

Administrative Leadership, Change, and Training Programs for Administrators

Peter Coleman

simon fraser university

Leadership focusing on change and development in organizations is rare. Transforming leadership, which develops shared goals and values, and transactional leadership, which seeks compromise and consensus, are both necessary for organizational change. A case study of a long-term attempt to introduce change in a school district, related to teacher evaluation policies and procedures, illustrates that even relatively careful long-range planning of a change, and considerable concern for transactional leadership, can be only modestly successful in practice, for a variety of situational reasons. This conception of leadership, and the case study, support some assertions regarding training programs. These typically fail to address themselves to transforming leadership, and particularly the ethical and value elements which are its most important feature.

Il est rare de rencontrer une type de leadership à la fois orienté vers le changement et le développement des organisations. La réalisation de changements au sein des organisations requiert tant un leadership axé sur le développement des valeurs et des objectifs communs qu'un leadership transactionnel c.a.d. plus orienté vers les compromis et les consensus. Une étude de cas effectuée dans une région scolaire portant sur des tentatives de modification à long terme de politiques et de procédés relatifs à l'évaluation des enseignants a montré que malgré une planification minutieuse et à long terme d'un changement et d'un souci constant d'assurer un leadership transactionnel on ne peut qu'espérer des résultats modestes pour toutes sortes de raisons circonstancielles. Cette conception du leadership et l'approche de l'étude de cas semblent confirmer certaines affirmations concernant les programmes d'études. Ceux-ci négligent de prendre en considération, dans la formation des leaders, la dimension de changement dont les valeurs et les aspects d'ordre éthique en sont les aspects les plus importants.

There are two main sources for information on the appropriate content of training programs: the "real work" of administrators provides one set of information, and scholarly inquiry provides a second set, which overlaps considerably but which often concerns itself with what administrators ought to do, and is critical of the "real" work. Wolcott's (1973) now famous ethnographic study of a principal illustrates the "real" work, as does Mintzberg's (1973) concurrent and much broader examination of administrators generally.

This paper will suggest that administrative leadership focusing on change is essential but uncommon, that it has transforming and transactional components (Burns, 1978), and that training programs should do more to develop such leadership.

LEADERSHIP IN ORGANIZATIONS

The notion of leadership as being primarily concerned with development

is not new. It is one of the basic propositions of Selznick's classic analysis of institutional leadership (1957, p. 24). It has recently been reasserted in Burns' massive survey of political leadership as an historical phenomenon. Burns distinguishes two kinds of leadership, transactional and transforming: the first parallels social exchange theory (see, e.g., Jacobs, 1974), the second is far more potent and leads to Burns' major conclusions: "political leadership is tested by the extent of real and intended change achieved by leaders' interactions with followers through the use of their power bases. Political leadership is *broadly intended 'real change'*. It is *collectively purposeful causation*" (1978, p. 434).

This conception of transforming leadership, based on impressive historical scholarship, can be considered an extension of Barnard's description, based on his experience in industry:

Leadership is the power of individuals to inspire cooperative personal decision by creating faith: faith in common understanding, faith in probability of success, faith in the ultimate satisfaction of personal motives, faith in the integrity of objective authority, faith in the superiority of common purpose as a personal aim of those who partake in it. (1972, p. 259)

A recent philosophical analysis arrives at a somewhat similar notion, suggesting that current understandings of leadership, which focus on "consideration, production emphasis, and situational factors," ignore a critical fourth dimension, the "morality that exists within the leader" (Barnard's phrase) which "can become subtly externalized, contributing to the administrative phenomena of legitimacy, credibility, and even charisma" (Hodgkinson, 1978, p. 179).

Organizational research on leadership has traditionally concerned itself with influence, the relationship between leaders and followers (see Campbell, 1977, p. 223; Jacobs, 1974, p. 194), and particularly with leadership as initiating change (Lipham, 1964, p. 122). But careful analyses of the work of administrators do not find much evidence that leadership of this kind is common. For example, Mintzberg describes the leader role as one of ten managerial roles, the one which defines "the manager's relations with subordinates" (1973, p. 56). Leadership also seems relatively rare in the work of educational administrators: a well-known study of how elementary school principals performed administrative tasks showed that "no factor clearly recognizable as *leadership* appeared in the analysis of principals' work" (Hemphill, 1964, p. 191). A similar study of superintendents found that of 671 interactions with others, only three per cent seemed to involve "the leadership dimension of initiating structure" (Lipham, 1964, p. 136).

Recent work seems to confirm these views. Wolcott's (1973) ethnographic study of the principalship in California suggests a reactive and spontaneous style of activity, with many brief interactions with others, and very few planned and deliberate interactions. Duignan's (1979) observa-

tion study of the superintendency in Alberta, Canada, arrived at very similar conclusions. The administrator is influenced by others rather than engaged in deliberate attempts to control events. Such activities are probably instances of Burns' transactional leadership which concerns itself with maintaining the organization through disturbance handling, resource allocation, negotiations, and information dissemination (see Mintzberg, 1973), and is common.

Transforming leadership, in which a leader "recognizes and exploits an existing need or demand," looks beyond that for potential motives and higher needs, and creates "a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation," (Burns, 1979, p. 4) is very rare. The case study which follows examines change in a school district with reference to these two types of leadership.

A CASE STUDY IN CHANGE IN A SCHOOL DISTRICT

In 1972, an administrator holding a recent doctorate in educational administration wrote a paper which maintained that it would be possible to improve the aggregate quality of instruction in a school district by a carefully planned, long-term process of change (Coleman, 1973; 1977). The proposal was based on two main and optimistic assumptions: one, that teacher behaviour could be changed; and two, that a set of research findings on teacher effectiveness, well-founded enough to guide practice, existed.

The proposal identified four desirable teacher behaviours – "warmth," "indirectness," "cognitive organization," and "enthusiasm." They were chosen because they had been found effective by empirical research, and could be measured and learned. They were to provide evaluative data to support teacher selection, development, and retention/release decisions. Table 1 summarizes the way in which these four dimensions were to be used.

The proposal further envisaged that teacher supervision and evaluation would be carried out by superintendents and assistant superintendents who would not require extensive training, that in-service programs would be based on needs identified by supervisors since teachers would not be aware of their deficiencies, and that the development of instruments, the planning and provision of in-service programs, and the fully informed release of the weakest staff members would all require a five-year commitment.

A review of the 1979 version of the Teacher Evaluation Handbook of the school district in which the administrator concerned tried to implement the scheme shows that there are very substantial differences between the plan and the reality. First, the dimensions of teacher behaviour used had changed, as had the instruments developed.

In addition to these changes, major shifts had to be made to accommo-

TABLE 1
*The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness: An Administrative Model
(Initial Version)*

<i>Dimension of Teacher Behaviour</i>	<i>Instruments</i>	<i>Decision Area</i>
Warmth	Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory	Selection
	Student Rating	Development
Indirectness	Flanders Interaction Analysis	Development; Retention/ Release
Cognitive	Verbal I.Q.	Selection
Development	University transcripts	Selection
	Explaining	Development
Enthusiasm	Enthusiasm	Development; Retention/ Release
	At Task	Development; Retention/ Release

date the views and needs of district staff in the proposal. First, teacher evaluation was the responsibility of the principals. As a consequence, extensive training in the use of, for example, interaction analysis (which later proved too time-consuming to be useful) and in other observation instruments and methods became necessary.

None of the various instruments developed was universally satisfactory, although an *At Task* observation system was particularly popular amongst elementary principals. The most powerful tool developed was certainly the *Teacher Behavior Inventory*.¹ This student rating of teachers was found to identify with some precision two major dimensions of teacher behaviour, *work* and *stimulation*, which students from Grade 4 to 12 found important. Factor loadings suggest a high degree of validity for the two constructs, and ratings of the same teacher by different students suggest a high degree of stability for the teacher behaviours identified.

Another related change was the provision that a "second opinion" could be sought from another supervisor, either from the central office or another school in certain cases, as for example, when a tenured teacher was under intensive supervision (i.e., had been adversely reported on previously). This shift was proposed and strongly advocated by some principals.

Second, a great deal of time and energy was spent in discussions with administrators, attempting to overcome rather generalized hostility to any evaluation system and focussed scepticism about the dimensions of

TABLE 2

*The Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness:
An Administrative Model (Post-Implementation Version)*

<i>Dimension of Teacher Behaviour</i>	<i>Instruments</i>	<i>Decision Area</i>
Clarity (incorporating behavioural measures of indirectness, explaining, and questioning) (Gage, 1971; Borg et al., 1970; Popham and Baker, 1973)	Clarity Observation Record; <i>Teacher Behaviour Inventory</i> (student rating)	Development: Mini-course I, Effective Questioning; Mini-course IX, Higher Cognitive Questioning; How to Explain Manual. Retention/Release
Enthusiasm (Rosenshine, 1970)	<i>Teacher Behaviour Inventory</i> ; Enthusiasm Observation Record	Development: series of observations. Retention/Release
Task Orientation (Jackson, 1968)	“At task” Observation Record; <i>Teacher Behaviour Inventory</i>	Retention/Release
Variability (Kounin, 1977; Rosenshine & Furst, 1971)	Variability Observation Record; <i>Teacher Behaviour Inventory</i>	Development: Series of Observations. Retention/Release
Opportunity to Learn (Fisher et al., 1978)	Academic Learning Time Observation Record	Development: Series of Observations Retention/Release
Classroom Management (Kounin, 1977)	Classroom Management Observation Record	Development: Classroom Management Program, Utah State. Retention/Release

teacher effectiveness proposed. There remains some real uneasiness about the extent to which the six dimensions “explain” the variance between good and bad teachers. This is, of course, justified in view of the nature of some of the supporting research.

Third, the administrative procedures surrounding the policy required considerable attention. Concerns about the clinical supervision process deadlines and reporting forms, a formal Board policy statement, and appeal system all had to be recognized, since no policy existed. All of this work had necessarily to be carried on in consultation with the local association of teachers, as well as the administrators.

The policy development process itself was subjected to an external evaluation (Levin, 1980), which demonstrated that the policy was not well-known amongst teachers, and was not viewed as being particularly significant. It seems very likely that the major effort made to develop the policy in consultation with principals was in part misguided, in that it assumed a high degree of consultation between principals and their staff which was not in fact taking place.

The 1979 policy statement reflected what was learned by proposing an ongoing evaluation of the policy, to take one or more of the following forms:

1. to evaluate the extent of administrator compliance with the policy by reviewing the evaluation reports;
2. to estimate changes in the overall quality of teaching by use of the *Teacher Behaviour Inventory* with a 20% random sample of teachers each spring;
3. to keep a record of the releases, resignations, promotions, and commendations made as a consequence of the policy;
4. to assess the quality of clinical supervision by checking a random sample of teacher records to see if recommendations for improvement were followed up by principals and supervisors;
5. to assess the extent to which professional development referrals were followed up by teachers through attendance at school or Teacher Centre workshops and seminars, or other professional development activities;
6. to conduct a replication of the M.E.R.C. interview (Levin) study, to assess changes in teacher and administrator attitudes to the policy;
7. to use some additional items in the Teacher Attitude Survey to assess changes in attitudes towards the policy.

This concern with the impact of the policy is roughly congruent (unwittingly) with Wergin's Organizational Policy Evaluation Model, which involves such propositions as: "successful policies are those which are built upon a broad base of political support" and must be evaluated politically (1976, p. 94).

Fourth, some considerable developmental work in provisions for teacher in-service had to be carried on, since no formal provisions existed. A Teacher Centre was developed to conduct professional development activities (Coleman, 1975), and a careful search for appropriate activities carried on (Coleman, 1976). A formal needs assessment based on teacher identification of needs was developed to guide activities of the Teacher Centre, which was conceived as a teacher-governed centre, rather than as an arm of administration.

Fifth, the original proposal envisaged a five-year implementation process, and the eventual process took six years. However, the original proposal did not emphasize sufficiently the amount of commitment and

energy required. The process consumed many hundreds of hours of administrator time, and a great deal of energy. In fact, work output is an important ingredient in effective leadership, on the evidence of this case study (see Lundberg, 1978, p. 80).

This case study illustrates three major problems for administrators which might help to explain why leadership is relatively rare. The first concerns the content of change: the original paper proposed several research findings as the basis for measures of effective teaching; the eventual handbook reveals major shifts in these measures, based on updated research findings. Yet even these adjustments may be inadequate now. A recent critique of research by colleagues suggests that the "questioning" component of "clarity" is not in fact reliably associated with enhanced learning (Winne and Marx, 1979, p. 222). But a Minicourse of Effective Questioning (Borg et al., 1970) is one of the main programs in use by the Teacher Centre for professional development.

However, a 1979 summary of research on instructional variables would support clarity, flexibility (variability), enthusiasm, the components of classroom management, opportunity to learn (time on learning), and task orientation quite strongly, suggesting that the focus, as amended, is reasonably sound (Wahlberg et al., 1979, p. 180).

A concern with the correlates of student achievement is of critical importance for administrators, and should guide those major elements of their work involving programs and personnel, including evaluation. (Coleman, 1978, argues this at length and provides a tentative model of these correlates.) Erickson considers a linkage between organizational research and production-function research to be possible, and to constitute a major paradigm shift (1977, p. 137). Yet production-function research is generally not yet an adequate guide for policy making (Benson, 1979).

The second major problem is suggested in the previous discussion of leadership. This policy shift was threatening to the comfortable mediocrity which is the normal state of some unconscientious professionals in any school district. Consequently it required transforming leadership to bring about a renewed commitment to the service ethic, and "a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation." Because this quality was differentially available amongst the eighteen principals, the use of the principals as school-level proponents of the policy shift was a major limitation. This might suggest that the school is the appropriate level for change efforts, rather than the school district, and many accounts of educational change do focus on school-level implementation (see, e.g., Charters, 1973). Yet even at school level change is slow and uncertain.

We find that even when all parties concerned support some desirable change in current practice, perhaps the introduction of a new program, or the development of a new instructional methodology, its implementation often requires several years and is only moderately satisfactory. For

example, a case study reported by Gross, Giacquinta, and Berstein (1971) found that an innovation not resisted by members of a school staff was only minimally adopted, because of teacher misunderstanding, lack of motivation, and lack of required capabilities, and because of shortage of required materials and incompatibility of other organizational arrangements with the innovation.

The third major problem is the extent to which change is unplannable. Of the five major shifts made in the proposed evaluation system, the first can be seen as an adaptation to local circumstances, and the second as overcoming resistance to change, common enough in the planned change literature (see, e.g., Klein, 1969). The third, the policy implementation and review activity, could presumably have been foreseen, but was not. It illustrates the current importance of the political paradigm in educational organizations, with its emphases on policy development, conflict resolution, and bargaining (Sergiovanni, 1977). Transactional leadership styles become essential for the success of the policy shift at this point.

The fourth shift, the Teacher Centre, was a major developmental activity which became at least as significant as the original planned activity. This illustrates the systems basis of organizations; one cannot change any major aspect of an organization without causing adjustments elsewhere. Often solving one problem creates two more (see Runkel et al., 1978, p. 100, for discussion). It is extremely unlikely that any plan for change could be so comprehensive as to foresee all, or even most, of the major consequences. However, Runkel's advice is nonetheless valid: those planning change should "try to anticipate problems that may emerge later by examining a reasonable part of the larger net of variables in which the immediate problem may be embedded" (1978, p. 104).

The fifth major shift suggests that change requires persistence. Given the high degree of mobility of senior administrators, and the extent to which proficiency in superficiality is a defining characteristic of managers (Mintzberg, 1973), the probability of the kind of relatively long-term effort suggested in the original proposal (Coleman, 1973), and described here, is relatively low.

This case study illustrates a few of the reasons why change is slow in education, and why examples of educational leadership have been hard to find, even in very large-scale studies such as Hemphill's (1964). However, it has also suggested that the planned change and organizational development literatures are useful for would-be transforming leaders, and that transactional leadership is an essential part of any change process. Some implications of the above for training programs for administrators can now be suggested.

TRAINING EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

In a previous paper I summarized existing views and proposed that the

main functions of administrators were the definition of organizational goals and purposes, the co-ordination of activities, and the management of the organization/environment exchange system (Coleman, 1972, p. 57). A program of studies based on these functions was proposed. Subsequent experience suggests some necessary modifications, clarifications, and elaborations, summarized in Table 3. The first row deals with purposes, rows 2, 3, 4, and 7 focus on co-ordination of activities, and rows 5 and 6 deal with external affairs.

The first column, drawn from Gross (1964), is based on a matrix of purposes for any organization, modified for educational organizations; it purports to be inclusive. The second column suggests some of the relevant fields of knowledge from which potential administrators need to draw information and concepts. Column three lists what appear to be desirable skills. This list follows March (1974) fairly closely. Column four lists main areas of application in school district operations, and column five lists appropriate administrator roles, based on Mintzberg's (1973) analysis.

Such a chart probably encompasses most of what is currently taught in programs in educational administration (see Friesen et al., 1979, for an international survey). However, the leader role occurs infrequently in the final column, and the type of leadership required is largely transactional. There seems little room for an emphasis on transforming leadership and developmental activity of the type described in the case study. Yet such leadership is imperative at certain stages in the life of an organization (Selznick, 1957). Change implementation must then be added to the three functions previously described – goal definition, co-ordination, and liaison.

Most importantly, the moral element of transforming leadership, the ability "to relate leadership behavior ... to a set of reasoned, relatively explicit, conscious values" (Burns, 1978, p. 46), must be considered. In the case study, the "improvement of aggregate teaching effectiveness" was the explicit purpose, but no attempt was made to assert the underlying value, that conscientious professionals *ought* to seek constantly to improve the quality of service available to clients. Miklos comments that "ethical and moral considerations are more pervasive in administrative decision-making action than is reflected by scholarly activity ... and by the substance of preparation programs" (1978).

There are two dimensions of organizational activity in which value considerations are particularly important, for somewhat different reasons. Goal setting may often be explicitly linked to social values, since goals serve to legitimate the organization (Etzioni, 1964, p. 5). Additionally, goal setting may be conceived as a process of mutual influence, on the grounds that "leadership is possible only in the context of shared goals" (Griffiths, 1977, p. 407). This process can be conceived as purely transactional if organizations are only "the perceived social reality within

TABLE 3
Proposed content of training programs for educational administrators

<i>Organizational Purposes (based on Gross, 1964)</i>	<i>Field of Knowledge</i>	<i>Desirable Skills and Abilities (based on March, 1974)</i>	<i>Area of Application</i>	<i>Managerial Role (based on Mintzberg, 1973)</i>
1. Satisfaction of Human Interests; Goals and Purposes	Philosophy and History of Education	Purpose-defining	Developing Goals, Purposes and Objectives	Resource-allocator (for setting priorities)
2. Production of Services; Programs & Instruction	Learning Theory; Research on Teaching; Program Evaluation; Testing & Measurement	Information Processing; Group Problem Solving	Program Development; Teacher Development; District Evaluation	Entrepreneur; Monitor & Disseminator of Information; Leader
3. Efficiency of Resource Use; Time, Money, Facilities	Management (PPBS)	Technical Decision-making Skills; Financial Management	Timetabling; Budgeting; Buildings	Resource-allocator; Monitor
4. Investment in Viability; Student Participation; Teacher Commitment; Community Support	Organizational Development; Survey Research; Small-group Interaction; Organizational Communications	Communication Skills (oral and written); Management of Meetings; Group Problem Solving	District Evaluation; Student Services	Disturbance handler (for coping with conflict); Spokesman; Disseminator

TABLE 3 (concluded)

<i>Organizational Purposes (based on Gross, 1964)</i>	<i>Field of Knowledge</i>	<i>Desirable Skills and Abilities (based on March, 1974)</i>	<i>Area of Application</i>	<i>Managerial Role (based on Mintzberg, 1973)</i>
5. Mobilization of Resources; Financial Support; Staff Recruitment; Political Support	Personnel Selection; Educational Finance; Politics of Education	Interviewing; Decision Making and Conflict Management	Grants & Budgeting; Staffing; School Board Affairs	Negotiator; Liaison (with outside organizations); Spokesman
6. Observance of Codes; Legal Requirements; Policy Provisions; Professional Codes	School Law; Policy Development; Sociology of Professions	Communication Skills (reading comprehension); Information Processing	School Board Policy Making; Administrative Procedures	Negotiator; Figure-head (for ceremonial purposes)
7. Rationality in Administrative Processes	Organizational Theory	Communication Skills; Time Management	General Administration	Monitor; Disseminator

which individuals make decisions" (Greenfield, 1973). Organizational goals then can best be seen as the outcome of a series of bargains and trade-offs arrived at by organizational members and (sometimes) clients. Because these trade-offs and agreements are themselves unstable, organizational goals may change quite rapidly. Then transactional leadership is essential.

However, mutual goal setting can be seen as an exercise in transforming leadership, in which the value component is a belief in participatory decision making as a vitally important characteristic of professional bureaucracies (Mintzberg, 1979). In the case study the failure to explicate the value base of the proposed policy shift and the nature of the changes which occurred suggest a largely transactional notion of leadership.

There is some real doubt that universities can develop leaders. March (1974) proposes that a university program in educational administration should attempt to teach only skills that are useful, will be used, and can be taught. Additionally, March maintains that university-based training programs should focus on preparing administrators for aspects of their work with strong intellectual components, since this is the proper domain of the university. He identifies five important analytical skills, already incorporated in the chart, although in somewhat different terms.

The commitment to transforming leadership, identified here as critically important, probably does not fall into the category of things which can be taught in university settings. Hodgkinson argues convincingly that the value dimension of administration is vitally important to combat widespread pathologies; his solution, that "administrative pathology is the disease of which philosophy can be the cure" (1978, p. 170), is less convincing (although see Miklos, 1978). A clinical experience element, in which students were able to observe superior exemplars of transforming and transactional leadership might be the best way of providing leadership training of this kind.

In addition, selection can substitute for training (Etzioni, 1959). Griffiths (1977) proposes some selection criteria, including personality variables, based on recent research. But if transforming leadership is sought, with its strong moral element, an as yet unexplored selection process becomes necessary, in which prospective administrators are screened in terms of value criteria (Miklos, 1978).

The following are proposed as the basis for a detailed program of study: the analysis of organizational purposes; relevant fields of knowledge; desirable skills and abilities; areas of application and related managerial roles; a general orientation to both transforming and transactional leadership, as opposed to administration; and a realistic notion of how to change organizations. Questions regarding specific topics to be taught, the appropriate sequence, and the methods to be used are not addressed here.

If administrators are to become leaders it will be as a consequence of

improved training programs, which should in our current state of decline be aimed at practicing as well as prospective administrators. Enough is known about leadership in educational organizations, and the tasks of administrators, to reform training programs. What is required has just been described – sustained attention to the task by energetic, change-oriented people in Faculties of Education, operating as transforming and transactional leaders.

NOTE

¹ Copies of the *Teacher Behavior Inventory* may be obtained by writing the author.

REFERENCES

- Barnard, C. I., *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Benson, C. *The economics of public education*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1979.
- Borg, W. R., Kelley, M. L., Langer, P., & Gall, M. *The minicourse: A microteaching approach to teacher education*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Macmillan Educational Services, 1970.
- Burns, J. M. *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.
- Campbell, J. P. The cutting edge of leadership: An overview. In J. G. Hunt and L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1977, 221–233.
- Charters, W. W. Jr. *Measuring the implementation of differentiated staffing*. Eugene, Oregon: CASEA, 1973.
- Coleman, P. The future role of the school administrator. *Interchange*, 1972, 3(4), 53–64.
- Coleman, P. The improvement of aggregate teaching effectiveness in a school district. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 1973, 9(3), 28–45. Reprinted in Borich, G. *The appraisal of teaching*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1977.
- Coleman, P. The teacher centre and educational renewal. *Manitoba Journal of Education*, 1975, 10(1), 39–44.
- Coleman, P. *Professional development: A status report*. A paper presented at the Work-Study Symposium, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Thunder Bay, Ontario, April, 1976.
- Coleman, P. Une recette d'apprentissage: Administrator accountability and the correlates of student achievement. A paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Quebec Association of School Administrators, April, 1978. ED 161 167.
- Duignan, P. The nature of a superintendent's work. A paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Canadian Association for Studies in Education Administration, Saskatoon, June, 1979.
- Erickson, D. A. An overdue paradigm shift in educational administration, or how can we get that idiot off the freeway? In L. L. Cunningham, W. G. Hack, & R. O. Nystrand, *Educational administration: The developing decades*. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1977, pp. 119–144.
- Etzioni, A. Organizational Control Structure. In J. G. March (Ed.), *Handbook of organizations*. Chicago: Rand, McNally, 1959, pp. 650–677.
- Etzioni, A. *Modern Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1964.

- Fisher, C. W., et al. *Teaching behaviors, academic learning time and student achievement: Final report of phase III-B, beginning teacher evaluation study*. San Francisco, Calif.: The Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1978.
- Friesen, D., Farine, A., & Meek, J. C. *Educational administration: A comparative view*. Edmonton, Alberta: University of Alberta, 1979.
- Gage, N. L. The Microcriterion. In Ian Westbury, & Arno A. Bellack, *Research into classroom Processes: Recent developments and next steps*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1971, pp. 175-181.
- Greenfield, T. B. Organizations as social inventions: Rethinking assumptions about change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 1973, 9(5), 551-574, Washington, D.C.: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science.
- Griffiths, D. E. Preparation programs for administrators. In L. L. Cunningham, W. G. Hack, & R. O. Nystrand, *Educational administration: The developing decades*. Berkeley, McCutchan, 1977, pp. 401-437.
- Gross, B. M. *The managing of organizations: The administrative struggle*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.
- Gross, N., Giacquinta, J. B., & Berstein, M. *Implementing organizational innovations: A sociological analysis of planned educational change*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1971.
- Hemphill, J.K. Personal variables and administrative styles. In *Behavioral science and educational administration*. Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1964, pp. 178-198.
- Hodgkinson, C. *Towards a philosophy of administration*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1978.
- Jackson, P. *Life in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.
- Jacobs, T. O. Leadership and social exchange. In K. W. Tilley, (Ed.), *Leadership and management appraisal*. London: The English Universities Press Ltd., 1974, pp. 193-210.
- Klein, D. Some notes on the dynamics of resistance to change: The defender role. In W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne, & R. Chin (Eds.), *The planning of change* (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969, pp. 498-506.
- Kounin, J. S. *Discipline and group management in classrooms*. Huntington, N.Y.: Robert E. Drieger Publishing Company, 1977.
- Levin, B. A constructivist approach to the study of teacher evaluation. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Canadian Association for Studies in Education Administration, Montréal, 1980.
- Lipham, J. M. Leadership and administration. In *Behavioral science and educational administration*. Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1964, 119-141.
- Lundberg, C. The unreported leadership research of Dr. G. Hypothetical: Six variables in need of recognition. In Morgan W. McCall, Jr., & Michael M. Lombardo (Eds.), *Leadership: Where else can we go?* Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1978, 65-83.
- March, J. G. Analytical skills and the university training of educational administrators. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 1974, 17-44.
- Miklos, E. Ethical aspects of administrative action: Implications for research and preparation. *Administrator's Notebook*, 1978, 26(5).
- Mintzberg, H. *The nature of managerial work*. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
- Mintzberg, H. *The structure of organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1979.
- Popham, W. J., & Baker, E. L. *Administrator's guidebook*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.
- Rosenshine, B. Enthusiastic teaching: A research review. *School review*, 78, 1970, 499-512.

- Rosenshine, B., & Furst, N. Research on teacher performance criteria. In B. O. Smith (Ed.), *Research in teacher education: A symposium*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971, pp. 37-72.
- Runkel, P. J., Schmuck, R. A., Arends, J.H., & Francisco, R. P. *Transforming the school's capacity for problem solving*. Eugene, Oregon: Centre for Educational Policy and Management, 1978.
- Selznick, P. *Leadership in administration*. Evanston, Ill.: Row Peterson & Co., 1957.
- Sergiovanni, T. Rational, bureaucratic, collegial, & political views of the principal's role. *Theory into Practice*, 1977, 18(1), 12-20.
- Wahlberg, H., Schiller, D., & Haertel, G. The quiet revolution in educational research. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1979, 61(3), 179-183.
- Wergin, J. The evaluation of organizational policy making: A political model. *Review of Educational Research*, 1976, 46(1), 75-115.
- Winne, P. H., & Marx, R. W. Perceptual Problem Solving. In P. L. Peterson, & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Research on teaching: Concepts, findings, and implications*. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1979, pp. 210-230.
- Wolcott, H. F. *The man in the principal's office: An ethnography*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Peter Coleman is an Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia V5A 1S6.