INFORMATION TO USERS

While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted. For example:

- Manuscript pages may have indistinct print. In such cases, the best available copy has been filmed.

- Manuscripts may not always be complete. In such cases, a note will indicate that it is not possible to obtain missing pages.

- Copyrighted material may have been removed from the manuscript. In such cases, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, and charts) are photographed by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is also filmed as one exposure and is available, for an additional charge, as a standard 35mm slide or as a 17"x 23" black and white photographic print.

Most photographs reproduce acceptably on positive microfilm or microfiche but lack the clarity on xerographic copies made from the microfilm. For an additional charge, 35mm slides of 6"x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography.

Jacobson, Barbara J.

PREDICTORS OF SUCCESS FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

The University of Nebraska - Lincoln   ED.D.   1986

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark __√__.

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____

2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____

3. Photographs with dark background _____

4. Illustrations are poor copy _____

5. Pages with black marks, not original copy _____

6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____

7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages __L___

8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____

9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____

10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____

11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.

12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.

13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.

14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____

15. Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received _____

16. Other_____

_____

_____

PREDICTORS OF SUCCESS

FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

by

Barbara J. Jacobson

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College in the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Education

Major: Interdepartmental Area of

Administration, Curriculum & Instruction

Under the Supervision of Professor Ward Sybouts

Lincoln, Nebraska

December, 1986

TITLE

Predictors of Success for

School Administrators

BY

Barbara J. Jacobson

APPROVED	DATE
Dr. Ward Sybouts	November 17, 1986
Dr. Fred Wendel	November 17, 1986
Dr. Wesley Meierhenry	November 17, 1986
Dr. Alan Seagren	November 17, 1986

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE

GRADUATE COLLEGE   **UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA**

PREDICTORS OF SUCCESS FOR

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

Barbara J. Jacobson, Ed.D.

University of Nebraska, 1986

Adviser: Ward Sybouts

The purpose in conducting this study was to determine if there were relationships between achieving success as a school administrator and the ratings from the NASSP Assessment Center and the course Educational Administration 850 grades and ratings.

The study involved 43 participants who had completed both Educational Administration 850 and the NASSP Assessment Center.

A panel of educational administration experts validated a definition of success. The five elements identified were human relations skills, job performance, goal attainment, job satisfaction and promotion.

Information concerning the elements of success was gathered from the participants and their supervisors through surveys. The participants' grades and ratings were gathered from existing records of the NASSP Assessment Center and Educational Administration 850.

To analyze the data, correlation coefficients and multiple regression were used.

Significant relationships were found among 850 grades and the peer and instructor ratings as well as between 850 grades and three of the seven NASSP

ratings. Instructor and peer ratings from 850 correlated significantly with four of the seven NASSP ratings.

Four of the NASSP ratings were found to correlate significantly with three of the elements of success. However, because of the limited number of correlations, the predictive validity of the Assessment Center is low. No predictive validity was found between the success elements and 850 grades and ratings.

In the selection process of school administrators, information from the NASSP Assessment Center and formal training has been used. These two experiences can provide relevant information about the potential administrator's strengths and weaknesses. However, the ability to predict success from these sources is limited.

Until success can be defined more accurately, predictors will continue to be difficult to determine. Therefore, multiple sources of information must be used in order to select successful school administrators.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the mid 1970s leaders of the American educational system experienced a lack of public confidence. Declining student achievement as well as complaints by employers and parents about a lack of basic skills in young people led to the widespread belief that the educational system was not doing an adequate job of preparing the youth of the nation. This disenchantment continued into the 1980s and has been documented in approximately 30 national reports on educational reform. Most of these reports concluded that excellence must be found and returned to the schools.[1]

From the National Commission of Excellence in Education report, Goldberg gleaned five areas which needed to be altered in order to re-establish excellence in our educational system.[2] One of the areas identified by Goldberg as crucial for providing quality education was leadership. The principal and superintendent were recognized as people of central importance who needed to address the issues and make the necessary changes. If reform is to take place, change must occur and change requires effective leadership.

---

[1]Patricia K. Cross, "The Rising Tide of School Reform Reports," Phi Delta Kappan, 66 (1984), 167-172.

[2]Milton Goldberg, "The Essential Points of a Nation at Risk," Educational Leadership, 41 (1984), 15-16.

The school administrator's role is becoming increasingly complex. With court decisions, legislative activity, teacher militancy and voter negativism, the school administrator's role has expanded. With the increased complexity, researchers have begun to identify the characteristics which make a school administrator effective.

Several characteristics have been identified as essential for an effective school administrator. The effective school administrator should demonstrate competence as an instructional leader by emphasizing achievement, setting instructional strategies and evaluating pupil progress.[3,4] The administrator who established goals and placed expectations upon staff and students was perceived as more successful than those who were seen as having lower or limited expectations.[5,6,7] Administrators perceived as effective were actively involved

---

[3]Phillip Hallinger, et. al, "School Effectiveness: Identifying the Specific Practices, Behaviors for Principals," NASSP Bulletin, 67, No. 643 (1983), 42-51.

[4]James Sweeny, "Research Synthesis on Effective School Leadership," Educational Leadership, 39 (1982), 346-352.

[5]Hallinger, et. al., pp. 42-51.

[6]Thomas Sergiovanni, "Leadership and Excellence in Schooling," Educational Leadership, 41, No. 5 (1984), 4-13.

[7]David L. Clark and Linda S. Lotto, A Delphi Analysis of the Instructionally Effective School, School Finance Project, (Cambridge: National Institute of Education, 1983).

in the supervision of staff.[8] They were also morale builders who provided a climate in which teachers and students could work.[9, 10]

Strong administrative leadership was identified by Edmonds as essential to an effective school.[11] Authors of a number of studies identifying effective schools agreed with Edmonds' conclusion about the importance of administrative leadership.[12]

As researchers identified characteristics which distinguished an effective school administrator, the trainers of future and present administrators need to examine their preparation process. In the literature, training for administrators has been classified into two phases, that of preservice and inservice.

Preservice training needs to focus on administrative and management theory. The importance of formal training was pointed out by Stanton.[13] He stated that academic study of school administration was the basis for decision-making. Administrators needed a theoretical background to be adequately equipped to make relevant decisions and to be able to justify and implement them.

---

[8]Michael Cohen and Lorri A. Manassee, "Effective Principal," School Administrator, 39, No. 10 (1982), 14-16.

[9]Hallinger, et. al., pp. 42-51.

[10]Keith Goldhammer, Elementary Principals and Their Schools, (Eugene: University of Oregon, 1971), pp. 1-15.

[11]Roland Edmonds, "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor," Educational Leadership, 37 (1979), 15-23.

[12]Michael Cohen, "Effective Schools: Accumulating Research Findings," American Education, 18, No. 1 (1982), 13-16.

[13]Michael Stanton, "Issues in the Professional Development of Secondary School Principals," Journal of Educational Administration, 18 (1980), 213-223.

Robert Krajewski agreed that administrative theory provided students with an important knowledge base which allowed for better decision-making in the effective operation of a school.[14]

Formal training is no longer sufficient to succeed in the administrative ranks. Administrative inservice is also needed to increase professional and personal effectiveness while increasing organizational effectiveness.[15]

The extent of training, whether preservice or inservice, does not guarantee that person will be an effective administrator. As the number of trained administrators grow, there is a need for leaders in school districts to adopt adequate selection processes. In the past, selection processes for administrators have not always been based on sound management practices. There is little empirical evidence that justified any basis for traditional selection procedures. Variables that have been examined and determined to make no significant difference were type and amount of teaching experience, experience as an assistant or vice principal, the number of graduate hours in educational administration, sex and marital status.[16, 17] Since the assumption that good teachers make good principals can no longer be viewed as an appropriate

[14]Robert J. Krajewski, "Role Effectiveness: Theory Into Practice," Theory Into Practice, 18, No. 1 (1979), 53-58.

[15]James L. Olivero, "Principals and Their Inservice Needs: Facing the Realities of the Situation," Thrust for Educational Leadership, 10 (May 1981), 4.

[16]Neal Gross and R. E. Herriott, "The EPL of Elementary Principals," National Elementary Principal, 45, No. 5 (1966), 66-71.

[17]Alan J. H. Newberry, "What Not to Look for in an Elementary School Principal," National Elementary Principal, 56, No. 4 (1977), 41-44.

administrative selection procedure, appropriate criteria for the selection of school administrators must be identified and used in order to ensure effective leadership.

A selection process that has been developed to help determine effective school administrators is the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Assessment Center. The NASSP Assessment Center was started in 1975. It was developed after extensive interviews with teachers and administrators. Twelve skill dimensions with specific definitions were found to relate to the most important characteristics of successful assistant principals and principals. The skills that are assessed are problem analysis, judgment, organizational ability, decisiveness, leadership, sensitivity, stress tolerance, oral communication, written communication, range of interest, personal motivation and educational values.

In an attempt to determine the possibility of establishing criteria which would identify effective school administrators and then identify indicators that would predict success, this research study was begun. The literature listed a number of criteria that have been used to define occupational success. There was no element which could be identified as the one factor which would determine success. The literature does substantiate that there should be a multi-faceted definition of success.[18]

Formal training and the selection process are both courses of actions for all potential school administrators if they are to reach their goal of becoming an administrator. The University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UN-L) offers Educational

---

[18]Marvin D. Dunnette, "Predictors of Executive Success," in Measuring Executive Effectiveness. ed. Fredric R. Wickert and Dalton E. McFarland (Appleton: Century-Crofts, 1967), 12.

Administration 850 as an introductory course to various administrative processes and educational principles. The NASSP Assessment Center was established on the University of Nebraska-Lincoln campus in 1980 to further aid the selection process.

With the information that was available from the Educational Administration 850 course and the UN-L NASSP Assessment Center, the researcher examined the existing data to determine if there were any relationships that could be found between Educational Administration 850, NASSP Assessment Center results and indicators of success.

Importance of Study

The selection of school administrators is a critical component for the success of schools in the next decades. No longer can school boards select the "good teacher" or the person with the best interview technique to become the principal. Selections must be based upon data about the candidate's skills and abilities that have been identified as essential to a successful school administrator.

In this study existing data about present school administrators were examined to determine if their performance in Educational Administration 850 or the NASSP Assessment Center could have been used to predict success, and, if so, school boards and districts could use these data in making personnel decisions. Potential successful school administrators could be identified and encouraged, while people who are lacking the appropriate skills and abilities could be encouraged to look in other directions for suitable careers.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a relationship between achieving success as a school administrator and any of the following: 1) the ratings from the NASSP Assessment Center, 2) Educational Administration 850 grades and 3) Educational Administration 850 ratings.

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested in this study:

1. There is no significant relationship between Educational Administration 850 grades and Education Administration 850 ratings.

2. There is no significant relationship between NASSP Assessment Center ratings and Educational Administration 850 ratings.

3. There is no significant relationship between NASSP Assessment Center ratings and Educational Administration 850 grades.

4. There is no significant relationship between success as a school administrator and Education Administration 850 grades and ratings and the NASSP Assessment Center ratings.

Definition of Terms

<u>Administrative Training</u> - Branch of educational management with special reference to organization of educational institutions and systems.

<u>Assessment Center</u> - A system used for identifying individual strengths and weaknesses for some specified purpose such as promotion, upgrade, development or placement. The following components are included in an assessment center: a series of characteristics to be measured, a means of measurement which incorporates the use of simulations and an especially trained staff to administer and interpret the behaviors observed.

<u>Competency-based Education</u> - One which trains and tests education students in stated skills in actual or simulated teaching or administrative experiences.

<u>Educational Administration 850</u> - A course that provides instruction in various administrative processes and educational principles for those who wish to assume leadership positions in education.

<u>Educational Administration 850 Ratings</u> - Three different ratings are given to each student taking the course. The ratings are a self-rating, peer rating and a rating by the instructors.

<u>Goal</u> - The end result aimed for in an educational career.

Human Relations Skills - The ability to practice skills in relating oneself to his/her social surroundings.

Inservice Training - Training that focuses on the continuous process of renewal which enables the individual to gain in specific knowledge and skills.

Job Stability - Term applied to a position held for a period of four years by one person.

National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Assessment Center - The NASSP Assessment Center is an approach developed by the NASSP in which potential administrative leaders are identified. The potential leaders participate in a variety of exercises in which their performance is assessed by a trained group of evaluators.

Occupational Success - The elements of success were determined by a panel of experts in educational administration. The five elements of occupational success that were validated were job satisfaction, goal attainment, human relation skills, job performance and promotion.

Performance-based Education - Training which stresses the explicit demonstration of performance as evidence of the various abilities necessary for a certain vocation.

Preservice Training – Formal training which exposes students to skills, knowledge, values and attitudes that are judged to be prerequisites for entrance into the profession.

Promotion – Progress on the career ladder in terms of title or size of school district.

Assumptions

The researcher made the following assumptions which are pertinent to this study:

1. The participants will continue to maintain their skills and abilities demonstrated in the Assessment Center or in the Educational Administration 850 course consistently over a period of time.

2. There is consistency in the NASSP Assessment Center ratings without regard to the assessor or the time period.

3. There is consistency in the Educational Administration 850 grades and ratings without regard to varying instructors or the time period.

4. Positions of the same title will be comparable in job descriptions and responsibilities.

5.   The measurement of success is perceptual data and is difficult to quantify in precise terms. For the purpose of this research study, criteria which was validated by a panel of Educational Administration experts have been quantified.

6.   Success of an educational administrator can be influenced by factors which are related to the specific educational position that is held.

7.   The validated criteria of success are measured by opinion and values and need to be considered as such.

Limitations

1.   This study drew its sample from class records of Educational Administration 850 since 1971 and the NASSP Assessment Center records since its beginning at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln in 1980.

2.   The study was limited to the identified population which responded to the questionnaire.

3.   This study examined only the elements of success that had been identified in the literature and were validated by a panel of experts.

Design of the Study

Participants

The population for this study was drawn from educators who have completed Educational Administration 850 and the NASSP Assessment Center at the

University of Nebraska-Lincoln. There were 60 people who had completed both the NASSP Assessment Center and the Educational Administration 850 course. These students were sent a questionnaire regarding their educational administration career.

Review of Literature

A review of literature was conducted to establish the importance of selecting an effective school administrator. An examination of current training and selection procedures was made in order to ascertain if any relationship existed between selection decisions and gathered data about abilities and skills.

The literature was reviewed in order to determine what elements had been used to define success. A further examination of the literature was done to determine if data about individuals could predict their success as school administrators. Literature concerning assessment centers was also examined to determine what research had been conducted on the validity of predicting success by this method. Educational leadership and efforts to identify traits of successful leaders were examined. A review of the administrative career ladder, mobility and situational leadership was also included.

Instrumentation and Data Collection

An instrument was developed to validate the definition of success of a school administrator. Ten elements of success were identified from the literature as having been developed to define occupational success. A survey was developed using these ten elements of success. A panel of twenty-five experts in the

discipline of educational administration was asked to determine the importance of each element when defining occupational success for a school administrator.

The responses from the panel of experts were analyzed and five elements of occupational success were found to be significant. These five elements were goal attainment, job satisfaction, promotion, human relations skills and job performance.

Two surveys were developed to ascertain the degree that the five elements of occupational success had been achieved by the identified population. The first survey was sent to the identified participants and included questions that related to goal attainment, job satisfaction, and promotion. A second survey was sent to the participants' immediate supervisors asking for their imput on the job performance and the human relations skills of the participants.

Additional data were collected from existing records. The grades and ratings of the Educational Administration 850 course were obtained. The ratings that were used were self-rating, peer-rating and instructor rating. Ratings from the NASSP Assessment Center were also used.

Data Analysis

A bivariate correlation coefficient was calculated to determine if there were relationships between Education Administration 850 grades and ratings, and the NASSP Assessment Center ratings. The level of significance chosen in this study was .05.

The independent variables—Educational Administration grades and peer, instructor and self-ratings and the NASSP Assessment Center ratings—were

analyzed for prediction of success on the dependent variables—job performance, human relations skills, job satisfaction, promotion and goal attainment. A multiple regression was used to analyze the data. The level of significance used in this study was .05.

Organization of the Study

In chapter two, the literature regarding the importance of selecting an effective school administrator was reviewed. An examination of current training and selection procedures was made in order to ascertain if any relationship existed between selection decisions and gathered data about abilities and skills. The literature was also reviewed in order to determine what elements had been used to define success. A further examination of the literature was done to determine if data about individuals could predict their success as school administrators. Literature concerning assessment centers was examined to determine what research had been conducted on the validity of predicting success. Leadership and the factors that affect it were also reviewed.

Chapter three includes a description of the procedures used in this study. A detailed description of the method in which the definition of success was validated as well as how the information relating to the validated elements of each participant was obtained is found. Specific information about the instruments used in the study are included.

In chapter four, the method of analysis of the data is explained. The data are presented and examined with respect to each of the four null hypotheses developed in chapter one.

A summary of the study and the findings of the study are presented in chapter five. Implications for the selection of future school administrators are discussed. Issues and questions raised by the study are posed with recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature reviewed in this chapter has been organized into four sections. The first section contains an examination of current training and selection procedures of school administrators to ascertain if any relationship exists between selection decisions and data about abilities and skills.

The literature in section two concerns the elements used in defining occupational success. A further examination was made to determine if data about individuals can predict their success as a school administrator.

Section three includes a description of the assessment center method of selection and the validity of assessment centers in selecting candidates for administrative positions.

Administrative leadership and the effort to quantify it is the topic of the fourth section. This section includes a review of the administrative career ladder, mobility and situational leadership.

Training and Selection of School Administrators

In the literature, training for administrators has been classified into two phases, preservice and inservice. Preservice or formal training provides students with the skills, knowledge, values and attitudes that are judged to be prerequisites

for entrance into the profession. Upon completion of preservice requirements, students are certified to hold a specified administrative job. Inservice training focuses on the continuous process of growth and renewal which enables an individual to gain in specific knowledge and skills. Preservice and inservice training are essential elements in the growth of an effective school administrator. The course Educational Administration 850, which is one of the variables being examined in this study, is included in the preservice preparation program at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Therefore, the major emphasis in this section of the review of literature will be on preservice training. Inservice training is examined briefly because of its increasingly important role in the development of school administrators.

Preservice Training

In the early days of American education, teachers with no training in administration were given various administrative duties. About 75 years ago, courses in school administration were introduced but usually consisted of the professor's "best practices." Today problems are viewed in a broader context by the use of established principles and practices.

There are approximately 300 colleges and universities which offer at least one graduate degree in educational administration. Four major national trends have been identified that characterize today's preparation programs.

1) Theory based substance drawn from social science disciplines are emphasized.

2) A variety of field experiences in several different settings are used.

3) A number of different instructional materials and methods are employed.

4) Faculties have become more specialized and have fewer generalists with administrative experience and more young scholars with social science backgrounds.[19]

The NASSP has adopted the following position on preparation programs in educational administration:

1) School administrators are accountable for educational leadership.

2) The process of educational leadership, to a considerable extent, may be defined in behavioral terms.

3) The development of educational leadership requires a continuous progress program.

    a) The first step is to identify and incorporate the existing competencies of a trainee upon entry.

    b) Further progress is determined by the achievement of program requirements rather than time requirements.

4) A leadership training program is based on function rather than form or position. However, the two must be interrelated.

5) The leadership training program should be based on relatively open admissions.[20]

---

[19]Robin H. Farquhar and Michael Martin, "New Developments in the Preparation of Educational Leaders," Phi Delta Kappan, 54 (1972), 26-27.

[20]Edgar A. Kelley, et. al., "Planning Preparation Programs," in Continuing the Search, ed. Edgar A. Kelley (Reston: NASSP, 1975), 6.

The AASA Committee for Advancement of School Administrators has recommended that educational administration programs include: 1) an interdisciplinary approach including knowledge from law, business, economics, science and the humanities, 2) studies including the processes of leadership, forms of communication, relationships with a board of education and tools of research and planning, 3) courses focusing on performance based and field experiences including year long internships, and 4) a core of common knowledge and special knowledge for specialization.[21] The recommendations from AASA and NASSP, as well as the national trends, emphasize the blending of theory and knowledge with practical experience.

The need for formal training in administrative theory as well as leadership theory has been suggested by Stanton and Krajewski.[22, 23] Formal training in human relations, the scientific method and organization and community theory are also considered important.[24] Administrative preparation programs should also include courses in school organization and administration, supervision, curriculum development and construction, and evaluation of instruction. These courses should be appropriate to the type and level of responsibility for a particular supervisory position.[25]

---

[21]C.A.S.A., Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators (Arlington: American Association of School Administrators, 1979), 6-9.

[22]Stanton, pp. 213-223.

[23]Krajewski, pp. 53-58.

[24]Allan Rousseau, The Elementary School Principal: What Training and Experience Factors Relate to His Success? (ERIC ED 081 072), 2.

[25]William H. Lucio and John D. McNeil, Supervision in Thought and Action (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979), 50.

In order to meet the demands placed on administrators today, Walton recommended a more creative approach to required coursework be taken. He suggested that prospective administrators' programs include semester seminars in social sciences such as government, public finance and social organization. A year long seminar in administration, a semester in the government of education and a year of literature on education should also be incorporated into the program.[26]

Although theory was identified as an important aspect in the training of school administrators, many have made the argument that preparation for a principal's position should include much field work. Goldhammer stated that two-thirds of the training for a principal should include direct experience in the field and the opportunity to examine the experiences in seminar work.[27] Reviewing preservice training, Cohen and Manassee found that theory was not particularly useful without an experience base in which the theories could be applied. Their research concluded that management behavior could be better learned within the context of the work structure.[28] To acquire behaviors that are consistent with learned theory and concepts, practicing attacking and solving educational problems was important. Educational administration students needed to gain the ability to see the whole picture.[29]

---

[26]John Walton, "The Education of Educational Administrators," in Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives ed. Jack Culbertson and Stephen Hencley (Columbus: University Council for Educational Administration, 1962), 97-100.

[27]Paul L. Houts, "A Conversation with Keith Goldhammer," National Elementary Principal, 53, No. 3 (1974), 27-34.

[28]Cohen and Manassee, pp. 14-16.

[29]Lucio, pp. 56-57.

The NASSP recommended that a preservice preparation program should not only include formal coursework but opportunities for writing and research. Practical experiences such as internships and simulations were emphasized in order that students be able to put theory into practice. Individual counseling and guidance with frequent opportunities for candidates to analyze their goals and objectives and to evaluate their progress should be an integral part of a preparation program.[30]

In a 1981 study, the effect of preservice training was questioned. Experienced principals and superintendents were surveyed to determine what competencies were perceived necessary for prospective principals. Also, they were questioned as to the level of proficiency needed by prospective principals and the most feasible time for demonstrating the competency. The competencies were taken from a list developed by Cook and Van Otten from the University of Utah. Administrators identified a majority of competencies as being learned best through experience. However, these same administrators felt that 80 percent of the competencies should be learned before obtaining an administrative position. Lyons made no conclusions about how to solve the conflict between the preservice coursework and the necessary work experience needed for training an administrator. However, preservice coursework was not viewed as a viable means to acquire competencies.[31]

This conflict described by Lyons continues to be a concern for planners of administrative programs in graduate colleges. Competency-based and

---

[30]Kelley, pp. 12-13.

[31]James E. Lyons, "Competencies Needed by Beginning Secondary School Principals," NASSP Bulletin, 65, No. 446 (1981), 59-66.

performance-based programs have been started in many institutions as a method to deal with the training concerns of theory versus experience. These programs allow students to acquire identified competencies and demonstrate mastery. Simulations, games, case studies, practicuums and administrative internships have all been viewed as important ingredients of these educational administrative training programs.[32, 33]

In examinining the relationships between formal training and subsequent success in administration, Bridges found there was no relationship. The number of years spent in college, the years devoted to graduate study and number of hours in undergraduate education courses were unrelated when judging the effectiveness of an administrator. The relationship was negative when the total number of educational administration courses was compared to the exercise of executive professional leadership. According to Bridges, principals with less extensive formal preparation in educational administration exhibited greater professional leadership. The study also stated that there was little relationship between the mastery of content and the success of being a principal or superintendent. There appeared to be a negative relationship between instructional flexibility of elementary principals and the extent of the principal's preparation in educational administration.[34]

---

[32]Ralph Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Educational Administration: An Introduction (New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., 1983), 14.

[33]Melvin P. Heller, Preparing Educational Leaders: New Challenges and New Perspectives (Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa Foundation, 1974), 35-37.

[34]Edwin Bridges, "Administrative Preparation: A Critical Appraisal," Educational Review, 28 (1975), 34-49.

Elementary principals in Bridges' study attributed their success to experience as a classroom teacher and on-the-job experience. Two percent singled out college preparation as an important determinant for success. In parallel data, junior high principals felt none of the six administration courses they were asked to rate were absolutely essential. Supervision of Instruction was the only course rated as essential by senior high principals.[35] These conclusions were also substantiated in another study which reported that graduate courses were negatively related to executive professional leadership.[36]

The need for formal graduate training in educational administration has been inconclusive when compared to the individual success of a school administrator. There is a positive trend but no statistical significance. The recency of graduate training was also not a factor in the success of a school administrator. Those school administrators who were recent graduates were no more effective than those who were further removed from graduation.[37]

Although authors of several studies have indicated there was no relationship between formal training and the effectiveness of a school administrator, the literature does indicate the need for formal training. A course which incorporates the theory along with opportunities to display leadership and practice administrative theory would seem appropriate.

There has been a trend to offer a common learnings course as an introductory or core course in training programs. Introductory courses usually

---

[35] Bridges, pp. 34-49.

[36] Gross and Herriott, pp. 66-71.

[37] Rousseau, pp. 11-13.

focus on basic administrative processes and principles and the development of competent administrative behavior.[38]

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln offers a core course in Principles and Processes of Educational Administration which incorporates theory and practice. Educational Administration 850 is an introduction to various administrative processes, principles and educational practices. The course is designed to be a performance-based course which provides the learner opportunities to practice specified knowledge and skills. Objectives of the course include providing the student with knowledge and skill in the following areas: awareness of community, change factors, communication skills, decision-making, leadership styles, the planning process and evaluation techniques.[39] With the knowledge and skills provided by Educational Administration 850, prospective administrators have the opportunity to examine their own strengths and weaknesses in order to direct their future needs in formal training and other experiences needed to become a school administrator.

Inservice Training

With increasing demands placed on school administrators by parents, teachers and students as well as the courts, federal and state governments and

---

[38]Jack A. Culbertson, "Changes in the Preparation of School Administrators," in School Administration Selected Readings, ed. Sherman H. Frey and Keith R. Oetschman (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1968), 170.

[39]Educational Administration 850 Course Requirements and Rationale (Yearly mimeographed pamphlet) (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1983), 1-3.

school boards, the skills and abilities necessary to be effective are continually changing. School administrators have recognized the fact that they must continue to develop professionally in order to remain effective. Formal preservice training may no longer be sufficient to succeed in the administrative ranks. Administrative inservice training is needed to increase professional and personal effectiveness while increasing organizational effectiveness.[40] Areas of growth and renewal for school administrators were identified by California State Legislature as instructional skills, management skills, human relations skills, political and cultural awareness, leadership skills and self-understanding.[41]

There are many administrative inservice programs that are available nationally as well as those developed by local districts. There are various types of inservice training in which school administrators have participated. University courses are a traditional and frequently employed option in order to acquire new skills and information. Institutes which are short-term, topic specific learning experiences are popular forms of training for administrators. Competency-based training which identifies skills that need to be gained to be an effective administrator and methods in which to acquire these skills can be prescribed. The academy type of inservice training is that which a school district or state department of education provides as structured learning experiences on an ongoing basis. Networking is an increasingly popular form of inservice training where individuals are linked together for the purpose of sharing concerns.[42]

---

[40]Olivero, p. 4.

[41]Dennis Managers, "Need for Administrator Training Voiced by Legislative Task Force," Thrust for Educational Leadership, 8 (March 1979), 5.

[42]John C. Daresh and James C. LaPlant, Inservice for School Administrators: A Status Report (ERIC ED 249 639), 6-12.

One important aspect of several programs such as the Center of Educational Administrator Development (C/E/A/D) or Project Leadership is the collegial support or "networking." This allows for a small group of administrators to meet periodically for the purpose of providing support to one another and working through problems common to the individuals involved.[43] Bank Street College found that after a two year period, principals involved in a support program were felt, by their staffs as well as themselves, to be more effective.[44]

Effective inservice for school administrators should:

Be inclusive of all faculty members not just principals.

Be used to update and supplement present college and university graduate studies.

Be done on a systematic basis.

Be related to the day-to-day problems faced by principals.

Involve the principal in actual diagnostic prescriptive techniques.

Allow principals to support and help one another.[45]

There are other activities for an administrator that are equally as valuable as organized inservice. Participation in professional organizations, professional reading, involvement in research or advance coursework are all methods by which administrators grow personally and professionally.

---

[43]Robert A. Gemar, "State of the Art — There are Programs Available," Thrust for Educational Leadership, 8 (March 1979), 16.

[44]Judith Burnes, "Inservice for Educational Leadership," National Elementary Principal, 55 (1975), 74-78.

[45]Gemar, p. 17.

Preservice and inservice training are essential components in the growth and development of the educational administrator. Both theory and practical experiences are needed in order for the administrator to be effective and bring about change in today's educational world.

Selection Processes

The awareness of the need for adopting sound selection processes for school administrators is growing. The number of trained administrators is increasing. However, not all trained administrators have the leadership ability that is necessary to be effective.

In the past, many administrators were given their positions based on the subjective judgment of the superintendent or the school board without the use of objective data other than college credentials and without the consideration of opinions of other professional persons.[46] The chief means of selection were through interviews, references, principal's and superintendent's reports and past performance reviews.[47]

The authors of a National Institute of Education report found that principals were selected more on the basis of subtle, behind-the-scene matters related to specific circumstances rather than on the basis of merit or equity. Five factors

---

[46]Richard L. Featherstone, "The Selection of Elementary School Principals in Ohio Cities, "Educational Research Bulletin, 34, No. 6 (1955), 155.

[47]Allan J. H. Newberry, "Practices and Criteria Employed in the Selection of Elementary School Principals in British Columbia," Dissertation Abstracts International, 36:5707A, 1975.

were identified as the basis for selection: 1) a groundswell of support and acclaim for an outstanding candidate, 2) a combination of board influence and superintendent's desire, 3) an accident of choice because of powerful parents and teachers, 4) a deep knowledge of and identification with special programs, and 5) a loyal member of a long-term administrative in-group.[48]

In an examination of selection procedures, Lucio and McNeil found that few school districts had specific procedures or standards of selection. More emphasis was given in the selection process to appearance, the ability to get along with others and previous experience than on the candidate's vision as an educational leader.[49]

In a comparison between school districts in the United States and New South Wales, Sharpe concluded that the selection process in the United States was not systematic. The process was too unstructured, too personal and could be politically influenced. Selection decisions were based on information of questionable value.[50]

Many surveys have been done but have provided no evidence that the traditional criteria for selection in the past would provide effective administrators. Variables that have been examined and determined to make no significant difference were type and amount of teaching experience, experience as

[48]D. Catherine Baltzell and Robert A. Dentler, "5 Paths to the Principalship," Principal, 63, No. 5 (1984), 38-41.

[49]Lucio and McNeil, pp. 48-49.

[50]Fenton Sharpe, Selecting A High School Principal in the U.S. and Australia: A Comparative Study (ERIC ED 123 709), 30.

an assistant or vice principal, the number of graduate hours in educational administration, sex and marital status.[51, 52] In a recent study, the only variable that was found to have made a difference in the hiring process was the sex of the applicant. Male administrators were hired more often than women as high school principals, superintendents, and deputy or associate superintendents. This was not an indication that males were more effective administrators than females but only that males were hired more often.[53]

Selection methods that have been used in the past have not provided school district personnel and boards of education with the appropriate types of information on which to make decisions. Past methods of selection such as unstructured employment interviews, letters of recommendation and rating scales had low predictive validity. Standardized tests can only be useful when considered as one piece of evidence.[54] Thyberg reported that interpersonal relations tests did an inadequate job of differentiating between candidates.[55]

The selection procedure for school administrators is a judgmental process. Thyberg contended that the judgment of trained, competent administrators was

---

[51]Gross and Herriott, pp. 66-71.

[52]Newberry, pp. 41-44.

[53]Kathryn Cirincione-Coles, "The Administrator: Male or Female," Journal of Teacher Education, 26, No. 4 (1975), 326-328.

[54]Kenneth E. McIntyre, "The Way It Was/Is," National Elementary Principal, 53, No. 5 (1974), 30-33.

[55]Clifford S. Thyberg, "An Exploratory Study in the Use of Interpersonal Measures in Selection and Evaluation of School Administrators," Dissertation Abstracts International, 26:183, 1965.

the most reliable method of evaluating candidates.[56] The development of procedures and processes can aid in making selection decisions.

In the development of selection procedures school district personnel need to determine what the local district's values and goals are and what are the specific requirements of the job vacancy.[57, 58, 59] Poteet stated, "Local tailoring of selection criteria is necessary and the consistency between the philosophy of education of the candidate and the district is essential."[60] The California State Legislature has stated that there is no foolproof predictor of successful performance as a principal. Different personality types meet the needs of different schools.[61]

When setting selection procedures, personnel in school districts are advised to:

1) Develop a systematic program for administrator selection.

2) Actively recruit if necessary.

3) Use research in establishing procedures and criteria.

---

[56]Thyberg, p. 183.

[57]Stuart R. Kahl, The Selection of Teachers and School Administrators (ERIC ED 221 917), 69.

[58]Lonnie Wagstaff and Russell Spillman, "Who Should Be A Principal," National Elementary Principal, 53, No. 5 (1974), 36.

[59]R. H. Poteet, Criteria for Selection of Public Elementary School Principals in the State of Texas (ERIC ED 035 963), 88-89.

[60]Poteet, p. 83.

[61]California State Legislature, The School Principal: Report Pursuant to Resolution Chapter 102 of 1977, (Report 77-26), (Sacramento: Office of Legislative Analyst, 1977), 38-39.

4)   Involve several people in both the development of the program and evaluation of candidates.

5)   Use a variety of information-gathering methods and selection criteria.

6)   Establish selection criteria locally.

7)   Tailor selection criteria to specific vacancies.

8)   Interview as an important means of evaluation.

9)   Give candidates information about the vacancy which allow them to self-select.

10) Constantly monitor the selection process.[62]

A recommendation from the National Institute of Education was that boards of education undertake a self-study and policy appraisal of their selection process. School boards need to develop and disseminate criteria and standards for administrative positions. The types of evidence gathered to appraise potential candidates need to be decided in advance. A decision on who will collect and appraise the evidence needs to be made. School boards need to make a commitment to using multiple sources of assessment. By opening up the intake process and generating an adequate pool of candidates, the selection process would be more merit and equity based.[63]

Other selection procedures that should be considered by school districts as policy and procedures are developed are: 1) making personality assessments from

---

[62]Kahl, pp. 56-57.

[63]D. Catherine Baltzell and Robert A. Dentler, Selecting American School Principals; Executive Summary (ERIC ED 239 421), 10-11.

objective instruments that assess personality traits, 2) using advisory committees to help devise a clear definition of the position, 3) developing a definition of the position and its role, 4) classifying prospective candidates in order to rotate them through opportunities that expose them to many situations, 5) using statistical measurements which assess precise knowledge about the candidate and 6) defining present and future requirements of the position.[64]

School boards are beginning to adopt written policies that will aid in the selection of school administrators. Criteria are being identified that can be measured in order to select effective administrators. Criteria such as mature judgment, ability to work well with others, evidence of leadership ability, ability to communicate effectively, sound health or physical stamina and dependability are indicators of effective leaders. Other indicators are the ability to express a philosophy of education, academic qualifications, understanding of children in their various stages of growth and development and the capability to conceive and foster creativity in working with children and adults.[65, 66, 67, 68]

School boards and district personnel need to set policy and procedures for selecting administrators. Within the procedures, opportunities to gather various types of information about the candidate should be provided. School districts

---

[64]Lucio, pp. 69-70.

[65]Kahl, p. 70.

[66]Wagstaff, pp. 36-38.

[67]R. M. Deever and J. E. Jurs, Criteria Utilized in Selection of District Office Administrative Personnel, (Tempe: Bureau of Educational Research and Services, 1975), 2.

[68]Donald L. Schilson, "The Elementary Principal: Selection and Training," American School Board Journal, 45 (1966), 61.

must tailor their local needs to the specific job when selecting the appropriate person to fill a vacancy. With a selection process that incorporates these ideas into its procedures, the likelihood of hiring an administrator who will be successful is increased.

Predictors of Occupational Success

The ability to predict occupational success has been a difficult task in past years. One of the major difficulties has been the determination of what constitutes success in a given occupation. Occupational success has been defined in different terms by different people, and it has had different meanings in relation to different occupations.

Success is an evaluative concept. Evaluation requires judgments and a criterion against which an outcome can be assesssed. Researchers have used a variety of criteria when judging success. However, no single criterion seems to be the most important indicator.

The use of several criteria has been identified in the literature as the best measure of occupational success.[69, 70, 71, 72, 73] However, combining the scores

[69]Stephen G. Cox, "Do Educational Measures Predict Vocational Success?" Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 19, No. 4 (1971), 271.

[70]J. G. W. Davies, "What is Occupational Success?" Occupational Psychology, 24 (1950), 7-12.

[71]Dunnette, p. 12.

[72]L. A. Munday, and J. C. Davis, Varieties of Accomplishments After College: Perspectives in the Meaning of Academic Talent (Iowa City: ACT Research Report No. 62, 1974), 13.

[73]Nancy Howes, "Characteristic of Career Success: An Additional Input to Select Candidates for Professional Programs," Journal of Vocational Behavior, 18 (1981), 278-279.

of several criteria into one composite score is not a valid method when measuring success.[74] Judging success from a variety of standpoints seems to be a more accurate measure.

Job Performance

A variety of criteria has been used as researchers attempt to measure and predict occupational success. Job performance is one indicator that has been used.[75, 76] The completeness and thoroughness of the job done and the method in which the task was performed indicated whether the person was successful at the job. The supervisor rating of employee is one method by which this indicator could be measured.[77]

---

[74]Dunnette, p. 12.

[75]Ellen L. Betz, "An Investigation of Job Satisfaction as a Moderator Variable in Predicting Job Success," Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1, No. 2 (1971), 123.

[76]M. B. Stott, "What is Occupational Success?" Occupational Psychology, 24 (1950), 109.

[77]Betz, p. 123.

Salary

Salary has been used as an element in defining success by many researchers.[78, 79, 80, 81, 82] The premise is that the higher the salary level, the more successful the person is at the job. Wise disagreed that salary is an indicator of success. He contended that salary is not highly related to performance because salaries are determined by established wage scales and seniority.[83]

Promotion

Occupational progress or promotion has been identified as an indicator of success. The upward progress of a person towards increasing job responsibility is considered to be the mark of a successful person.[84, 85, 86, 87] Cohen found that

---

[78]Dunnette, p. 15-16.

[79]David A. Wise, Academic Achievement and Job Performance: Earnings and Job Promotions (ERIC ED 081 374), 21-28.

[80]R. R. Olson, "Vocational Stability and Job Satisfaction: Characteristics of Postsecondary Technology Instructors," Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 11, No. 3 (1971), 11.

[81]Earl J. McGarth, "Profiles of Distinguished Alumni," Liberal Education, 57 (1971), 339.

[82]John W. Solcum and Herbert H. Hand, "Prediction of Job Success and Employee Satisfaction for Executives and Foreman," Training and Development Journal, 25, No. 10 (1971), 28-36.

[83]Wise, p. 42.

[84]Olson, p. 11.

[85]Dunnette, pp. 26-28.

[86]Stott, p. 108.

[87]Peter A. Cohen, "College Grades and Adult Achievement: A Research Synthesis," Research in Higher Education, 20 (1984), 281-282.

promotion was used as an indicator of success in fourteen studies. There was a positive correlation between promotion and success in twelve of those studies and in seven studies there was a positive statistical significance.[88]

Education

Education is considered by several researchers as an important element of occupational success. Wise contended that education changes individuals in such a way as to increase their capacity to perform various job related tasks. The knowledge and other cognitive skills gained in school increase productive capacity.[89] Wise's contention is in contrast with Bridges' study that found that no relationship existed between graduate hours and job effectiveness and even negatively affected job effectiveness.[90]

Academic achievement has been correlated positively with the rate of salary increase and the probability of promotion.[91] Three other studies revealed that the more successful people were, the higher levels of education they had obtained and the more degrees they had acquired.[92, 93, 94]

---

[88]Cohen, pp. 281-284.

[89]Wise, pp. 57-59.

[90]Bridges, pp. 34-49.

[91]Wise, p. 57.

[92]Dunnette, p. 17.

[93]McGarth, p. 340.

[94]Joan Claire Gordon, "Selection of Elementary School Principals," National Elementary Principal, 45, No. 5 (1966), 64.

Much emphasis has been placed by employers and graduate schools on the assumption that there is a direct correlation between academic achievement and future occupational success. Correlations involving self-reports and rating forms completed by academic officials showed more than twice the predictive validity of grades and test scores.[95] Grades earned in undergraduate study were equally valid in forecasting success in graduate and professional schools for men and women. Scores on standardized achievement and scholastic aptitude tests showed greater promise as predictors of success for women than men.[96] Samson also found that the predictions for success for females based on academic achievement were more accurate.[97] Hoyt found that using only grades as the basis for determining success in graduate school or later adult accomplishments was not a good indicator. A more comprehensive assessment needs to be done in order to evaluate the professional promise or competency of a student. One of his concerns about using grades as a predictor was that validity of grades needs to be established by determining how well they measure the amount of knowledge the student possesses and not by how "successful" students are in their subsequent enterprises.[98]

---

[95]Gordon Samson, et. al., "Academic and Occupational Performance: A Quantitative Synthesis," American Educational Research Journal, 21, No. 2 (1984), 312.

[96]Joan J. Michael, Jennifer S. Nadson, and Wm. B. Michael, "The Prediction of Academic Achievement in Graduate Study in Education," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 43 (1983), 1133-1139.

[97]Samson, p. 319.

[98]Donald Hoyt, The Relationship Between College Grades and Adult Achievement: A Review of Literature (ERIC ED 023 343), 44-50.

Goal Attainment

Occupational success can also be measured by goal attainment. Success according to Stott is dependent upon attainment of the chosen goal or at least progress towards it.[99] Occupational goals could be both economical and emotional. The goals or levels of aspiration that people set for themselves and their attainment is crucial in terms of determining if a person is successful.[100]

Job Satisfaction

Success is judged on an emotional basis as well as on conventional measures. Success suggests feelings of satisfaction which are dependent on being appreciated for the work that is done. Davies concluded that the individual's self-regard in the work place is extremely important. This self-regard is influenced by how persons interpret the feelings of others toward their work and personality. Both the attitude of the person's superordinate and subordinates are important to the person.[101]

People need to experience a sense of well-being and enjoy their work to experience emotional satisfaction.[102] This satisfaction is dependent on job content, the supervisor, the company or management, the degree of job autonomy

---

[99]Stott, p. 110.

[100]Davies, p. 16.

[101]Davies, pp. 15-16.

[102]Stott, p. 110.

and the pay.[103] Job satisfaction is so important to job success that Bretz states that job satisfaction moderates the relationship between predicted and actual job success.[104]

Honors

Achievement and recognition of performance were also used as identifiers of successful people. Blackburn and Havighurst found that the number of honors received had a direct correlation with the success of the social scientists they were studying.[105] Attainment of fame or being recognized were more meaningful to successful people than money, and thus they tended to receive more honors and became more successful.[106, 107, 108]

Human Relations Skills

Affective traits or human relations skills have also been used as indicators of success. Being able to deal effectively with people has been directly linked

---

[103]Slocum, p. 35.

[104]Betz, p. 126.

[105]Robert T. Blackburn, and Robert J. Havighurst, Career Patterns of Distinguished Male Social Scientists (ERIC ED 159 982), 15.

[106]Dunnette, p. 40.

[107]Stott, p. 108.

[108]Howes, pp. 286-287.

with increased earning power.[109] Attributes such as leadership and initiative were also found to be positively associated with successful job performance.[110]

In his theory of skill insight, Jennings discussed the role of inborn characteristics such as insight, awareness of others, and self esteem which enable a successful executive to deal in meaningful ways with people. Thus, people who can deal effectively with people are usually more successful as managers and executives.[111]

Years of Experience

Years of experience in a position has also been considered as an identifier of success. Cox contended that people are usually considered successful after completing five years in one position. Job satisfaction and the work being appropriate are important factors in the accumulation of number of years of experience.[112] Jaskolka indicated that having tenure in an organization can be an indicator of success. Tenure in one location could also be negatively related to success as it could be an indicator of failure to achieve upward mobility.[113]

---

[109]Wise, p. 5.

[110]Wise, p. 9.

[111]E. E. Jennings, "Two Schools of Thought about Executive Development," Personnel Psychology, 37 (1959), 370-372.

[112]Cox, p. 272.

[113]Gabriel Jaskolka, Janice M. Beyer and Harrison M. Trice, "Measuring and Predicting Managerial Success," Journal of Vocational Behavior, 26 (1985), 202.

Job Stability

Job stability can also be considered as a criterion for occupational success. Cox considered job stability as occuring when a person has been employed in the same job for more than four years. If people do not change jobs randomly but fulfill their own and others' expectations, then they could be considered successful.[114]

Success seems to be interrelated with a variety of elements. Wickert and McFarland talked of a total life pattern of successful endeavors. Successful people were good in college, had high socio-economic aspirations and were forceful, dominant and confident people.[115]

The attempt to define occupational success has been an on-going process for researchers for many years. Many criteria have been examined and no conclusive evidence has been found. The researchers generally agree that more than one criteria should be used but what those are is still being debated. Each individual occupation needs to examine its role in the work setting and make a determination about what constitutes success in that occupation.

Assessment Centers

An assessment center is a comprehensive, standardized procedure in which multiple assessment techniques such as situational exercises or job simulations are

---

[114]Cox, p. 272.

[115]Dunnette, p. 40.

used to evaluate individual employees for various purposes.[116] Assessment centers are used for identifying individual strengths and weaknesses for a specific purpose such as promotion, development or placement. Moses and Byham view the strengths of an assessment center as using techniques that are designed to stimulate critical behaviors related to success on the job. An assessment center also facilitates the integration of information since data are collected from a variety of sources.[117]

Five components characterize an assessment center. Jobs are described in behavioral dimensions. Standards of performance are established in relation to the identified behaviors. Individuals (assessees) are brought together to respond to performance situations such as interviews, in-baskets and fact-finding games. Trained assessors observe and rate behavior according to the specific behavioral dimensions. The ratings are compiled into composite scores and reported to the assessee.[118]

An assessment center has been defined by Thornton and Byham as a procedure (not a location) that consists of a standardized evaluation of behavior dimensions for targeted jobs based on multiple inputs.[119] The Third International

[116]George Thornton and William C. Byham, Assessment Centers and Managerial Performance, (New York: Academic Press, 1982), 1.

[117]Joseph L. Moses and William C. Byham, Applying the Assessment Center Method, (New York: Pergamon Press, 1977), 3-6.

[118]Stephen A. Williamson and Mary Lou Schaalman, Assessment Centers: Theory, Practice and Implications for Education (ERIC ED 192 166), 11.

[119]Thornton and Byham, p. 3.

Congress on the Assessment Center in 1975 endorsed Standards for Ethical Considerations for Assessment Center Operations. The standards included the following requirements for an assessment center:

1. Multiple assessment techniques must be used. At least one of these techniques must be a simulation.

2. Multiple assessors must be used. These assessors must receive training prior to participating in a center.

3. Judgments resulting in an outcome (i.e., recommendation for promotion, specific training or development) must be based on pooling information from assessors and techniques.

4. An overall evaluation of behavior must be made by the assessors at a separate time from observation of behavior.

5. Simulation exercises are used. These exercises are developed to tap a variety of predetermined behaviors and have been pre-tested prior to use to insure that the techniques provide reliable, objective, and relevant behavioral information for the organization in question.

6. The dimensions, attributes, characteristics, or qualities evaluated by the assessment center are determined by an analysis of relevant job behaviors.

7. The techniques used in the assessment center are designed to provide information which is used in evaluating the dimensions, attributes or qualities previously determined.[120]

---

[120] Moses and Byham, pp. 304-305.

Assessment centers have their roots in military organizations from the first half of the twentieth century. In the 1930s, assessment center methods were used to select German army, navy and air force officers. The German psychologists who developed the initial use of assessment centers based their procedures on two major tenets: 1) holistic observation and 2) naturalistic observation. They also used multiple assessors and multiple techniques to assess performance.[121]

The British War Office Selection Boards (WOSBs) modeled their program after the Germans' in order to identify army officers during World War II. An important component of the WOSB program was the leadership testing in group situations. Leadership was divided into three aspects that were operationally defined and systematically observed. The three aspects of leadership were level of function, group cohesiveness and stability. Reliability and validity studies were introduced by the British.[122]

The first assessment center in the United States was developed during World War II by the Office of Strategic Services (OSS). The task of the center was to identify personnel for a variety of jobs including operatives who could successfully undertake hazardous intelligence-gathering missions to secretaries. In two months, the OSS developed a model for assessing candidates. The steps provided are still considered an excellent example of the application of a combination of assessment theory and practice.

---

[121]Edgar A. Kelley and Frederick C. Wendel, "The Use of Assessment Center for Personnel Selection and Career Development in Educational Administration," Unpublished Pamphlet (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1983), 29.

[122]Thornton and Byham, pp. 27-33.

1. Conduct a job analysis.

2. Identify personality determinants for success and failure on the job and next select variables to be assessed.

3. Develop a rating scale for each personality variable and an overall variable.

4. Design a program of procedures to assess the identified variables.

5. Prepare a general description of the personality of each candidate before preparing specific recommendations.

6. Prepare simply written personality sketches which predict each assessee's behavior in the organization.

7. Conduct a staff conference to review and revise the sketches and to make final ratings and recommendations.

8. Construct experimental designs for the evaluation of the assessment program.[123]

In the 1950s American business and industry began to adopt the assessment center process. Using the assessment center concept, Douglas Bray of A.T.&.T. initiated an extensive longitudinal study, the Management Progress Study. This study was intended to investigate the factors which influenced the progress of young managers at A.T.&.T. Over a four year period from 1956 to 1960, 422 men were assessed in groups of twelve from six Bell companies. These men spent three days in assessment centers being assessed by trained personnel. Bray had

---

[123]Thornton and Byham, pp. 38-40.

identified twenty-five characteristics in the areas of managerial functions, interpersonal relationships, general abilities, values and attitudes. These characteristics were assessed by projective tests, paper and pencil tests, a personal history questionnaire, autobiographical essay, in-basket exercises, business games and leaderless group discussions. The assessors rated each participant on the twenty-five characteristics. A final rating of "yes" or "no" was given to each assessee indicating whether they predicted the assessee would or would not be promoted to middle management. The results of the individual's performance in the assessment was not revealed to company officials. After a five to seven year period, Bray found that the overall assessment ratings were predictive of the actual career progress participants had made.[124]

By the 1960s, several large corporations such as IBM, Sears, General Electric, and J.C. Penney were using assessment centers to select middle managerial positions. Twelve to fifteen companies had incorporated the assessment center concept into their selection process by 1970. In the 1970s, the concept of assessment centers expanded to other countries such as Norway, England, South Africa, Canada, Germany and Italy. Smaller organizations in the private sector as well as federal and state government and educational institutions adopted assessment centers as part of their selection processes. The role of assessment centers expanded and were not only used for selection and promotion but for early identification of potential, career development and inclusion in training programs.[125]

---

[124]Thornton and Byham, pp. 55-59.

[125]Williamson and Schaalman, p. 56.

According to Byham, 1000 or more organizations are now using assessment centers as part of their personnel program.[126] The authors of the NIE report on assessment centers stated that the key factor for this growing phenomenon was the powerful appeal to managerial audiences. Assessment centers are firmly established in research and can be promoted as a scientifically rigorous measurement technique. A voluminous amount of literature has appeared concerning assessment centers which disseminate information about the concept. With a variety of governmental, judicial and legislative directives concerning civil rights and equal employment opportunities, assessment centers provide an equitable process which has withstood the rigors of judicial scrutiny. A proliferation of consulting firms and other advocacy groups have used the assessment center concept as well.[127]

The effect of pressure from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has encouraged companies to use the assessment center method. One result has been early identification of potential managers which allows companies to identify representatives of minority groups and women with talent so they can promote them in their organizations to meet affirmative action goals.[128]

Two types of validity studies have been conducted in connection with assessment centers. External validity determined if assessment centers can be predictive of future job success. While internal validity established if relationships exist between various assessment center techniques.

---

[126] Moses and Byham, p. 33.

[127] Williamson and Schaalman, pp. 58-67.

[128] Moses and Byham, p. 35.

External validity has been established by many studies. Assessment centers have shown the ability to predict which people will progress into higher levels of management. Studies by A.T.&T., Michigan Bell and IBM have found that assessment centers are predictive of potential to advance into higher levels of management.[129, 130, 131] Moses, in his research, concluded that there was a highly significant relationship between assessment center ratings and progress in management.[132]

In a survey of twenty companies using the assessment center technique, Byham uncovered twenty-two studies that showed assessment centers were more effective in predicting managerial progress than any other technique. He did not find any studies that stated the assessment centers were less effective.[133]

Internal validity has not been as well established in assessment centers, but the evidence indicated that reliable information can be gained from assessment centers. The strength of the assessment center technique is the multiple

---

[129]James R. Huck, "Assessment Centers: A Review of External and Internal Validities," Personnel Psychology, 26, No. 2 (1973), 196-198.

[130]Richard J. Campbell and Douglas W. Bray, "Assessment Centers: An Aid in Management Selection," Personnel Administration, 30, No. 2 (1967), 12.

[131]Douglas W. Bray and Donald L. Grant, "The Assessment Center in the Measurement of Potential for Business Management," Psychological Monographs, 80, No. 17 (1966), 22-23.

[132]Joel Moses, "Validity of Assessment Centers," American Psychological Association Proceedings of the Annual Convention - 79th Annual Meeting, 1971, 870.

[133]Wm. C. Byham, "Assessment Centers for Spotting Future Managers," Harvard Business Review, 48, No. 4 (1970), 154.

assessment procedures that are used.[134] According to Thornton and Byham, assessment centers can yield more accurate predictions of managerial success than paper and pencil tests.[135] Bray and Grant determined that a reliable variance did remain after partialing out test scores indicating assessment procedures did contribute substantially more than paper and pencil measures alone. However, neither could have been omitted without loss of significant information.[136]

A study done by Wollowich and McNamara clearly demonstrated significant incremental validities. The use of tests, exercises and characteristics each contributed a substantially unique element to the prediction of managerial success.[137]

The use of the overall assessment rating (OAR) emerged as a significant predictor of management success when a statistical procedure was applied.[138] Williamson and Schaalman found that many of the predictive validity studies on assessment centers relied on the final overall competency judgment as the

_____

[134]Williamson and Schaalman, p. 11.

[135]Thornton and Byham, p. 316.

[136]Bray and Grant, p. 21-22.

[137]Herbert B. Wollowick and W. J. McNamara, "Relationship to the Components of An Assessment Center to Management Success," Journal of Applied Psychology, 53, No. 5 (1969), 352.

[138]Wollowick and McNamara, p. 351.

primary predictor.[139] Thornton and Byham agreed that the overall rating is more accurate than the typical ability or personality test.[140]

Assessment centers also have face validity as most assessees and assessors view the process as acceptable and valid.[141] Assessment centers are seen as equally fair for both race and sex equity issues.[142]

Research on reliability demonstrates a fair degree of reliability in measurement from the assessment center process. However, the design and quality of the assessor training is fundamental to both reliability and validity.[143] Studies on interrater reliability have reporter correlations of .70 or higher. Two studies with high correlations indicated that the observers were rating participants on many of the same aspects of performance.[144, 145]

In research for Michigan Bell, Moses determined that there was a relationship between two multiple assessment programs. The correlation between overall performance in the two programs was substantial. There was no significant difference found in the reliabilities obtained by any subgroup. This was

---

[139]Williamson and Schaalman, p. 234.

[140]Thornton and Byham, p. 316.

[141]Williamson and Schaalman, pp. 202-203.

[142]Moses and Byham, p. 34.

[143]Williamson and Schaalman, pp. 239-240.

[144]Bray and Grant, p. 10.

[145]John M. Greenwood and Walter J. McNamara, "Interrater Reliability in Situational Tests," Journal of Applied Psychology, 51, No. 2 (1967), 105.

one of the few studies that dealt with consistency of the assessee's performance when given different assessments during two different time periods.[146]

Assessment center researchers have found that objective measures of management progress such as salary growth or managerial level attained are predicted fairly well. Actual job performance tended to be less predictive. Assessment centers tend to predict future potential better than actual job performance or objective measures of management progress or success.[147]

In the NIE report, Williamson and Schaalman concluded that assessment centers can be considered an indirect measure of occupational competence. Assessment centers are most likely a measure of global potential for upward mobility.[148]

The use of assessment centers in education has been minimal. The New York City School District in 1980 used the assessment center methodology in establishing a center to select new junior high school principals.[149] The Broward County (Florida) Public Schools and the Greensboro (North Carolina) Public Schools also used the assessment center method in their personnel programs.[150]

---

[146]Joseph L. Moses, "The Development of An Assessment Center for the Early Identification of Supervision Potential," Personnel Psychology, 26, No. 4 (1973), 579-580.

[147]Williamson and Schaalman, pp. 235.

[148]Williamson and Schaalman, pp. 240-243.

[149]Thornton and Byham, p. 364.

[150]Williamson and Schaalman, p. 58.

In an effort to better articulate criteria for selection of effective school administrators, the National Association of Secondary School Principals along with the American Psychological Association's Division of Industrial and Organizational Psychology developed an assessment center. The NASSP Assessment Center was started in 1975. It was developed after extensive interviews with teachers and administrators and research on job related behaviors for principals. In 1986 there are 48 NASSP Assessment Centers located in over 20 states, Canada and West Germany. Twelve skill dimensions with specific definitions were found to relate to the most important characteristics of successful assistant principals and principals. The skills to be assessed were:

1. Problem Analysis. Ability to seek out relevant data and analyze complex information to determine the important elements of a problem situation; searching for information with a purpose.

2. Judgment. Skill in identifying educational needs and setting priorities; ability to reach logical conclusions and make high quality decisions based on available information; ability to critically evaluate written communications.

3. Organizational Ability. Ability to plan, schedule, and control the work of others; skill in using resources in an optimal fashion; ability to deal with a volume of paper work and heavy demands on one's time.

4. Decisiveness. Ability to recognize when a decision is required (disregarding the quality of the decision) and to act quickly.

5. Leadership. Ability to get others involved in solving problems; ability to recognize when a group requires direction, to effectively interact with a group to guide them to accomplish a task.

6. Sensitivity. Ability to perceive the needs, concerns, and personal problems of others; skill in resolving conflicts; tact in dealing with persons from different backgrounds; ability to deal effectively with people concerning emotional issues; knowing what information to communicate and to whom.

7. Range of Interests. Competence to discuss a variety of subjects--educational, political, current events, economics, etc.; desire to actively participate in events.

8. Personal Motivation. Need to achieve in all activities attempted; evidence that work is important in personal satisfaction; ability to be self-policing.

9. Educational Values. Possession of a well-reasoned educational philosophy; receptiveness to new ideas and change.

10. Stress Tolerance. Ability to perform under pressure and during opposition; ability to think on one's feet.

11. Oral Communication. Ability to make a clear oral presentation of facts or ideas.

12. Written Communication. Ability to express ideas clearly in writing; to write appropriately for different audiences—students, teachers, parents, etc.[151]

Participants of the Assessment Center engaged in simulation techniques and group exercises and an interview. These are written into the Center design to

---

[151] Kelley and Wendel, pp. 11-12

provide information for evaluating the specified skills. These techniques are based on activities that principals experience daily. They include leaderless group activities, fact-finding and stress tests, administrative in-baskets which require written responses, a structured personal interview and a participant feedback session.[152]

The assessment processes are administered by groups of trained assessors. Six assessors observe twelve participants for two days as they perform the designated tasks.[153] Each task was coded against certain skill dimensions and specific "look fors" were established for each skill dimension in each exercise.[154]

A different assessor observed and recorded a different participant's behavior in each exercise. There is one exception in that the assessor who coded the second in-basket exercise also conducted the assessee's structured interview. Five different assessors prepared reports on each assessee with one assessor preparing no report for a particular assessee. This allowed for one assessor to be an impartial juror.[155]

The assessors reviewed the written reports about each assessee. They independently rated each assessee in each skill dimension. The ratings are posted and a consensus reached if necessary. The team then seeks to reach a decision about placement recommendations and recommendations for development and

[152]Paul Hersey, "The NASSP Assessment Center Develops Leadership Talent," Educational Leadership, 39 (1982), 370-371.

[153]Paul Hersey, "NASSP's Assessment Center," NASSP Bulletin, 64, No. 438 (1980), 87-117.

[154]Kelley and Wendel, p. 46.

[155]Kelley and Wendel, p. 47.

improvement. The assessors then write a comprehensive report. This report is shared with each participant in a private feedback session.[156]

Eight assumptions provided the philosophical base upon which the NASSP Assessment Center was developed.

1. Personnel management decisions should be based on behavioral evaluations.

2. The key to the assessment center process is the use of simulations which provide data about a wide variety of behaviors. The behaviors should reflect on-the-job demands and should permit the assessment of traits and skills which are linked, with predictability, to actual on-the-job performance.

3. While simulations must be included as a source of data in an assessment center, the assessment center must also provide for the use of multiple data sources and data obtained must be pooled in the formation of judgments.

4. Assessment centers need to operate as a part of a human resource system.

5. Assessor training is an integral part of the assessment center program. Clearly stated minimum performance standards for assessors should be developed.

6. Assessees should be informed prior to assessment as completely as possible about the assessment center programs; preferably, this information should be made available in writing.

---

[156]Kelley and Wendel, pp. 47-48.

7. Each assessment center should conduct validation research which meets both professional and legal standards.

8. Information collected about assessees should be available to assessees within the provisions of the Freedom of Information and Privacy Act enacted by Congress in 1974 and/or subsequent legislation which defines the information rights of individuals.[157]

A validation study of the NASSP Assessment Center was done by a research team from Michigan State University. The content validity of the NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions was measured by asking experts to evaluate the degree to which the skills assessed were needed to perform each of the task dimensions satisfactorily. They were also asked to judge the extent to which the items in the assessment center exercises provided information about the various skill dimensions. The study concluded that the skills assessed were important in the performance of a principalship and the NASSP Assessment Center content validity was good.[158] Internal validity was highly correlated which indicated substantial agreement concerning the skill level of the candidates.[159]

The predictive validity or external validity was established for the NASSP Assessment Center by collecting job performance ratings from teachers, supervisors, support staff and self. The job performance ratings of individuals who

---

[157]Kelley and Wendel, pp. 19-20.

[158]Neal Schmitt, et. al., Criterion-related and Content Validity of the NASSP Assessment Center, (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1982), 61-62.

[159]Paul W. Hersey, The NASSP Assessment Center Projects: Validation, New Developments, (Reston: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1982), 2.

had rated above average in the assessment center were significantly higher than those who had rated average or below average.[160]

School climate was also assessed as part of the criterion-related validity of the study. Assessment center skill ratings were significantly and positively related to students' perceptions of the school climate in which the assessed candidate worked.[161]

In 1980 NASSP contracted with the Lincoln Public Schools and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln to evaluate the use of the Assessment Center as a diagnostic tool for improving preservice and inservice administrator training. With the success of this work the NASSP Assessment Center Developmental Consortium was formed in 1982. The Assessment Center technology now operates along a "career continuum" extending from preservice preparation through selection and placement to diagnosis and planning for inservice professional growth and development.[162]

Leadership

Attempting to develop a definition of leadership has been a task that researchers and philosophers have been struggling with for many years. Definitions range from the simple to the complex. Leadership is "the activity of helping others work toward common goals or purposes."[163] Leadership is "the

---

[160]Hersey, pp. 3-4.

[161]Hersey, p. 4.

[162]Kelley and Wendel, p. 43.

[163]Michael and Dolores Giammatteo, Forces On Leadership (Reston: NASSP, 1981), 2.

reciprocal process of mobilizing, by persons with certain motives and values, various economic, political and other resources, in a context of competition and conflict, in order to realize goals independently or mutually held by leaders and followers."[164]

All agree that being a leader does not mean the same as being an administrator. In the educational setting, there are many who keep the organization running smoothly. However, they are not concerned with "leading" the school. According to Hencley, McCleary and McGrath, an educational leader is someone who is concerned with effecting organizational change, defining goals and purposes and determining the basic character of educational enterprise through critical choice making.[165]

Educational leaders are concerned with change. They change the organization by shaping the behavior of individuals or groups.[166] Leaders change the process to maximize the contributions of individuals for their own benefit as well as the organization.[167] They change the behavior of others to do things differently.[168]

---

[164]James MacGregor Burns, Leadership (New York: Harper and Row, 1978), 425.

[165]Stephen P. Hencley, Lloyd E. McCleary and J. H. McGrath, The Elementary School Principalship, (New York: Dodd Mead and Co., 1970), 100.

[166]Charles F. Faber and Gilbert T. Shearron, Elementary School Administration: Theory and Practice (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970), 309.

[167]Larry Osbourne, Who's in Charge Here: The What and How of Leadership, Annual Convention of the American Association for Counseling and Development, (Houston: American Association for Counseling and Development, 1984), 3.

[168]Authur Blumberg and William Greenfield, The Effective Principal: Perspectives on School Leadership (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1980), 230.

Educational leadership is earned through attainment of prestige and personal influence.[169] The Personnel Research Board at Ohio State University did a study to determine what type of behavior a person exhibited in order to earn the title of leader. Two dimensions emerged. The first dimension was initiating structure in interaction. This behavior was in relation to outlining, clarifying and delineating leader-follower relationships and establishing clear organizational patterns, communication channels and procedures for accomplishing organizational tasks. The second dimension was consideration. Leaders communicated friendship, respect, trust and warmth in relationships between themselves and group members.[170]

The research at Ohio State University would substantiate Osbourne's thoughts on leadership. He identified task behavior and relationship behavior as essential leadership characteristics. Task behavior was getting the job done. Relationship behavior was what to do with people while the job is being accomplished.[171] Hersey also characterized leaders as people who get the task done but also build continuing cooperation.[172]

Five theories of leadership were identified by Adams and Yoder. One theory is the trait theory by which leadership is determined by the personality characteristics of the person who influences group members. The theory of leadership style is the type of behavior an individual exhibits when directing the

[169]Faber, p. 308.

[170]Hencley, p. 114-116.

[171]Osbourne, p. 4.

[172]Paul Hersey, The Situational Leader, (Escondido: The Center for Leadership Studies, 1984) 16.

activities of a group toward a shared goal. The situational theory is based on the idea that leadership is a role and that roles generate expectations about how people in a given situation should think or act. Contingency theory is based upon the idea that the leader's style and the situation match. The fifth theory is the transactional approach which is the dynamic process of mutual influence between leaders and followers which is directed toward the attainment of mutually established goals.[173]

Of these five theories, the situational leadership theory has gained much attention in the last decade. This theory of leadership has evolved as a reaction to the failure of the traitist theory. The underlying assumption of the trait theory was that leadership resides in the individual. With the possession of these traits, one could reproduce leadership in different groups and situations.[174] Researchers have attempted to uncover these traits that typified successful leaders. Over the last 70 years, hundreds of studies have been conducted and no universal set of traits have been found. Only 5 percent of the traits were found in four or more studies.[175]

An extensive review of literature was done by Stogdill in the late 1940s. The personal factors that he found associated with leadership were superiority in intelligence, better than average grades, general ability to get things done,

---

[173]Jerome Adams and Janice Yoder, Effective Leadership for Women and Men (Norwood: Ablex Publishing Co., 1985), 3-26.

[174]Lucio and McNeil, p. 64.

[175]Howard Carlisle, Situational Management (New York: American Management Association, 1973), 124.

judgment, insight, awareness, and ready adaptability to changing situations. Leaders rated high in application and industry, self-confidence and self-esteem, social skills and higher than average in popularity.[176] Even after identifying a variety of factors that made a leader, Stogdill stated that patterns of leadership traits differed with the situation.[177]

Situational leadership theory suggests that the demands of the situation have to fit particular leadership traits to be effective. Stogdill stated, "Qualities, characteristics, and skills required in a leader are determined to a large extent by the demands of the situation in which he is to function as a leader."[178]

Leadership is not determined so much by characteristics of individuals but by the requirements of social situations.[179] In order for a person to emerge as a leader in a situation, the personal characteristics must bear a relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities and goals of the followers. The factor of change must also be considered in the emergence and demise of a leader. The situation may be altered by the addition or loss of members, or changes in interpersonal relationships and goals.[180]

Leadership, however, can not be assumed to be incidental or haphazard. Not everyone can function as a leader even if designation has been made as the

---

[176]Ralph M. Stogdill, "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature," Journal of Psychology, 25, No. 1 (1948), 44-59.

[177]Stogdill, pp. 60-61.

[178]Stogdill, p. 63.

[179]Faber, p. 311.

[180]Stogdill, p. 65.

leader. Leaders emerge in working relationships among members of a group in which the leader has acquired status through active participation and demonstration of the capacity for carrying cooperative tasks through to completion. Stogdill identified significant aspects of people who can emerge as leaders in situations. They have the capacity for organizing and expediting cooperative effort, appear to be intelligent, alert to the needs and motives of others, and have insight into situations. These people are reinforced by responsibility, have initiative, are persistent and self confident.[181]

In Carlisle's theory of situational management, he has identified three sets of variables in situational leadership. They are characteristics of leaders, the characteristics of the followers and the situation.[182] Different situations need different types of leaders. Situations need to be interpreted accurately so proper leaders can be appointed or so leaders might engage in specific behavior that will be effective in certain situations. Key factors in a situation must be identified in order to determine what style is effective.[183]

Carlisle identified three types of leaders. They were the directive leader, who centralized authority within themself, the participative leader, who involved subordinates to the degree in which they could contribute to the decision, and the free-rein leader, who allowed subordinates to pursue work in the way they wished. He also identified key factors that affect situations. These factors are the

---

[181]Stogdill, pp. 65-66.

[182]Carlisle, p. 125.

[183]Carlisle, p. 133.

purpose, the task, the technology, the people, the structure and external forces. Leadership types and situational factors need to be matched in order for a person to be an effective leader.[184]

In an attempt to clarify variables that could affect a situational leader, Hersey has provided a framework for determining the type of leader that a situation dictates. The leader must first assess task behavior which is the extent to which leaders engage in spelling out duties and responsibilities to individuals or groups. The leader must also decide on the extent to which two-way or multi-way communication will occur. This is relationship behavior.[185]

The leader must also be able to assess the follower's readiness to respond to a task. The leader must be able to determine if the follower has the ability and willingness to accomplish a specific task. Once this has been determined, the leader can provide the appropriate responses for the situation. These responses could include telling, selling, participating, and delegating.[186]

There is a question whether leaders can be flexible enough to move along a continuum and change styles to fit the situation. Leaders have strengths and weaknesses that influence their ability to command in all situations.

Even though researchers have said that it is difficult to identify a list of skills and traits that will guarantee effective leadership, they have determined that certain skills are needed to influence people to follow and to change. What those skills and traits are will continue to be debated. This is the point where

---

[184]Carlisle, pp. 129-136.

[185]Hersey, pp. 29-33.

[186]Hersey, pp. 43-61.

theory regarding situational leadership intersects with the theory concerning innate or learned competencies to determine the degree of success of an administrator, that there will be an ongoing, and as yet unresolved, debate.

Career Mobility

As teachers move into administrative positions, several factors determine the positions to which they will advance on the career ladder. The move from teaching to administration is a vertical move. Schein viewed a person's ability to move through an organization in three conceptually distinguishable dimensions. A person who moved vertically was increasing or decreasing one's rank or level in the organization. Moving radially in the organization increased or decreased the person's centrality in the organization. The changing of one's function or division in the organization was characterized as moving circumferentially. To establish a successful career, a person must demonstrate the ability to move in all three dimensions.[187]

Another factor that determines to what degree a person will advance on the career ladder is whether the person is place-bound or career-bound. Carlson identified advancement of superintendents in these terms. Place-bound advancement was limited to waiting for available positions in the school district. Career-bound superintendents actively sought the superintendency and were usually hired as an outsider.[188]

---

[187]E. H. Schein, "The Individual, the Organization and the Career: A Conceptual Scheme," The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 7 (1971), 403.

[188]R. O. Carlson, School Superintendents, Careers and Performances (Columbus: Merrill Publishing Co., 1972), 39-42.

Carlson categorized superintendents as place-bound who are more interested in place than career and the opposite is true for a career-bound administrator. Watson described career-bound superintendents as people who were seeking professional satisfaction, had personal expectations and wanted a personal challenge.[189] Neither researcher has taken into consideration the reasons for a person's decision to remain in a school district. Women whose numbers are increasing in the administrative ranks may not have the opportunity to seek positions outside a community because of their spouse's occupation or other family commitments. The reasons for being place-bound may not always be credited to lack of interest in a career as Carlson and Watson imply.

In 1982, only 2 percent of public school administrators were women. One half of these women were hired from within the district while the other half were hired from outside of the district. Over a third of these women moved up the career ladder in a noninterrupted line that went directly from teaching or counseling to assistant principal and principal. However, 12 percent interrupted their careers for family considerations and 18 percent interrupted their careers for graduate school.[190]

The obtaining of advanced degrees was also an indicator of the amount of upward mobility school administrators hope to achieve. People who have obtained degrees beyond a master's degree were more likely to aspire to central office

[189]D. Gene Watson, Superintendents' Mobility Constructs and Succession Patterns (ERIC ED 042 253) 10-11.

[190]Theresa McDade and Jackson M. Drake, "Career Path Models for Women Superintendents," Journal of Educational Research. 75, No. 4 (1982), 210-215.

positions and superintendencies. The people whose career goal was to be a principal were more likely to terminate their official education after their masters' degrees.[191]

Positions within the educational hierarchy also led to certain advancements on the career ladder while other jobs tended to be ceiling positions. Gaertner traced three career patterns to the superintendency. One pattern was the specialist career pattern in instructional and central office administration. The second pattern was a pattern through the school unit which was most often the secondary school. The third pattern of moving through the elementary school was less likely to occur.[192]

Two ceiling positions were identified by Gaertner; they were the superintendent and the elementary principal. People did not move vertically on the career ladder after obtaining these positions. The positions of administrative specialist and assistant superintendent were found to be plateau or demotion positions.[193]

In a study on elementary principals, Wolcott supported Gaertner's ideas on the lack of upward mobility in the elementary principal position. He found that the majority of elementary principals have no aspirations to move upward on the

---

[191]Carlson, pp. 51-53.

[192]Karen Gaertner, "The Structure of Careers in Public School Administration," Administrator's Notebook, 27 (1978), 1-4.

[193]Gaertner, p. 3.

career ladder. They strongly identified with the school and judged themselves successful if they were viewed positively by their colleagues and superiors.[194]

Moving upward on the career ladder has been viewed as an indication of a successful school administrator. However, there are many factors which play a part in the decision to move upward. The ability to move, the goals of a person and the ability to perform the job are all considerations which must be examined to determine if promotion is an indication of success.

---

[194]H. F. Wolcott, The Man in the Principal's Office: An Ethnography (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973), pp. 317-327.

CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES

The purpose for conducting this study was to determine if there were relationships between achieving success as a school administrator and any of the following: 1) the ratings from the NASSP Assessment Center, 2) Educational Administration 850 grades and 3) Educational Administration 850 ratings. The research focused on the following questions:

1. Is there a significant relationship between Educational Administration 850 grades and Educational Administration 850 ratings?

   Variables to be investigated:

   A. Educational Administration 850 Grades

   B. Educational Administration 850 Ratings

      1. Self Ratings

      2. Instructor Ratings

      3. Peer Ratings

2. Is there a significant relationship between NASSP Assessment Center ratings and Educational Administration 850 ratings?

   Variables to be investigated:

   A. NASSP Assessment Center Ratings

68

1. Problem Analysis

2. Judgment

3. Organizational Ability

4. Decisiveness

5. Leadership

6. Written Communication

7. Personal Motivation

    B. Educational Administration 850 Ratings

       1. Self Ratings

       2. Peer Ratings

       3. Instructor Ratings

3. Is there a significant relationship between NASSP Assessment Center ratings and Educational Administration 850 grades?

    Variables to be investigated:

    A. NASSP Assessment Center Ratings

       1. Problem Analysis

       2. Judgment

       3. Organizational Ability

       4. Decisiveness

       5. Leadership

       6. Written Communication

       7. Personal Motivation

    B. Educational Administration 850 grades

4. Is there a significant relationship between success as a school administrator and Educational Administration 850 grades and ratings and NASSP Assessment Center ratings?

Variables to be investigated:

A. Success

    1. Job Promotion

    2. Human Relations Skills

    3. Job Performance

    4. Goal Attainment

    5. Job Satisfaction

B. Educational Administration 850 Grades

C. Educational Administration 850 Ratings

    1. Self Ratings

    2. Peer Ratings

    3. Instructor Ratings

D. NASSP Assessment Center Ratings

    1. Problem Analysis

    2. Judgment

    3. Organizational Ability

    4. Decisiveness

    5. Leadership

    6. Written Communication

    7. Personal Motivation

Survey of Literature

The first step in surveying the literature was the initiation of a computer search of ERIC materials on the topics of assessment centers, occupational success, and prediction of success. An extensive survey was also made of other literature and of the content regarding leadership theory, career mobility, career ladders and the training and selection of educational administrators.

Participants

The participants in this study were 43 educators who had completed the course Educational Administration 850 and the NASSP Assessment Center. These participants were identified by matching the names of individuals who had been participants in both the NASSP Assessment Center and Educational Administration 850.

Approval for Use of Human Subjects

Application was made to the University of Nebraska Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects for permission to initiate this research project. Permission was granted in March, 1986. (Appendix A) There also was a written statement in the contract between the NASSP Assessment Center and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln that ratings of all participants were available for research purposes within the prescribed procedures and measures for insuring the protection of confidential data. (Appendix A) All

participants of the Assessment Center signed a release form indicating that the results of their assessment could be made available for research purposes.

All participants in the study received two copies of a written consent form explaining the research study and their involvement. All the identified population who chose to participate signed the consent form and returned it and kept one copy for their records. (Appendix A)

Instrumentation

The data for this study were drawn from several sources. These sources included the NASSP Assessment Center ratings, Educational Administration 850 grades and ratings, a survey of the sample population and a survey of the participants' supervisors. While some ex post facto data were drawn from existing sources such as the Assessment Center ratings and Educational Administration 850 grades and ratings, survey instruments were developed to gather additional information from the sample and their supervisors.

A review of literature was undertaken to identify elements that could be used to define success. No single criterion was found. The literature listed a variety of criteria that had been used in past research studies. Ten elements were identified which seem to be the most prominent in the literature.

In order to obtain a valid definition of occupational success for a school administrator, a panel of experts was asked for their input. A panel of twenty-five educational administration experts from Nebraska and Kansas was established. This panel consisted of superintendents, associate superintendents,

Educational Services Unit administrators, professors of Educational Administration and administrators of professional educational organizations. (Appendix B)

A survey was developed that listed the ten elements of occupational success that had been identified from the literature. The survey included each element and a Likert scale so that each element could be measured in terms of importance when defining occupational success. The scale ranged from very important to very unimportant. (Appendix B)

The survey to validate criteria for measuring success was sent to the panel of experts in November, 1985. A 100 percent return was received on this survey. The results from the survey indicated five elements that were considered to be very important by the panel of experts. They were in order: 1) human relations skills, 2) job performance, 3) goal attainment, 4) job satisfaction and 5) promotion. The mean of the top five elements was above 2.0 or within the very important range. (See Table 1)

Table 1

Survey Results of Elements of Occupational Success
for School Administrators

Elements	Very Important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Unimportant	Mean	S.D.
Promotion	4	18	2	0	0	1.917	.504
Job Satisfaction	15	5	5	0	0	1.600	.816
Performance	21	4	0	0	0	1.160	.374
Goal Attainment	15	8	2	0	0	1.480	.653
Awards	0	15	8	2	0	2.480	.653
Income	1	15	8	1	0	2.360	.638
Education	4	18	2	3	0	2.160	.850
Job Stability	2	14	7	2	0	2.360	.757
Experience	0	13	8	4	0	2.640	.757
Human Relations	23	1	1	0	0	1.120	.440

The five criteria were then used as the basis for the development of two surveys which were sent to the sample population and their supervisors. The first survey was designed to be sent to the identified participants asking for information related to personal history, goal attainment, promotion, and job satisfaction.

The questions concerning job satisfaction were drawn from Bullock's Job Satisfaction Scale. The scale has a split-half reliability of .93 and test-retest reliability of .94 as reported by Bullock.[195] On this ten item scale, the participants were asked to consider their roles as an administrator or educational leader and to select for each item one of the five alternate statements that most accurately and honestly described their feelings about their jobs. The alternative for each item ranged from an expression of high job satisfaction to an expression of low job dissatisfaction. The tenth item required the participants to indicate their overall job satisfaction.

Questions concerning goal attainment were asked. These questions related to what the participants' occupational goals were, if they had been reached and if they felt they were progressing towards their goal. Additional questions were asked to determine if they felt they were career-bound or place-bound and why.

Promotion was defined as the progress on the career ladder in terms of title or size of school district. The participants were asked to list their career moves including the position held, the size of student population and the dates of

[195] R. P. Bullock, Social Factors Related to Job Satisfaction: A Technique for Measurement of Satisfaction, Research Monograph No. 70. (Columbus: State University Bureau of Business Research, 1952).

employment. One point was given each time a move was made on the career ladder, as defined by Gaertner, or to a larger school district.[196] The question was scored by giving a total number of points for the number of moves made up the career ladder in terms of position or school size.

A sample survey was sent in March, 1986 to twenty-five educational administrators throughout the state of Nebraska. Eighty percent of these surveys were returned. The Crombache's Alpha Reliability Test was used to measure internal consistency. The reliability of this survey instrument was .4096. A further examination of the survey indicated that if three questions concerning job satisfaction were deleted the alpha level of the reliability rating would rise. It was determined there were seven other questions concerning job satisfaction and these seven questions would provide sufficient information on the subject. When the three questions on job satisfaction were removed from the survey, the reliability of the survey instrument rose to .7417.

An additional survey was developed to be sent to the participants' immediate supervisors requesting input on job performance and human relations skills. The human relations skills questions were developed from Ronald Doll's research on administrative behavior in human relations. After extensive interviewing, Doll identified five major human relations characteristics that were indicative of a successful school administrator.[197] Using these five areas as the basis for the questions, supervisors were asked to respond on a Likert scale concerning their observations of these human relations skills.

---

[196]Gaertner, p. 2.

[197]Ronald Doll, Leadership To Improve Schools, (Worthington: Charles A. Jones, 1972), 35-59.

The job performance section of the survey was based on the twelve dimensions of the NASSP Assessment Center. The supervisor was asked to rate on a Likert scale the effectiveness of the participant in each of the dimensions. There were also two questions concerning the participants' overall rating as an administrator and their potential for advancement.

A second survey was also piloted in March, 1986. This survey was sent to twenty-five educational administrators as a pilot. They were asked to choose a subordinate and rate him or her with the survey. An 80 percent return rate was received. The Crombache's Alpha Reliability test was used. The reliability of the human relations section of the survey was .8641. The reliability of the job performance section of the survey was .9010.

Ex Post Facto Data Sources

Two of the data sources were drawn from existing records at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The NASSP Assessment Center ratings were reviewed. These records were available from 1980 when the Assessment Center was established on the University of Nebraska-Lincoln campus. Additional information on the participants' Educational Administration 850 grades and ratings were collected from the Educational Administration department at UN-L. These records were available from 1971 to 1984.

Data Collection

First Phase

The collection of data was divided into three phases. The first phase was to send the 60 identified participants a survey and consent form in April, 1986. They

were asked to read and sign the consent form and to respond to the questionnaire providing information on personal history, promotion, goal attainment and job satisfaction. They were also asked for the name of their immediate supervisor. (Appendix C)

A follow-up postcard was sent two weeks later to those individuals who had not yet returned their survey. An additional letter and survey were sent two weeks later to those people who had still not responded. (Appendix C)

Second Phase

The second phase was to gather additional information from the participants' immediate supervisor. The survey was sent upon receipt of the initial survey and consent form. (Appendix D) This survey asked for input on the participant's job performance and human relations skills. A follow-up letter and survey were sent to those supervisors who had not responded to the first inquiry. A third letter and survey were sent to those few who had not responded from the first or second letter. (Appendix D)

Of the initial survey, 45 of the 60 were eventually returned. Six were not returned because of unknown addresses and six people chose not to return their surveys. Three surveys were returned by participants who chose not to participate in the research for varying reasons. A total of 15 surveys were not completed.

The follow-up survey to the participants' supervisors yielded 43 of the 45 initial responses. One of the supervisors indicated a reluctance to evaluate one of the participants. The return rate of useable information was 72 percent.

Third Phase

The third phase of data collection was to gather information from the existing records. Ratings for each participant in the NASSP Assessment Center were obtained from the files. The ratings from the NASSP Assessment Center that were used were the six dimensions which were judged to be the most necessary to the performance of the job.[198] These dimensions were problem analysis, judgment, organizational ability, decisiveness, leadership and written communication. Personal motivation, a seventh dimension, was also considered.

The NASSP Assessment Center ratings were reported by ratings from extremely low to extremely high. There were thirteen different ratings participants could have received. These ratings were converted to an interval scale from one to thirteen. One indicated extremely low with a thirteen indicating extremely high. (Appendix E)

The Educational Administration 850 grades and ratings were obtained from the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The information was gathered on all participants who had returned their consent forms.

The grades from the Educational Administration 850 course were converted to an interval scale. Therefore, an A+ was a 4.5, an A a 4.0, a B+ a 3.5, a B a 3.0, a C+ a 2.5, a C a 2.0, a D a 1 and an F a 0. Most participants also had received three ratings which indicated their performance in the course. These indicators were a self-assessment rating, a peer rating, and a rating by the instructors. The peer and instructor ratings were reported as letter grades and were also converted

_____

[198]Schmitt, et al., pp. 51-61.

to the interval scale mentioned above. (Appendix E) The self-assessment rating was on an interval scale of four to ten with ten being the highest score.

Data Analysis

The first three hypotheses were analyzed by using a bivariate correlation coefficient. The NASSP Assessment Center ratings and Educational Administration 850 grades and ratings were compared to determine if relationships existed between any of the variables.

The Pearson product-moment correlation method was used to compute a correlation coefficient between the Educational Administration 850 grades and ratings and the NASSP Assessment Center ratings. This method was used because it was considered to have the smallest standard of error compared to other correlation techniques.

The coefficients were examined to determine if relationships existed between variables and the level of significance. After examining the data, the information was used to determine if significant relationships existed between the variables.

The fourth hypothesis was analyzed by using a stepwise multiple regression. The stepwise multiple regression analysis was used because it can aid in determining whether several predictor variables have an influence on a criterion variable. In this study, the predictor variables were the NASSP Assessment Center ratings and the Educational Administration 850 grades and ratings. The

criterion variables were the indicators of success as established by the panel of experts.

Correlation matrixs were developed between the predictor variable and each of the success indicators. This information was then used in a regression equation to establish a multiple correlation coefficient (R) and the common variance (R^2). These data indicated if there were variables in either the 850 grades and ratings or the Assessment Center ratings that could be used as predictors of success and the degree of their predictability.

CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose for conducting this study was to determine if there were relationships between success as a school administrator and any of the following: 1) Educational Administration 850 grades, 2) Educational Administration 850 ratings and 3) NASSP Assessment Center ratings. In this chapter, the characteristics of the sample group are described. The results of the four hypotheses developed in chapter one are reported and analyzed in terms of the variables specified in each hypothesis.

The first three hypotheses were analyzed using a bivariate correlation coefficient. This analysis determines the degree of relationship between two variables. The correlation coefficient is a precise way of stating the extent to which one variable is related to another. In this study the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) was used. This analysis was chosen because a relationship indicated by the coefficient is computed as if there were only the two variables and other variables did not exist. The Pearson product-moment method is a stable technique and is subject to the smallest standard error and determines the extent of relationship between two variables. The correlation does not substantiate causability but indicates the probability of a positive or negative relationship.

81

Correlation coefficients can range from positive 1.00 to negative 1.00. A positive correlation indicates that a high value of one of the two variables being correlated is associated with high values of the other variable. The same can be said if low values exist and are associated with the two variables. An inverse relationship exists when there is a negative correlation. Low values of a variable are matched to a high value of the other variable or vice versa. There is a lack of relationship between the two variables when the correlation range is near zero.

The following guidelines for interpreting correlation coefficients were suggested by Borg and Gall:

1)   correlation coefficients of .20 or under define no relationship,

2)   correlation coefficients of .20 to .35 define slight relationships,

3)   correlation coefficients of .35 to .60 define moderate relationships, and

4)   correlation coefficients of .65 to .85 define a high degree of relationship and allow possible group predictions that are sufficiently accurate for most purposes.[199]

The stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to determine the significance of hypothesis four. This procedure was chosen because it analyzes the extent to which criterion behavior patterns can be predicted. A stepwise multiple regression can combine two or more of the predictor variables and determine if they are better predictors than one predictor variable alone. The

[199]Walter R. Borg and Meredith Damien Gall, Educational Research: An Introduction, (New York: Longman, 1979), 513-514.

stepwise multiple regression weights each variable in terms of its importance in making a desired prediction.

The data are reported by multiple correlation coefficient (R) which measures the magnitude of a relationship and ranges from 0.00 to 1.00. The larger the R the stronger the association between the variables. The common variance (R^2) is the percent of variance in the two measures that have been correlated that is common to both. Determining the common variance is important because in prediction studies correlations must exceed statistical significance to be of practical value.

For the purpose of this study, the .05 alpha level was used as the criterion for significance. Four hypotheses were investigated and all were stated as null hypotheses.

Sample Characteristics

The sample group was composed of 43 educators who had completed Educational Administration 850 and participated in the NASSP Assessment Center. This group's present job assignments varied. They included superintendents, principals, teachers and several people who were no longer working in education. (See Table 2)

Table 2

Present Job Assignments of Sample Group
of Persons Who Have Completed
Educational Administration 850 and
the NASSP Assessment Center

Assignment	Frequency	Percent
Teacher	10	23.3
Assistant Principal, Elementary	1	2.3
Assistant Principal, Secondary	4	9.3
Elementary Principal	7	16.3
Secondary Principal	9	20.9
Administrator of Instruction	1	2.3
Assistant Superintendent	1	2.3
Superintendent	2	4.7
College/University Staff	1	2.3
College/University Administrator	1	2.3
Other	6	14.0

The size of school districts or colleges that the sample group worked in ranged from 200 students to 170,000 students. Almost one half of the participants worked in school districts from 0-1000 students. (See Table 3). The mode was a school district with 1300 students.

Table 3

Size of Student Population Being Served by Sample
Group of Persons Who Have Completed
Educational Administration 850 and
the NASSP Assessment Center

Size of District	Frequency	Percent
0-1000	19	48.7
1001-2000	6	15.3
2001-3000	2	5.1
3001-4000	2	5.1
4001-5000	2	5.1
5001-6000	2	5.1
6001-7000	0	0
7001-8000	0	0
8001-9000	1	2.6
9001-10000	0	0
10001-15000	2	5.1
15001-20000	0	0
20001-25000	0	0
25001-30000	2	5.1
Over 100,000	1	2.6

A master's degree was the highest educational degree obtained by the greatest number of people. Only two people had obtained doctorates. (See Table 4) A majority of the sample group were continuing to advance their education by obtaining higher degrees. Most of these people were participating in a doctoral or specialist program. (See Table 5)

Table 4

Highest Degree Obtained by Sample
Group of Persons Who Have Completed
Educational Administration 850 and
the NASSP Assessment Center

Degree	Frequency	Percent
Bachelor's Degree	3	7.0
Master's Degree	30	69.8
Specialist Certificate	8	18.6
Doctorate Degree	2	4.7

Table 5

Number Working on a Higher Degree by Sample Group
of Persons Who Have Completed
Educational Administration 850 and
the NASSP Assessment Center

Working on Degree	Frequency	Percent
Yes	29	67.4
No	13	30.2
Missing	1	2.3

The amount of administrative experience reported by the sample ranged
from no administrative experience to between sixteen and twenty years of
administrative experience. The mean number of years fell in the one to five year
range. (See Table 6)

Table 6

Number of Years of Administrative Experience
by Sample Group of Persons Who Have Completed
Educational Administration 850 and
the NASSP Assessment Center

Number of Years	Frequency	Percent
0 Years	12	28.6
1-5 Years	23	54.8
6-10 Years	5	11.9
11-15 Years	1	2.4
16-20 Years	1	2.4
Over 20 Years	0	0.0

There were 30 males and 13 females who participated in the study. (See Table 7) The age of the group ranged from 27 years to 52 years. The mean was 34.9 with a standard deviation of 5.98. (See Table 8)

Table 7

Sex of Sample Group of Persons Who Have Completed
Educational Administration 850 and
the NASSP Assessment Center

Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	30	69.8
Female	13	30.2

Table 8

Age of Sample Group of Persons Who Have Completed
Educational Administration 850 and
the NASSP Assessment Center

Age	Frequency	Percent
Under 25	0	0
25-30	11	26.2
31-35	14	33.3
36-40	10	23.8
41-45	4	9.5
46-50	2	4.8
Over 50	1	2.4

The sample group was a predominately male group of young administrators. The group has had a limited amount of administrative experience in smaller school districts. Ninety percent of the group had obtained their master's degree or higher. Over two-thirds of the group was continuing to pursue their education in order to obtain a higher degree.

Two of the criteria of occupational success that were validated by the panel of experts were promotion and goal attainment. Both of these had been established in the literature as important elements to consider when judging occupational success.[200, 201] The sample group was asked several questions concerning these two criteria and how they interpreted their ability to progress up the educational career ladder.

Thirteen of the twenty-two people in the sample group who had been promoted had only been promoted once to an administrative position. The highest number of promotions was three and this included only five people. The mean for promotion was 1.7. (See Table 9).

Table 9

Number of Promotions of Sample Group of
Persons Who Have Completed Educational
Administration 850 and the NASSP
Assessment Center

Number of Promotions	Frequency	Percent
0	14	33.0
1	13	30.0
2	11	26.0
3	5	12.0

[200]Cohen, pp. 281-284.

[201]Stott, p. 110.

The greatest number of people had as their career goal the position of superintendent with secondary and elementary principals as the next two choices. (See Table 10) Only three of the people had reached their career goal while the majority were still pursuing their goal. (See Table 11) The satisfaction rate for the advancement toward their career goal was either in the completely satisfied or more than satisfied range for over 75 percent of the people. (See Table 12)

Table 10

Career Goals of Sample Group of Persons Who Have
Completed Educational Administration 850 and
the NASSP Assessment Center

Career Goal	Frequency	Percent
Superintendent	14	32.6
Secondary Principal	9	20.9
Elementary Principal	6	14.0
Instructional/Curricular Supervisor	3	7.0
Administrator of Instruction	2	4.7
Administrative Specialist	2	4.7
College/University Staff	1	2.3
Teacher	1	2.3
No Definite Goal	2	4.7
Other	3	3.0

Table 11

Attainment of Career Goal of Sample Group of Persons
Who Have Completed Educational Administration 850
and the NASSP Assessment Center

Attainment of Goal	Frequency	Percent
Reached Goal	3	7.0
Almost Reached Goal	8	18.6
Not Sure Reached Goal	1	2.3
Not Reached Goal	23	53.5
Definitely Not Reached Goal	8	18.6

Table 12

Satisfaction of Progress Toward Career Goal of Sample
Group of Persons Who Have Completed Educational
Administration 850 and the NASSP Assessment Center

Satisfaction Rate	Frequency	Percent
Completely Satisfied	10	23.3
More Satisfied than Dissatisfied	23	53.5
About Half and Half	7	16.3
More Dissatisfied than Satisfied	3	7.0
Completely Dissatisfied	0	0.0

When job changes were made to attain career goals, an equal number of people considered themselves either place-bound or career-bound. Almost as many people classified themselves as neither. Many of the people in the neither category considered themselves in a static position in their career while they were obtaining a higher educational degree or wanting to gain experience before making a career move. Several people also stated that if the right opportunity presented itself, they would move but were not actively seeking a position. (See Table 13)

Men were more career-bound than women. Forty-seven percent of the men stated they were career-bound while only one (8%) of the women stated that she was career-bound. The highest percentage (54%) of women chose the "neither" category. When giving reasons for this choice most of them centered around the inability to move for family reasons.

The fifteen people who considered themselves place-bound were asked to list a reason for their choice. (See Table 14) Of the people marking themselves place-bound, 38 percent were women and 30 percent were men. Both men and women listed spouse's occupation as the major reason for not being able to move. Other family considerations also played a large part in the reason for not being able to seek career opportunities outside of the area in which they live.

Table 13

Classification of Career–Bound and Place–Bound
by Sample Group of Persons Who Have Completed
Educational Administration 850 and
the NASSP Assessment Center

Classification	Frequency	Percent
Place–bound	15	34.9
Career–bound	15	34.9
Neither	13	30.2

Table 14

Reasons Given for Choosing Place–Bound by Sample
Group of Persons Who Have Completed
Educational Administration 850 and
the NASSP Assessment Center

Reason	Frequency	Percent
Spouse's Occupation	6	40.0
Other Family Considerations	6	40.0
Health Reasons	0	00.0
Geographic Location	1	6.7
Educational Considerations	2	13.3

Overall, the sample population was a young, upwardly mobile group with a small amount of administrative experience. They had set career goals for themselves and were progressing toward those goals in a satisfactory manner. They were well-educated and were working towards higher degrees to help attain their career goals. They seemed to have a varying set of circumstances that determined the rate of progress toward their career goals. Family needs as well as gaining experience and education were major considerations in making career decisions.

Relationships between Educational Administration 850 Grades
and Ratings and the NASSP Assessment Center Ratings

Hypothesis One – There is no significant relationship between Educational Administration 850 grades and Educational Administration 850 ratings.

Hypothesis one was divided into subhypotheses to analyze significant relationships between the three separate ratings in Educational Administration 850 and the 850 grades. The subhypotheses were:

1-A) There is no significant relationship between Educational Administration 850 grades and Educational Administration 850 peer ratings.

1-B) There is no significant relationship between Educational Administration 850 grades and Educational Administration 850 instructor ratings.

1-C) There is no significant relationship between Educational Administration 850 grades and Educational Administration 850 self ratings.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated to determine if there were relationships between Educational Administration grades and ratings. Correlation coefficients were computed between Educational Administration 850 grades and the ratings given in Educational Administration 850. Two of the three ratings given in Education Administration 850 were significant correlations (at the .05 level). The correlation coefficient of the peer ratings with grades was .6727. The correlation coefficient of instructor ratings with grades was .7939. Both of these ratings showed a high degree of positive relationships. The coefficient correlation of the self-assessment ratings and the 850 grade was .2999. This was not a significant relationship. (See Table 15)

Table 15

Correlation Coefficients of Educational Administration 850
Grades and Ratings

Educational Administration Grades	Educational Administration Ratings		
	Peer	Instructor	Self
Grade	.6727***	.7936***	.2999

*** Correlation significant at the .001 level.
** Correlation significant at the .01 level.
* Correlation significant at the .05 level.

In the course Educational Administration 850, peer ratings and instructor ratings each constituted 30 percent of the final grade. The self rating was 10 percent, a term paper 15 percent, and a written test 15 percent of the final grade.

Because the peer and instructor ratings constituted a higher percentage of the final grade there is a positive correlation between grades and ratings.

Two of the three subhypotheses in hypothesis one were found to have significant relationships. In subhypotheses 1-A and 1-B, there were significant relationships between 850 grades and peer and instructor ratings. As stated in subhypothesis 1-C, no significant relationship existed between 850 grades and the self rating.

Hypothesis Two – There is no significant relationship between NASSP Assessment Center ratings and the Educational Administration 850 ratings.

Hypothesis two was divided into subhypotheses in order to analyze if significant relationships existed between the three separate Educational Administration 850 ratings and the NASSP Assessment Center ratings. The subhypotheses were:

2-A) There was no significant relationship between NASSP Assessment Center ratings and the Educational Administration 850 self ratings.

2-B) There was no significant relationship between NASSP Assessment Center ratings and the Educational Administration 850 peer ratings.

2-C) There was no significant relationship between NASSP Assessment Center ratings and the Educational Administration 850 instructor ratings.

The NASSP Assessment Center ratings and the Educational Administration 850 ratings were examined to determine if there were relationships between these two sets of variables. Six significant correlations were found between the

Assessment Center ratings and Educational Administration 850 ratings. The self assessment ratings had no statistically significant correlations with any of the seven Assessment Center ratings. All seven correlations ranged between a -.01 to a +.21 which would indicate there were no relationships and none of them were significant at the .05 level.

No significant relationships were found between three of the Assessment Center ratings and the Educational Administration 850 ratings. These dimensions were decisiveness, written communication and personal motivation. These correlations ranged between -.01 to +.31.

Correlations with Educational Administration 850 peer and instructor ratings were found with the other four Assessment Center ratings. (See Table 16) These correlations were positive and showed slight to moderate relationships. Six of the twenty-one correlations were significant at the .05 level.

The NASSP ratings of problem analysis and leadership were the two areas in which both peer and instructor ratings from Educational Administration 850 were significantly correlated. The Assessment Center rating of judgment showed a moderate relationship with Educational Administration 850 peer ratings. The NASSP Assessment rating of organizational ability also indicated a slight relationship with the 850 instructor ratings. (See Table 16) These relationships were all statistically significant.

Table 16

Correlation Coefficients of Educational Administration 850 Ratings
and NASSP Assessment Center Ratings

NASSP Assessment Center Ratings	Educational Administration 850 Ratings		
	Peer	Instructor	Self
Problem Analysis	.4749**	.4248**	.1340
Judgment	.3355*	.1696	.1301
Organizational Ability	.2504	.3529*	.2566
Decisiveness	-.0113	.0006	.0650
Leadership	.5279***	.4148**	.2193
Written Communication	.3074	.1982	.1646
Personal Motivation	.2126	.0064	-.0101

*** Significant at the .001 level
** Significant at the .01 level
* Significant at the .05 level

The 850 peer ratings correlated with three of the seven NASSP Assessment Center ratings. Leadership, judgment and problem analysis would be areas that could be exhibited by class discussion and other class activities.

The correlations between 850 instructor ratings and the NASSP ratings of problem analysis and leadership were moderately related indicating that instructors through a variety of techniques could determine these abilities. Organizational ability also was moderately related. The instructors could see evidence of this ability through assignments, test, simulations and in-baskets that peers might not have the opportunity to evaluate.

Hypothesis two was divided into three subhypotheses in order to analyze the relationships between each of the 850 ratings and the Assessment Center ratings. There were no significant relationships found in Subhypothesis 2-A between any of the Assessment Center ratings and the 850 self ratings. In investigating Subhypothesis 2-B, three of the seven Assessment Center ratings were found to have significant relationships with the 850 peer ratings. Contrary to the hypothesis stated in 2-C, three of the seven Assessment Center ratings were found to have significant relationships with the 850 instructor ratings.

Hypothesis Three - There was no significant relationship between NASSP Assessment Center ratings and Educational Administration 850 grades.

The relationship between Assessment Center ratings and 850 grades was examined. Correlation coefficients were computed among NASSP Assessment Center ratings and Educational Administration 850 grades. A moderate relationship was found in three of the seven ratings. Problem analysis, organizational ability, and leadership had positive correlations and were significant at the .05 level. (See Table 17)

Table 17

Correlation Coefficients of Educational Administration 850 Grades
and NASSP Assessment Center Ratings

NASSP Assessment Center Ratings	Educational Administration 850 Grades
Problem Analysis	.4296**
Judgment	.2139
Organizational Ability	.4575**
Decisiveness	.0512
Leadership	.4503**
Written Communication	.2616
Personal Motivation	-.0374

*** Significant at the .001
** Significant at the .01
* Significant at the .05

The three relationships that were judged to be significant between the Educational Administration 850 ratings and 850 grades were also found to be significant when the Assessment Center ratings were computed. The NASSP ratings of problem analysis and leadership continued to be areas that correlated high with Educational Administration 850. Leadership was an important attribute in Educational Administration 850. Tasks have been developed to allow for leadership skills to emerge. These skills were also encouraged.

Organizational ability and problem analysis were also found to correlate with grades. These skills were developed in tasks in 850 such as writing papers, taking tests, participating in simulations and in-baskets and taking part in discussions.

Personal motivation was negatively correlated (-.0374). It had no relationship between 850 grades and the Assessment Center ratings.

In hypothesis three, three of the seven Assessment Center ratings were found to have significant relationships. Problem analysis, organizational ability and leadership had significant relationships with Educational Administration 850 grades.

Relationships Between Success and Educational Administration 850

Grades and Ratings and the NASSP Assessment Center Ratings

Hypotheses Four - There is no significant relationship between success as a school administrator and Educational Administration 850 grades and ratings and the NASSP Assessment Center ratings.

Occupational success as defined by the panel of experts included the variables of job performance, goal attainment, promotion, human relations skills and job satisfaction. Each of these dependent variables was used in a stepwise forward inclusion regression analysis to determine if any of the independent variables could be used as predictor variables. The five dependent variables were

analyzed independently. Multiple criteria for prediction of success and not the use of a composite score has been identified in the literature as the most appropriate way to measure success.[202]

The dependent variables of job performance, job satisfaction, promotion, human relations skills and goal attainment were entered into separate correlation matrixes with the independent variables of Assessment Center ratings and Educational Administration 850 grades and ratings. (See Tables 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22)

---

[202]Dunnette, p. 12.

Table 18
Correlation Matrix Relationships between the NASSP Assessment
Center Ratings, Educational Administration 850 Grades
and Ratings and Job Performance

	Problem Analysis	Judgment	Organizational Ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Written Communication	Personal Motivation	Peer	Instructor	Self	Grade	Job Performance
Problem Analysis	1.000	.671	.609	.375	.582	.381	.479	.165	.110	-.187	.430	-.443
Judgment	.671	1.000	.576	.492	.675	.339	.589	.213	.129	-.103	.214	-.131
Organizational Ability	.609	.576	1.000	.635	.401	.501	.426	.090	.108	-.072	.458	-.214
Decisiveness	.375	.492	.635	1.000	.253	.297	.377	-.186	-.188	-.312	.051	-.071
Leadership	.582	.675	.401	.253	1.000	.291	.356	.137	.051	-.146	.450	-.188
Written Communication	.381	.339	.501	.297	.291	1.000	.555	.327	.273	.100	.262	-.251
Personal Motivation	.479	.589	.426	.377	.356	.555	1.000	.223	.136	.042	-.037	-.316
Peer	.165	.213	.090	-.186	.137	.327	.223	1.000	.922	.603	.450	-.104
Instructor	.110	.129	.108	-.188	.051	.273	.136	.922	1.000	.599	.451	-.100
Self	-.187	-.103	-.072	-.312	-.146	.100	.042	.603	.599	1.000	.172	-.012
Grade	.430	.214	.458	.051	.450	.262	-.037	.450	.451	.172	1.000	-.331
Job Performance	-.443	-.131	-.214	-.071	-.188	-.251	-.316	-.104	-.100	-.012	-.331	1.000

N = 43

Table 19
Correlation Matrix Relationships between the NASSP Assessment Center
Ratings, Educational Administration 850 Grades and
Ratings and Goal Attainment

	Problem Analysis	Judgment	Organizational Ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Written Communication	Personal Motivation	Peer	Instructor	Self	Grade	Goal Attainment
Problem Analysis	1.000	.671	.609	.375	.582	.381	.479	.165	.110	-.187	.430	-.056
Judgment	.671	1.000	.576	.492	.675	.339	.589	.213	.129	-.103	.214	-.159
Organizational Ability	.609	.576	1.000	.635	.401	.501	.426	.090	.108	-.072	.458	-.095
Decisiveness	.375	.492	.635	1.000	.253	.297	.377	-.186	-.188	-.312	.051	-.033
Leadership	.582	.675	.401	.253	1.000	.291	.356	.137	.051	-.146	.450	-.211
Written Communication	.381	.339	.501	.297	.291	1.000	.555	.327	.273	.100	.262	-.286
Personal Motivation	.479	.589	.426	.377	.356	.555	1.000	.223	.136	.042	-.037	-.179
Peer	.165	.213	.090	-.186	.137	.327	.223	1.000	.922	.603	.450	-.137
Instructor	.110	.129	.108	-.188	.051	.273	.136	.922	1.000	.599	.451	-.004
Self	-.187	-.103	-.072	-.312	-.146	.100	.042	.603	.599	1.000	.172	-.015
Grade	.430	.214	.458	.051	.450	.262	-.037	.450	.451	.172	1.000	-.075
Goal Attainment	-.056	-.159	-.095	-.033	-.211	-.286	-.179	-.137	-.004	-.015	-.075	1.000

N = 43

Table 20

Correlation Matrix Relationships between the NASSP Assessment Center
Ratings, Educational Administration 850 Grades and
Ratings and Job Satisfaction

	Problem Analysis	Judgment	Organizational Ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Written Communication	Personal Motivation	Peer	Instructor	Self	Grade	Job Satisfaction
Problem Analysis	1.000	.671	.609	.375	.582	.381	.479	.165	.110	-.187	.430	-.051
Judgment	.671	1.000	.576	.492	.675	.339	.589	.213	.129	-.103	.214	-.034
Organizational Ability	.609	.576	1.000	.635	.401	.501	.426	.090	.108	-.072	.458	-.076
Decisiveness	.375	.492	.635	1.000	.253	.297	.377	-.186	-.188	-.312	.051	.057
Leadership	.582	.675	.401	.253	1.000	.291	.356	.137	.051	-.146	.450	-.025
Written Communication	.381	.339	.501	.297	.291	1.000	.555	.327	.273	.100	.262	-.014
Personal Motivation	.479	.589	.426	.377	.356	.555	1.000	.223	.136	.042	-.037	.015
Peer	.165	.213	.090	-.186	.137	.327	.223	1.000	.922	.603	.450	-.016
Instructor	.110	.129	.108	-.188	.051	.273	.136	.922	1.000	.599	.451	.031
Self	-.187	-.103	-.072	-.312	-.146	.100	.042	.603	.599	1.000	.172	.253
Grade	.430	.214	.458	.051	.450	.262	-.037	.450	.451	.172	1.000	-.062
Job Satisfaction	-.051	-.034	-.076	.057	-.025	-.014	.013	-.016	.031	.253	-.062	1.000

N = 43

Table 21
Correlation Matrix Relationships between the NASSP Assessment Center
Ratings, Educational Administration 850 Grades and
Ratings and Promotion

	Problem Analysis	Judgment	Organizational Ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Written Communication	Personal Motivation	Peer	Instructor	Self	Grade	Promotion
Problem Analysis	1.000	.671	.609	.375	.582	.381	.479	.165	.110	-.187	.430	.447
Judgment	.671	1.000	.576	.492	.675	.339	.589	.213	.129	-.103	.214	.352
Organizational Ability	.609	.576	1.000	.635	.401	.501	.426	.090	.108	-.072	.458	.450
Decisiveness	.375	.492	.635	1.000	.253	.297	.377	-.186	-.188	-.312	.051	.274
Leadership	.582	.675	.401	.253	1.000	.291	.356	.137	.051	-.146	.450	.485
Written Communication	.381	.339	.501	.297	.291	1.000	.555	.327	.273	.100	.262	.346
Personal Motivation	.479	.589	.426	.377	.356	.555	1.000	.223	.136	.042	-.037	.400
Peer	.165	.213	.090	-.186	.137	.327	.223	1.000	.922	.603	.450	.141
Instructor	.110	.129	.108	-.188	.051	.273	.136	.922	1.000	.599	.451	.031
Self	-.187	-.103	-.072	-.312	-.146	.100	.042	.603	.599	1.000	.172	-.174
Grade	.430	.214	.458	.051	.450	.262	-.037	.450	.451	.172	1.000	.377
Promotion	.447	.352	.450	.274	.485	.346	.400	.141	.031	-.174	.377	1.000

N = 43

Table 22
Correlation Matrix Relationships between the NASSP Assessment Center Ratings, Educational Administration 850 Grades and Ratings, and Human Relations Skills

	Problem Analysis	Judgment	Organizational Ability	Decisiveness	Leadership	Written Communication	Personal Motivation	Peer	Instructor	Self	Grade	Human Relations Skills
Problem Analysis	1.000	.671	.609	.375	.582	.381	.479	.165	.110	-.187	.430	-.384
Judgment	.671	1.000	.576	.492	.675	.339	.589	.213	.129	-.103	.214	-.199
Organizational Ability	.609	.576	1.000	.635	.401	.501	.426	.090	.108	-.072	.458	-.119
Decisiveness	.375	.492	.635	1.000	.253	.297	.377	-.186	-.188	-.312	.051	-.087
Leadership	.582	.675	.401	.253	1.000	.291	.356	.137	.051	-.146	.450	-.242
Written Communication	.381	.339	.501	.297	.291	1.000	.555	.327	.273	.100	.262	-.236
Personal Motivation	.479	.589	.426	.377	.356	.555	1.000	.223	.136	.042	-.037	-.391
Peer	.165	.213	.090	-.186	.137	.327	.223	1.000	.922	.603	.450	-.024
Instructor	.110	.129	.108	-.188	.051	.273	.136	.922	1.000	.599	.451	-.029
Self	-.187	-.103	-.072	-.312	-.146	.100	.042	.603	.599	1.000	.172	.190
Grade	.430	.214	.458	.051	.450	.262	-.037	.450	.451	.172	1.000	-.180
Human Relations Skills	-.384	-.199	-.119	-.087	-.242	-.236	-.391	-.024	-.029	.190	-.180	1.000

N = 43

Job performance was entered into a regression equation and on Step 1 the independent variable of problem analysis yielded a significant model (F (1,41) = 10.03, p <.05) and produced a correlation quotient of .44 which was significant (at the <05 level). The common variance (R^2) was 20 percent. The variance was low and the error rate could be frequent. Combined with other elements it could be considered a predictor.

Table 23

Regression Summary Table for Job Performance

Step	Variable	R	R^2	F(eq)	Sig F
1	Problem Analysis	.44339	.19660	10.03279	.0029*

*Significant at the .05 level

Goal attainment was entered into the regression equation and no predictor variables were found to be significant. Also, no significant predictor variables were found when job satisfaction was entered into the regression equation.

Promotion was entered into the regression equation. Step 1 found the variable of leadership yielded a significant model (F(1,41) = 12.58, p <.05). Promotion and leadership had a correlation of .485 with a common variance of 23 percent. Organizational ability was the variable in Step 2. A significant model was obtained (F(2,40) = 9.08, p <.05). The correlation was raised to .56 with a 31 percent common variance. The change in common variance (R^2) was .08 (Fchange 2.40 = 4.51, p <.05).

Limits were reached after Step 2 as no other variable added significantly to the regression model. This final model which contained the NASSP Assessment Center leadership and organizational ability ratings was significant and accounted for 31 percent of the variance in the success indicator of promotion. This percentage would indicate a moderate predictability rating.

Table 24

Regression Summary Table for Promotion

Step	Variable	R	R	F(eq)	Sig F	Rchg	Fchg	SigCh
1	Leadership	.4845	.2348	12.579	.001***			
2	Organizational Ability	.5589	.3124	9.085	.0006***	.0776	.4513	.039*

*** Significant at the .001 level
** Significant at the .01 level
* Significant at the .05 level

The final success indicator of human relations was added to the regression model. Personal motivation yielded a significant model of $(F(1,41) = 7.39, p < .05)$. The correlation was .39 and accounted for 15 percent of the common variance. This indicated a moderate relationship. While the relationship was significant, the predictability is low. No other variables were found to be significant.

Table 25

Regression Summary Table for Human Relations Skills

Step	Variable	R	R^2	F(eq)	Sig F
1	Personal Motivation	.39071	.15265	7.38633	.0096**

** Significant at the .01 level

Using five indicators of success as variables, only human relations skills, promotion and job performance were found to have any significant relationship with four variables from the NASSP Assessment Center. The variables of personal motivation, problem analysis, organizational ability and leadership all had low to moderate common variances in association with only one success indicator. No significant relationships existed between the success variables and the predictor variables from Educational Administration 850.

There was a lack of significant correlation between success as a school administrator and the NASSP Assessment Center ratings and Educational Administration 850 grades and ratings. Significant correlations were found in only four of the eleven predictor variables and these appeared only once or twice in just three of the success indicators. The prediction of success using these variables would be of little use for individual predictions.

In summary, hypothesis one had three subhypotheses. There were significant relationships found between Educational Administration 850 grades and peer ratings and 850 grades and instructor ratings (1-A and 1-B). The third

subhypothesis (1-C) no significant relationship was found between 850 grades and self ratings. Hypotheses two was also divided into three subhypotheses. There was no significant relationship between the NASSP Assessment Center ratings and the 850 self rating (2-A). For the other two subhypotheses (2-B and 2-C) significant relationships were found between the NASSP Assessment Center ratings and 850 peer and instructor ratings. In Hypothesis three significant relations were found between NASSP Assessment ratings and 850 grades. In Hypotheses four, there was a lack of significant correlations between success as a school administration and the NASSP Assessment Center ratings and Educational Administration 850 grades and ratings.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is composed of four sections. In the first part, the context, problem, hypotheses and procedures of the study are summarized. The findings are summarized in the second section. The conclusions of the study reached are found in the third section. In the fourth section, implications are discussed and recommendations suggested.

Summary of the Study

The identification and selection of effective school administrators are of great importance in today's world. The pressures and demands on administrators are growing as members of society turn to education to help solve their problems.

In the past, school administrators have been selected for a variety of reasons, however, the reasons may not always have been based on equity or merit. Selection criteria need to be developed by school district officials to ascertain the skills and abilities of potential administrators and to make choices predicated on established criteria.

Assessment of learned skills, as well as of inherent traits, also is necessary to provide information on the strengths and weaknesses of prospective administrators. School administrators take part in a variety of experiences in their preparation for becoming certified as an administrator. Preservice training

is an established mode of preparing future educational leaders with the skills and abilities which are necessary to be effective.

The information generated from pre-service training and the assessing of skills and abilities could help in the process of selecting effective administrators. Officials in school districts could make use of this information in the selection process.

There is a controversy over the thought that no specific traits will ensure a successful leader. The theory of situational leadership is supported by those who believe that a leader's skills need to match the situation in order for the leader to be effective. While this may be true, a basic set of knowledge and skills needs to provide a basis from which a leader may work.

The ability to predict the success of a school administrator may not be possible given the situation and circumstances that an administrator might encounter. The attempt to develop methods by which prospective administrators could be identified would be desireable. This would allow personnel in training institutions to better prepare potential school administrators and enable school district officials to select the best possible candidates.

The Problem

The purpose in conducting this study was to determine if there were relationships between achieving success as a school administrator and any of the following: 1) the ratings from the NASSP Assessment Center, 2) Educational Administration 850 grades and 3) Educational Administration 850 ratings.

Hypotheses

1.   There was no significant relationship between Educational Administration 850 grades and Educational Administration 850 ratings.

2.   There was no significant relationship between NASSP Assessment Center ratings and Educational Administration 850 ratings.

3.   There was no significant relationship between NASSP Assessment Center ratings and Educational Administration 850 grades.

4.   There was no significant relationship between success as a school administrator and Educational Administration 850 grades and ratings and the NASSP Assessment Center ratings.

Procedures

The study involved 43 participants who had completed both the course Educational Administration 850 and the NASSP Assessment Center.

A panel composed of twenty-five educational administration experts validated a definition of occupational success for a school administrator. The five elements identified as criteria were human relations skills, job performance, goal attainment, job satisfaction and promotion.

Information concerning these five elements was gathered from the participants and their supervisors through surveys. Data also were gathered from

existing records of the NASSP Assessment Center and Educational Administration 850 about the participants' grades and ratings.

A bivariate correlation coefficient was used to determine if any relationships existed between Educational Administration 850 grades, Educational Administration 850 ratings and the NASSP Assessment Center ratings. A second analysis using a stepwise multiple regression was undertaken to determine if a relationship existed between the five elements of success and Educational Administration 850 grades and ratings and the NASSP Assessment Center ratings. Such calculations would help to determine if any of these variables could be used as predictors of success. The .05 alpha level was used as the criterion for significance.

Findings from the Literature

1.   The need for formal training for school administrators was established. With the increasingly complex role of a school administrator, a combination of administrative theory, an interdisciplinary approach drawing from disciplines outside of education and field experiences are necessary.

2.   Inservice training for school administrators is essential for the continued growth and development of the administrator. The training can take several forms but should focus on the needs of the individual. The idea of networking as a viable inservice technique has become increasingly popular.

3.   Selection processes for school administrators in the past have been based on subjective criteria from which superintendents and school boards have made their decisions. Few school districts have adopted specific selection procedures.

4. Selection methods which have been used in the past have not been effective predictors of successful school administrators. Selection criteria such as age, sex, marital status and amount of experience have been found to be irrelevant. Other methods where predictive validity have been found to be low were employment interviews, letters of recommendation, rating scales and standardized tests.

5. Written policies need to be adopted by school boards which set out procedures for selecting administrators. In the procedures a variety of information should be required to be gathered about a candidate. School boards should also be cognizant of tailoring the local needs of a specific job to the skills and abilities of the chosen school administrator.

6. No single criterion has been identified as the most important indicator of occupational success. The use of several criteria when judging success has been identified in the literature as the best measure of occupational success. The ten most commonly identified indicators of success were job performance, salary, promotion, education, goal attainment, job satisfaction, honors, human relations skills, years of experience and job stability.

7. Assessment centers have gained acceptance as a reliable and valid technique in which to evaluate individuals for a specific purpose such as promotion, development or placement. Assessment centers have multiple assessment techniques, multiple trained assessors, standardized methods, job-related exercises and objective, validated criteria. The NASSP Assessment Center has been judged to have both content, validity and predictive validity in the selection of school administrators and can be used as an effective tool in the selection of school administrators.

8. Educational leadership is more than keeping the organization running smoothly. Behaviors which are essential to educational leaders are task and relationship behaviors.

9. Situational leadership is a theory of leadership which has gained much acceptance. Researchers had difficulty in identifying specific skills and abilities that are essential to all leaders. The demands of a situation dictate what characteristics and skills are necessary by the leader to be effective. The ability to influence people to follow and to change are skills which seem to be essential in all situations.

10. Advancement on the career ladder has been influenced by several factors. These factors as identified by the literature are whether a person is place or career bound, the sex of the person, the obtaining of advanced degrees and the path of positions which was taken.

Findings from the Study

1. There were significant relationships found between (a) Educational Administration 850 grades and peer ratings and (b) 850 grades and instructor ratings.

2. There was no significant relationship found between Educational Administration 850 grades and self ratings.

3. There was no significant relationship found between Educational Administration 850 self ratings and NASSP Assessment Center ratings.

4. There were significant relationships found between Educational Administration 850 instructor and peer ratings and several of the NASSP Assessment Center ratings. The significant relationships were:

(a) There were significant relationships found between 850 peer ratings and the Assessment Center ratings of problem analysis, judgment and leadership.

b) There were significant relationships found between educational Administration 850 instructor ratings and the Assessment Center ratings of problem analysis, organizational ability and leadership.

5. There were significant relationships found between Educational Administration 850 grades and three of the NASSP Assessment Center ratings. These significant relationships were:

a) There was a significant relationship found between problem analysis and grades.

b) There was a significant relationship found between organizational ability and grades.

c) There was a significant relationship found between leadership and grades.

6. There were significant relationships found between the indicator variables of success and three of the predictor variables from the NASSP Assessment Center ratings and Educational Administration 850 grades and ratings. However, the significant correlations were found in only four of the eleven predictor variables and these appeared only once or twice in just three of the success variables. Using these few variables would be of little use for individual predictions. The significant correlations were:

a)   Job performance was correlated significantly with the NASSP Assessment Center rating of problem analysis.

b)   Promotion was correlated significantly with the NASSP Assessment Center ratings of leadership and organizational ability.

c)   Human relations skills was correlated significantly with the NASSP Assessment Center rating of personal motivation.

Conclusions

After examining the results of the data, the following conclusions were drawn:

1.   The literature does provide support for the need for formal training, however, Bridges found there was no relationship between success as a school administrator and the mastery of content in graduate courses.[203] This study would substantiate Bridges' research as there was no significant relationship found between success as a school administrator and Educational Administration 850 grades and ratings.

2.   Educational Administration 850 grades had no relationship to success as a school administrator or the NASSP Assessment Center ratings. Hoyt stated that grades used as a basis for determining success was not a good indicator.[204] This study would confirm those findings. This finding would lend support to the

---

[203]Bridges, pp. 34-49.

[204]Hoyt, pp. 44-50.

assessment center concept as the NASSP Assessment Center provides more comprehensive information about the skills and abilities of the person. A variety of information should be gathered about potential administrators to make appropriate decisions about their abilities.

3. The self assessment rating in Educational Administration 850 has little predictive validity as there is no evidence of any relationship with either the Educational Administration 850 grades, peer and instructor ratings or the NASSP Assessment Center ratings.

4. There is worth in having peers and instructors rate class members. They were able to identify those who exhibit leadership abilities and analyze problems well.

5. Many of the NASSP Assessment Center ratings had significant correlations with the 850 peer and instructor ratings. This result would seem to indicate skills that were emphasized in Educational Administration 850 were relevant and can be used in the assessment of school administrators.

6. Only the NASSP Assessment Center ratings provided any predictability factors for identifying successful administrators, however, the low number of relationships would indicate it should not be the only assessment tool used when selecting school administrators.

7. No one single criterion was found to be a predictor of success. This would substantiate the literature that indicates a number of variables needed to be utilized when identifying occupational success.[205, 206, 207, 208, 209]

8. The success indicator of promotion which indicates upward mobility was the only indicator that correlated with two of the Assessment Center ratings. A relationship existed between the Assessment Center and school administrators' movement upward on the career ladder. This result would support Williamson and Schaalman's statement that assessment centers were most likely to measure global potential for upward mobility.[210]

In his review of literature, Cohen found that promotion was positively correlated to success in 12 of the 14 studies using promotion as an indicator.[211] This study would help to confirm that promotion could be used as an indicator of success.

---

[205]Cox, p. 271.

[206]Davies, pp. 7-12.

[207]Dunnette, p. 12.

[208]Munday and Davis, p. 13.

[209]Howes, pp. 278-279.

[210]Williamson and Schaalman, pp. 240-243.

[211]Cohen, pp. 281-284.

9.   The two Assessment Center ratings of leadership and problem analysis would seem to have some predictive ability in selecting an effective school administrator.   These two ratings had relationships with Educational Administration 850 grades and peer and instructor ratings as well as indicators of success. The ability to lead and analyze problems were skills which would seem to allow a person to be effective in a variety of situations. Therefore, these two ratings should be particularly noted in Assessment Center ratings.

Implications and Recommendations

The ability to select a school administrator who will be effective is a concern that has become increasingly important over the last decade. Assessment centers have been developed to help aid in this process. The use of grades, graduate hours, higher educational degrees and years of experience also have been used to help select effective administrators, however, none of these have been successful in determining the "best" administrator.

The need for formal training is important because of the emphasis on knowledge and skills needed by future administrators. In this study the skills of leadership, organizational ability, problem analysis and judgment were found to be dimensions that were related to the skills and abilities needed to be successful in Educational Administration 850, however, other dimensions which have been found to be job-relevant and included in the Assessment Center were not related significantly to Educational Administration 850 grades or ratings. If these are important, more emphasis should be placed on them within formal training so that these skills can be developed or enhanced in potential administrators.

An effective school administrator must know the theory and principles of educational administration but, more importantly, must be able to put them to work. The purpose of an assessment center is to assess the learned and inherent skills and abilities of people. Assessment centers provide a variety of opportunities for participants to use their skills and abilities. Research on assessment centers such as the NASSP Assessment Center has shown that they were able to predict success with accuracy.[212] The assessment center approach is one of the best attempts in defining what skills and abilities are relevant in order to be an effective school administrator.

The findings of this study would indicate that the Assessment Center has some predictive ability, though there was not a high correlation with success as defined in this study. The predictive ability of the Assessment Center might be higher if a different definition of success were used. The low predictive ability would suggest the need to use the Assessment Center as only one tool in the selection of administrators.

There is another factor that could have contributed to the low predictive ability found in this study. The low predictive ability could have been affected by those in the sample population who chose not to be included in the study. Six of the surveys were returned because of unknown addresses. Six people chose not to return their surveys. Three other people chose not to participate. Of these three people, two were no longer holding jobs in education and one didn't want to burden his supervisor with a survey. Of the nine people who made the choice not to complete the survey, the possibility exists that these people did not view

---

[212]Thornton and Byham, p. 316.

themselves as successful in education or felt threatened by the research. If this is true, the data might have been more predictive if the sample had included the broader range of experiences. The majority of the people who replied were very positive about themselves and their career experiences.

The supervisors who replied were also positive about the skills and abilities of the participants. The one supervisor who indicated a reluctance to evaluate the participant did so because of the negativeness of the report. It is possible the data that was collected could have been more predictive if all responses had been obtained.

The results from the Assessment Center can provide a vast amount of useful information. The Assessment Center data should be used to provide future and present administrators with relevant information about their skills.

School administrators bring a variety of traits and skills to an administrative position. The ability to match these traits and skills to a situation is a determining factor in measuring the success of a school administrator. One administrator may be extremely successful in one situation but may fail in another because the situation and the administrator's skills do not match.

Indicators of success are not yet sophisticated enough to predict an effective school administrator for all situations. School district officials must have a variety of tools to use in selecting effective administrators. The administrator position that is open needs to be examined for what traits are needed by that administrator to do an effective job in that situation. Individual traits and skills could be identified which would be called for in a particular situation. Then school district officials could identify people who have strengths in the necessary areas.

The Assessment Center with its twelve skill dimensions provides information in areas that might be needed in particular situations. In certain situations, a person who is able to analyze a problem and be decisive may be more necessary than one who is highly organized and sensitive. School district officials could better analyze each administrative position for the necessary skills and select administrators with the appropriate characteristics.

Further research indicated by the findings of this study would be:

1)   A longitudinal study of administrators who have participated in the Assessment Center since the Assessment Center has only been available at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln since 1980. Most participants are relatively young and have not had time to become established administrators and to determine if they are or will be successful. As a consequence, studies covering a longer time span studying the same individuals would be desireable.

2)   A study to define occupational success for school administrators needs to be undertaken in order to determine useful valid indicators.

Attempts by school districts to select administrators who will be effective have increased. Officials in school districts must continue to develop criteria for the selection of administrators and use all the available information in such a process. The results of this research study would suggest that there is no one predictor that will ensure effectiveness and success but the combining of formal training and the assessment center method in selection will bring the process of selection and success much closer together.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Periodicals

Baltzell, D. Catherine and Dentler, Robert A. "5 Paths to the Principalship." Principal, 63, No. 5 (1984), 37-44.

Betz, Ellen L. "An Investigation of Job Satisfaction as a Moderator Variable in Predicting Job Success." Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1, No. 2 (1971), 123-128.

Bray, Douglas W. and Grant, Donald L. "The Assessment Center in the Measurement of Potential for Business Management." Psychological Monographs, 80, No. 17 (1966), 1-27.

Bridges, Edwin. "Administrative Preparation: A Critical Appraisal." Educational Review, 28 (1975), 34-49.

Burnes, Judith. "Inservice for Educational Leadership." National Elementary Principal, 55 (1975), 74-78.

Byham, Wm. C. "Assessment Centers for Spotting Future Managers." Harvard Business Review, 48, No. 4 (1970), 150-160.

Campbell, Richard J. and Bray, Douglas W. "Assessment Centers: An Aid in Management Selection." Personnel Administration, 30, No. 2 (1967), 6-13.

Cirincione-Coles, Kathryn. "The Administrator: Male or Female." Journal of Teacher Education, 26, No. 4 (1975), 326-328.

Cohen, Michael. "Effective Schools: Accumulating Research Findings." American Education, 18, No. 1 (1982), 13-16.

Cohen, Michael and Manasse, A. Lorri. "Effective Principal." School Administrator, 39, No. 10 (1982), 14-16.

Cohen, Peter A. "College Grades and Adult Achievement: A Research Synthesis." Research in Higher Education, 20 (1984), 281-293.

Cox, Stephen G. "Do Educational Measures Predict Vocational Success?" Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 19, No. 4 (1971), 271-273.

Cross, K. Patricia. "The Rising Tide of School Reform Reports." Phi Delta Kappan, 66 (1984), 167-172.

126

Davies, J. G. W. "What is Occupational Success?" Occupational Psychology, 24 (1950), 7-17.

Edmonds, Roland. "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor." Educational Leadership, 37 (1979), 15-23.

Farquhar, Robin H. and Martin, Michael. "New Developments in the Preparation of Educational Leaders." Phi Delta Kappan, 54 (1972), 26-30.

Featherstone, Richard L. "The Selection of Elementary School Principals in Ohio Cities." Educational Research Bulletin, 34, No. 6 (1955), 153-157.

Gaertner, Karen N. "The Structure of Careers in Public School Administration." Administrator's Notebook, 27 (1978), 1-4.

Germar, Robert A. "State of The Art - There are Programs Available." Thrust for Educational Leadership, 8 (March 1979), 15-17.

Goldberg, Milton. "The Essential Points of a Nation at Risk." Educational Leadership, 41, No. 6 (1984), 15-16.

Gordon, Joan Claire. "Selection of Elementary School Principals." National Elementary Principal, 45, No. 5 (1966), 62-64.

Greenwood, John M. and McNamara, Walter J. "Interrater Reliability in Situational Tests." Journal of Applied Psychology, 51, No. 2 (1967), 101-106.

Gross, Neal and Herriott, R. E. "The EPL of Elementary Principals." National Elementary Principal, 45, No. 5 (1966), 66-71.

Hallinger, Phillip, Murphy, Joseph, Weil, Marsha, Mesa, Richard P., and Mitman, Alexis. "School Effectiveness: Identifying the Specific Practices, Behaviors for Principals." NASSP Bulletin, 67, No. 463 (1983), 42-51.

Hersey, Paul. "NASSP's Assessment Center." NASSP Bulletin, 64, No. 438 (1980), 87-117.

Hersey, Paul. "The NASSP Assessment Center Develops Leadership Talent." Educational Leadership, 39 (1982), 370-371.

Houts, Paul L. "A Conversation with Keith Goldhammer." National Elementary Principal, 53, No. 3 (1974), 27-34.

Howes, Nancy J. "Characteristics of Career Success: An Additional Input to Select Candidates for Professional Programs." Journal of Vocational Behavior, 18 (1981), 277-288.

Huck, James J. "Assessment Centers: A Review of External and Internal Validities." Personnel Psychology, 26, No. 2 (1973), 191-212.

Jaskolka, Gabriel, Beyer, Janice M. and Trice, Harrison M. "Measuring and Predicting Managerial Success." Journal of Vocational Behavior, 26 (1985), 189-205.

Jennings, E. E. "Two Schools of Thought About Executive Development." Personnel Psychology, 37 (1959), 370-372.

Krajewski, Robert J. "Role Effectiveness: Theory Into Practice." Theory Into Practice, 18, No. 1 (1979), 53-58.

Lyons, James. E. "Competencies Needed by Beginning Secondary School Principals." NASSP Bulletin, 65, No. 446 (1981), 59-66.

Managers, Dennis. "Need for Administrator Training Voiced by Legislative Task Force." Thrust for Educational Leadership, 8 (March 1979), 4-8.

McDade, Theresa and Drake, Jackson M. "Career Path Models for Women Superintendents." Journal of Educational Research, 75, No. 4 (1982), 210-217.

McGrath, Earl J. "Profiles of Distinguished Alumni." Liberal Education, 57 (1971), 337-343.

McIntyre, Kenneth E. "The Way It Was/Is." National Elementary Principal, 53, No. 5 (1974), 30-34.

Michael, Joan J., Nadson, Jennifer S., and Michael, Wm. B. "The Prediction of Academic Achievement in Graduate Study in Education." Educational and Psychological Measurement, 43 (1983), 1133-1139.

Moses, Joseph L. "The Development of An Assessment Center for the Early Identification of Supervision Potential." Personnel Psychology, 26, No. 4 (1973), 569-580.

Newberry, Alan J. H. "What Not to Look for in an Elementary School Principal." National Elementary Principal, 56, No. 4 (1977), 41-44.

Olivero, James L. "Principals and Their Inservice Needs: Facing the Realities of the Situation." Thrust for Educational Leadership, 10 (May 1981), 4-9.

Olson, R. R. "Vocational Stability and Job Satisfaction: Characteristics of Postsecondary Technology Instructors." Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 11, No. 3 (1971), 5-14.

Samson, Gordon E., Grave, Elizabeth M., Weinstein, Thomas, and Walberg, Herbert J. "Academic and Occupational Performance: A Quantitative Synthesis." American Educational Research Journal, 21, No. 2 (1984), 311-321.

Schilson, Donald L. "The Elementary Principal: Selection and Training." American School Board Journal, 45 (1966), 65-67.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. "Leadership and Excellence in Schooling." Educational Leadership, 41, No. 5 (1984), 4-13.

Schein, E. H. "The Individual, the Organization and the Career: A Conceptual Scheme." The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 7 (1971), 401-426.

Slocum, John W. and Hand, Herbert H. "Prediction of Job Success and Employee Satisfaction for Executives and Foreman." Training and Development Journal, 25, No. 10 (1971), 28-36.

Stanton, Michael. "Issues in the Professional Development of Secondary School Principals." Journal of Educational Administration, 18 (1980), 213-223.

Stogdill, Ralph M. "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature." Journal of Psychology, 25, No. 1 (1948), 35-71.

Stott, M. B. "What is Occupational Success?" Occupational Psychology, 24 (1950), 105-112.

Sweeney, James. "Research Synthesis on Effective School Leadership." Educational Leadership, 39 (1982), 346-352.

Wagstaff, Lonnie and Spillman, Russell. "Who Should Be A Principal." National Elementary Principal, 53, No. 5 (1974) 35-39.

Wollowick, Herbert B. and McNamara, W. J. "Relationship to the Components of an Assessment Center to Management Success." Journal of Applied Psychology, 53, No. 5 (1969), 348-352.

Books

Adams, Jerome and Yoder, Janice. Effective Leadership for Women and Men. Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1985.

Blumberg, Arthur and Greenfield, William. The Effective Principal: Perspectives on School Leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1980.

Borg, Walter R. and Gall, Meredith Damien. Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: Longman, 1979.

Burns, James MacGregor. Leadership. New York: Harper and Row, 1978.

Carlisle, Howard. Situational Management. New York: American Management Association, 1973.

Carlson, R. O. School Superintendents, Careers and Performances. Columbus: Merrill, 1972.

Culbertson, Jack A. "Changes in the Preparation of School Administrators." In School Administration Selected Readings. Ed. Sherman H. Frey and Keith R. Oetschman. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1968.

Doll, Ronald C. Leadership to Improve Schools. Worthington: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1972.

Dunnette, Marvin D. "Predictors of Executive Success." In Measuring Executive Effectiveness. Ed. Fredric R. Wickert and Dalton E. McFarland. Appleton: Century-Crofts, 1967.

Faber, Charles F. and Shearron, Gilbert F. Elementary School Administration: Theory and Practice. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970.

Giammatteo, Michael and Giammatteo, Dolores. Forces on Leadership. Reston: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1981.

Goldhammer, Keith. Elementary Principals and Their Schools. Eugene: Center for Advance Study of Educational Administration. University of Oregon, 1971.

Hencley, Stephen P., McCleary, Lloyd E. and McGrath, J. H. The Elementary School Principalship. New York: Dodd Mead & Co., 1970.

Hersey, Paul. The Situational Leader. Escondido: The Center for Leadership Studies, 1984.

Kelley, Edgar A., Teagarden, R. Stephen, Trump, J. Lloyd and Larson, Robert L. "Planning Preparation Programs." In Continuing the Search. Ed. Edgar A. Kelley. Reston: NASSP, 1975.

Kimbrough, Ralph and Nunnery, Michael Y. Educational Administration: An Introduction. New York: MacMillian, 1983.

Lucio, William H. and McNeil, John D. Supervision in Thought and Action. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.

Moses, Joseph L. and Byham, William C., eds. Applying the Assessment Center Method. New York: Pergamon Press, 1977.

Thornton, George III and Byham, William C. Assessment Centers and Managerial Performance. New York: Academic Press, 1982.

Walton, John. "The Education of Educational Administrators." In Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives. Ed. Jack Culbertson and Stephen Hencley. Columbus: University Council for Educational Administration, 1962.

Wolcott, H. F. The Man in the Principal's Office: An Ethnography. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973.

Unpublished Materials

Educational Administration 850 Course Requirements and Rationale (Yearly mimeographed pamphlet). Lincoln: University of Nebraska, Department of Educational Administration, 1983.

Kelley, Edgar A. and Wendel, Frederick C. The Use of Assessment Center for Personnel Selection and Career Development in Educational Administration. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, Department of Educational Administration, 1983.

Newberry, Allan J. H. Practices and Criteria Employed in the Selection of Elementary School Principals in British Columbia. Dissertation Abstracts International, 36: 5707A, 1975.

Thyberg, Clifford. An Exploratory Study in the Use of Interpersonal Measures in Selection and Evaluation of School Administrators. Dissertation Abstracts International, 26: 183, 1965.

Publications of the Government, Learned Societies, and Other Organizations

Bullock, R. P. Social Factors Related to Job Satisfaction: A Technique for Measurement of Satisfaction, Research Monograph No. 70. Columbus: Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research, 1952.

California State Legislature. The School Principal. A Report Pursuant to Resolution Chapter 102 of 1977. (Report 77-26). Sacramento: Office of Legislative Analyst, 1977.

C.A.S.A. Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators. Arlington: American Association of School Administrators, 1979.

Clark, David L. and Lotto, Linda S. A Delphi Analysis of the Instructionally Effective School. Cambridge: School Finance Project of the National Institute of Education, June, 1983.

Deever, R. M. and Jurs, J. E. Criteria Utilized in Selection of District Office Administrative Personnel. Tempe: Bureau of Educational Research and Services, 1975.

Heller, Melvin P. Preparing Educational Leaders: New Challenges and New Perspectives. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1974.

Hersey, Paul W. The NASSP Assessment Center Project: Validation-New Developments. Reston: National Association of Secondary Principals, 1982.

Moses, Joel. "Validity of Assessment Centers." American Psychological Association Proceedings of the Annual Convention—79th Annual Meeting, 1971.

Munday, L. A. and Davis, J. C. ACT Research Report – Varieties of Accomplishments After College: Perspectives in the Meaning of Academic Talent. Iowa City: American College Testing, 1974.

Osbourne, Larry. Who's in Charge Here: The What and How of Leadership. Annual Convention of American Association for Counseling and Development. Houston: American Association for Counseling and Development, 1984.

Schmitt, N., Noe, R., Meritt, R., Fitzgerald, M., and Jorgensen, C. Criterion-related and Content Validity of the NASSP Assessment Center. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, Department of Psychology, 1982.

ERIC Documents

Baltzell, D. Catherine and Dentler, Robert A. Selecting American School Principals: Executive Summary. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 239 421, 1983.

Blackburn, Robert T. and Havighurst, Robert J. Career Patterns of Distinguished Male Social Scientists. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 159 182, 1976.

Daresh, John C. and LaPlant, James C. Inservice for School Administrators: A Status Report. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 249 639, 1984.

Hoyt, Donald P. ACT Research Report – The Relationship Between College Grades and Adult Achievement: A Review of Literature. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 023 343, 1965.

Kahl, Stuart R. The Selection of Teachers and School Administrators. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 221 917, 1980.

Poteet, R. H. Criteria for the Selection of Public Elementary School Principals in the State of Texas. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 035 963, 1968.

Rousseau, Allan J. The Elementary School Principal: What Training and Experience Factors Relate to His Success? U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 081 072, 1971.

Sharpe, Fenton. Selecting A High School Principal in the U.S. and Australia: A Comparative Case Study. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 123 709, 1976.

Watson, D. Gene. Superintendents' Mobility Constructs and Succession Patterns. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 042 253, 1970.

Williamson, Stephen A. and Schaalman, Mary Lou. Assessment Centers: Theory, Practice and Implications for Education. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 192 166, 1980.

Wise, David A. Academic Achievement and Job Performance: Earnings and Job Promotions. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 081 374, 1973.

Appendix A

Approval of Use of Human Subjects

University of Nebraska

Office of the Executive Secretary, IRB
5017 Conkling Hall
University of Nebraska Medical Center
42nd & Dewey Avenue
Omaha, NE 68105
(402) 559-6463

March 13, 1986

Barbara Jacobson
Educational Administration
UNL

RE: IRB # 171-86

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Predicting Success for School Administrators

Dear Ms. Jacobson:

The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects has completed its review of your proposal, including any revised material submitted in response to our request, and has expressed it as their opinion that you have provided adequate safeguards for the rights and welfare of the subjects to be involved in this study and has, therefore, recommended your project for approval. This letter constitutes official notification of the approval and release of your project by our Board, and you are therefore authorized to implement this study accordingly.

We wish to remind you that, under the provisions of the General Assurance from the University of Nebraska to DHHS on the Protection of Human Subjects, the principal investigator or project director is directly responsible for keeping this Board informed of any changes involving risks to the subjects or others. This project is subject to periodic review and surveillance by the Board, and, as part of their surveillance, the Board may request periodic reports of progress and results. For projects which continue beyond one year from the starting date, it is also the responsibility of the principal investigator to initiate a request to the Board for annual review and update of the research project.

Sincerely,

Ernest Prentice

Ernest D. Prentice, Ph.D.
Executive Secretary, IRB

EDP/lmb

University of Nebraska—Lincoln   University of Nebraska at Omaha   University of Nebraska Medical Center

NASSP Assessment Center Application   <u>Please Type</u>

PARTICIPANT APPLICATION FORM
UNL-LPS-NASSP ASSESSMENT CENTER

NAME_____SS#_____

PERMANENT ADDRESS:_____
                    (Street or P. O. Box)

_____
(City)   (State)   (Zip)

DATE OF APPLICATION:_____

AGE ON JANUARY 1 OF YEAR OF APPLICATION:_____

ETHNIC GROUP:_____SEX:_____

HIGHEST EARNED ACADEMIC DEGREE:_____

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN BUILDING ADMINISTRATION:_____

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS A PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR:_____

EMPLOYER NAME:_____

EMPLOYER ADDRESS:_____
                  (Street or P. O. Box)

_____
(City)   (State)   (Zip)

HOME TELEPHONE:_____
                (Area Code)   (Telephone Number)

OFFICE TELEPHONE:_____
                  (Area Code)   (Telephone Number)

PLEASE CHECK ONE OF THE BLANKS BELOW TO INDICATE THE "ROLE" WITHIN WHICH YOU
WILL BE APPLYING FOR PARTICIPATION:

_____Graduate Student at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln

_____Administrator Employed by the Lincoln Public Schools

_____Administrator Employed By, or Seeking Employment With, A School
     District and Applying for Participation Through that District's
     Contracted arrangement with the UNL-LPS-NASSP Assessment Center.

PLEASE INDICATE WHETHER YOU ARE APPLYING FOR A SPECIFIC DATE OR WHICH TO BE
INFORMED OF AVAILABLE OPPORTUNITIES.

_____Applying for a specific date (specify)_____.

_____Wish to be kept informed about available openings.

(OVER)

PLEASE CIRCLE EITHER "YES" OR "NO" FOR EACH OF THE STATEMENTS LISTED BELOW.

YES   NO   1. I have been informed about the purposes of the UNL-LPS-NASSP
             Assessment Center through handout materials or by discussion
             with an assessor.

YES   NO   2. I understand that I will receive a written confidential re-
             port about my performance in the assessment center.

YES   NO   3. I understand that applicants for positions as building ad-
             ministators in school districts which have asked those appli-
             cants to participate will have their written reports released
             to the sponsoring school district.

YES   NO   4. I understand that applicants who are participating as present
             or potential graduate students will not have their reports
             released without their permission and that their reports
             will not be used to make decisions about performance, ad-
             mission, or continuation in degree or training programs.

YES   NO   5. I understand that I have the right, if dissatisfied with my
             assessment center report, to ask to be re-assessed but that
             I may be required to wait at least two years before such a
             re-assessment is scheduled.

YES   NO   6. I understand that I may be asked to participate in the future
             in another assessment center but that it is my right to refuse
             to do so if I so wish.

YES   NO   7. I understand that I may be asked to complete other data col-
             lection procedures after participation in the assessment
             center as part of ongoing research and development efforts
             aimed at improving the preservice preparation, selection,
             and inservice development of school administrators.

YES   NO   8. At the present time, I am a school administrator or it is
             my present intention to seek roles in school administration
             within the next few years.

YES   NO   9. I understand that I must be present or available between
             8:00 a. m. and 5:00 p. m. for both of the two days of
             assessment center activities scheduled if I am asked to
             participate.

PREFERENCE WILL BE GIVEN TO PERSONS WHO HAVE ANSWERED "YES" TO ALL QUESTIONS
LISTED ABOVE.

SIGNATURE_____

University of Nebraska Lincoln

Division of Continuing Studies

500 Mile Campus

CONSENT FORM

PREDICTORS OF SUCCESS FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE

You are invited to participate in this research project because as an educator you have completed the course Educational Administration 850 and have also participated in the NASSP Assessment Center.

PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

The purpose of this study is to see if any relationships exist between success as a school administrator and Educational Administration 850 grades and ratings and the NASSP Assessment Center ratings.

EXPLANATION OF PROCEDURES

A survey has been sent to you along with this consent form. If you agree to participate in the project, you are asked to fill out the survey as honestly and completely as possible. You will then mail the completed survey and signed consent form in the enclosed stamped self-addressed envelope.

An additional survey will then be sent to your immediate supervisor. This survey will focus on your job performance and human relations skills. Your supervisor will be asked to return the survey in a stamped self-addressed envelope.

You will be assigned a number and all data that are gathered will be recorded by number and not under your name.

Data will then be collected from existing Educational Administration records. Your grade and instructor, peer and self ratings from Educational Administration 850 will be obtained as well as the twelve dimensional ratings from the NASSP Assessment Center.

These data will be compared to the information obtained from your survey and your supervisor's survey to determine if any relationships exist between them.

POTENTIAL RISKS

There will be no risk involved in participating in this study.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS

With the information gathered, it is hoped that factors can be identified that will be valid predictors of success for school administrators. If selection processes can be refined and more effective administrators chosen, the quality of our profession and education as a whole will increase.

University of
Nebraska
Lincoln
Division of Continuing Studies

500 Mile
Campus

ASSURANCE OF CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information obtained in connection with this project and which could be identified with you will be kept strictly confidential. All information will be reported in generalized statements. Your identity will not be revealed.

WITHDRAWAL FROM THE STUDY

Participation is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your present or future relationship with the Educational Administration Department at the University of Nebraska or the NASSP Assessment Center. If you decided to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue participation at any time.

OFFER TO ANSWER QUESTIONS

. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask. If you think of questions later, please feel free to contact the researcher listed below.

YOU ARE VOLUNTARILY MAKING A DECISION WHETHER OR NOT TO PARTICIPATE. YOUR SIGNATURE INDICATES THAT YOU HAVE DECIDED TO PARTICIPATE HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE. YOU WILL BE GIVEN A COPY OF THIS CONSENT FORM TO KEEP.

_____   _____
Signature of Participant   Date

_____   _____
Signature of Researcher   Date

Researcher

Barbara Jacobson   475-2701 (Day)   483-2116 (Night)

Appendix B

Definition of Success

Panel of Experts

Dr. Doug Christensen
Superintendent
North Platte Public Schools
Box 1557
North Platte, Nebraska 69101

Dr. William Gogan
Superintendent
Ord Public Schools
18th and K Streets
Ord, Nebraska 68862

Dr. Bill Hawver
Superintendent
Hutchinson Public Schools
Hutchinson, Kansas 67501

Dr. Dale Hayes
Professor - Educational Administration
212 Teachers College
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0473

Dr. William Kelley
Administrator
Educational Service Unit #14
P. O. Box 77
Sidney, Nebraska 69162

Dr. Paul Kennedy
Professor - Educational Administraiton
South 60th and Dodge
University of Nebraska-Omaha
Omaha, Nebraska 68132

Dr. Alvah Kilgore
Executive Director - Nebraska ASCD
27 Henzlik
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0355

Dr. Justin King
Executive Secretary
Nebraska Association of School Boards
140 South 16th Street
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Mr. James McDowell
Administrator
Educatior Service Unit #3
4224 South 133rd Street
Omaha, Nebraska 68137

Dr. James Merritt
Superintendent
Norfolk Public Schools
512 Philip
Box 139
Norfolk, Nebraska 68701

Dr. Robert O'Reilly
Professor - Educational Administration
South 60th and Dodge
University of Nebraska-Omaha
Omaha, Nebraska 68132

Mr. Bob Peterson
Executive Secretary
Nebraska Council For School Administrators
Suite 5
3100 "O" Street
Lincoln, Nebraska 68510

Mr. John Prasch
Educational Consultant
611 Hazelwood Drive
Lincoln, Nebraska 68510

Dr. Rex Reckewey
Associate Professor - Educational Administration
24 Henzlik
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0355

Dr. Ronald Roskens
President
University of Nebraska
Regents Hall
3835 Holdrege
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0745

Dr. Carroll Sawin
Assistant Superintendent - Personnel
Lincoln Public Schools
720 South 22nd
Lincoln, Nebraska 68510

Dr. Phillip Schoo
Superintendent
Lincoln Public Schools
720 South 22nd
Lincoln, Nebraska 68510

Dr. Norbert Schuerman
Superintendent
Omaha Public Schools
3902 Davenport
Omaha, Nebraska 68131

Dr. Alan Seagren
Vice President for Administration
University of Nebraska
207 Regents Hall
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0742

Dr. Robert Stalcup
Chairman - Educational Administration Department
202 Teachers College
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0473

Dr. Don Stroh
Superintendent
Millard Public Schools
1010 South 144th Street
Omaha, Nebraska 68154

Dr. James Travis
Associate Superintendent – Instruction
Lincoln Public Schools
720 South 22nd
Lincoln, Nebraska 68510

Dr. Richard Triplett
Superintendent
Bellevue Public Schools
2009 Franklin Street
Bellevue, Nebraska 68005

Dr. Fred Wendel
Professor – Educational Administration
202 Teachers College
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0473

Dr. Fred T. Wilhelms
1515 Ridgeway Drive
Lincoln, Nebraska 68506

**University of
Nebraska
Lincoln**

Division of Continuing Studies

500 Mile
Campus

Inside Address

Dear Name,

A study is being conducted at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln on predictors of success for school administrators. The study is examining two experiences at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln in order to determine if these experiences could be used to predict success. The experiences which are being examined are the NASSP Assessment Center and the course Educational Administration 850.

The literature does not give a singular definition of success but reviews a variety of elements which could be used to determine success. The literature does substantiate that there should be a multi-faceted definition of success.

We would like your expertise in helping to formulate a definition of success. Enclosed is a list of ten elements mentioned in the literature that have been used to define occupational success. Please decide how important each element is in terms of defining a successful school administrator. Then mark your answer on the scale following each element.

Your input, along with other leaders in the educational field, will be used to formulate a definition of success.

Please fill out the enclosed self-addressed envelope and return it by Nov. 27, 1985.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Barbara Jacobson

Elements of Success for School Administrators

Please decide how important you consider each element to be in defining
success for school administrators. Mark your choice with an X on each scale.

Promotion (either by title or size of school district)

1	2	3	4	5
Very Important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Very Unimportant

Job Satisfaction

1	2	3	4	5
Very Important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Very Unimportant

Performance

1	2	3	4	5
Very Important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Very Unimportant

Goal Attainment

1	2	3	4	5
Very Important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Very Unimportant

Awards, Honors or Special Assignments

1	2	3	4	5
Very Important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Very Unimportant

Income Level

1	2	3	4	5
Very Important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Very Unimportant

Education (highest degree obtained)

1	2	3	4	5
Very Important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Very Unimportant

Job Stability (has held the same job for four years)

1	2	3	4	5
Very Important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Very Unimportant

Amount of Administrative Experience

1	2	3	4	5
Very Important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Very Unimportant

Human Relations Skills (ability to practice skills in relationship to one's social surrounding)

1	2	3	4	5
Very Important	Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Very Unimportant

Comments:

Please return this survey in the self-addressed stamped envelope by November 27, 1985. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Barbara Jacobson
Dr. Ward Sybouts
Division of Continuing Studies
340 Nebraska Center
33rd & Holdrege
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska 68583-0900

Appendix C

Participant's Survey –
Patterns of Experiences and
Measures of Success of School Administrator's

University of Nebraska Lincoln

Division of Continuing Studies

Nebraska Center for Continuing Education
Lincoln, NE 68583-0900
(402) 472-

500 Mile Campus

April 9, 1986

Dear Fellow Educator:

A study is being conducted at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln on predictors of success for school administrators. The study is examining two experiences at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln in order to determine if these experiences could be used to predict success. The experiences which are being examined are the NASSP Assessment Center and the course Educational Administration 850.

The definition of success was validated by a panel of experts in the field of educational administration. Five elements of occupational success were identified as the most important factors in determining success as a school administrator.

You have been selected to participate in this research project because you have completed the course Educational Administration 850 and have also participated in the NASSP Assessment Center.

Enclosed is a consent form explaining the procedures of the study. Please read it carefully. If you are willing to participate, please sign one of the consent forms. The other consent form is for your records. Then complete the enclosed survey which should require about twenty minutes of your time.

Please return the signed consent form and the completed survey in the stamped self-addressed envelope by April 21.

Thank you for your time and valuable input.

Sincerely,

Barb Jacobson

University of Nebraska–Lincoln   University of Nebraska at Omaha   University of Nebraska Medical Center

No. _____

PATTERNS OF EXPERIENCES AND MEASURES OF SUCCESS
OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Please answer all questions in order.

2. There are two types of questions in this study.
    Questions involving a choice of answers can be answered by marking an X or the number in the blank space (_____). Questions involving your written comments or explanations should be answered in the space provided.

3. It is important that you be as honest as you can be in answering the questions.

---

1. What is your present assignment?

    _____ Teacher
    _____ Instructional/Curricular Supervisor (includes Consultants, Coordinators and
       Supervisors of subject areas and school levels)
    _____ Assistant Principal, Elementary
    _____ Assistant Principal, Secondary
    _____ Elementary School Principal
    _____ Secondary School Principal
    _____ Administrator of Instruction
    _____ Administrative Specialist (includes Administrators of Business Plant and Facilities,
       Employed Personnel, and Special Education)
    _____ Assistant Superintendent
    _____ Superintendent
    _____ College/University Staff Member
    _____ College/University Administrator
    _____ Other (please specify) _____

2. How large is the student population (K-12 or college) in which you are now serving?

    _____

3. What is the highest degree you have obtained?

    _____ Bachelors Degree
    _____ Masters Degree
    _____ Specialist Certificate
    _____ Doctorate Degree

4. Are you presently working on a program for a higher degree?
    Yes _____ No _____
    If yes, please specify: _____

5. How many years have you been employed in administrative positions?

___ 0 years   ___ 11 - 15 years
___ 1 - 5 years   ___ 16 - 20 years
___ 6 - 10 years   ___ Over 20 years

6. What is your sex?

___ Male
___ Female

7. What was your age at your last birthday? _____

8. Please list your career moves in school administration including the position you held, the size of the student population (K-12 or college), and the dates you served in that capacity.

Position   Size of School District   Date

9. What is your career goal?

___ Superintendent
___ Secondary School Principal
___ Elementary School Principal
___ Instructional/Curricular Supervisor (includes Consultants, Coordinators and
         Supervisors of subject areas and school levels)
___ Administrator of Instruction
___ Administrative Specialist (includes Administrators of Business Plant and Facilities,
         Employed Personnel, and Special Education)
___ College/University Staff
___ Teacher
___ Working outside of Education
___ No definite goal
___ Other (please specify) _____

10. ___ Indicate the statement which best describes your feelings about whether you have reached your career goal.

1 = I have reached my career goal.
2 = I have almost reached my career goal.
3 = I am not sure I have reached my career goal.
4 = I have not reached my career goal.
5 = I have definitely not reached my career goal.

11. ____ Indicate the statement which shows how well satisfied you are with the progress you are making toward your career goal.

1 = Completely satisfied
2 = More satisfied than dissatisfied
3 = About half and half
4 = More dissatisfied than satisfied
5 = Completely dissatisfied

12. Would you classify yourself as: (choose one)

____ Place-bound: Your career moves are limited to waiting for available positions within the district or region in which you live. (Please answer No. 13)

____ Career-bound: Actively seeking educational administrative positions, usually outside the school district in which you are now employed. (Skip No. 13, move on to 14)

____ Neither. (Please explain) _____
_____. (Skip No. 13, move on to 14)

13. If you marked place-bound, please specify the reason.

____ Spouse's occupation
____ Other family considerations
____ Health reasons
____ Geographic location
____ Educational considerations
Other (please specify) _____

For the following seven items, consider your position as an administrator or educational leader. Indicate those statements which most accurately and honestly describe your feelings about your job by placing the appropriate symbol on the blank to the left of the item.

14. ____ Indicate the statement which best tells how good a job you have.

1 = The job is an excellent one, very much above average.
2 = The job is a fairly good one.
3 = The job is average.
4 = The job is not as good as average in this kind of work.
5 = The job is a very poor one, very much below the average.

15. ____ Indicate the statement which best describes your feelings about your job.

1 = I am very satisfied and happy on this job.
2 = I am fairly well satisfied on this job.
3 = I am neither satisfied nor dissatisfied—it is just average.
4 = I am a little dissatisfied on this job.
5 = I am very dissatisfied and unhappy on this job.

16. ____ Indicate the statement which best shows <u>how much of the time</u> you are satisfied with your job.

1 = Most of the time
2 = A good deal of the time
3 = About half of the time
4 = Occasionally
5 = Seldom

17. ____ Indicate the statement which best tells what kind of an organization it is to work for.

1 = It is an excellent organization to work for—one of the best organizations I know of.
2 = It is a good organization to work for but not one of the best.
3 = It is an average organization to work for. Many others are just as good.
4 = It is below average as an organization to work for. Many others are better.
5 = It is probably one of the poorest organizations to work for that I know of.

18. ____ Indicate the statement which best tells how your feelings compare with those of other people you know.

1 = I dislike my job <u>much more</u> than most people dislike theirs.
2 = I dislike my job <u>more</u> than most people dislike theirs.
3 = I like my job about as well as most people like theirs.
4 = I like my job <u>better</u> than most people like theirs.
5 = I like my job <u>much better</u> than most people like theirs.

19. ____ Suppose that you have a very good friend who is looking for a job in your line of work and you know of a vacancy in this organization which your friend is qualified to fill. Would you:

1 = Recommend this job as a good one to apply for?
2 = Recommend this job but caution your friend about its shortcomings?
3 = Tell your friend about the vacancy but not about anything else, then let him or her decide whether to apply or not?
4 = Tell your friend about the vacancy but suggest that he or she look for other vacancies elsewhere before applying?
5 = Try to discourage your friend from applying bv telling the bad things about the job?

20. ____ Indicate the statement which shows how well satisfied you are with the job.

1 = Completely dissatisfied
2 = More dissatisfied than satisfied
3 = About half and half
4 = More satisfied than dissatisfied
5 = Completely satisfied

21. What is the name and address of your immediate supervisor?

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

_____

Please return your completed questionnaire to

Barb Jacobson
Dr. Ward Sybouts
Division of Continuing Studies
340 Nebraska Center
33rd and Holdrege
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588

by April 21. Thank you for your cooperation.

Postcard Sent as Follow-up to Participant's Survey

Dear

      As the school year comes to an end, I know that we all become extremely busy. A couple of weeks ago, I sent you a survey asking for information about your professional experiences. This information will be used in a study to examine if the NASSP Assessment Center and Educational Administration 850 can be used as predictors of success. My sample size is small so it is very important that you return the survey in order to make the results more valid. I appreciate your cooperation. Thank you for your time.

                        Barb Jacobson

**University of
Nebraska
Lincoln**

Division of Continuing Studies

500 Mile
Campus

May 27, 1986

Dear

     Recently you received a survey regarding your professional experiences as an educator. This survey is being done in conjunction with a research project which is attempting to determine if two experiences at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln can be used to predict the success of a school administrator. The two experiences which are being examined are the NASSP Assessment Center and the course Educational Administration 850. You were selected to be involved in this study because you have participated in both experiences.

     The number of participants is small and your survey is needed to add validity to the results. I would really appreciate it if you would take twenty minutes of your valuable time to complete the enclosed survey.

     Please return the survey and one copy of the consent form in the stamped self-addressed envelope as soon as possible.

     Your time and valuable input is greatly appreciated.

                           Sincerely,

                           Barb Jacobson

University of Nebraska–Lincoln   University of Nebraska at Omaha   University of Nebraska Medical Center

Appendix D

Supervisor's Survey –
Human Relations Skills and Job Performance Survey

University of
Nebraska
Lincoln

Division of Continuing Studies

500 Mile Campus

April 15, 1986

Dear Educational Leader,

A study is being conducted at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln on predictors of success for school administrators. The study is examining two experiences at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln in order to determine if these experiences could be used to predict success. The experiences which are being examined are the NASSP Assessment Center and the course Educational Administration 850.

The definition of success was validated by a panel of experts in the field of educational administration. Five elements of occupational success were identified as the most important factors in determining success as a school administrator.

is involved in this study and has given permission to contact you for additional information. The enclosed survey can be completed in about fifteen minutes. Please answer each question as honestly and completely as possible. Your responses will be totally confidential.

It is possible that the person in question does not have an administrative position at this time. Would you still complete the survey rating the person.

It would be appreciated if you would complete the survey and return it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope by May 2, 1986.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Barb Jacobson

University of Nebraska–Lincoln   University of Nebraska at Omaha   University of Nebraska Medical Center

No. _____

HUMAN RELATIONS SKILLS FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

Please decide how often the school administrator in question displays each of the following human relations skills. Circle the number of your choice on each scale.

1. Deals with other people in a fair manner.

    1_____2_____3_____4_____5
    Always   Often   Occasionally   Seldom   Never

2. Treats others in a friendly manner.

    1_____2_____3_____4_____5
    Always   Often   Occasionally   Seldom   Never

3. Listens to parents, teachers and students.

    1_____2_____3_____4_____5
    Always   Often   Occasionally   Seldom   Never

4. Is conscious of the image he/she projects.

    1_____2_____3_____4_____5
    Always   Often   Occasionally   Seldom   Never

5. Makes his/her words fit his/her deeds and vice versa.

    1_____2_____3_____4_____5
    Always   Often   Occasionally   Seldom   Never

6. Recognizes the worth of other people.

    1_____2_____3_____4_____5
    Always   Often   Occasionally   Seldom   Never

7. Willing to assist others with their concerns.

    1_____2_____3_____4_____5
    Always   Often   Occasionally   Seldom   Never

JOB PERFORMANCE OF A SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR

Please decide how effective the administrator in question performs his/her job in the following areas. Circle the number of your choice on each scale.

1. **Problem Analysis.** Ability to seek out relevant data and analyze complex information to determine the important elements of a problem situation; searching for information with a purpose.

1	2	3	4	5
Very Effective	Effective	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective

2. **Judgment.** Skill in identifying educational needs and setting priorities; ability to reach logical conclusions and make high quality decisions based on available information; ability to critically evaluate written communications.

1	2	3	4	5
Very Effective	Effective	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective

3. **Organizational Ability.** Ability to plan, schedule, and control the work of others; skills in using resources in an optimal fashion; ability to deal with a volume of paper work and heavy demands on one's time.

1	2	3	4	5
Very Effective	Effective	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective

4. **Decisiveness.** Ability to recognize when a decision is required (disregarding the quality of the decision) and to act quickly.

1	2	3	4	5
Very Effective	Effective	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective

5. **Leadership.** Ability to get others involved in solving problems; ability to recognize when a group requires direction, to effectively interact with a group to guide them to accomplish a task.

1	2	3	4	5
Very Effective	Effective	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective

6. <u>Sensitivity</u>. Ability to perceive the needs, concerns, and personal problems of others; skills in resolving conflicts; tact in dealing with persons from different backgrounds; ability to deal effectively with people concerning emotional issues; knowing what information to communicate and to whom.

```
1_____2_____3_____4_____5
Very            Effective        Adequate          Ineffective       Very
Effective                                                            Ineffective
```

7. <u>Stress Tolerance</u>. Ability to perform under pressure and during opposition; ability to think on one's feet.

```
1_____2_____3_____4_____5
Very            Effective        Adequate          Ineffective       Very
Effective                                                            Ineffective
```

8. <u>Oral Communication</u>. Ability to make a clear oral presentation of facts or ideas.

```
1_____2_____3_____4_____5
Very            Effective        Adequate          Ineffective       Very
Effective                                                            Ineffective
```

9. <u>Written Communication</u>. Ability to express ideas clearly in writing; to write appropriately for different audiences—students, teachers, parents, etc.

```
1_____2_____3_____4_____5
Very            Effective        Adequate          Ineffective       Very
Effective                                                            Ineffective
```

10. <u>Range of Interests</u>. Competence to discuss a variety of subjects—educational, political, current events, economic, etc.; desire to actively participate in events.

```
1_____2_____3_____4_____5
Excellent       Good             Average           Fair              Poor
```

11. <u>Personal Motivation</u>. Need to achieve in all activities attempted; evidence that work is important in personal satisfaction; ability to be self-policing.

```
1_____2_____3_____4_____5
Excellent       Good             Average           Fair              Poor
```

12. <u>Educational Values</u>. Possession of a well-reasoned educational philosophy; receptiveness to new ideas and change.

```
1_____2_____3_____4_____5
Excellent       Good             Average           Fair              Poor
```

13. How would you rate this person's overall performance as an administrator?

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5
Very   Effective   Adequate   Ineffective   Very
Effective   Ineffective

14. How would you rate this person's potential for advancement?

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5
Excellent   Good   Average   Fair   Poor

Comments:

Please return this survey in the self-addressed stamped envelope by May 2, 1986.
Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Barbara Jacobson
Dr. Ward Sybouts
Division of Continuing Studies
340 Nebraska Center
33rd and Holdrege
Lincoln, Nebraska 68583

**University of
Nebraska
Lincoln**
Division of Continuing Studies

500 Mile
Campus

May 28, 1986

Dear   :

Several weeks ago you received a survey concerning the administrative and human
relations skills of   . It is extremely important that this survey is returned
as the research on each participant cannot be completed without all the information.

The number of participants in this research project is small. Thus every survey
is needed to give the research more validity. It would be greatly appreciated if you would
take fifteen minutes of your valuable time to complete the survey.

I have enclosed another copy of the survey for your convenience. Please fill out
the survey and return in the enclosed stamped self-addressed envelope as soon as possible.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Barb Jacobson

University of
Nebraska
Lincoln

Division of Continuing Studies

500 Mile
Campus

June 5, 1986

Dear   ,

Several weeks ago you received a survey concerning the administrative
and human relations skills of   . I have not received this information
back from you. It is very important that this survey is completed and returned.
The research cannot be complete until all information on each participant is
received.

The study is examining two experiences at the University of Nebraska-
Lincoln in order to determine if these experiences could be used to predict
success. These two experiences are the NASSP Assessment Center and the
course Educational Administration 850. The participant is involved in this
study and has given their permission to contact you for further information.

I have enclosed another copy of the survey for your convenience. Please
fill out the survey and return in the enclosed stamped self-addressed envelope
as soon as possible.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Barb Jacobson

University of Nebraska–Lincoln   University of Nebraska at Omaha   University of Nebraska Medical Center

Appendix E

Conversion of Scores to Interval Scales

Conversion of Educational Administration 850
Grades and Ratings to Interval Scale

Grade or Rating	Interval Scale
A+	4.5
A	4.0
B+	3.5
B	3.0
C+	2.5
C	2.0
D	1.0
F	0.0

Conversion of NASSP Assessment Center
Scores to Interval Scale

Assessment Center Score	Interval Score
Extremely Low	1
Extremely Low to Low	2
Low to Extremely Low	3
Low	4
Low to Medium	5
Medium to Low	6
Medium	7
Medium to High	8
High to Medium	9
High	10
High to Extremely High	11
Extremely High to High	12
Extremely High	13