



Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

1979

The Role of Selected Suburban Cook County Superintendents in Providing Ways for Improving the Professional Skills of Principals

James Alexander Paziotopoulos
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Paziotopoulos, James Alexander, "The Role of Selected Suburban Cook County Superintendents in Providing Ways for Improving the Professional Skills of Principals" (1979). *Dissertations*. 1845.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/1845

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1979 James Alexander Paziotopoulos

THE ROLE OF SELECTED SUBURBAN COOK
COUNTY SUPERINTENDENTS IN PROVIDING
WAYS FOR IMPROVING THE
PROFESSIONAL SKILLS OF
PRINCIPALS.

by

James Alexander Paziotopoulos

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate
School of Loyala University in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

January

1979

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I feel a deep sense of gratitude to my advisor and committee chairman, Dr. Melvin Heller, whose incisive observations, comments, and guidance contributed immeasurably to this work. I would be totally remiss if I did not further acknowledge his full support in this endeavor.

I would like to thank Dr. Jasper Valenti and Dr. Philip Carlin, members of the committee, for their assistance in the development of the study.

A note of appreciation is also extended to the superintendents who participated in the research.

A very special note of recognition is reserved for my wife, Ann, whose professional and clerical assistance as well as her constant encouragement made possible the completion of this dissertation.

I want to say, "thank you" and "I love you" to my three children, Pamela, Alexander, and Natalie for the patient understanding and cooperation that they exemplified throughout this study.

In closing, I want to go back where it all began and mention two very special individuals.....my father, Alexander, and my mother Alexandra. If they did not make the countless personal and financial sacrifices while helping

me internalize the importance of academic achievement and excellence, the task of completing a dissertation would have been nothing more than a dream. Consequently, within this work, I have symbolically etched, in indelible ink, their unforgettable and memorable contributions.

VITA

James Alexander Paziotopoulos is the son of Alexander D. Paziotopoulos and Alexandra (Panagakis) Paziotopoulos. He was born December 16, 1936, in Oak Park, Illinois.

Mr. Paziotopoulos was graduated from Tilden Technical High School, Chicago, Illinois, in January, 1955. He was awarded the Bachelor of Arts degree in June, 1960, from Roosevelt University, Chicago, Illinois, and the Master of Education degree in April, 1963, from Chicago State University, Chicago, Illinois.

From 1960 to 1966, the author taught at the King Elementary School, Chicago, Illinois. He was appointed and served as headmaster of the Korae Elementary School, Chicago, Illinois, from 1966 until 1971. In 1971, he was appointed principal of the Kolmar Avenue School, Oak Lawn, Illinois, where he has served in that capacity since.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
VITA.....	iv
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of Problem.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	11
Importance of the Problem.....	16
Method and Procedure.....	17
Definition of Terms.....	18
Limitations of Study.....	19
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH....	21
III. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	60
Question I: Skill Requirement Factor.....	65
Question II: Assessment Factor.....	78
Question III: Action Factor.....	90
Question IV: Evaluation Factor.....	134
Question V: Adjustment Factor.....	143
Question VI: Retention Factor.....	156
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	168
Conclusions.....	168
Recommendations.....	171
Recommendations for Further Study.....	174
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	177
Books.....	177
Periodicals.....	178
Unpublished Material.....	179
APPENDIX A.....	180
APPENDIX B.....	181
APPENDIX C.....	185

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Rank Order of the Most Frequently Cited Professional Skills.....	68
2. Methods Used by Superintendents to Assess Their Principals.....	80
3. Superintendents' Cognizance of Applying Developmental Programs.....	104
4. Program Distribution Frequency.....	109
5. Developmental Programs Provided From 1975-1977..	112
6. Superintendents' Tenure in District.....	156
7. Principals Employed During Superintendents' Tenure.....	157
8. Principal Vacancies Within the Last Five Years..	158

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

William James once said, "The most important question a man can ask himself is not what shall I do, but what shall I become." Becoming an exemplary principal or school administrator is a life-long process. This process is characterized by many fragmented experiences. Each experience, although related to the entire process of becoming, is an entity onto itself. The contribution that each entity brings to the whole is a moot subject among those concerned with education.

The process of becoming currently begins with the prospective candidate gaining employment as a teacher. Without previous experience as a teacher, the candidate cannot qualify for the principalship. Evidently, the Illinois legislators feel that successful candidates for the principalship need this prior experience. Otherwise, they would not have enacted this requirement into the State Code of Illinois. On the other hand, some educators have expressed some reservations about the efficacy of teaching as a prerequisite to the principalship. As an example, Sarason seriously questions the relevance of teaching as a preparation

for becoming a principal. He says, "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."¹ Keller feels the same way as Sarason. He asks, "Does fulfilling a position that compels one to function essentially with children, provide the best training for a position that requires one to work primarily with adults?" Then, he answers the question by saying that teaching is a relatively isolated role and, as such, does very little to develop the leadership abilities needed for the principalship. Moreover, the organizational savvy and the human relations skills so vital today for effective leadership cannot be acquired in the classroom.² In a subsequent study, Keller not only validated his responses to the question, but his findings were consistent with the pervasive theme in the current literature: that is, strong leadership behavior is not characteristic of most principals.³

It is conceivable that findings, such as the ones cited above, are responsible for many state legislatures

¹ Seymour B. Sarason, The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971), p. 115.

² Arnold J. Keller, "Inside the Man in the Principal's Office," The National Elementary Principal, 53 (March/April, 1974), p. 25.

³ Ibid., p. 23.

reassessing their certification requirements. In fact, there has been legislation enacted recently in California, Washington, and Oregon, eliminating teaching as a prerequisite for administrative certification.⁴ Because such legislation has not been enacted in Illinois, the current statute found in the Illinois State Code may be partially responsible for restrictions in recruiting the most competent candidates to principalships. Certainly, there are educators who would concur with this observation; namely, those previously mentioned educators who feel that individuals without a teaching background would function more effectively as principals.

If teaching experience is not an asset, and there appears to be some evidence to that effect, then what other safeguards are taken by the appropriate state agency to insure properly trained professionals occupying the chair of the principal? The only other requirement for prospective candidates to fulfill is the specific formal requirements that will earn them a graduate degree from an accredited institution of higher learning. Earning the appropriate degree will automatically insure the candidates of receiving an administrative certificate. This requirement constitutes the second step in the process of becoming.

⁴ Lonnie H. Wagstaff and Russell Spillman, "Who Should Be Principal?" The National Elementary Principal, 53 (July/August, 1974), p. 35.

However, as Roald Campbell has pointed out, state certification requirements are often the product of professional compromise with little evidence that the various training components make any difference.⁵

Assuming that teaching and graduate work have not been effective prerequisites, then there appears to be a very real need presently for training school principals. This need should become more obvious after studying what principals are doing about improving their professional knowledge and skills. According to the literature, once they obtain their credentials and become practitioners, their formal training is a thing of the past. In other words, very few principals pursue additional course work. Whatever subsequent training they do receive is strictly on a hit or miss basis.⁶

Pharis may not interpret this tendency of principals avoiding additional training as detrimental to their professional growth. He feels that although one can be prepared for the principalship in a graduate school or through an internship, one learns to be a principal only after one

⁵
Ibid.

⁶
Walter D. St. John and James A. Runkel, "Professional Development for Principals: The Worst Slum of All?" The National Elementary Principal, 56 (March/April, 1977), p. 66.

becomes a principal.⁷ Universities, however, find this practice most alarming because the rapid increase of new knowledge has created a need for a continuous updating of professional skills. Currently, the universities have acknowledged the fact that they may have been contributors to the failure of their graduates in pursuing post-graduate training. They may have contributed to this practice by issuing degrees to their graduates that the graduate can keep for life. The degree symbolizes competency. The problems arise when the holders of these degrees assume that the degree is indicative of life-long competency. To counteract this presumption, the university is giving serious consideration to having its degrees expire automatically within a specific period of time, unless the degree-holder renews it after he has his abilities checked.⁸ However, the article does not disclose who will be responsible for checking the degree-holder's competency. If the universities implement this practice within the near future, it is quite probable that many more professionals will find it necessary to participate in planned activities that are designed for the purpose of improving, expanding, and renewing their skills, knowledge, and abilities. It is obvious that those individuals who fail to take part in the ongoing

⁷William L. Pharis, The Elementary School Principalship in 1968 (Washington, D.C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA, 1968), p. 8.

⁸_____, "Will Diplomas Need To Be Renewed?" Futurist, 10 (April, 1976), p. 112.

developmental programs will be running the risk of having their professional knowledge and/or skills become obsolete. This possibility of not keeping their professional knowledge and skills up-to-date could create some severe repercussions on principals who, also, would be required to participate in this proposed recertification process. If principals were unable to demonstrate competency in recently introduced but viable educational practices, they could lose the license that permits them to practice their profession. What makes the need for developmental programs apparent is the fact that principals who completed their graduate course work prior to 1970 had not studied the following critical issues in education: collective bargaining; priority and goal setting; multicultural values; community analysis; staff development; planning, programming, and budgeting system; cost-benefit analysis; the change process; systems analysis; organizational renewal; and coping with stress and conflict.⁹ Consequently, if, in fact, principals fail to continue their formal training, then how are they going to gain competence and knowledge in the various areas that are becoming a part of their job description?

Maybe formal training is not the most effective and desirable method to employ. The studies by Gross, the University Council for Educational Administration, Gold-

⁹ St. John and Runkel, "Professional Development," p.67.

hammer, and Becker, and others have all concluded that there is virtually no relationship between effectiveness on the job and formal preparation for the job. In fact, Gross found a negative correlation between quantity of formal preparation and leadership in the position.¹⁰ In another study, the majority (82.4 percent) of the principals who were included in the sample attributed their success as principals largely to two types of experiences: 1. Their experience as classroom teachers, and 2. Their on-the-job experience as principals. Less than two percent of the principals said that their college preparation and/or their experience as administrative interns contributed to their successful job performance.¹¹ Although ten years have elapsed since this study was conducted, there have been no recent studies that refute these findings.

The findings of the above studies imply that principals have no need of developmental programs. However, what the findings may suggest is what Brown has observed, namely, that although universities offer some new courses and provide some new ideas and materials, these institutions have been remiss in focusing on the question: How can a practicing

10

Charles E. Brown, "The Principal as Learner," The National Elementary Principal, 53 (July/August, 1974), p. 19.

11

Pharis, Principalship in 1968, p. 28.

administrator (principal) be helped? It may be that organizational constraints and values of the universities will continue to make it difficult for them to respond in any helpful way.¹²

However, progress in developing and enhancing the professional skills of principals will not be achieved if one simply confines himself to criticizing the training that every candidate seeking the principalship must pursue and complete. Certainly, changes should be initiated in this area, but not at the expense of neglecting to devote the time and energy in formulating and in implementing posttraining sessions for the incumbents, that is, those individuals currently fulfilling the role of the principalship. This opinion becomes even more significant when one peruses the study conducted by Bobroff and others who concluded that the middle school principal has seldom had specific training for the position.¹³ The Bobroff study appears to suggest the need for developmental programs for principals. Although this study focused on the middle school principal, it is conceivable that the same findings could be ascertained if elementary school principals were the subjects of the study.

¹²Brown, "Principal as Learner," p. 21.

¹³John L. Bobroff, Joan G. Howard, and Alvin W. Howard, "The Principalship: Junior High and Middle School," NASSP Bulletin, 58 (April, 1974), p. 61.

The focus of this study centers on the principalship at the elementary school level. Some of the problems associated with this role have been mentioned. What has not been discussed or described are the individuals who occupy these positions. A recent doctoral study describes the elementary school principal of 1973 as most likely a male, who was between forty-five and fifty-four years of age with fifteen to twenty years of experience. When the typical elementary principal of 1973 was compared with his counterpart of a decade before, the following differences were cited: The 1973 principal was better educated; he worked longer hours; he supervised more employees; he was less likely to have an assistant principal; and he was responsible for fewer students.¹⁴

In addition to serving schools with lower pupil enrollments, the 1973 principal faced a student body that contained a substantial increase in Negro and Spanish surname pupils.¹⁵ There is no question that the changes in the student composition and enrollment should have necessitated changes in the educational program as well as corresponding changes in the developmental programs for principals. Instead, the superintendents reacted to these conditions by

¹⁴Doris Jean Austin, "The Changing Emphasis in the Role of the Elementary Principalship Between the Years 1963 and 1973," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1976).

¹⁵Ibid.

generating an inordinate number of clerical tasks that had little relationship to the teaching function. They did so with such mindless zeal that many principals now find themselves drowning in a sea of paper work.¹⁶ This task may have discouraged principals from pursuing developmental programs. But clerical tasks are not the sole reason for the lack of participation in developmental programs on the part of principals. Other conditions prevalent in the educational field today are just as responsible. One educator aptly describes these conditions in this fashion:

We in education have been programmed to be loners by tradition, training, and the authority of the state. We confuse ourselves and others by claiming we have individual and exclusive rights to each job, each classroom, each office. We act like jealous, mistrusting entrepreneurs who, by mere coincidence, happen to work under the same roof. We further confuse ourselves and others by being shockingly stingy about giving recognition for individual accomplishment. We honor uniformity. We demonstrate this in the uniformity of salary schedules, increments, and fringe benefits. We support this in the uniformity of job descriptions. We recognize achievement not on the job but away from the job, giving rewards for courses taken and degrees acquired. But we deny recognition or rewards for improved performance on the job. Salary raises recognize merely the fact that we grow older on the job. What do we do in education to encourage personal satisfactions derived from performing the work itself? Any rewards which come in this fashion are hit or miss, speculative, future based, and at the mercy of a system which too often disdains goals, objectives, and performance information.¹⁷

16

Keller, "Inside Principal's Office," p. 24.

17

American Association of School Administrators, How to Evaluate Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, AASA Executive Handbook Series, Vol. LX (Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1977) p. 65.

These conditions, along with a number of other factors that were previously cited, should reaffirm the dire need for providing developmental programs for principals. However, there is one additional factor that makes the need for these programs even more critical; that is, the drastic decline in job mobility among principals. Given the realities of declining enrollments, accompanied by an unfavorable economic situation, it becomes difficult for principals to leave a secure position for what may have appeared in the past as a more desirable one. Thus, the individuals who are responsible for the operation of the schools today, probably will remain in that position for a protracted period of time. It just makes good economic sense that a sufficient amount of the resources of a school district should be invested in helping principals grow professionally.

Purpose Of The Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze how superintendents fulfill their instructional role in their efforts to assist principals in further developing the latter's professional knowledge and skills. By studying the instructional role of the superintendents, the kinds of professional knowledge and skills that superintendents consider vital for every principal to possess will be ascertained. The rationale for selecting these factors will also be known. The data will not only reveal the views of superintendents, regarding the most essential functions of the principalship, but more

importantly, it will identify those areas that superintendents should establish as the instructional objectives for their principals. ✓

The next step in the instructional or developmental process is to study how superintendents identify the degree ✓ of mastery exhibited by their principals within each instructional objective. Initially, information from this segment of the study should indicate what strategies and/or instruments are used by superintendents in their assessment of ✓ principals. Further investigation should disclose whether superintendents are cognizant of what instructional objectives need to be emphasized after they have ascertained the present strengths and deficiencies of their principals. Once the superintendents obtain these assessments of their principals, then it is important to discover how superintendents communicate their findings to them. The methods used for communication will reveal how superintendents motivate or prepare their principals for participation in the various instructional programs that may be offered. Motivation is an outgrowth of extrinsic or intrinsic reinforcers. The kinds of reinforcers that are offered to principals for continuing ✓ their membership in developmental programs are identifiable through this study.

Teaching is the step that follows assessment. The teaching task necessitates the utilization of instructional programs and activities. The kinds of programs offered and

the frequency of principals' participation in such programs should infer the degree of importance that superintendents place on their instructional role. ✓ However, the primary purpose of seeking what programs were offered to principals is to determine if there is any continuity between what the superintendents have stated as critical professional skills that all principals should possess and what they have subsequently done to help their principals improve those skills.

Studying the effectiveness of the instructional ✓ program or activity is the step that follows teaching. A program is considered effective when its instructional objectives are achieved by its participants. ✓ Thus, what is sought from this portion of the study are the methods or techniques used by superintendents to evaluate the effectiveness of the instructional programs that were offered to principals. ✓ Other information sought from this portion were the programs that superintendents found to be most effective and their rationale for selecting them. This information will indicate whether the superintendents made this choice on the basis of fact or on the basis of personal reaction and/or conjecture. Moreover, this information will further show what relationships exist between the programs selected by the superintendents and the instructional objectives that were initially established. A final but significant purpose for this segment of the study is to ascertain how accountable the superintendents are in providing effective developmental programs for

principals.

Adjustment follows evaluation in the instructional or developmental process. Adjustment means the process of changing the instructional objectives whenever additional professional knowledge and/or skill must be acquired by principals. This condition occurs when the demands on the principalship have been altered. This study should show the degree of awareness that superintendents possess, regarding the identification of forces that affect the role of the principalship. Then, information should be sought that reveals the ability of superintendents to list the kind of knowledge and/or skill principals would need to deal successfully with these new job demands. Lastly, this study should indicate whether superintendents can cite instructional programs that could help principals meet those new job demands.

The final step in the instructional or developmental process is retention. Retention refers to the number of principals who have been permitted to maintain their positions. Retention suggests that superintendents have taken into consideration all the previous instructional steps before making this ultimate decision. A high retention ratio within the district gives some indication that the instructional programs offered by superintendents were relatively successful. On the other hand, the results of the study could indicate that superintendents are totally remiss in providing assistance to principals and that the superintendents are content with the

status-quo. The concluding purpose of this phase of the study is to reveal the resolve of the superintendents to dismiss principals whose performance has been poor.

A number of purposes have been expressed relative to each step of the instructional process. However, within each of these six steps, there is one question that is considered more critical than the others. Thus, the salient purpose of this study is to answer the following critical questions:

Question I

Do superintendents specify and justify at least five professional skills that are needed by their principals to fulfill the role of the principalship?

Question II

Do superintendents ascertain the degree of development that each of their principals has achieved in reference to the five professional skill areas that they have cited for the principalship?

Question III

Do superintendents provide their principals with programs and/or services in these five professional skill areas?

Question IV

Do superintendents evaluate the programs and/or services that they have provided for their principals?

Question V

Do superintendents take into consideration the

changes that they foresee for the principalship in the immediate future when they plan developmental programs and/or services for the coming academic year?

Question VI

Do superintendents apply the results of the developmental or instructional programs that they offered to their principals in deciding who to retain or who to dismiss?

Importance of the Problem

When the literature discloses evidence that formal training in the universities and previous experience in the field as a teacher are not helpful in preparing candidates for the principalship, it is inevitable that those individuals concerned with the quality of leadership being provided to our schools become alarmed. If most candidates are poorly prepared, then how are they going to fulfill the multiplicity of tasks that are assigned to the principalship? How are they going to handle the constantly changing demands of society, particularly those societal demands that affect directly or indirectly the educational operation of their respective attendance centers? Obviously, principals need to participate in some kind of staff developmental program that will enhance their professional skills beyond what they normally may have been able to acquire through on-the-job experience.

This problem is going to become even more pronounced because principals will be remaining in their current

position for a longer period of time. We will be witnessing more stability and less job mobility among principals. Consequently, training and retraining of the principal staff must become a high priority item if an earnest attempt is going to be made to keep the leadership within our schools viable and effective.

The onus of recycling principals so that they continue to provide the highest quality of professional service at their attendance centers rests with the superintendents. If the superintendents are remiss and they fail to fulfill this professional obligation, then the children of this country will be the recipients of an inadequate education.

Method and Procedure

Only suburban elementary school districts that had more than six schools in their respective districts and that were located in South, Southwest, and West Cook County were included in this study. There were twenty-six (26) school districts that met the above criteria. In depth interviews, approximately one and one-half hours in duration were conducted with twenty-four (24) superintendents. Two superintendents were excluded from the study because the one superintendent refused to be interviewed while the other one was the superordinate of the individual who conducted the study.

To conduct the interview, an instrument was developed and used that consisted of six probe factors--each factor

being one of the related component parts of this study (see Appendix C). Under each of these probe factors was a series of associated questions that were asked of each superintendent. A total of thirty-five such questions were included in this instrument. However, additional questions were introduced in hopes of securing more definitive and factual information whenever the responses were general or evasive in nature.

Basically, the study focuses on the six critical questions that relate to each of the developmental or instructional steps explored during the interview process. A more detailed account of the method and procedure used to accurately respond to these questions is given in Chapter III. Also, to corroborate the verbal acknowledgments by the superintendents of the kind of programs and/or services that they offered to their principals, documents were collected and collated.

Definition of Terms
(as used in this dissertation)

Administration: The coordination of the efforts of groups of people toward the achievement of common goals.

Developmental Process: The six steps identified and defined in the questionnaire (see Appendix B), namely, skill requirement, assessment, action, evaluation, adjustment, and retention.

Developmental Programs: Activities that are organized and planned deliberately for the primary purpose of

improving the professional knowledge and competence of elementary school principals.

Function: Method, procedure, act, or means superintendents use in further developing the job performance of their principals.

Goal: Direction of major intent and desired achievement without indicating a specific time frame or blueprint of operational specifics.

Objective: A planned accomplishment which, under specific conditions and within a given time period, can help fulfill a related goal.

Program: A plan consisting of functions with objectives and goals.

Role: The expected pattern of behavior for the occupant of a position.

Skill: The development or the acquisition of the power to perform intellectual, physical, moral and/or legal acts.

Limitations of Study

Limitations of the study are primarily restricted to the proper interpretation of the responses made by the superintendents during the interview process and to the procurement of verifiable information that will substantiate those responses. Attempts to meet these limitations were made by asking the questions in a non-threatening manner, by collecting various documents, and by utilizing follow-up questions.

This study is not of superintendents individually,
but a study of superintendents collectively.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

The explosion of knowledge has beset every field of endeavor, some to a greater degree than others. Obsolescence has become a very real danger for every professional practitioner. Chaucer's words, "The life so short, the craft so long to learn," approximately describe in a succinct and accurate fashion the plight of today's professional man. The elementary school principalship is no exception. It is not immune to the dynamic forces and accompanied ills facing other professions. The role incumbent cannot use obsolete knowledge and techniques and expect to sustain a high level of performance, assuming that he was previously adjudged competent. Thus, it is obligatory for the role incumbent or principal to participate in some kind of ongoing developmental program that will continue to update and to further hone his professional skills and knowledge. His objective is to learn his craft so well that he, in fact, has mastered it. However, mastery is a relative concept because man can always find ways to improve his performance. Therefore, the developmental process for school principals, not unlike other professions, is continuous and never ending.

Holding fast to the rationale that professional development is unending, St. John and Runkel have cited the following assumptions as a basis for initiating and offering to school administrators excellent activities for professional development:

1. Every school district, every school, and every administrator needs to improve the quality of performance and service.
2. All educational personnel, regardless of position, age, and level of competence, can benefit from some form of effective inservice training.
3. It is equally as important to capitalize on strengths through professional development activities as it is to focus on improving weaknesses.
4. Both the school district and individual administrators have responsibilities for professional development in order to promote improved performance and goal attainment.¹

To further support the above assumptions and to promote among principals the necessity of constantly involving themselves in developmental programs, the authorized party, agent, or trainer who has been assigned the task of providing these programs must make principals cognizant of their individual needs. It is axiomatic that if one does not perceive a need, he will not exert any drive. Without drive, there can be no individual accomplishments. At this time, it would simply be redundant to state the dangers of the status quo. Thus, the trainer does not initiate developmental programs

1

Walter D. St. John and James A. Runkel, "Professional Development for Principals: The Worst Slum of All?" The National Elementary Principal, 56 (March/April, 1977), p. 67.

until he has procured from administrators (including principals) their perceived needs, until he has identified administrators' needs through the utilization of survey techniques, or until he has decided that administrators must participate in specific programs for the sake of increasing the effectiveness of their administrative performance.² Of course, without the subject, in this case the principal, accepting the data and/or recommendations, initiating changes in behavior will be extremely difficult.

It certainly appears to all concerned that human needs are among the more salient components of any developmental program. Human needs within this context are obviously the professional needs of principals. The manifestation of these needs occurs when the principal's professional equilibrium becomes unbalanced or upset. This condition arises primarily when there are changes in educational material; changes in the behavior patterns of pupils; changes in educational technology; changes in local, state, and federal requirements; and changes in pupil enrollments. Most, if not all of these conditions, were as prevalent in the immediate past as they are today. Accepting the preceding statement as fact, namely that principal's needs were as evident in the past as they are in the present, then why have developmental

2

William Watson Grant, "A Model for the Inservice Education of School Administrators Within the State of New South Wales, Australia" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1970).

programs been so unsuccessful?

According to the recent publication of the American Association of School Administrators, most school systems are still at the elementary stage of development, regarding the task of formulating job descriptions which, unfortunately, have remained descriptively static instead of dynamic. Subsequently, recognition of the different performance styles is still unknown in job description writing.³ This condition indicates that the school systems have not responded to the rapid changes that have taken place in the field of education. Moreover, there is no formal job requirement in most school systems which specifically mandates supervisors to help others improve their performance.⁴ If no one is authorized to help others, who is going to provide the developmental programs? Regarding those systems that provided programs based on the employee's job description, it is conceivable that they stressed obsolete skills and/or knowledge. Although it is beginning to become apparent why these programs were unsuccessful, it will become even more apparent as other studies are cited.

In studying the literature, Grant found the following

³American Association of School Administrators, How to Evaluate Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, AASA Executive Handbook Series, Vol. IX (Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1977), p. 67.

⁴Ibid., p. 62.

major weaknesses in the developmental programs for principals:

1. The lack of clarification of program responsibility
2. The lack of long range, careful planning
3. The absence of continuity and progression
4. The limited financial support
5. The haphazard attempts at evaluation and at providing guidelines for future improvement
6. The overemphasis upon stereotyped formats⁵

In another study, Harris and Bessent attribute program ineffectiveness to the following causes:

1. The failure to relate inservice program plans to genuine needs of staff participants.
2. The failure to select appropriate activities for implementing program plans.
3. The failure to implement inservice program activities with sufficient staff and other resources to ensure effectiveness.⁶

As far back as 1960, and apparently the situation has not changed dramatically, McIntyre observed and commented, "Monotony has probably ruined more inservice education programs than any other single factor. The deadly sameness of some programs from week to week, from year to year, is enough to break the spirit of even the most eager novice."⁷

⁵ Grant, Inservice Education, pp. 55-56.

⁶ Ben M. Harris and Wailand Bessent, A Guide to Better Practice (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1969), p. 4.

⁷ Kenneth E. McIntyre, Selection and On-the Job Training (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1960), p. 62.

The commission sponsored by the American Association of School Administrators to study inservice education for school administrators reported that the motivating force responsible for giving impetus to many programs has been the feeling that anything that can be done is better than nothing. The report goes on to say that the long range, careful planning is an exception rather than a rule. One looks in vain for a continuous thread of purpose running through the multiplicity of inservice activities in a state or a region. Financial support is meager, and the resources available may not be used to best advantage. Trial and error rather than adherence to proven principles and movement toward well-established goals characterizes these widespread activities.⁸

As one continues to peruse the literature, he discovers additional data relative to the adverse effects that past practices have had on the developmental programs for principals. As one continues to ponder and to study this situation, it becomes inevitable that he ask himself, Why have we not instituted changes for the sake of doing things in a more productive manner? The answer to this question is the lack of funds that have been allocated for such programs. Let us face it, we simply have not made any significant

⁸ American Association of School Administrators, Inservice Education for School Administration, Report of the AASA Commission on Inservice Education for School Administration. (Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1963), p. 104.

investment of public or private monies in the developmental growth of the principal, particularly when you compare the investment in principals to the millions of dollars committed annually for the training of middle management in the private sector.⁹

Another culprit who has contributed to this predicament is the school superintendent. Not only has he failed to fathom the importance of making such an investment for principals, but, more importantly, he has been remiss in giving much thought to maintaining ongoing developmental programs for principals. Remember, not all programs require substantial funds to implement. The reasons are not totally financial. One superintendent aptly embellishes this point when he remarked:

I was a superintendent of schools for eight years in a quite enlightened community, and in all honesty, I just did not think very much about sustained inservice programs for principals. This is not to say that I was not interested in the principals, I was, and I tried to involve myself with their concerns. But in retrospect, whatever I did to support them was not enough, and judging from conversations I have had with other superintendents, that same situation exists in other communities.¹⁰

Why have not the principals been more vocal in bringing to the attention of the superintendent their needs? Why have they remained so reticent? According to Brown, they

⁹ Charles E. Brown, "The Principal as Learner," The National Elementary Principal, 53 (July/August, 1974), p. 21.

¹⁰ Ibid.

have been reticent because they are fearful of receiving a poor evaluation from the superintendent if they reveal to him their needs. With the exception of new principals during a time of crisis, experienced principals rely more on their own peers and friends for assistance and advice than on their superintendents. By reacting in this manner, it can be said that principals to some degree contribute toward keeping the superintendent uninformed and inactive. Unfortunately the plight of the principal continues because he still encounters difficulty in seeking and in finding relevant resources when he needs and wants them.¹¹

Forearmed with the knowledge of the causes for past failures, what steps can be taken to ameliorate this dire situation? A digest of the literature leads to the following elaboration. Before initiating any action, a school district policy that will serve as a base for future decisions on developmental programs for principals must be devised. Without such a policy, the entire developmental program could be in total disarray because it would lack purpose and direction. Of course, to insure the conception of what hopefully will be a successful program, it is of utmost importance that the substance of the policy that shall be formulated and adopted by the superintendent and the school board be truly an outgrowth of their prudent deliberations. In other words, any

11

Ibid.

haphazard effort on the part of the superintendent or the school board within this endeavor could be fatal to any developmental program for principals.

St. John and Runkel in studying developmental programs for principals prepared a sample of such a policy. Cited below are some of the salient statements or points that they strongly feel should be included within these types of developmental policies:

1. The administration should acknowledge inservice activities as an integral part of the school system's operation.
2. Salary increments should be tied to the attainment of professional growth goals that have been met through comprehensive inservice programs.
3. All inservice programs should have specifically defined goals, should be well planned, should be efficiently organized, should be carefully coordinated, and should be systematically evaluated.
4. All inservice activities should be consistent with the overall goals and needs of the school system.
5. The school system should be responsible for providing inservice programs, whereas the individual principal will be responsible for maintaining and improving his professional skills.
6. The inservice requirements should be an outgrowth of the type of professional skills sought of each principal at the time of his employment.
7. The time needed for participation in inservice programs should be shared equally by the school system and the principal; that is, each party should allocate one-half of its time.
8. The superintendent should be responsible for communicating clearly to principals what professional development needs must be attained, and he should help them achieve them.¹²

The Conference Board, an independent, nonprofit business research organization, in a recently published report, commented about the inclusion of a salary increment when the employee attains his (professional or vocational) growth goals. Specifically, it noted the importance of separating performance improvement from performance evaluation. Performance evaluation is judging past performance to justify administrative actions, such as compensation decisions. Performance improvement focuses on the acquisition of specific skills and/or knowledge that an employee can utilize in improving his performance. When the above objectives are combined, as they were in policy statement number two above, a conflict evolves. Why? It evolves because performance improvement takes place within a setting that is oriented towards training individuals under the watchful eye of a superior whose sole role is to coach his personnel. However, doing well on the practice field does not warrant a salary increment because the efficacy of any developmental program is job performance. It is job performance that becomes the ultimate objective. It is the quality of job performance that merits salary increments. Thus, performance evaluation not performance improvement should contain a monetary reward. Moreover, the attitude and the reaction of the employee are far different to his superior who serves to judge him than they are to the one who serves to coach and to counsel him. For a developmental program to be successful, the superior must enjoy a counselor-

counselee relationship with his employee.¹³

There are other considerations and precautions that should be taken by superintendents before implementing a professional development program for their principals. Although some of these precautions were included or implied in the sample policy, their importance warrants their enumeration even at the expense of being redundant:

1. Administrators (principals) must have the freedom to attempt their newly acquired skills on-the-job if their professional development program is to be successful.
2. Administrators (principals) need adequate and accompanied support from their superordinates if their participation in the inservice programs that have been planned for them shall prove to be effective.
3. The activities scheduled for the participants must be interesting, significant, worthwhile, and activity centered.
4. The time and effort expended by the participants in these programs should be properly recognized and rewarded.¹⁴

A final consideration, just as important as the previous ones, is that professional development activities should not interfere or compete excessively with the basic requirements and duties of the job.¹⁵

Collecting and digesting the foregoing information,

13

Robert I. Lazer and Walter S. Wikstrom, Appraising Managerial Performance: Current Practices and Future Directions (New York: The Conference Board, 1977), pp. 36-37.

14

St. John and Runkel, "Professional Development," p. 69.

15

Ibid., p. 67.

enables one to prepare a more viable framework upon which he will be able to build and to implement an effective ongoing developmental program for principals. The focal point of such a program is to bring about changes in people, specifically in principals. ✓ Before one can initiate behavioral change in principals, he must become familiar with the total requirements of the job. Thus, the first step within this change or developmental process is to ascertain the required skill factors needed by and/or the job related responsibilities for a role incumbent to be successful on the job.

Houts says that for a principal to be a professional capable individual, he must be cognizant of the sociological and political forces that exist within the community, and he must possess the skill to deal with the diverse elements of a community. He must be skillful in group procedures and understanding so that he can answer some of the following questions: What is going wrong with the group? Why is it starting to falter? What kind of interventions will enable it to succeed more efficiently and effectively? Communication and sensitivity skills are essential. Sensitivity refers to understanding both the desires of other people and the impacts the principal's interventions could have on them. The principal should know a great deal about legal bases upon which schools operate, and about the kinds of problems that relate to the legalities of school operations. He should comprehend employee-management relations. Knowing organizational and

management theory, including social psychology, could help him acquire some expertise in this area. Understanding curriculum building and its accompanied processes that are required to meet particular kinds of individual and societal needs are definitely prerequisite skills for the principalship. The final requisite for the principalship is that the role incumbent should be an educational philosopher who is able to answer questions, such as What is education for? and What impact do the decisions I make have on society and on human beings?¹⁶

Pharis categorizes principal skills into three general areas, namely, technical, human, and conceptual. If the role incumbent demonstrates competence within the technical skill area, he evinces an understanding of, and proficiency in, a specific kind of activity, particularly one involving methods, processes, procedures, or techniques. Technical skills are primarily the "things" of a principal's business, that is, being able to accomplish tasks, such as organizing a school, making schedules, selecting textbooks, keeping records, offering hot lunches, conducting fire drills, and providing a multitude of other related tasks pertinent to the proper management of the institution. Within the human skill area, the principal who manifests proficiency in mastering these skills shows ability to work effectively as a group member and to build a cooperative effort among the staff members whom he

¹⁶ Paul L. Houts, "A Conversation with Keith Goldhammer," The National Elementary Principal, 53 (March/April, 1974), p. 30.

leads. Human skills are those skills a principal needs to successfully deal with people. The conceptual skills require a different set of skills. Those principals who have mastered these skills reveal an ability to see the enterprise as a whole. This ability includes recognizing how the various functions in the organization depend on one another, and how changes in any one part affect all the others. Conceptual skill enables the principal to predict what will happen based on what he sees.¹⁷ The observations recorded by Cunningham best describe not only the interrelationships that exist among these three skill areas, but, more importantly, how one skill area evokes another until the outcome reads--improved performance for principals. According to Cunningham, conceptual ability permits principals to see their problem in broad perspective; human skills and understandings enable principals to act upon their conceptual bases; and technical skills are the translations of conceptual and human skills into improved educational opportunities.¹⁸

Anyone who manifests these skills and can synthesize them in the manner just described is certainly exercising educational leadership. This skill is the one most frequently cited within the literature as the one most essential for the principalship. Goldhammer says that an educational leader is

17

William L. Pharis, The Elementary School Principalship in 1968 (Washington, D.C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA, 1968), p. 12.

18

Ibid., p. 16.

an educational specialist who knows what constitutes appropriate educational devices for meeting a particular range of needs. Secondly, the leader must have some philosophical perspectives on the societal and human needs for education because he must bring into congruence the social functions of education with the knowledge and practices of education. Third, he can evaluate the significance of the programs in his school by identifying their strengths and weaknesses. Also, he knows how to bridge the gaps within these programs by possessing the ability to build greater strengths where currently there are weaknesses. Fourth, he knows how to plan for the future.¹⁹

No one can deny the necessity of acquiring the skills and knowledge cited in the previous paragraphs if an individual is going to fulfill the role of the principalship in an admirable and in a competent fashion. However, professional skills are not the only ingredients that affect performance. It has been disclosed in numerous studies that the motivational orientations of principals are just as influential. Motivational orientations can be either extrinsic or intrinsic, according to Herzberg. Security, interpersonal relations, conditions of work, and technical supervision are extrinsic factors, and achievement and recognition are the intrinsic factors. Blum's findings suggest that the key factor seems to be security. If job security is not paramount, then the role

¹⁹Houts, "Keith Goldhammer," p. 27.

incumbent is considered a high-risk taker who is more concerned with the intrinsic factors of the job; whereas, if job security is important, then the incumbent is designated a low-risk taker who worries more about the extrinsic factors of the job. What does high or low risk takers and extrinsic and intrinsic factors have to do with the way principal's performances are affected? The principal's performance becomes affected because Ford, Borgatta, and Bohrnstedt observed that ✓ all administrative positions offer low security guarantees and high intrinsic rewards.²⁰ ✓ Therefore, principals who place primary importance on extrinsic job factors are not likely to be successful because they will not be able to fulfill their personal needs through their jobs. When need fulfillment is not possible, then there will be a corresponding decrease in drive that will ultimately affect job performance in an adverse manner. To further strengthen the impact that these factors have on job performance, Miskel's study indicated that risk propensity, combined with intrinsic-motivational needs, are better indicators of performance potentials than experience and education that we rely on so heavily in selecting principals.²¹ It should now become apparent that the most salient job components of the principalship are the professional skills and the motivational orientations possessed by the role incumbent.

²⁰ Cecil G. Miskel, "Principals' Attitudes Toward Work and Co-workers, Situational Factors, Perceived Effectiveness, and Innovation Effort," Educational Administration Quarterly, 13 (Spring, 1977), p. 52.

²¹ Ibid., p. 67.

After discussing the job requirements of the principalship at length, it is imperative to review the ways that should be employed in assessing the principal's job performance. Hersey says that instead of a report card-like "pass performance system," most school principals would prefer being measured by a method that evaluates them on the basis of some set of objectives. These performance objectives should be collectively established by the superintendent and the principal. Then, the principal is in a position to evaluate in a constructive manner the degree of success he attained in meeting those predetermined objectives, and he can analyze more effectively the quality of leadership that he had exerted in fulfilling those expectations.²² In a recent survey conducted by one of the principal organizations, more than fifty-two percent of the principals responding said that they have no say in designing the systems that evaluate their performance.²³ When decisions are made unilaterally, it is impossible to initiate and to employ two-way communication.

The most commonly used evaluating schemes for principals probably rely on the perceptual judgments of superintendents. The present findings suggest that these evaluations

²²National School Board's Association, "How School Boards Are Evaluating Principals," The American School Board Journal, 163 (July, 1976), p. 25.

²³Ibid.

relate most strongly to principal style variables.²⁴ The study conducted by Moser lends credence to these findings by supporting the fact that superintendents do expect from principals a particular style variable. In this case, Moser found that superintendents expect principals to conform to role behavior that stresses goal achievement, centralized authority, and institutional regulations.²⁵ A number of different approaches to performance appraisal have been developed over the years, including the use of rating scales; checklists; the ranking, or other comparisons of employees one with another; the comparison of the results produced by an employee with preset objectives; and an open-ended narrative or essay description of performance. According to the responses received from two hundred ninety-three companies, the most frequently reported approach used for performance appraisal of managers was the objective-setting or MBO approaches.²⁶ However, after conducting telephone interviews with company representatives to corroborate these findings, it became apparent that the most popular managerial performance appraisal approach is the conventional rating scale.²⁷

The following sources could be used by the superior-

²⁴Miskel, "Principal's Attitudes," p. 67.

²⁵Robert Moser, "The Leadership Patterns of School Superintendents and School Principals," Administrator's Notebook, 6 (September, 1957), p. 2.

²⁶Lazer and Wikstrom, Appraising Managerial Performance, p. 22.

²⁷Ibid., p. 23.

dinate to obtain informational data for whatever appraisal instrument he may be employing.

1. He could rely on his own observations. Specifically, he could inspect the employee's work and he could compare it to acceptable work standards.
2. He could ask the employee for a self appraisal.
3. He could analyze all available work records.²⁸

Regardless of what instruments are used or what sources are tapped, there are certain characteristics that all worthy performance appraisal systems should possess. It is an established fact that opponents of existing practices have taken an antithetical posture because the system has failed to embody these characteristics. Moreover, court decisions cite the presence or absence of these characteristics as essential issues to be examined when appraisal systems are challenged. What are these characteristics? There are five, namely, reliability, validity, job-relatedness, standardization, and practicality. Reliability means that the system yields consistent data, regardless who does the appraising. Validity can be defined by stating that the information gleaned accurately reflects whatever purpose the system or instrument was designed to serve. Job-relatedness are those criteria that are relevant and important to the job. They must be observable and measurable. Normally, these critical work behaviors are identified through careful job analyses.

²⁸ Frank Kowski and Julius Eitington, The Training Methods Manual (Washington, D.C.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 132 372, 1976), pp. 3-4.

Standardization refers to the use of the same forms and procedures for all personnel who have similar job descriptions and classifications. Practicality means that the system is simple and easy to administer. Also, the system does not discriminate against any protected class of employees.²⁹

Although it is imperative that these characteristics are included within any appraisal system, it is discouraging to read that only a third of the firms in the Conference Board study conducted a job analysis of all positions to be appraised to ensure that factors measured or judged by the appraisal system truly related to the requirements of the jobs. Fewer than half the firms report that they conducted pilot runs of their systems before implementing them to ensure that the systems did what they were supposed to do.³⁰ These findings indicate that very few firms incorporate these characteristics into their appraisal systems. It is conceivable that even a smaller number of school districts have included these characteristics into their own appraisal systems.

The appraisal systems employed by any school system are considered a vital component of any developmental program. Before the training needs of a principal can be determined, there are two factors that the trainer who is responsible for such a developmental program must know. The first one is the total requirements of the job. A job analysis of the princi-

²⁹Lazer and Wikstrom, Appraising Managerial Performance, pp. 4-5.

³⁰Ibid., p. 7.

palship could secure this information for him. The second one is the present performance exhibited by the principal, relative to the identified professional skills and motivational orientations. An appraisal system, incorporating the five previous mentioned characteristics, should provide this kind of information. Then by comparing the present performance of the role incumbent to his job requirements, the trainer should be able to detect his training needs without a great deal of difficulty. There are a number of reasons why training needs emerge. The following list is just a partial sample of the prevailing conditions that could create a need for further training:

1. Present performance is not up to standards.
2. New techniques must be taught.
3. Efforts can be improved after a period of refresher training.
4. Deficiencies detected in job knowledge or skill.
5. Changes are required in programs, work operations, or job procedures.
6. New programs have been undertaken.
7. Improvement is needed in attitudes, in human relationships, or in effectiveness.
8. Certain quantitative indicators manifest themselves, such as personnel turnover, complaints from public, and high cost of operation.³¹

Kowski and Eittington give the following reasons why people are unable to fulfill their job requirements: 1. Lack of knowledge or skill, 2. Environmental factors, and 3. Lack of proper motivation. Of the above reasons, only the first one

³¹Kowski and Eittington, The Manual, p. 3.

can be remediated through some type of developmental program. Remediation is possible because knowledge (information) and skills (tools) can be acquired by the trainee. Whereas, environmental factors are conditions found within the work situation that prevent the role incumbent from performing his tasks. These conditions are beyond the control of the incumbent. Subsequently, it is not a matter of acquisition which is an internal function for the incumbent, but it is a matter of re-engineering the environment. This condition requires the intervention of some external source to restructure the work situation. Thus, additional training will not resolve this dilemma. Also, training will not overcome any deficiency in motivational orientations. To rectify this condition, the trainer must ascertain the proper rewards to attach to the incumbent's correct performance. Thus, it can be stated with some degree of certainty that the efficacy of developmental programs is restricted to helping incumbents acquire knowledge of and/or skills for the job.³²

By identifying what type of deficiencies are ameliorable to some kind of intervention, it is possible to limit the expenditure of local resources and energy to those activities that will, in fact, improve the professional competence and functioning of elementary school principals. To accomplish this overarching purpose, there are four objectives that must be achieved. The first objective is to continue the on-the-

³²Ibid., pp. 4-5.

job learning that was begun in the pre-service program. The task is to make a deliberate effort to translate the knowledge, understandings, and generalizations of pre-service programs into a successful and constantly improving professional practice. The second objective is to fill in the gaps that were inevitably left since the pre-service program was concluded. This objective is primarily a remedial function; however, remediation is not the major purpose of all developmental programs. The third and principal objective of developmental programs is to help elementary principals keep abreast of any new proposals and their corresponding educational implications. Not only is it important for principals to acquire new knowledge, ideas, and theory that stem from research and educational practice, but they must be cognizant, also, of any new proposals being made for changes in materials, methodology, and organization. On the other hand, principals need assistance in analyzing the implications that the new knowledge and/or proposals will wrought on current educational policies and practices. Do new ideas and proposals mean redefinition of important educational goals? How compatible are they with the current point of view? What effect will they have on the educational program's content and organization? What kind of staff should be recruited if they are adopted? Which proposals are superficial "fads"? In attempting to keep pace with change, the principals must address themselves to these questions. The last objective is to assist the principal's

efficiency in handling their day-to-day functioning of their schools. There is a tendency on the part of the practitioners to handle these matters in a routine manner--a manner that may escape their constant surveillance.³³

Knowing the purpose for developmental programs, and being cognizant of the job requirements that can be taught within such a program, helps in formulating the multitude of programs that can be provided. But there is one other component that must be considered and understood before programs are designed and adopted. That component is adult learning. Specifically, what is sought in reference to adult learning is under what conditions do adults learn. The following list reveals some of these conditions:

1. Adults must want to learn.
2. Adults will learn only what they feel a need to learn.
3. Adults learn by doing. (They forget within one year fifty percent of what they have learned in a passive manner. It is imperative that they are given immediate and repeated opportunities to practice what they have learned.)
4. Adult learning centers on problems that are realistic. (Adults learn faster when the learning process begins with a specific problem that has been drawn from actual experiences. Thus, not only can adults work out some practical solutions to these situations, but they can deduce a number of salient principles that they can use with other similar problems.)
5. Experiences affect adult learning. (Adults are powerfully disposed to reject new knowledge when it does not fit-in with what they know.)
6. Adults learn best in an informal environment. (They

³³Pharis, Principalship in 1968, pp. 9-10.

should not be reminded of earlier school experiences.)

7. Adults should be instructed in a manner that utilizes a variety of methods. (They learn more quickly when information reaches them through more than one sensory channel.)
8. Adults want guidance, not grades. (They want praise, not tests; otherwise, they will withdraw from instruction because they fear the possibility of failure.)³⁴

Before discussing what developmental programs are available and what job requirements they can fulfill, it is important to fully understand what an instructor or trainer can contribute to the total learning process. The trainer can help principals become aware of their respective problem areas, and he can encourage them to become dissatisfied with the status quo. He can help them recognize alternate solutions to their problems, but he cannot assist them in selecting and practicing a new behavior. He can provide them with feedback on their performance, but he cannot help them to generalize and to integrate their new behavior within their established frame of reference. Thus, there are limitations in what the trainer can do to help principals during their learning process.³⁵

It will become apparent that there is certainly an abundance of developmental programs available for the professional growth of principals. The following discourse offers a small sample of the programs available and a brief description of each one.

³⁴Kowski and Eitington, Training Manual, pp. 7-9.

³⁵Carl Heyle, ed., The Encyclopedia of Management (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1973), p. 491.

The Four-Step Method is considered the best means of "breaking-in" the new worker or an experienced worker on a new task. As the name implies, there are four sequential procedures, namely, the preparation of the worker, the presentation of the operation, the examination of the worker's performance, and the follow-up. The first procedure entails three tasks: placing the learner at ease, ascertaining what the learner knows, and stressing the tasks that are to be performed so that the right interest and attitude is adopted by the learner. The second procedure dictates that each step is taken one at a time--a tell and show approach. During the third procedure, the learner is requested to execute the tasks and to explain the key points while the trainer watches the performance carefully. The primary task in this procedure is to insure the independent performance on the part of the learner. The final procedure encourages the frequent re-evaluation of the learner's performance so that help can be provided as it is needed.³⁶

The Coaching Method is effective in situations where a supervisor and a subordinate are working together in a given job situation. The coach will have to do considerable planning to provide a variety of training opportunities. He will analyze work programs and projects which are coming up and will decide in advance just what training they afford and how it can best be effected.³⁷

³⁶Kowski and Eitington, Training Manual, pp. 37-38.

³⁷Ibid., p. 39.

Program Instruction involves the presentation of small units of instructional material in a highly organized way. Learning proceeds from the simple to the complex. This information is presented in small increments called frames. Each correct response on the part of the learner results in an immediate reward, that is, the right to proceed to the next frame. Program Instruction provides the instructor or trainer with specific benefits, namely:

1. It is easy to monitor the progress of the learner.
2. It can serve as an adjunct or supplement to other forms of instruction.
3. The learner can proceed on his own, permitting the instructor to offer assistance wherever it is needed most.
4. All learners learn all the answers. Although each learner proceeds at his own pace, he is still subjected to the same kind of material and standard of teaching as every other learner. These conditions are very rarely met in the conventional training situation.

On the other hand, program instruction has the following limitations as an instructional strategy:

1. It is not suited for broad conceptual and attitudinal training. It is more properly suited to master a skill or specific, limited forms of knowledge.
2. It could cause bright learners to be turned-off by its step-by-step learning process.
3. It restricts the number of program revisions because of their high costs, thus, making it more difficult to keep programs current and relevant.³⁸

These developmental programs are designed and developed to serve individual learners. Other programs that have similar

³⁸Ibid., p. 51.

aims are cross-training, special assignments, acting assignments, and understudies. There certainly is not a dearth of developmental programs or techniques available for training individuals on a one-to-one basis. However, the literature contains an even greater number of programs that can be utilized for group instruction. A small number of such programs will be described while a larger number of programs will simply be cited.

The lecture method is a very popular means of providing trainees with need information. With good planning by the speaker, new ideas can be communicated, interest in a topic may be aroused, and key points can be summarized. The following are three prerequisites that any good trainer who is responsible for introducing this type of instructional technique into the developmental program must know: 1. How to plan the lecture part of the program, 2. How to select proper lectures, and 3. How to create the kind of situations that will enable each speaker to give his best effort.

These tasks can be accomplished if an effort is made to fit the lecture to the program's objectives. Towards this end, the speaker should be cognizant of what is expected of him, of the nature, size, and developmental level of the target group, and of what has gone on before this activity. Thus, it is not only the responsibility of the trainer to select the speaker but he must provide him with the above information if this technique is to prove itself effective.

The manner in which the speaker is introduced and the manner in which the administrative arrangements, such as equipment, facilities, and supplies are provided, also, will have an effect on creating a propitious setting for this activity.³⁹

Training conferences are the most widely accepted of the systematic methods used for supervisory training. A common type of training conference is built around topics chosen on the basis of established training needs. Each session has its specific objectives, its plan of instruction, and its body of content material. The conference leader guides the trainee group by the proper phrasing of questions and remarks, and he moves the group in the direction of the agreed upon topic by encouraging discussion. The conference leader may supply subject matter information during the session, or he may arrange for the presentation of factual information at the start of the meeting. What the leader avoids is the control of the free flow of ideas and opinions so long as they are pertinent to the discussion. The leader does not provide stock answers to a problem, nor does he necessarily anticipate a common agreement on the solution to a problem. Instead, emphasis is given to the emergence of ideas from among the participants, and to the pooling of group judgment and experience in the solution of problems. The key element in achieving success using this method is attaining the total involvement and participation of the entire trainee

³⁹Ibid., pp. 53-56.

group.⁴⁰ Additional techniques or methods that could be used to help trainees "open-up" are buzz groups, fishbowls, brainstorming, and role playing.

The complexity-resistance model uses videotape that presents material via sound, sight, and movement while revealing two universal ingredients contained within all training situations: 1. The complexity level of the material to be learned, and 2. The degree of the learner's resistance to the material. Thus, this model presents to the trainers four possible training situations, that is where both complexity and resistance are low; where resistance is low and complexity is high; where resistance is high and complexity is low; and where both resistance and complexity are high. In those situations where resistance and complexity are low, an example would be the orientation of a new employee, the trainer is concerned with using information which gives low involvement techniques that provide direct feedback. When resistance is low and complexity is high, an example would be the necessity of explaining a set of complex ideas, then the trainer's major concern is the introduction of intellectual and/or physical stimulation techniques to offset the lack of emotional involvement on the part of the learners. Graphic arts, such as animated illustrations, photographs, slides, and films are needed in abundance. When the situation evinces high resistance and low complexity, then the trainer is faced with learners who are totally opposed to change. To reduce

⁴⁰ Ibid., pp. 61-62.

this recalcitrant posture, trainers can expose the learners to highly dramatic television presentations, depicting actual instances when the new behavior is needed. With the appropriate mood music in the background, it is conceivable that the barriers will be overcome, and the learner's resistance to change will subside. In addition to the television presentation, other change inducing techniques, such as role playing and counseling should be used. Also, supervisors can facilitate change by exerting pressure and/or by offering support. The toughest situation arises when both resistance and complexity are high. In this situation, the trainer has to employ techniques that have high impact on the learner while forcing him to become highly involved in the learning process. Confrontation, feedback, and role-playing are just some of the involving, dynamic techniques that could be used. The basic key to success is predicated on the opportunities given to the learners to try-out the various skills that they have learned from the experiences that they have had while receiving the necessary reinforcement from the trainer and from the other members of the group.⁴¹ Other group techniques are demonstrations, staff meetings, critiques, panel discussions, group problem solving, case study methods, in-basket exercises, and learner controlled instructions.

⁴¹

Ibid., pp. 87-88.

While there seems to be numerous developmental programs to serve a variety of needs that exist among elementary principals, the question whether developmental programs should be conducted for principals while they are on-the-job or off-the-job has been answered by the educational community. It has been well established that the general and historic assumption in education has been that improvement takes place off-the-job rather than on-the-job.⁴² However, the literature disclosed advantages and disadvantages for either approach. On-the-job techniques are relatively inexpensive because there is little loss of productive time and there is rarely a need for a professional training director. On the negative side, the pressure of the daily operations, the lack of time for analysis and reflection, and the absence of skilled direction often make on-the-job training programs ineffective. On the other hand, what can be said of off-the-job training? First of all, there appears to be an increase in the number of these programs because they seem to offer a more effective way to produce managers. Moreover, there are some additional advantages that can be cited if this approach is fully implemented; namely, it permits the trainees to escape from office pressures; it helps institutions to eliminate in-breeding; it enables the participants to experiment with new ideas away from the critical eyes of peers; and it offers trainees an opportunity to be instructed by experts. Unfortunately, the utilization of this

⁴²American Association of School Administrators, How to Evaluate, p.v.

approach creates some unfavorable conditions as well. Some of the following conditions are responsible for such adverse effects:

1. The difficulty encountered in insuring the transfer of learning to the on-the-job behavior.
2. The problem experienced in trying to instill the proper motivation among participants when they resent the fact that a classroom instructor can teach them how to perform their jobs better.
3. The setbacks faced as a result of the loss of productive time.
4. The uncertainty encountered in finding competent instructors and suitable facilities.⁴³

Obviously, there is a lack of conclusive evidence that one approach is superior to the other.

What programs should be employed and where they shall be held are questions that superintendents must continue to grapple with in seeking ways to help principals. However, the superintendents should be extremely cautious of avoiding the trap of letting activity, rather than results, become the desired outcome of effort. It is imperative that the superintendents establish goals and objectives for every developmental program that they offer. Otherwise, they will be unaware of what they are aiming to achieve and they will start to drift. To avoid this pitfall, an assessment of each developmental program must be initiated and completed. Those programs achieving the specified goals and objectives should be continued; whereas, all other programs should be either dis-

⁴³Heyel, The Encyclopedia, p. 492.

continued or revised. To discern those programs that are truly effective from others that are less effective, the superintendent can resort to using a four step process, consisting of reaction, learning, behavior, and results.

The first step in the evaluation process is to measure the reaction of the principals to the developmental program. Why? Because if they do not like the program or if they feel that it is a waste of time, the odds are that they will reject the entire learning process. Therefore, to insure an effective approach to the entire evaluative process, it is incumbent upon the superintendents to do a good job of measuring the reactions or feelings of the participants toward these programs. How can the superintendent accomplish this task? Initially, he can begin this task by determining what he wants to ascertain about a particular program. Then he should prepare an instrument, such as a questionnaire, that covers these factors. It is essential that the instrument employed should enable the superintendent or his designee to readily tabulate and quantify the reactions of the participants. Moreover, if the instrument permits anonymity, the superintendent should be able to obtain more candid reactions to the program. Any additional comments that a superintendent can secure from the participants should be just as helpful in fulfilling this task.⁴⁴ However, it must be understood and underscored that this step is just the initial step. Although

⁴⁴Kowski and Eitington, Training Manual, p. 18.

the accomplishment of this first step is indicative of a good start, it is not a guarantee that the other steps have been or shall be achieved.

The second step is learning. Learning can be defined as the principles, facts, and techniques that were mastered by the participants in a classroom setting. These factors of learning must be measured and they must be stated quantitatively before and after the principals participate in the program. Course Achievement Tests (CAT) could provide such quantitative data if they are administered upon the completion of the developmental program. If the participants' scores on a standardized pretest are compared with their CAT scores, then it is possible to determine the amount of learning that was a direct outgrowth of the program.⁴⁵ Furthermore, whatever learning is to take place must be prestructured on an objective basis. This task rests entirely in the hands of the individual who is conducting the program. Consequently, it is his job not only to prescribe the terminal behavior that should be expected of each participant but to describe it in such a manner that it can be readily identified and measured. Then, he needs to spell out the circumstances or conditions under which the performance or behavior is to take place. Conditions refer to what kind of aid is given or is denied the participants while they are requested to execute the desired terminal behavior. The final factor that must be

⁴⁵Eugene R. Hall, Training Effectiveness Assessment (Orlando, Fla.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED. 137 390, 1976), p. 20.

included is the establishment of some standard of performance that is indicative of the minimum level of achievement expected of the participants. This standard of performance can be specified in terms of quality, quantity, speed, or cost. Lastly, wherever possible, a control group (those not participating in the program) should be used to compare their test scores with the test scores of the participating group. It is expected that the participants would receive significantly higher scores than the control group if the program was indeed effective.⁴⁶

The third step in the evaluative process is behavior. Behavior is that segment of evaluation whereby an attempt is made to determine what kind of change has occurred within the participants' job performance. Before appraising job performance, the first task is obtaining a job analysis. Without such an analysis, literally it would be impossible to construct a systematic appraisal system to assess the participants' on-the-job performance. Again, such an assessment is required on a before and after basis; that is, before the program begins and after the program concludes. The post-program appraisal should be made three to six months after its termination so that those who have participated in the program have an opportunity to put into practice what they have learned. Subsequent appraisal may add to the validity of the study, particularly if a control group is used as it was in step two. If superintendents are sincerely interested in evaluating

⁴⁶Kowski and Eittington, Training Manual, p. 19.

developmental programs in terms of behavioral changes, then they are strongly advised to seek the assistance and advice of statisticians, research people, or consultants because very few superintendents or trainers have the background, skill, and time to engage in extensive evaluations within this area.⁴⁷

Results is the fourth and final step in this process. The objectives of most developmental programs can be stated in terms of results, such as absenteeism, grievances, and increases in quantity and quality of work. From an evaluation standpoint, it would be best to evaluate developmental programs directly in terms of results desired. However, there are so many complicating factors that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to evaluate certain kinds of programs in terms of measurable results. Difficulties in the evaluation of programs are evident at the outset in the program technically called "the separation of variables;" that is, how much improvement is due to developmental programs rather than other factors? This problem makes it very difficult to measure results that can be attributed directly to a specific developmental program. As a direct consequence of this difficulty, it is recommended that superintendents or their designees begin to evaluate in terms of the three criteria described in steps one, two, and three.⁴⁸

The literature discloses a healthy trend toward

⁴⁷Ibid., pp. 19-20

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 20.

specificity in the written objectives that are to be met by the participants in a developmental program. This trend toward specificity plus the establishment of the objectives prior to the presentation are quite likely to result in better program selection and in outcomes that are more closely related to expectations. It can be stated with some degree of certainty that those superintendents who have adopted such a developmental approach have taken every known step to help their subordinates improve their job performance. It is conceivable that these superintendents will not be able to help everyone. What then should happen to those subordinates who have not evinced professional growth and corresponding job improvement? If the subordinate continues to exhibit poor job performance, then just and sufficient cause for dismissal must be contemplated. Just and sufficient cause could be defined as persistent failure to perform assigned work duties or to meet prescribed standards of the job. Tardiness and absenteeism are other causes. Many old time supervisors follow the rule that anyone missing more than twelve days should be given serious consideration for dismissal. Other causes are an adverse attitude toward other personnel or toward job assignments, willful violation of the institution's rules, and/or lack of qualifications for the job. The latter cause is not the fault of the subordinate. It is a matter of the subordinate being incapable of doing the work assigned to him or of being unable to meet the job's prescribed goals and ob-

jectives, even though he has applied himself in a diligent manner and he has maintained a commendable attitude. Also, this condition could surface when there is a change in the job requirements.⁴⁹

The length of time before dismissal is finally executed depends on the problem. Absenteeism, tardiness, and attitudinal problems should precipitate more immediate action; whereas, a commendable attitude and willingness on the part of the subordinates should require a longer period of time.⁵⁰

Whatever the case, this decision is normally the most difficult one that a superordinate has to make. Hopefully, as superordinates expend more time and energy in formulating and in implementing more effective and viable developmental programs, there will be a corresponding reduction in the number of incompetent subordinates, thus, reducing the superordinates' unpleasant task of saying, "You are Fired!"

⁴⁹ Aurora Parisi, "Employee Terminations," in Handbook of Modern Personnel Administration, ed. Joseph J. Famularo (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972), pp. 65-3 and 65-4.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 65-5.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

In this investigation, a developmental process model was designed to depict the six major functions that superintendents should undertake and execute whenever they are serving their principals in a pedagogical capacity. The six major functions are the skill requirement factor, the assessment factor, the action factor, the evaluation factor, the adjustment factor, and the retention factor.

To secure information relative to the superintendent's responses to each of these functions, six critical answers to six critical questions were sought:

Question I (Skill Requirement Factor)

Do superintendents specify and justify at least five professional skills that are needed by their principals to fulfill the role of the principalship?

Question II (Assessment Factor)

Do superintendents ascertain the degree of development that each of their principals has achieved in reference to the five professional skill areas that they have cited for the principalship?

Question III (Action Factor)

Do superintendents provide their principals with programs and/or services in these five professional skill areas?

Question IV (Evaluation Factor)

Do superintendents evaluate the programs and/or services that they have provided for their principals?

Question V (Adjustment Factor)

Do superintendents take into consideration the changes that they foresee for the principalship in the immediate future when they plan developmental programs and/or services for the coming academic year?

Question VI (Retention Factor)

Do superintendents apply the results of the developmental or instructional programs that they offered to their principals in deciding who to retain or who to dismiss?

In depth interviews were held with twenty-four suburban Cook County district superintendents who were responsible for six or more school buildings. The instrument that was used during the interview can be found in Appendix B of this study. However, it is imperative that some questions from this instrument be reclassified under different functions or factors for the purpose of discussing and analyzing the superintendents' answers to each of the critical and related questions. The number before the question indicates the order that each question was presented to the superintendent.

Skill Requirement Factor

3. Can you cite the five most important professional skills that you have attempted to assess about a prospective candidate for a principalship during the interview process?

4. Can you rank order each of the five skills cited, from the most to the least critical?
5. Why did you rank them in that order?
6. Are these professional skills included or inferred in the job description for principals? (Why not?) If inferred, please explain.

Assessment Factor

7. How often do you assess principals?
8. What methods, strategies, and/or techniques do you use to assess the degree of development that your principals have attained in each of the five stated professional skills?
9. How do those methods, strategies, and/or techniques help you identify the degree of professional skill development of your principals in each of the five skill areas?

Action Factor

10. What are the pronounced or more obvious skill deficiencies that your principals evince among the five professional skills?
11. What are their obvious skill strengths among the five skill areas? (If the superintendent is unable to cite a common deficiency or strength among his principals, then the superintendent will be asked to assess each principal in terms of questions ten and eleven).
12. How do you communicate your findings to your principals? Why do you employ that particular method? If you don't reveal your findings, why not?
16. How were these programs and/or services planned for the principals?
17. How is the principal's time adjusted to attend these programs and/or services?

18. What, if any, Board of Education policy exists that encourages principals to improve their professional skills?
19. What incentive or rewards, if any, exist for principals who participate in programs and/or services geared toward skill improvement?
20. Are those programs and/or services provided for principals by the superintendent included as part of the school board's total evaluation of the superintendent? Why? How?
13. What kind of programs and/or services can a superintendent provide for principals that would help principals strengthen their skills in each of the previous five mentioned areas?
15. What kind of programs and/or services have you provided for your principals in the past two years?
14. Do these services and/or programs for principals serve other purposes?

Evaluation Factor

21. How would you assess the effectiveness of each of these programs and/or services that you said could be provided for principals?
22. How did you assess the effectiveness of each of the programs and/or services that you, in fact, did provide for your principals?
23. Can you identify those programs and/or services that you have found to be most effective in attaining the desired results?
24. What, in particular, made these programs and/or services more effective than the others?

Adjustment Factor

25. Do you feel that the principalship in your district has changed or remained stable during your tenure in office?

26. What programs and/or services are you currently contemplating or planning for your principals in 1977-1978 school year? Why?
27. What, if any, changes in professional skills do you foresee for principals within your district in the near future? Why?
28. How will these changes alter the type of programs and/or services that you will be offering to principals in the future?
29. Do you think that there will be any changes in the planning procedure for these future programs and/or services?
30. How often has the job description of the principalship been revised? How recently?

Retention Factor

31. How many years have you served the district?
 1. How many of the currently employed district principals did you interview as prospective candidates for their position?
 2. How many of these principals whom you interviewed were employed by the Board of Education because you (superintendent) wanted them?
32. How many principal vacancies has the district had in the last five years or since you have been here if it is less than five years?
33. Why did the former principals leave the district?
34. Where are they currently employed and in what capacity?
35. Are there any principals whom you would like to replace on your current staff? Why?

Question I: Skill Requirement Factor

Do superintendents specify and justify at least five professional skills that are needed by their principals to fulfill the role of the principalship?

Item 3

Can you cite the five most important professional skills that you have attempted to assess about a prospective candidate for a principalship during the interview process?

Nineteen of the twenty-four superintendents (79%) cited five professional skills. Three superintendents listed four skills while the remaining two superintendents listed three and two skills respectively. Only three superintendents enumerated a non-skill. The following list comprises all of the professional skills and non-skills, including their identification symbol, that were cited by the superintendents:

1. Leadership (control and influence)-----L
2. Communication-----C
3. Management or Technical Skills-----T
4. Human Skills-----H
5. Knowledge of Subject Matter and
Instructional Process-----K
6. Decision-making-----dm
7. Conceptual Skills (whole related to parts)----Cp
8. Projects Administrative Image-----I
9. Drive-----D
10. Physical Stamina-----S
11. Exhibits Job Interest-----E

12. Conforms to System (loyalty)-----Cf
13. Steadfast (guts)-----Sf
- *14. Background Experience (academic and practical)
15. Goal - Director (task-oriented)-----Gd
16. Continues Academic Preparation-----Dv
17. Comprehends Role of Board of Education-----Bd
18. Team Member-----Tm
19. Supervisory and Staff Evaluation Skills-----SE
20. Facilitator-----F
21. Objective-----O
22. Change Agent-----Ca
23. Loves Children-----Lv
24. Conflict Resolution Skills-----Cr
25. Intrinsically Motivated-----Im
26. Perspicacity-----P

* non-skill

Item 4

Can you rank order each of the five skills cited, from the most to the least critical?

Rank order was determined by assigning five, four, ... one points to each skill, depending on how the superintendents prioritized them. That is, five points were allocated to a number one ranking; whereas, one point was assigned to a number five ranking. The skill with the greatest aggregate quantity was adjudged as the one that was most desirable among the superintendents. The aggregate quantity accrued to each

skill and the total number of superintendents who cited that skill are disclosed by a number recorded in the appropriate column on the accompanying table. Moreover, any skill not cited by at least four superintendents was not included in the following table.

Table 1

RANK ORDER OF THE MOST FREQUENTLY CITED PROFESSIONAL SKILLS

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Skill</u>		<u>Aggregate Quantity</u>	<u>Cited by How Many Superintendents</u>
1.	Human Skills-----	H	87	23
2.	Knowledge of subject matter and instructional process-----	K	57	16
3.	Management or Technical skills-----	T	30.5	12
4.	Leadership-----	L	29.5	7
5.	Communication-----	C	18	5
6.	Conformist to system-----	Cf	15	6
7.	Drive-----	D	13	6
8.	Decision-making-----	dm	12	4
9.	Supervisory and evaluative skills-----	SE	12	4
10.	Conflict resolution-----	Cr	11.5	4

Item 5

Why did you rank them in that order?

The rationales given by superintendents for the rank order that they assigned to each skill were grouped under four general headings, namely:

1. The most important tasks needed to fulfill the role of the principalship
2. One skill supercedes all of the others
3. The difficulty encountered in the acquisition of each skill
4. All skills are interrelated and are of equal importance

The rationales of twelve superintendents were listed under the first heading; the rationales of six superintendents under the second; three rationales under the third; and three under the fourth heading.

Item 6

Are these professional skills included or inferred in the job description for principals? (Why not?) If inferred, please explain.

Twelve superintendents responded that the professional skills that they cited were, in fact, included in their principals' job descriptions. Eight superintendents said these skills were inferred, and four superintendents admitted that they did not have formal job descriptions for principals.

When the job descriptions submitted by the superintendents were collated with the professional skills they had cited during the interview, the findings were different. Of the twelve superintendents who stated that the skills were

included, only four superintendents' responses were proven accurate. Five superintendents listed skills that were not included in the job descriptions of principals, and three superintendents did not even have a job description to submit.

Of the eight superintendents who claimed the skills were inferred in their job descriptions, the findings reveal that no superintendent could justify that claim. Therefore, of these eight superintendents, six had cited skills that could not be inferred from their job descriptions, and two superintendents did not have a job description to submit.

Of the four superintendents who disclosed that they did not have a job description, one superintendent actually submitted one. Upon investigation, it was ascertained that some skills cited by that superintendent were not included or inferred in the job description.

Some superintendents admitted that they formulated their rationales either by observing successful principals of past years, or by listing those skill deficiencies that will facilitate the dismissal of a principal. One superintendent said that the skills that he cited were similar to cogs on a wheel; that is, no principal can function without them.

To recapitulate, there were four superintendents whose professional skills for principals were included in their principals' job description, twelve superintendents who had one or more skills that were not included in the

description, and eight superintendents who did not have a job description for principals. Moreover, as an aside, it was noted that only ten superintendents included continuous professional development as part of their job description for principals.

Regarding the superintendents who said that the skills were inferred in the job description, they gave the following explanations for this occurrence:

1. The job description specifies the functions and/or tasks of the principalship and not the professional skills
2. The job description is similar to policy, that is, it is more general in nature

One final observation on this item was the fact that two separate pairs of superintendents had devised the same job description for their principals. However, neither pair of superintendents had cited more than two similar professional skills.

Summary and Analysis

On initial inspection of the information collected, there appears to be some support that superintendents have spent considerable time in working towards and achieving a conceptualization of the role associated with the principalship. This support stems from the fact that seventy-nine percent of the superintendents readily identified and ranked the five most critical skills needed by principals to experience success in the field. It could be contended that super-

intendents would not have been able to demonstrate facility in this task if they were unable to perceive the component parts comprising the role of the principalship and if they were unable to decipher how these parts interrelated with one another.

However, in perusing and in scrutinizing the data further, there arises serious doubt about the superintendents exercising the kind of forethought and analysis intimated in the above statements. In fact, something quite contrary seems to emerge. Specifically, it looked as if most superintendents were simply reciting, without possibly the benefit of previous study, what they considered for the moment were the important professional skills needed by their principals. This latter point of view surfaced because of the high incidence of superintendents (twenty out of twenty-four) who did not include within the job descriptions of their principals the professional skills that they cited during the interview session. If the superintendents had devoted an appropriate amount of time, energy, and study to properly fulfilling this endeavor (as they normally react to high priority tasks), then the likelihood of some of the following findings appearing in this study would have been more remote. That is, eight superintendents would probably not have been remiss in formally preparing a job description for their principals, nor would twelve other superintendents been negligent in including all the professional skills they considered important

in such a document. Moreover, it would have been less likely to find eight superintendents erroneously asserting the belief that the professional skills that they enumerated were, in fact, stated in the job description for their principals.

Before introducing other findings relative to this latter point of view, the question arises: Why are these findings indicative of a substantial number of superintendents assigning a low priority to this task? The answer can be partially ascertained by observing the casual or informal manner that these superintendents employed in fulfilling this task rather than the formalized treatment that they would normally render to tasks they deem important. The latter approach would have enabled these superintendents to become more knowledgeable of the skills associated with the principalship, consequently, making it less likely that written documents would be avoided and/or that facts would be distorted as the current findings tend to indicate. The formalized treatment would have either induced the superintendents to personally conduct a job analysis on the principalship or it would have encouraged them to secure the services of consultants to undertake this task. Regardless of the option selected, the job analysis would have provided these superintendents with the necessary information and corresponding insight to identify accurately the professional skills associated with and critical to the principalship. Then, as with other important issues, the superintendents would have

transcribed these skills into documentary form for the members of their school board to peruse and to adopt as part of a formal job description. In this manner, the superintendents would have clearly communicated to all concerned--including themselves as well as the members of the board of education--what skills are needed by their staff of principals.

However, the fact remains that twenty of the twenty-four superintendents either failed to provide a job description or their job descriptions did not contain the five skills they deemed important for the principalship. Because superintendents have evinced this type of behavior, there is a strong tendency to interpret it as a sign that superintendents have not communicated through their deeds the importance that they have orally attached to the identification of these skills. If superintendents' deeds manifested a tendency to consider the identification of these skills vital, would there have been more than one superintendent mentioning professional development as a critical skill and more than ten including it in their job descriptions? The answer to both questions could conceivably be in the affirmative if the superintendents attached a sense of urgency or importance to accurately identifying these critical and dynamic professional skills for further development and refinement. There has been no evidence in this study to support the fact that superintendents have adopted and acted upon this feeling of urgency toward this matter. One plausible reason for this occurrence not

materializing is the failure of the boards of education to make their superintendents accountable for providing and for justifying this kind of information. Another plausible reason is more devastating--a lack of effort by the superintendents.

Other sources of data that would have probably been affected by a more formalized approach on the part of the superintendents are the skills that are listed on page 68. In perusing this list, it becomes obvious that only three out of twenty-six skills originally cited were mentioned by at least one-half of the superintendents. Human skill--the ability to interact and work effectively with the human element--was cited by almost the entire sample of superintendents. As an aside, only one superintendent did not include this skill among the five that he mentioned; unfortunately, this superintendent recently resigned from his position because of personal difficulties encountered with the members of his board of education. It is conceivable that the human skill remains foremost in the minds of superintendents because principals who are deficient in this skill create an inordinate amount of problems within the district. Principals who lack other skills apparently do not have a similar impact on such a large percentage of superintendents as attested by the fact that knowledge of the subject matter and instructional process was acknowledged by approximately three quarters of the superintendents, technical skill by fifty percent of the superintendents, and the remaining twenty-three skills were cited by

less than twenty-five percent of the superintendents.

Again, the evidence appears to indicate that the casual and informal approach adopted by most superintendents regarding the identification of professional skills is responsible for superintendents' responses appearing more casual and spontaneous than formal and objective. Hopefully, by restating the existing conditions, this finding can be brought into sharper focus. Given that superintendents were instructed to limit their choices to five important professional skills, and given that they and/or their appointees had devoted sufficient time in studying the role of the principalship for the primary purpose of identifying the skills associated with that particular role, then it would be quite unlikely that only one skill would receive almost unanimous support from the total sample of superintendents. Restricting the choice to five skills should have promoted almost all of the superintendents to identify at least three common skills. Why? There should be no question that within the role of the principalship there exist certain basic and common skills that distinguish the principalship from other non-administrative roles. Therefore, any serious effort on the part of superintendents and/or their appointees to ascertain the skills comprising the very core of the principalship should have enabled them to collectively identify more than one common skill. The fact that only one skill was so identified makes it more plausible that the role of the principalship was not carefully analyzed by the super-

intendents and/or their appointees into its component parts. If the appointees analyzed the role, then they did a poor job of analyzing and/or transmitting the information to the superintendent. Also, the possibility exists that the superintendents could have been unattentive while the appointee was making his presentation. For example, two different pairs of superintendents who had identical job descriptions could cite no more than two similar professional skills for their principals.

Because of the reasons enumerated and supported in the above discussion, superintendents appear to have difficulty justifying the professional skills they cited. Consequently, the first critical question can be answered by affirming the fact that most superintendents can specify or identify five professional skills needed by principals to fulfill the role of the principalship, but they cannot justify their importance because they have failed to include these skills within the written and formal job descriptions prepared for their principals. Moreover, the failure of most superintendents to identify at least three or more common skills indicates a failure to justify the most essential skills that should be included within said role.

Question II: Assessment Factor

Do superintendents ascertain the degree of development that each of their principals has achieved in reference to the five professional skill areas that they have cited for the principalship?

Item 7

How often do you assess principals?

All but one superintendent involves himself directly with the assessment process. In that one district, it is the assistant superintendent who is assigned the task of assessing principals. Thus, eleven superintendents and one assistant superintendent conduct one formal assessment session per year. Five superintendents schedule two formal sessions per year. There are two superintendents who manage three and four formal sessions, respectively. There are two superintendents whose assessment process is ongoing throughout the school year. One superintendent provides four formal sessions to those principals who have less than five years in the district and two formal sessions to those principals who have more than five years in the district. Lastly, there are two superintendents who do not conduct formal assessment sessions. Tangentially, it was noted that twelve superintendents mentioned that they conducted informal assessments daily.

Item 8

What methods, strategies, and/or techniques do you use to assess the degree of development that your principals have attained in each of the five state professional skills?

There were twenty-two methods or strategies that twenty superintendents used in assessing the professional skills of their principals. The remaining four superintendents revealed that they relied on management-by-objective techniques to make said assessments. However, these superintendents were unable to answer under what conditions the professional skills that they cited for their principals would be measured. Therefore, it was assumed that they were not knowledgeable about the various methods that are available to accomplish this task. The following table identifies the methods used by superintendents to assess their principals; the number of superintendents who use that method; and the number of skills superintendents are assessing by using that method:

Table 2

METHODS USED BY SUPERINTENDENTS TO ASSESS THEIR PRINCIPALS

<u>Method Employed</u>	<u>No. of Supts. Using Method</u>	<u>No. of Skills Each Method Assesses</u>
1. Conduct inquiries of staff and publics that principal serves	5	5
2. Visit schools to observe the daily operation	12	12
3. Observe and study how effectively principal implements superintendent's directives	3	3
4. Attend faculty meetings	1	1
5. Peruse the principal's evaluation of personnel	5	3
6. Observe how principal handles staff and public grievances	1	2
7. Read principal's reports, bulletins, and newsletters to determine accuracy and quality	7	5
8. Listen to and observe principal during administrative meeting	7	9
9. Confer with principal	11	12
10. Identify channel of command followed by staff	1	1
11. Solicit principal's rationale for employing staff members	1	1
12. Receive unsolicited feedback from staff and other publics	12	9
13. Measure length of time principal takes to complete task	2	2

Table 2 (Con't)

<u>Method Employed</u>	<u>No. of Supts. Using Method</u>	<u>No. of Skills Each Method Assesses</u>
14. Observe principal's grooming habits	1	1
15. Count number of district-related activities attended by principal	2	3
16. Note what principal enrolls in and completes course work	1	2
17. Count the number of grievances directed at principal during negotiations	1	1
18. Review accomplishments of principal on task-oriented activities	1	1
19. Attend school functions to observe principal	3	2
20. Observe how principal functions as a member of a committee	1	4
21. Study each student body's achievement test results	3	2
22. Identify principal who is shunned by peers as a working partner	1	1

From the table, it can be easily discerned that one-half the superintendents use either visiting schools or acquiring feedback from staff and/or constituents for assessing principals. Conferring with principals was the choice of eleven superintendents; whereas, perusing principals' reports, bulletins, etc. and observing principals' reactions at administrative meetings were included within the repertoire of techniques used by seven superintendents.

Regarding the methods employed by superintendents to assess a variety of skills, visiting schools and conferring with principals topped the list. Both methods were used to assess approximately one-half the skills. Observing principals at administrative meetings and receiving feedback from staff and/or public were each instrumental in helping superintendents assess nine of the twenty-five skills.

What cannot be ascertained from the table is that there were only ten out of the twenty-four superintendents who actually employed a method for assessing each professional skill that they had initially cited for their principals. Of the remaining superintendents, two failed to use any method to assess one of the total number of skills that they had cited, leaving twelve superintendents who did not utilize any method(s) for assessing two or more of their principals' professional skills.

Item 9

How do those methods, strategies, and/or techniques help you identify the degree of professional skill development of your principals in each of the five skill areas?

Twenty superintendents admitted that it was extremely difficult to determine the degree of development that each principal manifested within each skill area. Consequently, they readily admitted to employing a very subjective process; that is, they depended on their own perceptual judgments in making this kind of determination. Two superintendents felt that the degree of skill development can only be attained when the superintendent and the principal can arrive at a common assessment.

Parenthetically, it is of some interest to note that of the four superintendents who used management-by-objective techniques to assess their principals' skills, three relied on their perceptual judgments to determine degree of development and one employed superintendent-principal consensus. It is ironic for these four superintendents to employ solely their perceptual judgments, an unstructured and subjective approach, in assessing the skills of their principals; when, in fact, they had adopted and then had forsaken the technique or approach (management-by-objective) that attempts to take into consideration most of the five objective characteristics (discussed in Chapter Two) needed to measure the skills in question.

There were only two superintendents who indicated that they possess and fully implement a technique that enables them to obtain the kind of specificity of skill development that is desired. One uses behavioral terms when he translates

into writing the degree of skill attainment expected of each of his principals. The behavioral term will define under what conditions the principal will have to demonstrate his skill proficiency and what will be acceptable in terms of the degree of proficiency required. At the appropriate time, the superintendent will assess the skill being interpreted and apply the behavioral objective. The other superintendent rates each of his principal's basic skills on a simple form and he has his three district administrators do the same. The form lists all the skills being assessed; thus, the administrators are assigned the task of recording a one, two, or three next to each skill. Then, they rank order their principals according to the quantitative scores that each one obtained on the entire set of skills. By quantifying the assessment process, it is possible to obtain information relative to the degree of skill development.

Summary and Analysis

When studying the assessment process, it appears from the data that most superintendents tend to be concerned with acquiring only a global assessment of their principals' performances. They admit to having difficulty in obtaining more specificity, that is, in ascertaining to what extent each of their principals mastered the professional skills that they, the superintendents, initially identified as among the five most important. Although the task of objectively assessing on-the-job performance is not easy, the literature reveals

that there are ways to do it. However, most superintendents remain either ignorant of their existence, apathetic about learning how to use them, or adamant about not using them. Why? According to the superintendents, using their perceptual judgments to obtain information about the general performance of their principals is adequate in helping them identify the professional skills that have not been properly developed and mastered by the principals. What is implied within this statement and what was inferred from the comments of the superintendents during the course of the interview is that this type of information is a by-product of the information they truly seek. That is, the superintendents are primarily interested in securing information about the total operation of each school in their district. What they are concerned about and alerted to is the possibility of problems, emanating from any school building. Detecting such problems serves as a signal to the superintendents that a more thorough investigation of the school in question should be conducted. In the process of formulating this investigation, the superintendents tend to scrutinize the performance of the principal as a potential source of the emerging problem or problems. However, their ultimate goal in conducting this investigation is to eliminate or to resolve herewith the source of the specific problems and not to focus on an assessment of the principal's professional role.

If they failed to recognize and to resolve these problems, the superintendents are all too cognizant of the

dire consequences; namely, whatever job security they are currently enjoying in the district could be in serious jeopardy. At this point, it should be more apparent why superintendents place more emphasis on assessing the general operation of each school building rather than on assessing the professional skills of their principals. The former assessment is patently more crucial to the superintendents. Therefore, it can be stated with some degree of certainty that the rationale that encourages superintendents to react in this fashion is expediency and survival.

A review of the data is required at this point in time to support the above findings. Before introducing this data, it is imperative to cite a few precontingencies that should exist if superintendents are to employ more objective techniques in seeking and in assessing the specificity of skills alluded to earlier in this analysis. Namely, the foremost task facing superintendents is to ascertain the various levels of mastery that can be achieved within a given professional skill. To formulate these levels, it is imperative that superintendents break down each skill as Bloom did with the cognitive domain. Secondly, to determine the level of skill mastery for each principal, the superintendents should use an instrument or procedure that contains the characteristics of reliability, validity, job-relatedness, standardization, and practicality.

Now that the preliminary criteria have been specified what have the superintendents done that adheres to both

contingencies? Regarding the second contingency, it was ascertained and reported that the three prevailing assessment methods used by approximately fifty percent of the superintendents were visiting schools, conferring with principals, and obtaining unsolicited feedback from the staff and public. None of these three methods contain all of the above characteristics. As an example, none of the methods can be considered reliable and it is questionable whether they are valid and job-related. The latter characteristic implies that the method used must enable the assessor to observe and to measure the skill being studied.

To further illustrate the lack of objectivity in the assessment process, and to call attention to the failure of superintendents to abide by the first contingency, it is essential to reintroduce the data that disclosed the admittance of twenty superintendents, relying on perceptual judgment and "gut reactions" to determine the degree of skill mastery. It is improbable that such a subjective approach would enable superintendents to obtain an accurate assessment of the degree of mastery attained by their principals within the specified professional skills. Not only is it unlikely that superintendents could acquire accurate individual assessments utilizing this approach, but, in reality, it would be highly improbable that such results could be attained. It is especially improbable when there are more than fifty percent of the superintendents who admit not making an earnest effort

to procure information relative to this type of assessment. All that could be expected of such superintendents employing this subjective approach is the attainment of a general performance profile for each of their principals. Consequently, it is not coincidental that most superintendents sought such a profile. The only exception noted in seeking a general performance profile among the superintendents were the two superintendents whose approach or method of assessment included the characteristics cited in the second contingency. However, two out of twenty-four is certainly a small ratio of superintendents attempting to include both precontingencies within their assessment procedures.

There is another occurrence that should be noted and discussed because it suggests something about the attitude being exhibited by superintendents, regarding their assessment procedures. It appears that superintendents are not taking their responsibilities for assessing the skills of their principals seriously because they have conducted few, if any, formal sessions with their principals for this very purpose. Specifically, more than one-half of the superintendents have formally conferred either once or not at all with their principals. Moreover, only one-half of the superintendents consider the task of assessing principals a daily chore. Certainly, this kind of response by superintendents is not indicative of the type of behavior one would expect of administrators who consider this task important.

Consequently, after collecting and carefully analyzing the data, the results indicate a lack of objectivity and effort on the part of superintendents in assessing each of the skills that they deemed important. Thus, it can be said that most superintendents failed to ascertain the degree of development achieved by their principals in the previously mentioned professional skills. Therefore, the answer to the second critical question: Do superintendents ascertain the degree of development that each of their principals has achieved in reference to the five professional skill areas that they have cited for the principalship? must be an unequivocal no.

Question III: Action Factor

Do superintendents provide their principals with programs and/or services in these five professional skill areas?

Item 10

What are the pronounced or more obvious skill deficiencies that your principals evince among the five professional skills?

Fourteen superintendents acknowledged that they had principals who had human skill deficiencies. Ten superintendents cited having principals who had skill deficiencies in the knowledge of subject matter and in the instructional process. From this point, there was a drastic decline in the number of superintendents who were able to identify other skill deficiencies among their principals. As an example, there were only five superintendents who cited leadership skills, four who mentioned technical skills, three who noted communication, conforms to system, and conflict resolution skills. Only one superintendent considered his principals deficient in drive while another one mentioned supervisory and evaluative skills. Both of these skills were among the ten most cited skills by superintendents. Also, there were nine out of twenty-six skills that were not cited by superintendents as being among those skills that their principals have had difficulty in acquiring and executing. Continuing academic preparation was one of them.

Item 11

What are their obvious skill strengths among the five skill areas?

Human skill and knowledge of subject matter and instructional process were mentioned by fifteen and eleven superintendents respectively as the top two skills in which their principals have shown the greatest strength. Technical skills were stated by seven superintendents and leadership by five. Four superintendents acknowledged having principals with strengths in decision-making, conforms to system, and conflict resolution skills. There were five skills that superintendents did not have any principals manifesting strengths and two of these five skills were supervisory and evaluative skills and continuing academic preparation.

Item 12

How do you communicate your findings to your principals? Why do you employ that particular method? If you don't reveal your findings, why not?

Formal conferences and written assessments are techniques used by fourteen superintendents to communicate their findings to principals. Four of these superintendents use formal conferences to eliminate misinterpretation and misunderstandings. Of the four, three superintendents revert to written assessments because it helps them summarize their findings in a more permanent fashion while the other superintendent included a written assessment so that he can maintain this year's findings as a reference for structuring his principals' objectives for next year. Two superintendents use the conferences to reach a common agreement between themselves and their principals on the latter's assessment. Then, they

translate this verbal agreement into writing to tangibly indicate that both parties concurred on these findings. Telling principals directly what superintendents thought of their job performance and putting these thoughts into writing to make them even more definitive is the rationale evinced by six superintendents. The remaining two superintendents among this group use both techniques because one finds it comfortable to transmit a board-mandated written assessment, whereas the other one is complying with the district's policy on merit pay for principals.

There are six superintendents who employ only formal conferences in transmitting their findings to their principals. Three superintendents stated that this technique enables them to transmit and to obtain the quickest and most accurate information. Two of the three also mentioned that they abhor writing. In fact, one superintendent said why write when it is more important to come face to face with a principal so that you can interpret his body language. After all, it is this message that is an outgrowth of the principal's body language that will enable the superintendent to determine the truthfulness of his subordinates' responses. Two other superintendents said that conferences either assist them in maintaining an ongoing assessment process, or it helps them in sustaining a non-threatening climate. The sixth superintendent simply said that it was the easiest way to get the job done.

One superintendent communicates his findings only in

writing because it is the only method that he has found that will substantiate the specific requests that he has made of principals.

Two superintendents simply communicate their findings by informally talking to their principals. This method provides one superintendent with the means of maintaining two-way communication, eliminating possible misinterpretation, while assisting the other superintendent in sharing his findings only with the concerned principal. That is, this method helps the superintendent keep the matter confidential.

Finally, there was one superintendent who does not communicate any of his findings. He takes a Rogerian approach in this matter. He feels principals are pretty honest in pointing out their own deficiencies. Therefore, according to this superintendent, only when superintendents permit principals to recognize their own deficiencies by allowing them to participate in some kind of self-assessment process, will principals do something to improve their skills.

Item 16

How were these (developmental) programs and/or services planned for the principals?

Twenty superintendents indicated that they undertook the task of planning for developmental programs. Their principals were restricted to making suggestions of programs that could possibly be implemented. Two superintendents left this task entirely in the hands of their assistant superintendents while the remaining two superintendents felt their principals

had to assume this responsibility. It is pertinent to note that only one superintendent out of twenty-four said that he discussed participation in specific developmental programs with each of his principals. Almost all superintendents indicated that they planned developmental programs for group participation; that is, their entire principal staff would attend and would participate in these programs collectively.

Item 17

How is the principal's time adjusted to attend these programs and/or services?

The time principals are permitted away from the building is a discretionary function exercised by all twenty-four superintendents. It is noteworthy that none of the superintendents indicated any objection about principals leaving their buildings to attend developmental programs. Nor did the superintendents adopt any administrative policy and/or issue any directives that would curtail this kind of practice on the part of their principals. The only restriction cited was that one superintendent objected to having more than one principal away from the district at any given time.

During the principal's absence, sixteen superintendents assigned a teacher to assume administrative responsibilities in buildings without an assistant principal; two superintendents sent an assistant principal from another building to the one without an administrator; four superintendents placed central office administrators in those buildings; one superintendent hired a substitute teacher to free the teaching-assistant for full time administrative duties;

and one superintendent just let the building operate without making any additional assignments.

Item 18

What, if any, board of education policy exists that encourages principals to improve their professional skills?

A board of education policy encouraging principals to improve their professional skills does not exist in seventeen out of the twenty-four districts. However, in the seven districts where such a policy has been implemented, the policies are divergent and unique. In one district, the board policy mandates that principals attend a four to six week summer workshop every other year. Also, said policy specifically states that the superintendent has the authority to issue a directive to principals, informing those individuals who have a particular skill deficiency that they must attend a conference considered by the superintendent pertinent to their needs.

Another district requires its principals to earn four credit hours of college course work every three years or to accumulate four hours of credit within the same period of time by attending workshops and/or conferences. The number of credits earned for participating in such conferences, etc., is determined by the superintendent. Whereas, the existing policy in another school district stipulates that each principal must earn three hours of college credit every three years.

Two other districts have board policies that simply state that professional growth must be provided to principals,

while a third one stresses the improvement of principal performance by including in its board policy the assessment procedure and instrument that is used for principals.

The last of the seven districts has a written policy that encourages its principals to attend one national conference, sponsored by any of the educational associations, every school year.

Item 19

What incentive or rewards, if any, exist for principals who participate in programs and/or services geared toward skill improvement?

All incentives employed by the various superintendents had monetary overtures. In fact, eight superintendents remarked that the incentive for principals to upgrade their skills was basically to maintain their jobs, and, thus, avoid any financial deprivations. Among those eight superintendents was one who sounded a refrain that may be heard more frequently in the coming years, namely, that only the most competent principals will be retained when school closings occur. Although thirteen superintendents revealed that they had initiated some form of merit pay whereby principals could receive some monetary consideration for improving their professional skills, the inference of withholding those considerations still exists. Among the remaining three superintendents, one mentioned the possibility of being promoted to district office; the other superintendent commented about the district defraying all the expenditures involved in attending develop-

mental programs; and the third superintendent indicated that the principals' salary schedule was attached to the teachers' schedule that provides the salary increments based on college credits earned.

Item 20

Are those programs and/or services provided for principals by the superintendent included as part of the school board's total evaluation of the superintendent? Why? How?

Almost three-quarters of the superintendents--seventeen to be exact--are not evaluated by the school board on the quality and effectiveness of the developmental programs that they offered to their principals. Why? According to the rationale offered by eight of these superintendents, school boards confine themselves to assessing only the product or results; that is, they assess only each building's accomplishments. Their findings on these accomplishments are predicated on the reactions expressed by the constituents of each attendance area. If the reactions are favorable, that is, there is a lack of complaints being registered, then the board members assume that the superintendent has helped his principals hone their professional skills.

Eight other superintendents are not only spared being evaluated on their professional developmental programs, but the board does not even conduct an evaluation of their total job performance.

The final superintendent who is in this category submits an annual self-evaluation on his performance to the

board. In his case, he simply does not think that developmental programs for principals warrant inclusion in his evaluation.

Seven superintendents declared that the board members evaluate their developmental programs. However, in ascertaining how the board members execute this task, it becomes obvious that in five instances it is a very superficial and tenuous evaluation. Specifically, one superintendent is requested by the board to submit the strengths and weaknesses of his principals' job performances and to anonymously rank order them. He is not asked any other questions. How does the board evaluate developmental programs based on this information?

Another superintendent writes a hundred page self-evaluation that includes the developmental programs offered to principals for the perusal of his board members. Who is doing the assessing--the board or the superintendent?

A third superintendent pointed out that the three institute days and the five inservice half-days must be presented to the board members for their assessment and approval. How can board members evaluate the effectiveness of a program when they have not seen it or taken any steps to obtain quantitative or qualitative input? Moreover, the discussion centers on principal developmental programs not on program for general staff.

The fourth superintendent mentioned how knowledgeable

board members are with contemporary developmental strategies and techniques used by industrial or commercial firms. Consequently, if the superintendent uses similar approaches, then the board members feel that the superintendent is handling this segment of his role appropriately and effectively. How can this criteria be considered more significant by the board than the results obtained in using these techniques?

Finally, the fifth of these seven superintendents had this to say. Each board member assesses the superintendent using an instrument consisting of fifty-two items. The responses are averaged by one board member who presents it to the superintendent in the presence of the total board. Among the items are a few that ask if the superintendent encourages his principals to maximize their professional participation in developmental programs, but in most cases board members are not totally aware of this segment of the superintendent's role. Unfortunately, the board members do not attribute that much importance to it, according to some off-the-record remarks made by the superintendent.

There are two out of seven superintendents whose board's evaluation of their developmental programs are relatively thorough and pertinent. One school board adopted the School Board Association's instrument for conducting an evaluation of the superintendent. This instrument contains a section on developmental programs for principals. The board members take time to question the superintendent on the various experiences and activities that he provided for his

principals, such as the kind of programs offered on cultural pluralism, the knowledge gained by principals from these programs, and the manner that the superintendent ascertained the effectiveness of these programs.

The other school board requested the superintendent to annually present to them an evaluation on each principal, namely, their strengths and weaknesses. Then, they ask the superintendent to evince what he has done to improve their deficiencies or to enhance their strengths.

Item 13

What kind of programs and/or services can a superintendent provide for principals that would help principals strengthen their skills in each of the previous five mentioned areas?

Superintendents' responses, regarding programs and/or services that they could render to principals, were grouped into the following nineteen developmental activities:

1. Invite outside consultants who are affiliated with the university, state or county superintendents' offices, book publishers, law firms, and/or educational cooperatives to provide in-district workshops or individualized instruction
2. Invite outside consultants to offer their services at out-of-the-district retreats
3. Assign a peer to coach them
4. Visit and observe other school operations and/or individuals who are exemplary in exhibiting a particular skill or trait
5. Peruse and discuss books or other related material

6. Model desired behavior
7. Establish a working policy that provides principals the opportunity to receive positive and negative reinforcers
8. Assign principals the task of completing a special project or assignment
9. Study and discuss case studies and other administrative concerns at administrative meetings
10. Subject principals to conferences or to counseling sessions with the superintendent
11. Solicit assistance from principal's spouse
12. Request each principal to write weekly summaries of local school events to be followed by weekly critique sessions with the superintendent
13. Send principals to national, state, or local conferences, workshops and/or meetings
14. Enroll principals in courses offered at the university or in programs sponsored by an organization or agency
15. Mandate that principals attend lectures given by eminent people on topics relevant to the principalship
16. Plan and implement in-district mini-courses, seminars, or lectures conducted by the school district staff.
17. View a training film depicting specific skills or workstyles, followed by a group discussion that is moderated by the superintendent
18. Show samples of the finished product that the superintendent expects of his principals
19. Participate as a total administrative staff in social activities, such as dinners that include spouses or golf outings

The following table identifies each of the nineteen programs listed above by the order that they were previously cited. In the column adjacent to each of the numbered programs is the number of superintendents who cited that particular program. The numeral in the next column discloses the number of different skills that each program could help principals master, according to the superintendents. Finally, the balance of the vertical columns identify each of the twenty-five professional skills that were mentioned earlier in this report by the superintendents. Each skill is identified by its symbol (see pages 65-66). The numerals under the last column with the word "none" as its heading reveal the number of superintendents who cited that particular developmental program without specifying for what skill--even after being asked.

The first horizontal column that appears at the bottom of the table indicates the number of programs that superintendents cited as being appropriate to use for helping their principals master each of the twenty-five skills. The second horizontal column discloses the number of superintendents who mentioned using these programs for each of the skills. The third column shows how often superintendents cited each skill when they were initially asked to identify the five most important professional skills needed for the principalship. The final column discloses the total number of programs that superintendents mentioned as a possible vehicle for assisting their principals in strengthening that specific skill.

Reverting back to the first horizontal column following the nineteenth program, the last numeral after the skills tells the reader the number of programs that superintendents are cognizant of, without knowing how to best employ that program in acquiring specific skills. In the second column, the last numeral indicates the number of superintendents who cited programs without knowing for what skill.

Table 3

SUPERINTENDENTS' COGNIZANCE OF APPLYING DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAMS

Program	Supts.	Skills	L	O	T	H	K	dm	Cp	I	D	S	E	Cf	Sf	Gd	Dv	Bd	Tm	SE	F	O	Ca	Lv	Cr	Im	P	None
1.	17	7	2		4	4	8									1				5						1	1	
2.	5	2			1	4																						1
3.	7	7	1			1	1	1		1													1		1			2
4.	6	2				1	1																					4
5.	5	3		1	1																1							2
6.	7	4				2				1	1															1	3	
7.	1	1																								1		
8.	2	1							1																			1
9.	10	4			3	3	2														1							4
10.	12	11	2	1	2	2		2		1				1	1					1				1	2		5	
11.	1	1								1																		
12.	1	5				1	1	1				1	1															
13.	15	6		1	1	1	6														1		1					6
14.	9	4	1	1	1		2																					5
15.	3	0																										3
16.	5	2			2		3																					
17.	2	1	1																									1
18.	1	1		1																								
19.	1	1				1																						

No. of Sundry Programs Cited for Each Skill		5	5	8	10	8	3	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	4	0	0	2	1	2	3	0	13
No. of Supts. Who Cited Programs for Each Skill		5	4	11	13	16	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	8	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	15
No. of Supts. Who Cited Skill Among Their Five Most Important Ones		7	5	12	23	16	4	2	2	6	1	2	6	1	2	1	1	1	1	5	1	1	3	3	4	1	1	
Total No. of Programs Mentioned for Each Skill		7	5	15	19	24	4	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	8	0	0	2	1	3	3	0	

It is obvious from the table that the following developmental programs are the seven most popular, according to the number of superintendents who mentioned them:

1. Invite outside consultants who are affiliated with the university, state or county superintendents' offices, book publishers, law firms, and/or educational cooperatives to provide in-district workshops or individualized instruction
2. Send principals to national, state, or local conferences, workshops, and/or meetings
3. Subject principals to conferences or to counseling sessions with the superintendent
4. Study and discuss case studies and other administrative concerns at administrative meetings
5. Enroll principals in courses offered at the university or in programs sponsored by an organization or agency
6. Assign a peer to coach them
7. Model desired behavior

The following eight programs are the ones that the superintendents said were the most versatile in terms of helping principals acquire the largest number of professional skills:

1. Subject principals to counseling sessions with the superintendent
- *2. Invite outside consultants who are affiliated with the university, state or county superintendents' offices, book publishers, law firms, and/or educational cooperatives to provide in-district workshops or individualized instruction
- *3. Assign a peer to coach them

*equivalent rank

4. Send principals to national, state, or local conferences, workshops, and/or meetings
5. Request each principal to write weekly summaries of local school events to be followed by weekly critique sessions with the superintendent
- **6. Model desired behavior
- **7. Study and discuss case studies and other administrative concerns at administrative meetings
- **8. Enroll principals in courses offered at the university or in programs sponsored by an organization or agency

Regarding the developmental programs that superintendents recited without knowing the skill that they were best suited in serving, the following seven programs were the ones most frequently identified among the superintendents:

1. Send principals to national, state, or local conferences, workshops, and/or meetings
- *2. Subject principals to conferences or to counseling sessions with the superintendent
- *3. Enroll principals in courses offered at the university or in programs sponsored by an organization or agency
- **4. Visit and observe other school operations and/or individuals who are exemplary in exhibiting a particular skill or trait
- **5. Study and discuss case studies and other administrative concerns at administrative meetings
6. Model desired behavior
7. Mandate that principals attend lectures given by eminent people on topics relevant to the principalship

Moreover, thirteen of the nineteen programs were mentioned at least once by fifteen of the twenty-four superintendents without the superintendents mentioning what skills principals could acquire by participating in that program.

The following seven professional skills had the greatest number of sundry programs that superintendents could employ in assisting principals with their skill acquisition:

1. Human skills
- *2. Knowledge of subject matter and of the instructional process
- *3. Management or technical skills
- **4. Leadership skills
- **5. Communication skills
- ***6. Projects administrative image
- ***7. Supervisory and staff-evaluation skills

On the other hand, if the criterion was changed to include the total number of programs that were mentioned by the superintendents for each skill, the rank order of the top seven skills would be different from the one just cited, to wit:

1. Knowledge of subject matter and of the instructional process
2. Human skills
3. Technical skills
4. Supervisory and staff evaluation skills
5. Leadership skills
6. Communication skills

- *7. Decision-making skills
- *8. Projects administrative image

In sixteen of the twenty-five professional skills, there were two or less developmental programs mentioned by superintendents as useful aids in assisting principals with the mastery of each of these sixteen skills.

The following seven skills had the largest number of superintendents who enumerated programs that could be used for that particular skill development:

1. Knowledge of subject matter and of the instructional process
2. Human skills
3. Technical skills
4. Supervisory and staff evaluation skills
5. Leadership skills
6. Communication skills
7. Decision-making skills

What cannot be deciphered from the table is the range in the number of programs mentioned by superintendents. However, in reviewing the data, the range extended from a high of eight programs mentioned by one superintendent to a low of one program mentioned by another superintendent. When the frequency distribution was tallied to obtain this data, a normal curve emerged; that is, the following results were procured:

Table 4PROGRAM DISTRIBUTION FREQUENCY

<u>Number of Programs Mentioned by Supts.</u>	<u>Number of Supts. Who Mentioned this Number of Programs</u>
8.....	1
7.....	2
6.....	3
5.....	7
4.....	7
3.....	1
2.....	2
1.....	1

From this data, it can be ascertained that the average superintendent is aware of approximately four or five developmental programs.

Further investigation reveals that one-third (8) of the superintendents could identify a developmental program for every skill they had cited. Three superintendents were able to identify a program for all skills but one, leaving thirteen superintendents who were unable to identify a program for two or more skills. In fact, there were four superintendents who did not identify a program for any of the skills that they had cited.

Item 15

What kind of programs and/or services have you provided for your principals in the past two years?

Initially, it can be readily ascertained from the data that all but two superintendents provided some type of developmental program for their principals in the last two years (1975-1977). In fact, one superintendent provided five programs; six offered four; two implemented three; seven introduced two; and six initiated one program.

To illustrate the type of developmental programs that were provided by the superintendents and to show what programs superintendents selected to help principals acquire specific skills, a table similar to the one on page 104 is being reproduced below following a brief explanation of the table's design.

The first vertical column lists the developmental programs in the same numerical order as they appeared in the other table. The next vertical column discloses the number of superintendents whose principals attend this type of program, while the following vertical column cites the number of different skill acquisitions that necessitated the use of this program.

These three vertical columns are repeated under "Programs Unrelated to Skills Cited by Superintendents." Continuing from left to right on the table, the remaining portion, excluding the aforesaid three columns, is divided in this manner. Under the programs related to skills are listed the developmental programs that were to be emphasized. Under the programs unrelated to skills are enumerated the skills that were stressed in the developmental programs offered by

superintendents to their principals. However, unlike the program-related skills, these skills were not initially identified by superintendents as among the five most important professional skills their principals needed to succeed in the field. The last column is titled "none." The numerals appearing in this vertical column reveal how many and what kind of developmental programs superintendents encouraged, chose, or directed principals to attend without the superintendents being fully cognizant of the programs' skill objectives. That is, the superintendents were unaware what professional skills the principals would possibly learn and acquire by participating in these programs.

Excluding the third horizontal column, the other three columns differ from those of the other chart in this manner. The first one ascertains the number of sundry programs that were actually provided by superintendents; the second one discloses the number of superintendents who definitely offered programs for each of the skills cited; and the fourth evinces the total number of programs principals attended to strengthen that specific skill.

Table 5

DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAMS PROVIDED FROM 1975-1977

Programs Related to Skills
Cited by Superintendents

Programs Unrelated to Skills
Cited by Superintendents

Prog.	Supts.	Skls.	L	C	T	H	K	Cp	Gd	SE	Cr	Im
1	8	6	1		2	2	3		1	3		
2	1	1				1						
3	2	2						1			1	
4	1	1					1					
5	0	0										
6	2	2			1							1
7	0	0										
8	2	2					1	1				
9	1	1						1				
10	0	0										
11	0	0										
12	0	0										
13	3	3		1	1		1					
14	1	1		1								
15	0	0										
16	2	1					2					
17	0	0										
18	0	0										
19	1	1										

Prog.	Supts.	Skls.	L	T	K	Tm	SE	None
1	6	2		1			5	1
2	2	2	1			1		
3	0	0						
4	0	0						
5	1	1					1	
6	0	0						
7	0	0						
8	0	0						
9	1	1					1	1
10	0	0						
11	0	0						
12	0	0						
13	0	0						8
14	0	0						5
15	1	1			1			
16	1	1		1				1
17	1	1	1					
18	0	0						
19	0	0						

No. of Sundry
Programs Provided
for Each Skill

	1	2	2	3	5	3	1	1	1	1
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

No. of Supts. Who
Offered Programs
for Each Skill

	1	2	3	4	6	1	1	2	1	1
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

No. of Supts. Who
Cited Skill Among
Their Five Most
Important Ones

	7	5	12	23	16	2	2	5	4	1
--	---	---	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---

Total No. of
Programs Provided
for Each Skill

	1	2	3	5	8	3	1	3	1	1
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

	2	2	1	1	3	5
--	---	---	---	---	---	---

	2	2	1	1	7	12
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

	7	12	16	1	5
--	---	----	----	---	---

	2	2	1	1	7	16
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

In gleaning the data from this table, it is pertinent to note that there were eight programs that the superintendent failed to employ during the past two years, to wit:

1. Peruse and discuss books or other related material
2. Establish a working policy that provides principals the opportunity to receive positive and negative reinforcers
3. Subject principals to conferences or to counseling sessions with the superintendent
4. Solicit assistance from principal's spouse
5. Request each principal to write weekly summaries of local school events to be followed by weekly critique sessions with the superintendents
6. Mandate that principals attend lectures given by eminent people on topics relevant to the principalship
7. View a training film depicting specific skills or work styles, followed by a group discussion that is moderated by the superintendent
8. Show samples of the finished product that the superintendent expects of his principals

Five programs were utilized only once in a similar span of time by the superintendents. Each of the following five programs was implemented to strengthen a specific skill:

1. Invite outside consultants to offer their services at out-of-the-district retreats
2. Visit and observe other school operations and/or individuals who are exemplary in exhibiting a particular skill or trait

3. Study and discuss case studies and other administrative concerns at administrative levels
4. Enroll principals in courses offered at the university or in programs sponsored by an organization or agency
5. Participate as a total administrative staff in social activities, such as dinners that include spouses or golf outings

Two superintendents planned and implemented in-district mini-courses, seminars, or lectures for the sole purpose of helping their principals acquire or strengthen one skill. These activities or sessions were conducted by school district staff, pursuant to the directives of the superintendents. Whereas, three sets of superintendents, each set consisting of two members, helped their principals attempt to master two skills through the latter's participation in only one developmental program. However, each set of superintendents used a different program to accomplish its skill objectives. The following three programs were provided by each group:

1. Assign a peer to coach them
2. Model desired behavior
3. Assign principals the task of completing a special project or assignment

Three superintendents sent their principals to national, state, or local conferences, workshops, and/or meetings for three different skill acquisitions. In other words, each superintendent wanted his principals to acquire

or to strengthen a skill unlike the one being asked by the other superintendents.

The most popular developmental program, according to the eight superintendents who instituted it in their districts, was the one where they invited outside consultants who were affiliated with the university, state or county superintendents' offices, book publishers, law firms, and/or educational cooperatives to provide in-district workshops or individualized instruction. Because superintendents used this program to help their principals with six different skills, it became obvious that this program was the most flexible in terms of addressing itself to a greater assortment of skill objectives.

In surveying the data on the table, it became apparent that the reason twelve superintendents involved their principals in developmental programs was to help their subordinates acquire or strengthen a skill that the superintendents did not include among their five most important skills for the principalship. These skills will be referred to as the unrelated skills. The table reveals that superintendents employed seven programs for the principals' edification in these unrelated skills. Five of the seven programs, with each program stressing a different unrelated skill, were selected by one but not the same superintendent; namely:

1. Peruse or discuss books or other related material

2. Study and discuss case studies and other administrative concerns at administrative meetings
3. Mandate that principals attend lectures given by eminent people on topics relevant to the principalship
4. Plan and implement in-district mini-courses, seminars, or lectures conducted by the school district staff
5. View a training film depicting specific skills or work styles, followed by a group discussion that is moderated by the superintendent

The sixth program was implemented by two superintendents. Each superintendent used the program to instruct their respective principals in one unrelated skill. Because each superintendent opted to stress a different unrelated skill, the program of inviting outside consultants to offer their services at out-of-the-district retreats served principals in two unrelated skill areas.

The seventh and the most popular program, because it was the one most frequently used for unrelated skills by the superintendents (six superintendents), was the one that superintendents invited outside consultants who are affiliated with the university, state or county superintendents' offices, book publishers, law firms, and/or educational cooperatives to provide in-district workshops or individualized instruction.

There were five programs that superintendents included in their developmental programs for principals without any foreknowledge of the programs' skill objectives. The following three programs were each provided by a different superintendent:

1. Invite outside consultants who are affiliated with the university, state or county superintendents' offices, book publishers, law firms, and/or educational cooperatives to provide in-district workshops or individualized instruction
2. Study and discuss case studies and other administrative concerns at administrative meetings
3. Plan and implement in-district mini-courses, seminars, or lectures conducted by the school district staff

The remaining two programs were utilized by eight and five superintendents respectively; viz:

1. Send principals to national, state, or local conferences, workshops, and/or meetings
2. Enroll principals in courses offered at the university or in programs sponsored by an organization or agency

Of the twenty-five skills that the superintendents considered most important for the principalship, only ten skills were targeted by superintendents as the instructional objectives of their developmental programs--the programs that their principals have attended during the past two years. Of these ten skills, superintendents used only one program to teach their principals five of these skills. Two or more programs were used to teach principals the remaining five skills that are listed below according to their rank order; that is, the skill that superintendents attempted to teach their principals by using the greatest number of programs is listed first, and the one they used to teach the least number of programs last:

1. Knowledge of subject matter and of the instructional process
- *2. Human skill
- *3. Conceptual skills
- **4. Technical skills
- **5. Communication skills

The skills considered most important by superintendents were the ones that the largest number of superintendents attempted to teach to their principals. Excluding the five skills that only one superintendent targeted for his principals, the remaining five skills that were program objectives for more than one superintendent are enumerated below according to rank order:

1. Knowledge of subject matter and of the instructional process
2. Human skills
3. Technical skills
- *4. Communication skills
- *5. Supervisory and staff evaluation skills

Regarding sheer number of programs geared for specific skill acquisitions, it is interesting to note what skills were the objectives of the largest number of developmental programs; to wit, according to rank order:

1. Knowledge of subject matter and of the instructional process
2. Human skills
- *3. Technical skills
- *4. Conceptual skills

*5. Communication skills

On the right side of the table are listed five unrelated skills. Among these five, only the skill relevant to being a team member is excluded from the ten previously mentioned and related skills. Regarding these five unrelated skills, two of them, team member and knowledge of the subject matter and of the instructional process, were the objectives of one program; that is, each program was targeted towards one of these skills. Two unrelated skills, leadership and technical skills, were each the objective of two programs that were totally unlike one another. Superintendents used three programs to teach the fifth one, supervisory and staff evaluation skills, to their principals.

The most popular unrelated skill, in terms of sheer number of superintendents using programs to help principals achieve it, was the supervisory and staff evaluation skills. A distant second were both leadership and technical skills, followed closely by knowledge of subject matter and of the instructional process and team member skills.

An exact replica of what was just stated about the popularity of the unrelated skills can be said of the total number of programs that were targeted by superintendents for each unrelated skill.

What cannot be determined from the table are the number of superintendents who had principals participating in some kind of developmental program that had as its goal one of the skills that the superintendents had initially con-

sidered as among the five most important for the principalship. These figures reveal the following results: Two superintendents attempted to teach three related skills through their developmental programs; another four superintendents attempted two skills; eight tried to teach one; and ten superintendents did not attempt to involve their principals in developmental programs for the purpose of teaching them one or more related professional skills.

Item 14

Do these services and/or programs for principals serve other purposes?

Seven superintendents responded that they were unaware of any side effects as a result of their principals' participation in developmental programs. Among the seventeen who noted a side effect, none of the superintendents mentioned experiencing any negative effects as a result of their principals attending these programs. In fact, there was total consensus that all programs were beneficial to the principals and the school district.

The side effects that were identified could be classified as either the "spin-off" or "domino" type. The spin-off type can be detected when principals acquire an unexpected skill while in the process of learning the intended one. As an example, the principals attended a conference to become more knowledgeable of the curriculum material available for instructing students in the area of cultural pluralism. In addition to gaining this information, the principals were

observed treating their staffs in a more cordial fashion. Thus, the "spin-off" from knowledge acquisition was human skill acquisition.

The "domino" type can be described as the kind of effect that creates a chain reaction, one area affecting other related areas. As an example, principals in upgrading their supervisory and staff evaluation skills achieved a better teaching performance from their respective staff members. Parents perceived this improvement in instruction and showed their appreciation by supporting a school district referendum.

Tangentially, there were fourteen superintendents who noted the "spin-off" variety; whereas, there were only three superintendents who mentioned seeing the "domino" type. It is quite apparent that the "spin-off" type is the one most frequently identified.

In conclusion, if three-quarters of the superintendents actually observed side effects as they have indicated, and if the propitious observations made by the superintendents regarding these effects are accurate, then it is obvious that superintendents should encourage and direct their principals to participate in skill-related developmental programs. There seems to be no evidence of any detrimental effect to any of the concerned parties as a result of these programs.

Summary and Analysis

In the process of analyzing the data, it was noteworthy to ascertain that only eleven superintendents had

principals participating in developmental programs that stressed appropriate skills. That is, the programs emphasized skills that were cited by superintendents as the ones their principals had shown either a deficiency or strength in performing. A recapitulation of these skill deficiencies and strengths with a few additional observations will serve as a helpful aid in answering the third critical question: Do superintendents provide their principals with programs and/or services in these five professional skill areas?

Regarding skill deficiencies, there were fourteen superintendents who said that they had principals on their staffs that manifested a deficiency in human skills. However, of the fourteen superintendents, only three had principals attending programs whose objectives were to improve human skills. This outcome cannot be attributed to program ignorance on the part of the superintendents because thirteen superintendents had identified collectively ten programs that could be beneficial to principals with this deficiency. It is just that superintendents did not make any effort to have their principals participating in these programs.

There were ten superintendents who mentioned knowledge of the subject matter and of the instructional process as a skill in which their principals showed deficiencies. Half of these superintendents had principals working on this skill in the programs that were attended. Nevertheless, there were sixteen superintendents who were collectively knowledgeable

of eight programs that could have been used to teach this skill. The fact remains that only five intervened and made sure that their principals received instruction in this skill. The causal factor again appears to be neglect and indifference.

Five superintendents diagnosed deficiencies among their principals in leadership skills. Of the five superintendents, none had principals receiving instruction in this skill. Again, superintendents were cognizant of programs that could be used for this purpose. In fact, they identified five such programs. If four superintendents know of programs that could be helpful and no one uses them to assist their principals, it is obvious that superintendents are remiss in teaching their principals leadership skills.

Technical skills were a concern of four superintendents who noted this skill deficiency among their principals. Only half of these superintendents had principals being instructed in developing their technical skills. When eleven superintendents can collectively reveal eight programs that can be effectively used for this skill acquisition, and when the findings show two of four superintendents using some of the programs for this purpose, there is evidently an indication of superintendents being negligent in this skill area as well.

Three superintendents observed skill deficiencies in communication, conflict resolution, and conforming to system. Communication and conflict resolution skills were taught to their principals by only one superintendent who provided the

appropriate programs. None of the three superintendents had principals in programs that taught them how to conform to the system. There were five programs that four superintendents enumerated as being an effective means of improving communication skills, two programs cited by two superintendents for conflict resolution skills, and one program cited by one superintendent for conformist to the system skills. According to the superintendents, programs exist to teach these skills. The majority of the superintendents are simply not looking for programs nor are they implementing them if, in fact, they are cognizant of them as the data indicate.

One superintendent cited drive while another said supervisory and staff evaluation skills were deficiencies exhibited by their principals. Neither of the superintendents had principals attending programs to acquire these skills. There was one superintendent who professed to know of a program that could be employed for acquiring the drive skill; whereas, seven superintendents were collectively aware of three programs that could be implemented for supervisory and staff evaluation skills. It appears that programs are available but superintendents do not use them, or they do not take the time to discover them.

When the same analysis is made using skill strengths instead of skill deficiencies, the results appear to be the same. As an example, there were fifteen superintendents who acknowledged their principals as having strengths in human

skills. There were only three superintendents who provided skill-related programs in this area. Eleven superintendents noted strengths in knowledge of subject matter and instructional process. Five provided skill-related programs. Seven cited technical skills but only one had principals attending skill-related programs. Five mentioned leadership, but only one offered skill-related programs. Four stated decision-making and conformist to system. None had skill-related programs. Four identified conflict resolution; one had a skill related program.

Thus, it can be noted that while there were nine skill areas where principals were found deficient, and seven skill areas where principals exhibited strengths, the majority of the superintendents making these claims provided no skill-related programs for their principals.

To gain greater insight into the reason why this phenomenon has occurred; viz., superintendents providing a dearth of skill-related programs, other related practices and happenings affecting the manner programs are planned, selected, and implemented must be examined. Commencing with the manner superintendents report their assessments of principals, it was found that eleven of fifteen superintendents who communicated their principals' skill deficiencies or strengths in writing had their principals participating in developmental programs whose instructional objectives were related to one of the initially cited professional skills. That is, these programs

were skill-related. Six of the nine superintendents who did not revert to written assessments had their principals attending developmental programs whose objectives were unrelated to those professional skills. To further highlight the difference between the two groups, it is essential to ascertain how many superintendents within each group provided programs that emphasized either the skill deficiencies and/or the skill strengths of their principals. According to the data, ten of fifteen superintendents who reverted to written assessments offered skill-related programs; whereas, only one of nine superintendents who communicated their findings verbally provided such programs. These findings support the belief that superintendents who are faced with preparing a written statement on any task are more prone to seriously studying and completing that task than their counterparts who avoid written statements. The very fact that a written expression is tangible, permanent, and self-incriminating is a plausible reason for observing and validating a greater percentage of skill-related programs being offered by superintendents who put the assessments of their principals into writing. Consequently, it strongly appears that accountability for fulfilling any task can be achieved primarily by having the responsible parties submit their objectives in writing.

When contrasting superintendents who were employed in a school district where the school board had adopted a policy mandating developmental programs for principals with superin-

tendents who did not work under such a directive, it was discovered that those superintendents who were required to promote such programs for principals did not succeed as well in meeting this requisite as those superintendents who did not have to adhere to a similar directive. Specifically, there were seven superintendents who worked under such a mandate. Four had principals involved in skill-related programs. Two had principals attending programs whose skill objectives were unrelated. One superintendent had no principal participation in any type of program. This superintendent was in direct defiance of school board policy that required principals to attend one national conference per year. Of the seventeen superintendents whose district operated without such a policy, ten had principals attending skill-related programs, while six had principals in programs with unrelated skill objectives. One superintendent had no principal participating in a program.

It is extremely difficult to determine why this phenomenon occurred because the opposite of what one would expect happened; that is, a somewhat larger percentage of superintendents who were not obligated by board policy had their principals in skill-related programs than did the superintendents who had a school board mandate to fulfill. To further becloud the rationale of this phenomenon, additional information obtained indicated that superintendents who are not evaluated by their boards on the kind and the quality of

developmental programs attended by their principals had more principals attending skill-related programs than did the superintendents who were evaluated by their boards. The data showed that eleven of the seventeen superintendents who were not evaluated by their boards in this area had principals in skill-related programs; whereas, only three of seven superintendents who were evaluated by their boards had achieved similar results. It is possible that the board seeks only to have superintendents involve their principals in programs. They obviously are not interested in pursuing whether these programs are skill-related. If they were, the superintendents response to this area would be quite different because superintendents--at least those interested in job security--would have made an earnest effort to meet the expectations of most of their school board members.

Again, it is appropriate to contrast the two groups of superintendents; that is, those superintendents whose assessments of their principals are written with those superintendents who avoid tangible instruments. Among the former group who worked under a board mandate to provide developmental programs, there were three of four superintendents who adhered to that policy by providing the appropriate programs. However, only one of three superintendents among the latter group could make a similar claim. The accountability rationale presented previously to explain the differences between the two groups--the groups using either written or non-written reporting of assessments--would apply to this situation as well.

When these two groups were compared in terms of the number of superintendents who assumed full responsibility for planning and selecting the most propitious developmental programs that their principals should attend, it was found that all fifteen superintendents who used written assessments (former group) maintained complete control of this task. Whereas, approximately half of the group of superintendents who verbally communicated their assessments (latter group) assigned other staff members to fulfill this responsibility. It is obvious that the former group felt a strong sense of personal commitment than the latter group in completing this task. This personal commitment was primarily responsible for the former group becoming totally involved in the planning and selection process. Moreover, this strong commitment had to be an outgrowth of the importance placed upon this task by the former group. How else could one substantiate the fact that there was only one program offered by the former group that was not skill-related, in contrast, to five unrelated programs proffered by the latter group? How else could one substantiate the tendency of the former group to go without a program rather than schedule an irrelevant one? As an example, there were three superintendents in the former group to only one in the latter group who did not offer a single program for fear of offering an irrelevant one. There is very little question that the former group had to be more cognizant of the needs of their principals; otherwise, these statements

could not be substantiated. The former group had to acquire this knowledge of their principals' skill needs by devoting more time to the assessment process. More time had to be spent because it requires a longer period of time to prepare a written statement than it does to present an oral one. Moreover, to re-emphasize the importance given to this task by the former group, one must keep in mind that superintendents normally do not spend more time on items that they consider unimportant, nor do they personally undertake unimportant tasks.

When ascertaining what side effects the superintendents observed, not only does the obvious surface, viz., how programs served to fulfill more than the intended professional skill needs; but, more importantly, it provides some insight into the ability of the superintendents to detect the unexpected. The fact that there were seventeen superintendents who noticed side effects is a clear indication that almost three-quarters of the superintendents are cognizant of this phenomenon.

An interesting point emerges on closer inspection of these data. Specifically, of the seventeen superintendents, thirteen were included in the former group, leaving more than half of the superintendents among the latter group who were unable to identify any side effects. Once again, time spent on a task manifests itself. Side effects cannot be detected without an earnest effort made to study each program and its

related occurrences in a careful and critical manner. These results add further credence to the belief that the latter group went about their task of providing developmental programs in a very casual way. Evidently they, the superintendents, and their employers revealed through their actions and deeds that this task of providing programs was not of utmost importance--even though it has been shown that all ramifications occurring as a result of any developmental program are beneficial to all concerned.

In reviewing the incentives offered to principals for attending developmental programs, there were two primary incentives that eight and thirteen superintendents cited respectively, namely, keeping one's job and merit pay. Keeping one's job is a form of punishment. Among those eight superintendents who mentioned this particular form, there were four whose principals attended skill-related programs. On the other hand, of the thirteen superintendents who utilized monetary consideration in the form of merit pay, eight had their principals participating in skill-related programs. Merit pay necessitates an assessment of one's job performance. The quality of the job performance is related to critical skill acquisitions. It is conceivable that superintendents who employ merit pay as an incentive for subordinates to enhance their professional development will be more aware of program objectives. Thus, they are more prone to exercise discretion in the kind of developmental programs their prin-

cipals will attend. Whereas, those superintendents who use the other form are not as likely to assume a supporting role because they place the burden of job improvement upon their subordinates. Therefore, it is not as important for them to be as cognizant of the various programs available.

Tangentially, it can be mentioned that the former group had three times the number of superintendents using skill-related programs than the latter group, regardless of the incentive approach employed. The reasons cited for the discrepancy are the same ones enumerated throughout this portion of the paper.

Of the fifty-five developmental programs attended by principals during the past two years, twenty-three required the principals to leave the district. Whenever principals leave the district one must assume a corresponding cost attached to it. Additionally, it was ascertained that all but two--twenty-two superintendents to be exact--provided programs for their principals that required an expenditure of district funds. This fact gives substance to the belief that superintendents not only allocated money for this purpose but actually expended it for such programs as well. Thus, the lack of funds cannot be cited as the reason for superintendents not offering more relevant programs.

In conclusion, it can be said that the common factor affecting the number of superintendents offering programs that are skill-related is strongly correlated to the number

of superintendents who convert the assessments of their principals into written statements. Although the response of the former group, regarding the provision of relevant programs, was relatively strong, the overall response from the total group of superintendents was not as significant. Consequently, the third critical question must be answered with a definitive no.

Question IV: Evaluation Factor

Do superintendents evaluate the programs and/or services that they have provided for their principals?

Item 21

How would you assess the effectiveness of each of these programs and/or services that you said could be provided for principals?

Six evaluative techniques were identified after compiling all the responses rendered to this question by the twenty-four superintendents. The six techniques are listed below, according to rank order; that is, the one utilized by most superintendents is mentioned first while the least popular one is stated last:

1. Reaction of principals
2. Behavioral changes in job performance
3. Perceptual judgment of superintendent
4. Feedback received from board members and constituents, regarding the principals' job performance
- *5. Results obtained
- *6. Feedback received from principal's school staff regarding his job performance

Note: *equivalent ranks

The reaction of principals to the developmental programs they attended was cited by nine superintendents as the method that they would use in evaluating those programs.

Five superintendents would resort to detecting what behavioral changes have occurred in their principals' job performances.

One superintendent replied that he would use both reaction of principals and behavioral changes in job performance to determine program effectiveness. Of the remaining nine superintendents, five would rely on their own perceptual judgments, while two would depend upon the feedback that they would receive from board members and constituents. One superintendent said that the most important criterion for fulfilling this task was the results obtained at the building level, namely, the achievement scores attained by the student body. The other superintendent would base his evaluation on the feedback that he would receive from the principal's building staff.

Item 22

How did you assess the effectiveness of each of the programs and/or services that you, in fact, did provide for your principals?

On this particular question, all twenty-four superintendents verified by their responses that they use the same technique in assessing program effectiveness, namely, their own perceptual judgment. These perceptions acquired by the respective superintendents are an outgrowth of various sources, specifically, observing personally how well the principals are performing their tasks; securing information from staff and/or constituents, or using both sources. In compiling the data, it was noticed that eleven superintendents depended strictly on their own observations and internal reactions in formulating their assessments. Seven relied on input

from others, while six combined the feedback that they received from others with their own observations.

Item 23

Can you identify those programs and/or services that you have found to be most effective in attaining the desired results?

Eighteen superintendents cited eight of the nineteen programs as being the most effective in achieving the desired results. The remaining six superintendents felt that no program warranted special recognition.

The eight programs given this special distinction by the superintendents are identified below, with the number of superintendents who mentioned the program recorded adjacent to it:

1. Invite outside consultants who are affiliated with the university, state or county superintendents' offices, book publishers, law firms, and/or educational cooperatives to provide in-district workshops or individualized instruction.....4
2. Study and discuss case studies and other administrative concerns at administrative meetings.....4
3. Subject principals to conferences or to counseling sessions with the superintendent....3
4. Visit and observe other school operations and/or individuals who are exemplary in exhibiting a particular skill or trait.....2
5. Enroll principals in courses offered at the university or in programs sponsored by an organization or agency.....2
6. Invite outside consultants to offer their services at out-of-the-district retreats.....1

7. Assign principals the task of completing a special project or assignment.....1
8. Plan and implement in-district mini-courses, seminars, or lectures conducted by the school district staff.....1

Item 24

What, in particular, made these programs and/or services more effective than the others?

Under each of the eight programs identified below is a list of rationales that were submitted by superintendents in explaining why they selected that program as more effective than the others.

1. Invite outside consultants who are affiliated with the university, state or county superintendents' offices, book publishers, law firms, and/or educational cooperatives to provide in-district workshops or individualized instruction
 - a. Gives the superintendent an honest appraisal of the participants
 - b. Brings much knowledge and expertise to the session
 - c. Gains respect, credibility, and confidence of group
 - d. Renders an informative and entertaining lecture
 - e. Plans and implements an effective and pertinent instructional program whose skill objectives are applicable to the principalship
 - f. Conducive to developing a strong sense of comraderie among participants
2. Study and discuss case studies and other administrative concerns at administrative meetings

- a. Provides opportunity for principals to interact with their superintendent, thus, enabling them to clarify whatever concerns or questions they may have before or during sessions
 - b. Causes principals to respond most attentively to these sessions because of the superintendent's presence
 - c. Conducive to the use of brainstorming to generate alternative solutions to problems
3. Subject principals to conferences or to counseling sessions with the superintendent
- a. Forces the superintendent to be specific in disclosing to principals their respective skill strengths and weaknesses before the amount of merit pay can be determined for every principal
 - b. Makes superintendent respond to and act more quickly on problems that may arise
 - c. Creates a setting where participants readily exchange more accurate information because the session provides opportunities for each party to establish better rapport
 - d. Enables participants to better understand the difficulties encountered by each party in fulfilling their responsibilities
4. Visit and observe other school operations and/or individuals who are exemplary in exhibiting a particular skill or trait
- a. Enables superintendent to view first-hand the skill, technique, and/or strategy being applied by others
 - b. Provides principal with the opportunity to show superintendent whatever he feels is of major concern
5. Enroll principals in courses offered at the university or in programs sponsored by an organization or agency

- a. Plans and implements an effective and pertinent instructional program whereby its skill objectives are applicable to the principalship (Instructor)
 - b. Brings much knowledge and expertise to session (Instructor)
 - c. Sends principals only to sessions that emphasize topical areas of major concern to district
6. Invite outside consultants to offer their services at out-of-the-district retreats
- a. Conducive to developing a strong sense of comraderie among participants
 - b. Enables principals to attend sessions that are far removed from the daily stresses of the job
7. Assign principals the task of completing a special project or assignment
- a. Interacts with participants who have some expertise in area
 - b. Helps principals learn something by doing it
 - c. Confers a sense of prestige to the principal who has been given a special assignment
8. Plan and implement in-district mini-courses, seminars, or lectures conducted by the school district staff
- a. Offers programs that are in close proximity to the principal's job
 - b. Enables principals to be selective while not restricting them to the number of programs they can attend

Summary and Analysis

Although the majority of the superintendents cited reaction of principals, behavioral changes in job performance,

and results achieved as a means of assessing developmental programs, it is questionable if they know how to secure such information while insuring its validity and reliability. That is, according to the superintendents, the reaction of their principals would be obtained through informal discussions. They never mentioned the utilization of any kind of instrument, such as a questionnaire, to obtain this information. The fact that nine superintendents responded that they would rely solely on the principals' reactions to assess the program is an indication that these superintendents are not cognizant of the entire evaluative process. Principals' reactions are simply cues whether learning took place. In other words, if negative feelings existed, there is a strong possibility that principals considered their participation in said program a waste of time; consequently, they probably rejected the entire learning experience.

To determine effectiveness, more than just the reactions of principals must be obtained. It is surprising that not one superintendent said anything about acquiring data that would reveal what was learned by principals and to what degree. However, superintendents did consider reviewing the principals' job performance for determining program assessment. With the exception of one superintendent, the others did not discuss subjecting principals to pre- and postevaluative techniques so that they could secure data that would differentiate the job performance of principals prior to and after program

attendance. Not one superintendent mentioned giving participating principals three to six months after completing the program to put into practice what they have learned. Nor did anyone say anything about relating the evaluative instrument or technique with the job analysis that had been formulated for the principalship. Superintendents were silent about the use of statisticians, consultants, and/or control groups to help them evaluate more effectively how programs affected the job performance of their principals.

There was one superintendent who felt that students' scores on achievement tests is the best criterion for evaluating program effectiveness. This superintendent was basing his judgment of program effectiveness upon the results achieved by students on a given test. Although results achieved is one of the factors for assessing programs, it is the most difficult because it is almost impossible for the superintendent to separate the variables to ascertain how much of the achievement score variation can be attributed directly to the program. Without that kind of information, assessment of any program using this approach is impossible. It is obvious that this superintendent was unaware of what this assessment approach entailed.

What five superintendents suggested as a means of assessing programs, namely, using their perceptual judgment is what all twenty-four superintendents resorted to in actual practice. This practice can be partly attributed to the

superintendents' ignorance of what could and should be done to assess program effectiveness properly. However, one cannot discount the fact that these superintendents have delegated a low priority order to developmental programs. Subsequently, responding on the feeling level is justified by the superintendents interviewed as both sufficient and adequate because of the time saved and the importance that they have attached to the task. This justification is questionable in this era of accountability, legality, and due process.

Regarding the eight programs that superintendents found to be most effective, and the corresponding rationales that they mentioned in support of their choice of program, it must be stressed that these programs and accompanied rationales were an outgrowth of the superintendents' perceptual judgments. There were no attempts on the part of superintendents to control their subjectivity. They relied strictly on their own reactions to support their findings.

Therefore, taking into consideration that reaction of principals, behavioral changes in job performance, and results achieved were not assessed in an objective manner, and what was learned and to what degree was not even included in the evaluative process, it becomes axiomatic that superintendents do not evaluate the programs and/or services that they have provided for their principals. As a result, the answer to the fourth critical question is a definitive no.

Question V: Adjustment Factor

Do superintendents take into consideration the changes that they foresee for the principalship in the immediate future when they plan developmental programs and/or services for the coming academic year?

Item 25

Do you feel that the principalship in your district has changed or remained stable during your tenure in office?

All the superintendents but one said that the principalship in their district has changed. The superintendent who commented that no changes were noted went on to say that the principalship in his district has been perceived since 1972 by the board and the superintendent as a miniature superintendency. Evidently, decentralization of the district office took place at that time.

A number of reasons were cited by the twenty-three superintendents for these changes. The reason most frequently mentioned is the augmentation of the duties, responsibilities, and public accountability associated with the principalship. This kind of expansion in the role of the principalship occurred because the tasks once reserved for the superintendent are now assigned to the principals. Add to this role the task of meeting state and federal guidelines, plus holding the principals accountable for student academic achievement and it begins to become obvious why, according to these superintendents, the role of the principalship, while being inflated, has also changed.

Another reason evinced by superintendents for changes in the principalship was the upshot of certain occurrences that eroded the principal's authority. One such occurrence was the advent of formal agreements between the boards of education and teachers. With the signing of these agreements, the authority of most principals diminished because the boards relinquished some of the power that principals could formally exercise. A similar impact on the authority of principals is occurring with each confrontation between principals and members of the community over school policy. It seems that these confrontations are happening more frequently. The reconciliation of differences in student expectations between home and school has also taken its toll. However, the change that has wrought the most concern among principals is the one that has expanded their tasks while reducing their authority and status.

One change cited by a superintendent has come full cycle. That is, at one time, authority and policy formulation rested entirely with the superintendent. Then these functions were broadened to include the principals. Now these functions are once again the exclusive domain of the superintendent. Why did it come full cycle? This superintendent's explanation cited the fact that his district has integrated its students. Integration requires uniformity of policy to be practiced throughout the district. Uniformity means centralization; that is, all school functions are controlled by the superintendent.

Lastly, one superintendent said the reason for the change in the principalship within his district was the high turnover rate in his student population. With such a migrant student population, the social and emotional problems among students has escalated. Consequently, the principalship requires a different set of skills to handle this problem in an effective manner.

Item 26

What programs and/or services are you currently contemplating or planning for your principals in 1977-1978 school year? Why?

There were fourteen superintendents who said that they have programs planned for 1977-1978 school year. Of the fourteen, four superintendents have invited outside consultants to conduct in-district workshops with their principals. They scheduled these programs to either inform principals on how to obtain state and federal funding, to help them provide more effective leadership at the building level, or to assist them in meeting their students' emotional and social needs.

Moreover, to aid principals with the task of meeting their students' academic needs, mini-courses were being planned by two superintendents. These courses will be offered in their respective districts. Whether workshops or mini-courses are being planned, the fact remains that the thrust of these programs is to help principals better serve their students and not the vested interests of the superintendent.

There were two superintendents who mentioned planning administrative meetings for this school year. Each superintendent has a different purpose in mind for conducting this program. The one superintendent is concerned primarily with the welfare of the student body, because in the process of procuring state and federal funds, he is obviously trying to enrich and increase the educational offerings that will be available to the students. Whereas, the purpose is different for the other superintendent who is attempting to help his principals acquire and apply business principles in their daily operations. His basic purpose is to train his principals so well that they can sell the public the entire educational product. By selling the public the product, the principals would be helping the superintendent enhance the image of the school district. The image, and not the students, is the salient reason for this program. Obviously, the vested interest of the superintendent is being served.

Among the remaining six superintendents who have planned programs, four mentioned assigning special projects to their principals. These projects will be assigned to fulfill one of the following four reasons:

1. To meet the school board demands
2. To improve the image of the school district
3. To conform to the Family and Privacy Act
4. To meet the demands of the community

Regarding the last two superintendents, one is planning a retreat while the other one is contemplating dual programs. The latter is assigning special projects and is bringing in outside consultants to conduct workshops. The retreat was planned to help principals meet the demands of the community; whereas, the dual programs are being offered to meet the demands of the school board. It is becoming axiomatic that these six superintendents are basically complying to the demands being made by an outside source--a source other than the district staff members.

The ten superintendents who were not included in the above discussion had admitted during the interview process that they did not plan any programs for the coming school year.

Item 27

What, if any, changes in professional skills do you foresee for principals within your district in the near future? Why?

There were eleven superintendents who did not envision any need for principals to acquire another professional skill or set of skills in the near future. However, the thirteen superintendents who acknowledged such a need cited technical, knowledge of subject matter and of the instructional process, and communication skills. Of the three skills, the technical skill was by far the most critical, according to the ten superintendents who mentioned it. The reasons vary why this skill was considered vital. Three superintendents felt that it was

important for principals to learn how to consistently interpret and apply the conditions stated in the formal board-teacher agreement. Without this ability, these superintendents were convinced that the principals were going to experience further erosion of their authority. Whereas, four superintendents mentioned the necessity of obtaining and of administering programs being mandated by the state and federal governments. They felt that this necessity is a direct outgrowth of government intervention in the field of education.

Two of the remaining three superintendents, who also cited the emergence of technical skills in the repertoire of the principalship, discussed the need for principals to learn how to utilize the services of auxiliary staff members. These auxiliary members are trained to meet an increasing number of physical, social, emotional, and learning disabilities among students. The mushrooming of disabilities can be directly linked to the high turnover rate existing within their student populations.

The other superintendent commented about the shortage of funds within the school district, necessitating a need for principals to learn how to manage a sound fiscal program at the building level. In this case, it was expected that the principals would evince prudent discretion in the purchase of all items for the school.

The two superintendents who mentioned knowledge of subject matter and instructional process did so because they

realized that the community is holding principals accountable for the academic achievements of their students. They are reacting to the "back-to-basics" movement.

Finally, the need to gain public support for the schools was responsible for one superintendent--the last one of the total group--to note the need for principals to acquire the skill of communication.

Item 28

How will these changes alter the type of programs and/or services that you will be offering to principals in the future?

Twenty-two superintendents did not envision any changes in the type of programs that will be offered to principals. However, there were two superintendents who did disclose a couple of interesting possibilities regarding program development.

One superintendent discussed the possible implementation of an instructional approach that would utilize video-tapes. These video-tapes would be used to record an instructional program that was prepared and presented by an eminent theoretician or practitioner in the subject area under study. Then these video-tapes would be shown to principals in either a group or individual setting. To underwrite the substantial costs of these programs, districts would have to form some kind of consortium.

The other superintendent mentioned the establishment of dissemination centers throughout the country. These centers

would have contact with experts from all regions of our country who would be able to provide to the center information, suggestions, and/or instruction on topics relative to the field of education. Principals would have accessibility to terminals that are connected to these centers. Thus, any inquiries or concerns that they may have could be transmitted to the centers. The centers would contact the appropriate expert and then it would relay this individual's response to the principal. This program is similar to the one that is being used in medicine.

Item 29

Do you think that there will be any changes in the planning procedure for these future programs and/or services?

Twenty of the twenty-four superintendents did not foresee any changes in the planning procedures. The four superintendents who believed these changes would occur, based their opinion on various phenomenon. Two superintendents cited the intervention of outside agencies, namely, the federal, state, or county government. Cooperatives were mentioned also as a possibility. According to these two superintendents, the intervention of outside agencies in planning future developmental programs for principals can be attributed to either of the following two reasons:

1. The superintendents do not have time for developmental programs, or
2. Education is under the auspices of the federal government

The remaining two superintendents who cited video-tape programs and dissemination centers respectively had other reasons for the changes in the planning procedure. The first superintendent--the advocate of the tape programs--stated the necessity of having to coordinate and plan the programs with the consortium. Without input from the consortium, the kind of programs and their availability could not be ascertained, thus, making planning impossible. The other superintendent who considered the dissemination centers thought that the bulk of the planning rested with the principal with little, if any, involvement by the superintendent.

Item 30

How often has the job description of the principalship been revised? How recently?

There were three superintendents who did not prepare a job description for their principals. Of the remaining twenty-one, fifteen superintendents have revised it once; three have changed it twice; two have altered it three times, and one changes it annually. Among these fifteen superintendents, four revised their descriptions one year ago; three did it five years ago; three sets of two superintendents changed it three, four, and ten years ago respectively; one altered it six years ago; while the other did it seven years ago.

The three superintendents who changed it twice did it as recently as one, two, and three years ago. Among the two

who did it three times, one modified it as recently as one year ago, while the other did it two years ago.

Summary and Analysis

There is a general consensus among superintendents that the role of the principalship has changed. It has changed because the duties and responsibilities of the position have increased and its authority has diminished. How did the superintendents identify these changes? They identified them by observing the changes in the daily functions performed by their principals. In other words, superintendents relied on their perceptual judgments to note the changes.

They did not evince possessing the necessary skills or knowledge that would help them plan, develop, and implement a more objective and scientific procedure to decipher more accurately the changes and corresponding trends that are and will be occurring within the principalship. Patently, the need for such a system is not considered urgent by superintendents. As long as the burden of initiating and achieving professional growth appears to rest with the principals and not the superintendents, it may be a long time before superintendents will direct their efforts to construct and use a more sophisticated procedure. This supposition can be further supported by noting the eighteen and twenty-two superintendents, respectively, who said that they did not see any reason for changes in the type of programs offered or in the planning process for such programs. They obviously did not see a need

to do much about the fact that societal and legal changes have serious implications for principals. Whether this absence of a plan for professional development is due to subjectivity, expediency, ignorance, expense or other reasons, the superintendents manifested once again the lack of importance that they have attributed to this task.

For further evidence to support their lack of attention that superintendents have given to identifying and to acting upon future trends, it is imperative to study and to review what, specifically, superintendents have done in terms of modifying the job descriptions of their principals so that they reflect the projected changes in the principalship. In this particular study, nine superintendents revised the job descriptions of their principals within the past two years. However, eleven superintendents changed these job descriptions more than three years ago. Three superintendents did not even bother preparing a job description. When superintendents are almost in total accord that the principalship has and is constantly changing, and when approximately two-thirds fail either to keep these descriptions current or to even prepare such descriptions, then it is quite clear why superintendents would encounter difficulty in being cognizant of the skills their principals would need in the coming years. Certainly, planning programs for unknown skills is no simple task.

During the time that the superintendents were discussing the changes occurring within the principalship, thirteen

superintendents indicated that principals had to acquire a skill other than the five they had initially listed as most essential. However, there were only three new skills mentioned by the thirteen superintendents and all three can be found among the original twenty-five skills. Therefore, none of these skills was new in the sense that it was previously unidentified by some other superintendent. Moreover, there is no doubt that a portion of these superintendents recited these new skills without ever engaging in any previous and serious study on this topic--especially when one takes into consideration that most superintendents had not spent any time revising their principals' job descriptions for more than three years. It is conceivable that the failure on the part of superintendents to study regularly and revise the job descriptions of their principals is responsible for approximately one-half the superintendents being unaware of any additional skills that their principals should acquire. This failure can be attributed to such factors as apathy, priority, or to the alleged fact that the skills initially identified are adequate to meet the new functions or responsibilities of the principal. It is difficult to discern what rationale is applicable to this situation.

In reviewing the data relative to planned programs, less than half of the superintendents, eleven to be exact, have planned developmental programs to meet the role changes that they have cited in the principalship. Ten superintendents

have not planned any programs, while three superintendents have planned programs that are totally unrelated to the changes they have noted in the principalship. Therefore, while every superintendent has observed changes in the principalship, less than one-half are doing anything concrete about these changes because of the reasons cited in the previous paragraphs. When more than fifty percent of the superintendents fail to consider the changes taking place in the principalship when they are planning future programs, then it is obvious that the fifth critical question must be answered with an emphatic no.

Question VI: Retention Factor

Do superintendents apply the results of the developmental or instructional programs that they offered to their principals in deciding who to retain or who to dismiss?

Item 31

How many years have you served the district?

The exact distribution of the twenty-four superintendents in terms of the number of years that they have been employed by their respective school boards as superintendents is revealed in the following table:

Table 6SUPERINTENDENTS' TENURE IN DISTRICT

<u>No. of Years as Supt.</u>	<u>No. of Supts.</u>	<u>No. of Years as Supt.</u>	<u>No. of Supts.</u>
One	1	Eight	1
Two	3	Nine	2
Three	2	Twelve	2
Four	3	Thirteen	1
Five	3	Fifteen	1
Six	2	Sixteen	1
Seven	1	Seventeen	1

By perusing this table, it can be noted that the range in years of service is from one to seventeen, with three-fourths of the superintendents having less than ten years of experience. Another way of interpreting this table is to say that half the superintendents have served the district for six or more years.

Item 1

How many of the currently employed district principals did you interview as prospective candidates for their position?

The range in the percentage of currently employed principals who were interviewed by their present superintendent is broad. That is, the range extends from eight to one hundred percent. This wide diversification that exists among the twenty-four superintendents in having the opportunity to interview their present principals can be shown more vividly by the following distribution table:

Table 7PRINCIPALS EMPLOYED DURING SUPERINTENDENTS' TENURE

<u>Percentage of Principals Interviewed</u>	<u>No. of Supts.</u>	<u>Percentage of Principals Interviewed</u>	<u>No. of Supts.</u>
8%	1	57%	1
10%	2	66%	3
18%	1	70%	1
20%	1	80%	2
25%	1	83%	2
29%	1	86%	2
33%	1	88%	1
38%	1	100%	2
40%	1		

It can be readily ascertained from this table that almost three-quarters of the superintendents interviewed at least one-third of their principals. Whereas, more than half of the twenty-four superintendents, thirteen to be exact, interviewed two-thirds of their principals. At the upper limits, it can be said that three-eighths of the superintendents interviewed at least four of every five principals who were employed in their district.

Item 2

How many of these principals whom you interviewed were employed by the board of education because you (superintendent) wanted them?

There was not even one instance cited by any of the twenty-four superintendents whereby their respective boards of education refused to endorse and employ their recommended candidate(s) for the principalship. Obviously, the superintendents filled all principal vacancies with candidates of their own choosing.

Item 32

How many principal vacancies has the district had in the last five years or since you have been here if it is less than five years?

The following table not only discloses what percentage of principal vacancies occurred in the past five years within the twenty-four districts but, also, it reveals how many school districts had a similar percentage of vacancies:

Table 8PRINCIPAL VACANCIES WITHIN THE LAST FIVE YEARS

<u>Percentage of Principal Vacancies</u>	<u>No. of School Districts</u>	<u>Percentage of Principal Vacancies</u>	<u>No. of School Districts</u>
8%	1	33%	1
9%	1	40%	1
10%	1	43%	2
13%	1	50%	4
14%	1	66%	2
17%	1	75%	1
20%	2	80%	1
25%	1	86%	2
30%	1		

The above data indicates that three-quarters of the school districts had a minimum of twenty percent vacancies within the past five years. Almost half of the districts, ten of the twenty-four, had vacancies in more than half of their principalships within that time period. Also, it is important to note that not a single district avoided any turnover among their principal staff. In other words, change in personnel occurred. The difference that existed between school districts was the percentage of change.

Item 33

Why did the former principals leave their position?

Within the last five years or within a shorter period of time for those superintendents who had less years in office, there were thirty-nine and one-half percent change among the principals in the twenty-four school districts. That is, of the one hundred eighty-seven principalships in the twenty-four school districts, there were seventy-four changes within that span of time.

Seventeen superintendents attributed thirty of the seventy-four changes to principals seeking and obtaining another job that they considered more desirable. These thirty principals willfully sought other positions according to their superintendents. Whereas, twenty-six principals were advised to seek other employment by their superintendents. There were thirteen superintendents who offered this kind of

advice. Of the remaining eighteen changes in the principalship, eleven superintendents said that fifteen of them were an outgrowth of principals retiring from their jobs, while three superintendents mentioned three principals leaving their positions to work on their doctorates full time.

Item 34

Where are they currently employed and in what capacity?

The thirty principals who sought and gained other employment are currently holding positions that can be categorized into seven job titles. More than one-third of these principals or twelve principals have accepted a principalship in another school district. Thirteen principals are presently working as school administrators. One is responsible for special education; two of them are curriculum directors; six are assistant superintendents; while five are serving school districts as superintendents. Of the remaining four principals, two are college instructors, and two have positions outside of education. One is an elected township supervisor; whereas, the other one is an insurance salesman.

Among the twenty-six principals who were advised to seek other employment by their respective superintendents, it is interesting to note that they have secured one of six positions. However, there are six superintendents who are unaware of what kind of job eight of their former principals are holding, leaving eighteen principals whose whereabouts are known. For instance, eight principals have returned to

the classroom as teachers; whereas, five have gained employment as principals in other districts. One principal has become a high school dean, while another one has accepted an assistant principalship. The remaining three principals are working as district administrators. One former principal is a business manager; whereas, the other two principals are administrative assistants.

The superintendents were not cognizant if any of the fifteen principal retirees were currently working for a salary in some other capacity. The three principals who returned to graduate school on a full-time basis are still actively involved in pursuing their degrees.

Item 35

Are there any principals whom you would like to replace on your current staff? Why?

Exactly one-half or twelve superintendents mentioned that they have a combined total of fifteen principals whom they would like to replace. Why? As one superintendent aptly said, "Everyone brings happiness to an organization--some by entering and some by leaving." The superintendents wanted these fifteen principals to leave and, thus, restore happiness to the organization because they felt these principals had specific skill deficiencies. The skill that was cited seven times was the human one, with leadership and drive mentioned three times respectively. Decision-making and knowledge were cited twice, while loyalty, communication, conflict resolution, and technical skills were stated once. However, there

were three superintendents who opted not to disclose the reasons for their desire to replace one of their principals.

Two of the superintendents who felt that they did not have any principals who warranted replacement disclosed thusly their rationales for their positions on this matter. One superintendent said that you only replace a principal when you know someone who is better. The other superintendent emphasized the fact that the worst performer in one group could be the best performer among the members of another group. Both superintendents were expressing similar rationales. Obviously, both superintendents were hesitant to replace principals. What is more difficult to ascertain is whether either of these two rationales were espoused and practiced by the other ten superintendents who showed similar restraint in replacing their principals.

Summary and Analysis

The information collected clearly shows that the vast majority of superintendents--twenty of the twenty-four--have served their respective school districts for three or more years. This length of time is certainly ample for superintendents to implement developmental programs for principals and to consider what these programs contributed to each principal's professional performance and growth. Thus, five-sixths of the superintendents have been on the job long enough to include these findings in determining what will be the future employment status of their principals.

Not only has the superintendents' tenure in office been adequate for rendering this kind of decision, but the decisions to be made would affect a large segment of the principals whom the superintendents were primarily responsible in hiring. That is, seventeen superintendents had personally interviewed and recommended at least one-third of their principals for employment. During the interview or pre-employment period, it is likely that superintendents became quite knowledgeable of the strengths and weaknesses of a sizable proportion of their staff of principals. In other words, prior to employing many of the principals, superintendents had some idea what capabilities each of them possessed. This foreknowledge should have provided the superintendents with a valuable source of information in making prudent decisions about the kind of programs that could be most helpful to these principals. The benefits derived from these programs should certainly affect the future employment of these principals in the school district. Acquiring similar information about the remaining principals whom the superintendents did not interview should have been pursued and attained as well. Why? Because prior to deciding whether to retain or to dismiss a principal, it is essential for the superintendents to project what this principal is capable of achieving. To make this projection, the superintendents need to know what strengths or weaknesses the principal possessed prior to as well as after his or her participation in developmental programs.

However, being cognizant of each principal's professional growth and performance is not sufficient in and of itself in determining each principal's future status within the school district. What the superintendents need to accompany this information is the discretionary power to exercise whatever options or decisions they want implemented. Without this power, the superintendents are rendered ineffective and their information becomes useless. In discussing discretionary power with the superintendents, it was ascertained that not one superintendent encountered any difficulty employing the candidate of his choice to one of the principalship vacancies. Whether the superintendents have comparable discretionary powers in retaining or in dismissing principals is a moot question. On the other hand, it would seem relatively safe to assume that in the majority of cases the board members who permitted the superintendents to hire their personnel would grant similar powers for dismissing personnel. If this were not the case, then the superintendents did an excellent job in misrepresenting the situation during the interviews.

Given that the superintendents had sufficient time to incorporate a developmental program, and given that they had the discretionary power to retain or to dismiss principals, what needs to be ascertained at this time is the manner or method used by the superintendents to exercise this power. The data reveal that every superintendent experienced at least

one principal leaving his staff. Further study indicates that thirty-three principals left willfully, while twenty-six left involuntarily. Almost all of the thirty-three principals who left voluntarily are gainfully employed in positions where they enjoy greater status and remuneration; whereas, just the opposite has occurred among the twenty-six principals who were encouraged to leave. It is extremely difficult to determine what, if any, influence the superintendents had on most of the thirty-three principals who sought and attained different positions. However, it can be said with some degree of confidence that the superintendents used their discretionary power, directly or indirectly, to dismiss the twenty-six principals. In fact, there were thirteen superintendents who were responsible for the dismissal of these principals and an additional seven superintendents who revealed that they currently are employing principals whom they would like to dismiss. As an aside, five of the thirteen superintendents also admitted having individuals serving as principals whom they would like to replace. Thus, twenty of the twenty-four superintendents either have dismissed or would like to dismiss members of their principals' staff.

Of the thirteen superintendents who dismissed principals, six of them did not provide principals with an opportunity to attend programs that stressed any of the five skills that they initially stated as imperative for the principalship. Five superintendents provided their principals with programs

that emphasized one such skill, while two superintendents offered principals developmental programs that stressed two skills. The seven superintendents who indicated the desire to replace principals on their current staff did not fare much better in terms of offering their principals appropriate programs. Namely, two superintendents did not offer any programs with the appropriate corresponding skills; three superintendents offered their principals programs that addressed themselves to one skill; one superintendent's programs incorporated two skills; while the last superintendent's programs included three skills. Half of the twenty-six principals dismissed were not offered any opportunities by their superintendents to acquire one of the five major skills. Furthermore, it was ascertained and stated in this paper that superintendents do not evaluate the developmental programs and/or services that they have offered to their principals. Consequently, as a result of the lack of skill development programs that have been offered to principals, and the corresponding lack of objective methods in assessing these programs, it becomes obvious that superintendents do not use the outcomes of developmental programs to determine the retention or the dismissal of their principals. Whether they do not use these outcomes because they lack expertise and interest in properly interpreting them is speculative, but warrants serious consideration. Until some external or internal agency or public body imposes these demands on superintendents, there probably

will not be any evidence of professional growth and genuine concern in utilizing the outcomes of developmental programs for rendering decisions on the future employment of their principals. Therefore, the answer to the sixth and final critical question is an emphatic no.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

It has been the purpose of this study to analyze how superintendents fulfill their instructional role in their efforts to improve the professional competency and the job performance of their principals. Subject to the limitations of this study, certain conclusions may be stated:

1. Most superintendents can specify but they are unable to justify at least five professional skills that are needed by their principals to fulfill the role of the principalship.
2. Most superintendents do not ascertain the degree of development that each of their principals have achieved in reference to the five professional skill areas that they have cited for the principalship.
3. Most superintendents do not provide their principals with programs and/or services in these five professional skill areas.
4. Superintendents do not formally and objectively evaluate programs and/or services that they have provided for their principals.
5. Most superintendents do not take into consideration the changes that they foresee for the principalship in the immediate future when they plan developmental programs and/or services for the coming academic year.
6. Superintendents do not apply the results of the developmental or instructional programs that they offered to their principals in deciding who to retain or who to dismiss.

The above six conclusions strongly indicate that most superintendents have not implemented, in a comprehensive and effective manner, the six instructional steps comprising the developmental process for principals. In summation, although the findings reveal that the superintendents experienced no difficulty in identifying five professional skills needed by their respective principals, the findings do indicate a failure on the part of superintendents to record and to include these skills within their job description for principals and to identify collectively three common and substantive skills for principals. Thus, through their deeds, superintendents have not only communicated a lack of importance attached to these skills, but, more importantly, they have transmitted serious doubt about identifying the most essential skills.

However, their failure is not confined to the first instructional step. It manifested itself in the second step as well. It surfaced when the data disclosed the failure of superintendents to ascertain the degree of development achieved by their principals within the professional skills they had cited in step one. Failure to find the degree of skill strength and/or deficiency of their principals made the task of the superintendents difficult in determining what skills needed immediate attention; what developmental programs should be offered; and where they should begin instruction in terms of the level of skill proficiency being demonstrated by their principals. Moreover, the

failure of superintendents to diagnose the degree of skill development among their principals is partially responsible for most superintendents not providing developmental programs in the professional skills that they identified and for superintendents not being able to evaluate the effectiveness of programs they did offer to their principals. It must be understood that program evaluation cannot be achieved without the superintendents knowing the degree of skill mastery attained by their principals prior to introducing a particular program.

Regarding the detection of role changes in the principalship--an occurrence that could alter the kind of skills that will be needed by principals and the kind of programs that should be provided for them--it was duly noted that every superintendent observed such changes. However, almost half of the superintendents failed to identify any new skills needed by principals to accommodate these changes, while more than half the superintendents failed to provide programs that would assist principals to better prepare themselves for these role changes. It certainly appears that superintendents expect their principals to prepare themselves for these changes without anticipating any help from them. Compounding these problems is the failure of superintendents to upgrade and to change the developmental programs by keeping them relevant and current for their principals.

Considering that superintendents have failed in each of the previous five instructional steps, it becomes axiomatic that they do not possess the necessary information to apply the results of the developmental programs that they offered to their principals in deciding who to retain or who to dismiss. Each instructional step is dependent upon the one that comes before it; consequently, failure to implement properly any of the instructional steps will guarantee the failure of all subsequent steps.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The one inescapable phenomenon constantly confronting mankind is the phenomenon of change. Whether man proacts or reacts to change is not pertinent to this discussion. The pertinent point is that man must respond to change because his very survival depends upon it. Relating this concept to the topic of this paper, nothing escapes the force of change--not even the principalship. Keeping principals prepared to perform their daily functions effectively, especially when many of those functions are in a state of flux, is indeed a difficult task but a task that must nevertheless be fulfilled. By whom? By the individual who is responsible for the total operation of the school district, namely, the superintendent. How does he do it? Basically, he would use the same techniques and strategies that are employed by any competent instructor who has been given the responsibility of teaching a group of people specific skills

and/or knowledge. The importance placed upon superintendents for performing this task well is obvious. Therefore, as a result of this study and in an attempt to further assist superintendents with this task, the following recommendations are being made:

1. Superintendents should allocate an adequate amount of funds from their school budgets to defray whatever costs are incurred in instituting and in maintaining an ongoing developmental program for their principals.
2. Superintendents should prepare a written job description for each of their principals, taking into consideration each principal's performance style.
3. Superintendents should annually review and revise, if necessary, their principals' job description so that they can maintain an up-to-date list of professional skills and knowledge needed by their principals in fulfilling their roles in a competent manner.
4. Superintendents and principals collectively should translate into behavioral terms the professional skills and knowledge that principals must acquire.
5. Superintendents should devise performance appraisal systems that are reliable, valid, job-related, standardized, and practical for assessing their principals professional skills and knowledge.
6. Superintendents and principals collectively should compare the results obtained from the performance appraisal systems that were devised for principals with the list of professional skills and knowledge that was translated into behavioral terms. The discrepancy that exists between the latter list and the former systems will serve to identify the training needs of each principal.

7. Superintendents and the staff or principals should select developmental programs that will serve the needs (the discrepancy found between the list and the appraisal systems) that the entire principal staff has in common.
8. Superintendents should work cooperatively with each principal in selecting developmental programs that will address themselves to the professional deficiencies exhibited by the principal. These deficiencies are determined by implementing recommendation number six.
9. Superintendents and principals should select primarily programs that require principals to take an active rather than a passive role.
10. Superintendents should give principals repeated opportunities to practice what they have learned.
11. Superintendents should ascertain from participating principals their reactions and feelings toward a particular developmental program. These reactions should be procured through the use of a questionnaire that covers those program factors considered by each superintendent to be pertinent and relevant.
12. Superintendents should administer to the participating principals the performance appraisal system that was used prior to the latter's involvement in the developmental program. The results of the appraisal system should be compared to the prepared list of professional skills and knowledge. The purpose of making this comparison is to note any discrepancies between the findings obtained from the appraisal system and the prepared list. Then, the discrepancy noted prior to the introduction of the program should be contrasted to the differences, if any, that exist presently. In this manner, developmental programs can be evaluated on the basis of the growth experienced by each principal in his/her target areas. Moreover, a general program assessment can be rendered by analyzing the progress made by each principal in the remaining non-targeted professional skill and knowledge areas.

13. Superintendents should utilize the findings obtained by implementing recommendation twelve to determine whether a principal should be retained or dismissed.
14. Members of the board of education should compel each superintendent to review annually what has transpired within the six steps of his developmental process for principals. Moreover, the board members should demand that the superintendent support and justify whatever information he discloses regarding this matter.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The role of superintendents in helping their principals provide the highest quality of professional service at their respective attendance centers is critical. Consequently, there is a need to ascertain if the findings of this study would be substantiated for larger groups in different geographic areas. Because of the need to recycle principals so that they can enhance their professional skills beyond what they normally would have been able to acquire through on-the-job experience, there is an added need for further research in relation to these questions:

1. What techniques or strategies can be used to acquire the necessary data to justify the selection of a specific number of professional skills needed for the principalship?
2. What are the perceptions of principals concerning the thoughts possessed and actions taken by their respective superintendents, regarding this six-step developmental process?
3. How can superintendents identify future forces or trends that will be impinging or will be affecting the future role of the principalship?
- ✓ 4. What constitutes desirable skill-related programs that effectively train the participating principals in acquiring and in applying said skill, and how are these programs implemented?

5. How do board members perceive the instructional role of superintendents in the developmental process and what effect does their perceptions have on their acceptance of the entire developmental process?
6. What is the role of colleges and universities in developing skill-related programs for principals and in helping the principals with the practical applications of the skill?
- ✓7. What is the role of principals in providing ways for improving the professional skills of teachers?

The bottom line for any educational institution is the quality of its instructional program as measured by the competence exhibited by its students. Therefore, anyone who is responsible directly or indirectly with student learning is an important cog in the educational process. It is just common sense then to make every effort to maintain and to update constantly the professional skills of this cadre of personnel. As one ancient and wise Greek said, "The individual whom you shall associate with and call teacher, will dictate the kind of lessons you shall learn." Consequently, those individuals who are fulfilling the role of a teacher--regardless of the level of instruction--have a tremendous responsibility. They must continue to strive for excellence in performing their duties. By working toward excellence, they become involved in a never-ending process--a process whereby each participant constantly finds himself in a developmental state. As long as man continues to strive for excellence, the developmental

process will be a subject for continuous study. In this context, the implications for the instructional leadership role of the superintendent are as obvious as they are crucial.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Books

- American Association of School Administrators. How to Evaluate Administrative and Supervisory Personnel. Executive Handbook Series, Vol. IX. Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1977.
- American Association of School Administrators. Inservice Education for School Administration. Report of the AASA Commission on Inservice Education for School Administration. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1963.
- Hall, Eugene R. Training Effectiveness Assessment. Orlando, Fla.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 137 390, 1976.
- Harris, Ben M. and Bessent, Wailand. A Guide to Better Practice. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Heyel, Carl, ed. The Encyclopedia of Management. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1973.
- Kowski, Frank and Eittington, Julius. The Training Methods Manual. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 132 372, 1976.
- Lazer, Robert I., and Wikstrom, Walter S. Appraising Managerial Performance: Current Practices and Future Directions. New York: The Conference Board, (1977).
- McIntyre, Kenneth E. Selection and On-the-Job Training. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1960.
- Parisi, Aurora, "Employee Terminations." In Handbook of Modern Personnel Administration, pp. 65-1, 65-14. Edited by Joseph J. Famularo. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972.
- Pharis, William L. The Elementary School Principalship in 1968. Washington, D.C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA, 1968.
- Sarason, Seymour B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

II. Periodicals

- Bobroff, John L., Howard, Joan G., and Howard, Alvin W. "The Principalship: Junior High and Middle School." NASSP Bulletin, Volume 58, Number 381 (April, 1974), 54-61.
- Brown, Charles E. "The Principal as Learner." The National Elementary Principal, Volume 53, Number 5 (July/August, 1974), 19-22.
- Houts, Paul L. "A Conversation with Keith Goldhammer." The National Elementary Principal, Volume 53, Number 3, (March/April, 1974), 27-34.
- Keller, Arnold J. "Inside the Man in the Principal's Office." The National Elementary Principal, Volume 53, Number 3 (March/April, 1974), 20-26.
- Miskel, Cecil G. "Principals' Attitudes Toward Work and Co-workers, Situational Factors, Perceived Effectiveness, and Innovation Effort." Educational Administration Quarterly, Volume 13, Number 2 (Spring, 1977), 51-70.
- Moser, Robert. "The Leadership Patterns of School Superintendents and School Principals." Administrator's Notebook, Volume 6, Number 1 (September, 1957), 1-4.
- National School Board's Association. "How School Boards Are Evaluating Principals." The American School Board Journal, Volume 163, Number 7 (July, 1976), 24-25.
- St. John Walter D. and Runkel, James A. "Professional Development for Principals: The Worst Slum of All?" The National Elementary Principal, Volume 56, Number 4 (March/April, 1977), 66-70.
- Wagstaff, Lonnie H. and Spillman, Russell. "Who Should Be Principal?" The National Elementary Principal, Volume 53, Number 4 (July/August, 1974), 35-38.
- _____. "Will Diplomas Need To Be Renewed?" Futurist, Volume 10, Number 2 (April, 1976), 112-113.

III. Unpublished Materials

Austin, Doris Jean. "The Changing Emphasis in the Role of the Elementary Principalship Between the Years 1963 and 1973." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1976.

Grant, William Watson. "A Model for the Inservice Education of School Administrators Within the State of New South Wales, Australia." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1970.

APPENDIX A

TWENTY-SIX SCHOOL DISTRICTS

<u>District</u>	<u>Village</u>	<u>Elementary Schools</u>
87	Berkeley	10
88	Bellwood	8
89	Maywood	12
97	Oak Park	10
99	Cicero	11
100	Berwyn	7
101	Western Springs	6
102	La Grange	6
103	Lyons	13
109	Justice	6
111	Burbank	12
117	North Palos	6
123	Oak Lawn	10
130	Blue Island	9
143 $\frac{1}{2}$	Posen	7
144	Markham	9
146	Tinley Park	6
147	Harvey	6
148	Dolton	7
149	Dolton	7
152	Harvey	9
158	Lansing	6
161	Flossmoor	7
162	Matteson	8
163	Park Forest	11
170	Chicago Heights	11

APPENDIX B

PROBE QUESTIONS FOR SUPERINTENDENT'S INTERVIEW

SKILL REQUIREMENT FACTOR: To identify the most important professional skills that the superintendent associates with the principalship, as well as his rationale for selecting these particular skills.

- Question:
1. - How many of the currently employed district principals did you interview as prospective candidates for their position?
 2. How many of these principals whom you interviewed were employed by the board of education because you (superintendent) wanted them?
 3. Can you cite the five most important professional skills that you have attempted to assess about a prospective candidate for a principalship during the interview process?
 4. Can you rank order each of the five skills cited, from the most to the least critical?
 5. Why did you rank them in that order?
 6. Are these professional skills included or inferred in the job description for principals? (Why not?) If inferred, please explain.

ASSESSMENT FACTOR: To ascertain the strategy used by the superintendent in measuring, in analyzing, and in disclosing the professional skills of principals.

- Question:
7. How often do you assess principals?
 8. What methods, strategies, and/or techniques do you use to assess the degree of development that your principals have attained in each of the five stated professional skills?

9. How do those methods, strategies, and/or techniques help you identify the degree of professional skill development of your principals in each of the five skill areas?
10. What are the pronounced or more obvious skill deficiencies that your principals evince among the five professional skills?
11. What are their obvious skill strengths among the five skill areas? (If the superintendent is unable to cite a common deficiency or strength among his principals, then the superintendent will be asked to assess each principal in terms of questions ten and eleven).
12. How do you communicate your findings to your principals? Why do you employ that particular method? If you don't reveal your findings, why not?

ACTION FACTOR: To determine what superintendents are doing to help principals improve their professional skills and to ascertain how and why they are doing it.

- Question:
13. What kind of programs and/or services can a superintendent provide for principals that would help principals strengthen their skills in each of the previous five mentioned areas?
 14. Do these services and/or programs for principals serve other purposes?
 15. What kind of programs and/or services have you provided for your principals in the past two years?
 16. How were these programs and/or services planned for the principals?
 17. How is the principal's time adjusted to attend these programs and/or services?
 18. What, if any, Board of Education policy exists that encourages principals to improve their professional skills?

19. What incentive or rewards, if any, exist for principals who participate in programs and/or services geared toward skill improvement?
20. Are those programs and/or services provided for principals by the superintendent included as part of the school board's total evaluation of the superintendent? Why? How?

EVALUATION FACTOR: To identify the process used by superintendents in judging programs and/or services offered to principals, particularly those programs and/or services that they consider effective.

- Question: 21. How would you assess the effectiveness of each of these programs and/or services that you said could be provided for principals?
22. How did you assess the effectiveness of each of the programs and/or services that you, in fact, did provide for your principals?
23. Can you identify those programs and/or services that you have found to be most effective in attaining the desired results?
24. What, in particular, made these programs and/or services more effective than the others?

ADJUSTMENT FACTOR: To disclose what, if any, thoughts the superintendent possesses and plans he has implemented, regarding current and future changes in the principal's professional skills and in-service programs.

- Question: 25. Do you feel that the principalship in your district has changed or remained stable during your tenure in office?
26. What programs and/or services are you currently contemplating or planning for your principals in 1977-78 school year? Why?

27. What, if any, changes in professional skills do you foresee for principals within your district in the near future? Why?
28. How will these changes alter the type of programs and/or services that you will be offering to principals in the future?
29. Do you think that there will be any changes in the planning procedure for these future programs and/or services?
30. How often has the job description of the principalship been revised? How recently?

RETENTION FACTOR: To determine the amount of personnel stability that exists in the principalship within the district and to analyze the reasons for this occurrence.

- Question:
31. How many years have you served the district?
 32. How many principal vacancies has the district had in the last five years or since you have been here if it is less than five years?
 33. Why did the former principals leave the district?
 34. Where are they currently employed and in what capacity?
 35. Are there any principals whom you would like to replace on your current staff? Why?

APPENDIX C

CRITICAL SCOPE QUESTIONSRELATIVE TO THE SIX PROBE FACTORS

1. Do superintendents specify and justify at least five professional skills that are needed by their principals to fulfill the role of the principalship?
2. Do superintendents ascertain the degree of development that each of their principals has achieved in reference to the five professional skill areas that they have cited for the principalship?
3. Do superintendents provide their principals with programs and/or services in these five professional skill areas?
4. Do superintendents evaluate the programs and/or services that they have provided for their principals?
5. Do superintendents take into consideration the changes that they foresee for the principalship in the immediate future when they plan developmental programs and/or services for the coming academic year?
6. Do superintendents apply the results of the developmental or instructional programs that they offered to their principals in deciding who to retain or who to dismiss?

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by James Alexander Paziotopoulos has been read and approved by members of the Department of Education.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

January 8, 1979
Date


Signature of Advisor