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LEADERSHIP TRAINING MODEL
FOR
COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIRECTORS

Wilbur D. "Deke" Johnson, Ed. D.
Western Michigan University, 1973

Goal and Objectives

It was the goal of this study to develop a Leadership Training Model for Community School Directors based on a review of research and literature pertaining to leaders. Specific attributes desired for this model are specified in the following objectives:

1. To identify the major functions of the Community School Director.

2. To recommend an approach for training the Community School Director.

3. To identify the major training needs of the Community School Director and to incorporate them into the training model.

4. To identify and propose a delivery system which could be: (1) used to fulfill the training needs of the Community School Director, and (2) operationalized by existing training institutions.

5. To identify and propose methods of instruction appropriate for developing the Community School Director to specific levels of competency.

6. To provide for the evaluation of the model based on the above stated objectives.

The Model

The Leadership Training Model for Community School Directors consists of training at three levels, each designed for a particular
phase of the training recommended for the aspiring Community School Director. The first level introduces the entrant to the role of the Community School Director and provides an overview of community education as well as to the subject matter relevant to community education. During level two the applicant works under the direction of a community educator while continuing the training program. Emphasis during this level is placed on the refinement of conceptual, human and technical skills. Completion of level three, with primary emphasis on conceptual and technical skills, should complete the formal training of the Community School Director and should qualify that individual for additional responsibilities such as those required of a system-wide coordinator. Each of the levels is outlined in leadership training models (I, II, III) and each is comprised of the following elements: competency level, functions, competencies skill-mix, training components, delivery agency and methods of instruction.

Critique

An instrument based on the objectives of this study was submitted to a panel of university staff members from across the United States who are conversant with the training needs of the Community School Director. Of the twenty-seven chosen to serve on the panel of experts, responses were received from twenty-four for an eighty-eight percent return. The majority of those responding apparently endorsed the Leadership Training Model for Community School Directors. The responses of panel members were tallied and then used to evaluate and modify the model.
CHAPTER I

THE COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIRECTOR'S CHANGING ROLE IN COMMUNITY EDUCATION

Statement of the Problem

This study provides a strategy for the training of Community School Directors. It is both timely and relevant to the community education movement as it gains momentum across the country. Need for the model which this study proposes is evidenced by: (1) the increasing demand for new Community School Directors and (2) the expanding job requirements which call for Community School Directors to be equipped with increasingly refined leadership skills.

Specifically, this study integrates recommended leadership training practices with the determinate skills and understandings required of practicing Community School Directors. The product of this study is a training model which is based on:

1. Training practices selected from business and educational specialists.

2. Skills proposed by community educators.

The focus of this model is on the specification of training experiences appropriate for the development of human, conceptual, and technical skills. Definitions for these skills have been prescribed as follows by Katz (1955):

1. Human skill - ability to work effectively as a group member and to build cooperative effort.

2. Conceptual skill - ability to see the enterprise as a whole and ability to envision how it relates with others.
3. Technical skill - proficiency in a particular activity involving methods, processes, procedures, or techniques, (pp. 34-35).

Introduction

The community education movement has grown steadily over the past years and projected plans suggest that it will continue to do so (Long Range Planning, 1973). Figures listed in Table 1 on the following page show the number of school buildings which have been established as community schools went from 357 in fiscal year 1967-68 to 2284 in fiscal year 1972-73. This is a growth of over 600 percent during this time. Projected figures show that there will be 8284 community schools by fiscal year 1977-78, an increase of over 400 percent above current figures.

Another indicator of the growth which community education is expected to experience is evidenced by the number of university centers for community education development. These university centers are situated in various states across the country and are charged with the responsibility of promoting and developing community education programs in various communities. There are twenty-four of these centers currently in operation, but by 1978 this number should increase to 116 (Long Range Planning, 1973).

With the increasing acceptance of the community education concept and with the increasing number of communities developing community education programs, the demand for leaders in the field of community education has grown markedly. Particularly in demand are those professionals known as Community School Directors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Number of Community Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967 - 68</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968 - 69</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 - 70</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 - 71</td>
<td>1363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 - 72</td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 - 73</td>
<td>2284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977 - 78</td>
<td>*8284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Projected figure based on long-range plan established by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.
The position of Community School Director is relatively new, although the origins of community education date back to the turn of the century (Solberg, 1970). However, it was 1951 before the role of Community School Director was defined. Early attempts at community education had brought about no staffing changes in the schools. Such attempts focused on curriculum development and required the traditional professional staff. Community education before World War I was exemplified by plans adopted in a number of cities and whose intent was two-fold: (1) to increase citizen awareness of school activity, and (2) to promote use of community resources in education (Cremin, 1961). These community education efforts did not generally include those citizens below or above legal school age in the educational, social, and recreational programs being developed in the schools.

Even as late as 1953, Drummond (1953) made no mention concerning the addition of professional staff to the community schools. In a discourse concerning professional staff development for the community school he dealt only with the traditional school personnel. Drummond (1953) felt that the professional staff should consist of personnel who possessed or could develop such competencies as follows:

1. An outlook which combines living and learning
2. Sensitivity to social problems and trends
3. Ability to live and work with others
4. Knowledge of the community and knowledge of techniques for studying the community
5. Breadth of interest in educational preparation
6. Physical health and emotional stability
7. Ability to apply knowledge
8. Knowledge of children and youth
9. Flexibility
10. Faith in people

A different tack concerning the community school concept and community school personnel was taken in Flint, Michigan in 1935 when Director of Physical Education and Recreation Frank Manley expanded the availability of public and private school facilities, city parks, and other recreational facilities for use by the general public. This expanded use was made possible through a grant secured from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. Coordination, operation and administration of the resulting community education program which was housed at scattered locations, which entailed a number of activities, and which involved a number of participants, required the retention of several part-time personnel. Responsibilities of these part-time employees included: (1) building security, (2) program operation, and (3) equipment procurement and maintenance. These individuals were employed full-time in other lines of work and were lay people, not trained in directing recreational programs. The use of such part-time personnel continued into the mid-1950's (Young and Quinn, 1963).

In 1951 William Minardo, with the title of Community School Services Director (which was later changed to Community School Director), was assigned to Flint's Freeman Community School. At that time, Minardo had earned a Bachelor of Science Degree and he held a Michigan permanent teaching certificate (Young and Quinn, 1963). Job requirements for this first Community School Director were few.
in number, but were far-reaching and were generally interpreted in
their broadest sense. The Community School Director of Freeman
Community School was to:

1. Know and work with the building staff.

2. Know and work with the entire community* of the
   school.

3. Teach on a half-time basis.

4. Be responsible for the promotion, coordination, and
   administration of all activities and programs related
   to Freeman School but which were not part of the K-6
   curriculum.

5. Enroll in one graduate course related to Community
   School Education each semester.**

Freeman Community School became the first to have a full-time
Community School Director. It was here the community education pro-
gram afforded the opportunity for total community involvement
(Young and Quinn, 1963).

To expedite greater community involvement and participation,
a Community Council which was representative of the homes, businesses,
churches, and other agencies working within the community was inaugurated.
The Community School Director initiated the Community Council and then
served on and with the Council. He was responsible for carrying out
and following up on Council recommendations. Recommendations ranged
from starting a new youth program to working with public officials to

*"Community" means those boundaries set for the Freeman
Community School by the Flint Board of Education.

**Eastern Michigan University offered courses beginning
in 1951 at the Flint Center in Community Education.
Courses were scheduled so as not to interfere with the
Community School Director's hours of responsibility.
improve street lighting problems.

The advent of the full-time Community School Director brought about significant changes in the expectations held for that position. Part-time forerunners originally had only operative responsibility for the Community School Program. The full-time Community School Director, instead of serving as an overseer, was responsible for a variety of functions emanating from within the school. No longer considered as adjunct personnel, the Community School Director was a professional staff member who functioned as part of the school team.

Every public school in Flint had a Community School Director by 1958. Job requirements and job descriptions for Community School Directors remained the same as when the first position opened in 1951.

Subtle differences in the role of the Community School Director began to appear in the fifties and the sixties. While the functions of the Community School Director operating programs in most of the elementary schools remained unchanged, there was a change for those assigned to larger elementary and secondary schools. The latter had little opportunity to know or become known by the community prescribed by the school boundaries. Two factors that interfered with this aspect of the role were:

1. The size and resources of the assigned facility induced more activities which required more time for coordination and administration.

2. The school community boundaries included a population so large that it was difficult for the Community School Director to become effectively familiar with it.

Hence, the Community School Director operating in one of the larger schools became, by circumstance, more of an in-building
administrator who was not involved with the community as were most others.

Sentiments toward this role change were varied. Some felt that emphasis should remain with community contact and community involvement and that the Community School Director should not have a primary responsibility within the building. Others considered the switch to in-building responsibilities as a natural change in the development of the role.

In the late 1950's and early 1960's, other school systems began to adopt variations of the "Flint plan" of Community School Education according to the National Community School Education Association (1970). As these adoptions took place, the role of the Community School Director was also incorporated in the new programs and again the role underwent some modifications.

For example, in Flint the Community School Director was responsible for one community school and its activities. In this capacity he often directly supervised activities and was rarely involved in seeking funds for the total Community School Program and he was rarely involved in making decisions directly related to the normal K-12 school operations. However, many community school programs established in other areas were in smaller communities where the position of Community School Director was expanded and the title was changed to Coordinator of Community Education. Even in cities comparable in size or larger than Flint increased the responsibilities of the Community School Director. Typically, the Community Education Coordinator is responsible for budgeting and finance, personnel procurement,
administration and operational policy-making in addition to interpreting, adapting, and coordinating his activities with existing programs.

A commonality of all Community School Directors described thus far is the continuation of the role they serve when acting as liaison between school and community. However, enlargement of the community education focus from the school community to the total community and the expansion of administrative responsibilities suggests new requirements for the Community School Director (Becker, 1972).

From inception of the position, the Community School Director has been thrust in a leadership position in the community which he serves. More recently, he has assumed leadership functions within the educational milieu. These new functions are important since they bring about fuller involvement and greater acceptance of the Community School Director in the administrative hierarchy. With this acceptance, the Community School Director serves more effectively as a bridge between the school and the community (Becker, 1972).

Recognition of the increased prestige attached to the Community School Director's role has come in terms of requirements for the position. For example, applicants for the position of Community School Director in Michigan are required to have a master's degree or a teaching certificate and a minimum of three year's teaching experience (Michigan Public Act #307, 1969). Requirements for this position in many school districts are often even more stringent.

The role of the Community School Director has changed and evidence indicates that this change will continue. Changes up to this point have increased the emphasis on the leadership requirements for
the role and concurrently leadership expectations of the Community School Director have increased.

To be a recognized leader, the Community School Director must be effective. He is being asked to do more than be an overseer. He is being asked to do more than serve as a liaison or communicator with the community. The Community School Director's role requires both intra-organizational and extra-organizational leadership. The Community School Director is called upon to fulfill the executive role which Barnard (1938) said called for skills in maintaining an operational organization, not merely providing operational service skills within the organization. It is then important, that the training of the Community School Director be given careful consideration.

Weaver (1972b) applauded the leadership that currently is found in community education while at the same time expressing concern in regard to recruiting and developing community educators. He observed:

After traveling 18,000 miles and participating in 250 interviews with practicing community educators across the country, I can say that I am proud of the quality of leadership provided by those who call themselves community educators. Certainly such an observation is to be expected when one considers the fact that those practicing as community educators now were recruited from among experienced educators who already demonstrated leadership ability thus virtually assuring successful performance in the leadership role. However, present and future demands for personnel capable of providing competent leadership in Community Education is resulting in the need to recruit potential community educators among candidates with limited training and no experience in the field, (p. 62).

Whether experienced, high calibre educators will continue to be lured into community education in such roles as Community School
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Directors remains to be seen. Whether such individuals will be lured into community education in sufficient quantity to meet the burgeoning demands for trained Community School Directors is doubtful. The increasing demand for trained Community School Directors relates back to the accelerating acceptance of community education programs across the United States. This is welcomed by the Mott Foundation since one of its main interests is the expansion of community education (Seay, 1972).

Recruitment and training of leaders for community education has been an important aspect of the program in Flint since its inception. The recruitment, selection, and training procedures for Community School Directors have changed in relation to the increased demand for Directors and in keeping with the increased responsibilities that they are required to assume. In an interview with Pendell (1972), Frank Manley described early selection procedures. He stated:

All our directors were handpicked. We didn't go through the personnel department or give tests to applicants. We picked out people that had a feeling for our program, people that were really human and felt that they wanted to do something for their fellow men, people who were dedicated and had the right kind of attitude, people willing to work . . . We were looking for real people who had a real purpose in life, people who wanted to help people help themselves, (p. 27).

During the early stages of the Flint program, Manley provided on-the-job training through weekly staff meetings and by asking questions which helped maintain the leader's perspective in community education. Always the emphasis was on involvement with people. Examples of questions which Manley liked to pose were recorded by
Pendell (1972) as follows:

1. How many people in your community can you borrow five bucks from?
2. Who are the ministers in your community?
3. Who are the businessmen that you can go to that will help you put a program over?
4. Name 25 people in your community that don't have children. What do they do? What's their life?

As the leadership role in community education evolved university credit classes were provided at the Flint Center under the auspices of Eastern Michigan University for undergraduate credit beginning in 1951. By 1955 the Mott program of the Flint Board of Education and Eastern Michigan University developed a graduate study program in community education. Cumulative enrollment in the graduate study program at the master's level grew from 115 in 1955 to more than 2600 in 1970. Of this number 378 have completed the master's degree with a major in community education (Seay, 1972).

When it became apparent that there was a further need for educational leaders in community education, the Mott Foundation in 1963 funded the Mott Inter-University Clinical Preparation Program for Educational Leaders. With seven Michigan universities providing the disciplinary and degree capability and the Flint system providing a laboratory for leadership internship experience, a total of 242 individuals taking master's degree work and 329 individuals working toward a doctorate degree have participated in the program (Bush, 1972). Participants in this program have come from across the United States, Canada and Australia.

Bush (1972) also observed that short-term and special institutes
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have been provided in Flint. Over 1000 have attended these within
the past few years with some participants working for graduate credit
and others taking it as an inservice or preservice experience provided
by their employers.

Part of the expansion of the community education concept across
the country can be attributed to the Community Development Centers
established at various universities in selected states across the
country. Such centers are found in Michigan, Utah, Indiana, Virginia,
Florida, Arizona, California, and Oregon. In addition to promoting
community education, some centers provide seminars and classes in
community education. However, most participating universities gener­
ally offer incidental courses and few offer training programs aimed
at developing Community School Directors.

Overview

This study consists of five additional chapters. Chapter II
outlines the tasks, traits and skills that have been identified with
leaders. Chapter III provides a perspective concerning leadership
training while Chapter IV details the educational needs of the Commu­
nity School Director. Chapter V presents two important facets of
this study: (1) the procedures used in the development of the leader­
ship training model for the Community School Director and (2) the
development of the leadership training model for the Community School
Director. Chapter VI serves as the capstone for this study and is
subdivided into: (1) a critique of the model based on reactions
solicited from a panel of community educators and (2) a response to
the critique by the author.

Material appearing in the next three chapters will serve a multiple purpose. In addition to providing a review of the literature pertaining to the development of leaders (and more specifically to Community School Directors), the material will also be used: (1) to conceptualize the framework of the model for training Community School Directors and (2) to identify elements and sub-elements which should be built into the model.
CHAPTER II

DESCRIPTION OF TASKS, TRAITS, ABILITIES
AND SKILLS OF A LEADER

Curiosity about leaders has precipitated a host of research studies and many books and articles. A number of these have been devoted to the description of leadership tasks and functions. Others have sought to identify traits or abilities that are common to leaders. Others have sought to learn about leadership behavior through the study of group factors or in terms of role expectations. Still others have sought to identify skills which are common to leaders and others have sought to understand leaders through study of the total organization and through the development of models.

The strategy employed in the development of this chapter is to expose the reader to some of the work that has been done in the area of leadership. Of particular interest in terms of this study is the work done relative to the skills of a leader and the effort devoted to the creation of models which seek to explain the leader in terms of himself, his role and his organizational setting.

Commonalities Noted in the Leadership Process

Writers seem to agree that there are a number of similarities in terms of the functions that leaders fulfill and the actions used in fulfilling leadership roles (Krech, Cruchfield, and Bellachev, 1962; Boles, 1971; Gulick and Urwick, 1937). Although leaders serve many
functions in varying degrees, these functions can be identified in most groups. Krech et al. (1962) divided leadership functions into two groups: Primary and assessory functions. Their outline of these functions is paraphrased as follows:

1. Executive - Creation and interpretation of policies, the definition of objectives, and the indication of their means of attainment; responsibility for ensuring that policies are effectively executed through subordinates.

2. Planner - Selection and specification of goals and selection of means to achieve goals and objectives.

3. Policy maker - Institutionalization of group goals by defining policies.

4. Expert - Possession of superior skill or knowledge.

5. External group representative - Maintenance of contacts with superiors and people outside the immediate group; official spokesman for the group; information usually channelled through the leader.

6. Purveyor of punishments and rewards.

7. Controller of internal relations - Definitions of internal group structure and settlement of clashes.

8. Arbitrator and mediator.

Krech et al. (1962) considered assessory functions to include those functions that find the leader serving as: (1) model of behavior, (2) symbol of the group, (3) substitute for individual responsibility, (4) ideologist, (5) father figure, and (6) scapegoat.

The leadership functions suggested by Krech et al. (1962) appear to be in accord with the leadership elements which Gulick and Urwick (1937) identified as: (1) planning, (2) organizing, (3) staffing, (4) directing, (5) coordinating, (6) reporting, and (7) budgeting. These elements are generally referred to by the acronym "POSDCORB."
Boles (1971) considered leaders in terms of actions which they are perceived to use. Based on extensive reading of the research and literature pertaining to leaders, leadership and leading, Boles (1971) developed a theory of leadership. He argued that regardless of the situation, regardless of the formality or informality of the group led, regardless of personal values, regardless of leadership style that there are certain actions which leaders are likely to use. Although Boles (1971) acknowledged that the actions which he listed may not be complete, he suggested that leadership actions be categorized as:

1. Initiatory
2. Assisting production
3. Maintaining the organization
4. Satisfying needs of a group and the individuals within it

Outlined below are the actions identified by Boles (1971):

1. Some actions of a leader may be perceived as initiatory (innovating, leading):
   a. Emphasizes the fact that change is a normal and necessary process.
   b. Makes clear to followers his preferred outcome—some end that likely would not be achieved without his intervention.
   c. Encourages innovation.
   d. Combines existing elements or ideas in new ways.
   e. Adopts pertinent ideas from other groups.
   f. Formulates and tests, or encourages formulation and testing of, hypotheses.
   g. Modifies views as new evidence becomes available.
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h. Shows group members what proposed changes will do for them when advocating change.

i. Takes on added responsibilities when he believes that he is more skilled or better informed than other group members on a particular matter.

2. Some actions of a leader that may be perceived as assisting production:

a. Clarifies the human need which the group exists to satisfy; specifies the product.

b. Determines the tasks of the social system in fulfilling its production function.

c. Aids the group in deciding what problems are worthy of its attention.

d. Organizes tasks to be done to achieve group goals in clusters of specialization; describes positions.

e. Specifies the performance requirements of positions to be filled.

f. Recruits, selects, and assigns additional group members when necessary.

g. Apportions tasks to group members.

h. Fixes responsibility for task accomplishment.

i. Provides direction for the group.

j. Causes interaction among group members.

k. Imparts to group members a "contagion to perform."

l. Takes actions or makes decisions on behalf of group members.

m. Uses group judgment in making decisions that depend upon judgment.

n. Speaks for the group to those outside the group.

o. Gets feedback from outside the group regarding its product.
3. Some actions of a leader that may be perceived as maintaining the organization:

a. Assists group in clarifying goals.

b. Helps select criteria for determining goal achievement.

c. Helps determine what constitutes observable evidence that the goals are or are not being met.

d. Helps determine tasks that must be done to achieve group goals.

e. Observes the behavioral limits set for him by the group.

f. Recruits qualified personnel for vacant positions.

g. Selects able personnel from among qualified recruits.

h. Seeks to identify deviations of performance of machines or people from pre-set standards.

i. Identifies unwanted effects in the performance of people or machines.

j. Adapts routine to new situations.

k. Establishes objectives of critical decisions.

l. Classifies objectives for critical decisions as to importance to the immediate social system.

m. Considers alternative means of coping with problems.

n. Gets information necessary for problem-solving.

o. Makes a tentative decision based on what appears to be the best thought-of alternative.

p. Decides on action necessary to implement a selected alternative.

q. Resists vested-interest pressure groups when his own group is endangered.

r. Learns from his experience.
4. Some actions of a leader that may be perceived as **satisfying needs** of a group and of individuals within it:

a. Helps to make group goals increasingly mutually acceptable to individuals.

b. Recognizes that group members are motivated by differing needs.

c. Helps individuals to identify with the group.

d. Helps individuals to feel accepted by the group.

e. Initiates messages that are of interest to group members.

f. Reduces uncertainties of human receivers of his messages.

g. Listens to the problems of group members.

h. Helps individuals adapt behavior to group requirements.

i. Assures that group members have the tools and supplies necessary to their tasks.

j. Uses economic resources to satisfy the needs of group members.

k. Uses human resources of knowledge and skill to satisfy the needs of group members.

l. Recognizes the limits of his own skills and/or knowledge.

m. Relies on the best-informed specialists when specialized decisions are required.

n. Recognizes signs of personal conflict.

o. Helps parties in conflict to see superordinate goals.

p. Solicits feedback from group members, (pp. 254-257).

A Perspective of Leadership
Based on Research Findings

Research studies have zeroed in on leadership from a number of
different perspectives such as: (1) leadership traits, (2) leadership behavior in the group setting, (3) role expectations, (4) leadership skills, and (5) leadership actions based on a study of the total organization. Attention will be devoted to these approaches to understanding leadership in the following paragraphs.

**Character traits**

Before 1945 most of the studies pertaining to leadership dealt primarily with the identification of the traits or qualities of leaders (Morphet, Johns and Reller, 1959). These studies were based in part on the assumption that human beings can be divided into two groups: leaders and followers. It was assumed that leaders possessed certain traits or qualities not possessed by followers.

In a comprehensive analysis of over 120 studies, Stogdill (1948) reported that on the basis of a minimum of 15 studies identifying a leadership trait that the average leader exceeds the average member in his group in the following areas: (1) intelligence, (2) scholarship, (3) dependability in exercising responsibilities, (4) activity and social participation, and (5) socii-economic status. He also noted that the qualities, characteristics and skills required in a leader are determined largely by the demands of the situation in which he is to function as a leader. Other traits supported by uniformly positive evidence from 10 or more of the studies which Stogdill (1948) surveyed were: (1) sociability, (2) initiative, (3) persistence, (4) knowing how to get things done, (5) self-confidence,
(6) alertness to, and insight into, situations, (7) cooperativeness, (8) popularity, (9) adaptability, and (10) verbal facility.

Gibb (1954) scanned the mass of literature on leadership and identified the following traits as important leadership traits: (1) physical and constitutional factors (e.g., height, energy, appearance), (2) intelligence, (3) self-confidence, (4) sociability, (5) will (e.g., initiative, persistence, ambition), (6) surgency (e.g., geniality, expressiveness, originality). Myers (1954) analyzed more than 200 leadership studies conducted in the previous five decades. In regard to the relationship of personality traits with leadership Myers concluded:

1. No physical characteristics are significantly related to leadership.

2. Leaders tend to be slightly higher in intelligence than the group within which they are members, but there is no significant relationship between superior intelligence and leadership.

3. Knowledge applicable to the problems faced by a group contributes significantly to leadership status.

4. Characteristics which correlated significantly with leadership were: (1) insight, (2) initiative, (3) cooperation, (4) originality, (5) ambition, (6) persistence, (7) emotional stability, (8) judgment, (9) popularity, and (10) communication skills.

Analyzing 35 different studies of educational leaders, Borg, Burr and Sylvester (1961) identified traits common to leaders as follows: (1) personality, (2) administrative ability, (3) general knowledge, (4) professional knowledge, (5) cooperation, (6) tact, (7) stimulation of co-workers, (8) social activity, (9) good judgment, (10) originality, (11) communicativeness, (12) forcefulness,
(13) physical characteristics, and (14) attitude toward teachers.
Also studying educational leaders, Kimbrough (1959) found on the
basis of data collected with the aid of his Tennessee Rating Guide
that major leadership criteria were: (1) good interpersonal relations,
(2) dependability, (3) good decision making and problem solving,
(4) inclusion of others in policy formulation, (5) intelligence, and
(6) knowledge of new educational techniques.

Examination of the above research findings indicates differences
among researchers concerning the relationship of various traits.
Shaw (1971) noted that relationships between specific traits and
leadership tend to be specific, but relatively weak. For example, a
person who has a certain personality trait is more likely to become a
leader than a person who lacks that trait, but there are many instances
in which he is not the leader. Murphy (1941) observed that leadership
traits are fluid and that individual traits may change with the situa­
tion. A trait that is positively related to leadership in one situa­
tion may be unrelated or even negatively related in another.

Shaw (1971) added:

The leader must have the abilities that are
relevant to the situation in which he finds him­
self. A person who has great ability with
respect to building bridges would have a better
chance of becoming an effective leader of a
bridge-building crew than one without such skills,
but his chances of becoming the leader of a
chemical research team might be very low indeed.
Hence, . . . abilities relevant to the group's
task are positively correlated with effective
leadership, (p. 275).

Although a number of traits have been found to correlate in
varying degrees with leadership effectiveness and leadership success,
there are a number of writers who question their use in regard to leadership appraisal or leadership development. Koontz (1971) questioned their use stating that many traits are measured subjectively and thus make it difficult to reach common agreement and to develop sound plans for personnel improvement. Uris (1962) rejected the trait approach since he considers it to be non-teachable and incomplete.

The trait approach is characterized by (Uris, 1962):

Non-teachability. Whether the various traits said to characterize the leader hark back to the ancient virtues—courage, self-confidence, initiative, and the like—or reflect the more sophisticated insights of modern psychiatry, for the most part they cannot be taught. It's never easy to "teach" courage or to impart a burning desire for achievement.

Incompleteness. Even once you have found an individual with the same traits that have been shown to characterize successful leaders, he won't necessarily demonstrate effective leadership. Clearly, something has been overlooked. His failure might be accounted for by such reasons as insufficient motivation. One might say that the individual lacks the drive that makes his successful "trait twin" an effective leader. Or it might be argued that, no matter how complete a list of traits has been assembled, certain qualities not easily identified, perhaps quantitative considerations, explain the ineffectiveness of a seemingly well-endowed individual, (pp. 79-80).

Katz (1955) considered the cultivation of traits to be largely unproductive in enhancing administrative skills.

Group factors

Another conglomeration of studies focuses more on the relations among group members and the leader than on the personal traits of the
leader alone in an effort to describe the emergence of effective leadership. Studies in this set focus on the interplay of factors present in the group situation as determinants of administrator behavior. Morphet et al. (1959) said that although the leader is still an important object of study, it is generally recognized that he cannot be studied in isolation. Thus primary research efforts on leadership shifted from leader traits to leader behavior in relation to the group.

Redl (1942) in a review of Freud's definition of the leader, his role, and Freud's distinction between individual and group emotions said that the leader is the central person around whom the group formative processes develop. He wrote that there are constituent emotions which each member brings to the group and secondary emotions which are stimulated by the group. The latter directly contribute to the leadership function. Redl (1942) identified basic functions which the leader can perform (e.g., he can serve as: (1) a source of identification for group members, (2) an object of majority emotional drives, (3) an ego support for these drives, and (4) a common conflict solver).

Stogdill (1948) built upon his leadership traits by creating the initiation-consideration rating for effective groups. More important to the leader than the possession of specific personality traits is the ability to: (1) show active consideration of others, and (2) initiate group interaction in that particular group situation. A list of desirable behavioral traits is considered a less consistent measure of the effective leader, because in each group situation it is
likely that different qualities will be most successful in mobilizing group members. Therefore, the behavior and characteristic needs of each member of the group is as important in determining whether or not the group will be effective and which individual will be most successful in leading the group, as the particular traits which made one individual the leader.

A number of studies have developed from Barnard's (1938) distinction between "efficiency" and "effectiveness." Sharp (1962) clarified efficiency as efficiency in goal achievement and effectiveness as effectiveness in satisfying the social and emotional needs of the group. Sharp said that especially in the informal group setting that group members are no longer simply tools for achieving a goal, but must be satisfied interpersonally as a part of the leader's task. Stogdill (1948) constructed two primary criteria for testing these two factors of a successful group: (1) consideration of others, and (2) initiating structure in interaction. Although one factor pertains to individual need satisfaction and the other to task accomplishment, both have been found to be highly correlated with successful interpersonal relationships between group and group members and between leader and group members. In their joint study, Stogdill and Shartle (1948) said that since research must be conducted within the interpersonal situation from which leadership evolves, concentration must be on the group structure as well as upon the group's goals. They added, however, that data must be used primarily to find the jobs that leaders do based on the definition that leadership is getting things done.
A number of studies support Stogdill's (1948) findings concerning need satisfaction and/or goal accomplishment of the leader and his group. Halpin and Winer (1957) in a study of airplane commanders found that the most influential leadership characteristics were: (1) consideration, (2) initiating structure, (3) production emphasis, and (4) sensitivity (social awareness), respectively. Halpin (1958) found that the most effective leaders functioned well in both consideration of others and in initiating structure in interaction from his work at Ohio State. Campbell (1960) emphasized initiation as an important criterion for effective leadership when he listed as the primary traits for effective leadership: (1) facilitating development of group goals and policies, (2) stimulating the development of appropriate programs, and (3) procuring and managing personnel and materials. Hemphill and Westie (1950) viewed administration as problem-solving. They said that through this process the leader may take the initiative in structuring group interaction. However, Griffiths (1959) said that decision making is a central function of the administrator. He considered the decision to be closely correlated with action itself and hence more goal-oriented than the problem-solving process.

**Role expectations**

Studies in this area are concerned with internal attitudes and perceptions of both leaders and followers and the relationship of these attitudes to administrative success. Parsons and Shils (1951) clarified the meaning of role expectations as follows:

The role is that organized sector of an
actor's orientation which constitutes and defines his participation in an interactive process. It involves a set of complementary expectations concerning his own actions and those of others with whom he interacts, (p. 23).

Therefore, it is not only the actual function that the leader performs, but the group members' perceptions of what he is doing that become of importance.

Bass (1961) said that the leader is able to cope with the group's problems. In doing so his success depends on: (1) the group members' perceptions of the situation, (2) his powers of coercion, (3) his ability to persuade others of his value and capability, (4) knowing when to be restrictive, and (5) knowing when to be permissive.

Hollander (1961) said that the two most important characteristics of the leader are: (1) competence in the group's central job or demonstration of task competence, and (2) active membership in the group as perceived by the other members. Hollander (1961) also found that as a member of the group, the potential leader builds up "idiosyncrasy credits" and may then attempt to innovate and challenge the established patterns of the group. In another study which involved 187 cadets, Hollander (1961) observed that the good leader is often selected as a good follower.

Hills (1964) viewed the administrative process in terms of mediation between institutional expectations and personality needs. From this vantage point criteria of effective and efficient leadership must include behavior relative to the expectations of the observers. Hills (1964) said the best leadership is a compromise between the institutionally-oriented and personally-oriented patterns.
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In other work done with role expectations, Getzels and Cuba (1957) conceptualized the school as a social system. They believed that the effectiveness of the individual is determined by his behavior relative to the expectation of his behavior held by others.

Leadership skills

There are certain interrelated skills which Katz (1955) considered essential for leadership success. He used the term "skill" to mean the ability to use one's knowledge effectively. Skills which Katz identified can be categorized as follows:

1. Technical skill - Involves specialized knowledge and ability involving methods, processes, procedures, or techniques within a specific kind of activity. It involves specialized knowledge, analytical ability involving that specialty, and facility in the use of tools and procedures of that specialty.

2. Human skill - Involves the ability to work effectively as a group member and to build cooperative effort within the group. As Katz (1955) used the concept, it is the executive's ability as evidenced by the way the executive perceives and recognizes the perceptions of his superiors, peers, and subordinates, and the way he behaves as a result.

3. Conceptual skill - Involves the ability to see the organization as a whole. Such a skill involves an understanding of how the various functions of an organization are interdependent and how changes in any one part affect all the others. Further, it entails the visualization of the relationship which the organization has with the field, the community, and the political, social and economic forces of the nation. Possession of conceptual skills should enable the executive to act in a manner that advances the over-all welfare of the total organization. To Katz's (1955) thinking Pharis (1966) added: "The ability to recognize the permutable relationship that exists between an organization and the society which supports it and to keep the organization serving the needs of the society," (p. 12).
Katz (1955) stated that all three types of skills are important at every level of administration. However, the technical, human and conceptual skills of the leader vary in relative importance at different levels of the organizational hierarchy (Hersey and Blanchard, 1969). Conceptual skills should be proportionately greater on the upper levels of the hierarchy; human skills are relatively important at all levels; and technical skills tend to be needed in a lesser degree as one advances from lower to higher levels in the organization.

Campbell (1964) applauded Katz for his work in clarifying the relationship between knowledge and skill. Livingston (1971) said that skills essential for manager are those involving opportunity finding, problem finding, and problem solving. These seemingly belong in the conceptual area. Livingston (1971) noted in his research that lack of such skills may account for the many failures of individuals in top-level positions even though they may have been highly successful in lower hierarchical positions. Kuriloff (1972) identified ten basic roles that the manager is called upon to carry out in the course of his work. Some of the roles require technical competence, some interpersonal competence, and some a combination of the two. Kuriloff (1972) felt that through a study of these roles that a set of competencies important to successful leadership could be derived and that they could be observed in the overt behavior of an individual seeking advancement in management as he performs his job. Examination of the competencies suggested by Kuriloff appears to confirm that these competencies are sub-categories of the technical, human and conceptual skills championed by Katz (1955).
Katz's (1955) skills have been incorporated into a number of models. In the following section of this chapter, Weaver (1972a) incorporates the conceptual, human and technical skills into his models pertaining to community education. These same skills are an integral part of leadership training models which are discussed in Chapter III. Katz's skills will also be incorporated in the model outlined in Chapter V.

**Organizational models**

Research in this area utilizes the forces within the total organization to understand the actions of leaders. Contributions in this area have been made by Argyris (1961), Bennis (1961), Cooperative Development of Public School Administration (1955), Roby (1968), Shartle (1956), Weaver (1972a), and Fiedler (1964, 1967, 1973). A brief discussion of their efforts follows.

Drawing upon the findings of psychology, sociology, and economics, Shartle (1956) emphasized the role of the individual in the organization and stressed the importance of the: (1) situation, (2) organizational milieu, (3) environmental events, and (4) interaction of all these in understanding leadership. He said that no particular type of organization is demonstrably superior to all others. Leadership is better understood as a given type of performance than in a list of personality traits. Shartle (1956) specified a number of variables which can be used to judge leadership performance and categorized them into two groups: (1) those that can be rated on the basis of the leader alone (e.g., value patterns; situational
patterns; measures of aptitude, knowledge, and skill; measures of personality and interest; measures of physical energy and capacity; past individual and organizational performance; and the problem or task assigned) and (2) those that must be analyzed as part of the organizational process and where the leader's performance is largely dependent upon the task and the group (e.g., the decisions made; ratings of performance; measures of attitude change; objective measures of performance; tenure and mobility; work patterns; leader behavior dimensions; sociometric ratings; and learning behavior).

**Organizational structure**

Argyris (1961) also concentrated on the organizational structure as the most accurate, direct route to understanding the proper role of the leader. He felt that the interactors' ratings of the leader can not be measured accurately without an awareness of a strong tendency to identify with organizational controls (e.g., requirements, restrictions and budgets) with the leader himself. Criteria Argyris (1961) proposed include: (1) awareness, (2) control, (3) internal influence, (4) problem-solving, (5) time perspective, (6) external influence, and (7) organizational objectives.

Leadership as conceptualized by Roby (1961, 1968) is similar to that of Shartle and Argyris in that the executive function is considered as the total process by which group actions are chosen from a series of alternative actions. Instead of dealing with personal or behavioral traits, Roby (1961) studied the group actions for clues to the leadership role. He considered each group action to be composed
of "action units" and each combination of acts to be called a "response aggregate." It is the group's task to choose the most valuable response aggregate, one which is best suited to the group's environmental state. In this framework it is the leader's role: (1) to bring about a congruence and to stress existing congruences, (2) to induce intelligent selection of the best response aggregates and to maintain a wide array of potential response aggregates, (3) focus materials on decision-making process, (4) provide information after structure is established, (5) make final decisions, and (6) act as arbitrator.

In a definitive essay on leadership theory, Bennis (1961) stressed the importance of the organizational structure in aiding with the self-assessment of administrative performance. He said that the decision maker, often faced with no operable means for evaluating a decision and often confronted with limited data, has no other recourse than to use the group and the organization as a security operation and as a validator. The organization, or group in a smaller dimension, is used as a situational and measurement tool even when only the actual material goal is the criterion of effective performance. The organization assumes even greater importance when the success of interpersonal relations within a group which is performing a specific task is also judged as part of the leader's goal. The organizational models do emphasize this group development process in varying degrees. Bennis (1961) stated that the functions of authority are a combination of role and expertise. He divided the latter into: (1) knowledge of performance criteria and (2) compatibility
of human elements of administration.

**Group achievement and group maintenance**

Halpin (1957) proposed a model for the study of administrator behavior in which he defined administration as a human activity with at least the following components: (1) the task, (2) the formal organization, (3) the work group(s), and (4) the leader(s). Using concepts from an earlier study (Halpin, 1953), Halpin (1957) included two group goals, group achievement and group maintenance after he found that effective leaders are those who score high on both dimensions. The following components are adapted from the model by Halpin (1957):

1. Organizational task
2. Administrator's perception of the organization's task
   a. Behavior as decision-maker
   b. Behavior as group leader
3. Variables associated with administrator's behavior
   a. Administrator variables
   b. Intra-organizational variables
   c. Extra-organizational variables
4. Criteria for administrator effectiveness
   a. Evaluation of administrator as decision-maker
      (1) Organization maintenance
      (2) Organization achievement
   b. Evaluation of administrator as a group leader
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(1) Organization maintenance

(2) Organization achievement, (p. 190).

Halpin's (1957) model is designed for studying an organization at two different times with the change that occurs in the interim to be used as a measure of leader effectiveness.

**Tri-dimensional concept**

A model on which Weaver (1972a) drew in developing his models for community education is known as the Tri-Dimensional Concept of Educational Administration. It was developed over several years under the auspices of the Cooperative Development of Public School Administration (CDPSA) in New York State (1955) at Columbia University. This model depicts the role of the leader as one consisting of three components: (1) the leader's job, (2) the man he is, and (3) the social setting in which he functions. Defined briefly, the job includes the administrator's tasks and responsibilities, which vary in importance as time passes, and includes all that is germane in the administration of today's schools. The man brings to the job certain capacities of body, mind, emotions, and spirit. He has beliefs, values, expectations, behavior patterns, energy reserves, and skills. While the job shapes him, the man also shapes the job. The social setting includes the pressures and compulsions of society. These not only establish and set limits for the job, but influence the thinking of the man and set values by which he adjusts himself and is judged.

The administrator's job divides into four parts (CDPSA, 1955):

1. Improving educational opportunity

2. Maintaining effective relations with the community
3. Obtaining and developing personnel

4. Providing and maintaining funds and facilities

Commensurate with each of the four parts of the administrator's job are administrative processes which include a number of elements (e.g., sensing problems and surveying their aspects; making inferences about what may happen if certain actions are taken; relating problems to individuals and groups; predicting and making decisions; and taking action and reviewing its consequences).

The man who enters a job affects it just as the job requirements affect him (CDPSA, 1955). Hence, it is important to look at the human factors pertinent to a concept of administrative leadership. An individual brings his total capacities of body, mind, emotion and spirit to the job. Such capacities deemed especially important are: (1) physical capacity, (2) intellectual capacity, (3) emotional capacity, and (4) spiritual capacity. The administrator's behavior must be consistent in terms of the process demands of the job (e.g., he must be able to sense and define problems, make inferences, relate to people easily, make decisions, and follow up with action and appraisal).

In regard to social setting, reference is made to all the pressures and forces of society (CDPSA, 1955). Not only do these establish and set limits for the job, but they also have an effect on the man's thinking and the expectations he has and by which he is judged. Four categories within the social setting which have much impact on the administrator are:

1. State of the economy: physically, technologically, scientifically and financially

2. Manpower and utilization
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3. Cultural and educational needs

4. Pattern of thought, belief and value

**Community education models**

Drawing from the tri-dimensional concept (CDPSA, 1955), Weaver (1972a) developed two models concerning community education. Weaver assumed that three major factors affect the community education process: (1) the social setting in which it is practiced, (2) the way the job is defined, and (3) the person who serves as Community Educator. It should also be noted that Katz's (1955) skills are integrated into the models which are compared in Table 2 on the following page.

When discussing the conventional model, Weaver (1972a) elaborated on the skills required by the Community Educator. Of prime importance are the human skills which require ability to build cooperative team effort among people and to sell oneself to others. Human skills are essential since, within the definition of the conventional model, it is necessary to sell the program to the community. Firm grounding in educational programming and public relations is needed in order to sell the program. Weaver (1972a) noted that the Community Educator must have some facility with technical skills and techniques unique to community education (e.g., listening where it is necessary to empathize while sifting out intent of the message).

Conceptual skills are needed in order to predict consequences with reasonable accuracy.

Weaver (1972a) observed of the conventional model that in most cases, the job was created through a need felt by the school which
TABLE 2
A COMPARISON OF THE CONVENTIONAL AND THE EMERGING MODELS OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conventional Model</th>
<th>Emerging Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The social setting:</strong></td>
<td><strong>The social setting:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A stable society</td>
<td>1. Societal uneasiness and dissatisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Highly organized communities characterized by common interests and collective action</td>
<td>2. Community disorganization (communities characterized by indifference, a lack of common interests and the absence of an organized structure for community problem solving)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Congruence of goals between the school and community</td>
<td>3. General dissatisfaction with the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Increasing awareness that the school is not necessarily the prime vehicle for education and training in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The job:</strong></td>
<td><strong>The job:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. School based</td>
<td>1. Community oriented - not school oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Part of a rational, bureaucratic, closed-system organization, the school</td>
<td>2. Part of a natural, open system not locked into a bureaucratic organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program oriented</td>
<td>3. More process based than program based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Accountable to the school which created the job in the first place</td>
<td>4. Accountable to the community not the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The person:</strong></td>
<td><strong>The person:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Exude charisma</td>
<td>1. Be objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Be loyal and dedicated to the school and to the concept of community education</td>
<td>2. Initiate structure to solve problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. High degree of human skills and some conceptual and technical skills</td>
<td>3. High degree of conceptual and technical skills and some human skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Adapt to ambiguity and crisis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
results in a need to interpret the position and the community education program to the community. With the exception of a community council meeting, most of the Community Educator's interaction, communication and influence are with the school system and not the community. Of the conventional model Weaver (1972a) said: "It's almost as if we had a standardized, conventional model of community education which has been exported wholesale to all communities," (p. 4).

Of the emerging model, Weaver (1972a) noted that all elements of the model affect the other elements. The social setting determines the way the job is defined. The job definition influences the person while inherent strengths and weaknesses in the person affect the job. Weaver (1972a) emphasized the direct intervention that exists between the social setting and the Community Educator in the emerging model. In contrast Weaver (1972a) said: "In the conventional model there appears to have been little influence by the social setting upon the job and even less interaction between the social setting and the person occupying the job," (p. 6).

In his concluding remarks about the two models, Weaver (1972a) said:

"I'm not sure whether we must tear down the conventional model in order to build a new model of community education. I hope not. But I am convinced that the future of Community Education in this country depends upon how it is perceived by those who are to benefit from it. If it is viewed as merely an extension of the school program, it's not likely to have widespread support. If, on the other hand, it is viewed as a means of organizing the educational forces of the community, including the school, to re-build the social order then its future is virtually assured for there is no more crying need in our time," (p. 13).
It appears that the individual performing the role of Community School Director in the conventional model would be more human-relations oriented while the role of Community School Director in the emerging model would be more task oriented. Because of these different orientations, cause is given to consider Fiedler's (1951, 1964, 1967, 1973) contributions to the understanding of leaders.

Leadership styles and situational variables

It can be inferred from the two models for community education which were proposed by Weaver (1972a) that consideration should be given to leadership styles and certain group situational variables. An interesting analysis of leadership styles and group situational variables has resulted in a model (Fiedler, 1964, 1967, 1973). A review of the process that leads to the development of the model is presented below. Some time earlier, Fiedler (1951) studied the perception of similarity or "assumed similarity," which, in his estimation, correlated with liking and warmth in interpersonal relations. Later, he became interested in the relationship between assumed similarity of opposites (ASo) as a predictor of leadership behavior (Fiedler, 1954). To measure ASo, an individual is asked to evaluate his most preferred co-worker (the co-worker he liked best in the past) and his least preferred co-worker (recalled from past experiences) on a number of characteristics. The ASo score is derived from a comparison of most preferred co-worker ratings and the least preferred co-worker (LPC) ratings: the greater the difference between the two sets of ratings the higher the ASo score.
The LPC score is obtained from the ratings of the least preferred co-worker. This score correlates highly with the ASo score. Because of this, the two scores are used interchangeably. The leader with high ASo/LPC scores perceives his least preferred co-worker in a relatively favorable manner. Fiedler (1967) described him as a person who derives his major satisfaction from successful interpersonal relationships. The low ASo/LPC leader considers his least preferred co-worker in very unfavorable terms, and is described as a person who obtains his major satisfaction from task performance.

Studies of the relationship between ASo/LPC scores and effectiveness as leader had a correlation range of -.67 to .69 (Fiedler, 1967). Fiedler felt that the effect of leadership styles on group effectiveness could only be understood by giving consideration to certain situational variables. Fiedler (1967) proposed a classification system which was based on the belief that the leader's style of interacting with his followers is affected by the degree to which the leader can wield power and influence over them. His system is based on three factors: (1) the leader's position power, (2) the structure of the task, and (3) the personal relationships between the leader and followers.

Fiedler (1967) noted that the most favorable group situation for the leader is one in which the leader-group relations are good, the task is highly structured, and the leader's position power is strong. The most unfavorable situation in terms of the leader occurs when the leader-member relations are poor, the task is unstructured, and the leader's position power is weak. According to Fiedler, the
low ASo/LPC (task-oriented) leader is more effective when the situation is either highly favorable or unfavorable to him and that the high ASo/LPC (relationship-motivated) leader is more effective when the situation is moderately favorable.

Further studies resulted in the following (Fiedler, 1973):

Our studies show that it makes no sense to speak of a good leader or a poor leader. There are only leaders who perform well in one situation but not well in another.

These results also show us why leadership training and leadership experience do not give us across-the-board improvement in leadership performance. When we increase the control and influence of either type of leader by experience or by training, some persons who previously were well matched with their job situations will now be mismatched, while previously mismatched leaders will become better matched, (pp. 26 and 29).

In closing Fiedler (1973) said:

Whatever the strategy, we must stop searching for the magic personality trait that identifies the ideal leader, and we must stop searching for a direct link between human-relations skills or job skills and leadership performance. Training and job experience help the leader increase his control and influence over his group. But how effective this influence will be depends upon a proper match between leader and situation, (p. 92).

Fiedler's contingency model helps to integrate leadership styles and situational factors as determinants of group effectiveness. His model suggests that the kind of leadership behavior that is most effective depends on the situation and further, it specifies those behaviors which are most likely to be effective in given situations. Fiedler's contingency model has implications for the development of a leadership training model for Community School Directors, especially when consideration is given to two models.
developed by Weaver (1972a): the Conventional Community Education Model and the Emerging Community Education Model.

Those developing training programs should be aware of the implications of Fiedler's (1967, 1973) contingency model. This model should also provide insights for those involved in screening and selecting individuals for a specific position.

Summary

Review of the literature seems to indicate that leaders have much in common. According to researchers and reviewers of the literature, leaders generally:

1. Perform similar functions or tasks.

2. Demonstrate necessary proficiency in the areas of conceptual, human and technical skills.

3. Possess certain traits and abilities.

4. Succeed in situations favorable to their leadership styles.

Whether the observations of Gulick and Urwick (1937), Krech et al. (1962), and Boles (1971) are accurate descriptions of leadership functions, their arguments are certainly persuasive. Because of their persuasiveness and because of the logic of basing a training program on what leaders do, further attention will be directed at the functions performed by leaders known as Community School Directors in Chapter IV. If common leadership functions can be identified for these professionals, then it would appear that they should be considered for inclusion in the leadership training model forthcoming in Chapter V.

In this chapter leaders were considered from a number of vantage
points. The literature abounds with attempts to explain the leader in terms of character traits, group factors, role expectations, leadership skills and leadership styles in relationship with situational variables. Early attempts at explaining leadership sought to identify personal qualities and attributes recognized in leaders. Traits and abilities which leaders have been found to possess are displayed in a matrix (see Table 3). Although the possession of certain traits have been found to correlate with leadership success (Shaw, 1971), the relationship is not strong. Uris (1962) and Katz (1955) felt it unwise to build a leadership training program based on traits. However, traits could be used rather effectively in screening and selection processes for training programs and work opportunities.

Studies revolving around group factors in an attempt to understand leaders generally emphasized that the leader could not be studied in isolation, that he must be considered in the context of his relationship with the members of his group. One of the more important contributions in this area was made by Stogdill (1948) who observed that in each group situation different qualities of a leader will be most successful in mobilizing members of the group.

Of role expectations it was pointed out that not only what the leader does in fulfilling his role, but the way that group members perceive what he does is important (Parsons and Shils, 1951). Hollander pointed out that the leader must demonstrate task competence and be considered to be active in the group in order to meet expectations of the group while Hills (1964) and Getzels and Guba (1957)
### TABLE 3

**TRAITS AND ABILITIES WHICH HAVE BEEN ASCRIBED TO LEADERS ON THE BASIS OF RESEARCH AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits and abilities</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ability to cope with group problems</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ability to initiate group interaction</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ability to initiate group structure</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Active membership in group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Adaptability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Alertness and insight into situations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cooperativeness</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Good follower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dependability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Emotional stability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Facilitates development of group goals and policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Forcefulness, energy</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Ambition</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Competence in group's central task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Goal oriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Production emphasis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits and abilities</th>
<th>Bass</th>
<th>Borg et al.</th>
<th>Campbell</th>
<th>Gibb</th>
<th>Griffiths</th>
<th>Halpin &amp; Winer</th>
<th>Hills</th>
<th>Hollander</th>
<th>Kimbrough</th>
<th>Meyers</th>
<th>Stogill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Task competences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Knowing how to get things done</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Inclusion of others in policy formulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Initiative</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Institutionally and individually oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Intelligence</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Judgment</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Decision-making and problem-solving ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Knowledge</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Originality</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Persistence</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Physical and constitutional factors</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Popularity and personality</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Attitude toward teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Sociability</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Activity and social participation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Interpersonal relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traits and abilities</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Tact</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Self-confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Social awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Socio-economic status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Stimulates the development of appropriate programs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Stimulates co-workers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Verbal facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Procurs and manages personnel and materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
stressed the need for the leader to meet both institutional needs and the needs of members of the group in order to be successful.

The skills approach for understanding and developing leaders was introduced by Katz (1955). Stemming from research and observations made by Katz (1955) the skills approach is based on the kinds of skills executives exhibit when they carry out their jobs effectively. Identifying the skills as conceptual, human and technical Katz (1955) provided a clean-cut and manageable approach for training leaders. Popularity and acceptance of his approach can be witnessed throughout this study on the basis of what other writers say (e.g., Campbell, 1964; Livingston, 1971; Kuriloff, 1972). Consideration will be given to these skills in Chapter III in terms of training programs and again in Chapter IV in terms of training Community School personnel. It appears that the skills approach to training leaders could be incorporated into the leadership model which this study proposes.

Because of the complicated nature of studying leaders and the organizations in which they function, a number of models have been developed to facilitate understanding of leaders. Of particular interest were the models developed by Weaver (1972a) and the Tri-Dimensional Concept of Educational Administration of Educational Administration (CDPSA, 1955). These models appear to emanate from work presented earlier in this chapter and make easier the conceptualization of a strategy which might be employed to develop Community School Directors. Further analysis will be made of training models in Chapter III.

Weaver (1972a) observed that two different types of leaders
are required to fulfill the requirements of the two models which he espoused: the conventional model calls for a human-relations-oriented individual while the emerging model calls for an individual who is task oriented. Support for his thinking is handily available from Fiedler (1967, 1973) who stressed the importance of matching leadership styles with situational variables.
CHAPTER III

LEADERSHIP TRAINING: A PERSPECTIVE

There is much we do not know about leadership training. Fiedler (1967) noted that despite the fact that we hold the leader responsible for the success or failure of an organization, despite the fact that he is admired and respected and that he is usually paid considerably more than his subordinates, and despite the fact that we spend heavily on the recruitment, selection, and training of leaders that we know next to nothing about what makes leaders effective. Bower's (1966) observations convinced him that the enormous numbers of words and dollars lavished on management development during the fifties and sixties did little more than alert managers more fully to the need for management development.

Answers to how leadership training programs should approach the problem of preparing leaders seem to vary with the philosophy and experience of various institutions and individuals. Farquhar and Martin (1972) said:

Some believe that preparatory programs contribute substantially to successful performance. Others believe that what preparatory programs can achieve is largely dependent upon the capabilities already possessed by those who enroll in them. And still others believe that preparatory programs play a negligible, or even dysfunctional role in developing the knowledge, attitudes, and skills required for effective educational leadership. While there are germs of truth in all of these beliefs, the lamentable fact is that no one really knows what influence leadership training has upon administrative performance in schools, (p. 26).
Melby (1971) agreed that we do not know how to develop leaders and that we are experimenting with various leadership training approaches. He added that all of us are students who have much to learn.

Leadership Preparation Programs in Education Are Relatively New

Although legislative authority and responsibility provided for the instruction of children by parents and masters under the legislative laws of 1642 and then the laws of 1647 required towns to establish schools, (Grieder, 1969) educational administration did not emerge as a profession for some two centuries. Early in the Twentieth Century, Paul Hanus and E. P. Cubberly pioneered in the teaching of educational administration on the university level. Prior to this, school administrators obtained knowledge from their own experiences and from practicing administrators. The depression in tandem with world wars triggered interest in the professional administration of education so that by 1950 there were several hundred universities and colleges offering master's degrees in educational administration and 90 universities were offering doctorate degrees (Grieder, 1969).

Preservice preparation programs have changed

During the past four or five decades, preservice education for educational administrators has tended to emphasize first the technical and mechanical aspects of administration, then human relations in cooperative educational activities, and, more recently a theoretical-
research approach to the study of administration, (Leadership in Public Education, 1972). As noted by Culbertson, Farquhar, Gaynor and Shibles (1969), four major trends have been taking place in administrative preparation programs. First, since the midfifties, program content has been away from technique-oriented subjects based on practical experience and toward theory-based substance drawn from the social sciences (e.g., sociology, social psychology, economics, political science and anthropology). A second change is embodied in the field experiences used in the preparation programs. Instead of following the traditional internship pattern where an intern is assigned to observe and assist only one school administrator in almost all that he does for the better part of a year, the intern is involved in a rotating internship which permits him to spend a few weeks in each of several different settings with which practicing administrators must be familiar (e.g., local, state, and federal educational agencies, mayors' and city planners' offices, legislative bodies, professional associations, health and welfare agencies, police and recreation departments, and business and industrial organizations) (Cresswell and Goettel, 1970).

The fourth trend noted by Culbertson et al. (1969) is the change that has occurred in the staffing of the preparatory programs. Universities are generally employing fewer generalists and more scholars with social science backgrounds. In addition, definitions of specialization areas for professors has changed as well. Areas of expertise in the fifties were often described in terms of educational levels (e.g., secondary administration) or according to task areas
(e.g., personnel administration). Common practice in the sixties was to define specializations in terms of academic subdisciplines (e.g., economics of education) or bodies of theory (e.g., organizational behavior). Fogarty (1972) has predicted that during the next decade distinction will be made in accordance with functional responsibilities so that although most professors will have teaching responsibilities, they will consider themselves as: (1) researchers who generate new knowledge, (2) synthesizers who collate existing knowledge, or (3) developers who apply knowledge to resolve practical problems.

**Division-of-labor in professional preparation**

Despite the changes that have taken place in the training programs for leaders, there has been and continues to be a division-of-labor between institutions of higher education and the profession. Lortie's research (1962) of the educational preparation for twenty professions caused him to note a key similarity: he found that in fields such as medicine, law, engineering, and architecture there exists a division-of-labor between the university and the profession in the induction of new professionals. In each of these fields, this division-of-labor is based on the recognition that the education of the beginning professional is not complete upon his graduation from professional school. His credentials at this point merely define a pool from which candidates for major responsibility will be selected. Receipt of the diploma is but the beginning in a series of key turning-points in the learning career of the young professional (e.g., doctor, lawyer). Those seeking professional recognition must face at
subsequent junctures acceptance or rejection by those judging performance based on demonstrated competence.

In the division-of-labor that exists between the university and the profession, it is the university's task to begin the professional education of the aspiring practitioner, said Lortie (1962). Emphasis is generally on the creation and transmission of general, systematic knowledge relevant to the practice of the profession. Only limited attention is given in such training to the many values and skills that must be learned in order to become a full-fledged member of the profession. The curriculum of the professional school in well-established fields typically includes the sciences and disciplines considered basic to the profession along with the body of organized knowledge developed in the field. The students in such professional schools are relatively young, rigorously screened, and involved full-time for several years in their basic schooling.

Lortie (1962) indicated that since the university omits so much in the preparation of its students that it is incumbent upon the profession and its professional associations to play vital roles in the preparation programs. The medical internship and residence are examples of professional commitment while other well-established professions also rely upon arrangements which are, if less formalized, similar. For instance, the early years in the architectural or legal office are primarily training years; beginning engineers usually play limited roles on important projects. Such beginning practitioners go through a process where they apply the general knowledge acquired in professional schools to a series of gradually broadening assignments.
carried out under the guidance of senior colleagues.

Lortie (1962) observed that post-academic instruction differs in at least three ways from university instruction: (1) it is "real;" (2) it involves genuine responsibility for others; and (3) it is under the control of experienced and successful practitioners. Lortie (1962) explained as follows:

The reality comes from the fact that the young professional is acting, not studying or observing or replicating in some variant of the Link Trainer. The element of responsibility stems from the fact that his skills are applied to persons who are ill or to constructing buildings that could fall apart. It is this element of responsibility, perhaps, which makes the supervision of senior practitioners so important and which underlies their niggardly assignment of tasks—the young man must be carefully taught and assessed if the profession is to avoid public censure for irresponsible work, (p. 79).

In addition to the testing and learning done on the work premises, the profession exacts three obligations on its practitioners which help provide for continuous inservice development. These interrelated obligations are: (1) the obligation of service to clientele, (2) the obligation to contribute to and to improve the profession, and (3) the obligation of self-improvement in professional knowledge and skills and in the maintenance of professional competence (Miller et al. 1972).

Professional associations are helpful in the development of professionals (Lortie, 1962). Activities provided by the professional associations range from elaborate and formal systems of specialized instruction and examination to informal help such as special courses, workshops, and seminars. The professional associations often publish
periodicals and books which stimulate professional growth. Professional associations serve all types of practitioners, but are of prime importance to the beginning practitioner since with some diligent application, he can reduce the amount of learning time by minimizing the amount of trial-and-error he must undertake.

The division-of-labor between the university and the profession should operate so that it helps guard against flabbiness in our leadership ranks. Gardner (1961) proposed that we bring into the profession the best qualified to exercise leadership. To do this, he said, we must insure that persons who are talented and highly motivated are selected for leadership roles. He noted we must have rigorous selection procedures, rigorous procedures for testing ability, and rigorous preparatory courses.

Purpose of the rigor is not only to screen out the less talented but to eliminate the less highly motivated (Gardner, 1961). Obstacles in such a program accomplish a vital sorting process while at the same time providing the one way to bring highly motivated persons to the top of organizations. Gardner (1961) said that persons completing such a program will not only demonstrate superior ability, but superior character as well. Corporate attitudes toward the Master of Business Degree tend to support Gardner's argument. Zalaznick (1968) added that corporate acceptance of such a degree is considerably less in terms of perceived real value and more in terms of its screening value. The degree program assures a further screening of intelligent people who are motivated toward a career.
Interest in leadership and administration is broad-based

Leadership is highly valued in human society as witnessed earlier by Fiedler (1967), so it is not surprising that many studies have been made of leaders, leadership and administration. Not only has interest been directed at educational administration but in such organizations as those found in business and industry, the military, religion, volunteer groups and a number of university research centers (e.g., Yale Labor and Management Center, Graduate School of Business Administration at Harvard University, Research Center for Group Dynamics at the University of Michigan, and the Personnel Research Board at Ohio State University), (Morphet et al. 1959).

Several groups have been organized for the purpose of adding to the understanding of leadership. Examples of these in the field of education are: (1) the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA), (2) the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (CPEA), and (3) the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) (Miller et al. 1972). The NCPEA was formed in 1947 with its main purpose to improve the preparation programs of school administrators. The CPEA under the auspices of the American Association of School Administrators was begun in 1950 to improve the theory and practice of educational administration. The UCEA is an incorporated consortium of over 50 universities having graduate programs in educational administration. Its purpose is to work toward the improvement of professional administrative personnel through interuniversity cooperation.
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No One Way of Developing Leaders

As noted by Farquhar and Martin (1972) there are a number of approaches to leadership training, but no one really knows what influence leadership training has upon administrative performance in schools. However, Uris (1962) contended that there are four basic approaches used in leadership training. He reported that the following approaches are used in some combination in managerial training: (1) learning by experience, (2) learning by theory, (3) learning by simulation, and (4) learning by mind-stretching. Uris (1962) said that research does not show that one of the above training approaches is consistently superior to the others.

Although there is no generally accepted approach for training leaders, there is some consensus about an important aspect of leadership development: all development is self-development. For example, Flory (1965) made the following observation:

Real manager development is self-development. What the real manager is like, how he became that way, and what he is to become are unique to him. There are as many good ways to manage as there are managers... Each human being has his own style of managing. There is no one best way to fulfill managerial responsibilities—no standardized pattern that works for all. And hence, there can be no profile of a good manager that specifies the degree of intelligence, quality of leadership, extent of drive, or personality pattern required to succeed.

To be sure, there are standard duties that require the manager to accomplish results through others. Such standard activities are delegating, communicating, understanding policy, and disciplining. But each such duty is successfully performable in an infinite variety of ways, depending upon the interplay between the manager, his situation, and his men, (p. 176).
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Cantor (1958), Feinberg (1965), and Livingston (1971) all commented in regard to the importance of self-development in leadership training programs. Cantor (1958) equated the development of excellent leaders with that of the development of excellent persons. He felt that a leadership training program must help the participant to learn to use himself in the quality of his performance. To do this, Feinberg (1965) observed that an individual needs to know a tremendous amount of information about himself if he is to set himself up as a leader, counselor and coach of others. In complex organizational interplay, the leader can draw only on his own resources to chart his course. Hence, leadership training must focus on the individual finding himself. It therefore would be futile to impose a standard training program, a doing of things "to" leaders. Instead a leadership training program should enable leaders to release their unique, possibly latent, potentialities.

Success of leadership training programs is predicated on the ability of trainees to learn from their experiences (Livingston, 1971). He said that second-hand learning confounds leadership development. Inherent in second-hand learning is the likelihood that trainees will develop an air of artificiality and superficiality. Livingston (1971) argued that learners must develop a way of experiencing learning so that it has meaning to them. If successful in this effort, such persons will be able to develop a theory base and a leadership style suited to their personalities. To do this they must learn how to exercise authority derived from their own knowledge and skill, or from the charisma of their own personalities. To Livingston's
thinking, Schmuck (1968) added that the method of translating knowledge into practice is an important factor. He noted that verbal learning is not the same as skill learning. Verbal learning enables a leader to talk about knowledge, but that only behavioral experience can train the leader to practice in a different way. Schmuck (1968) stated:

Generally, behavior practice should involve situations directly related to the administrator's job and should occur in a relaxed, anxiety-free, non-evaluative environment. Often practice in fantasizing behavioral responses before actually trying them out also facilitates more complete behavioral training. It is likely, furthermore, that the administrator will bridge the gap between knowledge and practice more effectively if the behavioral practice concerns behaviors that are very important to him and if the try-outs take place in pleasant and congenial circumstances, (p. 159).

Approaches to Leadership Training

Despite the fact that a number of reseachers (e.g., Livingston (1971); Hemphill, Griffiths, and Fredrickse (1962); Lipham (1960); Gross and Herriott (1965); Schutz (1966); Hines (1961); Craigo (1970); and Golhammer and Becker (1970) have demonstrated that various aspects of leadership training are not good criteria for predicting leadership success (see Table 4) preservice and inservice training programs continue to flourish and continue to be refined (Farquhar and Martin, 1972). However, Fiedler (1973) cautioned that "the scatter-gun approach to leadership training will not work, and in about half the cases it is likely to be counter-productive," (p. 30). Although it will not be practicable to deal with the myriad of leadership training
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of Programs</th>
<th>Craigo</th>
<th>Goldhammer &amp; Becker</th>
<th>Gross &amp; Herriott</th>
<th>Hemphill et al.</th>
<th>Hines</th>
<th>Lipham</th>
<th>Livingston</th>
<th>Schutz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Formal preparation and/or years spent in college....</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Amount of teaching experience..</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Technical and professional knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of degrees..................................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Grades..............................................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Years of experience/Years in present position........</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
programs available at this time, a select number which seem to have implications for the training of Community School Directors will be considered. Approaches pertaining to the development of technical, human and conceptual skills; specific jobs and specific job skills will be discussed.

Approaches to developing skills

In advocating his skills approach to developing leaders, Katz (1955) observed that the skill conception of administration indicates that we may improve leadership effectiveness and develop better leaders for the future. Indicating that his approach emphasizes learning by doing, Katz (1955) reported that skills are developed through practice and through relating learning to the individual's experience and background. Technical skills should be developed through a sound grounding in the principles, structures, and processes of the individual specialty and combined with actual practice and experience during which the aspirant is watched and helped by a superior.

Disciplines such as psychology, sociology, and anthropology have contributed to the development and understanding of human skills. Katz (1955) added that executives must internalize human skills rather than depending on the advice of others. He noted that the effective leader will: (1) recognize the feelings and sentiments which he brings to various situations, (2) maintain an attitude concerning his own experiences which will help him re-evaluate and learn from them; (3) understand what others by their explicit and implicit actions and words are trying to communicate, and (4) become skillful and communicat-
ing ideas and attitudes to others. Katz (1955) suggested that human skills could be developed on a formal and/or informal basis. Approaches which he recommended include the use of case problems used in conjunction with impromptu role playing, analyses of detailed accounts of actual situations involving administrative action, and coaching in human skills by supervisors and instructors.

Development and refinement of conceptual skills must be based on an approach which will enable the leader to develop his own personal skill viewing the organization as a whole and in coordinating and integrating its components Katz (1955). He noted that proven techniques in developing conceptual skills include: (1) coaching, (2) job rotation, (3) special assignments which involve interdepartmental problems, (4) management boards, (5) case-problems courses, complex classroom presentations, and (6) on-the-job observation by superiors.

Skills approach supported

Katz (1955) has won support for his skills approach for developing leaders by such writers as: Campbell (1964), Livingston (1971), Nicholson and Nelson (1972), and McNally and Dean (1963). Campbell (1964) observed that early training in administration tended to be devoted to technical skills, but that more recently human skills have been receiving more attention. Campbell (1964) added that conceptual skills appear to have been relatively neglected and that it is in this neglected area that the science of administration would have an opportunity to make its greatest contribution. Livingston (1971)
said that the often-neglected skills essential for a manager are those involving opportunity finding, problem finding and problem solving. Livingston (1971) noted that the lack of such conceptual skills may account for the many failures of individuals in top-level positions even though they may have been highly successful in lower hierarchical positions. Nicholson and Nelson (1972) said that the leader needs to develop and then constantly refine the technical, human and conceptual skills related to his vocation.

**Skills model**

McNally and Dean (1963, p. 113) developed a model (see Figure 1) which approaches the leadership training program of leaders from the skills vantage point. In explaining the model McNally and Dean (1963) identified four facets which are paraphrased below:

1. That all graduate professional preparation in administration should be built on the broad base of the general education component of undergraduate work in addition to a program of professional education preparatory for teaching.

2. That administrators be familiar with knowledge and insights which contribute to general administrative theory and practice from the fields of anthropology, sociology, philosophy, psychology, history of education and comparative education.

3. That administrators become knowledgeable about the content of education and administration as follows:
   a. General objective, nature, organization and control of education in the United States
   b. Administrative theory
   c. Staff personnel policies and administration
   d. Purposes, policies and conduct of school-community relationships
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Figure 1. Dimensions and Categories of an Administrator Preparation Program.
e. Content, organization and improvement of curriculum and instruction

f. Administration of pupil personnel

g. Administration of all funds and facilities

4. That administrators should learn administrative skills
   a. Conceptual
   b. Human
   c. Technical

Summarized below is a proposed two-year training program for elementary principals (McNally and Dean, 1963):

1. Approximately 65-75 percent of the program should include in the foundational fields, general substantive courses in professional education and in administration, and study and practice in technical, human and conceptual skills. Special emphasis should be placed on:
   a. Laboratory sessions for each administrative specialization
   b. Simulated techniques (e.g., case discussions, in-baskets, role play, analyses of filmed and taped problem situations)
   c. Guided field observation and study

2. Approximately 25-35 percent of the program should be devoted to:
   a. Specific courses dealing with area of specialization
   b. Internship experiences

Mott program

A leadership training program was established in Flint, Michigan in 1964 which is predicated upon the refinement of the technical, human and conceptual skills promoted by Katz (1955). Known as the
Mott Inter-University Clinical Preparation Program for Educational Leadership, it brings about a cooperative effort on the part of seven Michigan universities, the Mott Foundation and the Flint School System (Melby, 1965). The program is designed for those working toward master's degrees and doctorate degrees in leadership. Those aiming at a master's degree typically receive concentrated experiences with Community School Directors while doctoral candidates work on a shorter basis with Community School Directors and then serve in various internship capacities ranging from local governmental agencies, school systems, state agencies and business organizations.

The Mott Inter-University Clinical Preparation Program has as its goal (Mott Leadership Center Internship Handbook, 1970-71) the following:

To make available for study by Community Education leaders, the total resources of the universities and the Flint Community Schools including:

A philosophy of education which believes that the child is the product of his total environment—home, church, community and school, and that the school must understand and develop cooperative working relationships with all resources of the community.

A structural organization providing services for all segments of the total community regardless of the economic, social, or educational station and recognizing the fact that the school is the only single agency serving as a common denominator of society.

A relationship with all agencies to develop and encourage cooperation and understanding for the mutual betterment of the total community, (p. 3).

Stressed are four general areas by the Mott Inter-University Leadership Training Program (National Community Education Association, 1971):
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1. Understanding the Community Education Philosophy. The leadership program directs its efforts toward developing an internship that provides opportunities to the intern to establish an individual comprehensive Community Education philosophy.

2. Providing Technical Skills for Implementing Community Education. Once a basic philosophy has been established by the intern, the intern is given an opportunity to master a variety of technical skills to allow him to successfully implement the educational philosophy that he has accepted.

3. Establishing Humanitarian Concern Among Interns. Interns are made aware of the extent of human suffering, and human needs within the society, and the complexity of the problems facing each individual as he attempts to cope with life in a technological, production-oriented system.

4. Developing General Administrative Skills within the General Framework of the Educational System. Community Educators will be working for the most part within the public educational system and interns should have a general understanding of administrative principles applicable to this system, (p. 4).

Spelled out in Katz's (1955) skills the Mott Inter-University Leadership Program reads as follows (Mott Leadership Center, March 2, 1970):

A. Technical Skills

1. To lead group toward goal attainment.

2. To create an organizational climate in which all members may make significant contributions.

3. To function effectively under stress.

4. To utilize personal influence, authority, and power in goal attainment.

5. To communicate effectively in oral and written form.

B. Conceptual Skills
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1. To make logical interpretations and applications of research.

2. To identify and use appropriate leadership styles.

3. To make critical analyses of readings, presentations, and behavioral observations.

4. To diagnose failures in the functioning of organizations.

5. To diagnose priority needs of the organization and its members.

6. To evaluate programs and practices.

7. To coordinate efforts of group members to achieve goals.

8. To conceptualize one's own theory of community educational leadership, to represent that model graphically and to defend it.

C. Human Skills

1. To deal with others with whom he works so as to be perceived as patient, understanding, considerate and courteous.

2. To encourage staff suggestions and criticisms.

3. To delineate clearly the expectations held for members of the group or organization.

4. To attack ideas of group members without being perceived as attacking the person himself.

5. To lead a group while maintaining a balance between 'group maintenance' and 'task maintenance' behaviors.

6. To recognize and cope with 'risk.'

7. To demonstrate initiative and persistence in goal attainment.

8. To delegate responsibility.

9. To demonstrate indepth knowledge of the field of Community Education.

10. To maintain personal composure and control in
the face of conflict and frustration.

11. To lead groups comprised of members over whom he exerts no power.

12. To convey empathy and concern for others,
    (page not numbered).

Each intern participates as a student in the degree program of
the university with which he is enrolled as well as the Mott Inter-
University Leadership Program. The formal program at Western Michigan
University is outlined (see Table 5) for the master's degree and for
the doctor of education program (Department of Educational Leadership,
1970). The requirement for work outside the College of Education
suggests the interdisciplinary nature of the programs.

Although individuals working in the master's degree programs
have different internship experiences from those working in the
doctoral program, all participants join weekly interdisciplinary
seminars and monthly colloquia. Through these regularly scheduled
events, the interns are exposed to the leaders and administrators
from various organizations and disciplines. Campbell (1964) observed
that the interns are exposed to outstanding resource people from
Michigan and other states who also help them evaluate the quality of
the experiences they receive. Campbell, (1964) also stressed that
participating interns are given many and varied experiences in the
schools and community under the direction of professors of education
from seven universities.

Competency based model

Of particular interest in the development of Leadership Training
Model for Community School Directors known as the General Model for
TABLE 5
REQUIREMENTS IN SEMESTER HOURS OF STUDY FOR
THE MASTER'S AND DOCTORATE DEGREES
AT WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Master's</th>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>**Doctorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 - 13</td>
<td>Administration and supervision</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 11</td>
<td>Human relations</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 9</td>
<td>Concept formation</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 3</td>
<td>Independent study (internships)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total minimum semester hours</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*At least nine semester hours must be outside the College of Education.

**At least twenty semester hours must be outside the College of Education.
a Competency Based Curriculum (McCleary and McIntyre, 1972). Their model is similar in shape to the one presented in Figure 1 (McNally and Dean, 1963) and is based on the following assumptions (McCleary and McIntyre, 1972):

Learning is effective when the things to be learned are clearly specified; when the learner understands what is to be accomplished and accepts it as reasonable and worthwhile; when the prerequisite knowledge and skills are known and the learner possesses them or can attain them with reasonable effort; and when the level of performance of what is to be learned is understood by the learner and teacher.

Teaching is effective when content (technical skills, conceptual understanding, and/or human factors) is identified and inter-related so that the elements needed to achieve a given level of performance are known; when content is ordered into a "continuum" that carries the learner as far as necessary along a sequence of experience (from familiarity to understanding to application); when the content and processes are ordered so that each learner can progress along the continuum at his own rate (individualization); and when the methods of instruction (processes) are appropriate to the nature of what is to be learned (content) and to the level of achievement desired, (pp. 53-54).

Incorporated into the competency based model are the following (McCleary and McIntyre, 1972):

1. A competency dimension classified primarily as technical, conceptual, or human.

2. Levels of competence to be attained—familiarity, understanding, or application.

3. Content (subject matter) and processes (methods) to employed to develop the competency specified, (p. 54).

The competency dimension of the model is based on the skills proposed by Katz (1955). The levels of competence: (1) familiarity, (2) understanding, and (3) application provide a range of competencies.
extending from being aware of subject matter and being able to teach it or apply the knowledge or skill. McCleary and McIntyre (1972) listed seventeen methods of instruction which they felt were sufficiently discrete to make possible definition and evaluation. These methods of instruction are outlined (see Table 6) with the competencies to be learned.

McCleary and McIntyre (1972) observed that reading, lectures, discussions and field trips would probably fit more appropriately into the early part of an individual's training when familiarity with a wide array of content is desirable. They then recommended that the program provide opportunities emphasizing conceptual skills at the understanding level by making use of cases, scenarios, individualized instructional packages, tutorial instruction and student research. Following this sequence, the program would make provision for job-like activities with emphasis on conceptual skills at the understanding level through use of laboratory training exercises, gaming and human relations training. Finally, the program could include activities likely to develop technical skills (e.g., clinical studies, team research, internships) at the application level.

Training programs which prepare leaders for specific roles

A number of school districts have developed leadership training programs to prepare individuals aspiring to specific higher positions. These programs are of interest in that they spell out screening and selections procedures which could be of interest to those implementing the model which this present study proposes. Of paramount interest,
**TABLE 6**

**METHODS, LEVELS OF LEARNING, AND COMPETENCIES TO BE LEARNED AS PROPOSED FOR USE BY THE COMPETENCY MODEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Levels of Learning</th>
<th>Competencies to be learned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familiarity</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>*H</td>
<td>*M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field trip</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized instructional package</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer-assisted instruction</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student research</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory approach</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaming</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human relations training</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical study</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team research</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H, M, L (High, medium, low) = Extent to which the method, when competently employed, tends to be practical and effective in learning the designated skills at the levels desired.*
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however, are the strategies that are used in training participants with the cooperation of higher education, the profession and the professional associations as recommended by Lortie (1962). These leadership training programs suggest a means of training individuals on both the preservice and inservice basis. Three such training programs used in Maryland, Wisconsin and Montana will be reviewed below.

The Montgomery County, Maryland leadership training program was designed for purposes of: (1) identifying and preparing potential leaders, (2) orienting beginning leaders, and (3) fostering continuous growth of experienced leaders employed within and without the system through organized inservice opportunities, (Johnson, 1964):

1. Identification and preparation of potential leaders is a seven point process:

   a. Those holding a master's degree and who have a minimum of four years of teaching experience may participate if they so choose.

   b. Principals and supervisors are asked to submit confidential endorsements and recommendations for all participants under their jurisdiction.

   c. Candidates take a battery of tests prepared by the Educational Testing Service which includes tests on administration and supervision, content areas, nonverbal reasoning, and English expression.

   d. Candidates are interviewed individually by a committee consisting of teachers, principals and supervisors. The committee evaluates the following characteristics based on the applicant's area of interest: academic preparation, experience, personal appearance, poise, speech, ability to converse fluently and intelligently and emotional control.

   e. Candidates may take a special workshop course offered by the University of Maryland in
cooperation with the Montgomery County Schools with or without credit.

f. Candidates successfully completing the workshop may participate in an advanced workshop in educational leadership. Workshop applicants are selected by a screening committee that considers all available information and, on occasion, interviews the applicants.

g. The final step is the assignment to an administrative internship. The intern, relieved of former responsibilities, continues on full salary and is required to register at the University of Maryland for two full semesters at the University and to complete residency requirements for an advanced degree. The intern spends part of the internship experience in one or more individual schools and part in the central offices of the school system. The intern maintains a daily log and is evaluated by university and school system officials.

2. Orientation of beginning leaders: This phase consists of seminars, workshops, meetings with outside consultants, and help from specialists within the system.

3. Growth of experienced leaders: This phase is intended to inspire, stimulate, and continue the growth of experienced leaders through use of consultants, leaders and authorities with national reputations in the fields of educational leadership, supervision, curriculum, growth and development, and academic subject areas in seminars, workshops and discussion groups, (pp. 46-47).

The Appleton, Wisconsin leadership training program is locally sponsored and not connected with a college or university. Applicants are required to have taught a minimum of three years in the system, have a master's degree in school administration or a related field, and meet state certification requirements. The program consists of three stages (Sorenson, 1964):

If a principal thinks one of his teachers has the potential to be a good principal, he invited him to apply for the program. The teacher fills out a letter of application, files two letters of recommendation,
submits a 500-word statement on his philosophy of education, and has an interview with the superintendent.

If accepted the intern and his principal work together for the first year to improve his teaching techniques. He is given a syllabus on administrative jobs he must learn such as registration and enrollment reports, class scheduling, supplies and equipment, budgets, and supervision of custodians. At the end of the year, his performance is evaluated.

For 20 days during the second year (usually two or three days at a time), the board hires a substitute teacher to free the intern for actual work as a principal. During this year, the intern-teacher takes over many of the jobs of a principalship, some of them on his time. He completes a second syllabus of administrative duties.

The intern-graduate is a candidate for the next opening that occurs. To date the program has only been able to keep up with the current needs for new principals, but the school district hopes eventually to form a reserve of qualified men and women, (pp. 165-166).

The leadership training program initiated in Montana in 1971 relies heavily on a series of screening processes (Missoula School District #1, 1971). This leadership training program (see Figure 2), in addition to the rigorous screening procedures called for by Gardner (1961), also trains an individual for a specific job with appointment to the position made by the Board of Trustees on recommendation by the superintendent. Such a program seemingly attempts to match the job applicant with the job and the social setting.

Workshops are used as an inservice tool for training leaders

Lippitt (1969) acknowledged that the present-day approach to leadership training no longer considers the leader apart from his organization or the community in which he functions. The resulting historic trend away from the purely mechanistic, the directed
Application and Resume
Personnel Office - Application Rejected
Prepared Assigned Written Statement
Application Accepted
Curriculum Interview Committee
Application Accepted
Administrative Interview Committee
Application Accepted
Superintendent Interview
Application Accepted
Candidate Accepted
Candidate Accepts Assignment Agreement
Assignment to Administrative Supervisor
Experience and Study Program Cooperatively Developed
Cooperative Reviews
Candidate Reassigned for Further Experience in Administrative Leadership Training Program
Acceptance to Administrative Eligibility List
Appointment by Board of Trustees on Recommendation of Superintendent

Figure 2. Missoula, Montana School District Number One Administrative Leadership Training Program Vital Experience Route Technique
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development of leadership in the individual, is now flexibly oriented to specific leadership tasks and values in a known organizational climate (Lippitt, 1969). This leadership training is directed at helping the leader improve in the areas of self-understanding, productive relations with others, and ability to apply a variety of methods and solutions as well as skills and knowledge to multi-faceted leadership problems. Such leadership training can be accomplished through inservice training of which workshops have been identified as an important tool, (American Association of School Administrators, 1960; Baughman et al. 1969; Steig and Fredrick, 1969).

Because administration is a complex phenomenon illuminated by several disciplines, Culbertson (1962) said that inservice education must supplement and complement pre-service education. He further stated that the need for inservice education is reinforced by the tendency for knowledge to become obsolescent in the modern world. Albright (1962) called for intermittent if not continuous inservice training for practicing educational leaders.

Pharis (1966) said the purpose of inservice training is the improvement of the professional competence and functioning of leaders. Four goals of inservice training identified by Pharis (1966) are:

1. Continued learning. To continue on-the-job learning begun in the pre-service program. The deliberate effort to translate the knowledge, understandings, and generalizations of the pre-service program into successful constantly improving professional practice.

2. Remedial function. Helps to fill in the gaps inevitably left by the pre-service program, however good it may have been.

3. Keeping pace with change. To keep abreast of new proposals and their educational implications.
4. Increased efficiency. Increase one's efficiency in handling the day-to-day functioning of schools, (pp. 9-10).

In keeping with the purpose which Pharis (1966) stated for inservice training, the Adult Education Association (1956) emphasized that workshops, regardless of their subject matter are devoted to training their participants to do some job better and that the common goal for all participants in workshops was that of improving performance. Steig and Fredrick (1969, p. 71) said: "The word 'workshop' is definitive, in that it describes an attempt to turn theory into improved practice. Its purpose is thus action-oriented."

The Adult Education Association (1956) defined a workshop as follows:

A series of meetings, usually four or more two-hour sessions, that puts emphasis on individualized study within a group and with consulting teachers. Individual needs are the basis of choosing the problem to be solved. The significance of this method is that the individual student solves his own problems with the help of the group and the instructor, and leaves the workshop with a plan of action that he believes will fit his own situation, (p. 3).

Diedrich and VanTel (1945) listed four principal characteristics of a true workshop. In paraphrased form they are:

1. The focus of the workshop is directed at the problems, needs, and interests of the members. Members do most of the talking and ask the key questions. Solutions must be arrived at through cooperative effort. The final judge of the quality of an answer is the one who asked the original question.

2. Each participant is expected to do something about his problem or the group project.

3. The workshop must exemplify the principles of democracy.
4. The participants of a workshop are not evaluated; they evaluate the workshop.

Kelley (1951) felt that the essential ingredients of a workshop include: (1) a planning session where all are involved at the beginning, (2) work sessions where all have an opportunity to work with others on the problems of most concern to them, and (3) summarization and evaluation of the workshop at the close. Steig and Fredrick (1969) made these observations about workshops:

The basic tenets upon which workshops operate include: (a) The group should be flexible and able to function freely in an atmosphere of give and take; (b) Group discussion leads to decisions concerning common problems; (c) Decisions are usually based on consensus; (d) Consultants are employed if they have the necessary expertise; and (e) Authority for adopting group procedures to meet special needs rests with the workshop group, (pp. 73-74).

Wengert (1962), Steig and Fredrick (1969), and the American Association of School Administrators (1960) are all advocates of the workshop approach of developing leaders. Wengert (1962) called for the use of really sophisticated and demanding inservice seminars, short courses and workshops as strategies for developing leaders. Steig and Fredrick (1969) said, "No method yet devised does the specific task for which it is intended with greater flexibility and efficiency than does a properly organized workshop," (p. 71). The American Association of School Administrators (1960) found through surveys of universities and superintendents that workshops were ranked high as a means of training leaders. In a survey of 302 universities 293 responses were obtained. Identified by the universities as major strengths of preparation programs for educational leaders were: (1) internships,
(2) action research field experiences and (3) workshops, conferences and other types of in-service work for practitioners. In a survey to which 859 superintendents responded, the American Association of School Administrators (1960) found that the two major methods that far exceeded all others in providing information concerning new developments in school administration were: (1) professional reading (e.g., periodicals, textbooks, and research), and (2) professional meetings and workshops.

Further endorsements of workshops have been made by the Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (1955) and Baughman et al. (1969). The Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (1955) emphasized that there has been a growing use of the workshop approach to problem-solving. It was indicated that reasons for the increased use of the workshop technique include: (1) greater emphasis on problem identification and problem-solving in leadership training programs, (2) participation by practicing administrators whose experiences and positions constitute a need for modifying preparation programs to assume some of the aspects of inservice training programs, (3) emphasis on problems perceived by the participants and therefore deemed meaningful, (4) development of skills in dealing with groups and other individuals in addition to knowledge and information obtained, and (5) comparatively greater internalization of concepts and principles of administrative operation than with some other methods of instruction.

The following testimonial was offered by Baughman et al. (1969):
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Institutes and workshops are opportunities for professional growth. Whether offered by the school system, professional associations or educational institutions, these are excellent ways of improving oneself. They not only provide a chance to do some work on one's own in preparation for a contribution to the group, but they also allow the sharing of ideas and common problems with fellow administrators. The mere knowledge that other principals have encountered similar problems is valuable therapy. To get their reactions and attempts is enlightening. Furthermore, the camaraderie and enjoyment associated with the industry which are the part of well run workshops are worthy by-products to the central purpose of professional growth. For these reasons the workshop is a highly recommended device for improving one's professional ability, (p. 40).

Summary

While it is generally acknowledged that there is much that is not known about leadership training and while it is understood that leadership training programs are relatively new in comparison with training programs in other professions, it is also understood that strides are being made to improve them. Professional leadership training programs depend on the combined efforts of higher education, the profession and professional organizations to provide the necessary screening, orientation, general knowledge and specific competencies required of the practitioner.

In this chapter, additional emphasis was placed on the conceptual, human and technical skills, especially in terms of training programs and training models. Also emphasized were the training strategies which prepare individuals: (1) to various levels of competency, (2) with various skill-mixes, (3) for specific positions, and (4) with specific skills and understandings.
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A further objective of this chapter was to explore the practicability of embodying the skills approach advocated by Katz (1955) into leadership training programs. Katz (1955) suggested a number of approaches for developing leadership skills. His methods of instruction included examples which place emphasis on learning by doing called for by various writers (Cantor, 1958; Feinberg, 1965; Livingston, 1971). Utilization of the skills approach was made in the model created by McNally and Dean (1963). More closely related to the training of the Community School Director is the Mott Inter-University Clinical Preparation Program for Educational Leadership which is also predicated upon the skills approach. The most sophisticated model discussed in this chapter was the leadership training model developed by McCleary and McIntyre (1972). Not only does their model embrace the skills approach, but it is competency based and recommends methods of instruction for attaining various levels of competency. Utilization of the model proposed by McCleary and McIntyre (1972) in conjunction with the models developed by Weaver (1972a) should provide a framework for building the Leadership Training Model for Community School Directors in Chapter V.

It was also illustrated in this chapter that it is possible for university and local resources to be combined in the development of leaders (Lortie, 1962; Johnson, 1964; Melby, 1965; Katz, 1955).

The workshop method of instruction was included in this chapter for a number of reasons:

1. To augment the list of training methods suggested in this chapter.

2. To stress the potential for the involvement of the
profession, the professional organizations and the university.

3. To suggest the need for both preservice and inservice training.

4. To underline the need to make training both experiential and meaningful.

On the basis of material presented in this chapter it appears reasonable that major components of the model to be developed in Chapter V will be adapted from Katz's (1955) skills approach, the models by Weaver (1972a) and McCleary and McIntyre (1972) and the methods of instruction suggested in this chapter.

The purpose of Chapter IV is twofold: (1) to determine whether Community School Directors have functions in common and (2) to identify preparation needs and requirements of Community School Directors.
CHAPTER IV

THE PROFESSIONAL NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIRECTOR

A historical overview of the changing role of the Community School Director was provided at the outset of this study. Consideration was also given to some of the approaches used in training these professionals and to the apparent need for increasing numbers of well-trained Community School Directors.

In this chapter, the Community School Director is considered more microscopically. His role is outlined in the first section of this chapter while the second section is devoted to the needs of the Community School Director which have been identified in terms of state-level expectations, the literature and the research that has been done in regard to the training and the effectiveness of Community School Directors. These needs are displayed in terms of professional, personal and training needs at the conclusion of this chapter.

Functions and Goals

Functions and goals of the Community School Director have been gleaned from a number of sources: Whitt (1971), Mott Leadership Program Staff (1972), Winters (1972) and Weaver (1972a). The Community School Director has been depicted as follows by Whitt (1971):

The key to any Community School Program is the Community School Director. This individual is the coordinator and leader for all aspects of the community education program. He leads when there is a need to develop new programs and to maintain the old;
he coordinates when it is essential that he allow others to lead and to encourage others to move forward on their own. The Community School Director is a motivator, an expeditor, a learning specialist, a community relations expert, a master of ceremonies, a community action agent, a VISTA volunteer, an evangelist for education, a custodian and clerk, a vice-principal, a counselor, a boys' club leader, a girls' club sponsor, a friend of the neighborhood, and a humanitarian concerned with the welfare of our society. Now if this sounds as if it is too much, he is much more. For you see, the Community School Program is one of involvement, and a person who dares to become involved, must be ready to become whatever type of individual that is necessary in order to enable people to feel secure and to grow, (p. 41).

Based on a study of 106 Community School Directors, Winters (1972) found that these professionals gave the following five functions top priority:

1. Planning and operating programs
2. Community assessment
3. Finance
4. Communication (informational)
5. Community involvement

More comprehensive coverage of the functions of the Community School Director was provided by the Mott Leadership Program Staff (1972). Major functions identified were:

1. Planning of program
2. Promotion, publicity and interpretation and public relations
3. Recruitment and certification of staff
4. General admission
5. Training and supervision of professional staff
6. Coordination and cooperation with outside agencies
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7. Evaluation of the program

8. Professional growth

In more specific terms the functions read (Mott Leadership Program Staff, 1972):

1. Planning of program
   a. Planning elements of the program (developing, selecting and scheduling)
   b. Organization of new activities (including experimental programs)
   c. Meetings with advisory groups and interviewing key people in the economics, political and educational structure of the community
   d. Fact finding and community-needs surveys

2. Promotion, publicity, interpretation and public relations
   a. Preparation of newspaper and radio publicity
   b. Preparation and distribution of printed and mimeographed announcements
   c. Arranging for promotional radio and television programs
   d. Personal talks before local groups
   e. Appearances on radio and television programs
   f. Acting as discussion leader, moderator, etc., for other organizations
   g. Preparation and display of exhibits
   h. Planning public meetings on "open house" affairs
   i. Interpretation of adult education program to public school staff

3. Recruitment and certification of staff
   a. Search for qualified leadership
b. Interviewing prospective instructors

c. Procuring teaching certificates

4. General admission

a. Financial matters

(1) Preparing payrolls

(2) Approving expenditures

(3) Collection of fees

(4) Preparation of budget

(5) Preparation of claims for state and federal aid

b. Supplies and equipment

(1) Control of inventory

(2) Selection of instructional materials

(3) Material request approvals

(4) Arrange for printing, repairs and delivery of materials

c. Office management

(1) Supervision of clerical personnel

(2) Maintenance of records and files

d. Routine operations

(1) Correspondence

(2) Telephone communication

(3) Personal interviews

(4) Preparation of routine reports

(5) Arranging for registration

e. Special and miscellaneous activities

(1) Review material prepared by staff members
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(2) Leadership duties within local program

f. Participation in local school system staff meetings

5. Training and supervision of professional staff
   a. Group inservice training sessions
   b. Individual conferences with instructors
   c. Preparation and review of training bulletins and materials
   d. Visitation of activities

6. Coordination and cooperation with outside agencies
   a. Consultant services in connection with adult education projects of other community organizations
   b. Developing cooperative projects with other agencies
   c. Arranging special aspects of the public school adult program
   d. Serving on organizational committees as a result of local position as director of adult education

7. Evaluation of program
   a. Review and analysis of periodic reports
   b. Conferring with participants
   c. Survey and analysis of drop-outs
   d. Periodic review of program in relation to emerging needs
   e. Continuous studies of need (surveys, etc.)

8. Professional growth
   a. Attendance at state and national conferences
   b. Attendance and participation in workshops
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Although Whitt's (1971) description on the Community School Director comes close to being poetry, his perceptions seem to parallel the functions suggested by the Mott Leadership Program Staff (1972) and the work done by Winters (1972). Perhaps the most extensive work done in the area of functions and goals of Community School Directors has been done by Weaver (1972a). In a study based on interviews with 245 community educators from across the country which consisted of roughly equal groups of Community School Directors, Community School Coordinators and educators involved in community education activities at the university level, Weaver (1972a) found that 23 goals were considered primary by 50 percent or more of the respondents.

Weaver (1972a) categorized the goals under six processes: (1) coordinating, (2) surveying, (3) demonstrating, (4) programming educational opportunity, (5) training, and (6) promoting the school. The results of the study are listed below (Weaver 1972a):

1. Coordinating
   a. Coordinates efforts of community agencies
   b. Provides effective communication
   c. Eliminates duplication among agencies
   d. Assists residents to secure educational services
   e. Provides forum for community problems

2. Surveying
   a. Identifies community problems
b. Surveys attitudes and interests

c. Identifies required resources

3. Demonstrating

a. Demonstrates humanistic approach to education

b. Demonstrates methods of special change

c. Provides model for community living

d. Demonstrates principles of educational leadership

4. Programming educational opportunity

a. Extends use of school facilities

b. Increases multi-age and cross-cultural contacts

c. Provides programs for senior citizens

d. Provides teen-age enrichment and recreation

e. Provides recreation programs

f. Provides high school completion program

g. Improves educational opportunity for minorities

5. Training - Develops leadership among lay citizens

6. Promoting the school

a. Increases participation in existing school program

b. Promotes school as primary educational agency

c. Improves public image of the school, (p. 16).

Review of the functions of Community School Directors that have been identified (see Table 7) suggests that coordinating, demonstrating leadership, planning, programming, public relations, surveying and training are indeed major functions performed by the Community School Directors. However, such a listing should not be considered
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Mott Staff</th>
<th>Weaver</th>
<th>Whitt</th>
<th>Winters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Administration</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinating</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Demonstrating leadership</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluation of program</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Finance</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personnel management</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Professional growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Programming</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Public relations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Recruiting</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Surveying</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Training</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
exclusive of other functions. Two problems that may have restricted input are: (1) problems of semantics and (2) some lists were less extensive than others. Even with these limitations, the list of functions found in Table 7 is not unlike the list proposed by Urwick (1962) in Chapter II.

Preparation Needs and Requirements

Review of the literature indicates that there are no certification requirements for Community School Directors per se and that minimal training requirements imposed by law are rare (Becker, 1972 and Pease, 1972). Preparation requirements for Community School Directors appear to vary from community to community. For example, in Minnesota the following observation was made (Guidelines for Community Schools, State of Minnesota, 1970): "The precise qualifications for each Community Service Director should be determined by that Board of Education in keeping with its resources and organization," (p. 18). It was further noted in the Minnesota guidelines that the Community School Director should have professional or volunteer experience and education in teaching, adult education, recreation, community relations, social work, administration, or other related fields. Community School Directors, according to the Utah Department of Public Instruction (1970), "should be selected on the basis of their commitment to the Community School concept, demonstrated community leadership, social maturity and human relations skills," (p. 9). In Michigan, Community School Directors are required to have three years of teaching experience and a teaching certificate, or have a
master's degree (Michigan Public Act #307, 1969). However, this law only applied to school districts seeking partial reimbursement of the Community School Director's salary.

Frank Manley, the acknowledged founder of the community education concept and the man credited with developing the position of Community School Director (Becker, 1972), collaborated in developing a list of requirements for Community School Directors (Totten and Manley, 1969). It reads as follows:

1. Be a professionally trained school person.
2. Be a four-year college graduate.
3. Hold a regular teaching certificate.
4. Have one or more years of successful teaching experience.
5. Have taught, if possible, both academic and Physical Education classes.
6. Have been a "home room" teacher.
8. Know a great deal about curriculum and methods of instruction.
9. Have served as an assistant director under an established director.
10. Have completed two or more courses in Community-School prior to appointment.
11. Participate in inservice education which would include: (1) graduate study in Community-School Education—one year in school administration, one year Community-School vocational; (2) general meetings, conferences, workshops, and all faculty meetings; and (3) much reading, (pp. 145-147).

Totten and Manley (1969) recommended both preservice and
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in service training as they identified the professional needs of the Community School Director. Training methods which they listed are: coaching, coursework, reading, faculty and general meetings, conferences and workshops.

Drawing attention to the magnitude of training which is deemed necessary for the effectively functioning Community School Director, Hartvigsen (1972) advocated that the Community School Director "be more broadly trained and broadly conceived than probably anyone in the educational program today," (p. 43). He called for a more comprehensive and extensive training program for these professionals. Hartvigsen seemingly called for well-rounded training in conceptual, human and technical skills in a number of areas. Hartvigsen (1972) said:

The community school director, to be accepted by people, must have an understanding of their limitations as well as their potentialities. He must be a person of great flexibility concerning his demands of himself as well as of other people. He must understand, in a comprehensive fashion, the work of the community school in helping people of all ages—almost from the cradle to the grave—to solve problems. He must be more efficient, in many aspects of public school administration than has been traditionally required. He must be a good educational psychologist. He must understand child growth and development. He must understand adult needs in this same respect. He must be minimally skilled in evaluation, statistics, record-keeping, legal involvements, and in research as well as in organization, administration and the principles of educational instruction, (p. 42).

**Insights provided by research**

Although research in the area of community education is not...
extensive, there are a number of studies which provide some insights and which make recommendations concerning training programs for Community School Directors (Coats, 1970; Becker, 1972; Pease, 1972; Winters, 1972; and Weaver, 1972a).

The study done by Coats (1970) serves to provide an understanding of some of the methodologies used in the Mott Inter-University Clinical Preparation Program and the importance they are considered to have in terms of professional and personal development of those participating in the program. Analysis was made of responses from 224 former Mott interns from the years 1964-1970. Items most relevant to this study were grouped in three categories: (1) internships, (2) academic program, and (3) experiences with colleagues. The questionnaire called for responses on a five-point scale which ranged from little or no importance to a maximum of a great deal of importance.

A rank order of the sub-categories is provided (see Table 8). Ranking was done on the basis of the percentage of respondents who valued the sub-categories from at least a moderate to a great deal of importance with respect to: (1) professional development and (2) personal development. Ranking high in both development areas were: the inter-university colloquium, the inter-university seminars, school-related and non-school-related internships, and interaction with colleagues.

Using the Administrative Image Questionnaire as a test instrument, Becker (1972) obtained data from teachers, administrators, and selected Community School Directors in regard to the perceived
# TABLE 8
RANK ORDER OF THE PERCEIVED VALUE OF COMPONENTS OF THE MOTT INTER-UNIVERSITY CLINICAL PREPARATION PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance with respect to professional development</th>
<th>Aspect of the program</th>
<th>Importance with respect to personal development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Inter-university colloquium</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3. Inter-university seminars</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3. Experience with colleagues affiliated</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with your own institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Informal experience with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(voluntary contact with colleagues for purposes of exchanging ideas, socializing, studying, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. School related internships (e.g., central office, building level, state department of instruction, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Non-school related internships (e.g., social agency, government, industry, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9. Formal university classes</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9. Experience with colleagues affiliated</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with other institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9. Social experience with Mott fellowship advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Academic experience with Mott fellowship advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Formal experience with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(required contact with colleagues in academic setting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Value to you of living in the Flint community</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## TABLE 8 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance with respect to professional development</th>
<th>Aspect of the program</th>
<th>Importance with respect to personal development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. <strong>Experience with colleagues affiliated with other degree programs (e.g., with master's degree interns if you were a doctorate intern and vice versa)</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. <strong>Internships with Community School Directors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
leadership effectiveness of the latter. He found that three factors were rated as being most vital to the Community School Director's leadership effectiveness: (1) attitude toward his job, (2) leadership skills, and (3) managerial skills. Teachers, administrators and the Community School Directors considered the Community School Director to have good administrator attitudes and to be an effective administrator. The Community School Director was generally rated high on personal and attitudinal items, but relatively lower on management and communication items.

Becker (1972) concluded that the Community School Director's preservice training should include leadership, management and communications skills. He also felt that regular inservice information and activities should be a part of the Community School Director's on-going training.

A study conducted by Pease (1972) elicited responses from 29 superintendents, 29 Community School Coordinators, 119 principals and 81 Community School Directors. Pease found that 75 percent of the respondents thought the Community School Director should be professionally certificated. Preferred educational background for Community School Directors was a Community-School education. Following in order of preference were: administration, physical education and recreation, and vocational-technical training.

Desired minimum community education training in order of preference were: (1) a one-year internship, (2) a six-week internship, and (3) a two-week internship or a graduate course in Community Education (Pease, 1972). In terms of inservice training respondents
preferred: (1) participation in Community Education workshops and inservice training, (2) participation in school faculty meetings, (3) participation in the Flint workshops, (4) subscription to the Community Education Journal and (5) membership in professional organizations.

Winters (1972) conducted a study to determine what effect the length of the training program would have on the behavior and the perceptions of Community School Directors. Involved in the study were 25 former participants in the Mott inter-university program fellows, 81 Mott Institute (six-weeks) interns, and 10 training staff members. The first two groups of respondents were employed as Community School Directors at the time of the study.

Findings of immediate interest were (Winters, 1972):

1. Fellows were more active than interns in the use of mass media and group techniques in communication processes and collection of fees and involvement for locally raising funds.

2. Fellows tended to be more active than interns in the areas of: (a) community coordination, (b) finance administration, and (c) change agent roles.

3. Interns tended to be more active than fellows in the area of institutional coordination.

4. Fellows perceived their training to be more adequate than did the interns in the following functions: (a) assessment, (b) programming, (c) communication, (d) community coordination, (e) institutional coordination, (f) change agent role, and (g) finance administration.

In developing the Emerging Model of Community Education, Weaver (1972a) observed that the Community Educator should have the following:
1. Personal requisites
   a. Objectivity
   b. Initiative
   c. Adaptability

2. Skills
   a. Technical (high degree)
   b. Conceptual (high degree)
   c. Human

3. Knowledges
   a. Organizational management
   b. Human behavior
   c. Social systems, (p. 15).

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was: (1) to determine whether the functions of Community School Directors are sufficiently similar to warrant inclusion in the Leadership Training Model for Community School Directors, and (2) to identify the professional, personal and training needs of the Community School Director. Twelve functions were identified for inclusion in the leadership training model. Although there is some overlap of the functions meeting the criterion to be listed in the model, this should cause no major problem in terms of the effectiveness of the model.

The perceived professional, personal and training needs of the Community School Director have been summarized (see Table 9). These will be considered further in the development of the leadership
TABLE 9
PERCEIVED PROFESSIONAL, PERSONAL AND TRAINING
NEEDS OF COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIRECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Becker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hartvigsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totten &amp; Manley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Professional requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Certification</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. and volunteer experience</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate study</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. in community education</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Inservice training</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Personal needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. to community education concept</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. community leadership ability</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. and managerial skills</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Social maturity</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Training needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Communications</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Community coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Finance</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Group processes</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Institutional coordination</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 9 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. Leadership theory</td>
<td>Becker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Learning theory</td>
<td>Hartvigsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Management</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Organizational &amp; behavioral analysis</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Personnel administration</td>
<td>Pease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Programming</td>
<td>Totten &amp; Manley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Psychology (adult &amp; child)</td>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Public relations</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Research &amp; evaluation</td>
<td>Winters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. School law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Sociology &amp; social work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Survey research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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training model in Chapter V. Especially important are the training needs which will be used as training components in the model.

Several training methods for preparing community educators were suggested along with the functions and needs of these professionals. Examples include: (1) coaching, (2) conferences, (3) workshops, (4) reading, (5) course work, (6) colloquia, (7) seminars, (8) general meetings, and (9) faculty meetings. Those which will be particularly used in the model will be coaching, workshops, reading, course work, colloquia, and seminars.

The material in the first four chapters of this study provides a background and a rationale for the development of the Leadership Training Model for Community School Directors with its attendant components. Chapter V will culminate in the development of the model.
CHAPTER V

LEADERSHIP TRAINING MODEL FOR COMMUNITY
SCHOOL DIRECTORS

The position of Community School Director, which emanated from
the community education concept and which calls for different staffing
than that found in the traditional school (LeTarte and Minzey,
1972), is being adopted at an accelerating rate in communities
across the country. With the increasing sophistication and the
growing popularity of the role, demand is mounting for larger num­
bers of well-trained Community School Directors. At one time Flint,
Michigan was the sole center for training Community School Directors.
When it became apparent that there was need for an expanded delivery
system for such training, a limited number of universities began
offering classes in community education and a lesser number offered
degrees in community education. However, projections by the Mott
Foundation (Long Range Planning, 1973) strongly suggest that a much
expanded delivery system for preparing Community School Directors
is needed. It is to this need which this study is addressed.

Nature and Components
of the Model

The leadership training model proposed by this study is
predicated on the development of personnel for the Community School
Directorship through the cooperative efforts of the university, the
profession and the professional organizations. Major responsibility
for organizing and developing the recommended training programs will be placed on the university and the local employing agency. Recognizing that both the university and the local employing agency can make necessary and unique contributions (Lortie, 1962) to the development of individuals aspiring to become Community School Directors, this study proposes a model which should facilitate this process.

Models

Before discussing the leadership training model for Community School Directors, clarification of the meaning of the term "model" should be given. Brodbeck (1957) indicated one of the problems associated with models. She said:

The recent literature of behavior research is replete with models. The time is clearly more than ripe for a thorough-logical analysis of their nature and function. Yet, such attention as philosophers of science have recently given to models is disappointing. . .

The fact is that the term "model" is used most ambiguously, (p. 436).

Models are basically mnemonic devices in their structure, purposes and ends (McGrath, 1972). Examination of some of the common characteristics of models clarifies the meaning of "model" (McGrath, 1972). In abridged form, he said that a model:

1. Is a replica of some sort.
2. Is an agreed-upon symbol of some sort.
3. Provides a habitual form for thinking or conceptualizing about something.
4. Is a shortcut or an economy in thinking or for conceptualizing about something.
5. May be either complete or incomplete.

6. May be either simple or complex—or somewhere between, depending in a large measure upon the user and his needs.

7. Provides for standardization and control of conceptualizations, processes and definitions; it is a nomothetic structure or system.

8. Is a means; not an end, (p. 16).

McGrath (1972) added: "Models seek a systematic closure or manageability to enhance the likelihood of attaining standardization, predictability and ultimate control," (pp. 19-20).

As used in this study, "model" means: "a description or analogy used to visualize something that cannot be directly observed" (Webster, 1970, p. 544). The model developed in this study is a blueprint for the professional development of the Community School Director. It consists of seven basic elements:

1. Professional levels
2. Levels of learning
3. Functions
4. Competencies
5. Delivery agency
6. Training components
7. Methods

**Professional levels**

As used in this study "professional levels" designates the training level of the individual in the training program. The following designations will be used and are accompanied by entry
level requirements:

1. Community School Director I - A person with a four-year degree and at least one year of successful teaching experience or its equivalent.

2. Community School Director II - A person with fifteen semester hours beyond the bachelor's degree who has met the requirements for Level I or its equivalent.

3. Community School Director III - A person with a master's degree who has fulfilled the requirements for Level II.

4. Community School Director IV - A person with fifteen semester hours beyond the master's degree who has met the requirements for Level III.

The rationale for using various professional levels has a historical precedence. Forerunners of the Community School Director served on a part-time basis. Later this position evolved into one where the individual served half-time in a teaching capacity and worked half-time as a Community School Director. Eventually this became a full-time position as noted in Chapter I. A number of professional levels were listed in the Flint Community Education Program (Mott Leadership Program Staff, 1972).

Levels of learning

"Levels of learning" represent the levels of competence that the participant should demonstrate at the end of each training level. Levels of learning competence included in the model are: (1) familiarity, (2) understanding, and (3) application. These levels of learning were introduced in Chapter III in a discussion of the competency-based model developed by McCleary and McIntyre (1972).
Functions

The major components of the role of the Community School Director were discussed in Chapter IV. Components that were chosen by two or more sources (see Table 7) have been included in this element of the model. Those meeting the criterion are:

1. Administration
2. Community involvement
3. Coordinating
4. Demonstrating leadership
5. Finance
6. Planning
7. Personnel management
8. Programming
9. Public relations
10. Recruiting
11. Surveying
12. Training

Competencies

Competencies are based on the skills proposed by Katz (1955) which are vital in performing job-related responsibilities. These skills (conceptual, human, technical) were discussed in chapters II, III and IV. Work particularly pertinent to this study was done by Weaver (1972a) and McCleary and McIntyre (1972). These competencies will be listed by skill-mix (i.e., the proportion of each skill required to perform a given function well).
**Delivery agency**

"Delivery agency" as used in this study refers to the agency with prime responsibility for a training component of this model. Two such will be used: (1) the university and (2) employing agency. Typically the employing agency will be a school district, but it could be others such as a local governmental agency. Ideally the university and the employing agency will jointly work out the various aspects of the training program and each will participate actively in the resulting training program.

Basis for this cooperative approach to training Community School Directors comes from material in Chapter III (e.g., Lortie, 1962; McNally and Dean, 1963; Mott Leadership Center Internship Handbook, 1970-71; McCleary and McIntyre, 1972; and Johnson, 1964). Further support can be found in chapters I and IV.

The professional organizations could supplement the work done by the university and the profession by helping to institute professional standards, by providing professional publications and materials and by providing state and national workshops and conventions.

**Training components**

Training components used in the model were obtained through a review of the literature in community education and are based on the needs of the Community School Director in fulfilling his role. These components were discussed in Chapter IV and are identified by source in Table 9. These seventeen components are listed below:

1. Communication
2. Community coordination
3. Finance
4. Group process
5. Institutional coordination
6. Leadership theory
7. Learning theory
8. Management
9. Organizational and behavioral analysis
10. Personnel administration
11. Programming
12. Psychology (adult and child)
13. Public relations
14. Research and evaluation
15. School law
16. Sociology and social work
17. Survey research

Methods

"Methods" as used in the model will refer to methods of instruction. Methods have been reviewed several times in this study, especially in chapters III and IV. Twenty methods of instruction are listed below. Seventeen came from an interesting strategy for selecting instructional methods (see Table 6) which helps educators to select the method of instruction based on the level of competency desired in the areas of conceptual, human and technical skills. Another method, coaching, was added to the list and is based upon
recommendations from Katz (1955), Livingston (1971) and Missoula School District #1 (1971-72). Workshop was added on the basis of perceived value as outlined in Chapter III while colloquium and seminar were added on the basis of their value to participants in the Mott Inter-University Leadership Preparation Program (Coats, 1970). The methods which have been integrated in the model are:

1. Reading
2. Lecture
3. Discussion
4. Field trip
5. Case
6. Scenario
7. Individualized instructional package
8. Computer-assisted instruction
9. Tutorial
10. Student research
11. Laboratory approach
12. Gaming
13. Simulation
14. Human relations training
15. Clinical study
16. Team research
17. Internship
18. Coaching
19. Workshop
20. Colloquium, seminar
Goal and Objectives

The goal of this study was to develop a Leadership Training Model for Community School Directors based on a review of research and literature pertaining to leaders. Specific attributes desired for this model are specified in the following objectives:

1. To identify the major functions of the Community School Director.

2. To recommend an approach for training the Community School Director.

3. To identify the major training needs of the Community School Director and to incorporate them into the training model.

4. To identify and propose a delivery system which could be: (1) used to fulfill the training needs of the Community School Director, and (2) operationalized by existing training institutions.

5. To identify and propose methods of instruction appropriate for developing the Community School Director to specific levels of competency.

A final objective of this study was to provide for the evaluation of the model based on the above stated objectives. The strategy for evaluating the model appears later in this chapter.

Leadership Training Model
for Community School Directors

The Leadership Training Model for Community School Directors provides a suggested approach for the training of the Community School Director in various communities through the cooperative efforts of training institutions. Because the mode of operation, the needs, and the resources of each hiring agency, each university
and each community are somewhat unique, it is not anticipated that
the proposed model will be adopted carte blanche. However, it can
serve as a useful guide for developing and implementing leadership
training programs for these professionals.

The Leadership Training Model for Community School Directors
consists of three training models, each designed for a particular
phase of the training of the Community School Director. They are:

1. Leadership Training Model for Community School Director I
2. Leadership Training Model for Community School Director II
3. Leadership Training Model for Community School Director III

Each of the leadership training models (I, II, III) consists of
the following elements:

1. Competency level
2. Functions
3. Competencies skill-mix
4. Training components
5. Delivery agency
6. Methods

Entry level requirements for each level were detailed earlier.
Upon completion of requirements for each level, each participant is
expected to demonstrate the level of proficiency for that model (e.g.,
familiarity with the functions of the Community School Director)
before advancing to the next phase.

Leadership training model I

Intent of the Leadership Training Model for Community School
Director I (see Table 10) is to expose the participant to a broad overview of community education and to acquaint the participant with the responsibilities of the Community School Director.

The first two columns of the Leadership Training Model for Community School Director I are headed functions and competencies skill-mix. The twelve major functions of the Community School Director are identical for training models II and III. Although the competencies skill-mix remains outwardly the same for each of the training models (I, II, III) it should be understood that the skills for each function will be refined from one level to the next, only the proportion of these skills is expected to remain the same.

In Leadership Training Model I there are fourteen training components listed with the delivery agency responsibilities divided between the university and the local hiring agency. Training components for which the university has prime responsibility are:

1. Leadership theory (introduction)
2. Sociology
3. Organizational and behavioral analysis
4. Psychology
5. Learning theory

Methods which are used in this training model are reading, lecture and discussion with major emphasis intended to develop a conceptual understanding with material covered.

Training components for which the local hiring agency has major responsibility are:

1. Communications
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>Training components</th>
<th>Delivery agency</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - L</td>
<td>Leadership theory</td>
<td>University (U)</td>
<td>Read, lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Local (L)</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Administration</td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community involvement</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; behavioral analysis</td>
<td>University (U)</td>
<td>Read, discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Community coordination</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Leadership theory</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Group processes</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Read, internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinating</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; behavioral analysis</td>
<td>University (U)</td>
<td>Read, discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - L</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - H</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Demonstrating leadership</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Leadership theory</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Group processes</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Read, internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Finance</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; behavioral analysis</td>
<td>University (U)</td>
<td>Read, discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - L</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personnel management</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; behavioral analysis</td>
<td>University (U)</td>
<td>Read, discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Group processes</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Read, internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Personnel management</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Planning</td>
<td>Conceptual - L</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; behavioral analysis</td>
<td>University (U)</td>
<td>Read, discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Group processes</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Read, internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Programming</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; behavioral analysis</td>
<td>University (U)</td>
<td>Read, discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Public relations</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; behavioral analysis</td>
<td>University (U)</td>
<td>Read, discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Recruiting</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Surveying</td>
<td>Conceptual - L</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Read, lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Survey practice</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Training</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Learning theory</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Lecture, discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Psychology, sociology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Management
3. Public relations
4. Programming
5. Community coordination
6. Group processes
7. Finance
8. Personnel management
9. Survey practice

Method of instruction utilized by the local hiring agency is the internship. It is recommended that the internship be made up of two parts: (1) an intensive two-week training experience at the National Center for Community Education in Flint or, at a university based Community Education Development Center and (2) four one-week internship experiences with different Community School Directors. Ideally, the internship should be augmented by work experience with a Community School Director for fifteen to twenty hours a week.

In terms of credit hours, it is recommended that four semester credit hours be devoted to organizational and behavioral analysis, three semester credit hours be granted for the internship experiences, and that two semester credit hours be granted for each of the listed: leadership theory, sociology, psychology and learning theory.

**Leadership training model II**

Intent of the Leadership Training Model for Community School Director II (see Table II) is to prepare the participant for full-time responsibility as a Community School Director. Seventeen
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>Training components</th>
<th>Delivery agency</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - L</td>
<td>Leadership theory</td>
<td>University (U)</td>
<td>Read, discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Administration</td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Local (L)</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community involvement</td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Human relations training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Institutional coordination</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; behavioral analysis</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Student research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Community coordination</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinating</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Leadership theory</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, student research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Colloquium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Group processes</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Laboratory approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>School law</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - L</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Demonstrating leadership</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Colloquium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Personnel management</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; behavioral analysis</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Student research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Group processes</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Laboratory approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Finance</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Colloquium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - H</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Individualized instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Colloquium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Personnel management</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; behavioral analysis</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Student research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Group processes</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Laboratory approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Planning</td>
<td>Conceptual - L</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; behavioral analysis</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Student research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching, workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Programming</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Human relations training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - L</td>
<td>Surveying</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Individualized instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Survey practice</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Public relations</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Research evaluation</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Computer assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Psychology, sociology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Colloquium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Recruiting</td>
<td>Conceptual - L</td>
<td>Surveying</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Individualized instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Human relations training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Surveying</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Research evaluation</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Computer assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Psychology, sociology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Colloquium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Training</td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Learning theory</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Tutoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
training components are listed. Training components for which the university has prime responsibility are:

1. Leadership theory
2. Communications
3. Sociology
4. Psychology
5. Public relations
6. Organizational and behavioral analysis
7. Group processes
8. School law
9. Finance
10. Surveying
11. Research and evaluation

The local hiring agency has either prime or shared responsibility for the training components listed below:

1. Management
2. Institutional coordination
3. Community coordination
4. Personnel management
5. Programming
6. Evaluation
7. Survey practice
8. Learning theory

Three methods of instruction are used in this training model at the local level. A combination of coaching and workshop is used for evaluation while tutoring is the method used for learning theory.
Coaching is used for the following: management, institutional coordination, community coordination, personnel management, programming and survey practice.

Training components falling under the direction of the university expand on the methods of instruction used in the Leadership Training Model I by adding: case study, human relations training, student research, colloquium, laboratory approach, individualized instructional programs and computer-assisted instruction. In the Leadership Training Model I primary focus was on the development of conceptual skills. In the Leadership Training Model II conceptual skills receive attention, but greater emphasis is placed on the human and technical skills.

In terms of semester credit hours awarded for each training component in this leadership training model the following recommendations are made:

1. Two semester hours of credit be granted
   a. Leadership theory
   b. Communications
   c. Sociology
   d. Psychology
   e. Public relations
   f. Group processes
   g. Finance
   h. School law

2. Three semester hours of credit be granted for a course which combines surveying, research and evaluation and which requires student research in organizational and behavioral analysis.
In addition to the training program outlined in Leadership Training Model II it is recommended that the participant be employed as a half-time Community School Director while either working half-time in another capacity for the employing agency or studying at the university.

Leadership training model III

Leadership Training Model for Community School Director III is intended to enhance the competencies of the Community School Director so that he would be in a position to help develop other aspirants to the Community School Directorship and to broaden the participant in preparation for additional responsibilities such as those required of a Community School Coordinator who directs and supervises the activities of a number of Community School Directors.

During this phase of the training program, it is assumed that the participant is employed full time as a Community School Director.

Fourteen training components are used in Leadership Training Model III (see Table 12). Those falling under direction of the university include:

1. Management
2. Sociology
3. Public relations
4. Organizational and behavioral analysis
5. Psychology
6. Personnel management
7. Research and evaluation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>Training components</th>
<th>Delivery agency</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill-mix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - L</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>University (U)</td>
<td>Read, case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Local (L)</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Administration</td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Simulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Clinical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Clinical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Institutional coordination</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; behavioral analysis</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Team research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement</td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Community coordination</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Laboratory approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Demonstrating</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership</td>
<td>Human - L</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - H</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Personnel management</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, discussion, case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personnel</td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management</td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Personnel management</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; behavioral analysis</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Team research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Group processes</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Planning</td>
<td>Conceptual - L</td>
<td>Research &amp; evaluation</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Team research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Team research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Clinical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Public relations</td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Recruiting</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Surveying</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Research &amp; evaluation</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Team research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Psychology, sociology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Clinical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Survey research</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Team research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Training</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Team research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The local hiring agency has either prime or shared responsibility for the training components below:

1. Communications
2. Institutional coordination
3. Community coordination
4. Management
5. Finance
6. Personnel management
7. Organizational and behavioral analysis
8. Group processes
9. Programming
10. Evaluation
11. Public relations
12. Surveying

Two methods of instruction are employed at the local level. Team research is the method used for organizational and behavioral analysis, evaluation and survey research. Coaching is the method used for the remaining nine training components. Methods of instruction used for training components at the university level are: team research for organizational and behavioral analysis and research and evaluation; clinical for sociology and public relations; reading and case study for management; clinical and laboratory approach for psychology; and reading, discussion and case study for personnel management.

In terms of semester credit hours awarded for each training component in this leadership training model the following recommen-
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dations are made:

1. Two semester hours of credit
   a. Sociology
   b. Public relations
   c. Organizational and behavioral analysis
   d. Psychology
   e. Personnel management
   f. Research and evaluation

2. Three semester hours of credit for management

   Evaluation

   In keeping with the final objective of this study, provision was made for the evaluation of the Leadership Training Model for Community School Directors. To meet this need two steps were required: (1) identification of a panel of experts to critique the model and (2) development of an evaluation instrument.

   Selection of the panel of experts was based primarily on input received from Training and Dissemination Director Dr. Doug Procunier of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation (see Appendix A). Recommended by Procunier were community education pioneer Dr. Ernest O. Melby and the twenty-three Community Education Center Directors and Community Education Cooperating Center Directors. Added to the list by the author were three other community educators: Professor Emeritus Dr. Maurice Seay, Western Michigan University; Immediate Past President Dr. Donald C. Weaver, National Community School Education Association; and Assistant Center Director Mr. George Wood,
Western Michigan University.

Evaluation instrument for the model (see Appendix B) was based on the objectives stated earlier in the chapter. The evaluation instrument was either presented or mailed to each of the twenty-six panel members. Their responses were compiled and appear in the critique of the model found in Chapter VI. Following the critique is a response by the author.
CHAPTER VI

CRITIQUE OF THE LEADERSHIP TRAINING MODEL
FOR COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIRECTORS
AND RESPONSE TO THE CRITIQUE

Proposed in this study is a strategy for training Community School Directors. This strategy in the form of a model was presented in Chapter V. The model emanated from a review of research and literature pertaining to leaders and includes training practices selected from business and education. Taken into account in this model are the functions, competencies and training needs of the Community School Director combined with a recommended delivery system and attendant methods of instruction which are designed for the development and refinement of those professional skills thought necessary for those functioning optimally in the position of Community School Director. The model provides for progression through a series of three levels of proficiency and thus outlines a training program for persons entering with no previous professional experience in community education and prepares them to function either as fully functioning Community School Directors or as coordinators of community education activities of an entire district.

Direction for this study was provided by the goal and six objectives which are re-stated below. The goal of this study was to develop a Leadership Training Model for Community School Directors which is based on a review of research and literature pertaining to leaders. Specific attributes desired for this model as well as the evaluation of the model are stated in the following objectives:
1. To identify the major functions of the Community School Director.

2. To recommend an approach for training the Community School Director.

3. To identify the major training needs of the Community School Director and to incorporate them into the training model.

4. To identify and propose a delivery system which could be: (1) used to fulfill the training needs of the Community School Director, and (2) operationalized by existing training institutions.

5. To identify and propose methods of instruction appropriate for developing the Community School Director to specific levels of competency.

6. To provide for the evaluation of the model based on the objectives stated above.

The Leadership Training Model for Community School Directors was constructed by using the objectives as guidelines. Provision for the evaluation of the model was called for in the last objective. An evaluation instrument was constructed (see Appendix B) and was forwarded to a panel of twenty-seven experts in the field of community education as explained in Chapter V. The critique of the model is based on the responses elicited from this panel.

Critique of the Model

Twenty-four of the twenty-seven evaluation instruments were returned for a yield of eighty-eight percent. Respondents appeared to be generally supportive of the Leadership Training Model for Community School Directors (see Table 13). Most support was given item one where twenty-two respondents agreed that the major functions of the Community School Director were included in the model. Those
TABLE 13
RESPONSES TO INSTRUMENT ITEMS CONCERNING THE ACCEPTABILITY
OF ASPECTS OF THE LEADERSHIP TRAINING MODEL
FOR COMMUNITY SCHOOL DIRECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives and Instrument Items</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1:</strong> To identify the major functions of the Community School Director. Item: Agree with the functions that are listed.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2:</strong> To recommend an approach for training the Community School Director which is based on the competencies required for that position. Item: Agree with the skill-mix given for each item.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 3:</strong> To identify the major training needs of the Community School Director and to incorporate them (training components) into the model. Item: The major training needs are listed.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 4:</strong> To identify and propose a delivery system which could be: (1) used to fulfill the needs of the Community School Director, and (2) operationalized by existing training institutions. Item: a. The delivery system could be used to fulfill the training needs of the Community School Director. b. The training program could be generally operationalized in various communities.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 5:</strong> To identify and propose methods of instruction appropriate for developing the Community School Director to specific levels of competency. Item: The methods of instruction are appropriate as listed.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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endorsing item one did so by an eleven-to-one margin. Least support was given item two, which still was accepted by fifteen respondents. By nearly a two-to-one ratio the respondents agreed with the competencies skill-mix given for each item. Responses received for each item on the evaluation instrument will be reviewed under the objective to which it pertains. This will be followed by an overall reaction to the model from individual panel members.

Objective #1

The first objective of the study was to identify the major functions of the Community School Director. Of the twenty-four panel members who responded twenty-two agreed that the major functions of the Community School Director are listed in the models (I, II, III) (see Appendix B). One respondent disagreed with the functions as listed and recommended that several functions could be combined (i.e., administration and demonstrating leadership; community involvement, public relations, recruiting and surveying; programming and coordination). Another respondent neither agreed nor disagreed with the functions but did make the following suggestion: "I'm not sure that the twelve (functions) are all inclusive. One possibility would be to develop the program under five headings: planning, organizing, staffing, directing and controlling."

In regard to functions that should be added one respondent felt that evaluation should be included as a function while another recommended the inclusion of cross-cultural training.
Objective #2

The second objective of this study was to recommend an approach for training the Community School Director which is based on the competencies required for that position. Fifteen respondents agreed with the skill-mix given for each item, eight disagreed and one did not mark the item on the instrument. Three respondents who indicated that they disagreed with the skill-mix suggested between one and three changes. One respondent who agreed that the skill-mix given for each item made the following observation: "Really, I think the skill-mix is an arbitrary thing and of questionable value."

Of the changes recommended in the competency skill-mix, two or more respondents suggested the following changes (see Table 14).

Objective #3

The third objective of this study was to identify the major training needs of the Community School Director and to incorporate them into the model. Twenty of the respondents agreed that the major training needs of the Community School Director are listed in the model, two disagreed, and two neither agreed or disagreed.

Training needs which respondents felt should be added are:

1. Orientation to political science
2. Maintaining personal health and family relations while holding a demanding position
3. Community Education theory and development
4. Philosophy
5. Orientation to the role of change agent.
### TABLE 14

**CHANGES NEEDED IN THE COMPETENCIES SKILL-MIX AS ADJUDGED BY TWO OR MORE RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Proposed Competencies skill-mix</th>
<th>Recommended change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Administration</strong></td>
<td>Conceptual - L</td>
<td>6 M, 1 H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>2 H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Community involvement</strong></td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>2 H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>2 H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Demonstrating leadership</strong></td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>2 H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>3 H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Finance</strong></td>
<td>Technical - H</td>
<td>1 L, 1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Personnel management</strong></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>2 H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Planning</strong></td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>3 H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Public relations</strong></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>3 H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Surveying</strong></td>
<td>Conceptual - L</td>
<td>4 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is possible that some training needs were not listed in the model and that further consideration should be given to other needs (e.g., political science, Community education theory and development).

Objective #4

The fourth objective of this study was to identify and propose a delivery system which could be: (1) used to fulfill the training needs of the Community School Director and (2) operationalized by existing institutions. Over seventy percent of the respondents agreed with both parts of the objective. Comments made by panel members seemed to both support and question this aspect of the training model.

It should be re-emphasized that the major components of the delivery system do exist in or reasonably near each community. It should further be emphasized that the university provides the advantages of having specialized personnel and resources that can do much to facilitate the professional training of the Community School Director. The local hiring agency has the advantage of having personnel and resources which could be used to supplement those of the university. In addition, the local hiring agency provides direct access for the application and refinement of skills needed by the Community School Director. Additionally, those cooperating in the internship program, and those coaching and evaluating participants also benefit by having their skills enhanced. Undoubtedly problems will arise from the use of this joint delivery system, but the advantages should far outweigh the disadvantages.
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it is simply not reliable. It may be possible to arrange with a school district for set periods of inservice training provided through the university.

8. Local educational agencies should assume the responsibility of providing adequate experiences to back up university input.

9. I am not sure that the system is so mutually exclusive.

10. Good mixture. Strong internships are good.

Eighteen of the respondents agreed that the training program could be generally operationalized in various communities while four disagreed and two abstained. A comment made in reference to this item reads: "Whether or not the program will be operationalized depends on the location of the community in relation with the university."

Objective #5

The fifth objective of this study was to identify and propose methods of instruction appropriate for developing the Community School Director to specific levels of competency. Seventeen respondents agreed with the methods of instruction. Three disagreed and four others neither approved or disapproved.

Few changes in the methods of instruction were recommended:

1. No recognition of monthly seminars for exchange of ideas, etc.

2. Coaching is an effective technique. Why not a larger component of coaching for Community School Director I and II?

3. Add: video tape, audio tape, development of resource files and other practical aids.

4. I prefer seminars to lectures.

5. Add simulation to psychology.

Additional comments were made in regard to objective number five. Six respondents felt that the methods of instruction should be defined. Four specifically stated that they were confused by the
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term "coaching." Another assumed that the methods of instruction have a broad definition.

Overall reaction

An overall reaction to the model was expressed by each of the respondents. A majority reacted positively to the model. Comments are listed below.

1. Wow! I'm not sure that I had a complete understanding. We'll have to discuss it some time.

2. Good, but would ask that you consider what differences exist between community school directors and community education coordinators. If none, then I think community education coordinator is the better term.

3. We are happy to put our signature of approval on the proposal you have.

4. Good. You have an excellent idea. Are you sure a degree is necessary? You may have some arbitrary requirements. Can training requirements be put on performance terms? I'd like to see more emphasis on goal setting for a community and methods of evaluation. This is the best approach I've seen to date. I commend you on your approach.

5. I feel it is very good. We're attempting to incorporate many elements into our program. There just is an awful lot to try to include in one program.

6. The approach has merit. The format for obtaining information is difficult to respond to because of definitions and generalizations.

7. Suggest you delete Community School Director II. See no special need for such detailed training (I, II, III). See Community School Director I as the front-line worker and Community School Director III as a district-wide coordinator.

8. Looks like a good tool. I'll be glad to see the results of the survey.

9. The fact that there was no definition of a Community School Director troubled me because it seemed to take for granted
the original connotation of a building level director with a physical education background. If this leadership training model is something that will be a universal model, there would need to be more flexibility to provide for different (and developing) organizational patterns.

10. Good. This was difficult for me to analyze and internalize. I'm not sure I agree with the entry level requirements. You did not identify the difference in expectations/responsibilities for Community School Director (I, II, III) so I don't know whether the entry level requirements are reasonable or not. I'm never sure that successful teaching experience means anything in our field.

11. Excellent.

12. I get the impression that this model goes from practice to theory. Practice is excellent; however, there must be a framework within which you may work. Take a theory in which you believe and put it into practice to see if it is a good theory.

As I understand it, it needs a great deal of re-working. Levels and duties are not necessarily compatible. I'm not sure a building level coordinator must have all these skills to the degree indicated. Someone in the "system" should have these skills; however, no need for duplication of efforts.

13. Looks like a sound package. Obviously, interpretation is the critical point.

14. I am sorry, but the model you have asked me to respond to is one that doesn't have any meaning for me and consequently, I cannot respond.

15. I really like this. If implemented, it should take care of our training needs.

16. It serves the purpose of being a good modeling exercise and like most modeling exercises it conceives the world in normative terms on a pretty linear basis. Does not appear to allow a whole lot of flexibility (i.e., individual differences); appears to be highly degree-oriented; does not indicate how much or how little training might better be done by other campus units (i.e., sociology, political science, etc.). Seems to connote a strong College of Education basis; assumes that all these competencies can be interpreted into some type of functional, holistic approach in the field; does not speak to the issue of assessment of competence; (i.e., does the trainee's
behavior in the field reflect his/her familiarity/understanding); assumes either/or relationship of the delivery system: possibly a combination of each in many cases.

Did I miss the part where there is a strong input for Community Education theory? I suspect that if one really understands "why" then some of the "how's" will be easy!

Attempting to analyze anything this complex through correspondence, particularly when there needs to be so very many common definitions of terms is indeed difficult. Hopefully you will have some opportunity to discuss this firsthand with some members of your panel as we might be giving similar or different answers to different things! I suspect this is why so many "conceptual models" are presented graphically so people can deal with as few abstractions as possible. Perhaps this says something for the need for high-level communications skill in this crazy, exciting business.

17. I strongly disagree with a basic assumption for entry level requirement of one year of successful teaching. Teaching should not be a major criteria for entry.

18. It is a good base to launch a program. It has to be flexible enough to individualize. The most controversial areas are delivery and methods.

19. It is a good first step in putting all of the training elements into one model. I think its success in application would depend heavily upon the manner in which the training components and methods were actually translated into classes and personal experiences.

20. I have checked "yes" because the listings seem so reasonable. You've presented a beautiful plan.

21. Good, badly needed!

22. I have several reservations about the design of the model; questioning the design, I am more than a little skeptical about the significance of your findings.

23. Mixed. Why three training levels? Makes a complicated evaluation of your work even more complicated. Your work is a great start and will provide a springboard for discussion and a basis for developing training programs.

24. A great step in the right direction. We are concerned about the entry level requirements, specifically for Level I. We currently have some outstanding Community School Directors...
who do not have the bachelor's degree and we have numerous Community School Directors doing a good job who do not have a year of teaching experience. We sometimes seriously question whether teaching experience is helpful.

Response to the Critique

Those asked to respond to the Leadership Training Model for Community School Directors had a formidable task. Not only were the panel members asked to respond to a complicated set of documents, but they were asked to do so without benefit of direct communication. Their task was further complicated because of the nature of community education and the existing state of the field of leadership. Not only is the concept of community education relatively new where generally accepted definition of terms is lacking, but the role of Community School Director is an even more recent and emerging phenomenon. Further complicating matters is the fact that the field of leadership has yet to adopt common definition of terms, develop a taxonomy of leadership, or even reach agreement on the best approaches for training and developing leaders.

Despite these handicaps and despite the difficulty of the task, over eighty-eight percent of the panel members responded to the evaluation instrument. The majority of the respondents appeared to be supportive of the model. However, there were a number of comments and suggestions made in regard to the model. Response to the critique from the panel members will be made on an objective-by-objective basis. This will be followed by a response to general comments made by the panel members.
Objective #1

The first objective of this study was to identify the major functions of the Community School Director. Since almost ninety percent of the respondents agreed that the major functions of the Community School Director are listed, it can be assumed that this objective was reasonably well met. However, further consideration should be given to the possible inclusion of other functions (e.g., evaluation). It may also be possible to consolidate some of the functions and thereby streamline the model and simplify the training program.

Objective #2

The second objective was to recommend an approach for training the Community School Director which is based on the competencies required for that position. Over sixty percent of the respondents agreed with the skill-mix given for each item. However, on the basis of the changes recommended by a number of respondents and on the basis of a number of comments made in regard to this aspect of the model, it appears that further clarification of the meaning and the intent of this aspect of the model would have been helpful.

Objective #3

The third objective of this study was to identify the major training needs of the Community School Director and to incorporate them (training components) into the model. Over eighty percent of the respondents agreed that the major training needs are listed.
It is possible that some training needs were not listed in the model and that further consideration should be given to other needs (e.g., political science, Community education theory and development).

**Objective #4**

The fourth objective of this study was to identify and propose a delivery system which could be: (1) used to fulfill the training needs of the Community School Director and (2) operationalized by existing institutions. Over seventy percent of the respondents agreed with both parts of the objective. Comments made by panel members seemed to both support and question this aspect of the training model.

It should be re-emphasized that the major components of the delivery system do exist in or reasonably near each community.

It should further be emphasized that the university provides the advantages of having specialized personnel and resources that can do much to facilitate the professional training of the Community School Director. The local hiring agency has the advantage of having personnel and resources which could be used to supplement those of the university. In addition, the local hiring agency provides direct access for the application and refinement of skills needed by the Community School Director. Additionally those cooperating in the internship program, and with coaching and evaluating participants also benefit by having their skills enhanced. Undoubtedly problems will arise from the use of this joint delivery system, but the advantages should far outweigh the disadvantages.
Objective #5

The fifth objective of this study was to identify and propose methods of instruction appropriate for developing the Community School Director to specific levels of competency. Again over seventy percent of the respondents agreed that the methods of instruction are appropriate as listed in the model. One-fourth of the respondents felt that the methods of instruction should have been defined while others recommended minor changes and one suggested additional training methods. Had the methods of instruction been more clearly defined and a more complete rationale provided for their use been included in the instrument, reaction to this aspect of the model would probably have been even more positive.

General comments

A number of general comments seemed to revolve around: (1) entry level requirements, (2) the degree orientation of the program, (3) semantics and (4) the complicated nature of the model. Drawing some concern was the entry level requirement that an entrant have at least one year of successful teaching experience or its equivalent. Rationale for inclusion of this requirement is two-fold. The teaching requirement serves as a screening device and helps to insure that those entering this field do have an interest in people and are somewhat skilled at working with them. More importantly, the primary physical and financial resources with which the Community School Director has had access in the past and will most likely have access to in the future come from the school system. Education in
itself is a unique profession. If a Community School Director is going to operate optimally, he will necessarily have to know how to work effectively within the educational milieu.

Secondly, it is true that this leadership training program is somewhat degree oriented. The entrant is expected to have at minimum a bachelor's degree and by the time the program is completed the individual is expected to have earned at least fifteen hours beyond the master's degree. Again, this orientation does make some provision for screening individuals in an effort to insure the quality and motivation of participants, but it does more. The orientation toward degrees and university credit hours also places some parameters on the leadership training program; it provides for a greater assurance of quality control than possibly would be present otherwise; and it provides encouragement for the active participation of the university in the training program since the generation of credit hours is one of its measures of success.

The problem of semantics was a third area that appeared to concern some respondents. Clarification of terms and access to the related literature on which this study is based would have facilitated understanding of the model. But even more ideally would have been an action-group approach to working on the model where the panel of experts could meet face-to-face over a period of time to resolve problems pertaining to semantics and various aspects of the model.

Finally some respondents felt that the Leadership Training Model for Community School Directors was too complicated. It is true that the model is complicated and does require considerable
time and effort to understand. However, given a better understanding of the terminology used in the model and given the opportunity for personal interaction with others about the model, this frustration could have been greatly reduced.

Recommendations

It is recognized that this leadership training model is a beginning, but that much remains to be done before the leadership training program which it espouses can be operationalized. With this understanding, the following recommendations are made.

1. That the model undergo further refinement.
2. That the model be validated.
3. That the model be operationalized and evaluated through the use of longitudinal studies.

In order to carry out the first recommendation it is suggested that a panel of experts who are actively interested in this approach for training Community School Directors review this study in its entirety and then come together for a period of time to refine the model. The model could then be validated in a number of ways. Perhaps the most straightforward would be to operationalize it either under the auspices of the National Center for Community Education in Flint, Michigan or under the auspices of a Community Education Development Center at one of the universities. After further review and refinement then the model could be implemented in a number of university settings and evaluated through the use of longitudinal studies.
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APPENDIX A

THE PANEL
February 5, 1973

Mr. Deke Johnson  
Community School Development Center  
Western Michigan University  
3314 Sangren Hall  
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001

Dear Deke:

May I suggest that you use the Center Directors and Cooperating Center Directors as your panel of experts. They should know more about training leadership for community education than any other group. Please find enclosed a list of their names and addresses.

If you want to add to this group, I would highly recommend Dr. Ernest O. Melby, Florida Atlantic University, College of Education, Boca Raton, Florida 33432. Ernest is one of the few living pioneers in the community education business.

I hope this satisfies your needs. If it doesn't, let me know.

Sincerely,

Doug Brocunier, Ph.D.  
Director  
Training and Dissemination  

DP:kr  
Enclosures (2)
ALMA COLLEGE
Mr. Hugh Rohrer, Director
Regional Center for
Community Education
Alma College
Alma, Michigan 48801

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
Dr. Thomas H. Mayhew,
Coordinator
Southwest Regional Center for
Community School Development
415 Farmer Education Building
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85281

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY
Dr. Joseph S. Rawlings,
Director
Institute for Community
Education Development
Office of Extended Services
Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana 47306

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY
Dr. Israel C. Heaton, Director
Regional Center for Community
School Development
281 Richards Building
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah 84601

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY,
SAN JOSE
Dr. Tony S. Carrillo, Director
California Center for Community
School Development
School of Education, Room 423
California State University,
San Jose
San Jose, California 95114

EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
Dr. Jack D. Minzey, Director
Center for Community Education
101 Boone Hall
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY
Dr. Robert E. Cheek, Director
Center for Community Education
College of Education
Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton, Florida 33432

NORTHERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
Mr. John Garber, Director
Center for Community Education
Learning Resources 2-A
Northern Michigan University
Marquette, Michigan 49855

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY
Dr. Robert I. Berridge, Director
Center for Community Education
203A Bolton Hall
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas 77843

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
Dr. Delbert H. Long, Director
Center for Community Education
School of Education, Univ. College
University Station
University of Alabama in
Birmingham
Birmingham, Alabama 35294
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
Dr. Roland G. Frank, Director
Northeast Community Education
Development Center
U-142
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut 06268

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI
Dr. Everette Nance, Director
Midwest Community Education
Development Center
School of Education, 506
University of Missouri
8001 Natural Bridge Road
St. Louis, Missouri 63121

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
Mr. Larry Horyna, Director
Northwest Community Education
Development Center
1736 Moss Street
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA
Dr. Larry Decker, Director
Mid-Atlantic Center for Community
Education
164 Rugby Road
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
Dr. Gerald C. Martin, Director
Community School Development
Center
3421 Sangren Hall
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>California State University Northridge</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Carroll Lang, Director</td>
<td>Cooperating Center for Community School Development, School of Education, Dept. of Admin. &amp; Supervision, Cal. State University, Northridge, California 91324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of St. Thomas</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Thomas L. Fish, Director</td>
<td>Community Education Center, College of St. Thomas, Box 4004, 2115 Summit Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota 55105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colorado State University</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Charles Porter, Director</td>
<td>Community Education Center, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miami University</strong></td>
<td>Dr. James R. Showkeir, Director</td>
<td>Cooperating Center for Community Education Development, 352 McGuffey Hall, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio 45056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Montclair State College</strong></td>
<td>Miss Suzanne Fletcher, Director</td>
<td>Community Education Development Center, Montclair State College, 14 Normal Avenue, Upper Montclair, N. J. 07043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Florida</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Phillip Clark, Director</td>
<td>Center for Community Education, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Georgia</strong></td>
<td>Dr. David Mullen, Director</td>
<td>Community Education Center, College of Education, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Vermont</strong></td>
<td>Dr. William Bright, II, Director</td>
<td>Community Education Development Center, College of Education, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont 05401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You have been recommended as one who is eminently qualified to serve as a member of a panel of experts concerning the training of Community School Directors. You are invited to examine the enclosed Leadership Training Model of Community School Directors and then to comment concerning your reaction to the model. Your attention to this model and your reaction to it is asked.

You are aware that the Community Education movement is experiencing rapid growth. Two indicators of this growth are: (1) the number of new Community Education centers which are being strategically located in various universities throughout the country, and (2) the growing number of school districts which are implementing and operating Community Education programs.

It has been demonstrated that the vitality and the continued success of Community Education programs depends in a large measure on the skills and abilities of a relatively new professional, the Community School Director. Demand for these new professionals who are well-trained corresponds with the growth of the Community Education movement. Because of this demand, it appears that there is need for the refinement and expansion of the delivery system for training Community School Directors.

The enclosed leadership training model is an approach which could be used to meet this need. This model is an extension of research done by Past NCSEA President Dr. Donald C. Weaver and other studies in Community Education and will be used to meet the requirements for a doctoral degree. The proposed model calls for the close cooperation of the local hiring agency and the university in training Community School Directors.

Because of your knowledge and experience concerning the training needs and the training of Community School Directors and because of the important role you would play upon the implementation of a model like this, you are asked to review the following pages which outline the training program. Then, on the attached sheet, you are invited to critique the model. Positive and/or negative remarks are welcome.
Upon return of your remarks, your critique will be compiled and then incorporated with those from the other panel members. Should you like to have a copy of the resulting feedback, I will be most happy to share it with you.

It would be especially helpful to me if you would mail your critique no later than March 14.

Thank you! Your cooperation is much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Deke Johnson
Appended to this page are single copies of each of the following:
1. Leadership Training Model for Community School Director I
2. Leadership Training Model for Community School Director II
3. Leadership Training Model for Community School Director III
4. Evaluation form

Please read the following directions and explanation before reacting to items 1-3 above.

Directions

Evaluate the leadership training models (I, II, III) on the basis of the objectives stated below. Write your reactions on each of the models and/or on the evaluation form. Feel free to make both positive and negative remarks. Return the critique of the model in the envelope which has been enclosed for your convenience.

Explanation

Goal and objectives. The goal of this study was to develop a Leadership Training Model for Community School Directors based on a review of research and literature pertaining to leaders. Specific attributes desired for this model are specified in the following objectives:
1. To identify the major functions of the Community School Director.
2. To recommend an approach for training the Community School Director which is based on the competencies required for that position.
3. To identify the major training needs of the Community School Director and to incorporate them into the training model.
4. To identify and propose a delivery system which could be: (1) used to fulfill the training needs of the Community School Director, and (2) operationalized by existing training institutions.
5. To identify and propose methods of instruction appropriate for developing the Community School Director to specific levels of competency.

Entry level requirements. Entry level requirements for each training level are as follows:
1. Community School Director I - Bachelor's degree and at least one year of successful teaching experience.
2. Community School Director II - Bachelor's degree plus fifteen semester hours of work and successful completion of the requirements for Level I.
3. Community School Director III - Master's degree and successful completion of the requirements for Level II.

Competency levels. Competency levels are the levels of learning proficiency that each participant is expected to demonstrate upon completion of each training level (e.g., familiarity, understanding, application).

Functions. Functions are the twelve major components of the role of the Community School Director as identified from a review of the research and literature pertaining to his role.

(Continued on next page)
**Competencies skill-mix.** Competencies are based on a combination of conceptual, human and technical skills that are required to fulfill a leadership function. The letters that follow the skills (L, M, H) represent the words "low," "medium," and "high." They represent the proportion of each skill required in relation with the others in that set (e.g., administration requires a relatively low proportion of conceptual skills and a moderate degree of human and technical skills. Translated into percentages it would read: conceptual skills - 20%, human skills - 40% and technical skills 40%).

**Training components.** Seventeen training needs of the Community School Director were gleaned from a review of the literature. These components were placed in the model to develop specific skills to perform certain functions.

**Delivery agency.** Delivery agency as used in this study refers to the agency with prime responsibility for a training component of the model. Two such were used: the university and the local employing agency (typically the local school district). The university and the hiring agency must cooperate with each other to insure the success of the training program. The Community Education Development Center at each university is expected to play a key role in this effort.

**Methods.** This term refers to methods of instruction. Twenty methods were selected for use in the model based on their apparent effectiveness in developing given skills to a given level of competency (e.g., reading has been found effective in developing conceptual skills at the familiarity level of competency).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>Training components</th>
<th>Delivery agency</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill-mix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Administration</td>
<td>Conceptual - L</td>
<td>Leadership theory</td>
<td>University (U)</td>
<td>Read, lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Local (L)</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community involvement</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinating</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; behavioral anal.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Demonstrating leadership</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Leadership theory</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Group processes</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Read, internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Finance</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; behavioral anal.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - L</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - H</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personnel management</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Personnel management</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Planning</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; behavioral anal.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Group processes</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Read, internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Programming</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; behavioral anal.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Public relations</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Recruiting</td>
<td>Conceptual - L</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Read, lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Surveying</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Learning theory</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Lecture, discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M</td>
<td>Psychology, sociology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Training</td>
<td>Conceptual - L</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functions</td>
<td>Competencies</td>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill-mix</td>
<td>Training components</td>
<td>agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - L</td>
<td>Leadership theory</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>M Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, lecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Administration</td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community involvement</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>M Public relations</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Human relations tng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Institutional coordination</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>M Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinating</td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Community coordination</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Leadership theory</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, student rsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>M Psychology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Colloquim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Demonstrating leadership</td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Group processes</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Laboratory approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>L Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>M Psychology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Colloquim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>M Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; behavioral anal.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Student research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>M Group processes</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Laboratory approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Planning</td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - L</td>
<td>Organizational &amp; behavioral anal.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Student research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>M Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>M Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Public relations</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Read, discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>M Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Recruiting</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>M Public relations</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Human relations tng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Surveying</td>
<td>Conceptual - L</td>
<td>Surveying</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Individualized instr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>M Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Survey practice</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Training</td>
<td>Conceptual - M</td>
<td>Research evaluation</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Computer assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>M Psychology, sociology</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Colloquim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M</td>
<td>Learning theory</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functions</td>
<td>Competencies</td>
<td>Training components</td>
<td>Delivery agency</td>
<td>Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Administration</td>
<td>Conceptual - L Management</td>
<td>Human - M Communications</td>
<td>Technical - M Management</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M Communications</td>
<td>Technical - M Management</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M Public relations</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M Institutional coordination</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual - M Organizational &amp; behavioral anal.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Team research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordinating</td>
<td>Human - M Communications</td>
<td>Technical - M Community coordination</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Demonstrating leadership</td>
<td>Conceptual - M Management</td>
<td>Human - M Psychology</td>
<td>Technical - M Management</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Laboratory approach</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M Management</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personnel management</td>
<td>Conceptual - M Personnel management</td>
<td>Human - M Communications</td>
<td>Technical - M Personnel management</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M Personnel management</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M Programming</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Programming</td>
<td>Conceptual - L Research &amp; evaluation</td>
<td>Human - M Communications</td>
<td>Technical - M Evaluation</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Public relations</td>
<td>Conceptual - M Public relations</td>
<td>Human - M Communications</td>
<td>Technical - M Public relations</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M Public relations</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Recruiting</td>
<td>Conceptual - M Management</td>
<td>Human - M Public relations</td>
<td>Technical - M Communications</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human - M Public relations</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Surveying</td>
<td>Conceptual - L Survey research</td>
<td>Human - M Communications</td>
<td>Technical - M Survey research</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Training</td>
<td>Conceptual - M Research &amp; evaluation</td>
<td>Human - M Psychology, sociology</td>
<td>Technical - M Evaluation</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical - M Evaluation</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Team research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATION FORM

In addition to making notations on this form, please feel free to indicate your reactions to the various aspects of the leadership training models (I, II, III).

1. Objective 1: To identify the major functions of the Community School Director.
   a. I agree with the functions that are listed: ___yes, ___no.
   b. I feel that the following functions should be deleted: ____________________________
   c. I feel that the following functions should be added: ____________________________

2. Objective 2: To recommend an approach for training the Community School Director which is based on the competencies required for that position.
   a. I agree with the skill-mix given for each item: ___yes, ___no.
   b. I feel that the following should be changed (make changes which you feel are appropriate on the models I, II, III): ____________________________

3. Objective 3: To identify the major training needs of the Community School Director and to incorporate them (training components) into the model.
   a. I agree that the major training needs are listed: ___yes, ___no.
   b. I feel that the following training needs should be added: ____________________________
   c. I feel that the following training needs are not appropriate: ____________________________

4. Objective 4: To identify and propose a delivery system which could be: (1) used to fulfill the training needs of the Community School Director, and (2) operationalized by existing training institutions.
   a. The delivery system could be used to fulfill the training needs of the Community School Director ___yes, ___no.
   b. I feel that the training program could be generally operationalized in various communities: ___yes, ___no.
   c. Comments: ____________________________

5. Objective 5: To identify and propose methods of instruction appropriate for developing the Community School Director to specific levels of competency.
   a. I agree that the methods of instruction are appropriate as listed: ___yes, ___no.
   b. I feel that the following should be changed (make changes which you feel are appropriate on the models I, II, III): ____________________________

6. My overall reaction to the Leadership Training Model for Community School Directors is: ____________________________
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