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This study sought to examine the degree of congruence between the perceptions of principals and superintendents regarding critical skills needed by beginning principals. It was designed to replicate a study performed by Schmieder, McGrevin, and Townley in California in 1994. Schmieder et al. used Daresh and Playko's taxonomy of critical skills for novice principals and rank ordered them. This study differed from Schmieder et al.'s in that the critical skills were organized into three categories, which were used to determine whether principals and superintendents agreed on the skills that were important. Factors such as gender, ethnicity, and school district size were also examined, and two ancillary questions were investigated. These ancillary questions addressed critical skills that would match more precisely with the actual needs of the position which might be incorporated into pre-service preparation for principals and determined whether there was agreement among superintendents regarding the greatest challenges for beginning principals.

This study utilized two theoretical frameworks to view the issue of principal effectiveness. The first was a taxonomy of skills necessary for effective management of people. Three categories of skills that superintendents believed to be critical for new principals were identified: technical skills, self-awareness, and socialization skills. The second theoretical framework was socialization.

Six operational null hypotheses were tested by analysis of variance and correlation statistical techniques. Four hypotheses were accepted. Two ancillary questions were also investigated through the use of open-ended questions. The findings for the ancillary
questions indicated that both principals and superintendents felt that courses should be taught by instructors familiar with the day-to-day operations of public schools. Further, they believed instructors should connect the theoretical base with a practical perspective and that internships as well as mentoring programs should be addressed in the training of pre-service administrators.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Several years before the publication of *A Nation at Risk* (Boyer, 1983), a small group of educational researchers launched what has become known as the school effectiveness movement. The principal leaders of this movement were Brookover, Edmonds, and Lezotte, who concluded that strong instructional leadership by the principal was one of the necessary correlates for effective schools (Brookover et al., 1982; Edmonds, 1979, Lezotte, Hathaway, Miller, Passalacque, & Brookover, 1980). Consequently, other researchers have supported the idea that the principal is the key figure in productive schools (Brophy & Good, 1986; Dwyer, 1984). During the past 12 years, so much attention has been devoted to the role of the principal that Barth (1985) contended that a "re-discovery" of the school principalship has occurred.

In spite of the attention that has been given to this important role, little empirical research has been devoted to the socialization, competencies, and inadequacies of beginning principals (Alvy & Coladarci, 1985, Daresh, 1986, Garberiana, 1980; Greene, 1990, Sussmann, 1986). In one of the six studies conducted in the United States on beginning principals, Duke (1988) compared novice and veteran principals' perceptions of their experiences. In a related study, he identified the reasons bright, young principals consider quitting (Duke, 1988). Another study by Alvy and Coladarci (1985) found that new principals felt they were least competent in the areas of curriculum and instruction. In
A more recent study on beginning high school principals (Parkay & Hall, 1992), principals reported their most difficult challenges: coping with a wide range of tasks, establishing communication, dealing with a large number of decisions, and improving consultation procedures within the school. Kimbrough and Burkett (1990) noted that the skills needed by an effective school principal are so extensive and diverse they almost defy any attempt to list them.

A critical theoretical framework of the study of skills needed by novice administrators has been attempted by several researchers. Efforts have been made to identify skills crucial to principal effectiveness. The most notable effort has been by the National Association for Secondary School Principals (NASSP) (1992) Assessment Center Project which resulted in the identification of 12 skills considered key to principal effectiveness. Sergiovanni (1987) provided a popular categorization of skills administrators bring to bear on situations. These result in leadership forces that can be placed in five categories: technical, human, educational, symbolic, and cultural.

The most widely accepted approach for classifying managerial skills is a three skills taxonomy proposed by Katz (1955) and later discussed by Mann (1965) and Katz and Kahn (1978). This typology divided management skills into three categories: technical, human, and conceptual. Katz (1955) hypothesized that technical skills were most critical for entry-level management positions such as assistant principalships or principalships.

Studies by others challenged Katz's (1955) conclusions. These studies found that human skills were much more important than technical skills for managerial success. Other research on critical skills for school-site managers followed the pattern of asking
superintendents and novice principals to identify critical skills. Skills that rose to the top were effective communication, openess to divergent viewpoints, and talking to key school-site players while not showing favoritism (Daresh & Playko, 1989).

Another theoretical framework is that of socialization. Socialization was defined by Merton (1968) as "the processes an individual acquires, including dispositions, skills, and awareness needed to perform a social role effectively. Over time, one becomes a member of a profession through a process called 'professional socialization'' (p. 76).

A study of the socialization of new administrators was undertaken by Duke, Isaacson, Sagor, and Schmuck (1984). The results noted that the socialization experiences of novice administrators were usually informal, tense, and unplanned rather than designed. Feelings of unpreparedness, loneliness, and time constraints accounted for a tough first year for the new principal.

Parkay and Hall (1992) developed a professional socialization hierarchy for beginning principals that involved five stages; these stages included survival, control, stability, educational leadership, and professional actualization. The authors utilized a case-study approach and determined that principals enter the position at different stages of hierarchy. The "handwriting was on the wall" for each principal after the first year predicted his/her eventual level of effectiveness. This study was particularly relevant because it suggested that the faster the novice moved through various stages, the higher and longer his or her level of effectiveness would be, the sooner he/she developed confidence and a realistic view of what would be accomplished, the faster full effectiveness would be achieved. Work completed by Van Maanen (as cited in Schmieder, McGrevin,
& Townley. 1994) also indicated that beginning principals should be aware of the stages of their careers and the ups and downs of leadership.

As the public pressures educators to reform and restructure education, it is important to examine the skills administrators will need to lead our schools into the 21st century. This study attempts to gain an understanding of the skills that principals and superintendents identify as being critical to a novice principal's success.

**Statement of the Problem**

Schmieder et al.'s (1994) research study addressed the search for critical skills needed by novice principals. This study, conducted in the State of California, revealed a strong agreement between principals and superintendents regarding critical skills needed for novice principals' success. However, no study has been attempted in the State of Arizona.

This study seeks to examine how much congruence exists between the perceptions of principals and superintendents regarding critical skills for beginning principals. By understanding the types of critical skills needed, the principal would be able to move quickly through the early survival stages of the socialization process into the area of transformational leadership. This study is a replication of the California study by Schmieder et al. (1994). It used a survey methodology, and questionnaires were sent to all of the superintendents and a random sample of principals in Arizona.
Research Questions

Schmieder et al. (1994) attempted to identify critical skills needed by beginning principals in a study conducted in California. In replicating their study, the same questions were asked of superintendents and principals in the State of Arizona. The research questions addressed in the study were

1. Do superintendents agree about critical skills needed for a novice principal's success?
2. Do principals agree about critical skills needed for a novice principal's success?
3. What perceptions do superintendents have that might be incorporated into pre-service preparation for principals which match more precisely the actual needs of the position?
4. What perceptions do principals have that might be incorporated into pre-service preparation for principals which match more precisely the actual needs of the position?

Methodology

This research employed survey methodology to gather data from superintendents and principals regarding their perceptions of critical skills needed by beginning principals to be effective in their role. Additional data regarding their perceptions of the adequacy of educational administration certification programs in preparing persons to assume a principalship were gathered.
Population and Sample

The population of respondents consisted of 450 principals in the State of Arizona and 240 Arizona superintendents. In an attempt to survey as many beginning principals as possible, the survey was sent to all principals in Arizona who had been appointed to their present position in 1989 or later. All principals who participated in the study completed a 45-item questionnaire which asked respondents for background data relating to their age, gender, years in education, and present position, as well as their assessment of the adequacy of their university-based certification program. The questionnaire also asked them to assess the importance of skills normally associated with the role of the principal on a five-point Likert Scale. Each item was be rated from "critical" to "irrelevant." The items on this scale were derived from the work of Daresh and Playko (1989) "which involved the use of the Delphi Technique to determine the nature of specific skills which were sought and valued by superintendents as they selected new principals for their school districts" (p. 45). The first eight items in this section of the questionnaire related to skills traditionally considered technical or "how to" skills. The second eight-item set related to socialization skills needed by principals, and the third set of eight items related to self-awareness skills.

Superintendents selected for the study were from 234 school districts throughout the state. All district superintendents were asked to participate. The superintendents' questionnaire was similar to the principals' questionnaire. They included background data such as age, gender, years of education, principal and/or superintendent experience,
present position, and size of district. The survey also included an item eliciting superintendents' perceptions of the biggest challenges for beginning principals, as well as their opinions of how well prepared aspiring principals are to meet these challenges. The third section of the questionnaire included the 24 critical-skill items described in the principal questionnaire.

**Significance of the Study**

This study of the critical skills necessary for beginning principals is significant for several reasons.

1. Much has been written about the importance of the school principal. Yet, although the principal has been identified as an important consideration in the educational framework of a district, no clear set of defined skills has been developed to provide guidance to the beginning principal. A research base has been developed by Schmieder et al. (1994) to determine critical skills needed for novice principals in California. The skills needed were based on and validated by practicing principals and superintendents in Arizona. An awareness of specific competencies may provide a design to help the novice principal to understand what is important for successful job performance.

2. This study generates suggestions about what would match more precisely with the actual needs of the position. These
recommendations might be incorporated into pre-service preparation programs for principals.

3. The study provides suggestions for professional development that may be selected by both principals and superintendents to speed principals' progress through the socialization process. Merton (1968) defined socialization as the processes an individual acquired including dispositions, skills, and awareness needed to perform a social role effectively. It is assumed that the faster the principal moves through the early survival stages of the socialization process, the higher and longer his or her level of effectiveness would be. The sooner he or she developed confidence and a realistic view of what would be accomplished, the faster he or she would reach full effectiveness. Work completed by Van Maanen (1977) also indicated that beginning principals should be aware of the stages of their career and the ups and downs of leadership.

Limitations

All research studies are limited by the abilities of the researcher collecting the data. As a key instrument in collecting quantitative data for this study, the researcher constantly sought to ensure objectivity, validity, and reliability. The questionnaire used was developed for principals and superintendents in the State of California. Some of the issues that were important in California may not be an issue in the State of Arizona.
The study was limited to the State of Arizona, and the number of relatively new principals in the state may not provide an adequate sample. With only 240 school districts in the state, the superintendent sample was also small.

Finally, the study did not describe every aspect or impact of the role of the principal. Rather, it examined perceptions of those who were doing the job on a daily basis. The study attempted to understand and discuss some the complexities of the public school administrator.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

"So goes the teacher, so goes the school" (Sergiovanni, 1987, p. 27). This bit of wisdom may have provided the guide for examining and evaluating schools 150 years ago. When schools were small, often one room, and in a very real way, the school was the teacher.

Those relatively simple times in education have given way to an era in which schools and society as a whole have become increasingly complex. During the last quarter of the 19th century, industrialization began to impact our way of life. We welcomed millions of immigrants from Europe, and technology began to develop to a stage where what had been a startling discovery yesterday became a common occurrence of today.

We have changed our thinking about the schools of today. The role and function of the principal are in the forefront of that change. Historically, a principal's role was viewed as managerial. Payne (1879) stated, "Clearly some are born to lead and some to follow" (p. 337). Cubblerley (1923) wrote, "There is a technique of organization, administration and supervision based on a definite body of concrete experience and scientific information that every principal should know and use" (p. 119). Virtually all contingencies of a principal's work were noted by Cubberley (as cited in Sergiovanni, 1987), from prescriptions about what to do on the opening day of school, to how to assign...
playground duty in a 15-teacher school, to how to inspect the adequacy of a building's services.

**Administrative Principles**

Among initial advocates of the universality of administrative functions or principles of management was Luther Gulick. Beginning his research in the early 1900s, Gulick posited in 1937 that essential management elements consisted of planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling. He viewed these endeavors as undergirding all managerial processes. Fayol (1949) later augmented this list and held that the administrative process consisted of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting.

This notion of universal principles of administration continues to be useful. Yet other theorists also contributed to the understanding of administration. For example, Sheldon (1923) stressed that administration was both a scientific process and a philosophy. Managers not only perform functions such as listed by Gulick but also have ethical and moral responsibilities to the community. Herbert Simon (1982) and Daniel Griffiths (1959) wrote persuasively about the decision-making functions of administrators. In addition, the ability of administrators to communicate effectively with those within and outside the organization was considered a crucial function of leadership and management (Simons, 1961). Expanding the views of earlier educational advocates, administrative functions as related to schools included budgeting, organizing, leading, decision making,
staffing, planning, evaluating, communicating, and coordinating. The list of functions grew and included not only managerial but also leadership tasks.

**Administration Defined**

Administration is broadly defined by *Webster's Dictionary* (1989) as a "process of working with and through others to accomplish goals efficiently" (p. 19). Actions by the principal, school goals, available resources, and the necessity for working with other people, such as teachers and parents, are the essential elements of this definition. Principals initiate actions toward desired ends defined by the school's goals. When principals are successful in matching their actions to goals, with goals subsequently advanced, they are considered effective leaders (Sergiovanni, 1987).

Administrative activity cannot be implemented or achieved by principals alone; they must rely on others to accomplish their work. This point cannot be overemphasized. In seeking to maintain and improve schooling, principals are dependent on others. Teachers, for example, are keys to successful schooling and must be regarded as such by principals. In many respects, the nature of administrative activity is humbling, for principals can accomplish little alone. Accepting this reality is critical if one aspires to be an effective leader (Sergiovanni, 1987).

Most administrative theorists (e.g., Gulick, 1937, Sergiovanni, 1987, Griffiths, 1959) make a distinction between administration and leadership. They argue that the school principal is responsible for teachers and other employees, each of whom has specifically defined tasks. The principal's job—to coordinate, direct, and support the work
of others—is accomplished by defining objectives, evaluating performance, providing the
necessary resources, building a supportive psychological climate, running interference with
parents, planning, scheduling, bookkeeping, resolving teacher conflicts, handling student
problems, dealing with the school district central office, and otherwise helping to keep the
school running effectively day by day and improving its ability to achieve its objectives
(Lipham, 1964). Lipham considered this list of activities to be encompassed by
administration rather than by leadership. Administration, according to Lipham, refers to
the routine behaviors associated with one's job. He believed that leadership was revealed
in the initiation of new structures, procedures, and goals and that it suggested an emphasis
on newness and change.

Administrative Practice

In contrast to the theoretical and normative dimensions of an administrator's role,
what is it that school administrators actually do? Much of the site administrator's time is
spent engaged in important but fundamentally non-instructional activities: supervising
students (between classes, in the hallways, at lunch, at various extracurricular events,
before and after school, and during bus loading and unloading); responding to parental and
community concerns; preparing reports and responding to central office requests;
resolving conflicts between students or between students and teachers; handling student
discipline; requiring and distributing teacher resources; scheduling classes and other school
activities; supervising staff; meeting with individual and small groups of students, teachers,
or parents; and responding to any number of unexpected school emergencies that may
arise. Activities that are more clearly within the purview of instructional leadership, such as teacher supervision, classroom observation, curriculum development and evaluation, and instructional support and technical assistance for teachers, generally have not represented significant portions of the site administrator's day. The crucial instructional leadership role of the site administrator is mitigated by routine and managerial responsibilities (Sergiovanni, 1987).

Several studies have confirmed the domination of non-instructional leadership functions in which site administrators engage. A national survey of high school principals (Bryne, Hines, & McCleary, 1978) revealed that the median work week of a site administrator was 56.5 hours. During this period, the top three time-consuming activities were school management, personnel management, and student activities. By contrast, principals wanted to spend most of their time on program development, personnel activities, and school management. A complete listing of the activities of a principal during a typical work week ranked in order from the most time-consuming activity (1) to the least (9) is displayed in Table 2.1.

Using an ethnographic approach to analyze how a single elementary school principal used his time throughout the school day, Wolcott (1984) provided a detailed account of the enormous amount of time the principal spent interacting with others. Based on these interactions, Wolcott concluded that the amount of administrator time available for other school activities was restricted, as depicted in Table 2.2.

In another ethnographic study in which 24 building principals were studied over a two-year period, Morris, Crowson, Porter-Gehrie, and Hurwitz (1984) concluded that the
Table 2.1

Allocation of Time for a Principal's Typical Work Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of responsibility</th>
<th>Do spend time</th>
<th>Should spend time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student activities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student behavior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District office</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Byrne et al., 1978, p. 20
### Distribution of the Principal’s Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity of principal</th>
<th>Observed day-to-day range (in percentages)</th>
<th>Percent of time in &quot;average&quot; day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prearranged meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or conference</td>
<td>13-35</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberate but not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prearranged encounter</td>
<td>24-29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual or chance encounter</td>
<td>10-28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephoning</td>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking on intercom</td>
<td>0.6-1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone and stationary (e.g., working in office)</td>
<td>13-24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone and enroute (e.g., going to a meeting, walking down the hall)</td>
<td>7-14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Wolcott, 1984, p. 88
principal's work day typically was not focused on instructional leadership activities. Rather, the principal's day was unpredictable and filled with short-duration, face-to-face encounters with staff, students, and parents. These encounters were necessitated by such managerial activities as student monitoring, disseminating information within and outside of the school, and handling disputes and disturbances.

Mintzberg's (1973) study of executives led him to classify managerial activity into 10 roles within three major categories: figurehead, leader, liaison (interpersonal behavior); monitor, disseminator, spokesperson (information-processing behavior); entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator, negotiator (decision-making behavior).

Not unlike managers in business settings, school administrators must be both managers and leaders. As managers they must ensure that fiscal and human resources are used effectively to accomplish organizational goals. As leaders they must display the vision and skills necessary to create and maintain a suitable teaching and learning environment, to develop school goals, and to inspire others to achieve these goals. It is essential to school effectiveness that both managerial and leadership functions are prioritized and superbly performed.

Simultaneously, school systems are obligated to provide sufficient administrative support so that the press of managerial functions does not, out of necessity, restrict the opportunity to engage in leadership activities related to teaching and learning.

Functions of education executives at the school site have expanded in scope and become extremely complex. School administrators are expected to provide leadership in important educational endeavors such as goal setting, organizational planning, guiding
instruction, implementing curricular changes, and evaluating personnel while simultaneously managing concrete activities such as transportation, facilities, maintenance, and food service. School administrators not only must acquire broad knowledge concerning functions they will be expected to perform, but they also must possess the skills necessary to carry them out.

For the school to function effectively, it is important to focus on the leadership skills needed to create successful organizations. Leadership is the quality that enables an individual within a given setting to establish an organizational vision, to motivate and inspire others to embrace that vision, and to achieve and maintain organizational and individual goals. Leadership skills are critical in the operation of schools. Research by Blumberg and Greenfield (1980), Edmonds (1979), and Murphy (1983) supports this contention.

**Leadership Theory**

Major historical themes in the study of leadership include the great man, traitist, situational, and behavioral approaches (Lipham, 1964).

**Great-Man Approach**

Much of the early literature on leadership (1800s-1937) was characterized by analyses of the lives of great men. Many biographical analyses and autobiographical memoirs dealt extensively with leadership phenomena, although few of the authors made explicit the criteria which constituted the bases upon which the so-called great men were selected for study. The philosophy underlying these works was heavily oriented toward
the viewpoint that leaders were born and not made, that nature was more important than nurture, and that instinct was more important than training. Without resurrecting such controversies, suffice it to note that some learning of leadership by example was assumed; otherwise, the effort to document, analyze, and critique the lives of the exemplars could not have been justified (Lipham, 1964).

In the field of education, as contrasted with other disciplines such as political science, only limited scholarly effort has been directed toward analysis of leadership by utilizing the great-man approach. Few studies tended to enshrine leaders rather than to explain leadership. Historians of the future should devote sustained effort to clarifying the perceptions and understanding of leadership in the field of education (Lipham, 1964).

**Traitist Approach**

The traitist approach to the study of leadership, derived initially from the great-man approach, was based upon the recognition that an individual's behavior is determined in part by his/her unique personality structure. Some of the early speculation regarding the personal traits required for leadership included long lists of "desirable" personality characteristics. In the absence of suitable psychological taxonomies, such lists often included somewhat contradictory traits—kind but firm, pensive but active, steady but flexible, forceful but cooperative. It still is not uncommon to encounter descriptions of leadership expressed entirely in personalistic terms (Lipham, 1964).

The measurement movement in the sphere of psychology during the 1900s gave impetus to the traitist approach to the study of leadership. In the search for discriminating
leadership traits, a host of measures and a variety of procedures have been used, including interviews, observations, tests, checklists, and rating scales. Because some studies conducted in similar settings produced contradictory findings and because the studies failed to reveal a universally applicable pattern of traits typical of leaders in all settings, some researchers reacted violently and erroneously to the traitist approach. The current view is that there are several patterns of personality variables that differentiate leaders from followers and that such patterns are situationally relevant, if not situationally specific. The extreme reaction to the so-called failure of the traitist approach has abated, and researchers are examining with fresh perspective the relationship of the psychological dimension to sociological, cultural, and other dimensions of leadership in specific situational contexts (Lipham, 1964)

**Situational Approach**

Recognizing that psychological factors were not entirely sufficient to account for leadership phenomena, researchers in the 1900s focused more attention on sociological factors. The emphasis shifted from analysis of personal traits to the study of roles and relationships—from a concern with characteristics of the individual to a concern with characteristics of the group. Indeed, many of the early situational studies were primarily concerned with group phenomena and only incidentally with leadership. Basically, the situational approach maintains that leadership is determined not so much by the characteristics of individuals as by the requirements of social systems (Lipham, 1964).
In the situational approach to the study of leadership, the following kinds of group characteristics were measured: size, productivity, decision making, satisfaction, intimacy, autonomy, cohesion, homogeneity, polarization, conflict, stability, drive, and anticipation. Among the methodologies utilized to investigate these characteristics were observations of both structured and unstructured social systems, interviews with leaders and followers, performance on simulation exercises, problem-solving and decision-making analyses, sociometric choices, and assessment by expert judges. Derived from the studies were generalizations regarding such powerful and useful concepts as potential leadership, permissive leadership, persuasive leadership, and emergent leadership (Lipham, 1964).

Even so, it came to be recognized that if the analyses of leadership were limited only to situational factors, then the study of leadership, per se, was at a dead end. Conceptually, such an issue as the transferability of leaders was difficult to explain; operationally, such a matter as determination on the part of a leader to lead appeared to be denied. By the 1960s, there was a gradual drawing away from either traitist or situational approaches, and the emphasis shifted to analysis of the behavior of leaders (Cunningham & Gephart, 1973).

**Behavioral Approach**

Another approach to the study of leadership recognized that psychological and sociological factors as well as individual and situational factors were powerful behavioral determinants (Foley as cited in Lipham, 1964). This approach utilized both types of factors, thereby focusing upon the observed behavior of the leader-in-situation. It was not
necessarily assumed that the leadership behavior exhibited in a given situation would transfer to other situations; instead, this became a variable for investigation.

Methodologically, several research procedures were utilized: selecting a target population of highly regarded leaders (often based on formal position held), assessing leadership behavior utilizing rating scales, interviews, and observations, assessing individual, group, or organizational variables believed to be related to either general or specific leadership behaviors, and examining the interrelationships of the variables (Lipham, 1964).

Utilizing the behavioral approach to the study of leadership, scholars at the Personnel Research Board of the Ohio State University initially isolated two dimensions, initiating structure and consideration, as significant divisions for describing leader behavior (Hemphill & Coons, 1957). These dimensions were delineated from a factor analysis of data obtained from the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Hemphill & Coons, 1957) which assesses the behavior of leaders in social systems. The vast majority of the leadership behavior in the field of education have utilized the LBDQ. Within a single year (1957), over 30 such studies were reported in dissertation abstracts. There also has been a preponderance of such studies in business, industrial, and military settings. The major dimensions of the LBDQ are defined as follows: Initiating Structure refers to a leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between self and work-group members and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure. Consideration refers to leadership behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of his/her staff (Halpin, 1966).
The LBDQ (Hemphill & Coons, 1957) was subsequently revised by Stodgill (1974) to include assessment of leadership behavior on the following 12 dimensions:

1. representation—the leader speaks and acts as the representative of the group;
2. demand reconciliation—the leader reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder in the system;
3. tolerance of uncertainty—the leader is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset;
4. persuasiveness—the leader uses persuasion and argument effectively, and exhibits strong convictions;
5. initiation of structure—the leader clearly defines his own role and lets followers know what is expected of them;
6. tolerance of freedom—the leader allows followers scope for initiative, decision, and action;
7. role assumption—the leader actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others;
8. consideration—the leader regards the comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers;
9. productive emphasis—the leader applies pressure for productive output;
10. predictive accuracy—the leader exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately;
11 integration—the leader maintains a closely knit organization and resolves inter-member conflicts;

12. superior orientation—the leader maintains cordial relations with superiors, has influence with them, and strives for higher status. (pp. 325-326)

Several studies and experiments (e.g., Stodgill, 1974) attest to the viability of the LBDQ sub-scales for assessing leadership behavior.

The behavioral approach to the study of leadership also served as the basis for much of the work at the Midwest Administration Center at the University of Chicago, where three distinctive behavioral styles of leaders (normative, personal, and transactional) were identified (Cunningham & Gephart, 1973). The normative (nomothetic) style focuses on the normative dimension of behavior and, accordingly, on the requirements of the institution, the role, and the expectations. The personal (idiographic) style emphasizes the personal dimension of behavior and, accordingly, the requirements of the individual, the personality, and the need disposition. The transactional style calls attention to the need for moving toward the normative style under one set of circumstances and toward the personal style under another set of circumstances. Numerous researchers in the field of education have found this typology useful in analyzing, understanding, and predicting leader behavior (Getzels, Guba, & Campbell, 1970).

Studies utilizing the behavioral approach have contributed greatly to an understanding of the nature of leadership. From research based on the behavioral approach, the following generalizations may be made:
the leader-follower relationship represents a delicate mix of
personal and situational variables;

the personal and situational variables do not operate singly but in
discernible patterns and combinations;

the patterns and combinations of variables, including leader
behavior, may be misperceived by either the leader or the followers;

and

the degree or extent of misperception appears to be meaningfully
and systematically related to a variety of organizational, group, or
individual variables.

More importantly, however, the behavioral approach to the analysis of leadership
provides a perspective from which to view the definitions of leadership (Lipham, 1964).

Definitions of Leadership

There is both theoretical and the operational disagreement about a definition of
leadership. Those committed to a personalistic conceptualization tend to view leadership
as a one-way influence process and to define it in terms of specific inferred or observed
characteristics or combinations of characteristics of individuals. Those committed to a
situational conceptualization of leadership tend to view it as an interactive process and to
define it in terms of leader-group relationships and interactions.

Others who have an organizational orientation are committed to the view

that the incumbents of status positions are, ipso facto, leaders and.
therefore, their role behavior defines leadership behavior. Still others who have a pragmatic orientation insist that leadership simply consists of that which experts in the field wish to consider, designate, and measure as leadership. Thus, it is not surprising to find a plethora of definitions by those presumed to have had firsthand experience with the phenomenon. (Lipham, 1973, p. 6)

At the present time, there appears to be some overlap among the conceptualizations. As a result, we may define leadership as individual behavior which initiates a new structure in interaction within a social system. Such a definition takes into account effectiveness and efficiency measures, achievement and maintenance functions, situational and personalistic determinants, organizational and individual constructs, active and passive relationships, latent and manifest conflicts, formal and informal contexts, means and ends, and similar dichotomous distinctions. Leadership initiates change in the goals, objectives, structures, procedures, inputs, processes, or outputs of social systems. Because leadership involves social systems in action and interaction, it is relational and ineffably complex dynamic (Lipham, 1973).

**Leadership Effectiveness**

Leadership is that quality which enables an individual within a given setting to establish an organizational vision, to motivate and inspire others to embrace that vision, and to achieve and maintain organizational and individual goals. School leaders such as principals are legally empowered and responsible for various operational aspects of the
educational system. These leaders derive authority and power from their positions. One dimension of leader effectiveness is associated with the use of legitimate authority and power to accomplish organizational tasks. Leader effectiveness also is dependent on personal characteristics, the interaction with followers, and the situation itself. There are five basic areas in which research has attempted to account for leader effectiveness: identification of traits, influence through power, analyses of behaviors, the relationship of situational variables and leadership (the contingency approach), and influence through transactional leadership. School leaders should understand these conceptualizations or approaches as they seek to enhance their effectiveness.

**Leadership Traits**

An insistent and vivid theme displayed in early studies was that effective leaders possessed a set of innate traits and abilities that distinguished them from non-leaders. By identifying these traits and abilities, a composite picture could be constructed against which future or potential leaders could be assessed. Reviews of early leadership trait studies revealed no consistent pattern of traits for leaders exclusive of non-leaders or for effective leaders when compared to ineffective leaders (Stodgill, 1974). A different conclusion emerged, however, from some of the more recent literature.

Several traits appear to be associated with effective leaders in management situations. These include high need for achievement, self-confidence, need for socialized power, desire to compete with peers, high energy level,
interest in oral, persuasive activities, relevant technical, conceptual, and interpersonal skills. (Yukl, 1982, p. 2)

**Power-Influence Approach**

Leaders and followers have influence over one another. Leaders exert influence through power (the ability of one actor to get another actor to change his or her behavior or to do something which he or she otherwise might not do) and authority (the right to exert influence legitimated by follower consent or the position held). The manifestation of power by followers is associated with the extent to which leaders depend on information they generate, expertise they possess, or their cooperation in meeting organizational goals. Leaders derive power from two sources: the position (position power) and personal characteristics (personal power) such as expertise or charisma.

Several conceptualizations and definitions of power can be noted. Weber (1947) defined power as "the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance" (p. 152). He also distinguished power from authority in that the latter encompasses legitimation, by which he meant there was an acceptance of power because of value congruence between the exerciser of power and those affected by the power. In other words, authority is legitimated power.

Weber (1947) held that legitimated power or authority was inherent in the hierarchical structure he advocated for the bureaucracy. In this structure, each higher office assumed superiority over a lower office. Each office was staffed on the basis of technical expertise and competence which presumably ensured that the office holder...
willingly accepted the authority vested in that position. Although the technical competence of office holders would not always be superior to that of subordinate staff within an office, the structural hierarchy of authority was viewed as essential for organizational effectiveness and for the coordination and control of goals, objectives, and standards.

Etzioni (1964) maintained that power exercised by those in power positions differed according to the means used for compliance—physical, material, or symbolic. As such, power can be classified as coercive, remunerative, and normative. Coercive power refers to the application or threat of physical sanctions. Remunerative power refers to control over material resources and rewards. Normative power is the allocation and manipulation of symbolic rewards and deprivations through the employment of leaders, manipulation of mass media, allocation of esteem and prestige symbols, administration of ritual, and influence over the distribution of acceptance and positive response. Etzioni (1964) argued further that when two kinds of power are emphasized at the same time over the same subject group they tend to neutralize each other.

French and Raven (1959) provided an expanded conceptualization of power in which five sources of power were postulated.

**Reward Power.** The control and distribution of rewards valued by others.

**Coercive Power.** The control and withholding of reward valued by others.

**Legitimate Power.** Authority vested in or assigned to a position.
**Expert Power.** The expertise of special knowledge, skill, or experience.

**Referent Power.** Personal attractiveness or membership in someone's primary experience group; the desire to be like someone. (p. 150)

French and Raven's (1959) conceptualization distinguished between power derived from the organization (reward, coercive, legitimate) and power which resides in the individual (expert, referent). Which form or forms of power used will clearly depend on the situation.

Power resides in the individual and is bestowed by the office or position within the organization. It cannot be avoided in an organization, nor should it be. It is essential for establishing and accomplishing organizational goals effectively, maintaining standards, and reducing uncertainty. Coercive and reward power, however, tend to be less acceptable or satisfactory than expert, legitimate, or referent power.

**Behavioral Approach**

Studies of leaders' behavioral styles reveal that concern for the individual and for the task of the organization are important dimensions of leadership. As defined in the Ohio State University studies (Stodgill, 1974), these dimensions are initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure refers to the manner in which organizational procedures and leader-follower role relationships are defined in seeking to satisfy
organizational goals. Consideration is the capacity to foster and engender leader-follower trust, warmth, and respect.

Research findings by Likert (1961) generated similar dimensions of leadership. He concluded that leaders could be classified as being job-centered or employee-centered. Production-oriented leaders concern themselves with accomplishing organizational tasks. Employee-centered leaders focus on employees' individual needs for fulfillment and involvement. Likewise, Cartwright and Zander's (1960) research indicated that goal achievement and group maintenance were significant features of leadership.

Concerns for the task of the organization or the interpersonal needs of individuals are distinct facets of leader behavior. Some leaders manifest more of one than the other, and others exhibit neither. In general, leaders who frequently display high levels of individual consideration and concern for organizational goals tend to be more effective. Effectiveness of leadership style, however, is contingent on the situation. It is logical to assume, therefore, that a single and inflexible leadership style is impractical, undesirable, and unwarranted (Halpin, 1966).

**Contingency Approach**

According to the contingency approach, effective leadership is a function of the interaction of leader behavior or style and situational variables. In this view, there is no single best leadership style. Leadership behaviors are effective or ineffective depending upon the situation in which leadership is exercised.
Fielder (1967), an early proponent of the contingency approach, held that favorableness of the situation for the leader in relationship to the leader's style determined group effectiveness or how successfully tasks were accomplished. Situation favorability is measured by (1) leader-member relations—the degree of respect and extent of support the leader is accorded by subordinates; (2) task structure—the existence of guidelines and procedures relative to organizational tasks and job assignments; and (3) position power—the leader's discretion and influence over hiring, evaluating, rewarding, and dismissing subordinates. The most favorable situation is one in which leader-member relations are positive, the task is highly structured, and position power is strong.

In Fielder's (1967) model, effectiveness is a function of the leader's style which is classified as task or relationship oriented. Style is determined by measuring leader attitudes through use of Fielder's least preferred coworkers scale (LPC). Leaders who score low on the LPC are considered to be task oriented, and those with high scores are relationship oriented. Both facets are indicative of leader attitude or motivation. According to Fielder, "Task-oriented leaders are more effective than those who are relationship oriented in situations that are either very favorable or very unfavorable to them" (p. 13). Conversely, "relationship-oriented leaders are more effective in situations that are moderately favorable" (p. 14). However, "Fielder's contingency theory has been criticized because of its low predictive ability and because of methodological flaws" (Ashour, 1977, p. 339).

House and Mitchell (1977) employed a "path-goal" (p. 321) theory to explain leader influence on subordinate work motivation and satisfaction. According to their
view, subordinate motivation and satisfaction must be seen in relationship to situational outcomes. That is, the force of an individual's motivation to act is related to perceived desirability of the outcome and the expectancy that the outcome will be attained. Leader behaviors thought to influence the path-goal expectancy linkage are categorized by House and Mitchell as

**Directive.** Gives specific orders to subordinates.

**Achievement oriented.** Sets high standards, challenging goals, has high expectations for subordinate performance.

**Supportive.** Concern for interpersonal needs of subordinates.

**Participative.** Consulting with subordinates in making decisions.

(pp. 325-326)

Directive and achievement-oriented leaders can be equated with initiating structure, and supportive and participative leaders bear a similarity to the consideration dimension identified in Stodgill's (1974) leadership studies. Each behavior is applicable depending on the situation. When there is role ambiguity, directive leadership increases job motivation and satisfaction. Supportive leadership increases satisfaction in situations in which tasks are defined narrowly. Achievement-oriented leader behavior enhances subordinate feelings of self-confidence in meeting challenging goals whereas participative leader behavior increases work satisfaction when tasks are unstructured.

A third contingency approach is the situational leadership theory of Hersey and Blanchard (1982). These researchers contended that leadership style should be a function of follower maturity level. Maturity was viewed on two dimensions: job ability and
psychological willingness. Leadership styles to be used in accordance with maturity level were categorized as telling, selling, participating, and delegating. The first two styles—telling and selling—were considered to be task behaviors in which direction and guidance were provided. The second two styles were relationship behaviors, those in which the leader provided "support, encouragement, 'psychological strokes,' and facilitating behaviors" (p. 157).

Hersey and Blanchard's (1982) model assumed that as followers or groups mature, the style of the leader should change from a task orientation to a relationship orientation.

**Transformational Leadership Approach**

Although leaders influence the behavior of followers through the use of power, the ability of the leader to change followers' attitudes, raise their levels of motivation and morality, and build organizational commitment through an interactive process with followers is viewed as transformative leadership (Burns, 1978). This theory of leadership suggests that leaders motivate followers to achieve within the organization at levels higher than those that might otherwise be expected of them. Followers are motivated by the trust, loyalty, admiration, and respect they associate with the leader—characteristics that are fostered through their interaction with the leader. Moreover, leaders can be motivated to reach higher plateaus through their interaction with followers.

In some respects, transformative leadership is similar to the theory of charismatic leadership (House, 1977). In both theories, followers are influenced through an interactive process with the leader. Leader trust, admiration, and respect are important
considerations, and leaders inspire and motivate followers. Charismatic leadership theory differs from transformative leadership theory in that Charismatic leaders are viewed as having a supernatural purpose and a strong need for power and are idolized and worshiped by followers. Charismatic leaders depend on the perceptions followers hold for them.

Transformational leadership is identified by the research of Bennis and Nanus (1985) as "that which characterizes successful leaders in the private and public sectors" (p. 217). These leaders exemplify an organizational vision and commitment which permits them to "shape and elevate the motives and goals of followers" (p. 217). Additionally, they effect change based on organizational interests shared with followers, and they can engage in behavior and develop structures that will enable followers to satisfy their need for self-fulfillment.

Leader behavior is crucial to the effectiveness with which followers, subordinates, groups, and schools perform their tasks. In an attempt to understand effective leadership, research attention was originally focused on leader traits. Yet these studies displayed inconsistent findings. More recent studies, however, indicated that certain characteristics of leaders are important, for example, high need for achievement, self-confidence, and high personal energy level (Burns, 1978). The power-influence approach to leadership effectiveness posits that power resides in the position and in the individual. Followers or subordinates also possess power which can be a counterbalance to the excessive use of power by leaders. Legitimate, referent, and expert power tend to be more readily accepted by followers than coercive or reward power (Burns, 1978). The behavioral approach to leadership study revealed that leader behavior consists of two components
which can be plotted on distinct axes: initiating structure (concern for goal attainment or organizational tasks) and consideration (concern for individual interpersonal needs) (Burns, 1978). The contingency or situational leadership approach holds that leader effectiveness must be juxtaposed with situational variables (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Transformative leadership theory posits that successful leaders interact with followers to create and motivate followers to embrace an organizational vision, raise the levels of follower motivation as well as their own, stimulate change in the attitudes of followers toward performance goals and organizational purposes, and develop structures to enable followers to satisfy their need for self-fulfillment. There is no one best style of leadership. Effective leaders use several styles as the situation demands.

Current theories seek to explain interaction between leaders' styles and situational characteristics. The ways in which individuals behave in leadership positions or the styles that characterize their behavior may result from implicit and explicit assumptions they hold about subordinates. Such assumptions are the focal point of several management theories. One of the most compelling of these was formulated by McGregor (1960). It was his contention that the manner in which managers behave toward workers or the management strategy they use results from the notion that exercise of authority and control is necessary to motivate people to accomplish organizational ends. He called this concept Theory X. Conversely, Theory Y was the belief that people intrinsically wish to perform well and accomplish individual goals by meeting those of the organization.

Theories X and Y might be thought of as opposite ends on a continuum. Theory X embraces an authoritarian model of leadership, and Theory Y is humanitarian and
assumes the utility of participatory decision making and democratic principles. Theory X views people as dependent and in need of control, whereas Theory Y assumes a human tendency to progress toward independence and self-sufficiency. From the perspective of Argyris (1964), this was a movement from immaturity toward maturity. It is unlikely, however, that modern administrators function exclusively under assumptions of either Theory X or Theory Y. In practice, managers may display characteristics associated with either theory depending upon organizational and individual characteristics.

Rensis Likert (1967) speculated about the presumed nature of workers, which influences managerial strategy and behavior. Perceptions of the degree to which managers have confidence and trust in subordinates and thus involve them in a participatory or consultative way can be placed on a continuum that includes four belief systems. System or Level I is analogous to McGregor's (1960) Theory X. At this level, managers are exploitative and authoritarian. Managers at Level II continue to be authoritarian, but their authoritarianism is tempered by benevolence. Level III managers are consultative. At the other end of Likert's continuum is the System or Level IV manager who has full confidence in workers and who consults with them and involves them in decision making.

It is conceivable that school administrators view leadership through an authoritarian lens as in Theory X or System I. Yet notions of running a tight ship depend upon assumptions about subordinates that may be dysfunctional. This dysfunctionality is illustrated in Ouchi's (1982) analysis of Japanese and American businesses. It was his view that American organizations embraced principles that generally failed to involve
workers and provide for their development in a fashion that demonstrated trust, confidence, and respect.

Leader behavior is influenced at a fundamental level by implicit and explicit assumptions regarding workers. School leaders should recognize that staff members often desire to be closely involved in decision making and may possess the potential for making significant contributions to the organization's overall effectiveness. Although it may not always be possible or desirable for school administrators to avoid behaviors identified with McGregor's (1960) Theory X or Likert's (1967) System I, leadership assumptions associated with Theory Y and System IV are probably more effective in a school setting.

Theories and Situations

Leadership issues concern many researchers, not only in education but also in psychology and management, yet few data are available to show how leadership specifically affects changes in schools or school districts. Theories abound, however. According to Arter (1990), at the University of Oregon, leadership theory "has stumbled through the trait, behavioral, and situational approaches and the images of leader as orchestra conductor, quarterback, prince, hero, superman, spiny creature and Wizard of Oz" (p. 16). Some early discussions of leadership styles placed people into categories such as innovator, early adopter, adopter, late adopter, and laggard (Mazzarella & Smith, 1989).

Some researchers narrowly define leadership as mostly visionary and charismatic, even going so far as to say well-functioning schools may not need leaders as much as they
need managers. Others contend that leadership is essential, especially with regard to instruction. Those who define leadership by function tend to list all the tasks required of school leaders. "If leadership is described by what needs to be done," said Arter (1990), "then assessing leadership boils down to seeing how well the leader does those tasks" (p. 17). Styles and traits, however, tend to depend upon personality.

Jo Ann Mazzarella and Stuart C. Smith (1989) analyzed a dozen theories of leadership styles and noted that on the surface, styles seem to have much in common. There are major groupings along the lines of both task and human relations. The similarities end there. "For example, it might be assumed that leadership styles stressing human relations would be compatible with those focusing on participative decision making, yet some researchers contend a leader with a democratic style also must be skillful at task orientation" (p. 43).

Like Mazzarella and Smith (1989), leadership consultants Kenneth Blanchard, Drea Zigarmi, and Patricia Zigarmi (1987) "argued against an either/or stance on leadership styles--that one is either autocratic (directive) or democratic (supportive)" (p. 157). In many situations, they said, "Leaders rightfully show combinations of these extremes, which fall into four basic leadership patterns" (p. 158). "There are a number of situational variables that influence which leadership style will be appropriate in which situation. The variables include time constraints, job and task demands, school climate and culture, and employees' skills and expectations" (p. 34).
The Future of Leadership

The New Hampshire Education Think Tank (1992) developed a thesis for the next century. It stated, "If schools are to be strong institutions in the next century, then school leaders must adapt their attitudes and skills" (p. 2).

For two years, more than 30 education leaders including policy makers, administrators and teachers, school board members, and representatives of business and higher education, studied and discussed what changes in leadership skills would be needed to create good schools for the future. (Lewis, 1993, p. 59)

The Think Tank's report, "Leadership for Change" (New Hampshire Education Think Tank, 1992), identified six critical roles where the greatest changes will be seen:

Communicator. Communication has always been an important part of an administrator's job, but restructuring requires intensive network building and that, in turn, calls for good skills at finely tuned listening, questioning, and synthesizing.

Facilitator. Leaders must learn to help school sites deal with crises and conflicts by building consensus, understanding motivation, managing conflict, negotiating resolutions, and running meetings.

Analyst and Planner. Leaders must enter a school district asking questions. It is critically important for education leaders to identify, analyze, and understand the local culture of both the schools and the community. Analysis alone is not enough. It must be used to develop
strategic plans for the schools. A collective vision will have a strength that comes from group ownership to carry plans through to action.

**Educator.** As before, school leaders will be educational leaders, but in a new way. Principals will be viewed as master teachers. Superintendents and other central office staff will have specific areas of expertise and will spend much more time sharing their expertise with school-based teams.

**Technologist.** School leaders need to use technology to manage student data, initiate changes, and monitor budgets. They need to embrace new technology for classrooms and understand how technology can reform the way students learn.

**Politician.** School leaders need to develop more sophisticated political knowledge and skills. They need to understand the official and unofficial political avenues in their town, their state, and at the federal level (pp. 12-15).

The greatest barrier to school change, the Think Tank decided, is attitudinal, both among educators and among the public. Some educators see no need for fundamental change, others see too many barriers. The public has little understanding of higher-order thinking.

Everyone needs retraining, especially in the philosophy and practice of collaboration, the report stated. However, time and the availability of programs addressing these areas are limited. Furthermore, all players need
to redefine their roles. For example, school boards should view superintendents as professional consultants, and superintendents and principals should learn to become leaders rather than managers. (Lewis, 1993, p. 45)

**Critical Skills for Leaders**

As information bases increase at an astounding rate, as more and more at-risk students enter schools, and as political, social, and technological systems change radically, traditional educational structures will become dysfunctional. "In order for instructional leaders to successfully restructure school systems from the debris of traditional structures and create structures which will meet the needs of a multicultural and increasingly unpredictable society" (Peters, 1987, p. 39), seven critical characteristics will be required. "Principals who wish to survive as instructional leaders for the 21st century will need to be visionary leaders, strategic planners, change agents, great communicators, role models, nurturers, and disturbers" (Peters, 1987, p. 39)

**Visionary Leaders**

Educational research has long indicated that effective leaders must have a vision for the future. Effective schools research by Lezotte (1989) called for a clear mission for schools. Kanter (1983) stated, "Change masters must develop a shared vision for the direction of the organization and its participants" (p. 42), and Lewis (1988) maintained, "Organizational leaders must be vision makers" (p. 67). Researchers who have studied excellent schools have likewise noted that effective leaders are charismatic, visionary
leaders. Vision is a vital characteristic of leadership. Bennis and Nanus (1985) defined vision as a way of organizing meaning for the members of the organization. Peters (1987) offered the following characteristics of effective vision:

The vision should be inspiring, clear and challenging and about excellence, stand the test of time in a turbulent world, stable but constantly challenged, a beacon and control when all else is up for grabs, aimed at empowering our own people first, preparing for the future while honoring the past, lived in details, not broad strokes. (p. 487)

**Strategic Planners**

Strategic planning will be a prerequisite skill for principals to survive as instructional leaders, especially in turbulent times. Strategic planning allows new administrators to gather a quick picture of an organization and provides a mechanism for developing appropriate short-and long-term goals for the organization. Instructional leaders must be astute at assessing internal and external environments (Greene, 1987).

Such assessment should include a review of the organizational structure and member relationships to one another. Successful staff development efforts will revolve around the existing educational structure and personnel interaction, perceived and real leaders, power centers, and blockers. An effective administrator will always have a good feel for the organizational pulse and temperature. Instructional leaders should spend a large percentage of their time listening when they first arrive at an organization. They must understand the workings of the organization, proper channels, and real and perceived
leadership pools. Support from the school community is vital to making successful
restructuring changes.

Short and long-term objectives are elements of strategic planning that add
flesh to the leader's vision. Leaders must have the big picture in mind, but
also possess an ability to chunk down that vision into realistic, tangible
short-term objectives for staff, students, parents, and community
Allowance must also be made to see that such visions are flexible enough
to allow for a rapidly changing future. (Greene, 1987, p. 14)

Change Agents

Principals as instructional leaders must be change agents. The information base
and major technological advances increase daily, and a knowledge of the change process
will be crucial. Students of the future may expect to change jobs as often as four or five
times in their careers as new businesses bloom and die in 5-10 year cycles (Lezotte, 1989)
Instructional leaders aiming to restructure the educational system must be informed about
the multiple realities of change. An awareness of the stages of change can help leaders
guide staff members through an age of change. Knowledge of leaders and blockers will
enable change agents to assign roles for proper and successful adoption, implementation,
and institutionalization.

To guide educators safely through turbulent changing times, instructional leaders
must be well versed in strategies of change. They must know the phases, frustrations, and
assumptions of change
Communicators

As instructional leaders, principals must be master communicators. Verbal and nonverbal behaviors have a great impact on others (Bailey, 1988). Vision will be useless in an organization whose members are unable to communicate that vision. The language of leaders is noticeably different from that of followers. Charismatic leaders have an ability to reduce complex initiatives to simple, tangible, realistic, and desirable actions, beliefs, and attitudes. Educational advocate Ernest Boyer (1988) stated, "There is a need for leaders who can communicate the fact that schools must provide a sense of belonging for students and staff alike" (p. 46). All forms of school improvement must address this basic need, both publicly and privately.

Instructional leaders must not only be able to see the big picture, they must also take every opportunity to communicate that vision to staff, students, parents, and the community. In these difficult, changing times, leaders must be able to stand tall in the face of challenge and give clear, steady guidance to followers who are facing an unknown, sometimes frightening, future.

The instructional leaders of tomorrow must be able to communicate with staff, students, parents, and community members about the importance of education. The uncertain future of education requires those with vision to share their views and to convey to school personnel the urgency of restructuring their thinking.
Role Models

Principals as instructional leaders must practice what they preach. The old adage "do as I say, not as I do" is not valid in this era of change. A more accurate credo would be "actions speak louder than words." "Educators are hungry for leaders who are value-driven" (Lewis, 1988, p. 59). "Educational organizations also need leaders who are organizational patriots" (Sergiovanni & Corbally, 1984, p. 167). These patriots must model their belief in the direction the organization is heading. They must also have a high level of group loyalty and commitment to foster those qualities in others (Kanter, 1989).

Leaders cannot simply advocate change. They must actively work toward accomplishing realistic goals and provide resources to support innovative reform.

Nurturers

To be effective instructional leaders, principals must ensure that working and learning environments are healthy and productive. To allow change to flourish, Kanter (1983) suggested a team-oriented cooperative environment.

Environmental checks will prove helpful as leaders develop their awareness of organizational concerns, gripes, satisfiers, and dissatisfiers. A well informed leader can develop a positive atmosphere by being aware of and dealing with minor problems and issues before they become major problems. A nurturing atmosphere is one in which participants feel comfortable and safe. At the same time, high expectations must encourage
innovation and experimentation. An atmosphere for safe failure and
reflection is vital for restructuring organizations. (p. 26)

Instructional leaders must also subscribe to current research strategies for staff
development. To nurture a positive atmosphere for change, teachers must be encouraged
to use Joyce and Showers' (1988) strategies for instructional improvement in staff
development activities: theory, demonstration, practice, feedback, and coaching.

Schoonover and Dalzier (1986) called for leaders to be integraters. Administrators
need to find ways to adapt the curriculum to meet student needs. They need to integrate
organizational and individual needs and match them with the short and long-term
objectives of the organization. Sergiovanni and Corbally (1984) called for leaders who
know their people. Nurturers know the needs of all of their people and are able to mesh
those needs with a focused vision to meet them. Anne Lewis (1988) described a leader as
"one who was able to see other viewpoints and act on those varied viewpoints" (p. 24).
Instructional leaders need to be able to mold diverse groups into lifetime learners who can
appreciate their differences and find ways to complement each other and make the total
organization stronger.

Disturbers

Leaders must find ways to motivate those who are satisfied with the status quo.
Because of the rapidity of change within our society, educators cannot afford to become
comfortable. yet members must be comforted as they face the turbulence of the coming
era. In 1989 Lezotte noted. "The class of 2000 has already been within the public school
system for two-and-one-half years" (p. 98). Furthermore, "If educators are to effectively prepare those students for their future, a future which cannot be defined, they must undergo a reorientation in the way educators think and operate at school" (Caldwell & Wood, 1988, p. 52). Schools cannot continue to operate the way they have for the past 100 years. Educational leaders must take strong stands against traditional schools which have, in reality, never served students well.

Much has been written about the skills new administrators need to be successful in a school setting. However, a review of the existing research on the problems that are faced by beginning administrators indicates clearly that there is a major need for research to identify the skills that will enable new principals to feel successful. Scholars have traditionally spent little time examining the issue of how people become administrators; instead, research has more typically been directed at what practicing administrators do—or are supposed to do--on the job (Daresh & Playko, 1989). Despite this limitation on the quantity of data, some fairly strong statements related to how people move into administration have emerged.

Research-based information concerning initial socialization to educational administration makes it clear that any type of support, such as formalized entry-year and induction programs, would be a welcome addition. Only sporadically have activities been designed to assist new administrators. Some of the most recent investigations have been relatively small-scale studies conducted by Nockles (1981) and Turner (1981) and doctoral research by Marrion (1983) and Sussman (1986). A common finding of all three works, which was confirmed in a broader study by Duke (1988), has been that the
administrative entry year may be best characterized as the time filled with considerable anxiety, frustration, and self-doubt.

Another study of a considerably broader scale was completed in England by Weidling and Earley (1987). This project reviewed the characteristics of first-year secondary school head teachers (principals) throughout the United Kingdom. Surveys and interviews were carried out to gain information from beginning principals, their teaching staffs, and their administrative superiors concerning the ways in which principals were frustrated in their new positions. One of the many recommendations of the study was that beginning principals need to receive special consideration and support from their employing school systems. Weidling and Earley also noted that a major problem for head teachers was isolation from their peers. The researchers strongly suggested that ways be found to reduce the sense of separation experienced by novice administrators.

In another study of beginning principals in Ohio, Daresh and Playko (1989) found that administrators' concerns could be classified in three distinct areas: (1) problems with role clarification (understanding who they were as principals and how to make use of their new authority), (2) limitations on technical expertise (how to perform the tasks assigned by their formal job descriptions), and (3) difficulties with socialization to the profession and to individual school systems (learning how to do things in a particular setting—learning the ropes). Duke (1988) found many of these same themes in his study of new principals who were discouraged to the point that they were considering leaving the principalship, despite generally viewed as quite effective in their roles. In particular, Duke found that
these administrators experienced considerable frustration over the fact that they did not understand the nature of leadership responsibilities before they accepted the position.

Most studies of beginning administrators have found a rather consistent set of themes that has implications for the ways in which individuals might be better prepared to fulfill leadership roles in schools. It seems clear, for example, that substantial hands-on experience in performing administrative tasks and responsibilities is needed prior to employment. Entry-year or induction programs need to stress the development of strong norms of collegiality (Daresh & Playko, in press). Such programs must also allow new administrators the opportunity to test some of their fundamental assumptions and beliefs concerning the nature of power, authority, and leadership.

"Effective administration of schools . . . is part science and part artistry or craft" (Blumberg, 1989, p. 48). An awareness of specific key skills, competencies, or mind sets could help the new principal to understand what is important to successful accomplishment of the job.

Schmieder et al. (1994) believed that

Persons actively engaged in the role of the principal were a key source of knowledge regarding its challenges and demands. By asking new principals to reflect upon what they believe to be the critical skills necessary to effectively lead school communities in the 1990s and beyond a better understanding of the complexities of the role of the principal can be gained.

(p. 273)

Schmieder et al. (1994) defined three purposes for studying new principals:
1. To identify critical skills needed by the novice principal based on validation and perceptions of other principals and superintendents.

2. To make suggestions that might be incorporated into pre-service preparation for principals which match more precisely the actual needs of the position.

3. To suggest areas for professional development that may be selected by both principals and superintendents to speed the principal's progress through the socialization process. It is assumed that the faster the principal moves through the early survival stages of the socialization process, the sooner the ability emerges to exert transformational leadership at the school site. (p. 273)

This study utilized two theoretical frameworks to view the issue of principal effectiveness: (1) a taxonomy of skills necessary for the effective management of people and (2) socialization. The National Association for Secondary School Principals' (1976) Assessment Center Project selected 12 skills that were important for principal productiveness. Other researchers provided additional categories. For example, the work of Daresh and Playko (1989), Sergiovanni (1987), and Katz and Kahn (1978) identified conceptual, human, and technical categories. Katz and Kahn believed that as one moved up the business hierarchy, the importance of conceptual skills increased. However, technical skills were most important for beginning leaders.

A later study by Rice (1981) challenged Katz and Kahn's (1978) conclusions. This study found that human skills were much more important for managerial success than
technical skills. Furthermore, the application of Katz and Kahn's theories to an enterprise as personal and service-oriented as the educational system has been questioned.

Relating the study's findings to Katz and Kahn's (1978) taxonomies of skills for managers, another picture emerged. The more conceptual skills that were usually linked to high levels of management were the skills California administrators believed to be important for beginning principals. Kowalski, Ulrich, McDaniel, and Oho's (1992) study of desired skills for principals also suggested that principals needed to develop human relations skills and conceptual skills rather than focusing mainly on technical skills.

Past research on critical skills for school-site managers followed the pattern of asking superintendents and novice principals to identify critical skills. Emerging at the top of the list were effective communication skills, openness to divergent viewpoints, and talking to key school-site personnel while avoiding favoritism (Daresh & Playko, 1989). Specific job roles for effective principals, including visionary roles, facilitator roles, evaluator roles, were identified by Poston (1992).

A team of researchers at the University of Texas at Austin studied the leadership skills of elementary and secondary principals. Five essential qualities of effective principals emerged:

1. They have clear, informed visions of what they want for their schools to become—visions that focus on students and their needs.

2. They translate these visions into goals for their schools and expectations for teachers, students, and administrators.
They establish school climates that support progress toward these goals and expectations.

They continuously monitor progress.

They intervene in a supportive or corrective manner when this is deemed necessary. (Rutherford, 1985, pp. 31-32)

The second theoretical framework utilized in this study is that of socialization. Merton (1968) defined socialization as the proficiencies an individual acquires—including dispositions, skills, and awareness—to perform a social role effectively. Over time, one becomes a member of a profession through a process called professional socialization.

Duke et al. (1984) reported that the socialization experiences of novice administrators were usually informal, tense, and unplanned, rather than designed. Feelings of unpreparedness, loneliness, and time constraints accounted for a difficult first year for the novice principal. Alvy (1984) found that new administrators needed to adjust to alienation from the faculty, develop tolerances for the opinions of others, and have a wider perspective of pressing issues.

Two major issues concerning the critical skills needed by principals have emerged within the past several years:

1. pressure from the public to reform and restructure education and
2. the quality of current principal training. The issue of quality of principal training is receiving attention from numerous books and articles. Since the traditional role of the principal will change under restructuring, there is an additional emphasis on the training of
principals by universities. It becomes critical that professors of educational administration remain current in understanding the realities and demands of the principalship. The emphasis on national testing standards will provide an additional impetus to examine the caliber of principal training at the university level. (Schmieder et al., 1994, p. 276)

Universities need to take a leadership role in determining the skills most needed by beginning principals to be successful during these fluctuating times. In addition, it is important to examine how new principals perceive the adequacy of their pre-service program in preparing them to meet the new leadership challenges of the 21st century (Schmieder et al., 1994)

Conclusion

Extensive research regarding the role of the principal has been done over the last 100 years. Early research and writing focused on the management of small schools with a handful of teachers and few students going on to college or postsecondary education. More recent research examined the leadership practices of men and women in large, complex, educational organizations with national goals to send more and more students to postsecondary training. Most of these studies have centered around management of the organization, leadership styles, effective leadership, effective principalship, administrative theory, and instructional leadership. In the last few years, the research has focused on a new vision of shared responsibility and power.
Several years before the publication of *A Nation at Risk* (Boyer, 1983), a group of educational researchers (e.g., Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; Edmonds, 1979; Fielder, 1967) began extensive searches for effective leaders and concluded that strong instructional leadership by the principal was one of the necessary correlates for effective schools. Subsequently, other researchers (e.g., Arter, 1990; Daresh & Playko, 1989; Schmieder et al., 1994) supported the idea that the principal is the key figure in productive schools.

In spite of the attention that has been given to this important role, empirical research has been devoted mainly to the socialization, competencies, perceptions, and inadequacies of beginning principals. Principals must learn to master a complex array of challenges, and as many of the educational reforms that were proposed during the 1980s are being implemented in the 1990s and beyond, the role of the principal will become even more complex.

The need to understand the world of the beginning principal is especially critical because nearly two thirds of school principals will reach retirement age by the turn of the century (Boyer, 1983). To improve current policies and practices regarding the professional preparation of principals, researchers must first identify the skills and attributes that the new principal needs to develop into a competent educational leader. This knowledge can then be used to improve preparation programs for the leaders of tomorrow’s schools.

Very little research has addressed the training, hiring, induction, on skill development of those leaders who have been challenged to make the vision for education a
reality, nor have researchers studied new principals to glean from them the skills they learned or developed in their first year on the job.

It is critical for researchers to continue to examine programs and practices within schools of leadership to identify and teach critical skills that should be learned and practiced by new administrators. For the leaders of tomorrow to function effectively and to continue to hold the vision for our children to learn and grow, they need to be provided with the necessary leadership skills to do the job.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

This chapter includes descriptions of the study's methodology and the statistical design for analyzing the data. It is composed of the following sections: (1) statement of the problem, (2) hypotheses and ancillary questions, (3) the theoretical framework of the study, (4) research design and format, (5) study population and sample, (6) and data collection procedures.

Statement of the Problem

Schmieder et al. (1994) developed a research study that posed questions to address the search for critical skills needed by novice principals. This study was performed in the State of California and revealed a strong agreement between principals and superintendents regarding critical skills needed for novice principals' success. However, no study has been attempted in the State of Arizona.

This study examined the congruence between the perceptions of principals and superintendents regarding critical skills for beginning principals. By understanding and gaining competence in the types of critical skills needed, principals will be able to move quickly through the early survival stages of the socialization process into the area of transformational leadership. This study was a replication of the study Schmieder et al. (1994) performed in California.
Hypotheses

The major problems investigated in this study are stated in the following null hypotheses:

1. There are no significant differences between principals and superintendents' perceptions about technical skills needed for the novice principal's success.

2. There are no significant differences between principals and superintendents' perceptions about socialization skills needed for the novice principal's success.

3. There are no significant differences between principals and superintendents' perceptions about self-awareness skills needed for the novice principal's success.

4. A. There are no significant differences between male and female superintendents' perceptions of the critical skills needed by novice principals.

B. There are no significant differences between male and female principals' perceptions of the critical skills needed by novice principals.

5. Perceptions of administrators (principals and superintendents) regarding the critical skills needed by novice principals do not differ significantly based on ethnicity.
6. Perceptions of administrators (principals and superintendents) regarding the critical skills needed by novice principals do not differ significantly based on the size of the school district in which they are employed.

The following ancillary questions were also investigated:

1. Is there agreement between principals and superintendents regarding critical skills that might be incorporated into pre-service preparation for principals to match the actual needs of the position more precisely?

2. Is there agreement among current superintendents in the State of Arizona regarding the greatest challenges for beginning principals?

**Theoretical Frameworks**

This study used two theoretical frameworks to view the issue of principal effectiveness. The first was that of a taxonomy of skills necessary for the effective management of people. Previous attempts to pinpoint skills necessary for principal effectiveness included the National Association for Secondary School Principals’ (NASSP) (1976) Assessment Center Project. Project personnel selected 12 skills they felt were important for principal productiveness. Other authors provided categorizations which divided skills in taxonomies. For example, Sergiovanni (1987) suggested that skills which principals brought to bear on situations could be divided into cultural, symbolic, educational, human and technical. Daresh and Playko (1989) identified three categories of
skills that superintendents believed were critical for new principals: technical skills ("how do you ..."), self-awareness skills ("why do I ..."), and socialization skills ("what do we do ...").

However, the most accepted taxonomy of managerial skills was proposed by Katz (1955) and expanded by later work with Kahn (Katz & Kahn, 1978) which identified conceptual, human, and technical categories. Katz and Kahn believed that technical skills were most important for beginning leaders and that as one moved up in the business hierarchy, the importance of conceptual skills increased. They further noted that although human relations skills were important throughout the organization, less important for higher level executives who may not have the same degree of human interaction that lower level personnel encountered.

Later studies by Ludeman (1989) and Rice (1987) did not support Katz and Kahn's (1978) conclusions. These studies suggested that human relations skills were much more important to a successful manager than technical skills. Furthermore, the appropriateness of applying Katz and Kahn's theories to an enterprise as personal and service-oriented as the educational system was questioned.

In light of education reform efforts during the past decade--notably the decentralization of decision making to teachers and principals at the school site--there was a dearth of knowledge regarding perceptions of teachers, superintendents, and principals about the critical skills used by principals.

One interesting study by Kowalski et al. (1992) investigated the differences in the importance placed on individual principal skills by teachers and principals. When
principals' assessments of individual skills were compared with teachers' assessments. Particular attributes showed statistically significant differences at the .05 level. Teachers rated a principal's ability to empathize with others (human skill—Katz and Kahn's 1978 Taxonomy) as much more valuable than did principals. Principals rated evaluation programs, teaching performance, and engaging in clinical supervision as much more important than teachers.

The second theoretical framework utilized in this study was that of socialization. Merton (1968) defined socialization as the proficiencies an individual acquires (including dispositions, skills, and awareness) to perform a social role effectively. Over time, one becomes a member of a profession through a process called 'professional socialization' (p. 76).

Duke et al. (1984) reported that the socialization experiences of novice administrators were usually informal, tense and short rather than designed. They found that feelings of a lack of skills, loneliness and time constraints accounted for a difficult first year or years for the novice. Alvy (1984) found that new administrators needed to adjust to alienation from the faculty and develop flexibility in regard to the opinions of others and have a wider perspective of pressing issues.

**Research Design and Format**

The preparation of an assessment instrument is a major undertaking. Much has been written on how such instruments are prepared. Gronlund (1976) suggested that instrument developers should give heed to the following considerations:
1. Determining the purpose of testing.

2. Building a table of specifications.

3. Selecting appropriate item types.

4. Preparing a set of relevant test items. (p. 135)

After a process has been established for constructing an instrument, the qualities contained in the instrument should be considered. Best (1970) listed six:

1. Validity;

2. Reliability;

3. Objectivity;

4. Economy;

5. Simplicity of Administration, Scoring, and Interpretation.

6. Interest. (p. 190)

Gronlund (1976) provided the following advice. "In selecting or constructing an evaluation instrument the most important question is: To what extent will the results serve the particular use for which they are intended? This is the essence of validity" (p. 79). Gronlund further noted:

Next to validity, reliability is the most important characteristic of evaluation results. Reliability (1) provides the consistency which makes validity possible, and (2) indicates how much confidence we can place in our results. The practicality of the evaluation procedure is, of course, also of concern. (p. 105)
The questions addressed in this study were derived from the Delphi Technique (Orlich, 1989) which was used with a group of selected superintendents in the state of Ohio in 1989 (Daresh & Playko, 1989). This approach is appropriate for the study because it allows a wide variety of alternative perceptions to be gathered about a topic that is not initially well-defined. Orlich indicated that the Delphi Technique is a fluid process that provides participants with the opportunity to clarify their views, add important issues not included in their first responses, and identify concepts that are particularly relevant to the topic at hand.

A group of 20 superintendents across the State of Ohio were invited to participate in the first round of Daresh and Playko’s (1989) study. These individuals were selected because they had been identified by multiple sources as district administrators who were likely to have useful insights into the problems encountered by beginning principals. Further, each invited superintendent had hired one or more principals during the previous school year; therefore, it was expected that the issue of critical skills would be relatively fresh in their minds. A letter was sent to each administrator describing the nature of the Delphi Technique (Orlich, 1989), the responsibilities of participants, and an outline of the timeline for completing the data-collection process. The participants were asked to provide a list of the skills they believed were most critical for beginning principals to learn and demonstrate.

The first round of data collection provided the researchers (Daresh & Playko, 1989) with 133 items. These items represented a simple list of brainstormed items that were not prioritized in any way. It was clear that there was a considerable amount of
overlap among the items, and menus of the items were unclear or poorly developed. As a result, a second round of the Delphi (Orlich, 1989) process was initiated. Participating superintendents were asked to read through the complete list of skills generated during the first phase and to cross out any items they believed no longer belonged on the list. Secondly, they were asked to modify the wording of any ambiguous or unclear items. Finally, the respondents were asked to rank order the items remaining on the list.

The results of the second round of the process yielded a list of 55 separate items. Many of the original skills were either dropped from the new list or combined with similar items from the earlier list. This newly combined list was then forwarded to the 12 superintendents who continued to participate in the study. Again, the instructions required reviewers to clarify items on the current list, drop skills or modify wording, and rank order each issue. The list of items was classified according to three major groups of skills that were consistent with earlier analyses of the needs of beginning principals. These areas were technical skills, socialization, and role clarification. Respondents were asked to rank order their final lists of items across the established subcategories. The third and final survey sent to participating superintendents yielded a refined list of 24 individual items categorized as critical skills for beginning principals.

These 24 items became Daresh and Playko's (1989) taxonomy of critical skills (see Appendix A). Questions 1-8 represented the area of technical skills which were Level 1 skills for novice principals. Questions 9-16 represented the area of socialization skills which were Level 2 skills for novice principals, and finally questions 17-24 represented the area of self-awareness which were Level 3 skills for novice principals.
Tuckman (1978) wrote that scales are devices constructed or employed by researchers to quantify the responses of a subject on a particular variable. Scales may be used to obtain interval data concerning attitudes, judgments, or perceptions about almost any subject or object. The most commonly employed scales are:

1. Likert Scale
2. Semantic Differential
3. Thurstone Scale

A Likert scale is a five-point scale in which the interval between each point on the scale is assumed to be equal. Because analyses of data from Likert scales are usually based on summated scores over a number of items, the equal-interval assumption, which is actually called an equal appearing interval scale, is workable. This scale is used to register the extent of agreement or disagreement with a particular statement of an attitude, belief, or judgment. The survey instrument in this study used a Likert scale device to assess the perceptions of both principals and superintendents regarding critical skills needed by novice principals.

The second method used to gather data for this research was to ask both principals and superintendents to respond to open-ended questions regarding their perceptions of the adequacy of educational administration certification programs in preparing persons to assume a principalship. Additionally, superintendents were asked to identify what they believed were the greatest challenges for new principals. Using multiple methods for data collection is a form of triangulation. Methodological triangulation uses data from different collection methods, such as interviews and document analyses, to study the same
phenomenon. The reason for using triangulation is that the weaknesses of one data-collection method are frequently the strengths of another. By combining triangulating methods, a stronger research design is achieved (Denzin, 1970). Data gathered from the open-ended responses of each principal and superintendent were compared, contrasted, and analyzed.

**Study Population and Sample**

The population of respondents included in this study consisted of 450 principals representing elementary schools, junior high/middle schools, and high schools in the State of Arizona. Using a Department of Education roster of schools in Arizona, 150 elementary schools, 150 junior high/middle schools, and 150 high schools were randomly chosen to participate. In 1996, there were 791 elementary schools, 167 junior high/middle schools, and 160 high schools in the state. Questionnaires were sent to 67% of the elementary schools, 90% of the junior high/middle schools, and 94% of the high schools.

The Arizona Department of Education for Arizona maintains a roster of all superintendents in the state, and this list was used to identify each school district and superintendent. Questionnaires were sent to each of the state's 240 school district superintendents.

**Data-Collection Process**

The intent of this study was to gather and analyze data to provide an accurate view of the perceptions of superintendents and principals regarding critical skills needed to be effective in the role of principal. Data regarding perceptions of the adequacy of
educational administration certification programs in preparing individuals to assume a
principalship were also gathered.

Principals who participated in the study received a packet containing a cover letter
and a 45-item questionnaire (see Appendix B). Respondents were asked for background
data relating to their age, ethnicity, gender, years in education, and present position, as
well as their assessment of the adequacy of their university-based certification program.
The questionnaire also asked them to assess the importance of skills normally associated
with the role of the principal on a five-point Likert scale. Each item was rated from
Critical to Irrelevant. The respondents were asked for their perceptions regarding training
received and any additional areas that university pre-service training should include in their
program. Each packet included a self-addressed stamped envelope in which to return the
completed questionnaire to the researcher. Packets were mailed to a total of 450
elementary schools, junior high/middle schools, and high schools in the State of Arizona.
Each packet was numbered to allow for follow up as well as to identify each respondent
for computer input of information.

The superintendents' packet (see Appendix C) was similar to the one sent to
principals. It contained a cover letter and self-addressed stamped envelope, and the
questionnaire included background data such as age, gender, ethnicity, principal and
superintendent experience, and the size of the district. The survey also included an item
eliciting each superintendent's beliefs on the greatest challenges for beginning principals, as
well as the superintendent's perceptions of how prepared aspiring principals are to meet
these challenges. The third section of the questionnaire included the 24 critical skill items described in the principal questionnaire.

Prior to packets being compiled and sent to principals and superintendents in the State of Arizona, a letter (see Appendix D) was sent requesting permission to replicate Dr. June H. Schmieder's (Schmieder et al., 1994) study. Much of the information used in the packet was from the California study and helped in making the process work more efficiently.
CHAPTER 4
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter includes an analysis of the data reported in four sections: (1) a demographic profile of respondents. (2) tests of the hypotheses, (3) an examination of the ancillary questions, and (4) a chapter summary.

Demographic Profile of Respondents

The participating sample in this study included 134 of the 235 superintendents in the State of Arizona, a 57% return rate. Of the 134 respondents returning surveys, 122 were valid for use in the study. Twelve surveys could not be used: four were not completed by the respondent, two were returned with missing pages, three were returned by individuals who reported that their district was only a transport district with no schools or employees, and three arrived after statistical reports were completed. Superintendents were asked to identify the size and classification of their district. Table 4.1 represents the size of the districts. Fifty superintendents (41%) indicated that their district had fewer than 999 students. Forty-seven superintendents (38%) stated the population of their districts ranged from 1,000-4,999, thus the total, 79% of the districts in this study, served fewer than 5,000 students. Nineteen percent of the districts responding ranged from 5,000 to 49,000 students, with only 5% of those districts consisting of more than 20,000 but less than 49,000 students.
## Table 4.1

**Size of Arizona School Districts by Student Enrollment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-999</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-4,999</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-9,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-49,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>122</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages do not total 100 due to rounding.
Table 4.2 depicts the classification of districts. Types were fairly even with 48% of the districts representing either elementary or secondary schools and 52% representing unified districts (those including both elementary and secondary schools).

Tables 4.3 and 4.4 indicate the gender and ethnicity of the responding superintendents. This group consisted of 103 males (84%) and 19 females (16%). There were 102 (84%) white superintendents, and the second highest group was Hispanic with 14 (11%). There were four (3%) American Indians and two (2%) Asian/Pacific Islanders; however, no black superintendents were represented.

Table 4.5 represents total length of tenure as a school district superintendent. Fifty-eight (48%) had one to five years of experience, and 26 (21%) had between six and 10 years of experience. Superintendents serving 11-26+ years comprised 36% of the respondents.

Table 4.6 describes the superintendents' principalship experience. Forty-nine percent of the population had elementary school principalship experience. 14% had middle/junior high experience, and 37% had gained experience at the senior high school level. Of all the superintendents questioned, 50 (41%) indicated that they had no experience as a principal.

Table 4.7 shows the number of principals the superintendents hired in the last five years. Of the principals hired, 108 of the principals had five or fewer years experience in their positions.

Table 4.8 illustrates superintendents' perceptions about how well administrative credentialing programs had prepared the principals they hired to meet the challenges of the
Table 4.2

Classification of Arizona School Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3

Participating Superintendents by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4

**Participating Superintendents by Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>122</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5

**Length of Employment as Superintendents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 + years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6

Principal Experience of Superintendents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle/Jr. High</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior High</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Principalship Experience</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages do not total 100 because some superintendents had experience as a principal at more than one level.*
Table 47

**Principals Hired by Responding Superintendents in the Last Five Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals hired</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 48

Principal Preparation as Perceived by Superintendents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Well</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
principalship. Sixty-seven (65%) indicated that their principals' training could be rated as "above average" or "extremely well." Only three (3%) superintendents indicated that their principals had been trained poorly.

The participating sample in this study also included 318 of the 450 principals in the State of Arizona who were randomly selected by classification of school. From the 791 elementary schools in the State of Arizona, 150 elementary principals were selected to participate in the study. Of this number, 95 (63%) responded. One hundred fifty of the 167 middle/junior high schools in the State of Arizona were also selected. The response rate from this group was 78% (N = 117). From the 160 high schools in the State of Arizona, 150 high school principals were selected, and 106 surveys (71%) were returned. The return rate for the total sample surveyed was 71%.

Of the 297 respondents returning surveys, 276 were valid for use in the study. Twenty-one surveys could not be used: seven were not completed surveys, four were returned by the postal service due to incomplete addresses, three were filled out by school secretaries, and eight arrived after statistical reports were completed.

Table 4.9 indicates the gender of the principals in the study. Of the sample surveyed, 199 (67%) of the responding principals were male, and 98 (33%) were female.

Table 4.10 classifies the 297 principals who responded to the survey by ethnicity: 11 (4%) were American Indians, 2 (1%) were Asians/Pacific Islanders, 23 (8%) were Hispanic, 7 (2%) black, and 254 (86%) were white.
Table 4.9

**Participating Principals by Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.10

Participating Principals by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages do not total 100 due to rounding.
Table 4 11 portrays the current age of the principals responding to the survey. 14% were between the ages of 21-40, 54% were between the ages of 41-50, and principals over the age of 50 constituted 31% of the survey respondents.

Table 4 12 depicts principals' experience. One hundred forty-one (48%) of the responding principals indicated that this was their first principalship, and 156 (53%) reported prior experience.

Table 4 13 delineates the ages at which the principals were appointed to their first principalship. One hundred ninety-two (65%) of the principals indicated that they were appointed to their first principalship between the ages of 21-40, and 105 (36%) stated that they were appointed to their first principalship after the age of 41.

Table 4 14 represents the level of education the principals have earned. Only three (1%) of the principals did not have an advanced degree. Two hundred twenty-four (76%) of the responding principals had a masters degree, and 67 (23%) principals in the study had a doctoral degree.

Table 4 15 describes the size of the districts in which principals were working. One hundred fifty-one (51%) of the districts represented were populated by fewer than 4,999 students. Eighty-five principals (29%) came from districts that had between 5,000-19,000 students. Districts with 20,000-50,000+ students were represented by 61 (20%) of the responding principals.

Table 4 16 illustrates perceived adequacy of administrative training and credentialing programs preparing principals for their first position. One hundred seven (36%) of the principals felt that they were prepared very well or extremely well. One
Table 4.11

Participating Principals by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages do not total 100 due to rounding.*
Table 4.12

Principalship Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First principalship</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior experience</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages do not total 100 due to rounding.
Table 4.13

Principals' Ages at First Appointment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages do not total to 100 due to rounding.*
Table 4.14

**Degrees Held by Principals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.15

Size of Districts by Number of Students Enrolled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-999</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-4,999</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-9,999</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-49,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000+</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.16

Adequacy of Administrative Training as Perceived by Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely well</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percentages do not total 100 due to rounding.
hundred thirty-five (47%) reported that they had average preparation. Of all the principals responding to the survey, 48 (16%) believed they had below average or poor training.

Table 4.17 classifies the training institutions attended by principals. Two hundred twelve (78%) of all principals responding to the survey indicated that they attended a state institution (either public or private), and 60 (22%) reported out-of-state training.

Table 4.18 portrays principals' comfort level in consulting with their superintendent when in need of help or advice. Two hundred three (69%) of the responding principals felt very comfortable asking for help or advice, 66 (23%) felt fairly comfortable, and only 23 (8%) did not feel at all comfortable asking for help or advice.

Table 4.19 shows principals' comfort level about consulting with other principals in their district when help or advice was needed. Two hundred thirty-five (81%) of the principals reported that they felt very comfortable consulting with other principals in their district when they needed help or advice, and 54 (19%) reported feeling fairly or not very comfortable doing so.

Tests of the Hypotheses

Six hypotheses were formulated for investigation in this study. In this section, the hypotheses are restated, and a discussion of findings pertinent to each is included.

The hypotheses, as stated, are

Hypothesis 1. There are no significant differences between principals and superintendents' perceptions about technical skills needed for the novice principal's success.
Table 4.17

Types of Training Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public in-state system</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private in-state system</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public out-of-state system</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private out-of-state</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.18

Help from the Superintendent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Help/Advice</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all comfortable</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly comfortable</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very comfortable</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 4.19**

**Comfort Level When Requesting Help from Other Principals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Help/advice</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not very comfortable</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly comfortable</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very comfortable</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 2. There are no significant differences between principals and superintendents' perceptions about socialization skills needed for the novice principal's success.

Hypothesis 3. There are no significant differences between principals and superintendents' perceptions about self-awareness skills needed for the novice principal's success.

Hypothesis 4.
A. There are no significant differences between male and female superintendents' perceptions of the critical skills needed by novice principals.
B. There are no significant differences between male and female principals' perceptions of the critical skills needed by novice principals.

Hypothesis 5. Perceptions of administrators (principals and superintendents) regarding the critical skills needed by novice principals do not differ significantly based on ethnicity.

Hypothesis 6. Perceptions of administrators (principals and superintendents) regarding the critical skills needed by novice principals do not differ significantly based on the size of the school district in which they are employed.

The first three hypotheses were tested by determining the difference between the perceptions of superintendents and principals for each of the three functions of Daresh and Playko's (1989) taxonomy of technical skills, socialization skills, and self-awareness skills with regard to the success of a novice principal. A ONEWAY analysis of variance was
the statistic employed for examining the overall group variance, and t-tests were used to
determine where significant differences existed between individual groups.

The analyses of variance resulted in significant F values for technical skills (F
(1,416) = 14.1, R = .000. The self-awareness and socialization skills were not significant
(see Table 4.20).

Table 4.20 depicts the F values and their level of significance by skill.

Table 4.21 illustrates that no statistically significant differences existed between
superintendents' and principals' perceptions of the technical skills needed for novice
principals to be successful. A t-test was performed to determine the differences between
principals' and superintendents' perception regarding the technical, social, and self-
awareness skills required by novice principals. There were no statistically significant
differences between the superintendent and principal groups.

The second set of hypotheses sought to determine the effects of gender, ethnicity,
and size of school district on the beliefs of principals and superintendents with regard to
skills novice principals need for success.

The second set of hypotheses, as stated, is

Hypothesis 4

A. There are no significant differences between male and female
superintendents' perceptions of the critical skills needed by novice
principals.
Table 4.20

**Differences Between Superintendents’ and Principals’ Perceptions Regarding Critical Skills for Novice Principals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>60.069</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.069</td>
<td>3.704</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>6746.238</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>16.217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6806.308</td>
<td>417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5.921</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.921</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>0.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>6709.440</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>16.128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6715.361</td>
<td>417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>182.512</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>182.512</td>
<td>14.096</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>5386.265</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>12.948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5568.777</td>
<td>417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.21

T-test Comparisons Between Self-Awareness, Socialization, and Technical Skills for Novice Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>deviation</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>33.3689</td>
<td>3.8638</td>
<td>-1.925</td>
<td>005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>34.2027</td>
<td>4.0921</td>
<td>-1.971</td>
<td>050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>32.2787</td>
<td>3.6596</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>32.0169</td>
<td>4.1534</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>31.3033</td>
<td>3.6947</td>
<td>-3.754</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>32.7568</td>
<td>3.5580</td>
<td>-3.696</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are no significant differences between male and female principals' perceptions of the critical skills needed by novice principals.

**Hypothesis 5**

Perceptions of administrators (principals and superintendents) regarding the critical skills needed by novice principals do not differ significantly based on ethnicity.

**Hypothesis 6**

Perceptions of administrators (principals and superintendents) regarding the critical skills needed by novice principals do not differ significantly based on the size of the school district in which they are employed.

Table 4.22 illustrates that no statistically significant differences existed between male and female superintendents in any of the three categories of self-awareness, technical skills, and socialization skills needed for the success of novice principals.

Table 4.23 demonstrates that statistically significant differences existed between male and female principals regarding technical skills, self-awareness skills, and socialization skills needed for novice principals to be successful. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was rejected.

Table 4.24 shows superintendents' ethnicity had no significant effect on their perceptions of the self-awareness skills, technical skills, and socialization skills needed by novice principals.
Table 4.22

Comparisons Between Male and Female Superintendents' Perceptions of Critical Skills Needed by Novice Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>32.955</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.955</td>
<td>2.230</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1773.447</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>14.779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>806.402</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>10.924</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.924</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1640.854</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>13.674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1651.778</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>15.367</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.376</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1605.149</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>13.376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1620.525</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.23

**Comparisons Between Male and Female Principals' Perceptions of Critical Skills Needed by Novice Principals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>114.945</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114.945</td>
<td>6.985</td>
<td>009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>4821.652</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>16.456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4936.597</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>206.501</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>206.501</td>
<td>17.157</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3526.435</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>12.036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3732.936</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>90.612</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90.612</td>
<td>5.313</td>
<td>022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>4997.266</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>17.056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5087.878</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.24

**Comparisons of the Perceptions of Superintendents by Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>100.505</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.126</td>
<td>1.723</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1705.897</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>14580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1806.402</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tech-</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>38.728</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9682</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1613.051</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>13787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1651.779</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>107.957</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.989</td>
<td>2.088</td>
<td>087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1512.568</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>12928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1620.525</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.25 illustrates that principals' ethnicity had no significant effect on their perceptions of the self-awareness skills, technical skills, and socialization skills needed for novice principals to succeed.

Superintendents and principals' perceptions of self-awareness skills, technical skills, and socialization skills needed for novice principals to succeed did not differ significantly by ethnicity. Therefore, the fifth hypothesis was accepted.

Table 4.26 indicates that no statistically significant differences existed among superintendents based on the size of their school district in the three categories of self-awareness skills, technical skills, and socialization skills needed for the success of novice principals.

Table 4.27 demonstrates that the size of the school district had no significant effect on principals' perceptions of the self-awareness skills, technical skills, or socialization skills needed for the success of novice principals.

Ancillary Questions

The following ancillary questions were investigated:

1. Is there agreement between principals and superintendents regarding critical skills that might be incorporated into pre-service preparation for principals to match the actual needs of the position more precisely?

2. Is there agreement among current superintendents in the State of Arizona regarding the greatest challenges for beginning principals?
### Table 4.25

**Comparisons of the Perceptions of Principals by Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>32.716</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.179</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>4907.122</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>16.863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4939.838</td>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>38.768</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.692</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3695.719</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>12.700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3734.487</td>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>129.557</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32.389</td>
<td>1.901</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>4959.356</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>17.042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5088.913</td>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.26

Comparisons of the Perceptions of Superintendents by Size of School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>83,512</td>
<td>20.878</td>
<td>1.418</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1722,890</td>
<td>14.726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1806,402</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>115,267</td>
<td>28.817</td>
<td>2.194</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1536,512</td>
<td>13.133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1651,779</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>63,442</td>
<td>15.861</td>
<td>1.192</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1557,082</td>
<td>13.308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1620,524</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.27

Comparisons of the Perceptions of Principals by Size of School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>194,921</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.984</td>
<td>2.383</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>4744.917</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>6.362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4939,838</td>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>272,656</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54.531</td>
<td>4.568</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3461,830</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>11.937</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3734,486</td>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>336,908</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67.382</td>
<td>4.112</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>4752,008</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>16.386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5088,916</td>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participating superintendents and principals were asked to respond to the following question: Do you have any suggestions for improvement of university-based administrative credentialing programs? Of the 122 responding superintendents, 87 answered the open-ended question regarding pre-service training. Many advised the inclusion of instructors who were familiar with the day-to-day operations of public schools. This recommendation was evidenced by such comments as, "Require a certain percent of the classes be taught by those who have practiced in the field recently or currently" and "Courses should go beyond the theoretical framework of educational leadership but should also connect theory with practice."

Several superintendents offered suggestions for course offerings that would improve leadership programs, e.g., politics of education, administrative problem solving, leadership development, conflict resolution, human relation skills, evaluation of staff and conferencing skills, and special education law and practice.

A number of comments addressed on-site observations, on-the-job internships, mentoring, and the supervision of interns by practicing administrators. Statements such as the following suggested that observations be done early in the administrative credentialing programs. "Time needs to be set aside for students in the program to observe, shadow, and practice under the guidance of a practicing administrator" and "Place them with excellent mentors who are in the field and making a difference for students and their schools."

Internships were mentioned by superintendents who felt that they were not rigorous enough for the novice and that many of the internship experiences were too
short, isolated in nature, and did not give the intern a "real" experience. Some complained that the internship consisted solely of "busy" work such as the development of school reports, summer school supervision, and athletic supervision. Several superintendents suggested that to provide a more varied perspective, internships should be extended to a full school year in a school district that has not employed intern in an administrative capacity. Supervision by a practicing administrator would also help to ensure that the intern would receive mentoring in the most current educational practices.

Finally, several of the responding superintendents suggested that students in pre-service programs be given the opportunity to be mentored by practicing administrators. Comments noted the isolation of administrators and the importance of having someone to "bounce things off of" when faced with the many daily problems encountered in the school setting.

Of the 297 principals returning surveys, 227 provided suggestions for adjustments in administrative certification programs that prepare beginning principals. The responding principals' comments were similar to those of the superintendents. The principals recommended more practical courses and favored training in the technical aspects of the position. Suggestions for courses included more law courses; in-basket issues; time management, school finance, personnel techniques; interpersonal skills; stress relief techniques; teacher evaluations; conflict management; an emphasis on counseling issues; scheduling; discipline; "preparation in working with parents, community, school boards and the media;" curriculum development; and special education laws. Many principals noted that course work needed to be more hands-on and less theoretical in nature.
Principals commented on internship experiences in much the same way as superintendents, for example, extending internships to more than one semester. They supported input and guidance from building-level administrators, time for conferencing, modeling, and the teamwork experienced during the internship. Concerns about the short time allotted, the assignment of busy work or non-relevant activities, university supervisors' lack of expertise, and the absence of mentors to provide advice or counseling after the internship highlighted the principals' responses.

Principals mentioned shadowing, building-level administrative advocates, and practicing administrators acting as mentors as ways of improving the credentialing process. Several suggested that a mentor should continue to provide counsel during the first year of a new administrator's employment.

The ancillary questions provided insight into concerns about pre-service training and education. Superintendents and principals were consistent in their suggestions for improving credentialing programs. The results indicated that universities involved in preparing persons for the role of principal need to engage in some program evaluation and reform. School leaders need to believe they have the skills and knowledge-base necessary to lead. Some of the most valuable information supplied by superintendents and principals was that more time was needed to watch, question, and practice the skills and behaviors exhibited by effective principals. There was a strong relationship between principals and superintendents regarding critical skills that should be incorporated into pre-service preparation programs for principals. This strong agreement emphasizes the need to reform pre-service programs. Stronger links between university and school-based
personnel are critical for a more realistic understanding of the role of the principal, and collaborative programs between school districts and universities should be investigated.

The second ancillary question posed to current superintendents in the State of Arizona focused on the greatest challenges faced by new principals. Superintendents' answers were insightful. Visionary responses related to the needs of the students and to developing strategies and plans for achieving that vision without new funding. Some very basic level concerns about technical skills were also expressed. Superintendents indicated that to lead schools into the 21st century, principals need training in personnel management, public relations, law and the home-schooled student, how charter schools affect children in public schools, and how funding will be allocated to both educational systems. Many superintendents felt that the greatest challenges would occur in trying to bring together a diverse group of people to create the best educational opportunities for the children of Arizona. They were also concerned about the principal's role in helping to develop teaching strategies for the diverse groups of students entering the schools, working with restricted funding, and as one superintendent stated, "working with a state legislature that did not hold education or children in Arizona in high regard."

The challenges facing new principals will demand creative, enthusiastic, and collaborative leaders. The training received by administrators in the past is no longer relevant. The challenge for universities is to develop programs that reflect the emerging paradigm shift. Greater emphasis on interpersonal skills, psychology, adult learning, philosophy, creativity, and collaborative decision making may need to dominate the curriculum. Professors of educational administration may need to spend time re-educating
themselves to the realities of reformed or restructured schools and different types of learners.

Summary

Study results were obtained from the analysis of data gathered from principals and superintendents representing 134 school district superintendents and 318 principals from elementary, middle/junior high, and senior high schools in the State of Arizona. A demographic profile of the respondent groups was presented.

Six operational null hypotheses were tested by analysis of variance and correlation statistical techniques. Four hypotheses were accepted. Based on the questionnaire responses, the results of this study were

Hypothesis 1. There are no significant differences between principals and superintendents' perceptions about technical skills needed for novice principals' success.

Hypothesis 2. There are no significant differences between principals and superintendents' perceptions about socialization skills needed for the novice principal's success.

Hypothesis 3. There are no significant differences between principals and superintendents' perceptions about self-awareness skills needed for the novice principal's success.

Hypothesis 4

A. There were no significant differences between male and female superintendents' perceptions of the critical skills needed by novice principals.
B. There was a significant difference between male and female principals' perceptions of the critical skills needed by novice principals.

**Hypothesis 5** Perceptions of administrators (principals and superintendents) regarding the critical skills needed by novice principals do not differ significantly based on ethnicity.

**Hypothesis 6** Perceptions of administrators (principals and superintendents) regarding the critical skills needed by novice principals do not differ significantly based on the size of the school district in which they are employed for self-awareness skills. There were significant differences between superintendents from the various size districts regarding the socialization skills and self-awareness skills needed by novice principals. There were significant differences between superintendents from the various size districts regarding technical skills needed by novice principals. There were significant differences between principals from the various size districts regarding the critical skills needed by novice principals.

Chapter 5 presents a summary of the study and discusses the findings, conclusions, and implications of the study.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter consists of three sections. The first contains a summary of the study as presented in Chapters 1-4. The second section presents the findings of the study and the conclusions drawn from them. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the considerations for practice and further research which may be suggested from the results of the study.

Summary of the Study

This study examined congruence between the perceptions of Arizona principals and superintendents regarding critical skills for beginning principals. It replicated a study by Schmieder et al. (1994) performed in California. The purposes of their study were to identify critical skills needed by novice principals, make suggestions for pre-service preparation for principals, and suggest methods to speed the process of socialization. Schmieder et al. used Daresh and Playko's (1989) taxonomy of critical skills needed by novice principals and rank ordered them. This study differed from Schmieder et al.'s in that the critical skills were organized into three categories which were used to determine whether principals and superintendents agreed about the skills that were important. Possible differences by gender, ethnicity, and school district size were also examined. Two ancillary questions addressed (1) critical skills that might be incorporated into pre-service
preparation for principals to match the actual needs of the position more precisely and (2) whether there was agreement among superintendents regarding the greatest challenges for beginning principals.

The study utilized two theoretical frameworks to view the issue of principal effectiveness. The first was a taxonomy of skills necessary for the effective management of people. This framework, developed by Daresh and Playko (1989), identified three categories of skills that superintendents believed to be critical for new principals to possess: technical skills, self-awareness skills, and socialization skills. The second theoretical framework involved socialization, i.e., the knowledge that an individual acquires over time to perform a role effectively. The socialization experiences of novice administrators tend to be haphazard; lack of skills, loneliness, and time constraints combine to create a less-than-satisfactory socialization experience (Alvy, 1984; Duke et al., 1984; Merton, 1968).

The questionnaire administered by Schmieder et al. (1994) was also used for this study. Four hundred fifty principals representing elementary schools, junior high/middle schools, and high schools as well as superintendents from all 240 districts in the State of Arizona received questionnaires. One hundred thirty-four superintendents and 318 principals returned completed questionnaires. Data were compiled and analyzed; a ONEWAY analysis of variance was the statistic employed for examining the overall group, and variance and t-tests were used to identify where significant differences between groups. Ancillary questions were utilized to gather qualitative data from the respondents.
on their perceptions of pre-service training for principals and the greatest challenges faced by new principals.

Findings and Conclusions

This section summarizes the results and the conclusions that may be drawn from the tests of the hypotheses and ancillary questions posed for the study. The probability level for all tests of statistical significance was established at .05.

Six operational null hypotheses were tested by analysis of variance and correlation statistical techniques. Four hypotheses were accepted. Based on the responses to the questionnaires, the results of this study were as follows. The first hypothesis, which stated that there are no significant differences between principals and superintendents' perceptions about technical skills needed for the novice principal's success, was accepted. One-way analysis of variance produced statistically significant F values among groups for differences in the perceptions held about technical skills needed for novice principals' success. Subsequent t-tests analyses for individual group differences did not produce any significant differences in perceptions between superintendents and principals about necessary technical skills.

The second hypothesis, that there are no significant differences between principals and superintendents' perceptions about socialization skills needed for the novice principal's success, was accepted at the .05 level of significance.
The third hypothesis, that there are no significant differences between principals and superintendents' perceptions about self-awareness skills needed for the novice principal's success, was accepted at the .05 level of significance.

The fourth hypothesis was divided into two parts: (A) There are no significant differences between male and female superintendents' perceptions of the critical skills needed by novice principals and (B) There are no significant differences between male and female principals' perceptions of the critical skills needed by novice principals. This hypothesis was partially rejected. The analysis of variance resulted in F values that revealed significant differences between male and female principals' perceptions regarding critical skills needed by novice principals. However, no significant differences between male and female superintendents' perceptions of these same skills were found. The hypothesis for superintendents was accepted at the .05 level of significance. Yet, it must be cautioned that this result could be misleading because the ratio of male to female superintendents was extremely disproportionate. Of the 122 superintendents who responded to the questionnaire, only 19 (15%) were female.

Hypothesis 5 stated that perceptions of administrators (principals and superintendents) regarding the critical skills needed by novice principals do not differ significantly based on ethnicity was accepted at the .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 6 stated that perceptions of administrators (principals and superintendents) regarding the critical skills needed by novice principals do not differ significantly based on the size of the school district in which they are employed. This hypothesis was partially rejected. Superintendents' perceptions of the socialization and self
awareness-skills needed by novice principals did not differ significantly based on the size of their school district. However, district size did significantly affect superintendents' perceptions about the technical skills needed by novice principals. There were significant differences between principals' perceptions of the critical skills needed by novice principals based on the size of their school district.

Two ancillary questions were also investigated through open-ended questions.

1. Is there agreement between principals and superintendents regarding critical skills that might be incorporated into pre-service preparation for principals to match the actual needs of the position more precisely?

2. Is there agreement among current superintendents in the State of Arizona regarding the greatest challenges for beginning principals?

The findings for Ancillary Question 1 indicated that both principals and superintendents felt that courses should be taught by instructors familiar with the day-to-day operations of public schools. Further, instructors should connect the theoretical base with a practical perspective. Internships should be more intensive and extensive, that is, provide a wider range of actual on-the-job experiences and be longer in duration. Superintendents also stated a preference for administrative interns to train outside of their district to gain a broader perspective of school administration. Finally, superintendents and principals agreed that shadowing and mentoring would be valuable components for pre-service administrative programs.
In response to Ancillary Question 2, superintendents generally agreed that the greatest challenges for beginning principals included inadequate financial resources, lack of technical skills, and an increasingly diverse student population.

Recommendations

In this section, implications for practice suggested from the study and recommendations for further research are presented.

Considerations for the Practitioner

• The curriculum and teaching methodologies in educational administration programs should be reviewed and revised to align more closely with actual school experience.

• More consideration should be given to hiring instructors with recent building-level experience to teach courses in educational administration.

• Universities and public schools need to form partnerships to facilitate the development of on-site laboratory experiences.

• Universities and school districts should provide structured opportunities for pre-service administrators to shadow practicing administrators.

• Universities and school districts should create programs that facilitate mentoring relationships between pre-service administrators and practicing administrators or university faculty.

• University instructors should regularly shadow practicing administrators and draw upon these experiences to enhance their instruction.
• Site administrators should recognize the efforts of pre-service administrators and provide opportunities to practice their developing administrative skills.

• Internships should be longer in duration and reflect a reality-based administrative experience allowing skills to be practiced and refined.

• Support groups should be developed for pre-service and novice administrators to share concerns and questions and to use one another as sounding boards.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

• Conduct a study using a larger population base, such as the entire United States, to examine further whether significant differences exist between male and female superintendents' perceptions of the critical skills needed by novice principals. Data from this study suggested that there were no differences. However, these data must be viewed with caution because the ratio of female to male superintendents in Arizona is very disproportionate.

• Conduct a study using a larger population base to examine further the role ethnicity plays in what superintendents perceive to be critical skills for novice principals.

• Study existing programs that provide extensive site-based experiences for pre-service administrators to determine the possible effects of such programs.

• Conduct longitudinal research studying a novice principal from his/her first day as an administrator through year three to examine whether attitudes and perceptions of critical skills change over time.
In addition to the statements for future research, it is suggested additional research be conducted investigating the daily activities of the school principal. Through the use of field methodology, staff relations, how time is spent, and what the principal actually does on a typical day could be investigated.
APPENDIX A
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DARESH AND PLAYKO'S (1989) TAXONOMY OF SKILLS

AREA I: Technical Skills

1. How to evaluate staff (i.e., procedures for the task and also the substance).
2. How to facilitate group meetings.
3. How to design and implement a data-based improvement process.
4. How to develop and monitor a building budget.
5. How to organize and conduct parent-student-teacher conferences.
6. How to establish a scheduling program for students and staff.
7. Awareness of issues related to local school law.
8. How to manage food service, custodial, and secretarial staff.

AREA II: Socialization

9. Establishing a positive and cooperative relationship with other district administrators.
11. Knowing how to relate to board members and central office personnel.
12. Knowing where the limits exist within the district or building and balancing that with one's own professional values.
13. Understanding how the principalship changes family and other relationships.
14. Developing interpersonal networking skills that may be used with individuals inside and outside the system.
15. Ability to encourage involvement by all parties in the educational community.
16. How to develop positive relationships with other organizations and agencies located in the school's surrounding community.

AREA III: Self-Awareness

17. Demonstrating an awareness of what it means to possess organizational power and authority.
18. Demonstrating an awareness of why one was selected for a leadership position.
20. Having a vision along with the understanding needed to achieve relevant goals.
21. Demonstrating a desire to make a significant difference in the lives of staff and students.
22. Being aware of one's biases, strengths, and weaknesses.
23. Understanding and seeing that change is ongoing and that it results in a continually changing vision of the principalship.
24. How to assess job responsibilities in terms of the "real role" of the principalship.
APPENDIX B

LETTER TO PRINCIPALS AND SURVEY OF CRITICAL SKILLS FOR BEGINNING PRINCIPALS
May 20, 1996

Dear Principal:

The attached survey instrument is part of my research as a doctoral candidate at The University of Arizona. This project is concerned specifically with the skills needed by new administrators in schools in Arizona as perceived by both principals and superintendents. The results of this study will provide criteria to be used in professional developmental activities for new principals.

No individual or school will be identified in this research study. Coding is used to provide for follow-up contact if information needs to be clarified.

I realize that your time is valuable, therefore, I have designed this questionnaire so that you can complete it within fifteen (15) minutes. Yet it measures all the items that are important to the study. After completing the questionnaire, please seal it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided, and return it to me.

Your participation and perceptions are vital to this study. Please return the completed questionnaire to me by June 30, 1996. A summary of findings will be sent to you upon request. Your cooperation is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

Karyn L. Blair
Flowing Wells Junior High School
4545 N. La Cholla Blvd.
Tucson, Arizona, 85705
(520) 690-2314
1. Gender: (1) Male; (2) Female.

2. Current Age: (1) 21-30, (2) 31-40, (3) 41-50, (4) 51-60, (5) 61 or older.

3. Ethnicity: (1) American Indian or Alaskan Native, (2) Asian, (3) Pacific Islander, (4) Filipino, (5) Hispanic, (6) Black, not Hispanic, (7) White, not Hispanic.

4. Is this your first principalship?
(1)_____ Yes; (2)_____ No.

5. If you answered "No" to Question 4, how many years in total have you been a principal?

(1)_____ Less than 5, (2)_____ 5-10 years;
(3)_____ 11-15 years; (4)_____ more than 15 years.

6. Your age when you were appointed to your first principalship:

(1)_____ 21-30, (2)_____ 31-40; (3)_____ 41-50,
(4)_____ 51-60, (5)_____ 61 or older.

7. Classification of your current school:

(1)_____ Elementary; (2)_____ Middle/Junior,
(3)_____ High; (4)_____ Private.

8. Classification of your current district:

(1)_____ Elementary; (2)_____ Secondary;
(3)_____ Unified; (4)_____ Private.

9. Degrees (Please circle).

(1) BA/BS Major__________________ ,
(2) MA/MS/M.Ed. Major______________ ,
(3) Ph.D/Ed.D. Major______________ .

10. Experience (Your last position prior to current principalship): ______________________

11. Size of current district: (1)_____ 0-999;
(2)_____ 1,000-4,999; (3)_____ 5,000-9,999;
10,000-19,999; (5) 20,000-49,999;
(6) Above 50,000.

12. Number of years in each position: (Please mark with X).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>position</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher (K-6)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher (7-12)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Principal (K-6)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Principal (7-12)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean or Counselor (K-12)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal (K-6)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal (7-12)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How well do you believe your administrative training and credentialing program prepared you for your first principalship?

(1) Poorly; (2) Below Average;
(3) Average; (4) Very Well;
(5) Extremely Well.
14. What adjustments would you recommend be made in your administrative certification program to better prepare beginning principals?

(1) __________________________

(2) __________________________

(3) __________________________

15. At what type of educational institution did you obtain your administrative training?

(1) ___ Arizona University System;

(2) ___ Private College/University (in state);

(3) ___ Public/Private University (out-of-state);

(4) Names of institution(s) ____________

16. How comfortable do you feel consulting with your superintendent when you need help or advice?

(1) ___ Not at all comfortable;

(2) ___ Fairly comfortable;

(3) ___ Very comfortable.

17. How comfortable do you feel consulting with other principals in your district when you need help or advice?

(1) ___ Not at all comfortable;

(2) ___ Fairly comfortable;

(3) ___ Very comfortable.

18. What is the title of the individual who evaluates your performance as a principal?

(1) ___ Superintendent;
Does your school have an active site-based council?

(1) Yes; (2) No.

The following 24 skills have been identified by superintendents in another state as critical for new principals to possess. Using the scale below, please rate each item based on how important you feel it is for a new principal to possess the specific quality listed.

CRITICAL 5
VERY IMPORTANT 4
MODERATELY IMPORTANT 3
LESS IMPORTANT 2
IRRELEVANT 1

1. Knowing how to evaluate staff (e.g., procedures for the task and also substance: What do standards really mean?).

2. Knowing how to facilitate/conduct group meetings (large and small).

3. Knowing how to design and implement a data-based improvement process, including goal-setting and evaluating.

4. Knowing how to develop and monitor a building budget.

5. Knowing how to organize and conduct parent-teacher-student conferences.
Knowing how to establish a scheduling program for students and staff (master schedule)

Awareness of the state code and other issues associated with school law.

Knowing how to manage food service, custodial, and secretarial staff.

Establishing a positive and cooperative relationship with other administrators in the district.

Knowing how to delineate employee roles in a school setting.

Knowing how to relate to school board members and central office personnel.

Knowing where the ethical limits exist within the district or building and balancing that knowledge with one's own professional values.

Understanding how the principalship changes one's family and other personal relationships.

Developing interpersonal networking skills that may be used with individuals inside and outside the school system.

Knowing how to encourage involvement by all parties in the educational community.

Knowing how to develop positive relationships with other organizational powers and authorities.

Demonstrating an awareness of what it means to possess organizational power and authority.
18 Demonstrating an awareness of why one was selected for a leadership position.

19 Portraying a sense of self-confidence on the job

20 Having a vision along with an understanding of steps needed to achieve relevant goals.

21 Demonstrating a desire to make a significant difference in the lives of staff and students.

22 Being aware of one's biases, strengths, and weaknesses.

23 Understanding that change is ongoing and that it results in a continually changing vision of the principalship.

24 Knowing how to assess job responsibilities in terms of the "real role" of the principalship.

25 Other—please list

______________________________

______________________________
APPENDIX C

LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS AND SURVEY OF CRITICAL SKILLS FOR BEGINNING PRINCIPALS
May 20, 1996

Dear Superintendent:

The attached survey instrument is part of my research as a doctoral candidate at The University of Arizona. This project is concerned specifically with the skills needed by new administrators in schools in Arizona as perceived by both principals and superintendents. The results of this study will provide criteria to be used in professional developmental activities for new principals.

No individual or school will be identified in this research study. Coding is used to provide for follow-up contact if information needs to be clarified.

I realize that your time is valuable, therefore, I have designed this questionnaire so that you can complete it within fifteen (15) minutes. Yet it measures all the items that are important to the study. After completing the questionnaire, please seal it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided, and return it to me.

Your participation and perceptions are vital to this study. Please return the completed questionnaire to me by June 30, 1996. A summary of findings will be sent to you upon request. Your cooperation is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

Karyn L. Blair
Flowing Wells Junior High School
4545 N. La Cholla Blvd
Tucson, Arizona, 85705
(520) 690-2314
ARIZONA SUPERINTENDENTS

Please fill in the information below by placing an X on the appropriate line. Please do not record your name. All responses will be kept strictly confidential, and the results will be reported in terms of the entire population only. Please do not omit any items.

1. Size of district:
   (1) _____ 0-999;
   (2) _____ 1,000-4,999;
   (3) _____ 5,000-9,999;
   (4) _____ 10,000-19,999;
   (5) _____ 20,000-49,999;
   (6) _____ Above 50,000.

2. Classification of district:
   (1) ___ Elementary; (2) ___ (7-12) Secondary;
   (3) ___ Unified; (4) ___ Private.

3. Gender (1) ___ Male, (2) ___ Female.
4 Ethnicity

(1)______American Indian or Alaskan Native;

(2)______Asian;

(3)______Pacific Islander;

(4)______Filipino;

(5)______Hispanic;

(6)______Black, not Hispanic;

(7)______White, not Hispanic.

5. Length of time as a superintendent:

(1)______1-5 years, (2)______6-10 years;

(3)______11-15 years; (4)______16-20 years;

(5)______21-25 years;

(6)______26 years or more.

6 Principalship Experience: (1)______yes; (2)______no.

If "Yes," what level?

(1)______Elementary;

(2)______Middle/Junior High;

(3)______Senior High.

7. How many principalships have you filled in the last five years? (1)______0-1, (2)______2-3;

(3)______4-5; (4)______More than 5
What do you think are the three biggest challenges for beginning principals?

1. ______________________
2. ______________________
3. ______________________

How well do you think the principals you have hired in the last five years have been prepared by their administrative credentialing program to meet these challenges successfully?

(1) _____ Poorly, (2) _____ Below Average,
(3) _____ Above Average,
(4) _____ Extremely Well.

Do you have any suggestions for improvement of university-based administrative credentialing programs (use back of survey if needed).

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

The following 24 skills have been identified by superintendents in another state as critical for new principals to possess. Using the scale below, please rate each item based on how important you feel it is for a new principal to possess the specific quality listed.

CRITICAL 5

VERY IMPORTANT 4

MODERATELY IMPORTANT 3
LESS IMPORTANT 2

IRRELEVANT 1

1. Knowing how to evaluate staff (e.g., procedures for the task and also substance: What do standards really mean?).

2. Knowing how to facilitate/conduct group meetings (large and small).

3. Knowing how to design and implement a data-based improvement process, including goal-setting and evaluating.

4. Knowing how to develop and monitor a building budget.

5. Knowing how to organize and conduct parent-teacher-student conferences.

6. Knowing how to establish a scheduling program for students and staff (master schedule).

7. Awareness of the state code and other issues associated with school law.

8. Knowing how to manage food service, custodial, and secretarial staff.

9. Establishing a positive and cooperative relationship with other administrators in the district.

10. Knowing how to delineate employee roles in a school setting.

11. Knowing how to relate to school board members and central office personnel.

12. Knowing where the ethical limits exist within the district or building and balancing that knowledge with one's own professional values.

13. Understanding how the principalship changes one's family and other personal relationships.
Developing interpersonal networking skills that may be used with individuals inside and outside the school system.

Knowing how to encourage involvement by all parties in the educational community.

Knowing how to develop positive relationships with other organizational power and authority.

Demonstrating an awareness of what it means to possess organizational power and authority.

Demonstrating and awareness of why one was selected for a leadership position.

Portraying a sense of self-confidence on the job.

Having a vision along with an understanding of the steps needed to achieve relevant goals.

Demonstrating a desire to make a significant difference in the lives of staff and students.

Being aware of one's biases, strengths, and weaknesses.

Understanding that change is ongoing and that it results in a continually changing vision of the principalship.

Knowing how to assess job responsibilities in terms of the "real role" of the principalship.
25. Other--please list ________________________________

________________________________________________

________________________________________________
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LETTER OF PERMISSION
LETTER OF PERMISSION

February 17, 1996

Dear Dr. June Schmieder,

Thank you for the materials you sent to me regarding the study that you and fellow educators at Pepperdine University performed regarding critical skills for novice principals. I first read your study in the Journal of School Leadership (Volume 4, May 1994) and am excited about continuing this research.

During our phone conversation in December, you gave me your permission to update the study in Arizona. I am writing to request officially permission to use your study, including the survey, to gather data from superintendents and principals regarding their perceptions of critical skills needed by beginning principals. Your approval for this matter is vital to my research, and I am eagerly awaiting your reply. Please write me at my home address, 8945 N Spinel Place, Tucson, AZ 85742.

Sincerely,

Karyn Blair
Principal
Flowing Wells Junior High School
Tucson, Arizona
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