Busy school administrators have too many "fish to fry" to be subjected to remedial, piecemeal, uncoordinated, though well intended "management training."

Administrator Development: A Step Beyond Training

by John R. Hoyle
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas

Sheila Wilmore has been a junior high principal for the past 11 years. Both Sheila and her supervisor know that she was hired as a school manager and has not kept up with new developments in instruction.

Arch Edgell, an assistant superintendent in an urban West Virginia school district desires someday to become a superintendent in a suburban district.

John Winston is an outstanding communicator and visionary superintendent in a leading urban school district. John, however, has an admitted problem. He simply can't manage his time well enough to free him from administrative trivia to allow him to oversee key instructional programs.

Laura Londenberg is a bright elementary teacher who has completed her administrator certification at a nearby university. She now wants to move into administration. Her school district has initiated a leadership academy which will include a development program for prospective administrators. How does she become a part of the program and what must she need to learn that her graduate classes in educational administration may not have stressed.

David Wilson, Ph.D. in educational administration and new superintendent in a medium sized district has been told by the board of education to improve student test scores. Only two of his 12 principals have taken university

John R. Hoyle, is Professor of Educational Administration at Texas A&M University and specializes in Management Training and Assessment, Instructional Management, and Future Studies. He is one of America's leading reformers in administrator training and has national acclaim in future studies. He was selected as the 1982 Professor of the Year by the American Association of School Administrators, and wrote the national AASA *Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators*. He has coauthored a best selling textbook titled: *Skills for Successful School Leaders*, published by the American Association of School Administrators and authored numerous chapters, articles, and papers.

classes in recent years and the others are not excited about Wilson's school improvement plans.

All of these people have one thing in common: they need administrator development plans. (Note that I refuse to use the word training; you train technicians and other employees, but educational managers are professionally educated in universities and their skills are updated in executive development activities.) A vice-president of 3M Corporation and a member of the Texas LEAD Advisory Committee told me that 3M dropped the word "training" 10 years ago from its vocabulary because of its degrading connotation. 3M now says "Management Development Plans." Old habits of language die hard. Murphy and Hallinger (1987) edited a widely read book titled, *Approaches to Administrative Training*. The Texas State Board of Education adopted a management and leadership development rule to implement legislation enacted initially by the 69th legislature in 1984 (TEC 13.353). The law required that school districts offer in-service "training" in management skills for district administrators. Back now to the five educators who need administrator development plans. Sheila, Arch, John, Laura, and David are experiencing feelings ranging from frustration over lack of mobility to better positions and professional obsolescence, to increasing their levels of expertise in generic and specific skills. Each of them wants to improve his/her behavior and succeed as educational leaders, but they lack the knowledge and skill to do it. All of them may or may not realize that they are in need of administrator development. Realize it or not, they will acquire new and better skills if they hope to compete in the demanding changing world of school administration.

The Need to Improve Administrator Development Programs

There has been a growing concern about the ability of university preparation programs and professional development efforts to create school administrators with the "right stuff." This general concern regarding the inadequacy of administrator preparation and development has generated a flurry of reform activity. Since 1980 numerous authorities have criticized and presented alternative solutions to the administrator preparation and development problem. Pitner (1982), Miklos (1983), Hoyle (1985, 1987, 1989), Cooper and Boyd (1987) have reviews of past and current problems in administrator development and presented recommendations and guidelines for program improvements. Peterson and Finn (1985) assaulted the efforts of professors of educational administration by claiming that, "survey after survey of practicing administrators reveals that most judge their university training to have been easy, boring, and only intermittently useful to them in their wok. As with teacher education, one frequently hears such phrases as 'Mickey Mouse' " (p. 48). Hawley (1988) is less charitable to professors of school administration by asserting that " . . . uncertainty of purpose and lack of self-esteem among the educational administration professorate contribute to and are fostered by low status not only within universities but within schools of education" (p. 85). None of these critics has proposed any new or startling recommendations to enhance the professional development of school administrators. Other scholars have made less noise but solid contributions to the preparation and development by advancing positive proposals for improvement and reform. Achilles (1988) writes for those interested in improving the profession by stating, "I'm convinced that now is the time for new viewpoints, new models, new structures in educational administration. All involved in this very large enterprise need to build from a sturdy tripod: why, what, and how!" (p. 62)

Achilles and other leaders in educational administration realize that professional preparation at the universities is only part of the education of a school administrator. Our schools exist in a fast-changing environment. Issues rise and fall, values change, and new technology disrupts the system and offers new opportunities. The well prepared school leader is able to meet these challenges through staying up-to-date. Traditional university administrative preparation programs alone cannot produce a polished school leader. The university programs stress intellectual development and serve as screening devices, but the applied skills must be learned largely in a field setting. The impetus of reform legislation, along with developments in the research on effective schools and classroom instruction has resulted in heightened activity in administrator development programs.

Alternative Development Programs

This heightened emphasis is characterized by alternative development programs focusing on more varied instructional methodologies and different assumptions about the role of school leaders as teachers and learners. As a result of this new attention on school leadership, state legislation, universities, and foundations have established academies and institutes to re-school administrators. After a thorough review of national and state administrator academies, it became evident that the primary focus on the programs was on school principals. Conventional wisdom and research have always led us to believe that a great school almost always boasts a "Spark plug" principal. "Spark plug" principals are devoted to the welfare of those entrusted to them which gains the trust and support of teachers, staff, and students. It is clear that good principals are key to good schools. However, placing all of the emphasis and resources on the development of principals as the only key to school improvements falls far short. All administrators, central office staff, principals, and assistant principals must be included in professional development if schools are going to improve.

Opportunities for professional development are available in twenty-one of thirty-nine states responding to a survey. They reported that they have continuous education requirements for persons holding certification as school administrators (Gousha, LoPresti, and Jones, 1988). Officials in the other eighteen states indicated that they had no such requirements. The twenty-one states with continuous education requirements indicated that graduate study, continuing education units, and clock hours of staff development were the primary sources to meet the requirements. Gousha, LoPresti, and Jones also found that twelve of the sixteen large school districts in the sample required continuing education for all school administrators.

According to Daresh (1988) administrator in-service and development programs during the past few years have the following characteristics:

(a) Effective in-service is directed toward local needs;
(b) in-service participants need to be involved in the planning, implementation, and education of programs;
(c) active learning processes, rather than passive techniques such as lecturers, are viewed as desirable in-service instructional modes: people seek involvement in their learning;
(d) in-service that is part of a long-term systematic staff development plan is more effective than a one-shot, short-term program;
(e) local school in-service must be backed up by a commitment of resources from the central office; and,
(f) effective in-service requires ongoing evaluation (p. 22).

Daresh continues by describing five major models being applied to in-service education for administrators. The first and most popular model is graduate level credit courses at a university which leads to certification and a degree. The second model is the in-service academy sponsored by the local district or the state education agency (or university). A third model is the short-term in-service institute or workshop. Professional associations have led to this development. The National Academy for School Executives sponsored by the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) is perhaps the best example of these topic focused workshops. The fourth model which is in the early stages of development is the assessment center concept. The original purpose of the assessment center was to select candidates for administrative positions. In recent years the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and AASA have determined that the assessment center approach has considerable promise for use for in-service focused on the improvement of job related skills. The fifth and final model according to Daresh, " . . . is the network, or arrangement wherein individuals with common interests form an alliance for mutual support" (p. 22). This model is also known as "peer assisted" or "mentor" development programs.

The Blooming Academies

The second model described by Daresh—in-service academies—is a remarkable development which has mushroomed since 1980. The National Directory of Principal's Centers (1987) records and describes the functions of 90 Principal's Centers, academies, and institutes. New York State has ten and California lists six to lead in the new highly, visible, delivery mode for administrator in-service development. Most of the 90 centers have appeared on the scene since 1980 and more appear each year. The centers have expanded their influence of developmental activities to include programs for central office administration as well. The number of days, intensity, and follow-up activities vary widely. For example, participants in the Meadow Brook Leadership Academy in Michigan are involved in 10 one-day workshops for the first year and a smaller number the next year. The Harvard Principals' Center offers two or three sessions a month, which last two or three hours. The most common activity is the residential summer institute and/or academy. The Texas A&M University Principals' Center conducts a six-week institute which grants six hours of graduate credit and follows with a five day intensive academy. The academy includes national leaders as presenters and each of the 150 attendees select one of four strands for personalized development. The West Virginia Principals' Academy established by the State Department of Education in July 1984 includes an extensive ten-day summer residential session, two follow-up meetings of two days each, and a year long networking system. Another purpose of the academy is to provide county superintendents with improved procedures for selecting new principals. The component of the Academy was enacted in January of 1976 with the signing of an agreement with the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) to operate an Assessment Center based on the NASSP national model. The West Virginia Academy, like most others, stresses peer-assisted learning programs (PAL). In the PAL programs principals learn how to

record the data while observing a peer, analyze what they have recorded, and share the findings with that peer.

Collaboratives for All Administrators

Superintendents and other central office administrators gain their development opportunities through a variety of programs. State administrator associations have taken a much stronger role in staff development. Workshops stressing performance evaluation to determine a superintendent's areas of strength and weakness are growing in frequency. Universities collaborate with central office administrator associations and offer institutes and workshops which cover a wide range of topics and activities. An example of a professional association/university collaborative is the annual Administrative Leadership Institute co-sponsored by the Texas Association of School Administrators and the Department of Educational Administration at Texas A&M University. The most recent Institute focused on "Improving Administrative Performance." The seventeen hour, two day program consisted of presentations by professors of business management and educational administration and by leading Texas superintendents. Most of one day was devoted to peer assisted group sessions. The group members completed a self assessment performance inventory which included seven generic and job specific performance skill areas. Each person tabulated his/her performance scores to identify the skill areas that needed more personal attention and improvement. The groups were constituted according to administrative position (i.e., large, medium, or small city superintendent; assistant superintendent, and principals). Each group member contributed ideas and skill building strategies in each of the seven performance domains or areas. Then suggestions for personal skill building contributed in each of the groups were compiled and mailed to each participant to assist them in creating their personal development plan which is now required under the state management training rule.

Each participant was awarded a certificate of attainment which granted them management training credit required by the state. The institute was designed as a model for other universities or individual consultants who plan to offer in-service management training for school administrators in Texas.

Since the first wave of school reforms, several states have initiated collaboratives to make better use of state resources. Notably is the Connecticut Academy for School Executives (CASE) which was founded as a collaborative effort of the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) and Connecticut Association of School Administrators (CASA). The Board of Directors includes CSDE, the Connecticut Association of Boards of Education, Connecticut Association of School Personnel Administrators, Connecticut Association of Secondary Schools, Connecticut ASCD, Connecticut Coalition of Educational Leaders, and the Elementary and Middle School Principals Association. CASE is supported by a major grant from CSDE and by dues from member associates. The purpose of CASE is to provide long term professional growth opportunities for Administrators. It is offering programs on generic and specific skill areas for each Connecticut school leader.

In Mississippi the School Executive Management Institute was created through the Mississippi Education Reform Act of 1982. The Institute was formed under the auspices of the State Department of Education with a legislative mandated Advisory Board. The purpose of the school Executive Management Institute is to provide the framework for a variety of leadership, administrative, and management training programs which will lead in increasing administrative skill

levels leading directly to the school improvement process of the Educational Reform Act. This skill building framework consists of three tiers of development experience: 1) beginning administrators; 2) Board Certification Program; and, 3) senior administrators. The activities offered at each of these levels include: symposia, seminars, skill building programs, and "up-date" conferences (three annually). The initial focus of the programs on skill development is in the areas of school effects, research, leadership characteristics, communication, performance-based accreditation, instructional management, staff development, tests, measurement and evaluation, and administrative computer application.

During the next three years the framework will offer twenty or more development opportunities within the three tiers. A school administrator can demonstrate both skill attainment and the application of skills in the job which will lead to recognition as a "Board Certified Administrator."

This heightened emphasis on skill "up-dating" through state mandated or locally initiated performance development programs for practicing administrators has encouraged several universities not only to increase their in-service workshops and institutes but also to alter graduate degree programs. Administrator certification programs and masters and doctoral degree programs are becoming more concerned about performance skills and competence needed by graduates. The skill building is being meshed into standard course work and in expanded skill based internship and clinical experiences in public school systems. Such an effort to balance theory with clinical experience is generally known as the professional studies model. This model has recently been detailed by the author (1988, 1989). Planning is underway at Texas A&M University to select its first cohort group and begin a professional studies doctorate in 1989.

These degree programs are being strengthened by university/public school collaboratives that emphasize balance between the academic content and the real world of the school.

John Goodlad and Ann Lieberman of the University of Washington are among the leading pioneers in promoting university and school district collaboratives. They have found that the longer the collaborative structure has been in existence, the more trusting the relationship and the more possible it is to create collaborative inquiries of all kinds. David Thompson and Gerald Bailey of Kansas State University have written incisive articles and collected others on the subject of university/school district collaboration in the Fall, 1988 *Educational Considerations* published by Kansas State University.

These new and promising collaboratives strike at the heart of three of the recommendations in *Leaders for American's Schools*, the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration:

1. The public schools should share responsibility with universities and professional or organizations for the preparation of administrators:
2. Administrator preparation programs should be like those in professional schools that emphasize theoretical and clinical knowledge, applied research, and supervised practice; and,
3. Professors should collaborate with administrators on reforming curricula for administrator preparation.

The Knowledge Base or What

It is alarming that on some university campuses and in staff development programs the program planners have few

clear notions about the knowledge and skills that all educational administrators should possess. According to Peterson and Finn (1985), "One commendable version was offered by the American Association of School Administrators (Hoyle, 1982) spanning seven major areas of knowledge and skill. Under each of these headings, the AASA suggests administrators need a mix of empirical and theoretical knowledge and they need a feel for how to put their knowledge and skills into operation within the school organization so as to increase its effectiveness" (p. 53). This bold effort by AASA in collaboration with higher education and public school administrators remains the only set of guidelines for the preparation of school administrators in the United States. The issue is not, however, whether these guidelines are the ultimate gauge for quality programs; it is rather than no set of competencies, programs, guidelines, and knowledge is commonly accepted as the core for administrator pre-service or in-service development programs. It is striking how the seven AASA major areas of knowledge and skills are found in the programs of most academies and institutes. For instance many state and local district administrator development programs stress school climate and how to improve it, political theory and building coalitions, the curriculum and how to build and evaluate it, instructional management systems and how to run them, staff members and how to evaluate them, school resources and how to utilize them, and research planning and evaluation and how to use them.

In the absence of any other guide these other areas may have become accepted as a guide for best practice by planners of administrative institutes and academies. Perhaps the nine studies to validate the AASA competence and skills for the successful performance of principals, superintendents, and community college administrators have encouraged the wide spread emphasis in development programs (Hoyle, 1987).

The AASA National Executive Development Center

Based on the seven skill areas the AASA has developed the National Executive Development Center (NEDC) for experienced school administrators who wish to build on their strengths and increase their awareness of personal and professional knowledge, attributes, and skills. The first pilot center was established at the University of Texas, Austin in the fall of 1986. The emphasis is on professional growth through diagnosis of strengths and weaknesses and the development of a professional growth plan. The program is self-directed and self-paced with time-sequenced activities to enhance professional growth. The essential knowledge base is derived from the competencies and skills as outlined by Hoyle, et. al., (1985) in *Skills for Successful School Leaders*. Through several validation studies it was determined that the essential knowledge base for administrators should be combined into five leadership task areas or domains: 1) Institutional Leadership; 2) General Administrative Leadership; 3) Human Relations Leadership; 4) Liberal Education; and, 5) Personal Capabilities. Each leadership area has been broken down into task areas, tasks, and subtasks (competencies).

Once the individual accomplishes goals as validated by mentors, peers, and self, he/she may exit the system or recycle through the model for continued growth. According to Hohman (1988) AASA will establish seven centers across the United States. He projects that some 16,000 central office administrators nationwide could feel the impact of these programs which " . . . may literally redefine the professional development process for administrators" (p. 20).

The Management Profile

Another promising executive development model called the "Management Profile" was developed by Erlandson (1988). It is a comprehensive strategy for:

1. Diagnosing how effective a school administrator is likely to be in fulfilling the various functions and roles associated with the management of schools; and
2. Establishing individualized plans for professional development based upon this diagnosis.

In making this diagnosis, an integrated appraisal measure, developed by Professor Lyle F. Schoenfeldt of the Department of Management, Texas A&M University, is used. The administrator's "management profile" is captured in a half-hour videotaped interview that probes the administrator's views centering on three managerial roles and six functions, and uncovers, in operational terms, how these are fulfilled on the job. Also, the author and Erlandson developed the Perceived Performance Inventory (PPI) to obtain perceptions of the administrator and the administrator's subordinates, supervisors, and peers on how well the management functions were being performed. An analysis of the videotaped interview and the PPI is shared with the administrator who, with assistance provided by the Texas A&M University Principals' Center, develops and executes a professional development plan for bringing the profile more completely into line with personal and professional aspirations and with the needs of the school organization. Individualized development plans are designed with the administrator who is also assigned a mentor or "coach" to assist in professional development.

The Texas LEAD Center

The Texas LEAD Center is part of LEAD national networks described earlier in this volume. A recent publication written by Director Joan Burnham (1988) and her staff gave the following information on the role, focus, and future of the Center.

Who is involved?

The Center is a collaborative endeavor, pooling the resources and expertise from key entities in the state concerned with the professional development of school administrators. Consortium cosponsors are the Texas Association of School Administrators, the Texas Elementary Principals and Supervisors Association, and the Texas Association of Secondary School Principals. In addition to the presidents of the three cosponsoring organizations, a seven-member governing board includes leaders representing business and industry, the state education agency, colleges of education, and regional education service centers. A 33-member advisory committee offers further statewide access to expertise, guidance, and resources.

How Does the Center Work?

The Texas LEAD Center serves primarily as a developmental R&D center. To accomplish its mission of strengthening educational leadership development, the Center concentrates on five major functions:

- Collecting information on leadership skills, training, and practices.
- Developing and delivering leadership training services.
- Providing technical assistance and consultation.
- Disseminating and supporting utilization of information.
- Fostering interorganizational collaboration.

The LEAD Center's primary strategies are:

- Training-of-trainers.
- Use of work-teams (task groups) made up of practitioners, other educators, and private sector leaders.
- Development of state and national networks to provide input in training and planning and to disseminate LEAD information.

Burnham (1988), described the success of the first year by stating the following:

"As a new R&D statewide technical assistance center for school administrators, the Texas LEAD Center has an exciting year. During the second year of the LEAD Center, we will be continuing our efforts to pilot exemplary programs and leadership practices. An important aspect of that developmental thrust will be the continued efforts to work collaboratively with the private sector to adapt some of their outstanding management development training for school leaders. Trainers will be trained in LEAD programs, who will, in turn train administrators throughout the state. It is anticipated that those trainers will generate from diverse sectors in the state already involved with school leadership development (e.g., professional associations, school districts, educational service center, and universities).

Professional development programs selected for the training-of-trainers effort will address the generic Core Curriculum skills and job-specific skills discussed in the Management and Leadership Development SBOE rule for school administrators. Some of those programs will be those that were also piloted through the summer (1988) contract with the Texas Education Agency.

The Texas LEAD Center believes that the opportunity for administrators to have a great deal of say about their professional development plans is a unique one" (p. 1).

A LEAD Caveat

The Texas LEAD Center holds much promise for a working collaborative professional development model. In spite of the additional financial support from the Texas Education Agency and the numerous activities underway, problems loom on the horizon. The burning questions center on the role of the university schools of education in the long run and on the cloudy role of the corporate sector in assisting with the management training and development. Universities are not disposed to create non-credit administrator in-service on a regular basis. University scholars tend to look upon administrative in-service as a "quick fix" lacking systematic learning and a solid research base. Corporate trainers are prone to think that educators have little background in general management training and seek to "run" the school administrators through management 101 or remedial content that is taught in graduate pre-service programs in entry level educational administration courses. The LEAD Center, universities, and the business sector need to do a lot of talking and planning if a systematic, sequential, and workable model for administration development is to emerge. Time will tell if these three actors will and can join hands. Busy school administrators have too many "fish to fry" to be subjected to remedial, piecemeal, uncoordinated, though well intended "management training." The LEAD Center has located the better pieces of the puzzle. Now the hope is that the vision is clear enough to fit the pieces into an integrated picture of successful staff development for all Texas school administrators. The same hope prevails in all

other states looking for the best role for LEAD to play in facilitating a coordinated, effective administrator development program.

Conclusions

Sheila Wilmore, Arch Edgell, John Winston, Laura Londenberg, and David Wilson could each be overwhelmed with the plethora of development activities described in this article. Overchoice is the problem. How do they know which development activity is for them?

Researchers remind us that all school managers should demonstrate competency in both generic and specialized skills. However, observers have agreed that the complexities in the study of educational administration can hardly be reduced to a specific list of competencies and skills. If you the reader were pushed to provide a development program for any of our five educators mentioned above, what would you tell them? What program would you direct them to? Since staff development programs tend to imitate one another, development and training strategies and techniques tend to be faddish, i.e., effective schools research based on "the five correlates." The faddish, often quick-fix characteristics of development can be diminished by systematically determining the training development needs of the administrative staff and of the individual. In this way, management development programs will use interventions only for the administrators and the situations where needed. If the management development program is centered on the following three questions, then you probably will help our five educators select the program that fits their needs:

(1) Where is the development/training needed in the school district?
(2) What must the administrators learn in order to perform the job effectively?
(3) Who needs the development and of what kind?

To answer these three questions requires time and human resources. However, if in-service development is really to be successful in helping each of our five educators lead more productive lives and schools, then the time and resources must be supplied. The objectives of any development program must take into account the job description and responsibilities of the position held or desired by the individual. Task identification which focuses on the overt, observable behaviors that are involved in performing an administrative job must also be present in a successful development program. Unless the in-service program's objectives are based on a job analyses and a task identification, the program will likely to be merely another waste of time for the harried school administrator.

It seems clear that all programs must include the technology and resources to diagnose and map out the strengths and areas of less strength of a person's leadership and management skills. The identified areas of less strength are the beginning of a personal development plan which includes formal presentations, readings, observations, and peer and mentor assisted learning. If these components are present, Sheila, Arch, John, Laura, and David will grow professionally and be prepared to create learning environments where all students can and will learn.

References

Achilles, C.M. (1988). Unlocking some mysteries of administration and administrator preparation: A reflective prospect. D.E. Griffiths, R. Stout, and P.B. Forsyth (Eds.) **Leaders for America's Schools.** pgs. 41–67. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchans Publishing Corp.

Burnham, J.G. (1988). Directors message. **Focus.** Newsletter, published by the Texas LEAD Center, Austin, Texas.

Daresh, J.C. (1988). Administrator in-service. **An Encyclopedia of school administration and supervision.** (pp. 22–23). Phoenix, Ariz.: Oryx Press.

Erlandson, D. (1988). **The management profile.** College Station, Texas: The Principals' Center Press.

Gousha, R.P., LoPresti, P.L., and Jones, A.H. (1988). Report on the first annual survey of certification and employment standards for educational administrators. In D. Griffiths, R. Stout, and P.B. Forsyth (Eds.) **Leaders for America's Schools** (pp. 200–206). Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Corp.

Hawley, W.D. (1988). Universities and the improvement of school management: Roles for the states. In D. Griffiths, R. Stout, and P.B. Forsyth (Eds.), **Leaders for America's Schools** (pp. 82–88). Berkley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Corp.

Hohman, R.W. (1987). How many tomorrows? **Insight: Texas Association of School Administrators Premier Issue,** 19.

Hoyle, J.R. (1982). **Guidelines for the preparation of school administrators** (2nd edition). Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators.

Hoyle, J.R.; English, F.; and Steffy, B. (1985). **Skills for successful school leaders.** Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators.

Hoyle, J.R. (1985, Winter). Programs in educational administration and the AASA preparation guidelines. **Educational Administration Quarterly,** 21 (1): 71–93.

Hoyle, J.R. (1987). The AASA model for preparing school leaders. In J. Murphy, and P. Hallinger (Eds.), **Approaches to administrative training in education** (pp. 83–95). Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Hoyle, J.R. (1988, February). The 21st century superintendent: A great motivator. Paul B. Salmon Memorial Lecture presented at the Annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators.

Hoyle, J.R. (1989, January). Preparing 21st century superintendents. **Phi Delta Kappan,** 71 (1).

Miklos, E. (1983, Summer). Evolution in administration preparation programs. **Educational Administration Quarterly,** 19(3): 153–78.

Murphy, J. and Hallinger, P. (Eds.) (1987). **Approaches to administrative training.** Albany: SUNY Press.

National Directory of Principals' Centers. (1987). The principals' center: Harvard Graduate School, Cambridge, Mass.

Peterson, K.D. and Finn, C.E., Jr. (1985) Principals, superintendents, and the administrator's art. **The Public Interest,** No. 79 (Spring): 42–62.

Pitner, N. (1982). **Training of the school administrators: State of the Art.** Eugene, Ore.: Center for Educational Policy and Management.