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Besides processing documents and journal articles, the Clearinghouse has another major function: information analysis and synthesis. The Clearinghouse prepares bibliographies, literature reviews, state-of-the-knowledge papers, and other interpretive research studies on topics in its educational area.
FOREWORD

With the School Leadership Digest series, the National Association of Elementary School Principals adds another project to its continuing program of publications designed to offer school leaders essential information on a wide range of critical concerns in education.

The School Leadership Digest is a series of monthly reports on top priority issues in education. At a time when decisions in education must be made on the basis of increasingly complex information, the Digest provides school administrators with concise, readable analyses of the most important trends in schools today, as well as points up the practical implications of major research findings.

By special cooperative arrangement, the series draws on the extensive research facilities and expertise of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. The titles in the series were planned and developed cooperatively by both organizations. Utilizing the resources of the ERIC network, the Clearinghouse is responsible for researching the topics and preparing the copy for publication by NAESP.

The author of this report, Jerry Higley, is employed by the Clearinghouse as a research analyst and writer.
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INTRODUCTION

School principals are almost always originally trained as teachers. After picking up master's degrees in the summers, probably in educational administration, they join the pool of certified personnel and perhaps, if they are lucky, eventually wind up with a school of their own.

But since the principalship is one of the most demanding jobs in American public service, many are saying that this process isn't adequate. This paper will investigate the material published in the last few years relating to the training and certification of principals to discover what is now being done to change this process to make it more effective.

Leadership in various guises is the sought-after trait in principals. A training program that can consistently produce this trait has not yet been perfectly designed.

The difficulty of the problem is pinpointed by Heller. Theorists have created complex models, psychologists have studied personality traits, and social scientists have studied causes and effects, but leadership, in the final analysis, "depends upon execution and not upon verbalization, doing and not writing about doing."

A principal, Heller goes on to say, has to generate followers by developing "insights and talents for delegating authority, looking at alternatives in any situation, communicating effectively, organizing his tasks effectively, working effectively with community groups, and coordinating the total effort."

All groups concerned with the certification and training of principals could agree that these qualities are the ones they are trying to instill in prospective principals, but the goal has been, and may yet continue to be, an elusive one.
WANTED: A RENAISSANCE MAN

The school principal is required to be an expert in a number of widely divergent areas. He or she must have knowledge and skills in administrative leadership, organizational management, pupil personnel, instructional programs, finances and facilities, and the school-society relationship.

Specifically, he must know how to supervise teachers, help with their preparation and development, understand the role of the guidance counselor, know about programs for disturbed and disadvantaged children, communicate with parents, discipline, negotiate with professionals, evaluate teachers, plan the physical environment of the school, help change attitudes, understand new theories of grading, and so forth.

It is virtually impossible for one person to do all these things well; thus it is easy to see why there is controversy over how prospective principals should be trained. Presumably, certain things will have to be emphasized at the expense of others; priorities have to be established. What is the essential nature of the principal's job? What, generally speaking, must he be able to do?

Role Ambiguity

Much of the difficulty in determining the principal's appropriate role derives from his middle position in the educational hierarchy. Does he identify more with the other administrators in the central office? Or does he identify more with the teachers, having been one himself in most cases?

Though there is no completely satisfactory solution for this problem, education theorists need to be concerned because there is some agreement that this undefined middle ground causes ineffectiveness in the job and less than satisfactory operation of the schools.
A Shop Foreman

Though there are a great many views about what role the principal should primarily take, they boil down to two basic positions. Many see the principal as essentially a shop foreman or plant manager.

Since the principal, according to this view, is caught in the squeeze between various power sources, he is a functionary, a counterpuncher responding to various complaints, requests, appeals, and demands.

His primary function then is to keep the operation running as smoothly as possible, to carry out district policy, and to respond to community desires, while at the same time keeping teachers as contented as possible.

This view emphasizes training in the areas of public relations, facilities and finance, and the many technical skills required for such an operation. He would ruffle as few feathers as possible and know how to perform his routine tasks efficiently.

A Philosopher King

But others see the principalship in an entirely different light. They emphasize that education needs to change as society changes and that the principal needs to be the key to that change. Rather than merely react to forces that beset him, he should be an active innovator, one who raises issues and takes the responsibility for changing attitudes.

Such assumptions were built into a study of the principalship by Goldhammer and others. They conclude that the good principals are those who take risks, cut red tape when they feel it is necessary, and in general, have the courage to enact their own ideas about what direction education should take, and make them work.

This view emphasizes training in the areas of human relations, social sciences, education theory, and instruction. Rather than allowing teachers to dictate instructional policy, the principal should be an effective leader in those areas, aware of the latest research in subject disciplines and instructional practices.
This view also encourages leaders who have proved themselves in various fields, not just in teaching, to become principals.

Most likely, in practice, principals will continue to perform somewhere between these two extremes, coping the best they can with existing conditions, and at times trying to exert their individuality over the schools they have been assigned to serve.

But the call for improvement in the effectiveness of principals is well documented, and the logical places to start are with training and certification. These processes will determine to large extent who will be the principals of the future, and how well they will carry out such a demanding and difficult role.

Pervasive Localism

Any attempt to change the principalship would have to take into account the most pervasive characteristic of school principals across the country: they are less geographically mobile than any other comparably educated group. While this factor provides for a remarkable stability in the profession, it can also lead to a limited, local outlook and make change difficult.

Among graduate students, education majors do their schooling nearer home than do those in any other field. Craeger surveyed 33,119 graduate students in 153 schools in 1969 and found that 62 percent of those in education grew up in the same state in which they were studying. Of the other fields, law was closest with 55 percent.

Seventy-one percent of the students in education said that they intended to stay in the same state to work after graduation, a higher percentage than in all other fields. The doctoral students in that group were slightly more mobile than were those working on lower degrees, but only a few of such students ever become principals.

The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) reports that 92 percent of the principals in the
northeast grew up in that area, and that 89 percent of the principals in the southwest were natives. Other sections of the country had similar percentages.

Mitchell studied doctoral dissertations on the principalship, which provided additional evidence for these generalizations. Among the statistics he found were these highlights:

- In Kentucky the “average high school principal” was born and reared in Kentucky, and was a native of the geographic area he is now serving.
- In Missouri 29 percent of secondary principals were serving in their native home towns.
- In Pennsylvania almost all elementary principals received their undergraduate and graduate training from institutions within the state.
- Almost all the secondary school principals in Arkansas took their BA and MA degrees in Arkansas schools.
- 76 percent of the female principals had their degrees from the state in which they now teach.

Hiring practices also encourage this localism among principals. When Mitchell surveyed board of education members and superintendents in Michigan, 84 percent said that they would give preference to local applicants who were considered qualified. He also refers to a study of the assistant principalship in Texas, which indicated that those chosen were usually appointed from within their own districts. Assistant principals state that the principals and superintendents of the system in which they serve had the greatest influence on their appointment to their first assistant principalship.

Graduating students in education are also more hesitant than others to change locations once they get their degrees.

Educational leaders have not shared in one major national characteristic. We are thought of as a mobile society, and it has been shown that the more educated one becomes, the more likely he is to change his locality. But for educational administrators, this has not been the case.
TRAINING CONTENT: REFINING SKILLS IN A
CHANGING SOCIETY

In the last decade great pressure has been exerted on the
school principal from what Bruno and Fox call the “tired
taxpayers, militant minorities, suspicious citizens, and parsim-
onious politicians.” As a result, the principal has had to
acquire new skills or at least to become more proficient in
the old ones. The content of principal preparation programs
during this period was designed to refine the principal’s skills
to cope with this increased pressure, while at the same time
the content reflects changing views as to how this goal can
best be accomplished.

Recent Trends

The major shifts in content have been toward more em-
phasis on the social and behavioral sciences and the humani-
ties. According to the University Council for Educational
Administration (UCEA) commission report, the concepts,
theories, and research findings from the social sciences in-
creased in importance in the fifties and sixties. In the mid-
and late-sixties, program content included more work in the
humanities.

The inclusion of more study in these two disciplines ac-
companied an increased flexibility in program content gen-
erally.

Social Sciences

As educators were confronted with a society that changed—
sometimes slowly, at other times explosively— they tended to
borrow ideas from the social and behavioral sciences, both to
help the administrator-to-be to see the relationships between
school and community, and to aid him in viewing the school
itself as a social subsystem.
Culbertson, Fogarty, and Shibles have categorized the four basic ways of adapting social sciences for the study of administration.

1. The discipline-based approach focuses on the concepts, research findings, generalizations, and modes of inquiry of social sciences themselves.

2. The theory-based approach emphasizes theories of administration associated with the "science" of administration.

3. The problem-based approach starts with problems likely to confront educational administrators.

4. The career-based approach can accommodate the career objectives of candidates with a variety of purposes.

Humanities

More programs are including material from literature, philosophy, and various other arts, on the assumption that the prospective administrator, by such exposure, will develop the intellectual, personal, social, and ethical qualities essential to effective leadership. More specifically, according to Culbertson, he can be trained "to think clearly about persistent moral issues faced by those in organizations," "to analyze the contradictory forces that are generated by competing value systems," and "to assess possible consequences of being guided by one set of values as opposed to another," and perhaps even to develop his own creativity through exposure to that of others.

In actual practice, Farquhar discovered, most humanities courses are in literature, since it is the art most easily adapted for the study of administration.

Inadequacies

In spite of these trends, there is general agreement that training programs are still not adequately preparing principals
for the tasks they face. One recurring complaint is that the graduate schools emphasize theory and theoretical models, material "about" education, rather than more practical, work-oriented experience.

Goldhammer and others report that principals often score themselves low in their ability to establish and maintain effective human relationships and that they believe that a majority of their problems revolve around this weakness. Closely related to this deficiency is the inability to be an effective team leader. The majority of principals feel that they need more and better preparation in supervising, teacher evaluation, group decision-making, maintaining morale, and other related areas.

Another weakness principals detect in themselves is the inability to be an effective change agent. Most principals in the sample studied by Goldhammer and his colleagues would prefer to be instructional experts rather than building managers, but didn't know how to effect improvement in teaching from their staffs.

They also regret their inability to discover long-range planning strategies. Most feel the urgency of having the school's programs meet the genuine needs of the students but do not have the appropriate knowledge and skills to plan and evaluate. They find it difficult to know what is wrong and what could be done to improve the programs.

Principals are aware of the potential offered by current tools and technology to help solve some of these problems, but are usually confused about how to best utilize these aids and are hesitant to get involved with procedures they are unsure of.

New Directions

The majority of college instructors feel that the present content of programs needs only minor changes.

A typical program, according to an NASSP survey reported by Nickerson, consists of 7 to 12 hours in educational administration, 1 to 6 hours in philosophy of education, 1 to 6
hours in educational psychology, 1 to 6 hours in curriculum and instruction, and 1 to 6 hours in sociology. Sixth-year and doctoral programs (less frequently used to train principals) usually include some work in business administration, political science, and humanities, as well as a foreign language.

The only changes that the professors envisioned were the addition of some business administration, political science, and humanities courses at the master's level, and the dropping of the foreign language requirement.

The survey of universities and colleges by Goldhammer and others indicated that 24 percent of the respondents would like to make changes but that these would require more faculty and, therefore, more money, which they did not have at their disposal.

Another 15 percent of the colleges and universities were still discussing possible changes, while 18 percent were considering different core content, primarily in the social and behavioral sciences and in group sensitivity training. Both professors and principals agree that more systematic planning of program content would be desirable.

**Goal-Oriented Training**

One change favored by many in the graduate schools has more to do with the approach than with the content itself, though content would be affected. In this plan, the effectiveness of training would be measured by specific competency behaviors rather than by the more traditional credit hours and grade-point averages. Johnson, for example, notes 12 basic areas of competency that can be broken down into more specific behaviors.

1. knowledge of methods and sources of school finance

2. knowledge of laws and regulations pertaining to the school

3. knowledge of goals, strategies, and outcomes of contract negotiations and grievance procedures
4. operational expertise in research and evaluation of educational problems
5. up-to-date operational knowledge of instructional techniques and materials
6. skill in techniques of communication
7. ability to initiate and maintain positive human relationships with peers, superiors, and subordinates
8. understanding of the school as a social subsystem
9. expertise in systematic problem-solving procedures
10. knowledge of history and philosophy of education
11. understanding of the effects on children of the socioeconomic milieu in which they live their lives, and a commitment to making the school a medium through which they can maximize their backgrounds and talents
12. knowledge in the field of child and adolescent development, and psychology of learning

Such a model could lead to the eventual breakdown of rigid disciplinary boundaries. The customary program of one course in sociology, one course in literature, and one course in educational administration would be abandoned in favor of more cooperation between departments in providing students with competencies.

Systems Analysis

One developing area that could lead to significant changes in emphasis in the content of principals' training is "systems analysis" or what Bruno and Fox call "quantitative analysis." It includes the use of computer technology and various methods for quantifying information for the purposes of decision-making, such as systems analysis, operations research, cost-effectiveness analysis, and planning-programming-budgeting systems (PPBS).
Bruno and Fox claim that such systematic analysis can help an administrator to distinguish between subjective judgments and verifiable facts by separating the relevant from irrelevant issues, by identifying the specific assumptions and factual bases on which alternative recommendations rest, and by tracing out the knowable consequences and costs of each alternative. It can help with either tactical problems like student scheduling and bus routing, or with policy problems, such as salary negotiations, integration policies, and curriculum issues.

A UCEA survey cited by Bruno and Fox predicts that the next few years will see many more programs in educational administration using systems analysis as a significant part of the training content.

Many critics, however, would surely agree with Starratt that there are dangers in programs where the emphasis is on the process of decision-making, communication, and group planning, without sufficient concern for the content of these processes. Without content these processes become merely "sophisticated techniques to come to grips with trivia." A preparation program must also impart meaning, value, significance, a sense of what "ought to be," rather than just facility with processes.

Need for Research

There is definitely a need for more and better studies of what factors relate significantly to a principal's success as an administrator. This research could clarify what content can most profitably be incorporated into preservice programs and could benefit the systematic planning and coordination of programs.

One such study by Rousseau revealed that according to teachers' perceptions of their principals' success, training in educational administration proved to be a positive factor, whereas work in curriculum and instruction, the social sciences, and the humanities seemed to make little difference.
This conclusion leaves open the possibility that work in noneducation disciplines might be more effective if treated in nontraditional ways.
A factor in principal training considered by most observers to be even more important than the content of the programs is their structure. Since there is general agreement in the literature that traditional preparation programs haven't been successful, there are many suggestions for change.

The proposals for change tend to fall into four categories: those emphasizing newer teaching methods; those emphasizing alternatives to traditional courses, including various types of experience "in the field"; those involving an overhaul of the whole program, most notably the competency-based approach; and those advocating the removal of principal preparation from the control of the graduate schools altogether.

Virtually all the proposed and implemented changes in program structure are in response to a general discontent that theory about education is emphasized in the graduate schools at the expense of more practical, work-oriented experience. As Goldhammer and others point out, "There is little evidence that any real consideration has been given to the experiences that will develop in prospective elementary school principals the knowledge, skills, and critical insights needed to assess the consequences of alternative strategies."

Nontraditional Teaching Methods

The traditional teaching methods of lectures, textbook readings, and discussions have been in disrepute for well over a decade, and nearly every graduate department indicates that changes are being made or are at least considered desirable. According to the survey reported by Nickerson, professors are still using the old methods but are also using many new ones. The professors relate that the old methods are among the least effective, while such newer methods as simulation,
small-group projects, role playing, visits by resource people from the field, and field trips are much more effective.

Laboratory Training

The term laboratory training covers a variety of techniques, all of which put candidates into small groups that are relatively unstructured, providing the opportunity for the group to choose its own goals and tasks. The focus of this training is on the group itself, its reactions and behavior, with the group leader functioning as a resource person rather than as an instructor. He is someone trained in the behavioral sciences who can aid communication and provide feedback for group analysis and interpretation.

The work is designed to help the individual to understand and accept himself and others and to develop operational skill in interpersonal relations. How effective this method is, overall, is not clear. It can have a great effect on the participants but, in the hands of an incompetent leader, can be disastrous. Still highly controversial, it tends to be either highly praised or intensely disliked. Unfortunately, qualified leaders are still difficult to find. A typical interchange of ideas on its merits can be found in the article by Barnes and Gray and that by Gray.

Simulation

Simulation is a method highly regarded by both teachers and candidates because of its practical orientation. A number of packages are available, including background material for a fictional school or district, and inbasket exercises requiring responses from the candidates. Simulation experiences can test behavior in a variety of contexts in a short time, without the pressure of the real situation. They are, however, expensive to produce and can also be expensive to use if computer assistance is part of the instruction.

A typical example of a simulation project is the Monroe City Urban Simulation project (URBSIM), developed by UCEA. The Monroe City simulation was created to give students experience contending with the unique problems facing
inner-city schools, such as conflict between militant groups, decentralization, busing, and curriculum changes.

Although students rate simulation highly, and it seems especially suited for teaching skills of analysis, assessing its overall effectiveness is difficult. One series of studies cited by McCleary and McIntyre indicates that there is little relationship between the ability to solve inbasket problems and on-the-job performance.

Case Studies

Case studies have a long history in the study of law and medicine but have only recently been introduced into the training of educational administrators. Compared with simulation exercises, case studies are less expensive, more easily assembled, and require less organization; as a result, they are much more readily available. They can be either written, taped, or filmed descriptions of complex situations confronting an administrator. Scenarios, the open-ended form of case studies, present a problem without a solution and can be effective in studying role playing and small-group problem-solving.

Games

Games incorporate aspects of simulation with laboratory training and add the element of competition. It is an expensive method, and few games are now available. The survey reported by Nickerson indicates that few professors are familiar with them. One possible danger is that the desire to win can sometimes subvert the desire to learn.

Two games that are available for the training of principals are the Elementary Principalship Games by Ohm and Wiggins and the Secondary Principalship Games by Ohm, both from the University of Oklahoma. At the University of West Virginia, each student in educational administration is required to create two simulation games as a course requirement. Wynn notes that the understanding of the underlying issues necessary to design a game might make that process more valuable than playing it.
Alternatives to the Classroom: Field Experiences

At the same time that many programs are attempting to work reality-oriented classroom methods into their course of training, there is also increasing emphasis on the next step closer to practical training—getting the candidates out into the schools.

Field experiences are primarily either surveys undertaken by the student to become familiar with how the real administrator works or internships. Surveys can focus on the school system generally, or they can have a specifically human-relations orientation, a clinical and political action orientation, or an anthropological or sociological orientation. With the survey, the student is in the field but under the supervision of the program faculty, whereas in the internship he may be in contact with the faculty but is primarily performing an on-the-job service for the school district.

Although it is generally agreed that internships can be a valuable part of the prospective administrator's training, universities reported to Goldhammer and his associates some major difficulties in establishing these programs. The expense of instituting functioning internships (rather than those just on paper) is more than most schools can or are willing to handle. There is usually no money budgeted, the faculty is committed to other parts of the program, there are not enough school districts willing to participate in such a program, and few students would want to serve without some pay themselves. For these reasons most graduate schools put a low priority on internships.
American school principals were first certified in 1911 in order to protect the public from incompetent administrators. By 1957, according to the National Education Association's 1974 Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States, 46 states issued certificates for secondary principals and 45 states issued them for elementary principals. Today, every state but Michigan requires certification for school administrators. The District of Columbia, though it requires a master's degree of its principals, gives no certificates.

As the number of states requiring certification grew, there was a corresponding tendency to increase the requirements for certification. Only four states now require less than a master's degree of their principals.

Recently, however, certification has been seriously questioned as a fair and effective method of regulating entrance into the profession. A UCEA commission report indicates that since 1970 most changes in certification have involved decreases in the amount of required training and experience rather than increases.

The Challenges to Certification

Some critics of certification, such as Marien, attack the whole idea of "credentialism" as being harmful to the society in a general way. A credential becomes a commodity, sought for its own sake, without regard for the genuine purposes of professional training. These purposes then become distorted, upsetting priorities for trainees, schools, certifying agencies, and universities and colleges providing the training.

The Demand for Performance-Based Standards

The discrepancy between training and successful performance as an administrator has been noted by educational leaders
at all levels. Growing community involvement in the schools and the demand for accountability have increased this concern. Although preparation programs have been changing, if only gradually, certification requirements have been even slower to change.

Bridges and Baehr argue that there is no demonstrable relationship between the training educational administrators now receive and their records of success in the schools. Certification standards tend to be stated in terms of course requirements or “input” measures rather than professional performance requirements or “output” measures, making it difficult to meet effectively the demands of accountability.

Ethnic minorities concerned about their representation in the profession have added a new dimension to this problem. Arguing that traditional training programs and certifying examinations are instruments of middle-class institutions that reinforce social-class selection and effectively exclude capable minority leaders, minority groups have questioned the legality of certification requirements.

The courts now tend to support this accusation. In 1971 New York City had to give up its examination for principals because it discriminated against Puerto Ricans and blacks. The presiding judge ruled that the examination tested one’s ability to memorize rather than any abilities relating to effective performance as an administrator.

Forced into this type of accountability, certifying agencies in the future will no doubt have to demonstrate legally that there is some relationship between the prescribed training and on-the-job effectiveness. In the absence of such a demonstration, most current certification procedures will likely be ruled illegal, according to Bridges and Baehr, if appeal is made to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The Call for a “New Breed” of Administrators

In the attempt to find the best possible leaders for America’s schools, there are others who attack current certification requirements because they make it difficult for promising educational administrators to transfer from other
disciplines in the graduate schools or for experienced leaders from outside education to find suitable positions.

The National Program for Educational Leadership (NPEL), for example, insists that the traditional requirement of teaching experience is a handicap for the kind of administrator NPEL is training. NPEL is a national consortium of major universities committed to the project of recruiting outstanding leaders from outside education and training them for new careers in educational administration.

Wayson has also long advocated reaching out beyond the boundaries of education for prospective principals with fresh and constructive approaches to public education. This movement to circumvent certification requirements has forced certifying agencies to consider changes and to rethink the whole process of certification as a regulating force in the profession.

The View of the Certifying Agencies

According to the UCEA commission report, personnel in state education agencies claim that the certification programs already allow much more flexibility than is now being used by university professors interested in liberalizing the requirements. The authors of this report point out, for example, that although 23 states allow universities and colleges to get approval for experimental programs that could waive existing requirements for their graduates, only two states have schools taking advantage of this opportunity.

The state agencies believe that admission requirements and preparatory programs in the graduate schools inhibit the flow of talent into educational administration more than the certification requirements do. In addition to the experimental program options, they cite “approved program” arrangements, reciprocity practices, and the use of “equivalencies as evidence for flexibility in the administration of certification.

Twenty-six states have approved program arrangements whereby the training institutions have considerable flexibility in creating their own programs, with only a few courses, or types of courses, specified by state agency requirements.
A number of states also have reciprocity agreements with other states allowing more mobility within the profession than most educational administrators ever experience. The use of equivalencies is also a common practice in which prescribed certification requirements are met through special nonschool experiences.

Some Recent Changes

There have also been a number of exemplary changes in certification procedures, especially in some of the larger urban areas. These practices show what can be done to respond to the pressures for better and more representative leadership in the public schools.

Chicago

Redmond, Elenbogen, and Gardner report on the changes that were made in the Chicago Principals Examination in 1970. After the Board of Examiners carefully studied the present and future needs of the city’s public schools, it designed a certification process reflecting what it considered to be the new role of the principal, the need for community involvement, and the need for racial balance.

The new examination tests problem-solving ability rather than memorization of facts. It is based on the assumption that the principal should be a capable team leader rather than a curriculum specialist in all areas and an authoritarian decision-maker. An oral examination was included along with the written. The membership of the committees had to be sexually and racially balanced and include one person from outside the field of education. Of the first 150 candidates certified, 75 were white, 73 were black, one was of Japanese ancestry, and one was of Mexican ancestry.

One of the more striking aspects of the Chicago experience was the inclusion on the Board of Examiners of community business leaders who took an active interest in designing the examination along with the educational leaders.
The Ryan Act of 1970 in California is, according to Lamb, a "comprehensive and program-shaking piece of legislation." It brought to an end the issuing of credentials based only on credit received from an institution of higher education. As an alternative, the act, as Lamb states, moved "toward the competency-based professional preparation program where institutions are first authorized to offer such programs and then assigned the responsibility to qualify the level of competence of their candidates."

It specifies three ways of achieving certification: professional studies at a university, an internship, or an examination. The official guidelines for all three insist on competency performance standards of measurement.
CONCLUSION

There is general agreement that America's school principals are not doing the job that is expected of them. Many proposals to alter the preparation and certification processes are being offered in the hope of overcoming that deficiency.

Concentrated efforts are being made to get better people into training programs and to train them more effectively. It will be a number of years before the fruits of these changes become evident, because changeover is slow.

Wayson summarizes most of the complaints against the standard training process as it has evolved through custom, status, and certification law:

It teaches fragments, pays little attention to the person to whom it is directed, takes place in isolation from life, doles out unsatisfying rewards, teaches the trivial and avoids the profound, punishes (and probably extinguishes) behaviors that would be effective in schools, and separates principals in training from teachers in training—although they are the most powerful determinants of each other's role.

Whether or not the changes being made will correct these problems and improve the principalship remains to be seen. There is at least much talk of cooperation in ironing out these difficulties, much more than probably exists in reality.

There is still a marked tendency for one group to blame another for any existing problems. The professional organizations complain about the school districts, the certification agencies, and the universities. The universities blame the restrictions imposed upon them by certification. The state agencies place the blame back on the universities.

Yet, all are in their own ways making genuine responses to the needs they see arising. Absolute cooperation, no matter how greatly desired, is not likely to be forthcoming. However, there are indications that the way for change has been opened, and that the training of principals is now the subject of greater constructive attention than ever before.
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