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This study is divided into three sections. The first researches the techniques used to train and develop top-level business and corporate executives. The second part researches the techniques used to train the elementary and secondary school principal. The third part applies the findings to design a program by which school principals may be trained to lead their school as a top-level executive would their business or corporation.
INTRODUCTION

The American system of education depends largely for its functioning, if not for its survival, on the effectiveness of its school principals. The rigorous environment of school demands that today's principals be all things to all people. They must manage, delegate, direct, communicate and lead. They must do all of this, and still contribute to an expanding curriculum. They must be more than educators; they must be educational executives.

The term "executive" is defined by Peter Drucker (1976), as "the person in the organization who is responsible for a contribution that affects the capacity of the organization to perform and to obtain results."

An effective school executive can be the key to the success or failure of the entire school program. If a school has a reputation for excellence in teaching, if students are performing to the best of their ability, one can almost point to the principal's executive abilities as the key to success (Goodladd 1979).

Numerous changes in social and educational conditions have resulted in increased demands and pressures on the
school principal of the 80's. These changes have taken place so rapidly that school principals find themselves presently operating under a management system which has become obsolete. This causes the school principal to find himself experiencing a serious management overload (Owens and Steinhoff 1976).

This overload results in the erosion of the principal's attention to the most important aspect of his position; the instructional program. A growing list of studies (Eidell and Kitchell 1968) shows that close attention of principals to the educational program results in improved student learning. It is therefore important to student accomplishment that the performance of the principal not be handicapped by obsolete or ineffective management techniques (Austin 1979).

According to a study done by The National Association of Secondary School Principals Task Force on Modern School Management (1979), "the way out of the maze of new demands and competing pressures is for principals to upgrade and renew their techniques. ..."

The development of effective school executives however, does not happen as a matter of course, and should not be left to chance. Few principals become first-rate executives simply because of their work experience. For most,
the development of executive ability is a carefully guided process.

School principals and researchers and their spokesmen in government agree there is a need for professional training for school principals. The Secretary of the Department of Education, T. H. Bell, recognizes the importance of executive development for school principals. He states:

Our schools cannot be any better than the kind of leadership we give them. The single-most important thing we can do for education is to renew, retrain, and revitalize the school principal who has been in the field and needs the opportunity to regenerate his capabilities" (The School Administrator, Vol. 31, November 1978).

Don Davies (1976), consultant to the United States Office of Education, describes the unfortunate state of professional development for school principals as the "slum of education; disadvantaged, poverty-stricken, neglected, psychologically isolated, riddled with exploitation, broken promises--and conflict" (St. John and Runkel, 1979).

What are the reasons for this? State and national studies conducted during the last five years consistently suggest that even though training is available, a majority of school principals is not satisfied with current training and development programs (Miller 1977; Pharis 1976; McNally 1975).
Principals consistently report the following in programs now available: poor planning and organization, activities that are impersonal and unrelated to the day-to-day problems of principals; lack of participant involvement in planning; unclear objectives; lack of follow-up and evaluation; theory-based rather than reality-based programs; ignoring of adult learning characteristics; rigid and arbitrary requirements; out-of-date programs not pertinent to current trends; lack of quality and professionalism.

Nicholson (1976) concluded that the continuous professional training of school principals can be characterized by these statements: (1) What does exist is not very helpful; (2) There is very little hard research on what constitutes a "successful" program.

It would seem that the professional development of the practicing school principal needs assistance. A remedy may be found by examining the successful executive development strategies used by corporate and business executives.

For more than a quarter of a century, corporate and business companies have utilized university-sponsored executive development programs for the professional development of their top executives (Watson 1979). Research consistently points to the success and validity of these programs (Anshen 1964; Watson 1979; Andrews 1969).
Corporate and business organizations have found that executive development of their top executives is the key to their organization's ability for profit, productivity, and growth (Watson 1979). "The professional development of our top executives is the best investment we can make towards our organization's ability to successfully produce profits" (G. H. Trinkler, Vice-President of I.B.M., 1976).

Andrews (1969) concluded that executive development programs for corporate and business executives sponsored by universities (1) meet the goals and objectives they set out to accomplish; (2) have developed "standards" by which other executive programs are designed; and (3) demonstrate their success by continuing to attract organizations, despite financial and time expenditures.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to develop guidelines for a university-sponsored residential executive development program for school principals. The program would (1) adapt strategies of existing university-sponsored residential executive development programs for corporate and business executives, and (2) meet the professional training preferences of school principals.

The objective was to provide researched data which can be used by school districts, universities or inservice
coordinators in the development of professional programs for school principals.

Significance of the Study

The most important educational issue of the future is certain to be the most important educational issue of the past: how to improve the performance of the children who attend the public schools.

The school principal is the chief operating executive of the school; consequently the ultimate responsibility for the performance of the instructional program rests upon the principal.

It is the principal's job to establish and implement operating procedures for the administration of the school in order that it may achieve its goals and objectives. The degree to which these goals and objectives are accomplished effectively is in large measure a reflection of the principal's professional ability.

Methodology of the Study

A careful review of the literature was conducted in order to establish the guidelines for a program of executive development for school principals. The following questions guided this review:

1. What is executive development?
2. What does existing research say about the need for executive development on the part of school principals?

3. What does existing research say about the professional training preferences of school principals?

4. What do the business executive and the school principal have in common?

5. What are the methods used by corporate and business organizations in the professional development of their executives?

6. Are there differences between corporate professional training and the practicing school principal's professional training?

7. What are the characteristics of university-sponsored programs of executive development for corporate and business executives?

8. Can the successful strategies of corporate training and school principal training needs be adapted to form a professional development program for school principals?

Based on the review of the literature, the business and corporate training strategies were adapted and applied to the researched training preferences of school principals. These data provided a basis to develop guidelines for a
university-sponsored residential executive development program for school principals. The guidelines constitute the third chapter of this dissertation. This chapter is written in popular publishable form and is entitled Executive Development for School Principals: Application of the Literature Review. Because this chapter stands on its own merits, the reader need not read the whole dissertation to understand the chapter. The chapter provides: (1) General Information on Executive Development; (2) Executive Development Program Guidelines; (3) Program Summary. The objective of the chapter is to provide future program planners with the researched material and data necessary to develop programs.

Assumptions

This dissertation is based upon a number of explicit assumptions:

1. There is a direct and significant relationship between the effectiveness of the school principal and the quality of the educational program.

2. A positive change in the performance of school principals will result in a corresponding positive improvement in the educational effectiveness of the school.

3. The qualifications for school principal participation consist of: demonstrated excellence as a
classroom teacher, and high achievement in educational leadership of a school.

4. Universities have unique potential for marshalling the necessary resources to implement programs which can serve the professional development of school principals.

Limitations

1. Although much of the research of this study can be applied to other school administrators, the design of the program is limited to the school principal.
2. No attempt will be made to investigate programs for corporate executives other than those sponsored by universities.

Summary

This chapter has provided introduction of one problem to be studied, the purpose of the study, the methodology used to study the problem, and the assumptions and limitations of this study.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature in the areas of:

1. The school principal as an executive.
3. The professional training preferences of school principals.
4. The executive development methods used by corporate and business organizations.
5. The design and coordination of university-sponsored programs of executive development for corporate and business executives.
6. Executive development pre-training; training; post-training activities.

The School Principal as an Executive

This section examines the role of the school principal as an educational executive.

Definition of the School Principal

The California Department of Education, School Effectiveness Study (1977) finds the principal to be the
most important and influential adult in any school. He is responsible for all activities that occur in and around the school building. It is the principal's leadership that sets the tone of the school, the climate for learning, the level of professionalism and morale of teachers, and the degree of concern for what students may or may not become. The principal is the main link between the community and the school and the way he performs in that capacity largely determines the attitudes of parents and students about the school. If the school is a vibrant, innovative, child-centered place, if it has the reputation for excellence in teaching, if students are performing to the best of their ability, one can almost always point to the principal as the key to success.

Daman (1978) states:

Education theorists are placing a great deal of emphasis on the school principal. They are finding what good principals have known all along; that it is not the critics or the central office people or the university people who really make schools what they are; it is whoever lives in the principal's office.

Ruben Ingram (1979) states:

One of the keys to an organization's success is the proximity of its leader to the scene of the action. Generals must be near the front; corporate presidents must be on top of sales, production, and profits. In the same way, education's executives must be responsible for instruction and the programs designed to further it.
Ingram (1979), Jentz (1979), and Houts (1975) find the schizophrenic nature of the principal's job (instructional leader on the one hand, site manager on the other) requires both executive responsibility and executive authority. "In effect, principals, have to be the chief executives of their schools. As such, they become the ultimate quality control officers for the school and its program."

According to the California Department of Education School Effectiveness Study (1977), "executive" implies that no outside assessor, monitor, or evaluator can understand and judge the effectiveness of any facet of the school as well as the principal can.

Educators are beginning to view the individual school as the proper unit for educational change. Many are looking to the principal to become the influential agent of change within that unit. Attention has shifted to the school principal because effective principals make better schools (Gorton and McIntyre 1978).

Drucker (1974) states that no enterprise would seriously consider the appointment of a chief executive who did not have sound management skills. In fact, the ability to collect and assess accurately all information about the organization's progress towards fulfillment of its goals, and to make critical judgements resulting in sound decisions, are the two primary functions of an executive.
Davis (1974) finds that superintendents and school boards are becoming increasingly aware that neither they, nor their central office staff can directly supervise and control programs and activities at individual schools. Indeed, many superintendents and school board members would be happy to relinquish the authority to the building principals, provided the principals demonstrate that they have executive ability.

Goodladd (1979) finds the principalship can be challenging, exciting and rewarding. The job provides a unique opportunity to foster planned change and growth. An effective educational executive can organize a school for instructional improvement and within one year see positive pupil change (Beech and Radliff 1963).

Management Training and School Principals
This section examines management training on the part of the school principal, and explores the current condition of professional development for the school principal.

Reasons for Management Training
Many principals are being asked to manage a host of new educational programs developed at the state and district levels, and to develop school-level programs in response to local needs. At the same time, they are asked to share the
decision-making process with parents, students, teachers and community members. In a survey of school principals, the Public Education Commission of San Francisco (1976, p. 7) found these changes in responsibility are not always met with support and assistance from school districts, county superintendents of schools, or universities. Some principals are facing an increasingly complex role with limited opportunities to gain requisite skills, receive management technical assistance, or share ideas and resources with others. The degree to which principals feel supported, directly affects his ability and willingness to make decisions and bear risks.

The Public Education Commission of San Francisco (1976, p. 20) states:

The Principals interviewed were unanimous in stating that they needed outside help and training to do their jobs better, especially if their authority is broadened to include budget discretion and planning. A practical program was preferred over the typical in-service programs currently available.

The California Study on the Effectiveness of Schools (1977, p. 16) reports the management effectiveness of the school principal is directly related to pupil achievement, pupil attitudes toward school, teacher morale and parent satisfaction. Although management effectiveness is essential to effective schooling, principals surveyed did not feel their management training was adequate to develop the
skills and abilities necessary for effective school leadership.

Many school principals were trained prior to the current emphasis on school improvement, cultural pluralism, community involvement, educational opportunity, special education, student rights, and collective bargaining (Daman 1974).

The need for continuous professional development and retraining is a product of the times. Knowledge is expanding with explosive force, and tremendous professional and technological advances are being made. Even with the successful completion of the best formal doctoral program in educational administration, no principal can hope to acquire all of the necessary competencies and skills for effective performance in a time of such rapid change (Amato 1978). Preparation programs for the school principal cannot be realistically expected to produce a "finished product."

Interestingly, Fisher (1965) found that newly certified principals are in as much need of professional development as are those principals who received their preparation ten or more years ago.

In the 1978 survey of 1,600 principals conducted by the University of Utah for the National Association of Secondary School Principals, fully one-quarter said they
intended to quit by the end of the school year. Worse yet, the very best principals are quitting at an even higher rate. At the beginning of the survey, researchers singled out sixty exceptional principals. By the end of the year, one-third of this group had resigned.

A primary reason given by the departing principals is the frustration of facing situations for which they are poorly equipped. These principals are highly motivated but lack the managerial skills necessary to effectively approach the challenges of the present-day educational executive. A common request of this group is for effective continuous training to provide them the self-assurance and ability to counter current problems.

The National Association of Secondary School Principals (1980, p. 22) found that factors most frequently cited for leaving the principalship involve job conditions more than personal or community circumstances. They include the following causes, which are followed by the percent of respondents listing them: excessive time demands (56.5); emotional health (52.5); heavy work load (50.4); desire for change (40.8); fatigue (37.0).

The Montgomery County School system in Maryland, concerned by the spiraling responsibilities of its principals, decided to make systematic observations to determine what principals did all day. The study revealed:
(1) By far the greatest percentage of principal's time (58%) is devoted to the category of Management responsibilities.

(2) Instructional Leadership responsibilities occupy the next largest portion of principals' time during the school day (17%). However, the time spent in this category is less than one-third of the amount spent on Management responsibilities.

(3) Nine percent of the principals' time is devoted to Public Relations.

(4) Liaison responsibilities occupy nearly as much time (8%) as Public Relations.

(5) Outside Professional Activities, Personnel Activities or activities which involve a combination of other areas of responsibility--each occupies less than 5% of principals' observed school-day time.

(6) Management responsibilities outweigh all other categories of responsibility, in terms of actual numbers of activities in terms of percentage of distribution of time.

(7) On the average, a Management task is performed every eight minutes in the eight-hour school day, an Instructional Leadership task about once every 45 minutes, a Liaison task only once every four hours, and a Personnel activity less than once every three hours.

(8) Management tasks are of the shortest duration, lasting only five minutes each, on the average. Thus the greatest portion of a principal's time is divided among many brief management activities.

(9) Liaison activities last the longest--(19 minutes on the average).

(10) Staff evaluation activities last relatively longer on the average (17 minutes), particularly in senior high (26 minutes).
(11) Personal activities last only seven minutes on the average. Principals were generally observed to spend only between five and ten minutes eating lunch or taking a rest break (1975).

This analysis of principals' duties and time-use patterns suggests a fragmentation of principals' time and the number of tasks which consume it. Each day is spent moving from place to place, from problem to problem, making immediate, ad hoc decisions. The studied concluded:

The principalship has become a very complex and demanding job. A principal is called upon to meet responsibilities in a dozen or more discernible areas during a typical school day. Further, there is little opportunity to devote uninterrupted attention to a single activity without interference from competing demands (1975).

Given the exacting expectations and the range of intense pressures under which a principal must work, it is hardly surprising that many feel inadequate (Jackson 1977). Many live in fear that a puff of wind will demolish the precarious house of cards over which they preside. Some resort to slavish duplication of the system's job description, seeking to shift responsibility for their behavior to the central office. Others play it safe and take their legal responsibilities more seriously than their educational obligations. Many see themselves as glorified plant managers, who maintain order, maximize production, and minimize dissonance. And, like teachers, many feel guilty because
they know they are not doing—and cannot do—what is expected of them. Few are able to shape the job as much as it shapes them (Goldhammer, 1967).

Managing schools is a larger job today than it was in the past. School management bears little resemblance today to the traditional image of the "principal teacher." For example, it is estimated that the principal's job in 1979 has expanded to include approximately twice the volume of expectations for principals serving in 1969 (NASSP 1980). Principals find themselves running harder than ever just to stay even with the total load of expectations and responsibilities they carry.

The Management Task Force of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (1979) found that perhaps more serious, in the long run, is the erosion of time away from attending to the educational program. Management overload interferes with educational leadership. Managing a school must not become so demanding that the instructional program becomes a stepchild, crippled by inattention. An overburdened principal constricts a school's potential for performance.

When asked what changes would make the principalship more effective than it is at present the principals in the (1979) NASSP study collectively expressed the need for
professional training on modern management, staff evaluation, program evaluation, and current trends and issues. This was based upon the changes that have taken place in the principal's role. The school principal requires management, planning, legal and evaluation skills that were not anticipated a decade ago.

Keith Goldhammer (1967) points out what he views as a growing need for sabbatical and other long-term leaves of absence and training to provide the busy administrator with time for study and contemplation.

Damon (1974, p. 50) concludes that professional development for school principals can encourage and enable principals to consider more global and philosophical concerns than they might otherwise. Moreover, without this development, principals cannot realistically be expected to keep up with research, try out new ideas, or formulate alternative answers to educational problems.

Barth (1980) proposed that the most important single thing a school district could do to improve its school would be to permit or, if necessary, require its administrators to engage in well-planned programs of professional development.

The administrator who wishes to remain up-to-date cannot depend on chance or informal arrangements; he must seek the best possible means of continuing his education.
Under the circumstances it is quite likely that in the 1980s professional development for the practicing administrator will equal preservice education in importance (Goodladd 1979).

Current Condition of Professional Development for School Principals

Purkerson (1977, p. 14) found that despite state and district efforts, a successful and comprehensive model for professional development of school principals does not exist.

A study by Lutz and Ferrante (1972) reveals most continuing education programs to be spasmodic rather than programmatic; unrelated to the assessed needs of practicing administrators; focused too narrowly on the technical and tactical aspects of the job; inadequately financed; undertaken without planning, implementation, and evaluation that is essential to high yield; packaged into inconvenient delivery systems; and usually not patronized by a significant percentage of administrators. They conclude professional development is one of education's imperative needs, without which any administrator is likely to become obsolete.

Bellon (1970) finds most school districts are notoriously stingy in allocating funds for professional development. School administrators are dependent on their own time
and money resources to sustain their professional development. School districts place professional development of their administrators last on the priority list.

Damon (1978, p. 46) states that few principals are given sabbaticals or released time to work in education-related areas, to catch up on professional reading, conduct investigations, or visit and travel. Once the principal has been given one chance for professional development, the school district sees no need for follow-up support.

Damon (1978) also finds a majority of school districts are not providing principals with any kind of professional development program other than the administrative cabinet, or council meetings. Within strained budgets, funds for travel to conferences and conventions are eliminated—thus curtailing even this meager source of professional development.

Austin (1979) and Barth (1980) report that among the hundreds of inservice offerings by different institutions and agencies, there is a lack in coordination and planning. The administrator is forced to pick and choose, and he soon finds duplication of effort, lack of continuity, and sometimes even conflict of interest among the agencies and institutions, each of which—ironically enough—is attempting in its own way to help make him a better admini-
strator. He ends up, in effect, finding no inservice program at all, only inservice activities.

The entire United States Office of Education budget for fiscal year '75 directed less than 1/2 of 1 percent of the total available funds to administrative renewal. Lutz and Ferrante (1972) suggest that educational institutions should follow the lead of American business and view expenditures, both in time and money, allocated to professional development, as a valuable investment in the quality of education.

Lutz and Ferrante (1972) describe some creative continuing education programs across the country. Nevertheless, they did not find a large number of these programs in operation. If one is looking for a single program to serve as a model for the creation of new and innovative programs for continuing education of school administrators, little of value can be learned by reviewing present practices.

Lutz and Ferrante also state:

Given the lack of needed research and planning, present continuing education of administrators does not even approach the beginning stages of a science. There is a great deal more interest in implementing programs for continuing education than in developing and testing training models, or for that matter, generating data necessary to prepare continuing education packages to help solve educational problems (1972).
Goldhammer (1967) report that rigorous studies on the effectiveness of inservice education are rarely reported, thereby forcing those involved with inservice training to speculate concerning the mistakes that they or others may have made in instituting their educational programs. Failure to relate inservice programs to the genuine needs of principals, failure to select appropriate activities for implementing program plans and failure to start inservice program activities with sufficient staff and other resources to assure program effectiveness are cited as the major problem areas.

The American Association of School Administrators (1977) found there is little formal statewide or regional dissemination of principal training information. Traditional inservice principal training programs are of random orientation and are limited in effectiveness. In addition, there is a need for greater statewide interaction between institutions of higher education and school districts in providing preservice and inservice teacher training.

**The Professional Training Preferences of School Principals**

This section investigates the training preferences of school principals.

William Davis (1976) surveyed 305 school principals, randomly selected from six states; 205 responded to the
Inservice Training Preferences Survey. The following percentages of principals scored as preferred or strongly preferred on a Likert scale:

A. The Climate of Receptivity for Inservice Programs

Approximately 91% of the 205 principals are receptive to attending an inservice program.

Similarly, 89% of the respondents said they were willing to devote at least three days each year to inservice programs; nearly half were willing to devote between three and five days.

B. Factors Which Have Hindered Participation in Inservice Programs

Of the 48% of principals who stated they had not attended as many inservice programs as they would have liked to attend, 45% felt that their job responsibilities would not permit any additional absences while another 29% blamed this occurrence on their inability to locate a program which was scheduled at times they could attend.

Thus, according to the 205 principals, the scheduling of inservice programs has been a major obstacle to their more widespread participation.

C. The Scheduling of Inservice Programs

Seventy-nine percent of the principals preferred that inservice programs be scheduled during
the school year; eleven percent preferred that programs be held during summer vacation. January, February, and November were identified as the months which would be most convenient for the principals to attend inservice programs. June, December and especially May were cited as the least convenient times. Moreover, 74% of the respondents preferred that programs be held during the working day.

In this regard, 77% of the principals estimated that they could obtain at least three days of released time per year which they could devote to their inservice education. Indeed, among the principals, 38% felt provision of released time was a factor which strongly affected their decision to attend an inservice program.

Seventy-one percent of the participants preferred intensive programs. Furthermore, 53% of the respondents indicated that an intensive program should last no longer than three days, while an additional 45% felt it should last no longer than five days.

D. Location of the Program

Since time is a valuable commodity to an educational administrator, travel time should be cut to
a minimum unless an additional traveling distance brings extra benefit to the program.

Whether the program site is located near or far, 62% of the respondents felt that an attractive location was more than an inconsequential feature of an inservice program.

E. Learning Activities

Of the principals surveyed, 51% selected the discussion technique as the preferred mode of instruction; indeed, all but 12 principals (6%) either preferred or strongly preferred this option.

Over 50% of the respondents preferred or strongly preferred simulation, film, and case study techniques.

On the other hand, role-playing was most frequently cited being least preferred (93%), followed by supervised reading (20%), and gaming (12%). An examination of the above-cited preference patterns suggests that the principals wish to take an in-depth, non-passive role in their own learning.

Although strong support was given to groups of 11 to 15 (29%), a group of 6 to 10 people was the most preferred size for a discussion group. Fifty-seven percent of the principals stated they would
feel most comfortable and learn most effectively in a program designed for 10 to 36 participants.

Finally, 65% of the principals felt the above-mentioned instructional activities should be led by a school administrator with scholarly ability. An additional 19% preferred that "in-house" directors of staff development should serve as the program's principal trainer while only 12% felt that this responsibility should be given to university professors.

F. Reward and Motivation

When asked to select the most attractive of nine frequently employed features, principals most frequently mentioned the presence of a recognized and experienced scholar in the field (30%). Other features which were highly valued were "wide-spread participation by peers," "obtaining released time," and "school district credit for pay purposes."

The least valued feature was a certificate of achievement. Perhaps surprisingly, "received university credit" found little support. This surprise is augmented by noting that 31% of the principals were pursuing or soon planned to pursue an advanced degree.
Requested Improvements in Professional Development

Purkerson's (1977) findings agree with Davis. The personalization of inservice programs was found to be very important. Purkerson notes that the usual inservice programs were often felt to be the antithesis of what is needed to satisfy the basic needs of principals. He concluded that an enrichment center is needed where it is easy for the individual to consume what is important to him while he is there.

When Purkerson asked how inservice training in general might be improved, most of the respondents felt that:

1. Inservice Training should be directly related to the principals;
2. Inservice Training should be more practically oriented;
3. More time should be made available; and
4. Quality of the program should be improved.

Knezevich (1969) also emphasized principal involvement in both the planning and the execution of inservice programs. The major trend in future training will be the individualization and personalization of principal education programs. As Goodladd (1979) suggested, forward-looking boards of education have recognized that unless
adequate means are provided for their administrators to keep abreast of the new developments and demands of a changing society, quality education will have to suffer.

The State of Colorado Department of Education Task Force on Administration Renewal (1975) found these characteristics to be significant in professional development programs for school principals:

1. Individualized to the greatest possible extent.
2. Related to one-the-job concerns of the administrator.
3. Related to school improvement needs by the individual administrator.
4. Based on small group and individualized learning process.
5. Follow-up activities supported and encouraged by school districts.
6. Based on improved performance on the job as opposed to only providing administrators with new information.

The State Department of Education, California Administrator Survey (1979) found these deterrents to professional training:

1. Time demand by other activities and responsibilities.
2. Content not related to primary administrative assignment.
3. Scheduled for weekends.
4. Too "pooped" to participate.
5. No compensatory time offered.

Those which were rated as being significantly less of a deterrent were:

1. Insufficient course credits.
2. No course credit offered.
3. No salary increments resulting from participation.
4. A feeling that program in general is not worthwhile, lack of support from their superior, and attitudinal "climate" in the office not conducive to taking program.

The National Academy for School Executives (1980) recommends that executive development programs assist the school executive to comprehend more fully the constantly changing social environment of educational systems, agencies, and institutions. Offerings should prepare principals to respond quickly and meaningfully to critical problems and issues, to focus on the stresses and challenges and even some impossibilities facing the school principals. School principals have, in effect, asked for professional development that helps to clarify everyday problems and develop skills to deal with them.

After studying several authorities, Wofford (1978) identified several needs for professional development of school principals. Principals want helpful, nonjudgemental,
nonpunitive assistance in sorting out, reflecting on, and sharpening professional practice. They want help in becoming more secure about their values, goals, ideas, and practices so that they can act forcefully, consistently, and confidently.

Second, but equally important, they want sound managerial skills, including the classic functions of planning, organizing, coordinating, controlling, and evaluating specifically related to the primary goal of school instruction.

The primary motivating factor that spurs administrator interest in professional development is the quality of the program. Questioned most often is the ability of the program to keep principals aware of the skills and competencies they need in order to feel confident about their leadership and management effectiveness.

**Corporate and Business Executive Development Methods**

This section explores the process of executive development. The importance of executive development for executives has long been recognized and proposed by management expert, Peter Drucker. He states (1976):

Executive development of the effective executive is central to the development of the organization, whether it be a business, a government agency, a research laboratory, a hospital, or a military
service. It is the way toward performance of the organization. As executives work toward becoming effective, they raise the performance level of the whole organization. The raise the sights of people—their own as well as others.

As a result, the organization not only becomes capable of doing better, it becomes capable of doing different things and of aspiring to different goals. Developing executive effectiveness challenges directions, goals, and purposes of the organization. It raises the eyes of its people from preoccupation with problems to a vision of opportunity, from concern with weakness to exploitation of strengths. This, in turn, wherever it happens, makes an organization attractive to people of high ability and aspiration, and motivates people to higher performance and higher dedication. Organizations are not more effective because they have better people. They have better people because they motivate to self-development through their standards, through their habits, through their climate. And these, in turn, result from systematic, focused, purposeful self-training of the individuals in becoming effective executives.

Definition of Executive Development

Executive development is an activity focused on those individuals, primarily professionals (Barnard 1938), who have risen successfully to top managerial positions within various organizations. The key intended outcome is that the individual manager will be able to improve his managerial and personal skills to accomplish more effectively various organizational goals and objectives (Andrews 1969).

Usually an individual participating in an executive development program has already demonstrated his individual
skills and talents to the extent that he is already a successful and effective executive. Here success means that the individual has risen to the top or near the top of his organization, usually by applying certain qualitative and quantitative skills acquired from experience and professional education (Andrews 1969). On the other hand, effectiveness relates to the individual's ability through his skillful utilization of others to successfully attain the organization's goals and objectives.

Peter Drucker (1974) explains that executive development does not just happen as a matter of course, and it cannot be left to chance. Very few people become first-rate executives simply because of their experience in one position. For most people, the development of executive ability is a carefully guided process.

Executive development cannot succeed if its aim is to dramatically alter personalities or values and beliefs (Drucker 1974). Attempts to completely remake someone's personality nearly always fail because most people are resistant to this sort of change. However, executive development can help people to behave effectively in various situations and to consciously apply sound management practices.

Knowles (1978) finds executive development to be a deliberate process. It will flourish in an organization
where top management believes in it, supports it, and rewards it. Most important, it involves individual desire and commitment. Executive development is self-development. People may receive careful guidance and necessary developmental opportunities, but they must choose to improve if change is to occur.

What Executive Development Can Do

When conducted properly, management training can begin a period of reflection and development by giving the individual new perspectives about and insights into himself and others, organizational relationships, and the school environment.

In a survey, Crotty (1974, p. 84) identified the following five major reasons for the use of management development programs.

1. They broaden the manager's vision and understanding in preparation for additional responsibility.

2. They provide the manager with the latest information on business theory and practice.

3. They stimulate a more creative and innovative approach to problem solving and decision making.

4. They give the manager the opportunity to discuss ideas and problems with other business people.

5. They allow the manager to reflect upon and assess his or her career development and work role.
Powell and Davis (1973) conducted a survey of organizations using university management development programs. This study measured the degree of importance of the various reasons given for using these programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Program Utilization</th>
<th>Importance Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadens the individual's interests or awareness—i.e., widens her or his business perspectives.</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposes an already competent manager to new hypotheses or avenues of management thought.</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepares the individual for greater responsibility but not necessarily for promotion.</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides management training or education to an individual who was promoted through technical channels.</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits managers to interact and compare problems/solutions with managers in other areas.</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepares the individual for imminent promotion.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides an opportunity for subordinate development while the supervisor attends a program.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checks competency of potential successor.</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum score = 8
Minimum score = 1
Average of possible scores = 4.5

Watson (1979, pp. 11-12) finds that management training can produce important benefits which, even if not
considered miraculous, do have substantial value—including the following:

1. It can communicate to managers corporate philosophy, policies, procedures, rules, and standards. For example, it can acquaint lower-level managers with top management's posture with regard to specific issues. It can teach people how to follow merit-rating procedures or how to handle expense vouchers, and it can acquaint managers with company standards of performance. In short, management training can provide managers with a great amount of information which is necessary and helpful to the smooth functioning of the organization.

2. It can teach managers how to determine the consequences of various specific managerial actions and behaviors. For example, it can teach managers the consequences different leadership styles will produce given certain situations and types of employees. It can teach managers what kinds of results occur when organizations have goals and plans and when they don't have them. It can teach them the consequences of various types of organizational designs and arrangements given particular conditions, and it can teach managers which tools are appropriate for stimulating performance under various conditions. Most importantly, it can provide managers with useful diagnostic tools for assessing the significance and implications that various forms of behavior will have in specific situations.

3. It very often gives people the opportunity to check out their thinking with other managers and to compare the ways in which they define and solve problems. Managers frequently see this exchange of ideas with their peers as one of the most beneficial aspects of a training program. Sometimes managers find it reassuring to learn that others handle similar situations much like they do.

4. It can stimulate thinking and provide new and deeper insights to the managers. Management training involving face-to-face discussion among
attendees benefits managers as they expose one another to perspectives and views previously not thought of, understood, or even valued. Information-giving aspects of training will usually acquaint managers with new concepts. With these inputs, along with opportunities for expression, problem-solving experiences, and case-study assignments, minds are challenged and creativity is unleashed. These conditions usually stimulate imagination and thinking processes to probe to new depths previously unencountered. This also helps establish both a pattern and the will to continue thinking creatively after formal training has ended.

5. It can get managers to look at themselves and to understand how and perhaps why they perceive themselves, others, and situations as they do. It can teach managers to become more aware of themselves and others and to increase their awareness and sensitivity to and understanding of the significance of these behaviors.

6. It can teach managers new practices. Exposure to examples of successful management practices can provide managers with useful models to pattern their behavior after. It can teach managers, for example, how to read a balance sheet, how to conduct a performance appraisal interview, how to handle emotional employees, how to follow problem identification and problem-solving procedures, etc. It can teach the managers skills in listening, in problem-solving, in explaining concepts, in writing memos, etc.

7. It can change the manager's attitudes. To some extent training has been successful in changing the managers' attitudes toward new management practices such as participative management, discipline, motivation, and so on. Management training has not succeeded in remaking personalities, brainwashing people to new philosophies, or changing inferior managers into superior ones; but it has succeeded in changing people's opinions on a limited basis.

8. It can help cause people to choose to change their behavior and become better managers.
Executive Development Efforts

Activity in the area of executive development training has mushroomed during the past 40-45 years. Today, few major companies do not provide training for their managers and supervisors.

The comment made by Monroe J. Rathbone (1965, p. 44), former President and Chairman of the Board of Standard Oil of New Jersey, is typical of the belief held by corporate leaders, that management development is crucial to their organizations' success:

One of the most important jobs of any executive of any branch of our business, either our affiliated companies or any of our departments, and right on up to the board level and the chief executive level, is to perpetuate the best possible quality of management, because a corporation has an unlimited life, and its success is heavily dependent upon the quality of its management.

Management turns over, dies, and goes on to other places, so that you have to keep it moving, keep it alive, keep it creative. And this doesn't just happen. Certainly 15 percent, I think, of the time of most of the higher executives is spent developing people, identifying people, planning for their future development.

Plantly and Freeston (1979) stated that business and industry have found the most important function of executive development is to enable executives who are already involved in the day-to-day activities of management to see a pattern in what they are doing and its relation to the other activities of the company. Second, executive development should
upgrade the executive in knowledge and understanding of his current field of activities, not so much to teach him new techniques, but to enable him to make policies, to plan, direct and control better within that area. Third, a development program should prepare the executive for greater responsibilities by widening his horizon.

The business and corporate world recognizes managerial obsolescence as one great handicap. This is why the IBM corporation is reported to have more classroom space than a university of 30,000 students. Indeed, successful businesses invest approximately six percent of their annual budget in staff development (Watson 1979). Businesses have found that the professional development of their top executives is the key to their organizations' ability for growth, productivity, and profit.

Company Objectives. The purposes for which organizations send executives to development courses may be as varied as the number of candidates attending programs. However, five major reasons stand out (Andrews 1969):

1. To broaden the manager's vision and understanding, thus preparing him for additional responsibility.

2. To provide the executive with the latest information on business theory and practice.

3. To stimulate a more creative and innovative approach to problem solving and decision making.
4. To give him the opportunity to discuss ideas and problems with other businessmen.

5. To allow the manager to reflect upon and assess his career development and work role.

The continuing and growing utilization of executive programs by companies appears to be related to the "professionalization" of the practice of business (Andrews 1969). There is a realization that the job of the manager is becoming more complex and demanding. There is a growing scientific attitude toward management problems within many firms --managers find it necessary to keep current in the latest managerial and organizational theories and practices. For this reason, increased corporate attention is being given to the task of developing its management personnel. University executive courses are being adopted as one component of the company's total management development program, according to these firms (Bricker 1960).

University-sponsored executive development programs offer managers an opportunity to exchange ideas, discuss current problems, and visualize the future with both academic faculty and business peers in a relatively pressure-free environment (Anshen 1964, Argyris 1956). The continuing and constantly increasing demand for these programs demonstrates the positive evaluation made by American business and industry (Andrews 1969).
Executive development programs at universities are not viewed as distinct islands of learning separate from all other forms of management development. Companies report that they attempt to integrate these programs into organization's total management development activity. While internal training programs are centered upon scientific training needs, the university programs are broader in perspective. This outside educational activity is also used in conjunction with such informal management development techniques as job rotation, executive committee work, and special assignments.

Effects of University Executive Development Programs.

Bricker's (1976) examination of university programs finds:

1. University executive development programs are not for "problem cases." They simply are not geared for psychiatric therapy.

2. They should not be used as a "reward" or as a sort of "vacation" for deserving, but no longer "moving" executive.

3. The candidate should be consulted about the choice of program, and should know why he is being sent to one, and what he is expected to get out of it.

4. The participant should be totally relieved of his day-to-day responsibilities while he is attending the program by seeing that these responsibilities are properly delegated to another executive--preferably one who will need to experience some practical executive development.

5. A participant gets out of one of these programs just about what he puts into it.
Chandler (1962) finds university programs:

**PROS**

1. Permit exposure to a wide variety of perspectives and practices (this is especially true when there are plenty of opportunities for face-to-face interaction outside of class).

2. Offer opportunity for participants to get away from their company and to contemplate problems, issues, and own management practices and philosophy from a fresh perspective.

3. Provided the "right" outside courses exist and care has been taken in matching people with programs, there is sometimes a greater chance of meeting individual training needs.

4. Bring new perspectives to the firm from various sources.

**CON**

1. Can be "canned" materials and not entirely applicable to the needs of the audience.

2. Sometimes more expensive to send many managers away than it is to have an in-house program.

3. Sometimes difficult to fully know what the course will contain and involve beforehand, thus making the selection of programs a difficult task.

Miner's (1965) examination of the effects of university training programs led him to the following conclusions:

1. Almost all of the research studies done on the impact of management development offer positive evidence of change.

2. There is enough consistency among these results to offer substantial proof of the ability of management development programs to bring about certain types of changes.
3. The most frequently caused changes are the acquisition of human relations attitudes and problem solving skills.

Campbell et al. (1970) reviewed the empirical studies of training effects and revealed the following:

1. Approximately 80 percent of the empirical studies done on the effects of general-management and human-relations programs revealed that these programs yielded significant results.

2. There is reasonably convincing evidence that training and the laboratory method do induce changes in the back-home setting.

Selection of Participants. Corporate organizations find the selection of participants to be critical to the success of the development program. The training effort is usually thought of as preparation for advancement. An effective development program should help organizations fill their present posts more effectively.

Andrews finds university residential participants are selected by their corporations as representing executive material. Only three percent are self-initiated. Andrews (1969, p. 106) makes this statement:

Choosing a man for attendance at any university program is an important message to him and his associates. By and large, it is and probably should continue to be, regarded as a mark of recognition and notice to a man that the time has come when detailed knowledge of a single phase of the business is not enough.
The men who attended and regarded their selection in this light, Andrews (1969) found, in a survey of 6,000 participants, viewed their selection as a harbinger of advancement, a recognition of achievement, and an opportunity for development. The suggestion that further schooling was desirable was hardly ever regarded as criticism; apparently, the university programs have never been thought of as remedial.

Alfred Drucker, Vice-President, Management Development of I.B.M. Corporation (1979) states: "Only selected managers should attend higher level developmental classes. Men who attend should have the drive, ambition, and potential to insure that the dollars spent will pay a return."

Firms indicated the primary consideration in the selection of a candidate was his potential for growth and upward movement within the firm (Argyris 1956). Thus, in one sense, executive development programs are a convenient prepromotional training vehicle but not, of course, a necessary prerequisite to an executive's progression within the firm. Most of the firms are adamant in their claim that university programs not be used as a means for "straightening out" an ineffective manager. It is believed that this problem rests with the firm's management and should not be a reason for sending a man to a university program.

**Length of Training Programs.** Length of program requires that the participant be completely relieved of his job responsibilities during his attendance at the executive
development program. In most cases these responsibilities are formally and temporarily assigned to the candidate's subordinates. These men are designated in some firms as back-up men, assistant managers, or "junior comers." If there is no such person available or qualified, the work may be assumed by the candidate's superior or reassigned to men on the same peer level in the company.

Runkel and McGrath (1972) have demonstrated that the length of programs affects the seriousness with which the program is viewed by the participants. Programs of executive development put emphasis on the length of the program. The minimum length of time is two weeks and maximum is sixteen weeks. The longer the program the greater the impact.

Preparation for the Program: Individual Motivation

"To get full value from a management training course, you have to send the right man to the right school at the right time for the right reason," says Clarence B. Randall (1970), leading industrialist. In an article summarizing views and experience of industrialists, deans of well-known schools of business, and others with experience in executive training of personnel, he states:

1. Put formal training courses in proper perspective as a small, but potentially vital, part of the company's over-all executive development strategy.
2. Select candidates with great care, and make sure the courses they attend are suitably matched to their levels of experience and their specific development needs.

3. Prepare them in advance to get maximum benefit from their training.

4. On their return put them in jobs that will give them full opportunity to practice the new skills and concepts they have learned.

The specific preparation of a candidate for university programs is unique to each organization. In most, the candidate reviews the purpose of the program with either his superior or the management development director. The candidate is told what to expect during the executive course. Before taking the course, the candidate reviews with former program participants their experiences in the program. Also, most of the firms advise participants that they will be expected to prepare an evaluation of the program upon their return to the company (Bricker 1976).

**University-Sponsored Programs of Executive Development**

This section examines the design and coordination of university-sponsored executive development programs for corporate and business executives.

**General Description**

During the past half-century, collegiate schools of business have enjoyed a meteoric rise in the field of higher
education. A vigorous offshoot of this branch of learning has been the attempt to meet the demands of adult business education through the development of evening and extension courses, special conferences and institutes, and university-sponsored executive development programs.

Most of the growth in university-sponsored executive development programs has taken place since 1950. Of the major U.S. programs currently offered by universities, only three were in existence prior to 1950: M.I.T. in 1931, Harvard University in 1943, and the University of Pittsburgh in 1949. In 1954, there were 17 programs operating in 15 different universities. By 1977, growth in the numbers added to 45 programs in 39 Canadian and United States universities (Bricker 1976).

In a study of 45 programs, Bricker (1976) found they met the following criteria:

1. The program is offered by a recognized U.S. college or university.

2. It is a special program not open to regular students.

3. The duration of the program is at least two weeks but less than a full academic year.

4. It is a resident, live-in program requiring full-time participation and study.

5. It is a broad-coverage, general management program offered to middle and/or senior-level personnel.
6. It is not developed for a specific industry or a specific organization.

7. It is offered at least once a year on a non-credit basis.

The duration of these executive programs varies from a minimum of two weeks to a maximum of sixteen. Thirty programs representing 66% of the total, spanned a period of two to four weeks. Each program offers a somewhat different approach to the content studied and to the manner in which it is coordinated and presented to the participants.

Program Objectives

At first glance, an examination of university program brochures suggests that the objectives (purposes, aims, and goals) of executive development programs are similar (Bricker 1976). This is attributable to the style in which the brochures are developed. They are written in broad and all-encompassing terms without statements of quantifiable result-oriented goals. Moreover, most schools do not limit themselves to one or two specific ends but instead outline many purposes for this relatively short educational experience. Undoubtedly, the multiplicity of listed program objectives is designed to reflect the complexity of a busy executive's duties, problems, and responsibilities—or at least the university's comprehension of his need relative to the complexity of his work.
Review of stated program objectives reveals the universal existence of two common goals (Bricker (1976):
- To make generalists out of specialists;
- To increase the executive's effectiveness through exposure to current decision-making communication, and behavioral science findings.

Although the statements of program objectives seem similar, most programs attempt to provide a special emphasis or direction. Specific university orientation is most evident in the interrelationships between three program features: (1) the stated program objectives, (2) the admission requirements, and (3) the content or subject matter of the program. It is only in combination with the last two features that the skeleton of an executive development program, as presented in the written objectives, takes on the appearance of a unique and meaningful educational entity.

Bricker's (1976) study further leads to the following generalizations:

1. Universities base their programs on these assumptions regarding the business executives to whom their courses are addressed:
   a. He rarely has time to reflect on his work life and his performance as a manager.
   b. He is a specialist in his functional area.
   c. He has little or no time on the job to acquire competence in or an appreciation for other functional areas of the company.
d. The higher he moves within the firm, the more cognizant he must become of the organization's external environment.

2. Because they are based on these assumptions, university programs concentrate on broadening the participant's perspective. It is the degree and manner in which the particular university attempts to enlarge the executive's point of view that is the unique feature of its program.

Bricker (1976) found, in general, the executive is urged to look beyond his daily activities and to think in an ever-enlarging way about self-development, management, the company, the industry, the national economy, society, and world problems. Specifically, the course is designed to place the executive in an environment where he can:

1. Examine his own strengths, motives, and weaknesses.
2. Evaluate himself as a decision maker.
3. Reflect on his managerial performance.
4. Develop a company-wide point of view.
5. Analyze the economic concepts fundamental to the success and growth of the business community.
6. Understand the legal and political perimeters within which business and industry function.
7. Struggle with the question: What is the obligation of a competitive, profit-oriented enterprise to a society suffering from social problems and crises?
8. Explore the effects of international, political, and economic affairs on the economy and, in turn, on the businessman.
Andrews (1969) finds that university executive program bulletins, corporate development directors and writers on the subject seem to agree on these reasons for the use of university programs by companies, government agencies, and other organizations:

1. University programs have, as their primary objective, to broaden the manager's vision and understanding in preparation for taking on additional corporate responsibilities. This is what sets the university residential program off from the rest of management development programs. It aims to increase understanding rather than simply to add to information or skills. It aims to make generalists out of specialists and to place the corporation in the broader perspective of society. This is the justification for the prolonged absence from the job and for the necessity of withdrawing to an academic atmosphere.

2. In the same vein, the university residence program aims to provide executives with the time and resources with which to reflect their own development, and their role in the organization. The executive is urged to develop a broad, company-wide point of view. This objective is better accomplished away from the day-to-day pressures of the executive's present job assignment.

3. University programs also aim to provide managers with the latest information on business theory and practice. It is the combination of theory and practice that makes the university program valuable. The trend may be toward more practice and away from theory, but on the whole the better university programs have found a mixture of the two that seems to have satisfied both academicians and business practitioners.

4. The better university programs are designed to stimulate the creative abilities of executives and to cultivate innovative approaches to problem solving and decision-making.
5. Finally, the programs are intended to give the executive the opportunity to discuss ideas and problems with other executives.

Organization and Administration

Bricker (1976) and Andrews (1969) found that most university executive development programs are sponsored by collegiate schools of business administration. Where universities have a distinct graduate school of business, the program is administered through that organization. In other instances, departmental units of business colleges, such as centers for management education or a unit within the dean's office, assume the responsibility for the organization and administration of the program. Most schools have an executive program director.

Program Schedule

Most program directors try to schedule program sessions in such a way as to allow for a maximum amount of faculty-participant interchange. There are, of course, numerous possible combinations of sessions. The majority of programs schedule presentation/discussion sessions during the morning hours. The afternoon schedule varies from one presentation to reading or group discussion assignments. The evenings are also utilized in various ways. In some programs, certain evenings are set aside for special seminars.
or for participant concentration on some phase of self-development. In other programs the evenings are devoted
to small-group discussions centered around case studies or
business simulation exercises. Generally, the longer the
course, the more flexible and varied the schedule (Watson
1979).

Physical Facilities

This section examines the physical facilities used
in programs of executive development for corporate executives.

Setting. Physical setting and layout of the confer-
ence center will affect the outcome of the training--the
training facility should be located in a setting which is
free from the pressures, annoyances, and distractions that
are typically encountered in the course of a busy work day.

Participants should never be crowded too closely
together in meeting rooms or around table configurations
that are too spread out or bunched too tightly together
(Bass 1966). When seated at a table, the average person
needs a minimum of thirty inches of table space.

Residence. Many universities have built modern,
on-campus continuing education centers. These centers are
self-contained, air-conditioned units providing sleeping,
eating, conference rooms, study and certain recreational
facilities, all under one roof. The decision to use other-
than-university housing is usually based on the superiority of the hotel or motel over existing on-campus housing in terms of air-conditioning, lounges, sleeping rooms, bathrooms, and private dining facilities.

West (1979) states it is common practice, regardless of housing facility used, to allocate an entire building or one or more floors for the exclusive use of the program participants. Lounge and study facilities are almost always available in the building. Executives who attend these programs are often required to share rooms with other participants. Some program administrators feel that this sharing helps to build cohesiveness in the group. In more than half of the programs, however, single rooms are available.

Facilities also include a working desk, TV, radio, coffee-maker, and direct-dial telephone and message light.

Dining Facilities/Lounge Areas. For the most part, members of an executive development program eat in private dining rooms reserved for their use, usually located in the building where they live.

Areas adjoining the meeting room should provide a pleasant and quiet atmosphere. There should be ample restroom facilities nearby for men and women. There should be a smoking area, where participants can congregate, relax, and chat. Telephones should be available, as well as message
boards near the meeting room where announcements and messages for participants can be posted. A coat rack should be conveniently located (Bass 1966; Cone 1974; Planty 1966).

Recreational Facilities. Most of the universities provide recreational facilities (Andrews 1969; Bricker 1976; Watson 1979). Since many of the courses are conducted in or near metropolitan areas, off-campus recreation and entertainment are also available for those who have the time to use them. Most programs have formal or informal evening sessions and required reading assignments; recreation is usually a secondary consideration (Watson 1979).

Program Design: Pre-Training Strategies

This section examines the methods and strategies used by executive training development programs which prepare the participant for training.

Program Planning

Establishing a conducive climate for work and a smooth-running conference requires some systematic endeavor beforehand (Lynton and Pareek 1967). In the short time period of such a conference, maximum effort must be exerted in this area if any changes are to occur. The areas of concern in developing and maintaining an appropriate climate are as follows:
1. The training of group discussion leaders two or three days immediately preceding the conference.

2. Obtaining the services of highly qualified consultants to conduct the leadership training and later serve as coordinators for the conference.

3. Arranging for adequate facilities for the training period with the group discussion leaders as well as for the conference itself.

4. Providing administrative and clerical staff for both phases—the pre-training phase and during the conference.

5. Planning for an adequate budget to ensure maximum flexibility for the leadership training and the conference functions.

Each of the five dimensions listed contributes to the development of an atmosphere which is conducive to individual growth as well as skill development in problem solving.

Today's executive wants to take home some useful ideas—ideas that will pay off in some way. Otherwise, his attendance at a meeting is considered a waste of time. Meeting planners must take this fact into account throughout the planning.

A first step is to identify the factors that impede the effectiveness of meetings. Here are 10 common reasons why some meetings do not pay off (Pinet 1962):

1. The objectives of planners are unrealistic or unattainable.

2. The audience does not agree with or understand the objectives.
3. The audience is not interested in the material presented.

4. The audience does not feel any responsibility or concern about the success of the meeting—it is not their worry.

5. The material is poorly presented.

6. The speakers are inadequately prepared.

7. The speakers talk down to the audience.

8. The physical facilities are poor—the audience cannot see or hear.

9. The audience would rather be somewhere else or doing something else, but their opinions have not been asked.

10. The audience expresses resistance or hostility toward platform participants.

Anshen (1964) and Lippett (1962) found there are basic principles of planning a meeting that must be observed if it is to satisfy both the planners and the audience:

1. The planners must have a clearly defined objective for the total meeting and for each session. These objectives must be realistic and attainable.

2. The planners should know their audience's interests and what audience members expect to receive from the meeting. These interests and expectations must be related to the objectives.

3. Planners should insure that audience members feel the meeting is concerned with their problems and is important to them. Audience members should participate in the planning, wherever possible.

4. Presentation methods for each item of subject matter should be devised in terms of both the material to be presented and the situation in which it will be presented.
5. Planners should test the effectiveness of the communication at the meeting and again after the meeting in order to improve subsequent meetings.

6. Systematic follow-up procedures should be devised as part of the planning in order to assure adequate "take-home pay" for the delegates.

Requirements for Admission

Universities express considerable uniformity in the kind of participant they want in their executive development programs. While each university describes its admission requirements in its own way, there is agreement in important areas. Universities want participants who meet one or more of the following criteria (West 1979):

1. They have already reached a middle or top level position within their companies.

2. They hold, or are definitely being groomed for, responsible positions within their companies.

3. They either formulate or influence company policy.

Other admission requirements often listed by universities include such difficult-to-measure criteria as intellectual curiosity, desire to broaden one's outlook, and leadership qualities.

Men at or near first-level supervisory positions are excluded by universities because their advancement to middle- or top-level positions may be too remote for them
to benefit immediately and fully from their experiences at a program. There is also the possibility that some may already have reached the peak of their promotional possibilities. Men close to retirement are usually excluded despite their current administrative level (Bricker 1976).

The Participant's Organization

Bricker (1976) finds universities expect that participating executives will be sponsored by their companies. The firm nominates the candidate, and if the nominee is accepted by the university, his organization not only pays the program fee but is usually requested to release the executive from all regular responsibilities for the duration of the program. Companies are pointedly discouraged from interrupted the executive during training, even for "urgent" business.

While most universities admit more than one executive from the same company, few admit more than four. This is done to ensure a diverse and heterogeneous group. Finally, none of the universities requires that an applicant has achieved any specific level of academic attainment. Practical achievements as an executive are considered much more important.
Organizational Commitment

Requiring training applicants to come to the university with the explicit backing of the work organization ensures that the organization is informed, prepared to grant any necessary leave, and is willing to face at least some implications of training. The commitment is greater if the institution requires the candidate's organization to pay the training fees and also the candidate's salary during training.

It is essential for top management to be committed to the training program if it is to be effective. Such commitment is necessary if training is to be effective after the individual returns to his job (Andrews 1966, Argyris 1956).

Most companies are required to indicate their plans for their candidate's advancement as part of the application. Applications are usually rejected when no such plans are presented. These steps help university program planners design executive programs for the most promotable executives rather than for those most in need of further knowledge or skill. Universities discourage applications from executives needing remedial training (Bricker 1976, West 1979).

Andrews (1969, p. 215) states:

The principal justification for spending money which would otherwise be profit before taxes for an executive program is that broadened perspective
and increased self-confidence—the minimum effects
would normally contribute to better business
decisions, especially those involving the corpora-
tion as a whole and its environment. This connec-
tion is rarely visible but is inferred from the
testimony offered by participants. Even a life-
time of work in one industry will be constrictive
in the same degree as it increases knowledge of
industry practices. The greater familiarity with
how things are done distracts attention from how
they might better be done. The closer the atten-
tion paid to pressing problems of the moment, the
less the time available for looking to the future.
Detachment from responsibility, company, and family,
to look at management as a process and events in
the world which alter its purview and requisite
skills is at least an opportunity to redress dis-
tortions of perspective and point of view.

The difference in thinking which characterizes
companies sending men/women to executive courses
and those not doing so seems to be essentially
acceptance or rejection of this line of reasoning
on the part of the chief executive of the company.
His/her own interest in education, his/her belief
in the educability of his/her associates, and his/
her estimate of the skills required in effective
management are likely to determine the frequency
and number of men/women sent to outside programs.
McCarthy's work shows that in a sample of compan-
ies making the most frequent and sophisticated use
of programs, the attitude of the chief executive
was cited as the origin and source of continued
support of its interest in executive programs.
In the instance of the companies which refrain from
participation the chief executive's estimate of the
importance of the benefit reported by participants
must be lower than his/her counterpart in the using
companies. Otherwise he/she, like them, would sur-
mount somehow the inconveniences of participation.

Cost Commitment

With few exceptions, all participants' costs are paid
by the sponsoring organization. The question of program
cost appears to be of secondary importance to those companies
that make continuous and systematic use of executive development programs. The most meaningful way to view the cost of sending an executive to a university-sponsored program is to measure this cost against the future value of the program to the executive and his company (Bricker 1976).

If an executive gains in competence and personal motivation, and is thereby more effective in achieving company goals as a result (or partial result) of participation in a university-sponsored executive development program, it seems likely that a positive value accrues to him and his company alike (Watson 1979).

Investment decisions are made on the general reputation of the school. Two factors apparently contributing to the all-over reputation of the university are: (1) a well-known instructional staff, and (2) the quality of the university's business school. Such factors as program cost and distance from the firm are of minimal consequence to the companies queried (Bricker 1976).

Bricker's (1976) study finds that companies list improved executive performance resulting from attendance at a university program. This improved performance may be as specific and quantifiable as an application of a cost reduction technique within the firm, or as general as an improved managerial attitude. Some organizations state that the
executive returns with a new "air of confidence." This attitude apparently flows from two sources: the company endorsement and sponsorship of the executive at the university program, and the discussion and interchange of ideas and problems that takes place between the participants. Although these benefits are difficult to quantify or demonstrate, the participants themselves and their sponsoring companies believe them to be substantial (Watson 1979).

Quality of Program

Andrews (1969, p. 198) states, "We now know that the quality of the program is extremely critical to the success of an executive development program."

The way to persuade companies to release key men is to strengthen their conviction that the benefits may prove to exceed the costs. The way to do the latter, in turn, is to try to increase the essential quality of the educational experience in faculty competence, in subject matter, and in pursuit of specific objectives suited to the length of time chosen.

Participants come to programs expecting to work hard, and they value programs more highly in relation to the amount of worthwhile work they are asked to do. It is clear, Andrews adds, that both day and evening work for five-and-a-half or six days a week is an acceptable schedule.
The amount of work can be greater depending upon its quality, sequence, relevance, and perceived consistency with the purposes of the program and to the future of the individual executive.

Andrews (1969) and Watson (1979) have found that executives of high potential in important management positions have the mental energy and capacity to cope with a demanding regimen.

Recreation or "vacation" thought by some to be the chief component of favorability to an executive development program was voted last. Highest ranked was the formal educational process and content of the program and collegial relationships.

"Quality of the program is a crucial ingredient in the marketability of the university program. A quality program that has competent faculty and material relevant to the executive will perhaps become the most important adult education program of the future" (Andrews 1969, p. 109).

Correspondence with Participants

Watson (1979) finds communications from the university to participants prior to the program to be important for several reasons: (1) they help line up expectations for the program; (2) they provide information; (3) they prepare the participants for an experience of real relevance; (4)
they assure participants of the program's intention to
provide this; and (5) they establish the climate or tone of
the program and the work standards to be required.

Announcing the Program

Typically, the announcement to corporate executives
of a training program contains a general statement of the
needs to which the training addresses itself, followed by
more detailed training objectives; the categories of people
for whom this particular program is meant (for example, age,
experience, position); the training and main methods to be
used (for example, active participation, field work); the
duration, dates, location, and cost of the program; and
the admission requirements and procedures. Some institu-
tions introduce the course faculty in the announcement
(Watson 1979).

Participant Participation in
Program Planning

It is extremely critical to involve participants in
planning the program. "Experience assures us that even a
small start in this direction will widen the area of learn-
ing and increase candidates motivations for learning" (Burke
and Beckhard 1970).

Participants' motivation and pre-learning is en-
hanced by asking them to answer questions about themselves
as managers. This highlights training needs, motivates learning, and gives the university advance knowledge of the participants' present skills and training needs (Watson 1979).

Lippett (1962) finds considerable disagreement between program participants and program planners on needs and expectations of program outcomes. In order to address this problem, a systematic method has been developed to obtain from delegates themselves their ideas about what they consider key to their development. Asking for this information accomplishes several things:

1. It forces the individual delegate to think about the meeting before he goes to it.

2. It causes the individual delegate to feel important.

3. It increases the individual delegate's interest in the meeting because he has participated in planning part of it. (It may be curiosity alone to learn whether his problem will actually be discussed that prompts him to participate in the planning.)

4. It furnishes the planners with valuable information for agenda preparation.

5. It helps the planners to select priorities and allot time on the basis of the degree of interest in any given subject.

Too many meetings are planned on the basis of hunches about delegates' interest. It is relatively simple to assemble the facts which assure sounder and more accurate planning (Lippett 1962).
Conditions for Effective Learning:  
Group Setting

Although knowledge can be acquired in almost any psychological climate, deep intellectual and emotional understanding and acceptance of knowledge—especially new knowledge that suggests particular ways of new behavior—is reached more thoroughly and quickly in a special kind of psychological climate.

Halpin (1969) finds the following are six principal characteristics of this learning climate:

1. Learning takes place in a group setting.

2. Openness and mutual acceptance exists between the group members, and members have a strong attraction to the group.

3. The instructor is perceived by group members as being supportive and genuinely interested in their learning the concepts being taught, as well as in them as people. The instructor is enthusiastic about the concepts being taught and shows eagerness for trainees to learn them.

4. The concepts covered are sequenced in logical order and are covered at a pace that causes the acceptance of new thinking patterns and processes and the acquisition of new skills and new forms of behavior to occur gradually.

5. Trainees have a desire to know.

6. Learning is an active process. Trainees are gaining insights and making generalizations and conclusions for themselves.

Group Size. An impactful learning environment that is conducive to changing behavior cannot, in most cases, be
created for an individual in isolation. When trainees acquire new knowledge alone and are not interacting with others (for example, by reading or listening to a lecture), they do not have the opportunity to examine their own views or behavior to see where and how they are appropriate or inappropriate (Knowles 1970).

To maximize interaction, the size and physical arrangement of the group become of great importance. The trainer cannot interact readily with a crowd of participants sitting in rows facing him—the normal lecture arrangement. Horseshoe and circular arrangements are better but limit the size of the group to about twenty. Twenty is still too large if all participants are to be actively involved. Groups as small as eight characteristically have one member who speaks less than five percent of the time; the number of silent members goes up as the size of the group increases. If the groups are larger than eight—for other reasons—a trainer who is eager to foster interactions has many opportunities to subdivide it into buzz-groups of three or four, for instance, for which participants need only shift in their seats; or into small work or decision groups in different corners of the room or even out in the field (Lynton and Pareek 1967). Carroll and Paine (1972) find:
1. The informal atmosphere of a small group provides individuals with feelings of acceptance. In this nonthreatening environment, the trainees are with people who have similar problems at work and about equal levels of understanding of the various methods that can be used to resolve them.

2. People, even those who are not inclined to speak out, usually contribute freely in small group discussions. This occurs for a number of reasons including the following:
   a. Each person is encouraged to speak and contribute ideas—formal role expectation.
   b. The fear of inviting disapproval by disagreeing with the formal leader (the instructor) is absent because the instructor is not present, or if he is, remains silent.
   c. It is easier to contribute ideas in a small group than in a large group. In a large group, speakers generally feel they must speak in complete sentences or series of sentences, which form a logically sequenced presentation of a concept. In a small group setting, this feeling is not so strong and one can observe less formality in presentations of individual viewpoints.
   d. In small group discussions, individuals speak voluntarily. They are not called upon to answer questions, but volunteer their thoughts as they seem appropriate.

3. Individuals are able to check out the validity and usefulness of their ideas and viewpoints in a supportive climate. Alone, the individual's thinking is typically protected from doubt and question and eventual change because it is not questioned or challenged. The individual voicing an opinion in a small discussion group usually receives feedback and, as a result, is able to understand where his or her thinking is agreeable or not agreeable with the thinking of others. Learning alone, the individual does not come face to face with expressed innermost thoughts and
feelings. This does occur in the small group, which can reflect the thoughts and feelings for the individual to see.

4. The usefulness of various management contingent principles becomes apparent more quickly when they are taught and discussed in small group settings than when the individual merely hears or reads about them. This is because contingent principles can be examined in light of the experiences of many individuals. Strong testimonials as to their usefulness, especially from one's peers, is perhaps the most powerful method for bringing about their acceptance by others. This is lateral learning, which sociologists and psychologists say affects our behavior and how we learn most of what we know.

**Group Atmosphere.** Bellows and Ordiorne (1962) find an atmosphere of openness and mutual acceptance which protects group members from intolerable embarrassment and from the fear of rejection by others should exist in order to bring about the acceptance level of learning and changed behavior. Openness and mutual acceptance are perhaps the most difficult aspects to create of a good learning climate (Argyris 1956).

Bennis (1966) finds that when an atmosphere of openness and mutual acceptance exists in a group, its members feel that they are accepted as individuals. Each feels secure even though the views he or she expresses may not be in accord with those held by other members.

Bennis (1966) also finds the group can be a very powerful device for drawing its dissonant members toward
its way of thinking. As the group bonds of mutual understanding strengthens, the group becomes increasingly attractive because it meets a basic human need, that of belonging and feeling accepted. Through the ongoing exchanges of interpersonal encounters in the form of sharing ideas and experiences, particular viewpoints and values will emerge and become identified as being the group's opinion.

**Training: Learning Theory Applied to Adult Education Programs**

The review of literature contained in this section discusses the variables which appear to be linked to the success or failure of adult education programs.

**Teacher-Learner Climate**

At university programs, the pedagogical techniques are tailored to the abilities and needs of the group. The relationship between instructor and participant is different from that between faculty member and the regular college student. Limited enrollment affords the faculty member the opportunity to know the group more intimately. Also, informal social hours and group dinners foster this close student-faculty relationship. Moreover, many program directors encourage the participants and faculty to dress informally during the duration of the course.
An executive's willingness to discuss, to question and to challenge develops quickly in the academic environment. The consequences of his comments and even his words --scrutinized in his company by superiors, peers, and subordinates--are now reviewed only by his temporary peers and neutral faculty members. Wrong decisions do not result in costly errors to his company. Challenges to traditional thinking and practices are met with encouragement. This climate for growth unfolds through the various teaching methods adopted during the program (Andrews 1969).

Knowles (1978) writes that skillful adult educators have known for a long time that they cannot teach adults as children. Adults are almost always voluntary learners, and they simply disappear from learning experiences that don't satisfy them. Knowles (1978) identifies four crucial characteristics of adults that affect their learning:

1. Their self-concept shifts gradually from that of a dependent personality toward that of an increasingly self-directed person; and as this shift occurs they learn better if they are given increasing responsibility for their own learning.

2. They accumulate a growing body of personal experience that has increasing value for their own learning and the learning of others; and as they themselves attach increasing value to their own and others' experience, they learn better in situations in which the experience of the learners is used as a resource for learning.
3. Their readiness to learn becomes decreasingly determined by biological and academic factors and increasingly determined by the developmental tasks of their emerging social roles, and they learn better when learnings are timed to coincide with the needs and interests stimulated by these role requirements.

4. Their time perspective shifts from one of postponed application ("accumulate subject matter for possible later use") to one of immediate application ("learn things now that will help in coping with today's life problems"); and so they learn better those knowledges, skills, attitudes, and values that are relevant to the problems they face in life at this moment.

Burke and Beckhard (1970), from the review of the literature, delineated a set of factors which appear to determine the effectiveness of executive training for adult learners.

1. Adults will commit to learning something when the goals and objectives of the inservice are considered realistic and important to the learner, that is, job related and perceived as being immediately useful.

2. Adults will learn, retain, and use what they perceive is relevant to their personal and professional needs.

3. Adult learners need to see the results of their efforts and have accurate feedback about progress toward their goals.

4. Adult learning is ego-involved. Learning a new skill, technique, or concept may promote a positive or negative view of self. There is always fear of external judgement that we adults are less than adequate, which produces anxiety during new learning situations such as those presented in inservice training programs.
5. Adults come to any learning experience (inservice) with a wide range of previous experiences, knowledge, skills, self-direction, interests, and competence. Individualization, therefore, is appropriate for adults as well as children.

6. Adults want to be the origins of their own learning; that is, involved in selection of objectives, content, activities, and assessment in inservice education.

7. Adults will resist learning situations which they believe are an attack upon their competence, thus the resistance to imposed inservice topics and activities.

8. Closely related, adults reject prescriptions by others for their learning, especially when what is prescribed is viewed as an attack on what they are presently doing.

9. Adults' motivation for learning and doing one's job has two levels. One is to participate and do an adequate job. The second level is to become deeply involved, going beyond the minimum or norm. The first level of motivation comes as the result of good salary, fringe benefits, and fair treatment. The second builds on the first, but comes from recognition, achievement and increased responsibility—the result of our behavior and not more dollars.

10. Motivation is produced by the learner; all one can do is encourage and create conditions which will nurture what already exists in the adult.

11. Adult learning is enhanced by behaviors and inservice that demonstrate respect, trust, and concern for the learner.

Probably the most significant new pieces of information on adults learning—uncovered during the last decade—have direct and important implications for those responsible for executive training. First, it appears that a higher
proportion of adults that formerly thought may be operating at what Piaget calls the concrete operational stage rather than formal operations stage of intellectual development. This suggests that direct and concrete experiences where the learner applies what is being learned are an essential ingredient for executive training. Abstract, word-oriented talk sessions are not adequate to change behaviors.

This lends considerable support to the work of Michalak and Yager (1979) and Brunner (1976), recent advocates of experiential learning which originated with John Dewey. Experiential learning—learning by doing—includes:

1. An initial limited orientation followed by participation activities in a real setting to experience and implement what is to be learned—the skill, concept, strategy.

2. An examination and analysis of the experience in which learners identify the effects of their actions.

3. An opportunity to generalize and summarize when the learners develop their own principles and identify applications of those principles.

4. An opportunity to return to try out their principles in the work setting and develop confidence in using what is learned.
The second key finding comes from research by Rapports (1975) in England and Tough (1971) in Canada. Their work suggests that adults prefer to learn in informal learning situations where social interaction can take place among the learners.

Michalak (1979) points out several advantages of experientially based training. First, the understandings developed are tied not to abstract ideas, but rather to concrete experiences. Another strength of this approach to professional development is that the principles and skills developed through experiential learning are remembered more easily because they are tied to a sequence of personal actions and consequences.

Lawrence (1974) studied "successful" executive training programs and identified seven characteristics that seemed to reflect the trends in the rest of the literature:

1. Individualized programs are more likely to accomplish their objectives than programs that have the same activities for all participants.

2. Programs in which participants take some active role are more likely to be successful than those in which they are limited to a passive or receptive role.

3. Programs based on a demonstration of material or techniques combined with a supervised trial followed by some form of feedback, are more likely to be successful than those in which information or instructions are learned and stored for future application.
4. Programs in which participants provide mutual assistance are more likely to be successful than those in which participants work entirely on their own.

5. Programs occurring as a part of an overall executive development effort are more likely to be successful than one-shot efforts.

6. Programs of emergent design, in which executives choose at least some of the goals or activities, are more likely to be successful than programs which are entirely planned.

7. Programs which are self-initiated and self-designed tend to have a high rate of success.

Lawrence also concluded that programs aiming toward improvement of participant knowledge tend to be more successful than those directed toward performance which, in turn, fare better than programs attempting to modify attitude. His findings also indicate a high degree of success for programs that strike a balance between theory (knowledge) and performance (practice).

To summarize the research on adult learning, program developers should:

1. Include more participant control over "what" and "how" of learning.

2. Focus on job-related tasks that are specific to the executive.

3. Include opportunities for executives to practice what they are learning as part of their training.
4. Encourage small groups so that participants may learn from each other.

5. Provide choices and alternatives that accommodate differences among executives.

6. Allow peer-participants to give each other feedback concerning performance and areas of needed improvement.

The important implication of these findings for the development of adult education training is that adult learning is an internal, self-directed process and that those methods and techniques which involve the individual most deeply in self-directed inquiry will produce the greatest learning. Emphasis on experiential techniques and practical application appear essential, if this learning is to be optimized (Knowles 1970).

Faculty and Staff of Executive Development Programs

Over 70% of the administrators of executive development programs hold academic rank, primarily associate or full professorships. The remainder hold various administrative ranks within their respective institutions. Five devote full time to executive development. The majority, however, allocate 50% or more of their time to this area (Bricker 1976).
Program directors are assisted in their work by various administrative aides. In every instance, full- or part-time secretarial and clerical assistance is provided. In universities that sponsor programs two and three times a year, associate and assistant directors are usually employed. Also, the program faculty frequently assists the directed in administrative activities through assignments on curriculum and admissions committees.

In most programs, the faculty is drawn from within the ranks of the sponsoring university's business school (Andrews 1969). Eighty percent of the programs are staffed primarily with resident faculty members, occasionally augmented by academicians from other universities. Rationale for bringing outside faculty to the campus is twofold: (1) to offer program participants the current thinking of a recognized expert in a particular subject matter area, and (2) to provide resident faculty the opportunity to exchange ideas with the visiting professor.

Andrews (1969) finds the faculty of university executive education programs is usually topnotch. To make it in executive programs, the faculty member must not only have a secure grasp of the material taught but also be able to relate to executive middle and top management executives who are themselves expert in their own fields. Thus, faculty members might well have had extensive business and
consulting experience of their own, in addition to academic accomplishments.

Watson (1979) found the caliber of faculty in a program is a major determinant of its success. Even if the program has excellent and appropriate content, materials, facilities, and coordination, its overall impact will be minimal if the teachers are poor.

Bass and Vaughn (p. 136, 1966) report that topnotch program faculty should possess three important characteristics:

1. Knows the subject to be taught from both theoretical and practical standpoints.

2. Knows and understands the process of adult learning.

3. Has the ability to work with adults. Can establish a rapport with the participants that is conducive to learning. Can earn the participants' attention, acceptance, and trust quickly. Is genuinely interested in people and helping them to learn and develop their knowledge, skills, and personal characteristics.

Effective instructors for programs of executive development can also be identified by specific behaviors, which include the following (Planty and Freeston, 1979):

1. They know what the program participants do and because of this, they focus on and emphasize those aspects of the subjects they teach that are most useful to those whom they teach.

2. They understand the program's objectives, its philosophy, its methods, and exactly where they fit into the program.
3. They answer questions clearly and directly.

4. They illustrate the concepts and ideas they teach by means of practical examples so that they will be remembered, understood, and accepted.

5. They present their subject clearly and present the major points in a logical orderly manner.

6. They show how and where to apply the concepts.

7. They use a variety of teaching methods, but rely most heavily on those which involve active participation because these methods are most effective for developing the skills required for effective management.

Knowles (1978) describes a set of criteria by which to judge the qualifications of the faculty teaching an executive development program.

1. Faculty members must not only have the knowledge but must be successful practitioners of their subject or skill.

2. He must be enthusiastic about his subject and about teaching it to others.

3. He must have such traits of personality as friendliness, humor, humility, and interest in people, that make for effectiveness in leading adults.

4. He must be concerned more with the growth of the individual than with the presentation of facts.

5. His status in the occupational group, previous work experience, scholarly achievement are important only when combined with the characteristics described above.

6. He should be intrigued with the notion that adults are different from children as learners, and express positive pleasure at the prospect of adults participating in a training program for adults.
Number of Instructors. Since most beginning directors have unusually high expectations of how much learning and change will occur in training programs, there is a great temptation to have a large number of both subjects and instructors in the programs they plan. Forceful arguments are also frequently voiced in support of this approach: "It is our objective to expose participants to as many viewpoints as possible. The variety of having many different subjects prevents boredom" (Andrews 1969).

Planty and Freeston (1979) have found that if the objective of a program is the involvement of management ability, these arguments are not sound. A program, with much variety of instructors and topics, which is intended to acquaint the trainees with a wide range of information or to give them an overview of a subject, has some benefits, but does not bring about lasting change in one-the-job behavior--since it takes the trainees only to the first stage of the learning process; knowing about. Surprisingly, many people are unaware of this and are committed to what could be called information overkill; that is, the bombardment approach. If management training is to be impactful and long-lasting, there must be continuity in the subjects covered and these subjects must be covered in depth.

Watson (1979) states that a single one-hour or two-hour session is not enough. Moreover, change will not come
about as a result of a program that has instructors who advocate contradictory and conflicting philosophies and practices. Typical reactions to these programs are confusion, frustration, and the persistence of old forms of behavior and management practices.

The argument that a great number of different topics and instructors is refreshing and prevents boredom is a weak one (Burke and Beckhard 1970). Instead, participant actually experience a greater strain; continually "shifting gears" mentally and readjusting to each new speaker. Moreover, if subjects are treated in depth and appropriate detail, and if they are worthwhile and well-presented they will not be boring, but instead, stimulating and interesting.

Another factor that should be considered is how well the instructor is known and accepted by the group (Andrews 1969). The group's acceptance of the instructor will usually influence acceptance of what he teaches. Acceptance is earned slowly; even for the best instructors, it takes at least a half, and sometimes, a full day. Thus, it is generally better to have one professor cover several closely related topics than to have the same topics covered by several instructors. Watson (1979) suggests that programs have a minimum of two and a maximum of five instructors per week, assuming a five-day week consisting of two sessions per day.
Teaching Materials

Training materials, such as case studies, reading exercises, films, texts, etc. should be selected in light of two key considerations: (1) the training objectives of the session for which the material is to be used, and (2) the audience that will be receiving the training. Frequently, instructors are tempted to use only materials with which they are familiar. These instructors neglect to perform a careful search of the material available, largely because they do not know where to look, and this often results in their use of inappropriate materials (Watson 1979).

Classroom Training Methods

There are many training methods, each of which is uniquely effective in producing specific results under particular circumstances. The selection of the most appropriate methods for the various segments of a training program is an important determinant of its overall effectiveness. This section will examine the most commonly used methods of instruction for executive training.

Although the lecture-discussion method is used to some extent in all the executive development programs, it is not the sole, or even the primary, vehicle for the teaching-learning process. New information is effectively,
and sometimes more effectively, presented through the lecture-discussion method. Nevertheless, the limitations of this approach, coupled with the overall intent of the program prohibit the exclusive use of this teaching method (West 1979).

The executive's administrative skills are developed through two currently used teaching techniques: (1) the case study, and (2) the business simulation exercise. For purposes of executive development programs, the case study forces the executive to analyze a complex situation, and to suggest specific solutions to a problem. Whether the individual resolves the problem alone or as a member of a small group, the answer is carefully analyzed by the instructor and insufficient presentation of alternatives are pinpointed through the case approach.

The Lecture. This is the oldest, and it seems most often used, method of instruction. It involves the direct transmission of information in one direction, from speaker to listeners who remain passive (Burke and Beckhard 1970). The lecture can be effective in providing large numbers of people with straightforward, factual information.

Lecturing should continue uninterrupted for only short periods of time. Lippett (1962) claims that the maximum time a lecture should run is 45 minutes; others say an
hour. Very dynamic speakers may be able to hold a group's interest for as much as an hour and a half. The exact length of time a lecture can run and remain effective will, of course, vary with the speaker, the group, and the subject matter. The important point to remember is that, even under the best of circumstances, the lecture method is effective for only an hour-and-a-half to two hours at most (Lippett 1962). Beyond this, the audience's interest quickly wanes and the lecture's effectiveness deteriorates rapidly to the point of listener restlessness and boredom.

Although lectures are used in many executive development programs, discussion is the essential educational activity in all programs. Both in small group and larger class sessions, discussion is the natural medium for exchange of experiences among participants of the program. In classes this exchange is challenged, stimulated, questioned by the professor. The need to make discussion meaningful puts a heavy demand upon faculty, and it by no means follows that a professor successful in the conventional classroom will be successful in the executive program.

Case Study Method. A case study is a description or history of a real, or imaginary yet realistic, situation. Most case studies are quite readable as they are written in story form. Case studies may deal with the total organization
or specific units within it, such as personnel, finance, marketing, or manufacturing. The case may also deal with general problems or issues common to all departments, such as planning, decision-making, motivation, or change. Case studies may be written from the viewpoint of a neutral observer or from the viewpoint of one or more individuals in the case. Case studies should be objective and free of editorialization. If they are presented from a third party's perspective, they should be free of judgments. However, if written from the perspective of several of the key characters in the case, the case is enriched because it contains the emotions and perceptions of the characters.

Andrews (1969), Watson (1979) and Towle and Dauten (1967) found there are two distinct approaches for using case studies, each one being strongly advocated by very able educators. One of these is the deductive method, by which students themselves first acquire a knowledge and understanding of certain concepts and principles. Then they are given a case to study and analyze, and on which to practice the application of theory recently learned. They start with management principles (premises), study a situation (case), and arrive at conclusions (solutions to the case-study problem).

The other approach, the inductive method, is considerably more demanding of the students and the instructor.
In this method, students are given a case to study, along with readings and references to theoretical materials containing the concepts and principles being taught. Using this method, the students start by studying a situation (case), formulating conclusions (solutions to the case), and discovering the management principles (premises) for themselves. This is the Harvard method and, of the two approaches, is generally thought to be the better approach for teaching students how to identify, analyze, and solve problems; how to formulate creative solutions to problems; and how to become more able to search beyond their own immediate knowledge for answers (Andrews 1969).

Sometimes cases are used merely to illustrate principles and concepts; this is called the case problem method. Cases used for this purpose are usually short; only a paragraph or two in length. The instructor leads the students through the case problem, pointing out what is taking place and illustrating the principles and concepts being taught. This method is thought to be a good way for reinforcing ideas or illustrating points that need further clarification.

Buzz Groups. Buzz groups work to study, analyze, discuss, and solve case-study problems. They delve deeply into the complexities of the case being studied with the aims of understanding what took place, the reasons for it,
the significance of it, and perhaps how the problem could have been avoided—or might be avoided in the future—or solved now that they exist (Watson 1979).

Planty, an ardent advocate of the buzz group approach to case-study preparation, has spelled out the roles and responsibilities of the buzz group members. According to Planty (1966, p. 2):

All participants in a work-study discussion group have responsibilities for all the necessary functions in the group. These include leading, observing, understanding, recording, questioning, summarizing, serving as a resource person, contributing to the flow of thinking, getting agreement, learning and helping others to learn, and assisting in the problem solving process.

**In-Basket Technique.** The in-basket technique is a form of simulation exercise that was developed in this country by Educational Testing Service, in the early 1950s, as an outgrowth of techniques developed by the British Civil Service. This method is useful for testing a new manager's aptitude for handling a variety of problems with dispatch. It can also be a powerful training device (West 1979). The participant is presented with an "in-basket" for a typical day in the life of a hypothetical organization. He is expected to take on the problems presented by the mail (internal and external), one by one. Contents of the in-basket include reports and other reading matter that provide background in handling individual problems presented by other
items in the basket. Thus the in-basket contains a micro-
 cosmos of the hypothetical organization--perhaps an organiza-
tion chart, job descriptions, financial reports, policy
 statements and other material to place problems in context.
 Letters, memos, notes, reports then follow, each of which
 requires immediate disposition (West 1979).

 The participant takes whatever action he deems neces-
sary for each item. He must write out notes and memoranda,
telephone conversations and face-to-face discussions. The
 person works under pressure since all of the items must be
disposed of in a given time. He must set priorities, hand-
ing those appropriate to the job and delegating others.
The end result can be scored and a mark assigned to the
 project, or decisions can be reviewed by a superior, an
 instructor, or other program participants.

 Evaluation and Post-Training Efforts

 This section examines the activities which are used
 in executive development to evaluate the training process.
 Post-training continues training activities for the partici-
 pانت after he returns to his organization.

 Watson (1979, p. 272) finds the key to a logical
evaluation approach is always to keep in mind who needs what
 information, and for what reasons, and then to collect it by
 the best possible method and report it in an easily under-
 stood and usable fashion
Lynton and Pareek (1967) find that to evaluate a program the basic question is, simply, to what extent did the program achieve what it set out to achieve. Evaluation at the very end of the program tells about the new knowledge, understanding, and skill that the participant has gained during training. The same kind of data at various stages of the post-training phase shows how stable these gains are and to what extent they have survived transfer to the work situation.

Bellows and Ordiorne (1962) state evaluation should be planned at the same time as the training program and should constitute an integral part of the total program from beginning to end. In other words, evaluation, like training, is not a one-shot proposition but must be a continual process. The selection of the criteria, controls, and statistics for evaluation purposes should be made with the same care used in identifying the training needs and selecting the training methods. Moreover, the more precisely the needs and goals of training are defined, the easier it is to identify valid and reliable criteria for evaluation.

Evaluating the Training Effort

The training literature contains several statements of what can be considered thorough approach to evaluation. Research by Lawshe (1958), Kirkpatrick (1970), and
Fitzpatrick (1976) is fundamentally alike and serves as the basis of the approach presented in this section.

According to Lawshe, management training can be measured with respect to two sets of criteria (1958):

1. In-course evaluation of participants' progress. This is an appraisal of the effects of management training at the "training-room" level. More specifically it involves an assessment of:
   a. increased knowledge;
   b. acquired skills;
   c. changes in expressed attitudes;
   d. indications of interest;
   e. degree of participation; and
   f. acceptance of training given.

   (In short, this set of criteria is used to measure the effectiveness of the training as a process.)

2. Impact on the participants after training. This is an appraisal of the effects of training as revealed by subsequent, modified behavior on the job. It involves measures of:
   a. the transfer of instruction into changed behaviors and attitudes on the job;
   b. Learning--What principles, facts, and techniques were learned?
   c. Behavior--What changes in job behavior resulted from the training?
   d. Results--What were the tangible results of the training program in terms of reduced cost, improved quality, improved quantity, etc?
Watson (1979) supports the work of Lawshe, Kirkpatrick, and Fitzpatrick in recommending sets of evaluation criteria to assess more thoroughly the value of a training program. A composite of their thinking is set forth here as a set of criteria for evaluating management-training programs. It consists of five areas for evaluation.

1. Reactions--Reactions of participants to the learning experience and to those who presented it (i.e., coordinators and teachers). Reactions of program coordinator and the various teachers in the program regarding the learning environment and experience. Reactions consist of opinions and conclusions based on first-hand observations. They may be collected during, immediately after, or several months after the training occurs.

2. Learning--Measures of changes in attitudes, knowledge, and skills of the trainees. These changes may be measured immediately after the training experience to determine a program's immediate impact and several weeks or months later to measure retention.

3. Job Behavior--An assessment of how trainees behave differently because of their training. The biggest question this aspect of evaluation process aims to answer is: how and to what extent have trainees applied the various concepts and processes taught? It also seeks to determine who among the trainees have been changed as a result of the training.

4. Organizational Impact--This involves assessing the effects of attitude and behavioral changes caused by the training on both the functioning and the ability to function of the organization to which the trainees belong. The aim of this phase of evaluation is to ascertain both quantitative and qualitative changes in organizational performance which can be attributed to the training directly or indirectly.
5. Additional Outcomes--Other results or by-products of the training not identified or assessed by the other four areas. This includes such things as the social value of training. To what extent do trainees feel better about themselves? Has the training helped people satisfy some of their personal goals? Has it assisted them in their career development? Whereas organizational impact refers to an assessment of contributions of training to the organization's performance or capacity to perform along the lines or in the direction it has chosen to head or would like to head, the assessment of additional outcomes involves an examination of the impacts training has had on the organization's performance or capacity to perform with respect to measures it presently does not use.

Watson (1979) concludes with this statement about evaluation:

In general, good training conditions produce good conditions for making an evaluation. That is, when training objectives have been clearly defined and related to company goals and when management is actively committed to the program, then training may be carried out under very favorable conditions. And likewise, the evaluation of training can proceed in a clear and unclouded atmosphere, free of secret strategy; and the information needed for evaluation can be collected much more freely. The opposite is true when training objectives are unclear or when management does not support the training program.

Post-Training: Transferring Learning to the Back-Home Situation

The problems, great or little, that the returning participants face as they attempt to work on their jobs with new skills and attitudes are recognized as an important aspect of the training process.
The training session or program ends. The participant leaves for home with whatever he learned. If things have gone well, the participant returns to the home organization with motivation heightened, new enthusiasm from the satisfactions of learning, and eagerness to use on the job what he has learned.

Lynton and Pareek (1967), and Watson (1979) state that the participant needs:

1. To be encouraged to use what useful things he has learned. It may help to allow time for him to "settle in again." Explicitly so; otherwise he will take the time surreptitiously and feel guilty about it. The opposite, for instance finding a desk over-loaded with work held up till his return, will not help.

2. Opportunity to talk about and provide feedback to the organization about the training process.

Application of these two principles is worthwhile considering the investment that training represents, both in direct cost and loss of work from the participants during their time of training (Watson 1979).

Gommersall (1966, pp. 62-72) gives five common reasons why executives face problems upon returning to the job.

1. Inadequate Drive and Follow-Through

The lack of drive and persistence to follow-through and complete tasks is one of the most common human failings. The manager returning from a training program will have to overcome
this tendency to procrastinate if he/she is to do a conscientious job of applying newly acquired knowledge (Mee, 1969). In addition to this common human failing, he/she is faced with the distraction of everyday problems and concerns, which usually further divert attention and energies from systematically applying recently learned management knowledge.

2. Level of Understanding

An adequate level of understanding of theories and principles is necessary for their correct and successful application. Ideally, this is accomplished at the formal training program. However, this end might not be completely achieved for every principle that an individual might wish or need to apply.

3. Unwillingness to Try Out New Knowledge

Managers may be unwilling to believe that the theories and principles they learned at a training program will actually work. This is especially true in cases where there are sharp contradictions between these theories and the manager's values and attitudes.

4. Unrealistic Goals

The second imbalance may have occurred when setting goals of training. In their initial enthusiasm, participants, separately or jointly, set themselves goals that are excessively high. Though these unrealistic goals were unattainable all along, the trainers failed to dislodge them from the participants' minds.

5. Alienation

As participants have drawn closer to each other during the training program, they have also separated themselves from colleagues who stayed behind at work. The separation is widened by the new things participants have learned. The gap is particularly noticeable if it occurs in the realm of attitudes and values: to the extent that they have become more egalitarian, open, and
trustful among themselves, for instance. Others have become "different," less enlightened. This is alienation. Any alienation left unresolved at the end of the program interferes with even the most realistic plans participants have to communicate their learning to others. Often it heads them into general resentment and isolation at work. This unintended and unexpected result can be most painful and disillusioning.

Pigors and Pigors (1961) suggest program developers can take steps to increase the organization's awareness--and that of the participants--of the difficulties they have to face at the end of the training program. It can adjust the program to a volume and rhythm that leave participants in good shape to deal with the difficulties of transfer.

Post-Training Contact with University

Lynton and Pareek (1967) write that post-training contact between the university and participants and their organizations is agreed to be the kingpin of adequate follow-up services, but is in fact rarely attempted in a systematic manner. It is one of those crucial areas in training in which good intention is often left to substitute for action. If personal contact occurs from time to time, it does so as a chance by-product of some other program of the institution. Meetings with associates tend to be short and mostly social. They are pleasant enough while they last but not meaningful as support to participants on the job.
Or, a trainer instead of involving himself in a job problem of a participant and his organization, will use willing participants to organize or administer a local program of the institution. Examples of planned sustained contact are in fact very hard to come by.

Supplementary Services

Regular follow-up services of most institutions are limited to the issue of periodic news sheets and encouragement of new and old associations of participants. Without roots in continuing contact with participants and their organizations, these services soon atrophy. By themselves they are too slight and may be double-edged (Watson 1979).

The best contact is joint work right on the job in which the participant can be involved. In this way, the participants' efforts are backed by extra professional resources. The second best contact is through letters and updating of reading materials and newsletters. Some universities organize events or refresher courses for participants within the same locality (Lynton and Pareek 1967).

Knowles (1978) found there were additional gains in training results when trainees, upon returning to their organizations, closely followed a guided activity outline during the post-training program. Post-training activities carefully understood by participants will assure an organization of the participants' executive development.
Summary

This chapter has provided a review of the literature of executive development programs for corporate and business executives which are based at universities.

In addition, this chapter provides review of the literature of the professional training preferences of school principals. The chapter provides the information necessary for the adaptation of the features deemed most appropriate, to form program guidelines for an executive development program for school principals.
CHAPTER 3

EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT FOR SCHOOL PRINCIPALS:
APPLICATION OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter is designed for use by those concerned with the implementation of university-based executive development programs for school principals. This chapter provides: (1) Background information on the executive development process; (2) Guidelines for program development; and (3) A program summary.

All the information provided in this chapter was adapted from the review of the literature found in Chapter 2 of this study. The strategies used by corporations for the development of their executives at university-based executive development programs were adapted to the professional training preferences of school principals. The features deemed the most appropriate which could be applied to an educational framework and still incorporate the strategies used by corporations were adapted by the research.

Executive Development Principles

We can assume the principal is the primary catalyst for change in a school and is the person most responsible for the implementation of an effective school program. A
number of studies have shown that where a school program has been "turned around" and moved into a successful posture, a skillful, committed, and most often, inspirational principal was largely responsible.

If the school principal believes a proposed program will benefit the children in his charge and is visibly enthusiastic about its potential, then the attitude is likely to infect teachers, students and parents alike. The net result is generally an "up" or "can do" psychology that permeates the effort and increases productivity on the part of all participants.

Attitude and inspirational leadership—as important as they are—are not in themselves the total answer, however. There is a body of skills that a principal must have in hand if he is to lead a school in the improvement of the instructional program.

This is where an Executive Development Program for Principals comes in. The most important function of Executive Development for School Principals is to enable the principal who is already involved in the day-to-day activities of management to see a pattern in what he is doing and its relation to the activities of the school (Planty and Freeston 1979).

Second, executive development upgrades the principal in knowledge and understanding of his present field of
activities; not so much to teach him new techniques, but to enable him to make policies, to plan and to direct and control better within the school.

Finally, the program prepares the principal for greater responsibilities by widening his horizons.

In order to meet managerial and executive needs in the present and future, school districts must provide principals with special education programs that will prepare them for the changes and challenges that are sure to come in the future.

The objectives of Executive Development for school principals are twofold. The first and immediate objective is to raise the level of effectiveness on the present job. The long-range objective is to prepare the principal with recognized potential for future advancement and responsibility.

The objectives might be more succinctly stated in a simple formula:

Executive Development for School Principals = Improving Present Performance + Preparing for the Future (EDSP = IPP + PFF)

Why Executive Development for School Principals?

The 1977 California Study on the Effectiveness of Schools found the effectiveness of school principals to be
directly related to pupil achievement, pupil attitudes toward school, teacher morale, and parent satisfaction. Although effectiveness is essential to good schooling, principals surveyed did not feel their training was adequate to develop the skills and abilities for effective school leadership.

Superintendents and school boards are becoming increasingly aware that neither they themselves, nor their central office staff can directly supervise and control programs and activities at individual schools. Indeed, many superintendents and school board members would be happy to relinquish the authority to the building principals provided the principals demonstrate that they have executive ability (Davis 1974).

**Changing Role of Principals.** The need for continuous professional development and retraining is a product of the times. Knowledge is expanding with explosive force, and tremendous professional and technological advances are being made. School management bears little resemblance today to the traditional image of the "principal teacher." For example, it is estimated that the principal's job in 1979 has expanded to include approximately twice the volume of expectations for principals serving in 1969 (NAASP 1980).

Even with the successful completion of the best formal doctoral program in educational administration, no
principal can hope to acquire all of the necessary competencies and skills for effective performance in a time of such rapid change (Amoto 1978, p. 14). Preparation programs for the school principal cannot be realistically expected to produce a "finished product." Interestingly, Fisher (1965) found that newly certified principals are in as much need of professional development as are those principals who received their preparation ten or more years ago.

Alone at the Top: The Professional Reality

Many principals don't really feel close to anyone. Everyone is a potential adversary: parents, children, teachers, and central office staff. Principals may feel close to each other, but sometimes they can't even be sure that their fellow principals aren't also potential adversaries, competitors for scarce resources and public recognition. Many would agree with Philip Jackson's observation, reflecting his experience as Director of the University of Chicago's Laboratory Schools (1977, p. 29):

... one of the chief residues of my own administrative experience is the memory of having felt alone, not in the simple physical sense of being by myself, without companions, but in the deeper psychological sense of being apart from others.

Principals are inevitably set apart not only from the teachers they must constantly monitor, supervise, and evaluate. They are as much apart from those for whom they
work as from those who work for or with them. Central offices give lip service to "participation" by principals in important decisions, but few principals feel like participants (Goodladd 1979). Because the central office evaluates principals' performance, few feel comfortable sharing problems which might be interpreted as indications of weakness or even incompetence. Principals inevitably suffer from lack of collegiality.

**High Attrition Rate of Effective School Principals.**

The 1978 survey of 1,600 principals conducted by the University of Utah for the National Association of Secondary School Principals, found that fully one-quarter said they intended to quit by the end of the school year. Worse yet, the very best principals are quitting at an even higher rate. At the beginning of the survey, researchers singled out sixty gifted exceptional principals. By the end of the year, one-third of this group had resigned!

A primary reason given by the departing principals was the frustration of facing situations for which they are poorly equipped. These individuals were highly motivated but lacked the managerial skills necessary to effectively approach the challenges of the present-day educational executive. The request of this group was for effective continuous training to provide them the self-assurance and ability to deal with current problems (NASSP, 1978).
What Executive Development Can Do. When conducted properly, executive development can begin a period of reflection and development by giving the principal new perspectives about and insights into himself and others, organizational relationships, and the school environment.

Based upon the executive development research and the professional training preferences of school principals, executive development can produce these important benefits (adapted from Bricker, 1976, Andrews, 1969, Chandler, 1962, and Miner, 1965):

1. Provide for the development of sound management skills that can be applied immediately to the work situation and are relevant to the unique needs of the school principal.
2. Provide exposure to new technologies and tools of management essential to avoid obsolescence and improve performance.
3. Provide principals with the opportunity to view themselves as managers within the school setting, and to look at their managerial problems with a perspective often impossible under the pressures of "business as usual."
4. Provide principals with educational trends and issues that will affect them in the future.
5. Provide management experience to the principal's designee in his absence. This allows the lower-level administrator first-hand practical responsibility.

6. Provide an opportunity to compare and exchange ideas with peers who often feel isolated in their positions as school principals.

7. Transfer the school principal from the position of managing, to a situation where he can have a chance to regenerate, revitalize, and renew the purpose for his career choice.

8. Provide a supportive environment to plan a continuing self-development program after leaving the program.

Who Should Attend Executive Development Programs?

Executive development is targeted to the school principal who is most promotable rather than the one who is most in need of skills (Andrews 1966).

Unique to programs of executive development is the selection process. Principals demonstrate themselves as high-achievers, experienced decision-makers, and effective leaders in the operation of their schools.

Selected principals should have the drive and ambition and the potential to insure that dollars spent will bring in a return.
The Executive Development Program is not for "problem cases" and not a means for "straightening out" the ineffective principal. It is not a program for principal hopefuls, and is not to be used as a "reward" or as a "vacation" for the deserving but no longer "moving" principal. It is, however, a program for those who wish to excel at the good job they are already doing (Andrews 1966).

Why University-Sponsored Executive Training?

Universities and, more specifically, Colleges of Education, have the available educational facilities, faculties, and resources to provide an ideal setting for the executive development of school principals.

**Facilities.** These may be as simple as classrooms, but they may be laboratories or special equipment. Conference centers are valuable for resident instruction, although the institutions without conference centers may rent hotels or country clubs for residential study.

**Know-How.** The university brings a certain amount of knowledge gained by experience to the partnership. Sometimes, the know-how consists of knowledge of who the actual experts are in the field, or knowledge of which experts are effective with certain types of audiences. Other times, the know-how is just the skill of the experienced teacher.

**Staff.** Executive Development Programs for school principals should be sponsored by the College of Education,
Graduate Division. The program should have an executive program director, associate director, and secretarial and clerical staff which can devote full-time to executive development. The number of staff members is largely dependent on the frequency with which the program is sponsored as well as the size and structure of the program.

Setting. The campus setting is considered by many persons to be more conducive to a good learning situation. The campus exists for study, and the principal may be influenced positively by the academic atmosphere—at least subconsciously. The facilities have been designed for instruction. The library is available, if needed.

Neutral Ground. The university also stands for objectivity; for the search for truth. Principals who are skeptical about the objectivity of district-given instruction may be more receptive to the course when given by a university. The mere holding of the course on the campus rather than in the district is frequently considered to be valuable in terms of neutral ground as well as in terms of providing the academic setting.

Executive Development Program Guidelines

Critical to the success of the Executive Development Training for principals is the commitment on the part of school district top-level administration (Andrews 1966).
The school districts must have justification for releasing key principals and for spending money from a tight budget. This justification can be met by providing program excellence in five specific areas:

1. Relevant subject matter.
2. Experienced, competent staff.
3. Pursuit to the objectives of the program.
4. Professionalism.
5. Program follow-up.

Benefits will outweigh the costs if school district administration believes that the principal will return ready to meet new challenges, with renewed vigor, skill and polish, and make better decisions and increase the effectiveness of the district.

Standards of Admission

In order to attend a training program, principals should be nominated by their superintendent. This admission requirement ensures that all participants are mature individuals with a wealth of recognized practical experience. Nomination of the candidate must be accompanied by a letter from the superintendent (Watson 1979). This letter should include:

1. Background information on the principal.
2. Frank assessment of his abilities.
3. Plans established in order to make use of the new competencies the principal develops at the program.

4. Whether or not the principal will make substantial contribution to the program from his administrative experience.

Tuition and fees should be paid by the sponsoring school district. Principals' salary during the program and travel expenses are also paid by the district.

One means of maximizing executive training benefits for the district is to send more than one but not more than four participants from each district. The limit of four participants to a school district should be enforced in order to ensure a diverse and heterogeneous group (Bricker 1976).

In order to maximize interaction, the entire group should be limited to 30-36 participants. The entire group should be brought together only for lectures. Every effort should be made to keep classes smaller than groups of eight (Lippett 1962).

Schedule of Events and Daily Schedule

Following is a possible approach to scheduling the daily events and activities for participants and faculty of an executive development program.
Three Months Prior to the Program.

1. Announcement of the program.

2. Selection of faculty and experienced principals to serve as instructors and discussion leaders.

3. Nomination of participants by their superintendents.

4. Selection of participants by the university.

5. "Participant Preparatory Questionnaires" mailed to candidates.

6. Coordination of facilities, accommodations, meals, etc.

Initial Announcement of the Program: The initial formal announcement of the program should be mailed to District Superintendents three months prior to the program. Detailed lists of all districts and their addresses are compiled yearly in National Directory of School Unions and School Districts. Typically the announcement contains a general statement of the needs to which the program addresses itself, followed by more detailed program objectives; description of the principals for whom this particular program is meant (for example, age, experience, position); the training and main methods to be used (for example, active participation, case work, field work); the duration, dates, location, and cost of the program; and the admission requirements and procedure.
Two Months Prior to the Program.

1. Staff researches the principals' needs and program expectations from information supplied in questionnaires.

2. Faculty and instructors structure training to fit the needs of the group.

3. Mail case-studies and pre-reading assignments.

One Month Prior to the Program.

1. Preparation of participants' notebooks.

2. Schedule of training program mailed to participants.

3. List mailed of participants and faculty members with brief biographical sketch on each attached.

4. Faculty training and final program coordination.

Opening Day Schedule of Activities.

1. Introduction.

2. Explanation of the plan of work.

3. Organization of work groups of six persons each.


It is important to make the opening day special--plans should be made for some appropriate ceremonial beginning such as each principal speaking briefly about his hopes for the program.
Perhaps the spirit of the Executive Development Program can best be summarized by these remarks which could be made by the Director in the opening session:

Welcome!

This three-week session is called Executive Development.

Our program is defined as a meeting for open discussion. That's what goes on during these three weeks--open discussions with faculty and 36 principals.

Why are you here? What do you expect to get out of the Forum? Well, that's pretty much up to you.

There's no material to learn. It's not necessary to take a lot of notes, because the program doesn't require you to remember a lot of details. There are no tests. No one is checking up on you to see if you do well. You're on your own!

During the three weeks, you will have the opportunity to find out what's going on in education and get some ideas on how you might be a more effective principal.

You will be able to do this because you are exposed to some 50 successful principals and faculty members. They will be sharing with you their experience, know-how, their philosophies, their attitudes, their sense of values, their priorities.

Don't expect them to be teachers and lecturers--in the usual sense. Remember, they are primarily successful individuals coming out here to share with you what they do, to talk with you about how they manage. They are resources.

During the three weeks you will have lots of opportunities to ask questions. In fact, the success of the program depends, to a large degree, on your asking questions.
I would encourage you to get involved in exchanging ideas. Talking with the faculty. Asking questions. Exchanging experiences. Remember! The program is a meeting for open discussion. The presenters expect interaction.

Because the program is designed to improve managerial performance, you are going to find a heavy emphasis on competencies. If you check the dictionary, you will find the word "competent" defined as "having requisite ability or qualities. . . qualified or capable, able, fit."

During the three weeks you will have an opportunity to check out the abilities and qualifications of a lot of different individuals.

Throughout the program you will be comparing your experience and knowledge, your skills and abilities, your philosophy, your management style, your attitudes, values and priorities with what the faculty shares with you during the three weeks. You will be evaluating your competencies, in comparison with their competencies.

You will be able to pick out some things you need to learn more about. . . or need to learn to do. . . or perhaps some things you need to learn to do better.

The difference between where you are and where somebody on the faculty is might be thought of as a gap. . . a gap that you discover. During the three weeks you will have many opportunities to identify gaps. You will have to decide which gaps you want to close and how you might go about doing it. What kind of priorities are you going to set on whatever you decide you need to do?

The key to keeping the program in perspective is to continually ask your self, "What do I need to do to improve my managerial effectiveness. . . based on what I'm exposed to at the program."

When you get back on the job, what are you going to do better? What are you going to do differently? What are you going to try that's new? That's where the payoff comes. In what you do after the program is over.
During the three weeks you will be working together in small groups... seven principals to a group.

In your groups you will be analyzing... sharing ideas and experiences... discussing what has been talked about during the program... evaluating what you have heard and seen... making some decisions as a group, making some decisions as individuals.

Each small group is a heterogeneous mix... of experience... of expertise... of skills... knowledge... and learning needs.

You are sitting in your small groups this afternoon. This is your group for the three weeks.

I hope you will look upon this program as a great opportunity. There has been nothing like this done before. We are convinced this is the way to help principals become more effective.

You are here because you are self-starters, decision-makers, doers, achievers, action-oriented. You are self-directing and competent.

You have a three-week opportunity to interact... with the faculty... among yourselves.

Any evaluation of the success of the program will be based on two things: one is how well you take advantage of the program to get what you need and want; and the other is your back-home application of what you get out of this program and what you do back home to close some of the competency gaps which you might discover during the three weeks.

Program Schedule

Program planners should try to schedule sessions in such a way as to allow for a maximum amount of faculty-participant interchange.

A typical day starts at 8:30 a.m. with small classes of six or seven individuals. One class is taught in the
morning and one in the afternoon, except for Wednesdays, when there is only a morning class. Afternoons on this day are scheduled with occasional field trips, guest speakers, or other events of special interest. Evenings are set aside for special seminars or for concentration on some phase of his self-development. Small group discussions are centered around case-studies or individual sessions with faculty members or in individual counseling. Sundays are left open, except for the necessity to prepare for Monday's classes.

Each class takes place in an informal workshop setting; team assignments, case-studies and video-tape feedback are incorporated to produce optimum learning. In-course assessment of each session by principals is built into the time-frame of each session. Staff and faculty meet each day to go over these and revise the program to fit the principals' needs.

Closing Day

It is important to provide for some kind of formal way to end a period of such intensity. This will set the program off from the rest of daily life and free the participants to leave the program with closure (i.e., semi-formal graduation exercise where each member speaks and where achievements are recognized and awarded.)
Closing day should also include the reviewing and refining of a total continuing personal development plan, arrangement of times and places for geographical cluster groups to meet for follow-up clinics, and evaluation of the course work by individuals and groups.

Return to Work

The participants should:

1. Be encouraged to use what useful things they have learned. It may help to allow time for him to "settle in again." Explicitly so; otherwise they will take the time surreptitiously and feel guilty about it. The opposite; for instance, finding a desk overloaded with work held up till their return will not help.

2. Be provided an opportunity to talk about and give feedback to the organization about the training process (Lynton and Pareek 1967, Watson 1979).

The Follow-Up

After the program concludes, participants should be asked to rate themselves on the program and their learning competencies. A follow-up survey of participants and school district superintendents should also include significant improvements in managerial development. This continual, long-term follow-up can be conducted through the use of:
a) newsletters and communication from the university; and
b) organized local "refresher courses" for participants.

Climate for the Program

An atmosphere of openness and mutual acceptance which protects group members from intolerable embarrassment and from the fear of rejection by others should exist in order to bring about the acceptance level of learning and changed behavior.

Informal contacts among principals are also of great importance in furthering the learning process. To facilitate such contacts, meal times, coffee breaks, cocktail hours, and periods of recreation should be kept as informal as possible and are scheduled to be as long as possible. Principals are encouraged to review and work through what is going on in their groups and what they have heard in lectures; to work out in subgroups those problems which the total group could not solve; to explore in greater depth issues which have arisen in the group; to get other members to elaborate on feedback which was given initially in the group; to explore with others, who have similar jobs or have similar problems, the relevance of things learned to the job situation (Knowles, 1978).

Group Setting. A group setting is required. When principals acquire new knowledge alone and are not interacting
with others (for example, by reading or listening to a lecture), he does not have the opportunity to examine his own views or behavior to see where and how they are appropriate or inappropriate (Knowles 1970).

**Atmosphere.** The physical setting and layout of the conference center will affect the outcome of the program. The training facility should be located in a setting which is free from the pressures, annoyances, and distractions that are typically encountered in the course of a busy workday. It should provide an atmosphere conducive to serious study and reflection, where principals can escape from the everyday pressures and worries and devote themselves to examining their own values, philosophies, and management practices in light of other methods or newer approaches (Planty and Freeston 1974).

**Faculty-Student Relationship.** The relationship between instructor and principals is different from that between faculty member and the regular college student. Limited enrollment affords faculty members the opportunity to know members of the group more intimately. Also, informal social hours and group dinners foster this close student-faculty relationship. Program directors should encourage the participants and faculty to dress informally during the duration of the course.
Pre-Program Correspondence with School Districts

Communications from the university to participants prior to the program is important for several reasons: (1) it helps line up expectations for the program; (2) provides information; (3) prepares the participants for an experience of real relevance; (4) assures them of the program's intention to ensure this; and (5) establishes the climate or tone of the program and the work standards to be required.

Sending information to the selected participants should begin at least two months prior to the opening session of the program (Watson 1979).

Letter to Selected Principals. A letter which explains the program and how it will be conducted is sent to each participant two months before the course is to be held. This letter is extremely important because it helps to shape the participants' expectations about the program and establishes the climate or tone of the program and the work standards that will be required. Not only does it contain factual data and information, but it also carries emotional, unwritten messages, including such things as the director's interest in the participants and their comfort, the seriousness of the program, the extent to which the participants can be themselves at the program, and some assurance that participants will not be subject to the threat of embarrassment or intimidation.
A principal's willingness to discuss, to question, and to challenge develops quickly in the academic environment. The consequences of contributing comments, which are scrutinized on the job by superiors, peers, and subordinates are now reviewed only by temporary peers and neutral faculty members. Wrong decisions do not result in costly errors. Challenges to traditional thinking and practices are met with encouragement. This climate for growth is perpetuated throughout the program.

**Individual Counseling.** Individual counseling in the executive development context is an appropriate method by which principals talk over their problems with professional counselors. The counselor is skilled in individual communications and serves as a listener or sounding board to help principals analyze their job performances and their career problems and needs.

Counseling also enables principals to get help with personal problems outside the work organization involving home, children or themselves, as well as their work and their superiors. It can deal with internal problems too delicate to discuss with the boss. Organizations have come to realize that if personal problems are suppressed, the results can be serious for the individual and the organization (Bittel and Craig 1967).
A letter announcing the course can go a long way in either alleviating all anxieties and defensiveness or accentuating them, depending upon how it is written. One can hope to do a reasonable job of predicting the impact of the course announcement letter only by placing himself or herself in the shoes of the reader. Particular care should be taken to assure that the letter does not convey a condescending tone or carry with it the implied message, "We at the university have all the answers you dummies need, and we will straighten you fellows out in a few weeks." It should express the fact that none of the participants will be put on the spot or embarrassed or examined by lengthy tests. It should imply that the people who attend will be treated as mature executives.

The letter should explain the following to the principals:

1. The purpose or purposes of the course.
2. Superintendent support (frequently the letter goes out over the superintendent's signature to convey this).
3. The daily schedule including topics to be covered and the faculty who will teach them.
4. Assignments.
5. Travel information or a request for participants to inform the training staff of their travel plans.
(e.g., airline arrival times and flight number) so that they can be met at the local airport, train depot, or bus terminal.

6. A map of the training site and directions on how to get there.
7. The starting times of events and the locations where the participants should gather.
8. What to wear and what to bring.
9. A description of the dining and living accommodations and nearby recreational facilities.
10. Whom to contact if they have any further questions or requests.

Program Preparatory Questionnaire. In order to ensure that program planning and case study discussion group selection proceed as effectively as possible, participants should be asked to complete a series of questionnaires two months prior to the program (Burke and Beckhard 1970).

Preparatory questionnaires might include the following:

1. Personal information sheet.
2. Experience/interest inventory.
3. Personal time log of activities.
4. Inventories of leadership style, management style, and group process techniques.
Questionnaires should be sent to all participants with formal instructions for completion of the items. This material will be used to develop an individual notebook in which principals may chart their own program development.

The following questions may be used to obtain useful data for program planning:

1. Describe a recent situation in which you were involved in which you would have liked to use the training offered in this program. What happened? What did you do? What left you dissatisfied?

2. List the new technical and other skills you would like to have at your command to deal with a similar situation in the future.

3. Would you have been free to use these skills in the situation or were other changes required also? If other changes were required, list the additional skills you would need to promote them.

4. On which training areas would you choose to concentrate your attention at the program?

Asking this information accomplishes several things:

1. It forces the principals to think about the program before they go to it.

2. It causes the principal to feel important.

3. It increases the principal's interest in the meeting because he has participated in planning part of it.
(It may be curiosity alone to learn whether his problem will actually be discussed that prompts him to participate in the planning.)

4. It furnishes the planners with valuable information for agenda preparation.

5. It helps the planners to select priorities and allot time on the basis of the degree of interest in any given subject (Lippett, 1962).

**Pre-Program Reading Assignments.** It is usually a good idea to send participants some reading material and cases before the program begins, along with a description of the case-study method and how it works. In total, these materials should be limited to not more than 25-30 typewritten pages. By receiving pre-program assignments, participants will quickly get the message that the program will be demanding and should not be considered a vacation from work. Most participants will make an honest attempt to complete the assignments and, hence will reduce some of the work load they would otherwise have to face while at the program. Even if every person does not complete each assignment beforehand, an important step has been taken—that is, setting the standard of serious work.

**Superintendent's Role.** It is important that the selected principal leave for training assured that the superintendent regards his training as thoroughly worthwhile and
makes steps to enable him to use his new competence when he returns (Andrews 1966).

The superintendent should: (1) review the purpose of the program with the principal; (2) tell him what to expect from the executive course; (3) establish the procedure by which the principals' new competencies will be used; and (4) let the principal know he will be expected to evaluate the program once he returns. This evaluation normally covers such broad categories as: (1) participant reaction to the program; (2) contribution or benefits to the individual and to the school district; (3) a recommendation for continued district participation in the programs; and (4) a plan for his continued personal development.

Length of the Program

Programs should operate for a minimum of three weeks. It is quite clear that length influences quality as well as amount of long-term effect. It determines the degree to which impact is superficial or fundamental. Research has demonstrated that programs operating less than three weeks are considered "wine-tasting programs." Any amount of time can be put to good use, but in programs of serious purport, the longer the time the deeper the impact (Runkel and McGrath 1972).

The ease with which personnel can be spared depends upon the commitment and ability of the administration. If
any person cannot be spared for three weeks at some time, a severe problem exists. It is more than likely that the indispensability is not real. Its illusory life is supported by lack of conviction on his boss's part that the experience is worthwhile, or timidity in entrusting responsibility to untried hands. The latter quality is patently a major hindrance to executive development within organizations, for unless opportunity to exercise responsibility is given the capacity to handle it cannot be developed (Bursk 1971).

School principals prefer that programs of professional development be scheduled during the school year. January, February, and November are identified as the months which are most convenient to attend. June, December and especially May were cited as least convenient times. Furthermore, principals requested that programs be held during the working weeks rather than scheduled vacation times (Davis 1974).

Job Responsibilities During Attendance

All job responsibilities should be suspended during attendance at the executive development program (Andrews 1969). This three-week length of time away from the work site is to be viewed as an opportunity rather than a problem. In most cases responsibilities should be formally and
temporarily assigned to the principal's subordinates. An Intra-District Bulletin might be distributed which could read:

Memo To: All Staff
From: School Superintendent

Jim Jones, Assistant Principal, will become acting Principal of Barlow High School, while C. J. Smith attends an Executive Development program.

Sally Kaiser, English Department Head, will become acting Assistant Principal, replacing Jim Jones. John Miller, English Teacher, will become acting Head of the English Department, replacing Sally Kaiser.

These temporary assignments at Barlow High School will be in effect for approximately three weeks starting April 6, 1982.

A period of three weeks of job rotation provides an opportunity for at least three people to take realistic high-level responsibility. If there are no persons available or qualified, serving in a subordinate capacity to the participant, the work may be assumed by the principal's superior.

Cost Commitment

Tuition and training fees must be paid by the sponsoring school district. This guideline ensures greater willingness on the part of the school district to face some of the implications of training.
The argument for supporting inservice efforts has some logic and tradition to support it. For example, Goodlad (1979) contended almost a decade ago that:

Public schooling probably is the only large scale enterprise in this country that does not provide for systematic updating of the skills and abilities of its executives and for payment of the costs involved. Administrators, we presume, can acquire markedly different ones through some process of osmosis.

For those interested in estimating expenditures, the following items should be noted:

1. **Tuition**: This is the basic charge for instruction. Tuition varies considerably from program to program and naturally tends to be higher for those programs which run for a longer period of time and/or have more restrictive enrollment quotas.

2. **Fees**: In some programs, participants are charged extra fees for books, for special materials, or for specific recreational, entertainment or group projects. Generally, these fees are nominal.

3. **Room and Board**: For most programs these costs are included in the tuition fee. In a few programs they are listed separately.

4. **Travel**: These costs, of course, depend on the distance the participant must travel to and from the university. If the executive plans to return to his home on weekends, this item may be an important
consideration. Generally for those programs of short duration, the universities prefer the executive to remain on campus. For programs of longer duration, the universities usually schedule one or two long weekends to allow for trips home.

5. **Incidentals, Recreation and Entertainment**: In this area there are likely to be extensive variations in cost for individual executives, even from the same company. Company accounting regulations and varying living habits among individuals will cause differences that can only be estimated.

6. **Salaries**: Companies should include the salary of the executives as part of the cost of sending an individual to such a program.

The most meaningful way to view the cost of sending a principal to a university-sponsored program is to measure this cost against the future value of the program to the principal and his district. In other words, is the dollar return on this investment in human capital less than, equal to, or greater than the dollar cost of the program? Some interesting work has been done, measuring the dollar return to investment in human capital in terms of undergraduate and graduate education. Up to now, little quantitative analysis of this kind has been done in the executive
development area. Nonetheless, if a principal gains in competence and personal motivation, and is thereby more effective in achieving district goals as a result (or partial result) of participation in a university-sponsored executive development program, it seems likely that a positive value accrues to him and the district alike.

**Training**

School principals expect to work hard at programs of professional development; when this expectation is not fulfilled they become frustrated and apathetic to the learning. The harder they are asked to work the more they value the program. The elements of a program designed to be most effective are based on adult learning concepts.

Programs should:

1. Fit the needs of each participant, rather than require the same activity for all principals.
2. Provide a choice and alternative which can accommodate differences. Allow principals to give each other feedback concerning performance and areas of needed improvement.
3. Make principals take an active role rather than a receptive role.
4. Be based on actual demonstration of material rather than information stored for possible future application.
5. Allow principals to work closely with peers in small groups of no larger than seven, in order to learn from each other.

6. Contain course work that is reality-based, up-to-date, and relates specifically to the school principal's concerns.

7. Be taught by successful faculty experienced in the problems of being a principal.

Preparatory questionnaires filled out by the principals provide a good base for this individualization of the program objectives. If principals arrive at the program, after having given input which provides information to personalize the program, and they receive instead a "canned" program, the effectiveness of the program will be essentially destroyed. Every effort must be made to individualize and personalize the program to the participants involved.

An additional way to accomplish this is to ask those participants to take responsibility for designing specified blocks of time in the program. This can be an alternative or an addition to involving them to a limited degree in planning the whole program. For example, principals might design nine hours work per week for themselves with individual guidance from a faculty member. Participant-designed
programs have been found to be at least as demanding as any the faculty would have organized (Lynton and Pareek 1967).

Training Methods

Selection of the most appropriate methods for training in the executive development program is an important determinant of the program's effectiveness. The (c) case-study, (2) buzz group training, and (3) in-basket training methods have been found to be the most appropriate methods of instruction in programs of executive development. Davis (1976) has found role-playing to be considered least effective by school principals.

The basic aims of a case-study approach are to teach concepts and principals (knowledge), and to increase one's abilities in problem identification, analysis, judgement, decision-making and problem-solving (diagnostic skills). Additionally, this method is aimed toward producing new attitudes: acceptance of others and other points of view; openness to new untried approaches to problems; tolerance of ambiguity; and nondogmatic thinking (personal characteristics).

The burden of learning is placed on the participants; for them it is a nondirective experience. The principals must become self-motivated and deeply involved in learning the many subtle, complex lessons which, when combined, are
generally referred to as "wisdom." The use of case studies is based on the supposition that wisdom cannot be taught, but must be learned from experience. It is believed that the materials and lessons will be remembered better and longer and will be more likely to guide individuals in their future decisions and actions (Pigors and Pigors 1961).

In a case-study program, the entire class of participants is divided into several study groups of five to eight people (buzz groups). The case is often presented to participants well before the buzz-group meetings so they can study it and read pertinent theoretical material--such as chapters in textbooks and articles--and form their own judgements individually. The more thorough and conscientious participants are in making their preliminary preparations, the more fruitful the buzz-group discussion becomes. Each group analyzes, discusses, and consolidates the thinking and opinions of their members to formulate a group report on the case.

In a buzz-group, case-preparation meeting, participants may discuss anything they feel is pertinent and significant. The buzz-group leader will usually try to keep the discussion "on-track." Through free-wheeling discussion, however, the group's thinking often becomes both broader and deeper and, as a result, students delve into elusive, complex subtleties that might otherwise go unexamined. In
these open, give-and-take sessions, participants frequently realize their own individual approach is not the only "good" one and that there are often many other ways to solve problems (Watson 1979). Moreover, they learn to sense weaknesses in their own approaches and thinking and come to respect the thinking of others. Perhaps most importantly, they learn to identify and analyze problems among themselves and then to arrive at creative solutions to these problems—no longer having to rely on the instructor to identify the problem and give them the correct solution.

When the buzz groups have prepared their reports, the entire class is reassembled. Representatives from the various buzz groups present a report to the entire class and the instructor (Planty 1966). All students are free to raise questions and comment on the reports presented. Additional discussion usually follows, and this typically is directed at further explorations into concepts brought out by the reports and comments made about them. The instructors will then summarize what has been observed from the group reports, make additional comments on the case analyses and reports, and finally give their own thinking and conclusions. An instructor may even go further and lecture to the class, providing more insight and adding support through research evidence and illustrations of the principles being taught.
A form of simulation exercise, the in-basket technique was developed in this country by Educational Testing Service in the early 1950s at an outgrowth of approaches used by the British Civil Service. This method is useful for testing a new manager's aptitude for handling a variety of problems with dispatch. It can also be a powerful training device.

The name is descriptive. Participants are presented with an "in-basket" for a typical day in the life of a hypothetical school. They are expected to take on the problems presented by the mail (internal and external), one by one. Contents of the in-basket include reports and other reading matter that provide background in handling individual problems presented by other items in the basket. Thus the in-basket contains a microcosm of the hypothetical school—perhaps a calendar flow-chart, staffing patterns, discipline problems, parent communication and other material to place problems in context. Letters, memos, notes, reports then follow, each of which requires immediate disposition (West 1979).

The participants take whatever action they deem necessary for each item. They must write out notes and memoranda, telephone conversations and face-to-face discussions. The person works under pressure since all of the items must be disposed of in a given time. He must set
priorities, handling those appropriate to the job and delegating others. The end result can be scored and a mark assigned to the project, or decisions can be reviewed by a superior, an instructor, or other program participants.

This method can be very effective. It is inexpensive and quite flexible, lending itself to adaptation to conditions prevailing in the school. The items in the basket can be culled from actual situations, perhaps slightly disguised.

The Faculty of Executive Development Programs

The faculty of university executive education programs must be topnotch. To be most effective an executive program instructor, the faculty member must not only have a secure grasp on the material taught but also must be able to relate to principals who are themselves expert in their fields. Thus, program faculty members might well have had extensive principal and other educational experiences of their own, in addition to academic accomplishments.

The role of the faculty differs quite sharply from that usually assumed in a conventional academic program. Likely to be of about the same age as the participants, the professor appears more as an equal than a superior and often serves as a moderator, discussion leader, or chairman rather than as a teacher. He does not give grades, grade examinations, or presume to pass formal judgement on individual
work performed. The professor is helped either by the innate conscientiousness of his class or by its members' wish to do well before their peers. Not supported by academic coercions, he depends upon the intrinsic interest of the material and issues he presents for study and upon the responsiveness of the participants in his course. Faculty generally are judged for their ability to stimulate useful experience for participants rather than for their standing as scholars or rank in profession. The caliber of faculty in a program is a major determinant of its success. Even if the program has excellent and appropriate content, materials, facilities, and coordination; if the teachers are poor, its overall impact will be minimal (Watson 1979).

Philip Crotty of Northeastern University's Executive Development Program explains that:

The instructor determines the tenor of his/her relationship with his/her class. He/she has the advantage of small class size and informal social contacts over dinner, and at other after-hours occasions, to develop rapport and to learn of the strengths and needs of the students. In turn, however, he/she is under close scrutiny for the level of his/her professional knowledge, the competence of his/her teaching and the significance of his/her insight (1974, p. 80).

Bass and Vaughn (1966, p. 136) report that one can generally be assured of securing topnotch program faculty members if they possess three important characteristics:

1. Know the subject to be taught from both theoretical and practical standpoints.
2. Know and understand the process of adult learning.

3. Have the ability to work with adults. Can establish a rapport with the participants that is conducive to learning. Can earn the participants' attention, acceptance, and trust quickly. Are genuinely interested in people and helping them to learn and develop their knowledge, skills, and personal characteristics.

Effective instructors for programs of executive development can also be identified by specific behaviors, which include the following (Planty and Freeston 1979):

1. They know what the program participants do and because of this, they focus on and emphasize those aspects of the subjects they teach that are most useful to those whom they teach.

2. Understand the programs objectives, its philosophy, its methods, and exactly where he/she fits into the program.

3. They answer questions clearly and directly.

4. They illustrate the concepts and ideas they teach by means of practical examples so that they will be remembered, understood, and accepted.

5. They present their subject clearly and present the major points in a logical orderly manner.

6. They show how and where to apply the concepts.

7. They use a variety of teaching methods, but rely most heavily on those which involve active participation because these methods are most effective for developing the skills required for effective management.
In summary, the high morale and infectious enthusiasm generated by a faculty which has a clear understanding of the objectives of the program and subscribes whole-heartedly to them is a key element to the success of the process of development and renewal for executives.

Teaching Schedule

As a rule of thumb, programs should have a minimum of two and a maximum of six instructors per week (Planty and Freeston 1979), assuming a six-day week consisting of two sessions per day.

If a program has only a few instructors, principals have a greater inclination and opportunity to interact on a more personal basis, because barriers are reduced and participants become more likely to seek assistance on problems they face at work. Moreover, this closeness builds greater group cohesiveness and openness to self-reflection and self-understanding, which are the first steps toward personal growth and development (Anshen 1964).

If management training is to have a long-lasting impact, there must be continuity in the subjects covered; and these subjects must be covered in depth. A single one-hour or two-hour session is not enough. Moreover, change will not come about as a result of a program that has instructors who advocate contradictory and conflicting
philosophies and practices. Typical reactions to these programs are confusion, frustration, and the persistence of old forms of behavior and management practices (Watson 1979).

The argument that a great number of different topics and instructors is refreshing and prevents boredom is fallacious. Instead of being refreshing, it actually puts a greater strain on participants, who have to continually "shift gears" mentally and readjust to each speaker (Burke and Beckhard 1970).

Teaching Materials

Executive training programs should have individual notebooks for principals. Notebooks should contain the following (Watson 1979):

1. Daily schedule of classes and activities.
2. Information about conference center and facilities; including maps when necessary.
3. Short resumes of biographies of instructors and participants to assist group members in becoming acquainted with each other quickly.
4. Outline and assignment sheet for each session.
5. Case studies.
6. Other materials for class exercises such as in-basket games, role-playing exercises and instructions, management game guidelines and materials, etc.
7. Readings
8. Lined notebook paper for taking notes.

The notebook should be attractive and neat. A first-rate notebook conveys to participants the image of a first-rate program. All reproduced material should be clear and clean. Xeroxed copies can usually meet this appearance requirement, but offset printing copies are most attractive. Many universities have attractively printed or embossed notebooks designating the school and the program. The additional cost of this is usually minimal and a justifiable expense. Notebooks used should be three-ringed binders with a ring size that is one-half inch thicker in diameter than the thickness of the stack of materials and papers that the notebook will hold (Watson 1979).

The materials for each session should be grouped together for easy reference. A schedule and assignment sheet should precede them. Notebook dividers will help participants to locate appropriate materials quickly as they are needed.

**Evaluation of the Program**

Evaluation of the program is important for three reasons: (1) it provides information during the program to
assess participants learning; (2) it provides data to revise or adapt the program; and (3) it provides information for the sponsoring school district on the outcomes or further training needs. Evaluation should not be viewed as a one-shot effort. It should be planned as an integral part of the program from beginning to end (Ordiorne 1961).

Evaluation should be done in three parts:
1. In-course evaluation of participants progress.
2. Post-program evaluation.
3. School district evaluation.

In-Course Evaluation

Daily evaluation of the sessions is an important element in the degree of mastery achieved by the participants. It not only allows the principal to sense the degree of learning; but also, when viewed collectively, a sense of programming strengths and weaknesses is developed (Fitzpatrick 1976). Daily evaluation deserves to have time allocated for it. The following is an example which may be used in an executive development program:

Your Impressions Today

Your Name ___________________________ Date ________

Write your impressions about the day's work. Keep the questions given below in your mind while writing your impressions. Put the date and name on the sheet. The questions are not
to be answered—they are only for guidance. You can use another sheet if you want to write more.

1. Did you have some new insights into your behavior?
2. Did you have some new insights into the behavior of others in the group?
3. How did you see the group today? Describe, using some adjectives (e.g., productive, cohesive, fighting, developing, etc.).
4. How did you see the trainer? Describe using some adjectives (e.g., helpful, confusing, distracting, damaging, etc.).

Using questionnaires need not involve extra work for the trainers. Participants can take turns distributing, collecting, and collating the forms and presenting a brief summary before the next session. The first 20 minutes every morning should be given to reviewing the results of the previous evening's evaluations, which are then plotted on graphs of display for easy reference (Watson 1979).

Impact on the Participants After Training

This is an appraisal of the effects of training as revealed by subsequent, modified behavior on the job. It involves measures of:

a. Reaction: How well did the participants like the program?

b. Learning: What principles, facts, and techniques were learned?
c. Behavior: What changes in job behavior resulted from the training?

d. Results: What were the tangible results of the training program in terms of reduced cost, improved quality, improved quantity, etc?

e. Additional Outcomes: Other results or byproducts of the training not identified or assessed by the other four areas. This includes such things as the social value of training. To what extent do trainees feel better about themselves? Has the training helped people satisfy some of their personal goals? Has it assisted them in their career development?

Impact on the School District

This phase of the evaluation involves a determination of the extent to which training has played a part in organizational success. The kinds of things that indicate significant contributions to organizational success are observed behaviors in:

a. an improved supervisory and management force;
b. improved interschool functioning;
c. improved motivation and morale.
d. improved communication, vertically and horizontally;
e. greater teacher and student satisfaction with school services rendered.
Physical Facilities

During the past decade, many universities have built modern, on-campus continuing education centers. These centers are self-contained, air-conditioned units providing sleeping, eating, conference rooms, study and certain recreational facilities all under one roof.

Residence. Residence facilities will vary in university programs. A typical location contains: single rooms with a private bath or suites with eight people in each with single beds, three baths and a lounge (Bricker 1960).

Residence facilities can include: laundry facilities, daily maid service, sauna, jaccuzi, exercise room. Indoor recreation includes: a lounge, table tennis, pool tables, recreational library, and a small bar available after 6:00 p.m. Outdoor recreation includes: jogging and an exercise trail. The emphasis is not on recreation since not much time is available for it. Recreation is subtly muted, with hard work the evident theme.

For the most part, members of an executive development program should eat in private dining rooms reserved for their use, usually located in the building where they live.

Classrooms. In most executive development programs the participants spend approximately six hours each day in the meeting room; it should be obvious that this room must
meet specific conditions to assure a good and comfortable learning environment.

People should never be crowded too closely together or around table configurations that are too spread out or bunched too tightly together. When seated at a table, the average person needs a minimum of thirty inches of table space. Three feet (36 inches) will be more appropriate, especially for large people. Frequently, people are seated around tables as closely as the chair space permits, which invites discomfort, sore muscles, and irritable participants (Bass 1966).

Areas adjoining the meeting rooms should provide a pleasant and quiet atmosphere. There should be ample restroom facilities nearby for men and women. There should be a smoking area, where participants can congregate, relax and chat. Telephones should be available, as well as message boards near the meeting room where announcements and messages for participants can be posted. A coat rack should be located conveniently outside the meeting room.

Program Summary

Executive Development Program for School Principals is an intense three-week program of participatory training. Open discussion groups are held every day, starting at 8:30 a.m. in the morning, and continuing until early evening.
In order to develop a stimulating and productive atmosphere, a number of different training techniques are employed. Courses take place in an informal workshop setting; faculty members carefully integrate oral and visual presentations, team assignments, case studies, and videotape feedback to produce an optimum learning pace. Most importantly, the group's own experiences are used to evaluate new techniques just established and to generate an interchange of ideas.

The program seeks to develop the principal as an individual. For this reason, it provides opportunities to pursue special areas of special interest in considerable detail.

Faculty participation in the Executive Development Program for Principals is a carefully planned selection process. The faculty is comprised of only the most experienced and knowledgeable members of the education and business community.

To insure that the program remains responsible to the needs of the principal, each participant is asked to critique faculty and areas of instruction as the conference progresses.

Two months after completion of the program, both district administration and program participants are given
the opportunity to measure the results of their learning through a series of written questionnaires and informal personal consultation.

Candidates for the Executive Development Program for Principals are nominated and sponsored by a school district. Application is to be completed three months prior to the program. A letter from the superintendent must accompany the principal's nomination. A policy of accepting only two principals from each district is enforced in order to ensure a heterogeneous group.

In order to insure that program planning and discussion group selection proceed as effectively as possible, all participants complete a series of pre-program questionnaires. This inventory of personal directions and experiences is used to align program material already produced with the needs and expectations of the participants.

Research has shown that the time was never so ripe for enrichment as when one is already actively involved in the pressures of a demanding and successful career.

The Executive Development Program is designed to enhance the leadership qualities already possessed by principals, and to cultivate those areas of management which may be underdeveloped. Executive development is not for everyone. The hours are long; the pace is fast, and the
demands extensive. Enrollment is restricted to only 36 principals who are now experiencing the complex and dynamic problems of managing a school. This is not a program for principal hopefuls; this is a program for those who wish to excel at a job they are now doing. The Executive Development Program should provide principals with broadened knowledge and ability to insure present career effectiveness and confidence to face the future challenges that are certain to arise in the educational system.
Conclusion Statements

Executive development for school principals is a unique concept which can and should be achieved. Numerous studies show the principal to be the key to the quality of the school program. Executive development is one approach to enable principals to keep abreast of changes and innovations, to learn new skills, or develop or improve abilities needed in current or future positions.

The value of executive development lies in the benefits to be derived from a concentrated learning program which not only develops and improves needed skills and knowledge but also exposes the principal to other participants who have fresh ideas and insights, expertise, and enthusiasm.

The importance of professional development is understood by the educational system, but little has been done to utilize executive development as a method to improve the effectiveness of education.

To this researcher, the American system of education is one of the most unique enterprises undertaken in the
annals of mankind. Every effort must be made to insure that it is successful, because our children are our nation's future.

Executive development can be central to the development and future of an effective school system. But several items must be taken into consideration before the executive development process can begin to produce benefits:

1. The substantial investment of both dollar and manpower for executive development programs must be viewed as an investment in the future of the school system.

2. Universities must be committed to implement a program which is unique, and of such high caliber that it demands excellence.

3. Curriculum for executive development programs must be professional, individualized, and specifically designed to address the concerns of school principals.

4. Pre-training programs for school principals should recruit and limit the programs to those educators who have the capabilities, potential and commitment necessary to achieve executive leadership.

5. Executive development is beneficial, but school principals must have the following if executive development is to be effective.
a. Increased authority over staff selection, retention, and dismissal in order to assure commitment to the school program.

b. Discretionary power to organize the school administrative and support services (including administrative aides) in order to carry out the executive's plan.

c. Discretionary funds at the school to implement decisions.

d. Freedom to determine daily activities, travel for professional purposes, and expenses to support them in order to find solutions to problems.

e. Expert legal and legislative interpretations and advice.

f. Salaries and executive prerogatives commensurate with responsibilities in order to attract and retain executive-level people.
Suggestions for Further Study

Further research is needed before the results of this study can actually be used to implement a successful Executive Development Program for principals. It is suggested that further study be conducted in the following areas:

First, attention must be given to the development of a curriculum specifically designed for school principals. What should be the content of courses that will deal with the problems of managing the complex environment of a school?

Second, an in-depth study of the cost factors in producing an Executive Development Program should be undertaken. Within such a study a question might be asked which leads to understanding the attitudinal differences between the corporate business world and educational system in financial commitment to professional development. Additionally, alternative approaches to funding such a program should be explored.

Third, a detailed survey should be coordinated to determine which universities could best provide the resource necessary to develop and offer a program of Executive Development for School Principals. Involved in such a survey could be the search for "experts and personalities in
education" who would bring the most effective instructional ability to a program of executive development.

Finally, more understanding is needed of the linkages necessary with both the school district and the university in order to implement a program.

It is further suggested that attention be turned to the development of a program of executive development for the chief executive of the school district, the superintendent.
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