Increasing efficiency.* Routine matters of day-to-day school operation can take up large blocks of time if the principal feels comfortable doing them, or they can be completely left to slide if he doesn't. Either extreme can be avoided only by attending to the appropriate priorities and learning how to be efficient.

A number of other observers, including many practicing administrators, tend to question the existing preparatory system and call for more radical measures for choosing principals and retraining them. Wayson, for example, concludes that the

single major problem with the principalship is the lack of effective leadership, and that the system as it now stands not only does not encourage leadership in its principals, but does much to destroy leadership potential. "Graduate schools and school districts are not the places to develop leaders."

This view perhaps has more to do with preservice training, but does have consequences for inservice training as well, especially since it implies that good principals need not come from the ranks of graduate students or teachers.

Morrow, Foster, and Estes maintain that an effective principal needs only "integrity, the capacity for leadership, and an inclination toward a life of the mind," which includes "human learning and the habits of reflection and introspection."

If this attitude became widespread, the method of selecting principals would be altered, and along with it the purposes and scope of inservice training.

THE METHODS

No startlingly new methods for the inservice training of principals have been introduced in the last five years. But the literature has included an increasing number of inservice plans, reflecting a developing concern over the problems that principals face. This chapter surveys current training programs and touches on the various areas of interest found in the literature.

Informal Methods

The term "inservice training" usually suggests formally organized programs. However, there are numerous ways principals can informally increase their effectiveness by developing their leadership potential and sharpening their skills. Although most of these informal activities are commonplace, their helpfulness should not be overlooked in the attempt to find new perspectives.

Self-Evaluation

Systematic self-evaluation can allow principals to distance themselves from daily job involvement, providing new perspectives on their professional performance. This process of evaluation encourages principals to make beneficial changes in the administration of their schools.

Time studies and performance rating sheets can assist the principal in discovering what kind of job is being accomplished and in what areas it might be worthwhile to consider changes. Time studies involve the analysis, by percentage, of the amounts of time the principal spends in his or her various activities. Performance rating sheets are checklists of essential duties that allow the principal to rate himself according to how well he believes he is accomplishing these duties.

If, for example, a principal discovers that he is spending only 30 percent of his time in teacher conferences, and if he

has rated his performance in this area as fairly low, then he can conclude that this area requires additional attention. Informal performance indicators, such as time studies and performance rating sheets, might show the need for the principal to become involved in more formal types of inservice programs.

In a recent series of articles, entitled "Chautauqua '74: The Remaking of the Principalsip" and published in four consecutive issues of the *National Elementary Principal*, one point is made consistently. If principals do not become more involved in defining their own roles in education, this definition process will be carried on by outside forces, perhaps to the detriment of both principals and school systems in general. One way for the principal to ensure an active part in role definition is to engage in accurate, thorough self-evaluation.

The confidence to creatively define his role is a quality that the principal needs in order to be a good leader. This confidence depends in part on the possession of appropriate skills, but it also comes from the ability to see things more realistically. According to Wayson,

Frequently, what is denounced as the overpowering resistance of the system is really an inexact assessment of what is possible and an overblown projection of what signifies success. . . . The constraints on the principal, like constraints on most people, arise primarily from the way he chooses to view himself, his world, and his role. To transform his role, he must see himself and his surroundings in a different way.

Other Individual Activities

Reading. This means of viewing oneself and one's surroundings "in a different way" ought to be so obvious as to be hardly worth mention. But the literature still emphasizes that principals spend far too little time reading. Even such a hectic job as the school principalsip requires time out for reflection and consideration of the best that has been said in books, not only about education but about psychology, sociology, history, literature, and popular culture. Reading is one more device the principal has for keeping in contact with his

immediate community, with the wider circle of the world community, and with humanity's best and most essential ideas.

Writing. Principals certainly should not leave the writing to the professionals or the professors. Getting ideas down on paper can be an important means of gaining additional perspective on a job, creating for the principal an additional medium for contact and dialogue. Even if the writing is not intended for publication, the discipline required can be valuable for scrutinizing one's own ideas and utilizing the ideas of others.

Travel. In addition to more formally organized travel for specific purposes, informal travel experiences can also contribute to the principal's individual growth.

All these individual activities can be aided by funds and sabbatical time allotted by school districts, but even without such assistance, the principal must take advantage of any means he can to aid his own development.

Community Participation

There are various ways that the principal can informally involve himself in group activities. Every opportunity should be taken to enhance the image of the principalship and to increase the principal's contact with the community. Everything from leading a Boy Scout troop to coaching the girls' track team can improve the principal's community relations, as well as teach him more about the community he serves. The call for the 1970s is to carry on the interest in involvement from the '60s.

Formal Programs

Inservice training programs are designed by either university departments of education or professional organizations. The differences in points of view between these two groups have resulted in emphasis on different methods, though in many cases overlap exists. The academic point of view has gravitated increasingly toward the methodology of science and the development of competency-based curricula. The professional point of view has most often had a more humanist base.

Academic Emphasis: Skills Development

Those who intend to make a science of principal preparation are concerned with isolating the particular skills a principal needs and designing a program to develop those skills.

Katz divides administrative skills into three categories—technical, human, and conceptual:

- *Technical skills* involve an understanding of variables, methods, and procedures, as well as the ability to work with these elements.
- *Human skills* relate to one's capacity to understand and work with people, encouraging cohesive group behavior.
- *Conceptual skills* are those concerned with comprehension of the organization as a whole and the ability to recognize interdependence of roles.

McCleary and McIntyre have developed a comprehensive model based on these three skill areas and have added three levels of competence to be attained: familiarity, understanding, and application. Any particular task that a principal would be expected to perform could then be analyzed by skill area and level of competence, and appropriate methods could be applied.

Seventeen major methods of instruction are considered for use in this model, and their usefulness for any particular skill or level has been determined. For example, simulation, human relations training, clinical study, team-research, and internships have proved effective for teaching technical competencies.

For teaching conceptual skills, such methods as case studies, scenarios, individualized instructional packages, computer-assisted instruction, laboratory approaches, gaming, simulation, human relations training, and clinical study have been most useful. For human skills, human relations training has been by far the most satisfactory.

But different methods can be appropriate for the different levels of learning as well. At the familiarity level, reading is

the best method. But at the understanding level, case studies, scenarios, individualized instruction packages, computer-assisted instruction, laboratory training, gaming, simulation, human relations training, clinical study, and team research are more effective. At the level of application, simulation, human relations training, clinical study, team research, and internship are the best methods.

Although teaching is still conducted primarily along well-established lines with courses, lectures, discussions, reading, research, and papers, these methods get little attention in the literature and are gradually being replaced with procedures that allow the student more organized situations for interaction with the material.

Simulation. Simulation is now a popular method of study that can be an important part of any inservice program. The University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) and other groups, as well as particular universities, have developed packages providing the principal with many actual situations that require attention, and testing his behavior in a variety of contexts in a short period of time, without the pressure of the real situation. It actively involves him in the material in a way that few other methods can.

Cost is a major problem in simulation, but more packages are being produced regularly, and in the near future more may be available at a better price. Although students rate simulation highly, and it seems especially suited for teaching skills of analysis, assessing its overall effectiveness is difficult. One series of studies cited by McCleary and McIntyre indicates that there is little relationship between the in-basket simulation exercises and on-the-job performance.

Case Studies and Scenarios. Case studies and scenarios are less expensive, are more easily assembled, and take less organization than do simulation exercises. They do not get as close to the real situation since they are colored by the preparer, but they can nevertheless cover a wide range of situations. Case studies are written, taped, or filmed descriptions of complex situations faced by principals and are readily available. Scenarios, the open-ended forms of case studies,

present a problem without a solution and can be effective in studying role playing and small-group problem-solving.

— *Human Relations Exercises.* Human relations exercises are attempts to translate research findings of behavioral scientists into laboratory exercises, designed to help the individual to understand and accept himself and others, and to develop operational skill in interpersonal relations. More commonly called sensitivity training or a variety of other names, this method seems to have a deep and lasting effect on the participants and, for this reason, depends greatly upon the expertise of the group leader. It can be highly effective, but, in the hands of an incompetent leader, it can be dangerous. There is much research available in the literature, but it is still difficult to gain access to good leaders.

Gaming. Gaming is a method incorporating aspects of simulation and laboratory training with the added element of competition. It is an expensive method, and few games are now available, but students generally find it stimulating and helpful.

These are only a few of the more innovative popular methods of instruction currently being used for the inservice training of principals. In general, they are well received by students, and the literature contains many reports of their successful use. But many of the methods are expensive, require qualified resource personnel who are scarce, and also take substantial amounts of time for implementation. Access to instructional materials is still not as easy as it needs to be.

Older forms of instruction are cheaper, more easily organized, and no farther away than the nearest university. A course here and there or a seminar on a given topic of immediate concern still seem to be the norm for inservice programs.

Institutes, workshops, and conferences may utilize any or all of the various methods of instruction and are increasingly available through universities or professional organizations. The variety of both methods and content in these programs is great, and almost all of them are evaluated by the participants as successful.

Professional Concern: Leadership

It is not accurate to say that all working principals object to academic training or that all professors of education endorse competency-based programs of instruction. But it is true that the most vocal of the practitioners see problems in the training of principals that cannot be solved by newer and better courses and methods of instruction, whereas the majority of university educators prefer to keep training centered in the university.

For most professionals the central concern is the issue of leadership. Rather than isolating particular skills because they are identifiable, these practitioners would prefer to range wider in order to build up the image of the principalship and to encourage the quality of leadership, by whatever means, at preservice and inservice training levels. This, they insist, is not done now, and probably cannot be done effectively within the system as it now exists.

In summing up the articles in the Chautauqua series, McNally says that "whatever the reason, the papers reflect that most principals are not exercising the vigorous leadership for instructional and program improvement that most of the authors believe should be the principal's primary concern."

The difficulty in summarizing suggestions for improving leadership in the principal's office points up the fact that there are few specific data to go on. The emphasis is on cooperation, openness, and relevance to the principal's actual needs. Some advocate such procedures as pairing administrators, exchanging principals, or in other ways broadening the perspective of the administrator through some form of outside contact.

This point of view depends more on the organization of the informal methods of self-development and growth mentioned earlier in the chapter than on any particular program.

Merrow, Foster, and Estes describe "networking," essentially a human relations exercise, but for and by principals, without the academic trappings:

What the administrator went through did not resemble training. No one told him, "These are the problems facing schools, and here is what you should do." No one said, "Here

are some training exercises that we would like your reaction to." And no one said, "Tell me your problems." Instead, he discussed his problems with his peers (which perhaps led to some new ideas), did some problem-solving exercises, and identified some behavior patterns of individuals and groups.

Regardless of the direction that the majority of inservice education takes, the principalship can only be improved, whether it be based on fundamental structural changes in the process of selecting and training principals, or whether it be based on the proliferation of more economical and accessible programs within the existing system. Either alternative would likely prove more successful than the limited assistance that now filters down to the beleaguered occupants of the principals' offices.

THE IMPLEMENTATION AND COORDINATION OF PROGRAMS

Educational theorists and practicing principals agree that if inservice training programs are to be effective, some long-range planning is necessary. No matter how successful a given program is, little will be accomplished unless someone takes the responsibility for providing a systematic plan for getting the principals and the training together.

School Districts

For the most part this responsibility has been left to the individual school district, and many educators prefer that it remain there. But up to now, school districts have not placed a high priority on inservice training of principals. Drachler refers to a recent questionnaire that was sent to 50 large cities. Of the 34 cities that replied, only one school district had an ongoing inservice program for its administrators.

Whether the impetus comes from the principal himself, the district, or the professional organizations, it is clear that some type of comprehensive process would be valuable. Rather than trusting to random procedures in crisis situations, this process should involve both the immediate and long-range needs of the principal and the district.

A Comprehensive Plan

Lutz and Ferrante have suggested a comprehensive process that would allow the school district to set up inservice programs as they are needed. It has six basic stages and can be applied to both the overall inservice program and specific objectives within such a program.

Obtain commitment to continuing education. The first step in this process may be the hardest to achieve. The administrators and local school boards would have to recognize the central position that principals occupy in the educational

system and be willing to give a high priority to their inservice training. The high costs of consultant fees, materials, and travel are major obstacles in most districts. It might turn out, however, that by carefully determining ongoing needs, the expense would be little more than current costs of meeting certification requirements and emergencies.

Assess needs. Lutz and Ferrante emphasize that all concerned groups in the district should be consulted in determining its needs, including teachers, citizens groups, parent-teacher organizations, advisory committee, and students. Surveys and questionnaires can be used for this purpose. Administrators can review their personal competencies in light of the needs and determine what type of outside help might be necessary.

Develop objectives. After establishing the priority of these needs, performance objectives should be developed in behavioral or measurable terms, identifying "the expected results of the activities of a program taking place under certain conditions and with a definite purpose in mind."

Determine activities. At this stage plans should be made to discover what specific activities will accomplish the objectives. Emergency needs should be taken care of first by planning primary activities and possible alternatives. Activities for future goals can then be considered.

Prepare evaluation plan. If the objectives are written "in performance terms with minimum specifications for each activity," appropriate evaluation procedures can be determined. Consultants can aid in drawing up evaluation plans for particular activities and the overall continuing education program.

Develop budget and finalize plan. At this point a refined estimate of the cost can be submitted to the school board along with the proposal. If approval is given, the program can then be implemented.

When new needs are determined, the process is repeated.

Private Agencies

A few private organizations, such as CFK Ltd. of Englewood, Colorado, are available, not only to provide specific consulting services but also to develop ongoing programs for

school districts. But here again the school districts must initially be convinced of the need to provide such a program and be able to budget for it.

Most of the comprehensive plans for inservice training, like those of Lutz and Ferrante and CFK Ltd., utilize competency-based instruction and performance-based evaluation as the backbone of the program.

Professional Organizations

Since school districts generally have not been receptive to the idea of high-priority, ongoing programs or, even if they were, been able to provide the necessary funds, many authors advocate turning to other sources for help. Many believe that the professional organizations are the appropriate agents to design comprehensive plans for inservice training.

But principals have different backgrounds, interests, biases, and plans. Organizing them into a functioning unit is as difficult as coordinating plans between school districts and universities. But Wayson believes that the National Association of Elementary School Principals is the group that can most easily overcome the parochialism of principals and can exert the most power on behalf of the principalship.

Wayson proposes a comprehensive program of inservice training that would be initiated by NAESP and would draw on as many other agencies as possible. In addition to providing retraining, the program would serve to raise the professional stature of principals. One important phase would be to move the basic training centers out of the ordinary graduate school program, much in the way that the medical profession has withdrawn from the university.

This program involves the use of university resources, but the local university (the smaller ones, he suggests) would serve simply as part of a regional network to serve regional needs and would be coordinated by what he calls a National Consortium for Developing School Leadership. A "National Faculty" would develop and regulate the curriculum. The membership for this group would be drawn from universities,

professional associations, school districts, industry, government, and other related social science and humanities fields, and would also include outstanding practicing principals. If such a program were to achieve sufficient status, it could become virtually a certifying body by awarding certificates that would need to be periodically renewed. It could supply the nudge to stir the school districts out of their slumber. This plan would also take into account the continuing surplus of principals prepared by university graduate programs.

But even this program would have to contend with the usual gaps between theory and practice, as well as with the political maneuvering of various groups. Wayson's program could compete with university principal preparation programs by offering a viable training alternative. Whether or not such competition actually arose, it is certainly possible that university program directors could perceive this new educational approach as a threat.

And as the principal acquires greater professional autonomy, he could also acquire increased political clout in the local, state, and federal arenas. Upper echelon school administrators could even come to feel threatened by their principals' greater professional and political impact.

But politics being what they are, Brown, among others, is doubtful that the professional organizations can be looked on as any more receptive to genuine local needs than are the universities. Rather than construct a nationally organized program, he suggests that what is needed are more alternatives, more possibilities for training, and more sources of guidance.

He believes that state departments of education might be one other place to look for leadership in this area. According to Brown, the state departments could ally themselves with state teachers colleges to turn these colleges into inservice centers, since they are already turning out too many graduates who cannot find jobs.

Brown also presents plans for a new kind of institutions to serve principals and administrators exclusively. Although the universities are now the most important sources of help for inservice training through providing consultants, instructors,

materials, and research, they cannot be as responsive to professional needs as the new institutions could.

He believes that the new inservice centers, to prevent repeating past mistakes, should avoid such characteristics of a university as "course requirements, degree programs, credits, a faculty reward system that emphasizes scholarly research rather than teaching and learning, ingrained attitudes and traditions, and the built-in inertia familiar to all institutions."

But unfortunately, he fails to indicate who should create and sponsor these new institutions. It is also questionable whether this kind of institutional proliferation can actually accomplish the goal of coordinating inservice resources. Practically speaking, the solution would seem to lie more in utilizing existing structures than in creating other variables to complicate the coordination process.

The Problem of Prestige

The whole business of initiating and coordinating programs of inservice training involves three basic issues: (1) funding, which in turn depends on (2) interagency cooperation, which in turn depends on (3) the prestige of the principalship.

To many authors, the most damaging aspect of current inservice programs is that they give principals an image of themselves as trainees, still students in subordinate positions. To people already trapped in middle-management positions, self-image can be a thorny issue. The problem involves how to keep principals abreast of developments in their field and at the same time give them the status they feel they deserve—in other words, how to admit weakness in order to gain strength.

The major complaint running through all the literature is that the educational system at all levels is too entrenched in its ways, too afraid to be flexible and allow things to take their natural course. The principals, the universities, and school districts all have their vested interests. To loosen up somewhat in order to make gains for everyone—for education itself—is difficult and painful, but seems to be a necessary first step toward revitalized inservice education.

THE PRINCIPAL'S ROLE

Virtually all authors calling for the upgrading of inservice training accept the basic notion that the principal is one of the key figures in the whole educational process, if not the central figure.

Becker and his colleagues, in a book colorfully subtitled *Beacons of Brilliance and Potholes of Pestilence*, conclude that although more study is needed to isolate the characteristics of a good principal, a general description can be attempted. For the most part, the good schools, the "beacons of brilliance," were manned by principals that were charismatic leaders.

The exemplary principals worked well with teachers, delegated authority, and worked for change. They often attempted to cut district red tape to accomplish what they considered meaningful goals and were not afraid to take risks.

Some writers, however, disagree with the basic premise that the principal is the central figure. While admitting that in some rural areas principals maintain some semblance of an older power structure and that a few dynamic people even in urban districts can exercise a certain amount of power, they insist that the principal is essentially a functionary and that movements in education are consistently reducing his potential for leadership.

From this point of view, reforming the goals of inservice training is an unrealistic dream, only contributing further to the frustration that the principal already feels. Instead of creating a climate in which the principal can become better at what he is allowed to do, the greater role expectations fostered by inservice leadership training make him feel even more inadequate in comparison.

Myers expresses this view by describing the overwhelming forces—societal, organizational, and sociological and psychological—that determine the principal's role for him.

The major societal factor restricting the principal is the basic uniformity of all American education. The large turnover of teachers and principals requires standardization, and it is perpetuated by the mobility of the population, the national character of colleges and graduate schools, national testing, national textbooks, and national curricula.

The organizational factors center around the restriction of power by teachers and students from the bottom and superintendents from the top. The principal has no effective means of punishing or rewarding either teachers or students; both bypass him by going directly to higher administration to register complaints and to receive benefits.

As psychological and sociological factors, Myers cites studies by Coleman and Stephens indicating that various changes in instructional conditions make little difference in the final educational outcome. To credit the principal with the ability to become the key agent for change is meaningless.

Myers also draws heavily on the idea that the principal isn't capable of becoming all that the visionaries project for him. Few people can become wise enough and learned enough to do the kind of job that many experts are prescribing for the principal.

Extending this idea one step further are those like Hoban who would eliminate the principalship altogether. According to Hoban, principals should be eliminated for the following reasons:

- The principal cannot be a change agent in instruction because of the nature of his authoritarian relationship with teachers.
- The principal is reluctant to delegate authority because of his own accountability.
- Administrators by their very nature are committed to the status quo.

Eliminating the principalship could result simply in changing the name of the job, because certain tasks still must be performed, whether they are done by a principal or head teacher. The real issue is not so much what person is

called, but, what specifically he is called on to do and how he can best get it done.

The two major choices seem to be whether the principal is an overall leader or a mediator. At the moment many principals are trying to be both, but, being pressed on all sides, mediation is increasingly their province.

Whether they are to become more than mere conciliators and middlemen probably depends on the people who make up the principalship in the future. Regardless of what methods of inservice training are devised and made available, what matters is what the principals, individually and collectively, will settle for. If dissatisfaction is great enough, the "typical" principal may cease quieting the waters and start causing a few ripples of his own.

CONCLUSION

The amount of literature dealing with the inservice training of principals is extensive and is growing steadily. What was in the past an overlooked area of education is now receiving appropriate attention. Programs are being designed, and attempts are being made to make them fit the genuine requirements of the principal.

Most authors see the principal as beset by restrictions on all sides and are convinced that he must be trained to overcome those restrictions. For some, surmounting these limitations means developing more and better training methods, courses, and facilities, and encouraging better financing by the districts. To others it means changing the selection process, emphasizing and encouraging the qualities of leadership at all levels of training.

But the fundamental question of what the principal is primarily to be is largely undecided. Some say that he spends too much time on managerial duties and others that he is to be only a manager.

It is clear that the principalship is caught up in the turmoil of educational change. Future advances in inservice training will depend on how that change affects the office of the principal—whether it grows in importance, shifts its focus, or recedes into the background.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Many of the items listed in this bibliography are indexed in ERIC's monthly catalogs *Resources in Education (RIE)* and *Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE)*. Reports in *RIE* are indicated by an "ED" number; journal articles in *CIJE* are indicated by an "EJ" number.

Copies of most ERIC reports, but not journal articles, can be ordered from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. If a report is available from EDRS, its order number and prices are given. When ordering, please specify the "ED" number. Unless otherwise noted, reports are available in both microfiche (MF) and paper copy (HC). Please include check or money order payable to EDRS.

Postage must be added to the cost of all orders. Rates are as follows. Microfiche: \$0.18 for up to 60 fiche and \$0.08 for each additional 60. Paper copy: \$0.18 for first 60 pages and \$0.08 for each additional 60.

Address requests to EDRS, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210.

Achilles, Charles M., and Hughes, Larry W. "The Paired Administrator Team Concept: A Promising Administrator Training Model." *Planning and Changing*, 3, 2 (July 1972), pp. 45-50. EJ 064 505.

Becker, Gerald; Withycombe, Richard; Doyel, Frank; Miller, Edgar; Morgan, Claude; DeLoretto, Louis; and Aldridge, William, under the direction of Keith Goldhammer. *Elementary School Principals and Their Schools: Beacons of Brilliance and Potholes of Pestilence*. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1971. 209 pages. ED 056 380 MF \$0.75 HC \$10.20. (Also available from Publications, CEPM, 1472 Kincaid, Eugene, Oregon 97401. \$3.00.)

Bolton, Dale L., editor. *The Use of Simulation in Educational Administration*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1971.

Brainard, Edward. "Individualizing Administrator Inservice Education." *Thrust for Education Leadership*, 2, 5 (April 1973), pp. 29-33. EJ 076 414.

Brown, Charles E. "The Principal as Learner." *The National Elementary Principal*, 53, 5 (July/August 1974), pp. 19-23.

Center for Educational Technology. *CET: Center for Educational Technology, Trenton, New Jersey*. Trenton: 1972. 57 pages. ED 062 809 MF \$0.75 HC \$3.15.

- CFK Ltd. Associates. *Individualized Continuing Education for School Administrators—One Approach. An Occasional Paper.* Englewood, Colorado: 1970. 16 pages. ED 053 440 MF \$0.75 HC \$1.50.
- Cullinan, Paul A. "Computer As Teaching Tool." *Trend*, 6, 1 (Fall 1969), p. 36.
- Drachler, Norman. "How Can a School District Launch a Meaningful Training Program for Its Administrative Staff?" Paper presented at the American Association of School Administrators annual convention, Atlantic City, February 1973. 5 pages. ED 077 096 MF \$0.75 HC \$1.50.
- Hoban, Gary J. "The School without a Principal." In *The Power to Change: Issues for the Innovative Educator*, I/D/E/A/ Reports on Schooling, edited by Carmen M. Culver and Gary J. Hoban, pp. 148, 149. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973:
- Hoffman, Parnell H. *Administration In-Service Programs of the UCEA Institutions.* University Park, Pennsylvania: College of Education, Pennsylvania State University, 1971.
- Jerrems, Raymond L. "Sensitivity Training, the Affective Dimension of Inservice Training." Sensitivity Training and the School Administrator: A Special Section, Part IV." *The National Elementary Principal*, 50, 6 (May 1971), pp. 63-69. EJ 039 484.
- Katz, Robert. "Skills of an Effective Administrator." *Harvard Business Review*, 33 (January/February 1955), pp. 33-42.
- Knezevich, Stephen J. *The Development and Testing of a Model for a Nationally Based Vehicle Dedicated to the Continuing Professional Growth of School Administrators. Final Report.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1969. 137 pages. ED 030 194 MF \$0.75 HC \$6.60.
- Koerner, Thomas F., and Crawford, Martha A., editors. *Where Will They Find It?* Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1972. 94 pages. ED 072 029 MF \$0.75 HC \$4.20.
- Kuralt, Richard C. "The Principal's Turn." *The National Elementary Principal*, 53, 3 (March/April 1974), pp. 38-40. EJ 096 024.
- Lavin, Richard J., and Schuttentberg, Ernest M. *An Innovative Approach to Public School Staff Development. A Collaborative Mode.* Chelmsford, Massachusetts: Merrimack Education Center, 1972. 30 pages. ED 069 602 MF \$0.75 HC \$1.85.
- Lindgren, Richard F., and Mitchell, William D. "The Exchange Principalship: An Opportunity for Professional Growth." *The National*

Elementary Principal, 48, 4 (February 1969), pp. 28-29. EJ 000 045.

Lutz, Frank W., and Ferrante, Reynolds. *Emergent Practices in the Continuing Education of School Administrators*. ERIC/CEM-UCEA Series on Administrator Preparation. ERIC/CEM State-of-the-Knowledge Series, Number Sixteen. UCEA Monograph Series, Number Three. Eugene, and Columbus: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, and The University Council for Educational Administration, The Ohio State University, 1972. 55 pages. ED 069 015 MF \$0.75 HC \$3.15. (Also available from The University Council for Educational Administration, 29 West Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210. \$2.00. Quantity discounts as follows: 2 to 24 copies, \$1.80 each; 25 or more copies, \$1.60 each.)

McCleary, Lloyd E., and McIntyre, Kenneth E. "Competency Development and University Methodology: A Model and Proposal." *NASSP Bulletin*, 56, 362 (March 1972), pp. 53-68. EJ 052 762.

McNally, Harold J. "Summing Up." *The National Elementary Principal*, 54, 1 (September/October 1974), pp. 6-15.

Morrow, John; Foster, Richard; and Estes, Nolan. "Networking: A White Paper on the Preparation of School Administrators." *The National Elementary Principal*, 53, 5 (July/August 1974), pp. 8-18.

Musella, Donald F., and Joyce, H. Donald. *The Secondary School Principal. An In-Basket Simulation Exercise*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1973. 23 pages. ED 079 896 Document not available from EDRS. (Available from Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. \$2.00.)

Myers, Donald A. "The Chautauqua Papers: A Dissent." *The National Elementary Principal*, 54, 1 (September/October 1974), pp. 18-26.

Pharis, William L. *In-Service Education of Elementary School Principals*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966. 48 pages. ED 011 696 Document not available from EDRS.

Sarason, Seymour B. *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

University of Massachusetts. *School Communications Game*. Amherst, Massachusetts: School of Education, 1970. 61 pages. ED 051 090 MF \$0.75 HC \$3.15.

Wayson, William W. "A Proposal to Remake the Principalship." *The National Elementary Principal*, 54, 1 (September/October 1974), pp. 28-44.