DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 312   EA 019 394

AUTHOR   Bartell, Carol A.; Willis, David B.
TITLE   American and Japanese Principals: A Comparative
              Analysis of Excellence in Instructional
              Leadership.
PUB DATE   Apr 87
NOTE   57p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
              American Educational Research Association
              (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987). One version of
              the appended questionnaire (4 pages) is written in
              Japanese.
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research/Technical (143) --
              Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator
              Characteristics; *Cross Cultural Studies; Cultural
              Context; Educational Environment; Ethnography;
              Foreign Countries; *Instructional Leadership;
              Interviews; Leadership Responsibility; Leadership
              Styles; *Principals; *Role Perception; Role Theory;
              *School Effectiveness; Secondary Education; Social
              Science Research; Sociocultural Patterns; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS   *Japan

ABSTRACT

             Guided by interpretive ethnographic methods and by
instructional leadership concepts, this comparative study of
secondary principals in Japan and America discovers characteristics
of excellent principals and examines their values in relation to
dominant cultural themes. The investigation applies anthropologist
Clifford Goertz's assumptions (1973, 1983) about extracting
significant meaning from informants' interpretations of situational
experiences. From principals recognized as outstanding through a peer
selection process in their own nations, researchers selected American
and Japanese secondary-school principals to be surveyed through
questionnaires and open-ended interviews. Responses were received
from 67 American and 71 Japanese principals. Principals rate
relations with teachers as a key leadership factor. Japanese
principals' symbolic role derives from instructional qualities;
American principals emphasize additional abilities. For both, an
"effective school" possesses a positive climate, clear goals, and
high student expectations. Strong leadership and student/teacher
visibility characterize American principals. Japanese principals are
more visible to teachers and the surrounding community and obtain
instructional leadership from trust in teachers' performance. All of
the principals are committed to serving others, but strategies
differ--Americans approach operations directly and Japanese rely on
teachers. Student achievement concerns both nations. Anthropology and
education converge where the quality of human encounters is the
ultimate focus. Understanding tensions between educational ideology
in a national context and the principal's setting can help to
construct an order congruent with values from both worlds. An
eight-page bibliography and appendices are included. (CJH)

American and Japanese Principals:
A Comparative Analysis of Excellence in Instructional Leadership

by Carol A. Bartell, University of Iowa (U.S.A.)
and David B. Willis, Soai University (Japan)

© 1987

Presented at the American Educational Research Association
Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., April, 1987

American and Japanese Principals: A Comparative Analysis
Of Excellence In Instructional Leadership

by Carol A. Bartell and David B. Willis

What role do Japanese and American principals play in schools that
effectively educate students? How are the responsibilites of the principals
in each society articulated in practice? How do principals in each society
define their own responsibilities for providing instructional leadership?
What personal qualities do principals themselves feel contribute to effective
instructional leadership? What do the terms "instructional leader" and
"effective schools" mean to principals in each culture?

Recent studies have focused on the role of the principal in the shaping
of effective schools in the American context (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980;
Coleman, 1983; Edmonds, 1982; Greenfield, 1987; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982;
McCurdy, 1983; Shoemaker & Fraser, 1981; Ubban & Hughes, 1987). A common
theme that has emerged from this research is the role of the principal as an
instructional leader. Thus a search has ensued for a fuller understanding of
the concept of "instructional leadership" and the actual nature of such
administrative practices in "effective schools." This search can benefit from
turning to contexts other than America if we wish to further expand our
understanding of effective educational leadership.

Japan provides us with a particularly interesting example in this
respect. A recent report issued by the U. S. Department of Education (1987)
and speeches made by Secretary of Education Bennett have called for serious
attention to be paid to the education which is offered to Japanese citizens.
The Department of Education report follows in the wake of glowing media
reports on Japan's educational "success" and is itself full of praise for the
Japanese system. The Japanese educational system, highly regarded for the

quality of the students it produces and their contributions to economic success and social stability, can provide additional insights into administrative practices that could lead to increased educational effectiveness.

At the same time, the Japanese search for creativity and innovation in education can benefit from an examination of the best that American education has to offer. A comparative study should intentionally be a complementary study, too, and this is one of the goals of the present research. The line of comparative educational research which this follows has a long tradition. Rather than a "broad-brush" montage that includes the interaction of politics, economics, and society, the present research is mainly concerned with an examination of "effective" pedagogical concepts and methods as they occur in two specific cultural contexts.

Because educational administrators in Japan have traditionally been drawn from and considered part of the teacher corps (indeed, the term for principal in Japanese, koochoo sensei has the connotation of master teacher), formal study of administrative roles is quite recent. Indeed, there is still no formal path of preparation for becoming an administrator that is separate from that for becoming a teacher.

Most of what is available in Japanese is either in the form of practitioner-oriented manuals (Adachi, 1980; Niibori, 1979; Mase, 1972) or impressionistic reminiscences written by retiring principals for the journal of the All-Japan Secondary Principals' Association. There has been no study by Americans of Japanese educational administration, much less of the Japanese principal. Although this role and its functions receive some mention in the literature on Japanese education (U.S. Department of Education, 1987; White,

1987; Kobayashi & Ota, 1986; Okihara, 1986; Rohlen, 1983; Cummings, 1980; Shimahara, 1979; Kobayashi, 1978; Anderson, 1975), many questions have yet to be addressed.

A major objective of the present research is to actually describe principals who have been selected as outstanding by their own societies. Principals have been the object of intensive study in America, but, until recently, seldom the actual subject. For school administration in Japan there is little extant literature, thus making this area of special interest to educational researchers. Because of this dearth of published comparative studies on excellent principals, then, the present research sets out to: a) delineate certain descriptive demographic parameters of these principals in Japan and America and b) examine the values they hold.

This research is particularly relevant because of the recent national attention given to the role of the principal in effective schools and the growing spotlight on Japanese education. The research thus represents an extension of our knowledge in both areas, notably in terms of the similarities and differences of beliefs of "excellent" U.S. and Japanese principals.

Questions

The purpose of this study is to provide a comparative account of principals in two cultures which can aid us in answering the following questions:

What are the defining characteristics of excellent principals, especially in terms of behavior, values and goals?

How do the themes found in their respective cultural contexts influence excellent principals?

We are particularly searching for patterns which can indicate general statements about excellence in educational administration. An additional justification for pursuing this study is the gap in comparative literature concerning school administration in the U.S. and Japan. Furthermore, there are few accounts of what excellent principals actually believe, the values of real people in a real situation, particularly as it is seen in a comparative context.

A study of principals in these two cultures adds an important dimension to the literature concerning excellence in education and educational administration. Such a study provides information about what happens in this setting from the view of the insiders themselves.

Methodology

The intent of this study was to determine how principals in each society perceived their roles as instructional leaders. The inquiry was guided by the research on effective schools, the concept of instructional leadership that has emerged from this body of literature, the themes of comparative education, and the literature on Japanese education.

Data for the study came from multiple sources. A careful literature review was conducted to determine what themes and issues could be applied in a meaningful way across societies. Informants (principal-leaders and other educators in each society) were interviewed for their perpectives on instructional leadership. Outstanding principals were identified nationwide in both Japan and America and asked to respond to a survey questionnaire. In-depth interviews were then initiated with a small, purposively selected group of survey respondents for further understanding. It might be noted that

this study is on-going and will now focus on leadership behavior in the day-to-day school contexts using participant observation.

The theoretical basis of this approach follows Geertz, who stated that the task of an ethnographic study is hermeneutic or interpretive, and Nelson Goodman, who conceived of "world-making" as the critical foundation of belief and action. The conception of social life in these views is organized in terms of symbols whose meanings must be grasped if the culture and its principles are to be understood.

This study, then, attempts what Geertz calls a systematic "unpacking of performed meaning" (1982, p. 152). As Geertz noted,

> We are all natives now, and everybody else not immediately one of us is an exotic. What looked once to be a matter of finding out whether savages could distinguish fact from fancy now looks to be a matter of finding out how others, across the seas or down the corridor, organize their significative world. (Geertz, 1983, p.152)

An important assumption is that individuals behave in any situation based on what that situation means for them. This perspective gives an understanding of what is happening by beginning with behavior, then proceeding to determine what patterns might lead to that behavior. The initial assumption we are making, of course, is that "excellent" behavior is indicated for the subjects of our samples by their having been selected as "excellent principals." From there we proceed in our search for relevant patterns of belief and values.

As interpretive or hermeneutical research, this study can be seen as an attempt to mediate in the examination of principals' behavior as well as a conscious effort to avoid the split between what is and what ought to be. Geertz (1983, p. 151) has elaborated on this:

> That thought is spectacularly multiple as product and wondrously singular as process has thus not only come to be a more and more powerful animating paradox within the social sciences, driving theory in all sorts of directions, some of them reasonable, but the nature of that paradox

has more and more come to be regarded as having to do with puzzles of translation, with how meaning in one system of expression is expressed in another - cultural hermeneutics, not conceptive mechanics.

Survey Population

Because there are different responsibilities for instructional leadership at each educational level, the focus of this research was on secondary principals. It was felt that at this level the instructional leadership role is less well-defined than at the elementary level. Moreover, secondary principals manage educational institutions which can be seen as key links between the world of study and the (future) world of work.

The principals selected as the population to receive the survey questionnaire were chosen because they had already been recognized through a peer selection processs as outstanding principals in their own nations. This is thus a purposive sample, rather than a representative one that would provide a statistical basis for generalization to a larger population. Principals were selected to represent the model of the effective principal that appears to be emerging in each society. The intent of the study was to develop a profile of the effective instructional leader in each society, based upon what is deemed worthy of special recognition in both Japan and the United States.

American principals who had been chosen as "outstanding principals of the year" by their state level chapters of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) in 1985 and 1986 were selected as the purposive sample from the United States. The criteria for selection are provided by the national association and can be found in the Appendix. The entire population, consisting of one principal per state per year, was surveyed. To date, 67 of

a possible sample of 102 principals (Puerto Rico was also included) have replied, yielding a response rate of 66%.

For Japan a group of excellent principals was sought that would be as comparable as possible with the U.S. sample. With the help of Japanese principals who acted as informants, we decided that the Zen-Niku Koochoo-Sensei Riji (All-Japan Secondary Principals' Board of Trustees) most closely approximated the American sample. These principal/trustees are selected annually by their peers in every Japanese prefecture in what is described as a natural consensual process. Each prefecture sends four or five principals for a total of about 170 trustees. The position is regarded as a great honor, indicative of a long and distinguished career of educational leadership.

Since about 70 of these people had already retired when the 1986 list was published, it was decided that the sample would be the remaining 102, of whom 71 replied as of this writing for a response rate of 70%.

Politics and the pecking order of schools are clearly part of this process, with the older, established, urban, and more prestigious prefectural schools sending a disproportionate number of representatives. Small country schools have almost no representation on this Board. The criteria established by NASSP for selecting their outstanding principals were reviewed by Japanese informants, who agreed that the criteria mentioned were the main points upon which Japanese principals would also be evaluated.

Design of Questionnaire

The survey questionnaire was designed in the U.S. and pretested on five secondary principals. The instrument was then sent to Japan for review by the other member of the research team and his informants. The instrument was again revised in line with categories of significance for American and Japanese principals. This was considered an extremely important part of the survey design, and items were added, re-worded or deleted in accordance with key informants' perceptions and beliefs. The meanings which principals attach to their beliefs and behaviors were considered critical to the research design, a concept variously referred to as the signification of meaning (Geertz, 1983, p. 152) or ethnographic semantics (Spradley, 1972; Donmoyer, 1985). The survey was then translated into written Japanese, followed by a blind back-translation into English in order to assure content validity. The Appendix contains the version that was sent to principals in the U.S. and the Japanese translation.

Translation issues were especially significant in the research design, both in America and in Japan. The interpretation of items was checked and re-checked with different informants. Clear meanings were arrived at for all but a few terms.

Certain items could not be directly transalted between the Japanese and American surveys. Administrative categories, highest educational level obtained, school size, type of school, school ownership, and staff positions were different enough to require a reconstruction of the survey instrument.

As for areas of responsibility for principals, Questions 1-6, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 17-20 were literally matched. Others were difficult for informants and were either reworded or dropped. Questions 7-9, 12, and 15 still carried

slightly different nuances for respondents, mostly related to the differing structures of the respective educational systems, while Question 16 is completely different and Questions 21-23 were dropped from the Japanese version because they were considered by Japanese informants to be either included in other questions or irrelevant. As was mentioned, all translations were also "back-translated," a standard technique for assessing content validity in cross-cultural research.

The terms which both informants and researchers found to be of particular difficulty were "effective school" and "instructional leadership," but of course the meanings attached to these terms are the subject of considerable research and conjecture. For the purposes of this study, we chose to let our informants define these terms themselves.

In the first section of the questionaire, demographic information was collected from each principal in order to make further comparisons. This information was also useful in the selection of principals for follow-up interviews. Questions in the second section were designed to measure degree of responsibility perceived by principals for specific areas of instructional leadership. Principals were asked to rate each item on a 1 to 5 scale which indicated the degree to which they felt responsible for particular areas of instructional leadership. The scale was defined as ranging from (1) "little or no responsibility" to (5) "I bear the major responsibility for this area."

In the next section of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to rank order the qualities of principals that might be associated with educational leadership. The items were to be ranked from 1 to 9 in order of importance, with 1 being the most important.

The final section consisted of four open-ended questions. Principals were asked why they sought a principalship, what their career ambitions were for the future, what it meant to them to be a leader in education (an "instructional leader") and how they would define an "effective school". Results of the survey were discussed with both American and Japanese informants.

Analysis of the Data

Descriptive statistics were employed with data obtained from Part I and Part II of the survey questionnaire in order to describe the individual variables and the strength of relationships between variables. Measures of central tendency, measures of dispersion, and measures of bivariate relationships were applied as appropriate.

Thick description was provided through interviews, on-the-job observations, and content analysis of the open-ended questions on the survey instrument. Quotations incorporating pertinent material from interviews were added to enrich the descriptive portions. Frequency counts were employed on items that could logically be grouped into taxonomies. These diverse methods of data collection were selected in order to "triangulate" information between sources. Data collection will continue in 1987-1988.

Becoming a Principal

Who are these outstanding principals in each society? What is their background? What career paths do they follow? What are their career ambitions? There are some striking similarities as well as some striking differences between these cultures.

Career Paths

Both groups of principals have been classroom teachers, although this is a much clearer career path for the Japanese than for the Americans. Japanese principals as a group have been teachers for a far longer period of time before moving into a principalship (a mean of 19.75 years vs. 7.33 years for American principals). The Japanese leader has also had more preparatory administrative experience and has assumed the position at a later age. There are few women secondary principals in either society. In our U.S. sample of principal-leaders there were only three females (5%), while in the Japanese sample there were none. This is partly a reflection of age, since the mean age for both the U.S. and the Japanese principal is quite high (49 and 59, respectively, which we might expect for a sample of people being given a national honor). Women have, of course, only recently started assuming leadership positions in either country. The following represent portraits based on the frequencies and medians/means of this particular set of principals:

> The U.S. principal is male, holds an M.A. degree, has been a classroom teacher for seven years, and is 49 years of age. He is unlikely to have worked outside of an educational setting. He was probably an assistant principal for two years and had one year of other administrative experience. He has been a principal for 15.5 years. He is most likely

to be the principal of a school with 750 students or less that is
located in a small town of with a population of less than 150,000.

The Japanese principal is also male. He is likely to have had his
education before the War, either at an imperial university or a
teachers' training college. He was most likely a classroom teacher for
a period of nineteen years and is 59 years of age. He was a head
teacher (similar to the assistant-principal role) for three years and
has had five years of other administrative experience, probably as a
shido-shuji (supervisor) with the local Board of Education. He is also
unlikely to have worked outside of the school setting. His
principalship tenure has been for a period of seven years. The size of
his school is probably 1350 (measured by number of classes in Japan,
which would be 30 classes or more, with an average class number of 45).
He describes his community as "central city."

Why do persons seek the principalship? This question was asked on the

survey as an open-ended question. Responses were content-analyzed and grouped

by similar responses. Principals often gave more than one reason for seeking

such a role, so all responses were coded. Tables 1 and 2 represent a

classification of these responses, arranged by country and in descending order

of their mention.

Insert Tables 1 and 2

It is clear that for the American principals major reasons for seeking

this position include the desire to assume a leadership role, to advance

professionally, and the belief that one has the competencies required to

perform the job. Salary increase is also a consideration. Mentorship appears

to be important, as a large number of principals mentioned that they were

encouraged by others, usually their own principals under whom they had taught,

to consider a principalship. Some typical responses from American principals

citing the responses that appeared most frequently include:

> Ambition...a desire to move up the career ladder. I was confident of my
> ability and sought the job for typical reasons--status, financial
> return, the desire to influence a school, etc.

> The opportunity to influence decisions, take part in higher level
> planning; a new experience; I thought I had something to offer; a higher
> salary.

> I enjoy being in a position of leadership. I'm very competitive. I
> thrive on challenges. I wanted to work at a job that was not boring. I
> was asked to get into administration by a practicing administrator.

For the reasons why Japanese principals seek the position of principal,
we should first look at some general points regarding personnel and employment
in the Japanese context. How Japanese deal with personnel matters at all
levels in their schools is undoubtedly at the heart of Japan's educational
success. In many ways, the principal is the ultimate source of authority in
the orchestration of interpersonal relationships.

The key words are trust and solidarity. Great emphasis is placed on
social order and commonly-shared identity and purpose. Important descriptors
include dedication, high morale, motivation, obedience, discipline,
acceptance, and group-centeredness. Intense personal commitment to the common
endeavor is paramount and is inculcated early in the experience.

Initiation activities, for example, involve everyone. The new people
(whether they are students or teachers) become the center of attention, but
the initiation in no way resembles hazing. The purpose is to make newcomers
feel welcome and relieve any anxieties they may feel about their new status.

At the same time the hierarchy of the workplace is subtly made clear.
Extreme deference in speech indicates who is at the top of the hierarchy.
During a personnel initiation party shortly after joining a school, for
instance, the person whose beer is poured first, the person who comments on
whether the food served is tasty or not, and the person who suggests that it

is time to go home are all senior people in the school hierarchy. Ritual indications such as these are keys to understanding how the personnel hierarchy is successfully operationalized.

All this serves to illustrate what is perhaps the paramount point of becoming a principal in Japan: most Japanese principals do not seek this position. This may seem astonishing to those of us attuned to the American system of ambition and "ladder-climbing," but it is fully in accord with the highly centralized, group-effort-focused nature of Japanese endeavors in the work-place. Whereas the commitment of the American principal may first of all be to his career, the commitment of the Japanese principal is to the work-group to which he belongs.

In Japan, the route to the principalship is highly centralized in terms of selection and placement. This of course sounds more logical, more efficient than our own system, but it may also discourage the change-oriented innovator from becoming a principal in Japan. Some Japanese principals even noted that they thought that the principalship could not be sought in Japan because of the structure of the system. This system ordains who is the best man for the job in what is seen as a kind of "natural process." Significantly, there is a series of examinations which lead progressively to each position. Although there is no formalized route of study for becoming a principal, there are study guides available for these examinations that look rather similar to course syllabi for basic educational administration programs in the United States.

Although salary is given as the second-most important reason for Naturally, this conditions how one looks at one's work and at one's future work, the job itself, still comes first in importance and the salary second.

administrators in Japan make only 10-20% more salary than teachers with the same experience as well as reflecting a traditional Japanese modesty about is not even mentioned as a reason. This partly reflects the fact that their becoming a principal by Americans whom we surveyed, salary for the Japanese Naturally, this conditions how one looks at one's work and at one's future career ambitions.

In fact, the most important similarities between American and Japanese principals that we can detect from the data seem to indicate that salary is not the key factor in seeking the principalship even for Americans. Instead, what we see is a clustering of responses in both groups around the ideas of realizing one's own educational ideals and leadership skills as well as working with others to promote educational excellen.

The primary message which this data seems to be telling us is that principals in both cultures have a strong committment to the service function of their positions, to serving others. There is also a strong mention by both groups of encouragement by other people to become principal. Some comments which illustrate the Japanese principal's view as to why he "sought" the principalship (actually, more appropriately, why he became a principal) are as follows:

> I was appointed, then determined to become a principal.
>
> No particular reason. It was an assignment.
>
> I didn't intend to become one. I had to become a principal after experience. I didn't show signs that I wanted to be (one).
>
> I never wanted to be a principal.
>
> To establish the school educational environment and to improve the students's learning and help them to build character.

Career Goals

What are these outstanding principals future career goals? Do they wish to remain in the job that they apparently do so well, or do they seek other professional opportunities? An analysis of the career ambitions of the U.S. principals is found in Table 3.

Insert Table 3

Many principals were very happy with what they were doing and had no further aspirations (44%). The following is a representative statement of this point of view:

> I have no desire to be other than what I am. I am happy doing what I am doing. I do it successfully (if other people's perceptions are to be believed), and I have made my commitment to spend my life working at this level. Why aspire to other jobs in this business which remove you from the "real world" of education, where teachers and kids are to be served?

While a large number of principals express no desire to move to another position, about an equal number (45%) indicate that they may be seeking another professional opportunity within the next five to ten years. This point of view is expressed here:

> Currently, I enjoy being a high school principal. However, I also have aspirations to be able to do more for larger groups of people. I believe I have seen many incompetent people in administration and that incompetence is not necessary and in fact is obviously very damaging. (My premise is one of) supporting what is best for the student and teacher relationship and the instructional process. Because of this I have higher ambitions to go on to ecome a superintendent somewhere in my career. Beyond that, if luck would have it, I would like to be a be a leader within the state or national level to mold the educational process for the students of tomorrow.

18

What of the career ambitions of Japanese principals?   First of all, we must note that interpretation of this question would have been considerably different for our Japanese sample. Most of the principals surveyed were about to retire, so they took the question as indicating what they would ideally like to be doing five or ten years after their retirement.

Moreover, the structure of the system makes for much less job mobility than in America. There is no higher position like a superintendency for which principals might aspire, although some may seek a job in a university or with the local Board of Education for reasons of social prestige after retirement. Finally, to be seen as ambitious in Japan is frowned upon, a social belief which undoubtedly influenced respondents' answers when they were asked why they sought a principalship and what their career ambitions were for the future.

Insert Table 4

The results of this question (career ambitions in the next five or ten years) even more emphatically state a service committment.   A sampling of comments by Japanese principals follows:

Make efforts for the students. Although I hope to have some other job, I'll be engaged in a junior college as I was requested.

Looking at the future all the time, I'd like to take a leadership in keeping the ideology of the human society healthy. I will be retiring in five to ten years, but I'd like to do something helpful in the society somehow.

It's important to have capability to lead the faculty as a human being and professionally, sharpening awareness of problems, making progress in myself. Even after my retirement, I'd like to work as a volunteer in educational work.

That so many principals mention continued service to education and society as their main concern, both before and after retirement, is again indicative of a service commitment that can only be said to be remarkable. In terms of career ambitions, this contrasts with the American sample, which was clearly oriented more towards personal career goals.

Being a Principal: Beliefs of American and Japanese Principals

Values: Roles and Responsibilities

How do these outstanding principals view their responsibilities for instructional leadership?

There are striking differences in the organization of schools and the division of responsibility for leadership. While the Japanese principals came from much larger schools, they reported only slightly more classroom teachers at their schools (average class size typically being 45), slightly fewer full-time administrators (Japanese mean = 2.2; U.S. mean = 2.8), many fewer other professional staff (Japanese mean = 3.4; U.S. mean = 8.8), and approximately half the support staff (Japan mean = 10.2; U.S. mean = 20). Therefore, it must be kept in mind that there are fewer persons in the Japanese school with whom to share responsibilities.

These principals were asked to rate twenty-three items on a 1 to 5 scale (twenty for the Japanese principals, since Japanese informants saw the last three items as either irrelevant or incorporated in previous questions), indicating their degree of responsibility for each area. The items themselves were drawn from the American literature on effective schools and instructional leadership. A description of the ratings were provided as follows:

> 1: Little or no responsibility at all
> 2: Some responsibility, but others bear the major responsibility for this area
> 3: Responsibility shared equally with others
> 4: Much responsibility for oversight and direction, with some responsibility delegated elsewhere
> 5: I bear the major responsibility for this area

The mean rank calculated for each area of responsibility for each group of principals is displayed in Table 5. Tables 6 and 7 report the mean rank ordered from high to low for the respective samples.

Insert Tables 5, 6, and 7

The top four areas of responsibility for the U.S. principals were: evaluating the performance of teachers, providing a supportive climate for teachers, articulating the goals of the school to the staff, and providing an orderly atmosphere for learning. This would indicate that American principals exert their leadership by facilitating good instruction, or in the words of some of these principals, "getting the job done through people...creating optimal conditions for others to excel...supporting of the efforts of others to do their best...provide leadership, support, and assistance to faculty."

A major component of such leadership involves the highest ranked item, which was evaluating the performance of teachers. This is an area for which principals have taken a great deal of reponsibility in recent years and is receiving attention in the literature. Many states are now adding a certification or recertification requirement that addresses the particular competencies involved in supervision of instruction. Several principals described formalized procedures that were in place in their school districts or even in the state, in some cases. Principals spoke of clinical models,

with mutually agreed upon goals, classroom observations, pre- and post-conferences, and, in the case of those teachers who did not meet expectations, remediation plans.

Particularly notable for the Japanese sample is the very high ranking given to the variable: recruiting/hiring outstanding teachers. While this also ranked quite highly among principals in the U.S., it was the highest variable for the Japanese principals, with a mean rank of 4.81. It should be noted that there are typically five applicants for each teaching position in Japan. Competition is fierce as the position of being a teacher is associated with prestige, a high salary, good working conditions, and stable prospects for continued employment in the future. It might be mentioned that teaching is one of the few career paths in Japan for which there is a guarantee of equal pay for equal work for women as well as generous maternity benefits.

The sorting-out process of those that potentially would make the best teachers is done at the beginning of a teacher's career by the educational bureaucrats working for the local Board of Education. Many of these bureaucrats are themselves on the way to positions as principals and have strong connections with those who preceded them and are already in the schools as building-level principals. Considerable "networking" takes place at the time of teacher recruitment, selection, and placement, with principals vying with each other for the best pick of the new crop of young teachers.

A few words on the position of principal in Japanese schools may be in order at this point. The principal is an important symbolic figure in the school, an embodiment of the traditions and character of the school. At the opening and closing ceremonies of school and after every vacation principals are expected to give inspirational speeches to the entire school. The content

of the talks is invariably didactic and will touch on one or more of the following themes:

1) responsibility for one's actions including a reminder that good behavior reflects well on one's school and family

2) the fact that all students are representatives of their school, a community shared with fellow students

3) the unacceptable nature of behavior which spoils the school name for all (students in Japan seldom take their uniforms off so are easily identified when there is trouble, at which time the police will notify the school authorities first, after which the principal will get in touch with the parents)

4) a reminder that to succeed in entrance exams and in life early preparation and hard study are required

Expectations are high that behavior will be proper and that all students will try their hardest at everything they attempt. Cooperation and harmony are valued above all else and lie at the core of the Japanese emphasis on quality in an organization's internal relations and activities. Shame is great indeed if the student fails to succeed, but not trying and failing is cause for even greater shame.

Ultimate responsibility for the school and the actions of the students is in the hands of the principal. American principals who find much stress in their jobs might consider the position of Japanese principals, who are personally responsible for any untoward action by any student or teacher. Japanese newspapers occasionally report the suicide of a principal caused by the shame a student or staff member has brought to the school's name (Daily Yomiuri, 1982). There are few "rules" as such in a Japanese school, but the example of the "virtuous man" is incalculable.

Stern and distant, principals are super-parent figures and yet symbolize at the same time the intimate relationship that exists between the Japanese teacher and student. The principal is considered the ultimate teacher. He

or she has probably been chosen from the ranks, a senior teacher who has had long experience with students. The principal's role in a Japanese school is, above all else, to mediate and articulate common goals between disparate groups.

Depending on the academic status of a given high school, Japanese principals command what an American might feel is an inordinately high status. Respect for knowledge endows special meaning to the symbolic position of principal. The actual job of principal is really more along the lines of P.R. par excellence, since the principal is the major representative of the school to the surrounding community in garnering resources, warding off outside actions of potential danger to the school, and communicating with parents.

Rohlen (1983) tells of the following anecdote that well-illustrates the typical values held by principals (this one is being told by a principal at graduation): Two friends were graduating. One had been accepted at a good university, one had not. The second was unhappy and jealous, as their teacher had told them they had an equal chance. But the successful friend apologized deeply, saying he was sorry the result could not have been the reverse. His friend reflected on his jealousy, "No wonder I failed. I had the wrong attitude. It was good I failed." The principal then said to the graduates, "When things don't go the way you expect, you come to life's true turning points. They say Japanese wood is especially strong. Do you know why? Because of our hot summers and cold winters. Be full of energy and remember it is life's hardships that give strength."

24

Values: Qualities of Educational Leadership

What are the qualities of educational leadership that are considered to be important to these principals? Principals were asked to rank order a set of eight qualities in descending order of importance. The mean rank of each group of principals is reported in Table 8 and Table 9, in descending order. In Table 10, the Japanese and American principals overall rankings of each item are reported.

Insert Tables 8, 9, and 10

Note that each of the groups had items that clustered together in the top three rankings. The American principals ranked understanding of the instructional process, relations with teachers, and relations with students as the most important. The Japanese also felt relations with teachers were important, along with moral character, and warmth and consideration.

The importance placed on relations with teachers among both groups indicates that this is a key factor in the leadership role in both societies. Both groups feel that good teachers are essential to learning and that it is important to select good teachers, encourage and facilitate their performance, and lead them toward sound educational goals. This relationship, however, differs somewhat across societies.

The Japanese principals, as was noted earlier, spend many more years in the classroom as teachers, perfecting their own teaching skills. They are respected first of all for their teaching abilities. Even the label of "head teacher" which is applied to the person who fills a role similar to an

assistant principal, connotates the importance of the respect accorded to the ability to teach.

U.S. principals who were later asked if it were necessary to be considered an outstanding teacher before becoming a principal felt that, while it was important to understand the instructional process and to be able to recognize good teaching, the role of the principal required different sorts of abilities.

The principal's role in Japan today can be seen as largely symbolic and ritualistic. Contact with students is closest when they are graduating, a time when the principal normally gives a moving speech which is by turns paternalistic, humble, warm and exhortatory. Graduation is also one of the few occasions when students can see the principal as a real person and not as a model of Confucian morality. The effect of this self-effacement is a further strengthening of the idea of the principal as "principal teacher." One of the most touching expressions of the teacher-student relationship is the singing of "Hotaru no hikari" (The Light of the Firefly) to the tune of auld lang syne at school graduation. The words of the song convey the affection, respect and gratitude of students for their teachers - and everyone sheds tears. The principal, of course, is at the symbolic center of this scene.

Values: Effective Schools and Instructional Leadership

The main point of instructional leadership found in recent literature is to develop and foster effective schooling. What do principals mean when they talk about effective schools? What do they see as the model of the outstanding school?

Certain themes emerged from our analysis of what the U.S. and Japanese principals considered an "effective school" to be.

An effective school has a positive school climate. Students feel good about attending such a school and teachers feel good about teaching there. The entire staff works together to foster a caring attitude. There is a safe and orderly environment. The role of the administration is to support the faculty and the staff and to serve students. There is a wide involvement in decision-making, which includes input from faculty and staff as well as parents and the community.

The school has clearly established goals. Everyone works together to achieve these goals. There is frequent monitoring and feedback to keep everyone on task, although the manner in which this is carried out is rather different in each culture. Everyone knows what is expected of him/her. The school is dynamic and changing, constantly striving to do better.

High expectations are set for all students. Students will show both academic and personal growth. There is an attempt to meet the needs of all students and prepare them to be successful in life. The school provides the best education possible for all with the resources available.

Strong leadership and visibility to students and teachers are especially evident for American principals. Japanese principals, on the other hand, are actively visible to the teachers and the surrounding community outside the school. For the Japanese principal, an effective school is characterized by a focus on instructional leadership in the sense of a natural expectation or trust that his teachers will do their best at all times. A typical expression of these concerns from the Japanese side was the following comment from a retiring principal:

It was one of the theses (of my management studies) to find clues to solving problems by thinking of the matrix of 4M (men, material, money, management) and of the PDS cycle (Plan-do-see). Particular to this was the problem of "men", how to encourage the faculty's morale being the most important element. Trying to listen to teachers' opinions, making good use of good opinions, and trying to pay attention to the constructive views of the opposition. Being in a responsible post in a school, the administrative side tends to be taken. But I tried to use the leadership side, putting it out in front.

Although there are many differences between Japan and America, one of the most compelling findings of the current research is the remarkable similarity in beliefs characterizing "effective schools." Although the strategies for reaching this goal may be different (with the Americans employing a more direct approach by principals in the day-to-day operation of the school while the Japanese rely heavily on their teachers to carry out these strategies) the end result, the effect or impact which reaches students in the classroom, is very similar. Good schools and good instructional leadership can be recognized in any cultural setting for their single-minded pursuit of quality in education and human relationships.

Why Compare the U.S. and Japan? - An Epilogue

This research is particularly relevant because of the recent national attention given to the role of the principal in effective schools as well as the growing spotlight on the educational system in Japan. The research thus represents an extension of our knowledge in both areas, notably in terms of the similarities and differences in beliefs of "excellent" U.S. and Japanese principals. There are similarities across the two cultures, particularly in regard to education. In Japan, as in America, there is considerable public concern for high achievement among high school students. In both countries there is a perception that schools are badly in need of reform.

The question of significance can also be answered by referring to the power of "example." The Chinese realized both the power and the virtue of example long ago. They operated for centuries, for instance, without a complex legal system, preferring example as a tool for instruction and edification. Likewise, this study has examined the power of example as it was conveyed by a principal's representation of themselves and their functions.

Moreover, it is suggested that the significance of the study lies at least partially in new ways of looking at old conceptual categorizations, be they organizational, administrative or other. The formulation of new relationships is of interest and it is here that a comparative study of Japanese and American principals offers novel ways of seeing how old elements can be combined.

What if, for instance, the experience of excellent principals in these respective countries might foreshadow a world of the future where quality is the key paradigm? How might they provide new ways of viewing the direction of national educational institutions? In the search for educational excellence in America and other nations are there possible lessons which might be learned from the principal, a key figure in the operation of schools? Certainly the experience of outstanding administrators in comparative perspective at least helps us frame question concerning excellence and instructional leadership in a different light. An awareness of alternatives is important. The culture of school principals can reveal a great deal. As Rohlen (1974, p.270) points out,

> If we are to advance our understanding of organizations beyond the present boundaries created by the functional and historical perspectives, we must also learn to consider them in cultural terms, and this requires a solid empirical foundation developed through sensitive fieldwork, especially as it illuminates the character of immediate reality in each case.

This study's purpose was, like that expressed by Brameld (1968) for educational anthropology, to help others identify and improve the self-defeating aspects of personality and patterns of everyday social life. As he contended, anthropology and education converge at the point which makes the greatest difference to human beings, a point of contact where the quality of human encounters is the ultimate focus.

The value of this sort of research thus resides in the intellectual contribution it makes to our understanding of the world. If we are equipped with a critical understanding of the tension between the ideology of education in a national context and the social setting of the principal's world, we may be able to tolerate the tension more easily and build a more meaningful educational order with the values and the symbols provided from both worlds.

Table 1. Reasons for Seeking a Principalship Given by U.S. Principals

Reasons for seeking a principalship	Number of Mentions	Percent
Felt I had leadership abilities/administrative skills	21	32%
Increase in salary	13	20%
Professional advancement	11	17%
Interest in working with people/students	10	15%
To have an impact on instructional program	10	15%
To influence/have impact on larger no. of students	9	14%
For the challenge of the job	9	14%
To be a change agent/influence policy decision-making	10	15%
Satisfaction of serving/making a contribution	7	11%
It was a professional goal	4	6%
Nature/control of work activities	2	3%
Enjoy working with teachers	2	3%
To implement a philosophy	1	2%
Influenced by role models	1	2%

(n=66)

Table 2. Reasons for Seeking a Principalship Given by Japanese
Principals

Reasons for seeking a principalship	Number of Mentions	Percent
Realize my own educ. ideals, promote educ. excellence	20	28%
Appointed, ordered, superior's recommendation, had to	13	18%
No intention or reason to become a principal	14	20%
Not seeking, a natural process	11	15%
Help students (learning, growth, finding a job)	7	10%
I never wanted or thought of being a principal	7	10%
Teacher's role limited in improving education	2	3%
A sense of mission	1	1%
Challenge of the job	1	1%
Lucky	1	1%
Make use of my experience	1	1%
My dream since I was young	1	1%
My father was a principal	1	1%
Prestige	1	1%
To "realize educational love"	1	1%
To display leadership skills	1	1%
It's only given to someone fully qualified	1	1%

(n=71)

32

Table 3. Career Ambitions of U.S. Principals

Career Ambitions	Number of Mentions	Percent
Remain in the principalship	28	44%
Superintendency/Central Office	10	16%
Other educational leadership role (unspecified)	8	12%
Retirement	7	11%
Principalship or superintendency/central office	6	9%
College-university teaching or administration	3	5%
Outside of education	1	2%
Consulting	1	2%

(n=64)

Table 4. Career Ambitions of Japanese Principals

Career Ambitions	Number of Mentions	Percent
Retirement	21	30%
Education-related work in society (after retirement)	22	31%
Make our school educationally active, help students	15	21%
Do something helpful in society (esp. with youth)	11	15%
Complete my present job, doing my best	9	13%
No clear view of the future	5	7%
Teach in a college	4	6%
Improvement of teachers in my school	4	6%
"Human trust" relationship with the faculty	2	3%
The same as now	4	6%
A positive and flexible attitude	1	1%
Be free from distrust and irresponsible critics	1	1%
Be involved in educational politics	1	1%
Die from senility	1	1%
Educate myself more	1	1%
Head of a preparatory academy	1	1%
Leadership in society	1	1%
Living as a common old civilian	1	1%
Maximize the effect of education	1	1%
No wishes	1	1%
Personal progress	1	1%
Remaining healthy	1	1%
Turn our school from an easy-going to a severe one	1	1%

(n=71)

Table 5.   Rankings of Areas of Responsibility for Instructional Leadership

	U.S.		Japan	
	x	SD	x	S
Selecting/reviewing of curriculum materials	2.88	1.02	3.75	.9
Emphasizing student achievement	4.05	.75	3.69	.9
Evaluating pupil progress	3.09	1.02	3.18	1.0
Providing orderly atmosphere for learning	4.55	.73	4.23	.7
Devising instructional strategies	3.56	.85	3.56	.8
Introducing new intructional methods to teachers	3.62	.89	3.86	.8
Evaluating performance of teachers	4.76	.47	4.65	.7
Arranging school events	3.62	1.07	3.58	.8
Reviewing and determining school's educational goals	4.20	.73	4.39	.7
Articulating goals of school to public	4.29	.65	4.60	.6
Articulating goals of school to staff	4.60	.63	4.54	.6
Providing supportive climate for teachers	4.74	.44	4.13	.7
Responding to community expectations	4.23	.77	4.04	.8
Involving teachers in decision-making	4.23	.68	4.10	.9
Conveying society/community values to students	3.39	.82	3.72	.8
Accepting responsibility for student behavior in school	4.09	.87	4.21	.8
Accepting respon. for student behavior outside school	2.53	1.21	3.84	.9
Managing resources allocated for instructional use	3.99	.98	4.31	.7
Recruiting/hiring outstanding teachers	4.26	.90	4.78	.5
Setting expectation for student behavior	4.21	.81		
Setting expectation for student performance	3.89	.77		
Involving parents/community members as volunteer helpers	3.49	1.09		

(n=66)   (n=71)

Table 6. Rankings of Areas of Responsibility for Instructional
          Leadership by U.S. Principals

	x	SD
Evaluating performance of teachers	4.76	.47
Providing supportive climate for teachers	4.74	.44
Articulating goals of school to staff	4.60	.63
Providing orderly atmosphere for learning	4.55	.73
Articulating goals of school to public	4.29	.65
Recruiting/hiring outstanding teachers	4.26	.90
Responding to community expectations	4.23	.77
Involving teachers in decision-making	4.23	.68
Setting expectation for student behavior	4.21	.81
Reviewing and determining school's educational goals	4.20	.73
Accepting responsibility for student behavior in school	4.09	.87
Emphasizing student achievement	4.05	.75
Managing resources allocated for instructional use	3.99	.98
Setting expectation for student performance	3.89	.77
Introducing new intructional methods to teachers	3.62	.89
Arranging school events	3.62	1.07
Devising instructional strategies	3.56	.85
Involving parents/community members as volunteer helpers	3.49	1.09
Conveying society/community values to students	3.39	.82
Evaluating pupil progress	3.09	1.02
Selecting/reviewing of curriculum materials	2.88	1.02
Accepting respon. for student behavior outside school	2.53	1.21

(n=66)

Table 7. Rankings of Areas of Responsibility for Instructional
Leadership by Japanese Principals

	x	SD
Recruiting/hiring outstanding teachers	4.78	.54
Evaluating performance of teachers	4.65	.70
Articulating goals of school to public	4.60	.67
Articulating goals of school to staff	4.54	.69
Reviewing and determining school's educational goals	4.39	.75
Managing resources allocated for instructional use	4.31	.73
Providing orderly atmosphere for learning	4.23	.72
Accepting responsibility for student behavior in school	4.21	.84
Providing supportive climate for teachers	4.13	.75
Involving teachers in decision-making	4.10	.90
Responding to community expectations	4.04	.82
Introducing new intructional methods to teachers	3.86	.88
Accepting respon. for student behavior outside school	3.84	.90
Selecting/reviewing of curriculum materials	3.75	.97
Conveying society/community values to students	3.72	.82
Emphasizing student achievement	3.69	.95
Arranging school events	3.58	.89
Devising instructional strategies	3.56	.88
Evaluating pupil progress	3.18	1.03

(n=71)

Table 8:   Mean Rank by U.S. Principals

Principal Qualitities	X rank U.S.
Understanding of the instructional process	2.96
Relations with teachers	3.07
Relations with students	3.83
Warmth and consideration	5.11
Moral character	5.16
Efficiency	5.39
Relations with parents and community	5.40
Inteliectual knowledge	5.63

(n=66)

Table 9: Mean Rank by Japanese Principals

Principal Qualitities	X rank Japan
Moral character	3.00
Relations with teachers	3.05
Warmth and consideration	3.80
Relations with students	4.37
Understanding of the instructional process	4.42
Intellectual knowledge	4.67
Efficiency	6.45
Relations with parents and community	6.47

(n=71)

Table 10: Rank Order of Qualities Perceived as Important by Principals

Principal Qualitities	U.S. Rank	Japan Rank
Efficiency	6	7
Intellectual knowledge	8	6
Moral character	5	1
Relations with teach. 's	2	2
Relations with students	3	4
Relations with parents and community	7	8
Understanding of the instructional process	1	5
Warmth and consideration	4	3
	(n=66)	(n=71)

REFERENCES

Adachi, Kenji, and Tokaishi, Kunio. (1980). Koochoo no Shokumu to Sekinin (Duties and Responsibilities of a Principal). Tokyo: Daiichi Kohosha.

Anderson, R. (1975). Education in Japan. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Atsumi, Reiko. (1979). Tsukiai — obligatory personal relationships of Japanese white-collar company employees. Human Organization, 38(1), Spring, 63-70.

Barnhardt, R., Chilcott, J. H., and Wolcott, H. F. (Eds.). (1979). Anthropology and Educational Administration. Tucson, Arizona: Impresora Sahuarv.

Barry, H. (1981). Uses and limitations of ethnographic description. In: Handbook of Comparative Human Development, R. H. Munroe, R. L. Munroe, and B. Whiting (Eds.). 91-111. New York: Garland STPM Press.

Befu, Harumi. (1971). Japan — An Anthropological Introduction. Tokyo: Tuttle.

Blumberg, A. & Greenfield, W. The Effective Principal: Perspectives on School Leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bogdan, Robert C., and Biklen, Sari K. (1982). Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Boyer, Ernest L. (1983). High School. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Brameld, Theodore. (1968). Japan: Culture, Education, and Change in Two Communities. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Bridges, Edwin, M. (1982). Research on the school administrator: the state of the art, 1967-1980. Educational Administration Quarterly, Summer (3), 12-33.

Byrne, D.R., Hines, S.H., and McCleary, L.H. The Senior High School Principalship, Vol. I: The National Survey. Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals. 1978.

Calhoun, C. J., and Ianni, F. A. J. (Eds.). (1976). The Anthropological Study of Education. The Hague: Mouton.

Campbell, R. F., Cunningham, L. L., Usdan, M. D., and Nystrand, R.O. (1980). The Organization and Control of American Schools. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.

Chudler, A. A. (1974). The international school principal. In W. G. Thomas (Ed.). American Education Abroad, 117-122, New York: Macmillan.

Cooper, Harris M. (1984). The Integrative Research Review. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Corbett, H. Dickson, Dawson, Judith A. and Firestone, William A. (1984). School Context and School Change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cronbach, Lee J. (1979). Beyond qualitative versus quantitative methods. In Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Evaluation Research, Beverly Hills: Sage, 124-126.

Cummings, William K. (1980). Education and Equality in Japan. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cusick, P. A. (1973). Inside High School. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

The Daily Yomiuri. (1982). Death of a principal. The Daily Yomiuri, March 26, p. 2.

Deasy, R.J. (1986). Education in Japan: surprising lessons. Educational Leadership, 38-43.

De Vos, George A. (1973). Socialization for Achievement. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dobbert, M. L. (1982). Ethnographic Research: Theory and Application for Modern Schools. New York: Praeger.

Doi, Takeo. (1985). The Anatomy of Dependence. Tokyo: Kodansha.

Doi, Takeo. (1986). The Anatomy of Self. Tokyo: Kodansha.

Donmoyer, R. (1985). Cognitive anthropology and research on effective principals. Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 21, No. 2.

Duke, B.C. (1986). The Japanese School: Lessons for Industrial America. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Duke, B.C. (1986). The liberalisation of Japanese education. Comparative Education, 22(1), 37-45.

Eddy, Elizabeth M. (1985). Theory, research, and application in educational anthropology. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 16(2), Summer, 83-104.

Edwards, R. (Ed.). (1973) Relevant Methods in Comparative Education. Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education.

Ekstein, M. (Ed.). (1969). <u>Scientific Investigation in Comparative Education</u>. London: The Macmillan Co.

Erickson, Frederick. (1984). What Makes School Ethnography 'Ethnographic'? <u>Anthropology and Education Quarterly</u>, 15(1), Spring, 51-66.

Fetterman, David. (Ed.). (1984). <u>Ethnography in Educational Evaluation</u>. Beverly Hills: Sage Publishers.

Finnan, Christine Robinson. (1980). The emergence of policy statements from ethnographic case studies. <u>Urban Review</u>, 12(4), 201-09.

Firestone, W.A. & Wilson, B.L. (1985). Using bureaucratic and cultural linkages to improve instruction: the principal's contribution. <u>Educational Administration Quarterly</u>, Spring, pp. 7-30.

Gearing, F., and Sangree, L. (Eds.). (1979). <u>Toward a Cultural Theory of Education and Schooling</u>. The Hague: Mouton Publishers.

Geertz, Clifford. (1973). <u>The Interpretation of Cultures</u>. New York: Basic Books.

Geertz, Clifford. (1983). <u>Local Knowledge</u>. New York: Basic Books.

Getzels, J. W., Lipham, J. M., and Campbell, R. F. (1968). <u>Educational Administration as a Social Process</u>. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Gibson, Margaret A. (1982). Reputation and respectability: how competing cultural systems affect students' performance in school. <u>Anthropology and Education Quarterly</u>, 13(1), 3-27.

Glaser, Barney G., and Strauss, Anselm L. (1968). <u>The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research</u>. Chicago: Aldine and Atherton.

Goetz, J. P. and LeCompte, M. D. (1984). <u>Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research</u>. Orlando, Florida: Academic Press.

Goodman, Nelson. (1978). <u>Ways of World-Making</u>. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.

Greenfield, W., ed. (1987). <u>Instructional Leadership: Concepts, Issues, and Controversies</u>. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Gronn, Peter C. (1984). On studying administrators at work. <u>Educational Administration Quarterly</u>, 20 (I), 115-129.

Harrington, Charles. (1982). Anthropology and education: issues from the issues. <u>Anthropology and Education Quarterly</u>, 13(4), 323-347.

Hatch, J. Amos. (1985). The quantoids versus the smooshes: struggling with methodological rapprochement. Issues in Education, III(2), Fall. 158-168.

Hersey, P., and Blanchard, K. H. (1977). Management of Organizational Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Horio, T. (1986). Towards reform in Japanese education: A critique of privatisation and proposal for the re-creation of public education. Comparative Education, 22(1), 31-36.

Jick, Todd D. (1983). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: triangulation in action. In van Maanen, (ed.), Qualitative Methodology. Beverly Hills: Sage, 135-148.

Kapferer, Judith L. (1981). Socialization and the symbolic order of the school. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 12(4), 258-274.

Katz, Daniel and Kahn, Robert. (1967). The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Khleif, Bud B. (1971). The school as a small society. In Wax, et al. (Eds.). Anthropological Perspectives on Education. New York: Basic Books, 144-155.

Kida, H. (1986). Educational administration in Japan. Comparative Education, 22(1), 7-12.

King, E.J. (1986). Japan's education in comparative perspective. Comparative Education, 22(1), 73-82.

King, E. (1975). Analytical frameworks in comparative studies of education, Comparative Education, 11(1), 85-102.

Kobayashi, T. (1978). Society, Schools, and Progress in Japan. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kobayashi, T. & Ota, H. (1986). Secondary education in Japan. Manuscript, Kyoto University.

Kogawa, T. (1981). Japan as a manipulated society. Telos. No. 49, 138-140.

Lightfoot, Sara Lawrence. (1983). The Good High School. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Mannari, Hiroshi, and Befu, Harumi. (1983). The Challenge of Japan's Internationalization. Nishinomiya, Japan: Kwansei University.

Martin, William and Willower, Donald. (1981). The management behavior of high school principals. Educational Administration Quarterly, Winter, 17(1), 69-90.

Mase, Matsugu, ed. Koochoo no Jitsumu (The administrative work of a principal). Tokyo: Gakuji Shuppan, 1972.

Masemann, Vandra. (1976). Anthropological approaches to comparative education. Comparative Education Review, 20(3), 368-80.

Masemann, Vandra. (1982). Critical ethnography in the study of comparative education. Comparative Education Review, 26(1), 1-15.

McCurdy, J. The Role of the Principal in Effective Schools. Arlington, Virginia: The American Association of School Administrators, 1983.

Miles, Matthew B., and Huberman, A. Michael. (1984). Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Musgrove, F. (1982). Education and Anthropology. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Nakane, C. (1971). Japanese Society. Middlesex, England: Pelican Books.

National Academy of Education. (1978). Report and Working Papers - The Committee on Anthropology and Education. New York: National Academy of Education.

Niibori, Michiya. Gisen Koochoo Gaku Nyumon (Introduction to the Practical Study of a Principal). Tokyo: Meiji Toshan Shuppan, 1979.

Nicholson, C. K. (1968). Anthropology and Education. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.

Nuernberger, Ann Bailey. (1982). Case study of a laboratory high school: ethnography of school culture and the curriculum change process. Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University.

Ogbu, John U. (1981). School ethnography: a multilevel approach. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 12(1), 3-29.

Ohanian, S. (1987). Notes on Japan from an American school teacher. Phi Delta Kappan, 360-367.

Ohta, T. (1986). Problems and perspectives in Japanese education. Comparative Education, 22(1), 27-30.

Okihara, Y., et. al. (1977-1986). International reports - Japan. Educational Administration Quarterly.

Okihara, Y. (1986). The wide-ranging nature of the Japanese curriculum and its implications for teacher-training. Comparative Education, 22,(1), 13-18.

Overholt, George. (1980). Ethnography and education: limitations and sources of error. Journal of Thought, 15(3), 11-20.

Patton, M.Q. (1980). Qualitative Evaluation Methods. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Pelto, P. J., and Pelto, G. H. (1978). Anthropological Research, The Structure of Inquiry. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pettigrew, Andrew M. (1983). On studying organizational cultures. In John Van Maanen. (Ed.). Qualitative Methodology, 87-104, Beverly Hills: Sage.

Pitner, Nancy J. and Ogawa, Rodney T. (1981). Organizational leadership: the case of the school superintendent. Educational Administration Quarterly, Spring, 17(2), 45-65.

Porter-Gehrie, Cynthia. (1980). The ethnographer as insider. Educational Studies, 11(2), 123-24.

Roberts, J. I., and Akinsanya, S. K. (1976a). Educational Patterns and Cultural Configurations. New York: David McKay Co.

Roberts, J. I., and Akinsanya, S. K. (1976b). Schooling in the Cultural Context. New York: David McKay Co.

Rohlen, Thomas P. (1974). For Harmony and Strength. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rohlen, Thomas P. (1983). Japan's High Schools. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rohlen, Thomas P. (1985/86). Japanese education: if they can do it, should we? American Scholar, Winter, pp. 29-43.

Rosenstiel, A. (1977). Education and Anthropology: An Annotated Bibliography. New York: Garland.

Rutherford, W.L. (1985). School principals as effective leaders. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(1), 31-34.

Rutter, Michael, et al. (1979). Fifteen Thousand Hours - Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children. London: Open Books.

Sanday, Peggy Reeves. (1983). The ethnographic paradigm(s). In John Van Maanen. (Ed.). Qualitative Methodology, 19-36, Beverly Hills: Sage.

Sander, Benno, and Wiggins, Thomas. (1985). Cultural context of administrative theory: in consideration of a multidimensional paradigm. Educational Administration Quarterly, 21(1), 95-117.

Schensul, Jean J. (1985). Cultural maintenance and cultural transformation: educational anthropology in the eighties. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 16(1), Spring, 63-68.

Scott, W. G., and Hart, D. K. (1979). Organizational America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Scott, W.R. (1981). Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall Inc.

Selznick, P. (1957). Leadership in Administration. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sergiovanni, T.J. & Corbally, J.E., eds. (1984). Leadership and Organizational Culture. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Shimahara, N.K. (1979). Adaptation and Education in Japan. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Shoemaker, J. & Fraser, H.W. (1981). What principals can do: some implications from studies of effective schooling. Phi Delta Kappan, November, 178-182.

Shukla, S. (1983). Comparative education: an Indian view. Comparative Education Review, Vol. 27, No. 2.

Sizer, Nancy F., and Theodore R. (1970). Moral Education. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Sizer, Theodore R. (1985). Horace's Compromise, The Dilemma of the American High School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Smith, R.J. (1983). Japanese Society: Tradition, Self, and the Social Order. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spindler, George. (Ed.). (1955). Education and Anthropology. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Spindler, George. (1963). Education and Culture - Anthropological Approaches. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Spindler, George. (Ed.). (1974). Education and Cultural Process - Toward an Anthropology of Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Spindler, George. (Ed.). (1982). Doing the Ethnography of Schooling. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Spradley, J. (Ed.). (1972). Culture and Cognition: Rules, Maps and Plans. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

Spradley, J. (1979). _The Ethnographic Interview_. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Spradley, J. (1980). _Participant Observation_. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Stone, Franklin D. (Ed.). (1978). _International Perspective - Educational Administration - a Directory_. Iowa City: University of Iowa.

Torney-Purta, J. & Schwille, J. (1986). Civic values learned in school: policy and practice in industrialized nations. _Comparative Education Review_, Vol. 30, No. 1.

Ubben, G.C. & Hughes, L.W. (1987). _The Principal: Creative Leadership for Effective Schools_. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

U.S. Department of Education. (1987). _Japanese Education Today_. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. News & World Report. (1987). The brain battle. January 19, pp. 58-65.

Van Maanen, John. (Ed.). (1983). _Qualitative Methodology_. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Van Maanen, John. (1983). The ract of fiction in organizational ethnography. In John Van Maanen. (Ed.). _Qualitative Methodology_, 37-56, Beverly Hills: Sage.

Waller, Willard W. (1932, 1967). _The Sociology of Teaching_. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Wax, M. L., Diamond, S., and Gearing, F. O. (Eds.). (1971). _Anthropological Perspectives on Education_. New York: Basic Books Inc.

Wax, Murray, and Wax, Rosa ... (1980a). Anthropological fieldwork: comments on its values and limitations. _Journal of Thought_, 15(3), 1-10.

Wax, Murray, and Wax, Rosalie. (1980b). Fieldwork and the research process. _Anthropology and Education Quarterly_, 11(1), 28-37.

Willis, D. (1984). Japanese education: lessons for America. _The Japan Times_. April 29, p. 12?

Willis, D. & Horvath, P. (forthcoming, 1987). The Japanese principal: an examination of role and responsibility.

Wilson, Stephen. (1977). The use of ethnographic techniques in educational research. _Review of Educational Research_, 47(2), 245-65.

Wolcott, Harry F. (1971).   Handle with care: necessary precautions in the
      anthropology of schools.   In: Wax, M. L., Diamond, S., and Gearing, F. O.
      (Eds.).   _Anthropological Perspectives on Education_.   New York: Basic
      Books Inc..   98-117.

Wolcott, Harry F. (1973).   _The Man in the Principal's Office_.   New York: Holt,
      Rinehart & Winston.

Wolcott, Harry F. (1975).   Criteria for an ethnographic approach to research
      in schools.   _Human Organization_, _34_, 111-127.

Wolcott, Harry F. (1982b).   Mirrors, models, and monitors: educator
      adaptations of the ethnographic innovation.   In: _Doing the Ethnography
      of Schooling: Educational Anthropology in Action_.   George D. Spindler.
      (Ed.)   68-95.   New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Wolcott, Harry F. (1985).   On ethnographic intent.   _Educational Administration
      Quarterly_, Summer, _21(3)_,   187-203.

Yin, Robert K. (1984).   _Case Study Research_.   Applied Social Research Methods
      Series, Volume 5.   Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Ziegler, R.J.   (1986).   An American principal examines Japan's schools.
      Principal, _66_(1), 34-38.

48

APPENDIX

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF OUTSTANDING PRINCIPALS FOR

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

1. The princ.pal anticipates emerging problems and acts in an effective way to resolve them.

2. The principal is moving actively to implement the goals and objectives of the school.

3. The principal works to improve the educational program and student achievement.

4. The school climate is positive and reflects high morale.

5. The school involves the community in the life of the school, and uses community resources for students.

Part I. Directions: Please provide the following background information.

Name:_____

Address:_____

Telephone Number:_____

Age:_____   Sex:_____

Number of years of teaching experience:_____

Number of years of experience as school administrator:_____

Number of years in present position:_____

Highest degree held:

_____B.A.   _____M.A.   _____Ed.S.   _____Ed.D. or Ph.D.

Number of residents in the district served by your school:_____

Number of students enrolled in your school:_____ Grade levels:_____

Type of community served:

_____Rural (population less than 2,500 or less than 1000 people per sq. mi.

_____Small town (population less than 150,000)

_____Medium City (population 150,000 - 500,000)

_____Large city (population more than 500,000)

_____Suburban (adjacent to large city)

Please indicate the number of staff (including yourself) at your school in each of the following positions:

	Full time	Part time
Administrators		
Classroom teachers	_____	_____
Teacher aides	_____	_____
Counselors	_____	_____
Subject Area specialists (i.e., reading specialist)	_____	_____
Library and other media specialists	_____	_____
Social workers	_____	_____
Security officers	_____	_____
Food service personnel	_____	_____
Clerical	_____	_____
Custodians	_____	_____

Part II

Directions: As a principal, there are some areas of instructional leadership for which you are largely responsible, other for which you bear some respnsibility, and other areas in which your have little or no responsibility at all. Rate the following items on a 1 to 5 scale, indicating the degree to which you feel responsible for each particular area of instructional leadership in your role as a principal. Use the code indicated below to represent the following degree of involvement:

1: Little or no responsibility at all
2: Some responsibility, but others bear the major responsibility for this area
3: Responsibility shared equally with others
4: Much responsibility for oversight and direction, with some responsibility delegated elsewhere
5: I bear the major responsibility for this area

	Low				High
Selecting/reviewing of curriculum materials	1	2	3	4	5
Emphasizing student achievement	1	2	3	4	5
Evaluating pupil progress	1	2	3	4	5
Providing an orderly atmosphere for learning	1	2	3	4	5
Devising instructional strategies	1	2	3	4	5
Introducing new instructional methods/strategies to teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Evaluating performance of teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Involving parents in instructional program	1	2	3	4	5
Training parents and volunteers	1	2	3	4	5
Co-ordinating instructional program	1	2	3	4	5
Determining instructional goals	1	2	3	4	5
Articulating goals of school to the public	1	2	3	4	5
Articulating goals of school to the staff	1	2	3	4	5
Providing supportive climate for teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Responding to community expectations	1	2	3	4	5
Involving teachers in decision-making	1	2	3	4	5
Conveying society/community values to students	1	2	3	4	5
Determining how students will be grouped for instruction	1	2	3	4	5
Setting expectations for student behavior	1	2	3	4	5
Setting expectations for student performance	1	2	3	4	5
Accepting responsibility for student performance in school	1	2	3	4	5
Accepting responsibility for student performance outside of school	1	2	3	4	5
Managing resources allocated for instructional use	1	2	3	4	5
Recruiting/hiring outstanding teachers	1	2	3	4	5

Part III

Directions: Answer the following questions in your own words.

Why did you seek a principalship?

Describe your career ambitions. What position do you hope to hold in the next five to ten years?

What does it mean to you to be an "instructional leader"?

How would you define an "effective school"?

PLEASE INDICATE BELOW IF YOU WOULD BE AVAILABLE FOR A FURTHER, IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW BY TELEPHONE REGARDING THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL AS AN INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER. THE INTERVIEW WILL TAKE APPROXIMATELY 30 TO 45 MINUTES.

_____YES _____NO

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME. YOU WILL RECEIVE A SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS.

Questionaire for the Effective Principal

(A Comparative Study of Leadership in Japan and America)

　このアンケートは相愛大学とアイオワ大学の共同研究として行うもので、すぐれた業績をあげている校長先生について、また、そのリーダーシップについて、日米間の比較研究をすることを目的としております。

　あなたはすぐれた教育実績をあげられ、都道府県内の指導的役割を果たしておられると聞いておりますのでご協力をいただければ幸甚です。　なお調査結果は匿名にいたします。

１．校長先生御自身についてお答えください。

氏名＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

住所＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

電話番号　（　　）　－

年齢　　　　　才　　　　　　　　　　　　性別　男・女

教員としての経験年数（管理職を除く）　　　年

管理職としての経験年数　　　　年

　（１）校長　　　　年　　　，

　　　　教頭　　　　年

　（２）教育委員会事務局勤務

　　．教育長　　　　　年

　　　　教育次長（または部長）　　　　年

　　　　課長（部課名　　　　　　　　　）　　　年

　　　　指導主事（または管理主事）　　　年

　　　　その他（具体的に

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　年）

その他の職業経験（具体的に

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　年）

現任校の年数　　　　年

最終学歴（該当するところに○をつけてください）

　　旧大卒　　　旧高専卒　　　旧高師卒　　　新大卒

　　新高卒　　　検定　　　　その他

２．現任校の状況についてお答えください。

学校の規模　　30学級以上　　　24学級以上　　　18学級以上　　　17学級以下

地域　　　　　農業地域　　　工業地域　　　農工業地域　　　都心部

　　　　　　　都心部及び工業地域　　　郊外　　　郊外及び工業地域

　　　　　　　郊外及び農業地域　　　漁業及び農業地域　　　その他

学校の種類　　普通科　　　商業科　　　工業科　　　産業科　　　家庭科　　　園芸科

　　　　　　　芸術科　　　その他

　　　　　　　県立　　　市立　　　私立

職員数

	専任	非常勤
校長・教頭	_____名	_____名
教諭	_____名	_____名
実習教諭	_____名	_____名
実習助手	_____名	_____名
養護教諭	_____名	_____名
事務員	_____名	_____名
管理員	_____名	_____名
その他	_____名	_____名

３．次の項目について、校長としてどの程度責任を感じ指導実行されているのか、下記の基準を参考にして、１～５のいずれかに〇をしてその程度をお示しください。

　　１．ほとんど責任はなく他のものに任せてある。

　　２．いくらかの責任はあるが、おおむね他のものに任せてある。

　　３．他のものと一緒にその責務にあたっている。

　　４．ほとんどの責任は自分にあり、自分でその責務にあたっているが、多少他のものに任せることもある。

　　５．校長の任務としてその遂行に努力している。

1. カリキュラムを検討し作成する。　　　　　　　　　1　2　3　4　5

2. 生徒の学力向上に力を入れる。　　　　　　　　　　1　2　3　4　5

3. 生徒の学力向上の程度を評価する。	1	2	3	4	5
4. 勉強に対する適切な環境づくりをする。	1	2	3	4	5
5. 教育手段を考案する。	1	2	3	4	5
6. 新しい教育方法を教員に提案する。	1	2	3	4	5
7. 教師の勤務状態を評価する。	1	2	3	4	5
8. 学校行事を調整する。	1	2	3	4	5
9. 学校の教育目標を検討、決定する。	1	2	3	4	5
10. 学校の教育目標を明らかにし公表する。	1	2	3	4	5
11. 学校の教育目標を職員に提示し理解させる。	1	2	3	4	5
12. 教員の教育理念を理解し取り入れる。	1	2	3	4	5
13. 地域社会の期待に答えるよう努力する。	1	2	3	4	5
14. 決定事項は教員と共に考え決定する。	1	2	3	4	5
15. 地域社会の持つ価値観を生徒に伝え定着させる	1	2	3	4	5
16. 生徒の期待にこたえるよう学力を向上させる。	1	2	3	4	5
17. 生徒の校内での行動に対して責任をもつ。	1	2	3	4	5
18. 生徒の校外での行動に責任をもつ。	1	2	3	4	5
19. 学校運営費予算の決定と管理を掌る。	1	2	3	4	5
20. 力量ある教員を補充する。	1	2	3	4	5

4. 次の項目において、校長の役割としてより大事であると思われる順に番号を付け
てください。

( ) 効率の良さ

( ) 豊富な知識

( ) 道徳的人柄

( ) PTA及び地域社会との関係

( ) 生徒との関係

( ) 教員との関係

( ) 教育方法とその効果の理解

( ) 暖かさと思いやり

( ) その他 ( )

5．次の質問にお答えください。

1．校長になろうと思われた理由をお聞かせください。

2．仕事に対しての抱負をお聞かせください。今後5〜10年後にはどのような
職業・地位につかれたいと思っておられますか。

3．教育の現場での指導者とはどうあるべきだとお考えでしょうか。

4．"良い学校"とはどのような学校だとお考えでしょうか。

* 教育指導者としての校長の役割についてもっと詳しくお聞きしたい場合、電話によ
るインタビューにお答えいただけるでしょうか。（30〜40分位）
（Yes ・ No）

* 貴重な時間を割いていただき、誠にありがとうございました。
結果が出ましたらお送り致します。