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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of a principal preparation program on the interpersonal communication abilities of aspiring principals. From the first Cohort School Leadership (CSL) program, 36 Interns and 5 Alternates comprised the final population for this study. Nine Interns were identified through stratified random selection for on-site interviews.

From April 1990 through May 1991, data for this quasi-experimental design were collected on Interns' and Alternates' perceptions from pre/post surveys; interviews and observations; and demographic information.

Four null hypotheses were developed for the quantitative study. Related t-tests showed no significant differences in Interns' and Alternates' perceptions of interpersonal communication abilities in relationship with employees, colleagues and supervisors. The Mann-Whitney U test rejected three null sub-hypotheses by showing that significant differences existed between Interns and Alternates perceptions of Exposure and Feedback in relationship with colleagues, and on Feedback in relationship with supervisors. Multiple regression prediction equations revealed that only the pre-selection interview score figured prominently in the prediction, and only with Feedback in relationship with supervisors.

Responses to interviews showed that Interns perceived positive shifts in interpersonal communication skill development and the internship was identified as the program component having the
greatest impact on this development. Interns' interactions with other cohort members and mentors may have accounted for their positive perceptions of interpersonal competence with these two groups. Some Interns indicated discomfort in relationships with fellow teachers or perceived peers.

The primary conclusion of this study was that the year-long internship did not have a significant impact on the development of interpersonal communication abilities of Interns, as measured by the JPRS. However, extended interpretation of percentile scores and responses during interviews showed that positive shifts towards interpersonal competence were perceived by Interns. This difference may show that the instrument may not be sufficient enough to identify how Interns "feel" about their interpersonal relationships.

If interpersonal communication abilities of school administrators is valued, then relevant changes need to address this skill development. Further research is needed to identify program components which lead to the development of interpersonal competence.
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CHAPTER I
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

There is no quarrel that the principal's role is key to the improvement of schools. However, school restructuring and reform call for a new kind of leader. Reports of the "Effective Schools" research of the 1970s identified the "instructional leader," one who provides direction, resources and support to teachers and students, as the most significant leadership dimension (cited in Rossow, 1990). This altered the role of the principal by shifting the focus from that of an operational "manager" of schools to one of instructional leadership.

Today, the role of the principal goes beyond the debate of whether the school leader should be an instructional leader or manager, or even a combination of roles as "leader/manager" (Gardner, 1991). It goes beyond the role of a "transactional leader," whose motivation is extrinsic where the exchange of goods and services is to achieve independent goals to maintain the system. The effective principal's role leads to the emergence of a "transformational leader" who is driven by intrinsic motives in pursuit of shared interests and commonly identified goals to transform the system (Leithwood, 1992). Leithwood suggests that school administrators must be transposed to using facilitative power...
to build a shared vision, improve communication, and develop collaborative decision making processes.

As principals are required to expand their leadership role to involve other members of the school's community in the decision-making process, new and different skills may be required. In working with others, the human dimension, or how individuals interrelate with one another, becomes very important (Stanford & Roark, 1974). How does an effective leader facilitate positive interpersonal relationships among others? What are the skills, behaviors or abilities required to support positive interactions among individuals and groups?

As new emphases are placed on these changing behaviors and roles of the key leader of schools, those who work with professional development programs also need to re-examine how they prepare future principals (Murphy, 1991). Educational administration programs came under attack by the National Commission of Excellence in Educational Administration (1987) in its report which concluded that at least 300 universities and colleges should cease preparing educational administrators and called for re-examination and transformation of school administrator preparation.

This chapter will identify the problem, offer a rationale for the approach to the problem, present the research questions and hypotheses, and note the limitations and definitions for this study.
Context of the Problem

Call for School Improvement

The nation's public schools are in trouble. By almost every measure - the commitment and competency of teachers, student test scores, truancy and dropout rates, crimes of violence--the performance of our schools falls far short of expectations. (Twentieth Century Fund, 1983, p. 3)

The outcry that public school education was not doing a good job was amplified by the Effective Schools Research of Brookover, Lezotte, Edmonds and others during the 1970s, and major reform reports of the 1980s such as: The National Commission on Excellence in Education's A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform (1983); A Time for Results: The Governor's Report on Education (1986); and the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession's (1986) A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the Twenty-first Century. The report, A Nation At Risk, was emphatic in stating "The educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people" (The National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 5).

These reports calling for school reform were revolutionary in bringing about an awareness of the desperate state of America's educational system not only in the educational arena but also in the public's view. Beyond the concern for the overall quality of
American education, there was a loss of confidence in all forms of leadership that extended to elected, corporate, civic, religious, as well as educational leaders (Smith & Andrews, 1989).

Reports such as the Sandia National Laboratory's "Perspectives on Education in America" (cited in Carson, Huelskamp, & Woodall, 1991, May 10) concurred that: "Serious problems do exist in the American Education system. However, there is no system-wide crisis." This report states that: "Much of the current reform agenda is misguided (and that) . . . progress will only be made by focusing on real not perceived problems" (Carson et al., 1989).

Major waves of reform have crashed on the educational scene with the following areas of emphases:

Wave 1 - authoritarian, top-down, lacking in the correct content, narrow and rigid (system oriented).

Wave 2 - bottom up, concern for students at risk and for empowering teachers (school site orientation).

Wave 3 - shared decision making with focus on students (school/community orientation), (Murphy, 1990b).

Wave 4 - ethics and values, democratic, grassroots reform; focus on ethical as well as economic imperatives (orientation of individual worth), (Futrell, 1989).

Rebecca Canning (1989, pp. 383-384) in a "Postscript to the Conference" on school reform noted, "Reform is not the work of a single piece of legislation, a single event, or a single wave, but rather an ongoing obligation to scrutinize what is going on and attempt to
make needed improvements." Constructive climates for evolving change need to be created.

There is a need for models that enable teachers and administrators to work together in creative new ways to develop programs. Teacher education programs linking schools and universities together have been a major response to the need for improving teacher preparation. About one hundred colleges and universities have adopted the Holmes Group agenda, which encourages extended preparation programs with more rigorous admission standards, major in the arts and sciences, strong clinical component set in public schools, and a more significant role in teacher education for successful practices (Moore, 1989, p. 395). Barth (1989, p. 209) argues that "principals need to play key roles in enhancing the profession of teaching. . . . [and] the building of collegiality within the school is all important."

Principal preparation programs have begun to respond to the call for school improvement. Sergiovanni and Moore (1989, p. 208) state: "It is clear that little progress will be made with respect to meaningful school reform unless there are serious attempts to examine critically the traditional management posture and develop better alternatives." The human side of the enterprise is receiving more attention as school communities respond to the call for school improvement. Educational leaders must, likewise, assess their roles as they are called upon to respond to the new era of school improvement.
Call for Changing Roles of the Principal

If public schools are to survive as a viable part of this country's social and political system we must see something different in our educational leaders. (Beckner, 1990, p. 49)

The roles of the principal today are a far cry from the spelled out duties of principals in the 1925 Education Code of California (cited in Lo Presti, 1982) which stated that the principal was responsible for focusing on discipline first and the educational program second; holding monthly fire drills; and keeping buildings and ground neat and clean for daily inspections. These delineated functions are of little help to principals today.

Joseph Murphy (1990a) discussed the re-emergence of the school administrator as a key to school and district improvement:

For much of the last quarter-century, a general belief in the professional impotence of administrators has prevailed. . . . The picture of the . . . principal as the beleaguered professional who can exercise little influence over his or her organization, and who is only distally connected to important educational processes and outcomes, has been widely accepted in educational administration circles. (p. 279)

Murphy (1990a, p. 279) suggests however, that conditions are becoming more favorable for principals to exert considerable influence over their schools and districts: "1) there is a growing understanding that the very real conditions in schools captured by
open systems and political decision-making theories render the administrator's job difficult, but not impossible; 2) education is once again at the forefront of the public agenda where there appears to be a leveling off and even a small turnabout in the decline of public confidence in schools; and 3) the onslaught of collective bargaining has receded somewhat as the catastrophic predictions of wide-spread teacher-administrator hostility and rampant loss of administrator influence have failed to materialize."

The Education Commission of the States (1983, p. 29) noted, "In study after study, it has been shown that one key determinant of excellence in public schooling is the leadership of the individual school principal."

Emerging information is showing more directly that "school administrators are generally a key factor in change and improvement in schools and districts. . . . Support for this position is derived from five related literature sources: school change; school improvement; staff development; administrator as instructional leader; and school effectiveness and district effectiveness" (Murphy, 1989).

Leadership can be conceptualized as a function of groups and occurs in the processes of two or more people interacting. "In this interaction process, one person is able to induce others to think and behave in certain desired ways. . . Leadership (also) involves intentionally exercising influence on the behavior of other people" (Owens, 1991, p. 132). A number of approaches or theories have been influential in thinking about leadership. Immegart (1990)
suggested that these leadership theories can be grouped into four major categories as listed and described below.

1. **Trait Theory of Leadership** - supports the concept of leaders as people who are "endowed with certain traits or characteristics that especially fit them for their leadership roles" (Owens, 1991, p. 133). Supporters of this theory conclude that leaders who already possess these traits should be sought out for their leadership potential. Others argue that there is little to support the belief that traits and the capacity to lead effectively are systematically related (Stogdill, 1948; Mann, 1959; Bass, 1960).

2. **Style Theory of Leadership** - involves a pattern of behaviors which an individual demonstrates in leadership situations (Immegart, 1990). Such behaviors show the leader's tendency towards task-orientation or people-orientation (Blake & Mouton, 1966). The implications of research are that effective leaders exhibit a repertoire of styles related to the situation, context and task (Jago, 1982; Stogdill, 1974). Immegart (1990) notes that there is a fine line between much of the research on leadership style and the inquiry into leadership behavior.

3. **Behavior Theory of Leadership** - serves to operationalize earlier style conceptualizations (Immegart, 1990). Behavioral approaches to the study of leadership focus on what leaders do to help groups interact positively and accomplish their tasks (Halpin, 1966; the Ohio Studies in Owens, 1991). A number of studies demonstrate the positive correlation between leadership style and behavior (Immegart, 1990). Others
(House & Baetz, 1979) negate this view and attribute outcomes to other variables like group interaction, conditions, interaction of leadership style with behavior of performing group.

4. **Situational or Contingency Theory of Leadership** - purports that group productivity is dependent on a match of leadership orientation (task or relationship) and situational favorableness (mix of personal-trait group and situational variables). Fiedler (1967) operationalized this through his "Least Preferred Co-worker Scale (LPCS) and concluded that one cannot speak of effective or ineffective leadership, only effective or ineffective leadership in one situation or another. He challenged the notion that there is one best way to lead.

These different theories add to the complexity of how one views leadership. An understanding of these theories on leadership is necessary to prepare principals for their complex roles which continue to evolve from managing schedules, budgets and buildings; to supervising teachers, planning curriculum, assessing programs; to creating and establishing a strong mission and climate for the school.

John Gardner (1991, p. 12), emphasized that the role of manager and the role of leader should be combined into that of a leader/manager, one who thinks longer term; looks beyond the unit to organizational and global trends; influences constituents beyond their jurisdictions; emphasizes intangibles such as vision, values, and motivation; has the ability to cope with conflicting requirements of multiple constituencies; and thinks in terms of renewal or revision of process and structure required by ever-changing reality.
In 1978, James McGregor Burns proposed a concept of leadership described as "transactional" which focuses on extrinsic motives and needs; and "transformational" which focuses on higher-order, more intrinsic needs. Burns' concept of transformational leadership was subsequently extended by Roberts (1985), Bass (1987), Sergiovanni (1990), and Leithwood (1992). Roberts (1985, p. 1023) described transformational leadership as "a leadership that facilitates the redefinition of a people's mission and vision, a renewal of their commitment, and the restructuring of their systems for goal accomplishment." Under transactional leadership administrators and teachers exchange needs and services in order to accomplish independent objectives. Transformational leadership is identified when administrators and teachers pursue higher level goals, common to both groups, regardless of special interests and independent goals (Leithwood 1992).

While internal forces of the school are calling for altered leadership roles, an increasing number of external forces are also impacting on the evolving role of the principal. This increased pressure comes from politicians, parents, members of the school's community, and the community at large. The contemporary educational leader needs to be able to interact with a complex network of individuals and agencies, and be aware of the roles these external forces play in school improvement and student achievement (Heck, 1991).

Interactions with various sub-groups within the school's community require strong human or interpersonal relations skills
(Heck, 1991; Gorton, 1983). A study on secondary school principals listed effective and ineffective behaviors under "Human Relations" which included the following:

**Effective Behaviors**

1. Listens actively to staff and faculty ideas and creates opportunities for staff to express ideas.
2. Provides resources and supportive environment for collaborative planning.
3. Establishes school wide goals and program with staff participation.

**Ineffective Behaviors**

1. Avoids staff involvement.
2. Provides little or no feedback.
3. Does not provide for collaborative planning through resources or support (Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985).

Interview data from these secondary principals indicated that most administrators believe that human relations and communications skills are essential tools of administration. In the realm of human relations, the principal needs to develop specific skills and abilities to work with others. One of these skill areas is interpersonal competence that is reflected in how an individual interacts and communicates with another.

Robert G. Owens (1991), in his book *Organizational Behavior in Education*, noted an important understanding that came out of organizational studies of the 1980s:
Perhaps the most powerful learning to have arisen during the first century of organizational studies concerns what is now obvious: that the key to understanding organization lies in understanding the human and social dimensions. Toward the middle of the twentieth century, triggered by the Western Electric research, students of organization began to grasp what Douglas McGregor was later to describe as the human side of enterprise. This was the realization that human motivation, aspiration, belief, and values have wondrous power in determining the effectiveness of efforts to lead and develop organizations. (p. 37)

Interpersonal Communication

As leaders are called upon to expand their interactive roles with others, communication becomes key. Bass (1990) referred to the quality of communicating with others as an interpersonal competence. The traditional view referred to interpersonal competence as the ability to socialize, to fit with group norms, to comply with authority, to avoid conflict, and to be polite and mannerly. The human relations movement described interpersonal competence as involving empathy, insight, heightened awareness, and the ability to give and receive feedback (Stanford & Roark, 1974).

The human relations era however, maintained that "while administrators might act civilly, even kindly, to subordinates - power
in the organization is hierarchical and . . . ought to be exercised asymmetrically from top down" (Owens, 1991, p. 37). In the human resources development movement, the culture of the organization epitomized not only what the organization stands for, but also the aspirations of the individual participants themselves. Therefore, interpersonal competence would reflect support of both the organizational culture and the individual's goals, by "... establishing, nourishing, and keeping alive the enduring values and beliefs that give meaning to the organization and make clear how individuals become and continue to be part of the organization as it develops (Owens, p. 48)."

Studies showed that managers or leaders with interpersonal competence demonstrated an openness to discussions about one's feelings, consensual solutions to conflict, and the development of commitment to actions (Argyris, 1962). These leaders were more willing to depend on trust and shared decision making than on power (Zaleznik, 1965).

B. M. Bass (1990, p. 110) stated:

Evidence of interpersonal competence has included a wide variety of behaviors, such as showing understanding, caring, and consideration for others; displaying authenticity, rather than transparency; communicating easily and clearly; fostering and maintaining good relations with others; and serving to increase harmony, reduce tensions, and resolve conflicts.
Compared with incompetent managers, Kaplan (1986) notes that "competent managers are influential but not dictatorial, good in dealing with people and in delegating, and trustworthy and credible rather than overly political." They promote group decisions to take full advantage of their subordinates' knowledge and to increase their subordinates' commitment to the decisions (Lombardo, Ruderman, & McCauley, 1987).

Considerable evidence shows connections between competence in communicating and satisfactory performance as a leader and manager (Bass, 1990). Successful corporate leaders shared many common communication skills in that they were able to "expand their thinking by their active soliciting of new ideas and feedback from others and were continuously reaching out for new information. . . . they knew how to persuade others about the quality of their ideas and had the ability to communicate persuasively to others and to enlist their support by persistently working for it" (Bass, 1990, p. 111).

Jay Hall, in an article entitled, "Communication Revisited" (1973), noted a cross-cultural study which showed that seventy-four (74) percent of the managers sampled from companies in Japan, Great Britain and the United States, cited communication breakdown as the single greatest barrier to corporate excellence. Hall (1973) further notes:

Just what constitutes a problem of communication is not easily agreed upon. . . . More often than not, the communication dilemmas cited by people are not
communication problems at all. They are instead symptoms of difficulties at more basic and fundamental levels of corporate life. . . . Problems of communication in organizations frequently reflect dysfunctions at the level of corporate climate. The feelings people have about where or with whom they work-- feelings of impotence, distrust, resentment, insecurity, social inconsequence, and all the other very human emotions - not only define the climate which prevails but the manner in which communications will be managed. (p. 56)

R. R. Blake and J. S. Mouton (1968, p. 4) indicated that "when management is effective and relationships are sound, problems of communication tend not to occur."

The changing roles of the principal require interaction at various levels with various groups. To be effective with various groups, the principal must be competent in interpersonal communication skills and demonstrate the ability to interact effectively with others. The way in which these skills are developed, is a question for principal preparation programs.

As important as these areas of human relations and communication skills are, principal preparation programs have addressed their development with varying degrees of emphases. Berscheid (1985) stated:

The changing role of the principal rests within the relationships with other people, yet only rarely is it an explicitly stated objective of formal education. . . . The
attainment of interpersonal knowledge and skills is usually an informal and haphazard affair, and learned in the hard school of life." Therefore, it is appropriate to review the status of initial preparation or pre-service programs in light of the changing role of the principal, especially in the human interaction dimension, and to ascertain whether competence in interpersonal communication is impacted upon by principal preparation programs. (p. 62)

Call for Improved Principal Preparation Programs

Once the reform spotlight was focused on the role of school administrators, a number of problem areas quickly became illuminated. None have been more visible than issues relating to administrator training, especially the quality of initial preparation programs. (Murphy, 1991, p. 50)

Assessments of preparation programs granting certification and advanced degrees to school administrators revealed these programs to be deficient in almost all areas, from the recruitment and selection of new candidates to the certification and placement of graduates (Peterson & Finn, 1985; Griffiths, 1988). Critical reviews such as those of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1989) and The National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (NCEEA, 1987) offered suggestions for improvement.
The latter report entitled *Leaders for America's Schools* (1987, p. xiii) emphasized, "The needed agenda was not merely change but a revolution in the way schools are organized. . . . a revolution in education requires competent, skilled, visionary leadership as has never been available before."

D. E. Griffiths (1988) a major critic of programs for training school administrators, stated that such programs ranged in quality from *embarrassing to disastrous*. It is curious since Griffiths, as a member of the Commission of Excellence in Educational Administration, was personally responsible for administrative training programs in this country. In essence, Griffiths, attacked himself and other Commission members as he criticized the state of school administrative training programs. This dilemma brings into question whether any significant changes can be made regarding the way leaders are prepared to work in schools.

There is evidence, however, that renewal efforts are underway to improve the professional preparation of new leaders for schools (NASSP Bulletin, 1990, November). These efforts have resulted in the development of models of school organizations that offer more potential for school improvement than do bureaucracies" (Murphy, 1990a, p. 280). Most of these newer perspectives share common characteristics:

- decentralization of authority to the site level (Goodlad, 1984; National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, 1987; National Governors' Association, 1986);
• restructuring roles and functions of teachers and principals
  (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Clark,
  1987);
• team approaches to school management (Glatthorn & Newberg,
  1984; Lieberman, 1988); and
• self-managing teams (Hackman, 1986; Manz & Sims, 1987).

In many states, legislators are responding to the reform
movement by supporting policy changes in the preparation and
certification of school administrators. A potpourri of emphases,
conceptualizations and approaches to principal preparation programs
have been developed in the literature. Some of the common
elements in successful administrative preparation programs include:
• a cohort of students who go through a given program
together (Goodlad, 1987);
• expanded field experience and principal internships (Shute,
  Webb, & Thomas, 1989; Richards & Fox, 1990; Werner, 1989);
• experienced principals who serve as mentors to aspiring
  principals (Barnett, 1990; Daresh, 1990);
• integrated course work that purposefully links theory and
  practice (Bass, 1990);
• increased professor/practitioner collaboration (Goodlad, 1987);
• problem-based learning (Bridges & Hallinger, 1991).

Although school leaders perceive their job in its human as well
as technical dimensions, most training programs emphasize the latter
(Goldman, Kempner, Powell & Schmuck, 1990). In this technical
dimension, the skill or technical aspects, like instruction, theory,
observation techniques are emphasized while the human dimension is de-emphasized or neglected. Bruce Barnett (1990) suggests that this may be one of the reasons why administrative training programs are deficient.

To address the human dimension, some principal preparation programs are beginning to put more emphasis on field-based experience through internships where students work closely with a mentor during their formal preparation. Barnett (1990, p. 17) states that "mentors are expected to provide aspiring administrators with more practical, experienced-based activities than currently exist in traditional preparation programs."

To support the expanded practicum experience, professors of educational administration preparation programs need to work closely with the mentors and interns to ensure opportunities for learning. Training for both mentors and interns needs to be provided for each to understand their relationship and the purposes of observation and feedback (Barnett, 1990). Principal preparation programs must include components that develop competencies and give opportunities for the application of these skills in a variety of real-life school situations.

Discussion to this point has referred to the context of the problem from a broad perspective: amplifying the call for school improvement; identifying the need to address the changing roles of the school principal; and supporting the alignment of principal preparation programs to address the human dimension of aspiring principals. Interpersonal competence was also identified as a key
element in the human dimension of leadership. The following
discussion considers the statement of the problem in a more specific
context relevant to this study.

The Hawaii Context

In Hawaii, as in other states across the nation, reform
movements have caused educators and other community members to
explore restructuring for school improvement. Among these efforts,
the Hawaii State Legislature mandated, through State Statute (1989),
that all public schools in the state be involved in "School-Community
Based Management" (SCBM). This mandate called for more autonomy
and shared decision making at the school site. A Hawaii State task
force on SCBM (1989) recognized the key role of the principal, but
also strongly recommended the involvement of at least five other
elements of the school's community in the decision-making process:
teachers, staff, students, parents, and the community at-large. SCBM
therefore, requires shared leadership behaviors and highlights the
necessity for the leader to develop a higher level of interpersonal
communication abilities.

In recognition of this shift in governance with proposed
changes in the decision-making process, and the significance of the
principal's key role to school success, the Hawaii State Department of
Education (DOE), in collaboration with the College of Education at the
University of Hawaii at Manoa (UHM), developed the "Cohort School
Leadership (CSL)" program.
The development of the year-long CSL program was influenced by the "concepts of participatory management which require administrative behaviors conducive to transforming and establishing school cultures which enhance effective schooling" (Araki, 1992, p. 7). These concepts were incorporated into the design of the CSL program and guided by the following themes of reform initiatives for school leadership.

1. **Adaptation of leadership to the local context**

   The strategies of administering and leading a school have changed dramatically with the call for school-based management, local control of schools, and parent and student choice. The movement is away from a centrally determined instructional program to an educational program adapted to the needs, characteristics, and aspirations of the children in a particular community. These initiatives will involve the principal in the design and development of curricula, and in the selection of instructional material and personnel.

2. **Shared Decision Making**

   Education that is locally adapted calls for more participative planning which involves all members of the school/community, including principals, teachers, parents, staff, students, and other community members. The principal will need to be an active participant in collaborative planning and shared decision-making.

3. **School Renewal**

   Effective school reform is not a short-term undertaking, but a continuous process of self-examination and renewal. It involves a
constant review of program assumptions and personnel effectiveness. This initiative requires that principals have the ability to receive and act upon independent and collective self-criticism.

4. Utilization of Knowledge

Principals and teachers must have access to pertinent research findings and be able to apply that information to the specific contexts in which they are working. Principals will need to have an understanding of educational research and how to apply such knowledge to practice through school leadership. (HI State DOE, 1990, pp. 2-3).

The focus of this program design was to develop future school leaders who can lead the school organization to improved performance and achievement. In addition, the DOE recognized the need to "prepare leaders who can work positively with people to lead them to higher accomplishments. . . . skillfully generate employee growth, cooperation and focused improvement direction (HI State DOE, 1990).

The development of the CSL program considered the urgency of meeting the need of a projected critical shortage of qualified educational leaders; strengthening the preparation of educational leaders for their changing roles; and supporting the principal as key to the success of educational reform. Four key administrative behaviors served as the driving force of the CSL program design: high goal emphasis; team building; supportive relationships; and work facilitation (Araki, 1992). To support the development of these
administrative behaviors, the CSL program incorporated the content framework of the National Commission for the Principalship which identified twenty-one domains, organized into four major areas; functional, programmatic, interpersonal, and contextual. These will be described in more detail in Chapter II.

Elements, noted earlier and identified as important in the preparation of aspiring principals, were incorporated into the CSL program and include: problem-based education; internships under the guidance of experienced mentors; integrated coursework; facilitative leadership; and a cohort of students who experience the program together.

One of the critical elements of the CSL program is the identified strand for improving interpersonal competence. In recognition of this, pre-selection interviews were conducted by a trained team using questions based on the "Ventures in Excellence" (1983) instrument. The underlying research of this instrument indicated that leadership qualities are strongly associated with a person's belief system, attitudes, skills, behaviors, and sensitivity to people and people interactions. This instrument emphasizes the potential leader's affective domain and is based on the premise that excellent school administrators possess human centered, altruistic attitudes and beliefs and display skills and behaviors that intrinsically motivate themselves and others to persevere and strive for excellence. The assessment areas of "Human Development," "Human Interaction," and "Positive Relationships" relate specifically to ways in which leaders work effectively with others. Some of these
identified competencies include the individual's ability to: appreciate the uniqueness of others and understand what motivates them; commit to bringing out the best in people by using appropriate strategies; highlight individual's strengths; plan and arrange programs to meet needs of people; involve people affected in organizational planning; allow for greater personal and group effectiveness; help others work in areas where they are able to use strengths and pursue interests; know uniqueness of others and facilitate efforts with parameters of mission and function of organization; assess others' strengths and talents in most effective manner; communicate with people in a manner which prizes them; and build positive, harmonious relationships. Various activities within the CSL program were planned to address the development of these interpersonal skills.

The foregoing discussion of the context of the problem set the stage for this study. The following section discusses the need and significance of this study and the approach to the problem.

**Rationale for Approach to Problem**

**Need and Significance of This Study**

There is an identified need for this study, not only in its local context as a means of assessing a particular professional preparation program on the development of a specific strand of leadership, but also in the broader field of educational leadership research. A review of the research on leadership and leader behavior led
Immegart (1990, p. 287) to conclude that "there has not been very much priority for such study, over the last decade or so. . . . Educational studies of leadership and research on educational leaders appear to be dwindling in numbers, not increasing."

In regards to studies on leadership training, Immegart was critical that such studies have provided meager evidence about leadership and the effectiveness of leadership training. Stogdill (1974, p. 199) noted that no effort was found in studies to compare trainees to non-trainees. Other criticisms of leadership studies were in regards to the implementation of untested models; poor quality of preparation programs; and weakness of design and execution. The conclusion is that it is difficult to determine the value of leadership training from the available evidence (Immegart, 1990, p. 268).

Theories of leadership behavior offer a set of ideas regarding the leader's tendency towards people orientation [human dimension] or task-orientation [task dimension] (Rossow, 1990). Several studies have noted this dichotomous relationship of leadership: "consideration vs. initiating structure" (Ohio State Leadership Studies in Owens, 1991); "concern for people vs. concern for production," (Blake & Mouton, 1978); "employee-orientation vs. production orientation" (Katz, 1950); "employee-centered vs. job-centered" (Likert, 1961); "ideographic vs. nomothetic" (Getzels & Guba, 1957); and "democratic vs. autocratic" (White & Lippit, 1960).

Although several studies have noted the importance of the human dimension of leadership, not much attention has been given to interpersonal competence, as a specific strand in this dimension.
If the changing role of the principal is directed towards shared or participatory leadership, then interaction with others is eminent. As principal preparation programs place greater emphasis on the development of interpersonal competence for future principals, it is equally important to assess whether the program has achieved this goal.

**Theoretical Approach**

The emphasis on the human dimension of leadership in organizations and the interdependence of its members is consistent through various theories about leadership. An overview of four categories of leadership theories was presented in an earlier section. The approach to this study focuses on ideas as they relate to principal preparation programs and interpersonal competence.

In the pragmatic view, leadership takes place in an organization which is an integrated system of interdependent structures and functions, and consists of persons who must work in harmony with each other. Katz identifies one of the principles of a good polity, as one which applies to principals, teachers and students as they live and work together in schools. He describes this relationship as the interdependence of each member of a commonwealth as a citizen (cited in Bass, 1990).

Regarding the school administrator's participation, as a leader, in the formulation of public educational policy, pragmatism argues that if the public is given the opportunity to see the basic issues, the best alternative will be chosen. This proposition is central to democracy. Pragmatism emphasizes that education must be of a
democratic nature, since the improvement of society requires the wholehearted involvement of all citizens, both as individuals and as members of social living (and) is essential to the fullest and best growth toward responsible, self-directed, and self-controlled individuals" (Graff, Street, Kimbrough, & Dykes, 1966).

Pragmatism views human beings as the products of their experiences:

What is experienced by ordinary human beings in everyday life is the only reality to be known. There is no doctrine of absolute reality. To know reality, one must immerse oneself in the thick of it, experiencing as much as one can. (Graff, Street, Kimbrough & Dykes, 1966)

This view supports the principle that professional learning should take place in the context of thinking and acting as a principal (HI State DOE, 1990). Other professional schools in the fields of law and medicine, for example, have found that immersion in one's professional role in the field is a powerful means of professional education. Reform initiatives continue to emphasize the need for expanded field experiences through internships.

Pragmatism places "Man as the master of his institution," (Graff et al. 1966) which suggests a different kind of education for the role of master than that for the role of subordinate. New emphasis is placed on the potentiality of Man to shape his own destiny by modifying himself and his environment in directions of his choice. Man can be proactive by acting upon his environment as well as reacting to it. This emphasis on Man's potentialities and the placing
of great responsibilities on his shoulders have tremendous implication for administration never before realized. This view supports the principle that aspiring principals should be actively involved in and responsible for their own learning in order to become independent professionals (HI State DOE, 1990). Preparation programs need to offer opportunities to assist aspiring principals to identify and gain access to the theoretical knowledge, research, and professional literature in order to develop appropriate responses for which they are held accountable.

"Human worth and dignity are essential concepts because they furnish the best climate wherein man many realize his own highest potential" (Graff et al., 1966). Stanford and Roark (1974) note that education today calls for man to have three major competencies or abilities if society is to survive: 1) Man must learn to live with others in a humane way, or man must be humane; 2) Man must learn the skills necessary for effective living; and 3) Man must learn to live in his physical world in a way that benefits both him and the world.

Ashley Montagu (1970) refers to man's most important talent as being the talent for humanity. Montagu defines this talent as involvement and expands on this by stating:

The talent for being humane operationally means the involvement in the welfare of one's fellowman. . . . The most basic of all opportunities is the right to growth and development as a human being who has been deeply involved in the love of others, for the health and identity
of the person consists in the meaningfulness of his
interrelationships." (p. 56)

Stanford and Roark (1974, p. 6) suggest that Montagu's
description contains the essence of the concept of a humane person
as one who is not just kind and loving toward another, but is
involved in enhancing the welfare of his fellowman, and places the
welfare of his fellowman on a par with his own.

An extension of these beliefs that Man is a humane person
supports the principle that aspiring leaders need to learn about
leadership and administration in collaboration with one another and
with practicing professionals (HI State DOE, 1990). Shared leadership
does not mean sacrificing one's own individual leadership or power.
Instead, shared leadership means that one can derive satisfaction
from his contribution to the welfare of others (Stanford & Roark,
1974). According to a study by McClelland and Burnham (1976),
good managers were oriented toward serving their organizations; and
generating team spirit, clarity of purpose, and a sense of
responsibility among their subordinates.

The foundation for understanding man in this study draws
from "The Third Force" psychology (Stanford & Roark, 1974), which
is a reaction to both behaviorism and psychoanalysis. Behaviorism
views man: as a "reactive being" whose behavior is influenced
entirely by environmental conditions, not by any decision on his
part; and as a "history of his reinforcements" which shows that what
man is, has been determined by the positive and negative
reinforcements given to his behavior (Stanford & Roark, p. 18).
Supporters of the third force psychology suggest that psychoanalysis has erred in paying too much attention to man's emotional disturbances and not enough to his healthy aspects. The emphasis of Third Force psychology is on expanding human potentialities and therefore is labeled "humanistic psychology" (Stanford & Roark, 1974, p. 19). The major tenets of this position characterize man as being proactive (Psychological Theory, Stanford & Roark, p. 16-17) and basically good and that his perception of "what is" is crucial. In addition to the emphasis of man as a proactive being who actively takes part in shaping his destiny as well as living it, this theory emphasizes the concern for values, purposes, and the quality and nature of interpersonal relations. All questions regarding the human condition are viewed as central to this theory bringing it into the arena of everyday human life. The purpose then, of education would be to "help man become that which he can become," and of a principal preparation program, to help leaders become that which they can become.

Interpersonal communication plays an important role in how man interacts with another. Most of communication deals with social interaction and communicating with feelings, attitudes and relationships of the persons involved. Stanford & Roark, (1974) note the following:

Ultimately the goal of communication is human interaction. . . . Communication makes interaction possible and provides the participants with a means by which they can affect each other. The adequacy of
communication determines the extent to which each person is able to send and receive messages accurately and completely. Therefore, it is obvious that the quality of communication influences the quality of the interaction. (pp. 37-38)

Bass (1990, p. 122) concluded that "Interpersonal competence is fundamental to successful and effective leadership. Interpersonal competence may involve the ability to communicate and handle conflict appropriately; and the willingness to promote positive relationships through authenticity, caring, insight and empathy."

**Johari Awareness Model**

Joseph Luft and Harry Ingham, two behavioral scientists who studied interpersonal and group processes, offer a way of thinking about interpersonal functioning. They developed a model of social interaction called the "Johari Window," which is an "information processing model where interpersonal style and individual effectiveness are assessed in terms of information processing tendencies, and the performance consequences thought to be associated with such practices" (Hall, 1973, p. 57). Their model is based on several critical assumptions which include:

- human behavior is best understood in terms of the whole or large units of behavior.
- the key to group interaction is what is going on subjectively or what the feelings of the group are.
behavior is influenced more by emotions and largely irrational strivings than by logic and reason.

- the individual has limited awareness of sources of his own behavior and of effects of his behavior on others.

- the best understanding comes with an appreciation of qualitative differences of the processes of interaction between people and within groups.

- attention needs to be given to ongoing processes and changes which are taking place,

- the experiencing individual deserves more attention than do transpersonal rules.

The Johari Awareness model uses a four-part figure to represent the total person in relation to others (see Figure 1). It represents the interaction of two interpersonal sources of information, Self and Others, and the behavioral processes required for using that information. "The two informational sources, Self and Others, have information which is pertinent to the relationship and, at the same time, each lacks information that is equally important. Thus there is relevant and necessary information which is Known by the Self, Unknown by the Self, Known by Others, and Unknown by Others. The Self/Other combinations of known and unknown information make up the four regions within the interpersonal space and . . . characterize the various types and qualities of relationships possible within the Johari framework (Hall, 1973; Luft, 1969).
**Figure 1**

The Johari Window: A model of Interpersonal Processes

"The model may be thought of as representing the various kinds of data available for use in the establishment of relationships" (Hall, 1973, p. 57). The squared field represents the individual's interpersonal space. Awareness of behavior, feelings and motivation serve as a basis of dividing the total figure into quadrants. As Luft (1969, p. 13) indicates, "Sometimes awareness is shared, sometimes not. . . . An act, a feeling, or a motive is assigned to a particular quadrant based on who knows about it. . . . As awareness changes, the quadrant to which the psychological state is assigned, changes."

Each quadrant is defined by Luft (1969, p. 13), and expanded by Hall (1973), as regions. These four regions include:

**Region I: The Arena** - that portion of total interpersonal space that is thought to control interpersonal productivity through mutual understanding and shared information. The larger Region I becomes, the more rewarding, effective, and productive the relationship is apt to be.

**Region II: The Blindspot** - that portion of total interpersonal space which holds information that is Known by Others but is Unknown by the Self. The self is not fully aware of the interpersonal information and is handicapped by a blindspot of hidden or unperceived information.

**Region III: The Facade** - that portion of total interpersonal space which holds information Known by the Self but is Unknown by Others. This region provides a protective front for the self or a facade which, if used in excess, could limit interpersonal effectiveness.
Region IV: *The Unknown* - that portion of total interpersonal space where information is *Unknown by the Self* and *Unknown by Others*. Information may become known as interpersonal effectiveness increases.

Hall (1973, p. 59) describes two major processes of the Johari Awareness model as *Exposure* and *Feedback*. These processes or variables have been incorporated into a "Personnel Relations Survey" developed by Jay Hall and Martha S. Williams (1987). As one seeks to inform others of relevant information which he has and they do not, his Arena is enlarged in a downward direction which also results in a reduction of one's Facade. If an individual behaves in a non-defensive, trusting, and possibly risk-taking manner with others, the indication is that he is contributing to increased mutual awareness and sharing of data. This is called the Exposure process in which there is an open disclosure of one's feelings and factual knowledge, in a conscious and genuine attempt to share. The Exposure process is under direct control of the Self and may be used as a means of building trust and validating mutual exposures.

Hall & Williams (1987) note the dynamic character of the model as critical in that the horizontal and vertical lines which partition the informational space into regions can move, indicating that individuals can control what their interpersonal relationships will become. (see Figure 2) According to these authors, this means that you can significantly influence the size of your "Arena" in relating to others, by the behavioral processes you choose to use in your relationships.
Figure 2
Interpersonal Styles as Functions of Exposure Use and Feedback Solicitations

To enlarge the Arena laterally, the need for mutual exposures becomes apparent. To reduce one's Blindspot, the "Feedback" process involves active solicitation of information the (Self) feels others might have which he does not. Hall (1973, p. 59) elaborates on this notion: "The active, initiative-taking aspect of this solicitation behavior should be stressed, for again the Self takes the primary role in setting interpersonal norms and in legitimizing certain acts within the relationship." According to Hall (1973) the amount of Feedback the Self solicits is dependent upon the willingness of others to expose their data. Therefore, the need for a climate of mutual exposures becomes apparent. Feedback-seeking behaviors are less direct and dependent upon the cooperation of others. The Self's own prior willingness to deal openly and candidly may dictate the level of cooperative and trusting behavior which will prevail on the part of other parties to the relationship. Hall (1973) concludes:

One can theoretically establish interpersonal relationships characterized by mutual understanding and increased effectiveness (by a dominant Arena) if he will engage in exposing and feedback soliciting behaviors to an optimal degree. This places the determination of productivity and amount of interpersonal reward—and the quality of relationships—directly in the hands of the Self. In theory, this amounts to an issue of interpersonal competence; in practice, it amounts to the conscious and sensitive management of interpersonal processes. (p. 59)
Theoretical Assumptions

This study was guided by the following integrated statements of assumptions.

1. Significant learning occurs through human interaction. The key to group interaction is what is going on subjectively or how an individual sees himself and others, and how he uses this knowledge to order his world (Luft, 1969, p. 5-6).

2. The ultimate goal of communication is human interaction.

3. Interpersonal communication is reflective of interpersonal competence.

4. Interpersonal communication can be measured through both the Feedback and Exposure processes.

5. The more open and balanced the Feedback/Exposure circuitry, the greater the interpersonal competence.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of a principal preparation program on the development of interpersonal communication abilities of aspiring principals and alternates, as measured by the processes of Feedback and Exposure of the Johari Awareness Model.
Research Questions

This study addressed the following research questions.

1. What impact does a principal preparation program have on the interpersonal communication abilities of aspiring principals?

2. Is there a relationship between aspiring principals who experienced the year-long internship and alternates who did not, in the development of interpersonal communication abilities?

3. Is there a relationship between an individual's gender, educational background, ethnicity, school district assignment and other selected measures, and his interpersonal communication tendencies?

Empirical Approach to the Problem

The use of the paper-pencil survey makes the critical assumption that the phenomenon of this study can be described or measured accurately through self-report and participants' responses are honest and accurate (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). Although the flaws of self-report data have been well documented in the general research literature (Immegart, 1990), others recognize that the survey method of collecting data can be useful (Marshall & Rossman, 1989).

To support the quantitative analysis of the survey data, this study included the qualitative approach which recognizes the
importance of context, setting, and subjects' frame of reference. Marshall & Rossman (1989) note, "Qualitative methods are effective at getting at the subtleties of how leaders think and how they frame their experience, and they offer a process to gain a better understanding of the complexities of human interactions" (p. 21).

The qualitative study also provided the opportunity to "investigate a contemporary phenomenon (interpersonal competence) within its real-life context (internship on site) . . . when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident . . . and in which multiple sources of evidence are used" (Yin, 1989). Data gathered from different sources can serve to "corroborate, elaborate, or illuminate the research in question" (Rossman & Wilson, 1985); and strengthen the study's usefulness for other settings" (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). The qualitative design follows Thomas' 1949 proposition (cited in Marshall & Rossman, 1989) that it is essential in the study of people to know just how they define the situation in which they find themselves. Bernard Bass (1960) stated:

In dealing with interpersonal behavior, two kinds of data must be examined: data based on observations of the behavior of members and groups, metered either by instrument or human observer, and data based on the participants' verbal reports. It would be foolhardy to attempt to exclude one type at the expense of the other, for it is clear that the behavior of participants in
interaction is dependent on their perception of the situation as well as the realities of the situation.

This aspect of the research relied on in-depth interviews and observations as the primary methods of data collection. The purpose of the interviews was to have interns reflect on their behavior in the contextual setting, describe activities, and interpret how such activities impacted on their development of interpersonal communication skills.

Quantitative and qualitative analyses were used to test the following hypotheses and answer the following research questions.

Set of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

There are no significant differences in Interns' perceptions of interpersonal communication abilities among three relationship levels as measured by the Johari Personnel Relations Survey (JPRS) instrument.

Sub-hypotheses:

a. There is no significant difference between the pre/post Johari Exposure scores among Interns in their relationship with employees.
b. There is no significant difference between the pre/post Johari Feedback scores among Interns in their relationship with employees.
c. There is no significant difference between the pre/post Johari Exposure scores among Interns in their relationship with colleagues.
d. There is no significant difference between the pre/post Johari Feedback scores among Interns in their relationship with colleagues.
e. There is no significant difference between the pre/post Johari Exposure scores among Interns in their relationship with supervisors.
f. There is no significant difference between the pre/post Johari Feedback scores among Interns in their relationship with supervisors.

Hypothesis 2

There are no significant differences in Alternates' perceptions of interpersonal communication abilities among three relationship levels as measured by the Johari Personnel Relations Survey (JPRS) instrument.

Sub-hypotheses:
a. There is no significant difference between the pre/post- Exposure scores among Alternates in their relationship with employees.
b. There is no significant difference between the pre/post Feedback scores among Alternates in their relationship with employees.
Hypothesis 3

There are no significant differences in Interns' and Alternates' perceptions of interpersonal communication abilities among three relationship levels as measured by the Johari Personnel Relations Survey (JPRS) instrument.

Sub-Hypotheses
a. There is no significant difference between Interns' and Alternates' post Johari Exposure scores in relationship with employees.

b. There is no significant difference between Interns' and Alternates' post Johari Feedback scores in relationship with employees.
c. There is no significant difference between Interns' and Alternates' post Johari Exposure scores in relationship with colleagues.

d. There is no significant difference between Interns' and Alternates' post Johari Feedback scores in relationship with colleagues.

e. There is no significant difference between Interns' and Alternates' post Johari Exposure scores in relationship with supervisors.

f. There is no significant difference between Interns' and Alternates' post Johari Feedback scores in relationship with supervisors.

**Hypothesis 4**

There is no relationship between Interns' perceptions of interpersonal communication abilities and the demographic factors of gender, ethnicity, years of educational experience, assigned school districts, and pre-selection interview scores.
Ancillary Questions

In addition to the proposed hypotheses, the data collected from the pre/post surveys, and the observations/interviews of the selected cohort were examined in an attempt to determine answers to the following ancillary questions:

1. Were there any shifts from the pre to post internship in Interns' perceptions regarding the development of interpersonal communication skills?

2. What components of a principal training program led to increased development of interpersonal communication abilities, as perceived by selected principal Interns?

3. How did selected Interns perceive their interpersonal competence in interactions with employees (teachers, staff, students, parents); colleagues (cohort, vice-principals); or supervisors (mentors, professors, CSL program staff)?
Limitations

This study was intended to assess the impact of a particular principal preparation program on the development of interpersonal communication abilities of the first cohort of interns. Since this group comprised the total population of interns in the program, the conclusions of this study may not be generalizable to a universal population of principal interns. However, implications from this study could possibly apply to a hypothetical set of future cohorts.

The number of alternates is small in comparison to the number of interns who experienced the program. Therefore, caution needs to be taken in using the results of this group for the purpose of comparison. Alternates were seen as a comparative group because they went through the pre-selection phases of the CSL but did not experience the internship.

Another limitation to this study may be the fact that the pre-post surveys call for self-perception data. According to Immegart (1990), the flaws of such data have been well documented in the literature. This study however, will attempt to provide corroboration and support of the paper-pencil survey through observational data and interviews.
Definitions

The following are operational definitions for the purpose of this study.

**Balanced Arena** - indicates the use of Exposure and Feedback processes in near equal amounts. More positive interpersonal feelings result from balanced systems (Hall & Williams, 1987).

**Communication** - conceptualized as a process of exchanging information which deals with social interaction of sharing feelings, attitudes, and relationships of persons involved (Stanford & Roark, 1974, p. 27).

**Exposure** - refers to the interpersonal information that is known by others or unknown by others in one's relationship with others (Luft, 1969; Hall & Williams, 1987).

**Feedback** - refers to the interpersonal information that is known by the self or unknown by the self in one's relationship with others (Luft, 1969; Hall & Williams, 1987).

**Four Regions** - determined by the combinations of relevant information which is known and/or unknown by the self, feedback, and known and/or unknown by others, exposure.
Interpersonal competence - the ability to involve empathy, insight, heightened awareness in interactions and the ability to give and receive feedback (Human Relations movement); implies openness to discussions about one’s feelings, consensual solutions to conflict, and the development of commitment to actions (Argyris, 1962); and depends on trust and shared decision making among individuals, than on power (Zaleznik, 1965). The Johari Personnel Relations Survey measures individual "tendencies to facilitate or hinder the flow of interpersonal information in an individual’s relationships with others" (Hall & Williams, 1987).
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature, including published studies which have examined what educational leaders of the 1990s need, to be effective leaders in the human dimension. A specific focus is on interpersonal communication abilities, as one strand of the human dimension of educational leadership. A general review of the literature supports the context of the problem, by establishing the need for: changing perspectives of public education; changing roles of principals; and improving principal preparation programs. The background and description of the Cohort School Leadership program is also presented.

Literature Review Rationale

This study of the impact of a "Cohort School Leadership" (CSL) program on the interpersonal communication abilities of principal interns was built upon the following major premises: 1) Effective leaders do make a difference in school success; 2) The changing roles of principals call for leaders with strong interpersonal communication abilities; and 3) Principal preparation programs need to provide opportunities for potential leaders to develop their interpersonal abilities. The assumption is that leaders who are skilled in the area of interpersonal communications tend to be more
effective than those who do not demonstrate such skills. Leaders, in their increasingly human interactive roles, need to develop skills in interpersonal communications and the development of these skills can be influenced by a leadership preparation program. This study assessed the impact of the Cohort School Leadership (CSL) program on the development of interpersonal communication abilities of the first cohort of principal interns or aspiring principals.

The Context of the Problem

Call For School Improvement

There is a public/societal concern that our schools are not doing well. Public confidence in schooling was in major decline in the early 1980s (Boyd, 1984). The report, A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform (The National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), served as a dramatic turning point in educational reform. Doyle and Hartle (1985, September, p. 23) stated that "the dramatic rhetoric of this report, when coupled with the reports of several other national study groups, painted a picture of an educational system in chaos. . . . these reports made education front-page news in the media and catapulted education to the top of the public policy agenda."
Some examples of the reform rhetoric from respective reports include:

**Making the Grade** (1983, p. 3)  "The nation's public schools are in trouble . . . the performance of our schools falls far short of expectations."

**Action for Excellence** (1983, p. 3)  "There are few national efforts that can legitimately be called crucial to our national survival. Improving education in America--improving it sufficiently and improving it now--is such an effort."

**Educating Americans for the 21st Century** (1983, p. 1)  "The nation is failing to provide its children with the intellectual tools needed for the 21st century."

**High School** (1983, p. 1)  "The time for renewing education has arrived . . . . There is a growing consensus that our future depends on public education."
Nation Prepared (1986, p. 2) "America's ability to compete in world markets is eroding."

Tomorrow's Teachers (1986, p. 3) "America's dissatisfaction with its schools has become chronic and epidemic."

Time for Results (1986, p. 2) "To meet stiff competition from workers in the rest of the world, we must educate ourselves and our children as we never have before."

Leaders for America's Schools (1987, p. xiii) "... a revolution in education requires competent, skilled, visionary leadership as has never been available before."

[cited in Plank & Ginzberg, 1990 in Murphy (Ed.), p. 132-134].

These reports brought about an unprecedented outpouring of reform measures from the states. A report by the Education Commission of the States (1984, July) noted the creation of more than 250 state task forces to study various educational issues and recommend changes; the introduction of thousands of education bills in state legislatures; and the raising of standards for teacher certification, high school graduation, and post secondary admissions.
In addition, business leaders, community groups, and others who had not usually been involved in education, participated in identifying and implementing a new educational agenda. "This is the golden age of education reform" (Doyle & Hartle 1985, Sept., p. 24).

The Hawaii Business Round Table commissioned Paul Berman and Associates to do a study of the public educational system in the state of Hawaii which resulted in a report of recommendations. This report, entitled "The Hawaii Plan--Educational Excellence for the Pacific Era (1988), " noted the following:

A paradox lies at the center of any fair assessment of Hawaii education. The current public school system has many strengths--the best system of equity in the nation, many highly competent teachers and administrators, pockets of excellent schools and programs, and an unshakable commitment to serve all of Hawaii's diverse students. Aware of these virtues, officials feel frustrated that the general populace seems to view Hawaii's public education as substandard. Most people do indeed perceive the system as performing below the level of education on the mainland.

The "Berman Report," as it became known, served as a catalyst for several major reforms within the public educational system of Hawaii. Among the most noted is the Hawaii State mandate for "School/Community Based Management" (SCBM). This was one effort to decentralize the management of schools by bringing impetus for
change to the school site. Proponents of educational change, such as John Goodlad (1987), emphasize that schools must serve as the "centers for change." SCBM was also an attempt to involve other members of the school's community in the educational agenda of schools. These members include not only school personnel such as principal, teachers, students and staff, but also business and community members.

Although public confidence in schooling may have been in decline in the early 1980s (Boyd, 1984; Elam & Gallup, 1989), recent surveys appear to be more hopeful about public education. Scott Thomson (1986) stated:

The public has much greater confidence in schools today than in 1980. The closer Americans looked at education . . . the more they realized two things: 1) Schools were doing a good job in the face of terribly tough obstacles; and 2) If the public supported schools with more funds and some encouragement, the schools could improve substantially. (p. 41)

Thomson also asserts that basically the public is behind schools more now than they've been for twenty years, since the Sputnik era.

The movements from national reports, to state reform legislation, to individual school based management are reflected in a statement by Doyle and Hartle (1985), that "Education is a national concern, a state responsibility, and a local function." This change has major implications for emerging as well as current school leaders.
Changing Roles of the Principal

The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Curriculum Council, in its report "Restructuring: The Principal and Curriculum Change" (1990), recalls why the principalship was created in the first place and why principals are still essential for school leadership and change. "The word principal comes from the Latin principalis, meaning 'first in rank, station, or esteem.' The school principalship was a well-understood concept in the America of the eighteenth century (Williams, 1957). The principal was the principal teacher of the school." Confinement of the principal to a single classroom was challenged in 1887 by J.B. Maxwell, a high school principal, calling this a mistake because it prevented him from spending some time in other classrooms so that he may inspect the work of his teachers. The inspecting role of the principal was an important historical function of supervision. The introduction of new state laws and regulations put increased pressure on school principals to supervise, making them directly responsible for curriculum and instruction and their resulting test scores.

Supervision and inspection played important roles in the industrialization or scientific management era. In the early years of the twentieth century, factories in the United States and many other industrialized countries operated according to a set of principles developed by Frederick W. Taylor, a management engineer. "Taylor
taught Henry Ford and other leading industrialists of the time that workers are not to be encouraged to think creatively about their work. . . . Thinking . . . is the job of managers and supervisors. . . . Creative thinking by front-line workers would only jeopardize the Grand Plan" (Bonstingl, 1993, pp. 2-3).

This factory model was reflected in American schools during this same period, where the belief was that this would best prepare young people to enter the world of work. Schools reflected the world of work at that time, where students were regimented to take orders, obey bell signals to begin and end each class period, sit in rows, move through the material in lock-step fashion, work quickly to cover all the material then move on to the next batch of material (Bonstingl, 1993, p. 4). The principal's role at that time was as supervisor and operational manager.

While such a role may have been acceptable during the industrialization era, the "effective school movement" attempted to identify and define characteristics of an "effective principal" which appear to contribute to superior performance in schools. Descriptive characteristics of effective schools include the following: high level of academic achievement; safe and orderly environment; clear and focused mission; strong leadership; frequent monitoring of student progress; schoolwide staff training; and local involvement. In this movement, the principal continues to be identified as the key to school effectiveness (Weber, 1971; Kean et al., 1979; Murnane, 1975;

"Although some reformers (Chubb, 1988; Holmes Group, 1986) suggested that administrators were more likely to impede rather than serve as a catalyst for change, others reemphasized the importance of school administrators as central to reform efforts to improve schools" (Murphy & Hallinger, 1987).

Fran Rees (1991) in her book on facilitation skills of leaders, identified the following related skills areas as necessary for leadership development:

• shows high sensitivity to others and concern for others' needs;
• is consistently helpful and responsive to others;
• demonstrates fluency in written/oral communication;
• builds trust through open, collaborative relationships;
• listens well and is unusually receptive to others' input;
• gives personal recognition for work well done;
• generates loyalty and enthusiasm in support of participative environment.

Although agreement does not exist on what it means to be an effective principal (Duke & Imber, 1985), the role of the principal of the 1980s and early 1990s has been one of an "instructional leader." Kenneth A. Leithwood (1992, February) describes the term "instructional leadership" as one which focuses on "first-order" changes to improve the technical, instructional activities of the school
through close monitoring of teachers and students' classroom work. Leithwood and others note a level of "second-order" changes which refers to building a shared vision, improving communication, and developing collaborative decision-making processes (Leithwood and Montgomery, 1986; Duke, 1987; Smith and Andrews, 1989). The implication is that "successful first-order changes usually depend on the support provided through significant second-order changes (Leithwood, February 1992). Saronson (1990) indicates that failure to acknowledge this complexity is one reason for the failure of educational reform. "Restructuring initiatives are primarily about second-order changes; they require leadership with a similar focus . . . . School administrators must focus their attention on using facilitative power to make second-order changes in their schools. . . . 'Transformational leadership' provides such a focus" (Leithwood, 1992, p. 9).

Roberts (1985) described "transforming leadership" as a leadership that facilitates the redefinition of a people's mission and vision, a renewal of their commitment, and the restructuring of their systems for goal accomplishment."

The idea was first introduced by James M. Burns (1978) and extended by Bass (1987) to non-educational settings. Burns defined "transformational leadership" as leadership where administrators and teachers pursue higher-level goals which are common to both groups. He defined "transactional leadership" as leadership where administrators and teachers exchange needs and services in order to
pursue independent goals. As a further means of contrast, Burns sees the transactional role as focusing on extrinsic motives and needs; and "transformational" as focusing on higher-level, more intrinsic needs (Sergiovanni, 1989, pp. 214-215).

In three recent studies which compared schools initiating reforms of their own choice, and schools reacting to district and state level mandates, Leithwood and others found that transformational leaders can be described in light of pursuing three fundamental goals: 1) helping staff members develop and maintain a collaborative, professional school culture; 2) fostering teacher development; and 3) helping them solve problems together more effectively. Bass (1987) and Sergiovanni (1990) consider transactional practices as central to maintaining the organization, but not necessarily to stimulate improvement. Transformational leadership is seen as providing the incentive for people to attempt improvements in their practices (Leithwood, 1992, February).

As transformational leadership indicates, the principal is no longer the sole visionary who defines what is good and proper in the school curriculum. Although still accountable, few principals have sole "control" over what happens in their respective schools. Principals are often plagued by state and district mandates, imposed graduation requirements, state and national testing, and various public planning documents.
A report by the NASSP Curriculum Council (1990) noted: The principal today must execute his or her responsibilities far more subtly, far more collegially, far more collaboratively than predecessors of years ago. . . . Control today means direction-finding within the limits established by those in high authority. . . . More than ever before, control means shared decision-making—both of the process and of the final decision itself. (p. 3)

English and Hill (1990) stated that, "Treating people impersonally can undermine the school climate for constructive change." They used the following developmental staging chart, to formulate a vision of what schools of the future will be. The chart describes the existing school (custodial school) in the left column; the right column describes the Restructured School; and the middle column characterizes an interim stage in development from the custodial to restructured one. Excerpts from this chart are presented below for the purpose of comparing various factors as related to what is and what should be for the vision of successful schools. The chart also summarizes the changing role of the school leader from the manager of the scientific management era, to the instructional leader of the effective schools movement and the transformational leader of the continuing renewal period. (see Figure 3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Custodial School</th>
<th>Effective School</th>
<th>Restructured School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concept base</td>
<td>Scientific Management</td>
<td>Effectiveness Research</td>
<td>Theory Z-information society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Triangle table of organization;</td>
<td>Core of principal and cabinet related to individual teachers.</td>
<td>Principal and teacher cabinet linked to teaching teams, linked with learners, parents; school-w/in-school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teachers at base.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>One-way; formal; principal to individual teacher or parent.</td>
<td>One-way directed; leader-initiated plus requested feedback.</td>
<td>Two-way vertical for issues and proposals by team, individual, and principal; two-way horizontal for job-alike consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Principal has legal responsibility for decisions; teachers perceived as unable or unwilling to accept decision responsibility.</td>
<td>Principal seeks information and advice in making decisions for the school; keeps everyone informed of decisions.</td>
<td>Much collaboration; decisions made at implementation level; principal and teachers have a clear view of 1) decisions to be made alone, 2) decisions that require advice and input, 3) decisions that are corporate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Authority leader; one role identified.</td>
<td>Persuasive leader who teaches, persuades of personal vision; leadership core identified.</td>
<td>Transforming leader who creates leadership in others; many roles of leadership identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal's role</td>
<td>Manager, implements the program efficiently and effectively; style as controller.</td>
<td>Instructional leader, expects excellence in teaching, aligned program and results in achievement; style as controller-problem solver.</td>
<td>Entrepreneur; explores new programs, opportunities, recognition for staff; style as opportunist, supporter, problem-solver, cheerleader, controller.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3
Comparison of Custodial, Effective & Restructured Schools

Restructuring schools, characterized by site autonomy, shared decision making among school staff, enhanced roles for teachers and parents, bring about altered roles for school leaders. Restructured schools "redesign decision making, communication structures, changing roles and relationships both within the school and between the school and its external environment" (National LEADership Network Study Group on Restructuring Schools, 1991, March).

Interpersonal Competence

Greenfield (1986) suggested that the "cornerstones of effective school administration are moral imagination (the capacity to develop a compelling vision regarding what is possible and desirable to achieve in a given school situation) and interpersonal competence (the knowledge and skills needed to influence teachers and others in desired directions)."

Principals need to be skilled in participative styles of leadership (Campbell & Sparkman, 1990) which emphasize shared decision making and working collaboratively with colleagues. This requirement highlights the human dimension of leadership and the need for improved interpersonal communication. Interpersonal processes refer to how persons behave and incorporate the behavior and experience of a person in an interpersonal situation. An interpersonal situation is one in which two or more persons take account of each other for some purpose or decision. Two aspects of interpersonal processes can be related to interpersonal perception,
which is related to role expectations and interpersonal interaction which is related to role behavior.

"Competencies were defined as the specific abilities that an individual has or can develop, such as the ability to interview, consult, plan, train, or negotiate" (Klopf, Scheldon, & Brennan, 1982).

Bass (1990, p. 122) noted that "Interpersonal competence is fundamental to successful and effective leadership." In the human relations movement, interpersonal competence involved empathy, insight, heightened awareness and the ability to give and receive feedback. Interpersonal competence implied an openness to discuss one's feelings, a willingness to participate in consensual solutions to conflict, and a commitment to follow-up through action (Argyris, 1962). Managers with interpersonal competence were considered to be more willing to depend on trust and shared decision making than on power (Zaleznik, 1965).

Behaviors that demonstrate interpersonal competence have included "showing understanding, caring, and consideration for others; displaying authenticity, rather than transparency; communicating easily and clearly; fostering and maintaining good relations with others; and serving to increase harmony, reduce tensions, and resolve conflicts" (Bass, 1990, p. 110). R. E. Kaplan referred to competent managers as "influential but not dictatorial, good in dealing with people and in delegating, and trustworthy and credible rather than overly political ( cited in Bass, 1990, p. 110). "Competent managers," according to Lombardo, Ruderman, and
McCaulay (1987), "promote group decisions, to take full advantage of their subordinates' knowledge and to increase their . . . commitment to the decisions."

According to Thorndike and Stein (1937), investigating interpersonal competence empirically has been difficult. Social intelligence was difficult to distinguish from general intelligence. In the early 1980s researchers like Erez (1980) were able to assess social intelligence and showed how it related to a tendency to be employee-centered or job-centered. Empathetic abilities have proven to be difficult to measure while other characteristics of interpersonal competence have lent themselves more readily to empirical measurement.

Rosenthal (1979) stated, "The quality of one's verbal and nonverbal communication has been seen to contribute to one's overall interpersonal competence." The connections between competence in a leader's communication and satisfactory performance have been well documented. Kanter (1983) from 200 interviews with successful corporate leaders, found that leaders had several communication skills in common. They were able to expand their thinking by active soliciting of new ideas and feedback from others; continuously reach out for new information; know how to persuade others about the quality of their ideas; communicate persuasively to others and enlist their support by persistently working for it.
Paul Bredesen (1987) analyzed the interpersonal communication of school principals and found that dyadic interpersonal contacts dominated principals' communication activities; principals prefer accomplishing communications through talk; and openness and high visibility characterize the success of their communication activities.

Bass (1990) reported, "The quality of one's talk does make a difference in one's success in emerging as a leader." A survey of 217 corporations to determine which training needs were the highest priorities for managers, showed oral communication abilities to be the highest. High-producing supervisors in the aircraft industry communicated effectively (Comrey, High, & Wilson 1955). Satisfaction with effectiveness of officers and noncoms among over 30,000 U.S. Army personnel, was strongly correlated with their ability to communicate effectively with their subordinates (Penner, Malone, Coughlin, & Herz, 1973).

Studies related to leadership style showed that communication style of upper managers and the immediate superiors of employees affected different aspects of their employees' satisfaction. Klauss and Bass (1982) completed path analyses for their relationships among managers' communication styles, according to their supervisors, peers, and subordinates, in an information technology firm, a navy civilian agency and social service agency. Managers who were described as highly informative and trustworthy, contributed considerably to their colleagues' role clarity, satisfaction with
managers, and evaluations of the effectiveness of the managers. Trustworthiness or credibility tended to depend on being a careful listener, and on being informal and open in two-way conversations. Informativeness tended to depend on being seen as a careful transmitter of information and using frank, open, and two-way communications. St. John (1983) observed that the credibility of supervisors was enhanced by frankness, consistency, accessibility, keeping promises, accepting responsibility, personal style, and showing interest in others.

It can also be noted that transformational leaders tend to have more ability to deal with conflict, as compared to transactional leaders (Bass, 1990, p. 116). Transformational leaders are less readily disturbed by conflict, possibly because they are more at peace with themselves (Gibbons, 1986).

Bass (1990) notes that insight and empathetic competence should be important if the leader is transactional in an exchange relationship with his followers. Bass further suggests that the leader learns what the followers want in order to make the right offers to them for compliance. The transformational leader understands the interactions of prospective followers and uses this knowledge to address their developmental needs.

The contemporary vision of better schools for the 21st century continue to identify the principal as key. Araki (1992) in a paper presented to the American Educational Research Association (AERA), emphasized:
The principals of tomorrow must be active participants in school improvement, understand the unique character of the schools, and work effectively with teachers, other support staff, and the community to develop school programs that will succeed. . . . They must be willing to consider different paradigms and assumptions, continually assess their activities, and benefit creatively from experiences of others. They will need intellectual skills to deal with the notions of diversity, community, and connectedness. (p. 5)

**Improving Principal Preparation Programs**

Although the changing roles of principals have been acknowledged by many in the field of educational administration, principal preparation programs have been slower to change from their traditional offerings. National studies have shown the need for both identifying better models for preparing principals and developing a cadre of highly competent school principals. Scott Thomson (1986), Executive Director of the National Association of Secondary School Principals stated, "The current administrative training programs are outdated and deficient." A report, released by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (cited in Stover, 1990, p. 18), indicated that "the current system of preparing school executives is recognizable more by its weaknesses than by its strengths." The report included, among these weaknesses: irrelevant
coursework; inconsistent screening of applicants; lack of relevance of curriculum/research learning to any practical test; and limited internships in the field. Thomson (1990) added that training programs have become more and more theoretical and less focused on the practice of the actual profession. Others in the field of educational administration, including professional organizations have also voiced their concern for the state of administration programs (Griffiths, 1979; Griffiths, 1986; Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, 1987; Murphy & Hallinger, 1987).

A 1988 study by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (cited in Stover, 1990) suggested that faculty selection at principal preparation universities can be open to question. The study also noted that of 22 deans of educational administration programs in the study, only one had any administrative experience in schools. This study also indicated declining university support for administrative programs and cited that more than half of the doctoral degree-granting programs have five or fewer faculty members. In 1987, the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration recommended abolishing educational administration programs at 300 of more than 500 institutions.

The literature suggests that there has been much diversity in preparation programs for educational administration and studies of
the 1980s showed that there was no consensus as to what direction preparation programs should go (Stover, 1990). Cunningham (1985) summarized this period as one where such programs ranged from intensive, targeted skill development to the acquisition of more general knowledge; from expensive to low cost; from formal to informal structures; and from high to low quality programs. This diversity also reflected the lack of common agreement among preparation institutions as to what it is that administrators must be prepared to master in order to perform as an effective administrator in the field (Norton, 1986).

The National Governors' Association (1986) noted that the focus of State educational reform agendas had been more on improving the teaching profession than on improving school leadership and management. However, it also recognized that leadership and management issues are finally receiving attention by state policy makers as new roles for teachers, principals, and superintendents are debated.

Joseph Murphy (1990) notes in his chapter "School Administration Responds to Pressures for Change:

Efforts to make improvements in school administration have emanated primarily from state governments . . . . By and large, state reform initiatives to improve school administration have been directed at the certification-selection-employment loop rather than at preparation programs themselves. Neither the recruitment of
potential administrators nor the content and delivery of preservice training programs has received much attention to date. (p. 305)

Murphy points to a few reasons why this may be so. Universities have historically had autonomy from legislative action outside of the budget area. Program content has remained in their jurisdiction almost without question from external forces.

State initiatives related to administrative aspects, which have been most prevalent since 1979, were reviewed by Murphy (1990a). Excerpts from this review are presented below in regards to specific areas of administrative training:

1. **Selection.** Twelve states developed assessment centers to evaluate the skills of prospective administrators (National Governors' Association, 1987).

2. **Post employment Training.** Continued professional development for principals and superintendents has received major emphasis in the reform movement (Education Commission of the States, 1984; National Governors' Association, 1987). In twenty-four states, legislation directed post employment training for school administrators (Underwood, 1989). Legislative acts established leadership academies and administrative training centers (ASCD, 1986); and led to professional development requirements for recertification (Murphy, 1990a).
3. *School-based management.* Twelve states have enacted programs to facilitate the development of site-level management (National Governors' Association, 1987). Murphy (1990b, p. 307) states: "However, the major aspects of school-based management . . . (such as redistribution of control and authority among teachers, parents, and administrators) are not directly addressed in this structural approach to developing models of school-level governance."


Such programs, however, are often not aligned with the perceived new roles for principals. "To better serve schools and their students in a rapidly changing society, today's educational leaders require knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are different from those reflected in educational administration curriculums of the past" (National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1991; National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 1989; University Council for Educational Administration, 1989; Daresh & Playko, 1992).

Araki (1992), in a report to the American Education Research Association's (AERA) annual meeting, noted:
The traditional college courses usually are not presented in the context of realistic events, conditions, and problems of the classrooms, schools, and communities and tend to promote student isolation, competition, and acceptance of conventional practice and knowledge. Field experiences are usually unrelated to the concepts developed in the formal university course context. Coordination of learning experiences between the courses and field work is difficult to achieve because the instructors are members of different organizational systems. (pp. 5-6)

The inconsistencies that currently exist between the emerging roles of the principal and the traditional principal preparation programs need to be addressed through more innovative principal preparation programs. Daresh and Playko (1992) concluded that "few existing programs in educational administration include learning experiences wherein aspiring administrators are led through self-awareness exercises to increase the likelihood that they will be able to demonstrate skills identified as critical by (their) study."

They recommend a tri-dimensional approach for pre-service preparation to include three types of learning experiences: academic learning to learn fundamental concepts and terms; 2) field-based learning to develop skill and competence in specific tasks and duties of administration; and 3) personal formation to permit aspiring administrators to engage in a time of reflection and review.
of personal strengths, weaknesses and commitments to the field of leadership.

The literature on educational administration strongly resound in support of such major themes:

- integrated theory and practice (NASSP, 1985; Wasden, Muse, Ovard, 1989)
- supported internships under the guidance of qualified mentors (Barnett, 1990; Norton & Levan, 1987; NASSP, 1985; Anderson, 1989; Goodlad, 1984)
- problem-based learning (Bridges & Hallinger, 1991).

The following is a discussion of these major themes as they relate to principal preparation programs.

Integrated Theory and Practice

Bruce Anderson (cited in Stover, 1990), vice-president of the Danforth Foundation which has funded several leadership development efforts, stated that "The biggest problem of (administrative training programs) has to do with the gap between practice and theory. Too much attention continues to be paid to esoteric issues." Barnett, Caffarella, Daresh, King, Nicolson & Whitaker (1992), developed five core learning experiences, as part of their principal preparation program at the University of Northern Colorado. This was noted as a deliberate attempt to move away
from an emphasis on traditional courses such as school law, supervision, finance, school-community relations, and personnel. These five core learning experiences were as follows:

1. **Understanding Self:** Develop a personal vision for educational leadership including fundamental values and attitudes and a sense of how they relate to governance, administration, leadership, and curriculum development issues.

2. **Using Inquiry:** frame problems and make decisions in educational leadership to understand alternative ways of knowing and how they relate to leadership in organizations.

3. **Shaping Organizations:** understand the structural components of educational organizations and theoretical frameworks that describe organizational behavior.

4. **Understanding People:** explore issues related to personnel development within educational organizations, adult learning and development and staff appraisal.

5. **Understanding Environments:** introduce concepts of demography, cultural diversity, governance, politics, law, and finance that influence policies and operations, and explore how educators in turn influence external environments.

Barnett et al. (1992) suggest that these core learning experiences provide a knowledge base that integrates understandings from diverse disciplines with closely linked field experiences to bridge theory and practice.
Internship: (Expanded Field Experience)

The internship experience was reported as the dominant field-based program requirement by almost 75% of schools surveyed by the NASSP in 1978. "The popularity of the field experience . . . . is evidenced by an obvious increase in field experiences in principal preparation programs throughout American colleges and universities and in certification requirements of state departments of education (Werner, 1989). With this popularity however, have come several concerns about the nature and quality of internships as well as other forms of the field experience (Barrilleaux, 1972; Ramsey & Lutz, 1973). Too often interns experience what Richards and Fox (1990) called "cast-off" administrative duties such as bus duty, lunch duty, hall duty, front-desk duty, scheduling, report reviews, and textbook orders.

Although the field experience is considered an integral part of a quality administrator preparation program, "no great amount of evidence or hard data have convincingly demonstrated that field-based activities improve the preparation of school administrators" (Werner, 1989, p. 1). Daresh (1987) found that "over a 40-year period, an extremely limited amount of theory-based research on the preservice practicum for administrators had been undertaken. Most of the literature available was in the form of descriptions of local field-based internship programs."

A study by Sweeney, Huth and Engle (1981) of 57 principals who experienced the NASSP Administrative Internship Project and
62 non-intern principals with similar backgrounds, found no significant difference between perceptions of their ability to discharge their responsibilities in selected skill areas. However, the intern principals unanimously agreed that the field experience made a major contribution to their professional development and advancement in the profession. "The administrative internship can be one of the most memorable moments in the administrator's professional career" (Karst, 1982).

Werner (1989, p. 1) defines the field experience as "the actual living through of a set of circumstances or events with direct exposure and personal involvement in the learning process . . . . representative of the day-to-day activities carried on by practicing principals." Planning and organization of the field experience are the most essential elements to the success of the total program. Reflections of the field supervisor, the intern, and the professor support the integration of classroom theory with on-the-job practice and the intern's self-knowledge.

The National Association of Secondary School Principals (1985) called for preparation programs to include a significant amount of administrative experience in field settings and strongly recommended that the university's responsibility for offering field experiences should be equal to that of teaching traditional courses.

Werner (1989) included the following policy considerations for incorporation into any effective internship program:
1. The primary purpose of the internship program is to help the student apply the knowledge and theory of administration by participation in a directed field experience.

2. Internship activities must challenge the student to demonstrate the ability to assume and perform administrative responsibilities.

3. The student should be under the joint supervision of the university supervisor and a cooperating administrator with final authority held by the university.

4. The internship should include periodic conferences at the site of the field experience, to determine progress and the need for assistance.

5. On-campus seminars should be an integral part and supportive function of the internship. (p. 3)

The Committee of Professors of Secondary School Administration and Supervision (PSSAS) of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (1985) conducted a non-random survey of various colleges and universities throughout the United States. The survey reviewed how internships were being carried out in principal preparation programs during the mid-1980s. In general, the purpose of the field experience was to provide a merging of classroom learning with real-world experiences. Some specific
findings related to the operational dimension of the administrative internship:

1. Internships ranged from one semester to two years. Several factors supported the full-year internship such as: responsibilities of principals are substantially different in fall and spring semesters; greater number of holidays in the fall affect the activities and attitudes and teachers; and weather conditions impact on student deportment.

2. On the average, the total actual field time required was approximately 150 hours with a range from 90 to 600 hours.

3. Credit hours required by universities ranged from two semester hours to 16 quarter hours, with most programs awarding six semester hours of credit for a full-year internship.

4. The identification of the site and site supervisor was generally left to the recommendation of the intern.

5. Some programs included the internship as part of a course or seminar while others identified "internship" exclusively and required certain seminar sessions as a part of the experience.

6. Almost all programs required the intern to keep a daily log or journal of his or her activities. Format, design and expectations differed among institutions.
7. Grading was generally done cooperatively with the university and site supervisor, with the university usually having the final say. In some cases, the intern was actively involved in the evaluation with the university and site supervisors. (pp. 5-7)

On the selection of site and site supervisor for the internship, Gorton's survey (1987) found that 63% of those universities responding had no criteria for the selection of sites for internship experiences; 80% reported no criteria for the selection of site supervisors. "These data are significant because reports and articles indicate that these two variables most strongly affect the success and effectiveness of an internship program" (Gorton, 1987).

Werner (1989) emphasized that the objectives of the field experience should offer interns the opportunity to:

• gain a comprehensive view of school administration in actual practice;

• demonstrate administrative experience under competent supervision and counsel;

• demonstrate administrative competencies and professional skills through actual on-the-job experiences;

• assess one's own level of preparation for the work, demands, and stress of the principalship. (p. 3)

Richards and Fox (1990) suggested interns should be involved in meaningful experiences during their internship which would allow them to be:
• responsible for instructional supervision and staff supervision which includes evaluation and improvement of teaching;

• responsible for leadership which involves facilitating a group to decision and action in dealing with pressing problems, or initiating and implementing some significant improvement in the curriculum or operation of the school;

• responsible and accountable for managing a specific project or event that involves a degree of complexity through planning, creativity and supervision;

• responsible for decision making and problem solving by being a part of the principal's leadership team and being directly involved in the daily grind of policy implementation and breakdowns in the operating routine;

• responsible for public speaking and public relations through presentations to faculty, parents, students, other administrators, community groups, and school board.

(pp. 26-28)

To summarize this discussion of the internship or field experience, it is important to note the following:

Field experience is more than mere exposure to events in the broad arena of educational administration. It is a means by which the prospective administrator can develop skills and improve his or her ability to exercise leadership in the complexities of educational
management. . . . With proper planning, structure, and implementation, the internship as a distinct level of field experience can serve as a capstone for an effective principal training program. (Werner, 1989, pp. 8-9)

Mentoring

Mentoring has only recently been applied to public education as a mode of professional development for both teachers (Bridges & Hallinger, 1991) and administrators. It refers to a relationship between a practicing and a potential administrator. The emphasis of such a relationship is to give on-site experiences to would-be administrators through learning-by-doing activities, extensive consultations, modeling and reflections with the intent of continuous integration of theory and research with the field experiences (Barnett, 1990, May).

Araki (1992) referred to mentoring as that which "provides the intern with a broad range of leadership roles and experiences. It is broad enough to give the intern moments in which to form insight into administering a school. It provides experiences that are sufficient in number, breadth, and quality to develop the intern's knowledge as well as skills in interpersonal relations, staff development, curriculum planning, and vision crafting." (p. 14)

The two-pronged ideology of the mentoring process offers a continuing dilemma. On the one hand, the intern should be taught to keep the school on track by learning to maintain its operations. On
the other hand, the intern's training needs to take her beyond the maintenance mode in order to create a vision to transform the school. Too often, leadership preparation programs emphasize the development of the former at the expense of the latter. John Gardner (1991) describes this dilemma as follows: "...young leaders become servants of what is rather than shapers of what might be. . . . By the time they reach the top, they are likely to be trained prisoners of the structure." Gardner goes on to say that "no system can stay vital for long unless its leaders help it to change and grow."

Leadership to transform the school goes beyond where the school is at and seeks to create a vision of where the school should be headed in the future. This transformational leadership involves others in the school's community to address long-term changes for the school. Research shows that this kind of leadership is also necessary for school effectiveness.

Leadership to maintain and leadership to transform are complementary ideologies that should be reflected in the mentoring experience. Maintenance is oriented to the present, everyday events; centered on standard operating procedures; directed to a specific or general audience; and focused on short range activities. Transformation is future-oriented, fixed to a vision, and centered on programs and structure; directed to a diverse audience including parents, community members, students; and focused on long-term incremental change.
Critical inquiry which is oriented to exploration and discovery is also a vital part of mentoring. Interns and mentors are brought together to raise and explore the critical questions. Interns come to realize that "people are a vital part of the school, and the school is an expression of what people believe and how they should relate to each other. . . . Beliefs shape actions. Schools, then, may be construed as beliefs that are being played out by people acting singly or in unison. Those beliefs, or representations of reality, form the 'vision' to transform schools." Phenomenological inquiry views the school as the reflection of human beliefs where in order to change schools, people's beliefs must first be changed.

The Mentoring Handbook, (Evergreen Collegial Teacher Training Consortium, 1987) identified the range of mentor functions: role modeling or teaching by doing; giving direct assistance by making time available on a regular basis; observing and providing feedback; and helping to set short-and long-term professional goals.

With regards to this study, the types of skills that mentors should already possess and impart to their respective interns fall into the category of "Human Relations," and include inspiring and supervising others; building coalitions; taking risks; and maintaining stamina, enthusiasm, a sense of humor, and flexibility.

Marsha Playko (1990, May, p. 29), Associate Director of the Ohio LEAD Center, identified some of the characteristics that are necessary in building effective mentoring relationships based on her experience of being mentored. She reflects that expectations of a
"mentorship should feature availability, open lines of communication, demonstration of administrative expertise, the allocation of sufficient time, attention to the clarification of job expectations, and the provision of spiritual support."

**The Hawaii Context**

In Hawaii, educators responsible for the preparation of principals, responded to the call for improvement of principal preparation programs in light of school reform and the changing roles of principals. The University of Hawaii at Manoa and the Hawaii State Department of Education joined in a collaborative effort to develop the Cohort School Leadership (CSL) Program which more closely aligned principal preparation with the changing roles of the aspiring principal. The internship program was a major component incorporated into the CSL program. Through this program, the aspiring principal could apply the knowledge and theory of administration by participating in a directed field experience under the guidance of a qualified mentor. The CSL program model addressed two problem areas identified by the National Commission on Excellence in School Administration (in Hallinger & Murphy, 1991) which specified the lack of curriculum integration and the lack of adequate clinical preparation.
Cohort School Leadership Program Model

The development of this new principal preparation program resulted from a report of recommendations by the Task Force on Excellence in Educational Administration (HI State DOE, 1988), one of the initiatives of the Hawaii School/University Partnership (HS/UP). This sixteen-member task force composed of representatives from the Hawaii State Department of Education (DOE), the College of Education of the University of Hawaii at Manoa (UHM), and other professional and community organizations, examined the feasibility of developing a preparation program for school administrators. Its final report recommended that the DOE and the Department of Educational Administration in the College of Education at UHM develop a field-based preparation program for principals. In addition, the report also recommended actions for the College of Education, public schools, and state policy makers to take, in order to ensure that Hawaii’s schools would have the educational leaders for the 21st century.

The need to reassess the current School Administrator Training (SAT) program was emphasized through the following factors.

- A critical shortage of educational leaders was projected for the decade of the 90s signaling a need for program expansion. An estimated 60% of Hawaii’s schools would be led by new principals partly due to retirements, promotions and transfers of incumbent principals.
• Principals were being directed to assume new roles and responsibilities in order to implement new reform initiatives. Recognition of these new roles requires new ideas to reshape the current program.

• The professionalization of educational administration was becoming a major thrust of school reform efforts. Principals were expected to play a key role in school renewal.

• The implications of School/Community-Based Management and adaptation of leadership to the local context required principals to work effectively with teachers, other support staff, students and the community. This required a higher level of competence in interpersonal communication abilities. "The outlook for reform depends upon the talents and motivations of principals as key participants in collaborative planning and shared decision making" (HI State DOE, 1990, p. 3).

The CSL program was designed with a few basic principles in mind to support the emerging administrator/leader roles:

1. Professional learning should take place in the context of thinking and acting as a principal (e.g., case studies, simulations, problem-solving, clinical work).

2. To become independent professionals, interns should be actively involved in and responsible for their own learning.

3. In order to learn to work collaboratively in schools and with the community, interns should learn about leadership and administration in collaboration with one another and with
practicing professionals (principals, vice-principals and other educational officer and management types).

4. To develop a thoughtful and self-critical attitude toward professional practice, interns should routinely evaluate and be evaluated for their learning and performance.

The CSL program is supportive of the concepts of participatory management by promoting the leadership behaviors expected of educational leaders in the state public school system. These behaviors include the "ability to unify staff and build a sense of commitment to high performance goals; commitment to school-community based improvement and team building; achievement-oriented and supportive leadership and relationships; and management of the full scope of administrative responsibilities and facilitation of work" (Araki, 1992).

The CSL program was designed as a year-long program organized into five phases from pre-selection to certification. An additional two phases served as post-program options where cohort members could: 1) complete coursework and other requirements to earn a Master's degree; and 2) serve as a probationary vice-principal. The following overview describes Phases I - V as implemented during the first year of the CSL program.
Phase I: Pre-Screening for Analytic Ability, Leadership Potential, Commitment, Preparation, Readiness. (September to February)

Candidates completed appropriate application forms which included: a recommendation from the respective principal; a passing score of 44 or higher on the Miller Analogies Test (MAT); and a rating of 7 or better on all categories of the "Leadership Potential Form."

Phase II: Screening for Communication Skills and Readiness. (January to March)

Successful candidates demonstrated both written and oral communicative skills and demonstrated responsible, personal, and professional qualities with a readiness to enter the training program. Assessment of both written and oral communication was made by a panel of administrators. Interviews were based on an adaptation of the Ventures For Excellence (1983) instrument.

Phase III: Summer Training A (June)

Selected Interns and Alternates were introduced to school leadership through a two-week intensive training program where successful candidates demonstrated their leadership attributes, practical school management skills and a strong commitment to the profession, in a context of training for a school leadership position (DOE Manual, 1990, p. 10). Upon successful completion, Interns received three semester hours of university graduate school credit.
for EDEA 601, "Introduction to Educational Administration."

Emphasis in this phase was on the development of leadership character traits, sound educational philosophy, professional job commitment, and practical school management skills through activities such as: 1) cooperative learning, 2) seminars and modules, 3) case-studies, 4) reading and writing activities, and 5) large group instruction.

Phase IV: Summer Training Session B (July to August)

During this five week session, Interns were required to draft a school improvement plan for their assigned school. Interns also enrolled in two courses: EDEA 602, "Research in Educational Administration;" and EDEA 650, "Human Factors in Organizations."

These graduate courses were to be realigned to integrate coursework with Interns' school improvement plans, as a means of integrating theory and practice. Coursework was taught by university professors while professional socialization was primarily the responsibility of DOE personnel.

Phase V-A: One-Year Internship (August to June)

This supervised internship in a school setting took place under the mentorship of an experienced principal. In addition, Interns participated in and received 21 university graduate credits for the following courses:
EDEA 610  School Community Relations  
EDEA 645  Principles of School Management  
EDEA 670  School Supervision  
EDEA 780 F  Seminar in Curriculum Administration  
EDEA 720  Administrative Internship  
EDEA 630  School Law  

"These courses, taught by professors, were designed to integrate theory with practice and enable interns to achieve the characteristics and behaviors of effective school principals" (DOE Manual, 1990, p. 12).

Interns were also required to attend ten "Topical Case Study Seminars" conducted on Saturdays and taught by mentor principals. Major topics included: working with adults/adult learning; evaluation and needs assessment; student programming; personnel management and development; school financial and resource management; student activities; exceptional child; technology in the schools; student discipline and behavior; and curriculum leadership.

Interns participated in one cross-training experience at another school which gave them a different age/grade level experience. This experience was under the supervision of a different mentor principal. For example, if an intern was assigned to an elementary school for the internship, he would be placed at either an intermediate/middle grade or secondary school for his cross-training.

According to the DOE manual, a strong emphasis was placed on the interns' responsibility for self-initiated professional growth. The
belief is that "a personal growth plan is at best when the intern
embraces the concept of excellence, has a positive trusting
relationship with mentor, is open and honest when sharing of self,
assesses oneself, accepts viewpoints of others, co-diagnoses findings,
takes specific action with measurable objectives, and re-assesses
oneself with revised actions to take" (DOE Manual, 1990, p. 13).

Phase V-B: (April through June)

Interns were assigned to small group teams consisting of six
interns to work collectively on two comprehensive school case study
projects. The task was to understand and analyze two complex
school case situations; research other reference materials to clarify
operating, legal, budgetary, and regulatory constraints; identify
issues and priorities; respond to a typically large mix of pressing
school leadership/administration concerns; and propose long range
plans for school improvement. The completed "School Improvement
Plans" were evaluated during this phase.

Phase VI: The Masters' Degree (Optional: Summer and post-
internship)

Interns opting to complete the master's program needed to
complete all requirements established for Phases I through Phase
V-B and the following courses: EDEA 699 (Plan A or Plan B paper)
and one additional course.
Phase VII: One-Year Probationary Period as Vice-Principal.

Upon successful completion of Phases I through V, interns were issued an Initial School Administrator Certificate (ISAC) which made them eligible to compete for vacant vice-principal positions and to enter Phase VII. It is a Hawaii State DOE requirement that all certified principals complete a one-year probationary period as a vice-principal, prior to a principal assignment. Placement is sought for the school year following the internship.

In order to align administrator preparation activities with emerging roles of principals, the CSL program intended to use environments which were reflective of high interaction among key teaching-learning elements by presenting educational theory and courses in the context of realistic events, conditions, and problems of the classroom, school, and community; integrating theoretical perspectives with field experiences; coordinating learning experiences among program components through the involvement and interaction of related personnel; and sequencing opportunities for collaboration and active involvement among the cohort (Araki, 1992).

The Internship in Phase V, as the "treatment" for this study, will be discussed in Chapter III.
Summary

A review of the literature showed that the roles of principals are changing. The leader can no longer be the sole visionary who defines the school curriculum and authorizes change. Instead the principal's role is one of a transformational leader who must share his leadership with others and work more collaboratively to bring about school improvement.

Interpersonal competence was identified as fundamental to successful and effective leadership. Investigating interpersonal competence empirically has been difficult, as noted by Bass (1990). The quality of one's verbal and nonverbal communication has been identified by Rosenthal (1979) to contribute to one's overall interpersonal competence. Studies on leaders' communication skills revealed several commonalties. Among these were active solicitation of other people's ideas and acceptance of feedback from others.

Current administrative training programs were found to be outdated and deficient. To address the changing roles of aspiring principals, the Hawaii State Department of Education and the University of Hawaii at Manoa developed a Cohort School Leadership Training Program. Successful components of the literature on preparation programs were incorporated into the CSL program: integrated theory and practice; expanded field experience or a year-long internship; practice under the guidance of a mentor; and problem-based learning. The interpersonal strand has been well
documented in the goals and areas of assessment throughout the CSL program.

This study examined the effectiveness of this program on the development of the leadership strand of interpersonal communication. The methodology for this study is described in Chapter III.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to identify the research process used in this study including descriptions of the population, instrumentation, data collection, and design. The analyses of data used to test the hypotheses and answer the ancillary questions will be discussed both quantitatively and qualitatively.

Population for Study

Description of Population

The population for this study consisted of the first cohort of principal Interns and Alternates in the Cohort School Leadership (CSL) program of 1990-1991. A subset of 9 Interns from the total cohort, identified through a stratified random selection process, was selected for the multi-respondent study.

This first cohort included 43 Interns and 9 Alternates or a total of 52 individuals. All individuals were invited to participate in the CSL program after successfully completing the initial screening process. Of this total, there were 29 NEW Interns and 2 NEW Alternates; 14 School Administrative Training (SAT) Interns and 7 SAT Alternates. The NEW group had not participated in any prior principal preparation program, while the SAT group was "grandfathered" or carried over from the former Hawaii State School Administrator Training (SAT) program. During the transition period
from one principal preparation program to another, SAT candidates who did not complete their program, were considered eligible to continue their training through the CSL program. These individuals were screened under the SAT pre-selection criteria and successfully completed a comparable two-week summer session. Criteria for selection of the SAT group were similar to those of the NEW cohort, except for the new interview instrument, based on "Ventures For Excellence," and other minor revisions in the selection process. Neither the NEW nor the SAT group had any field experience, as an administrator in the DOE system, prior to their internship.

The nine designated Alternates to the CSL program served as a quasi-control group for the population of Interns on the pre-post survey scores.

Selection of Population

1. Pre-selection Requirements of the CSL Program

Prior to selection, the CSL candidates were required to meet eligibility criteria established by a task force of representatives from the DOE and the University of Hawaii-College of Education. All candidates needed to:

• have a basic or professional teaching certificate or Master's Degree in Education or Educational Administration;
• have 5 years of full-time teaching experience in K-12;
• be a full-time certificated teacher; and
• be accepted into the University of Hawaii at Manoa's Graduate Division (M.Ed. candidate) or possess a Master's degree in Educational Administration.

Individuals who met these criteria were then eligible to submit a program application and self-assessment form within the established time period from November 9 through December 8, 1989. Candidates were also required to meet a set of minimum ratings as described in the CSL Handbook (1990):

**Analytic ability**

1. An acceptable score of "44" or better on the Miller Analogies Test (MAT), determined by a fixed cut-off score, equivalent to a one-half standard deviation below the local mean of the first test group of applicants.

**Leadership potential**

2. An acceptable score of "7" or better in each category of the Leadership Potential Form based on the principal's or supervisor's assessment of the individual's performance.

**Commitment and preparation readiness**

3. An indication of awareness and commitment to school leadership, and commitment to becoming a school principal determined by ratings and supporting data by external evaluators.

During Phase II, candidates were screened for communication skills and readiness as measured by the following:
1. A score of five or higher (on a scale of 1-10, low to high), as determined by a panel using criteria identified on the Written Communication Rating Scale (WCRS).

2. A score on a scale of 1-30 (low to high), as determined by a consensus score of a three-member panel using the "Ventures For Excellence-Future Principal Interview Rating Scale" (FPIRS).

Upon successful completion of the pre-selection requirements of Phases I and II, candidates were recommended and invited to participate in the first CSL program for the Fall of 1990.

Twelve Alternates who did not go through the internship experience were identified as the comparison group for the Interns on the pre/post survey scores.

Selection of Subset for Qualitative Study

The two-week summer session of Phase III in the CSL program involved the NEW group of Interns and Alternates. The carry-over group of SAT candidates had already completed a comparable phase in their initial program. The 29 NEW group comprised about two-thirds of the total population of selected Interns. Therefore it was determined that about two-thirds or six of the total subset would be representative of the group of NEW Interns. The remaining three for this subset were selected from the SAT group of Interns.

A stratified random selection process was used to identify the subset of nine individuals based on the pre-survey scores of the total population. Six individuals were selected from the NEW Interns for the qualitative study. Their selection was based on the sum-total of
raw scores compiled from responses on the "Exposure" variable in all three sections of the Johari Personnel Relations Survey. Exposure scores were selected over Feedback scores because they showed greater differentiation among scores.

A frequency distribution of these scores showed that the outlier groups fell within the lower range of scores (68-84) or upper range of scores (108-148). For the purpose of this study, the subset was selected from the group scores with the highest frequency between the outlier groups. Of the total group of 30 Interns and 4 Alternates, there were 15 possible subjects. This population was then stratified to reflect a balance in gender, internship assignment by geographical location and then by grade level.

Three SAT Interns were selected for the subset using the same criteria described for the selection of NEW Interns. However, the SAT group displayed a higher frequency of scores on the dependent variable of Exposure which fell within the high range of scores (121.9 - 149) than those of the NEW group. Interpretation of these scores will be presented in the discussion section of Chapter IV. As a result of the frequency of scores at the high range, two subjects were selected from the high range and one from the lower range of scores (61-78.4) bringing the total number in the subset to nine.
Instrumentation

The Johari Personnel Relations Survey (JPRS), a commercial instrument developed by Jay Hall and Martha S. Williams, was selected because of its intent to measure the interpersonal communication tendencies of individuals through two variables of "Feedback" and "Exposure." The JPRS was designed to provide the opportunity for managers to assess their own interpersonal style by identifying their communication tendencies in their interactions with subordinates, colleagues, and superiors.

The instrument consists of three sets of twenty questions where options for responding are organized in a Thurstone paired-choice format (Hall & Williams, 1987). This format forces a numeric choice among addends whose sum is equal to five (5). The same survey was used for the pre- and post-test. An assumption was made that respondents would be less likely to identify their numeric choices on the post-survey in exactly the same way as on the pre-survey. Except for substituting "employees," "colleagues," and "supervisors" in their respective sections, the wording in each set of questions was exactly the same. Responses reflected the individual's perceptions of how he interrelated with these three groups.

Evidence of reliability and validity were established by Alpha coefficients of .78 for Exposure, and .80 for Feedback, which showed that internal reliability was good; and canonical correlation of .69 with the "Minnesota Multi-Phasic Instrument," and .79 with "Bass' Famous Sayings Test" confirmed the construct and concurrent
validities (Hall & Williams, 1987). In addition, normative data was available on the compiled scores of 12,809 managers in eight organizational types (Hall & Williams, 1987). Converted raw scores can be compared to the normed scores in respective groups of managers on both dimensions of Exposure and Feedback.

Percentage scores, derived from the raw scores on Exposure and Feedback and plotted on the Personnel Relations Survey chart, offered the opportunity to graphically represent one of four interpersonal styles identified by Hall and Williams (1987). These charts identified the individual's interpersonal communication tendencies for leadership styles: Type A, B, C, or D which are summarized below.

**Type A:** This interpersonal style reflects minimal use of both the Exposure and Feedback processes and an impersonal approach to interpersonal relationships. The dominant region is the *Unknown.*

**Type B:** This interpersonal style reflects an aversion to Exposure resulting in Feedback solicitation that is much over-used by individuals who appear to be quasi-supportive. The *Facade* region is dominant in this style.

**Type C:** This interpersonal style reflects an overuse of Exposure and a neglect of Feedback solicitation by individuals who are ego-striving and distrust others' opinions. The *Blindspot* region is dominant in this style.

**Type D:** This interpersonal style reflects a balance between the use of Exposure and Feedback solicitation where candor and openness
are coupled with a sensitivity to others' needs to participate (Hall & Williams, 1987). The *Arena* is the dominant region and productivity is expected to increase.

Type D was identified as the most desirable (Luft, 1969; Hall & Williams, 1987), where the individual's Arena represents a balance between Feedback and Exposure. An ideal Arena, according to Hall & Williams (1987), is represented by an 80 x 80 percentile square.

**Data Collection Procedures**

Data was collected at designated times and from identified sources during the Cohort School Leadership program, as described in this section.

Records of these two pre-selection phases were provided by the Hawaii State Department of Education (DOE). Scores on rating scales, and demographic data such as gender, years of educational experience, ethnicity, administrative school district and pre-selection interview scores were collected on the identified population for this study.

**Pre/Post-Internship Survey**

The Johari Personnel Relations Surveys (JPRS) were mailed to 40 Interns and 12 Alternates, one week prior to the beginning of Phase III. NEW Interns and NEW Alternates were asked to return the completed surveys on the first day of their two-week training session of Phase III. SAT Interns and Alternates were asked to
return their completed surveys prior to their first day of participation in the program, which was the five-week session of Phase IV.

Forty-seven or 90% of the pre-internship surveys were returned. Since the design of this study involved a comparison of pre/post scores, post-surveys were sent only to those whose pre-surveys were received. One post-survey was withheld because of possible involvement in litigation procedures. Therefore, 46 post-program surveys were distributed to Interns and Alternates with a return of 41 or 89%. For the Cohort, this took place in their final group session which was during the first week of May, 1991. Of the total number of 41, there were 36 Interns and 5 Alternates. These numbers reflected those remaining in the program at the time of post-testing. Attrition was due to individuals who withdrew or were dropped from the program. Some Alternates filled Intern vacancies and participated in the internship while a few SAT candidates were assigned to "On-the-Job Training (OJT)" positions as Vice-Principal.
Observations and Field Notes

"Human behavior is significantly influenced by the setting in which it occurs; thus one must study that behavior in situations. . . . Research must be conducted in the setting where all the contextual variables are operating" (Wilson, 1977; Willower, 1990). Therefore, the New Cohorts and New Alternates were observed in their classroom settings at the Hawaii Leadership Academy site, during the two-week Summer Session of Phase III, in June, 1990. The observations helped the researcher become familiar with the program activities and establish rapport with the participants. In addition, these observations helped the researcher determine which situations to observe and what questions to ask. During this period, initial questions were formulated and a more precise focus of the research was established (Marshall & Rossman, 1989).

During Phase IV, the 5-Week Summer Session in July-August 1990, the Cohort was observed on-site during their leadership training sessions, held from 8:00 a.m. to 12 noon. The purpose of these observations was for the researcher to become familiar with the SAT Interns, and the various program activities conducted during Phase IV. Of special interest, during this session, was the observation of how the SAT Interns interrelated with the NEW Interns who had spent two intense weeks together in Phase III.
Interviews

During the last week of the five-week summer session, thirty-minute interviews were conducted with each of the nine individuals in the subset, for the following purposes: to orient the group to the purpose of this study, without identifying the specific strand of leadership; to collect background information about the individuals themselves; to receive feedback regarding specific activities of Phase III (e.g., Leadership Skill Development (LSD) sessions); and to identify current perceptions related to their interpersonal communication abilities. These preliminary interviews were conducted to identify perceptions prior to the internship (see Appendix A for set of questions).

During their internship, the nine individuals were interviewed on-site while they were in their cross-training assignment. The purpose of these interviews was to have Interns reflect on their behavior in the contextual setting, describe activities and interactions, and reflect on how such activities may have impacted on their leadership development. These interviews took place during February and the beginning of March which was about mid-point of the internship (see Appendix B for sample questions).

During these site visitations, the techniques of shadowing and reflective interviewing were utilized. "Shadowing is the process of gathering descriptive observational data, while reflective interviewing is the feedback conference that focuses on what was observed during the shadow" (Barnett May, 1990, p. 18). The extent
to which the shadowing technique was used, varied from site to site. However, when the opportunity to shadow was limited, the reflective interviewing drew upon statements made during the interviews to expand the discussion. Other questions evolved as a result of the shadowing experience and the flexible nature of the qualitative study. The line of inquiry was directed toward the Interns' perceptions of their communication abilities and interpersonal relationships.

Each interview was taped, with the permission of the individual Interns and with the assurance that individuals would not be identified. With the exception of one, each interview was taped in its entirety. Upon request of the interviewee, the tape was turned off during a part of the session. However, general notes were made to cover this section without breaking the confidentiality code of the individual. Each interview was transcribed for reference and documentation but not for publication in this study. Based on the Interns' responses, major topics and trends were identified and coded for categorization and clarity.

The pre/posttest scores, field notes on observations, tapes and transcriptions of interviews, demographic data, and program records offered multiple sources of evidence for this quantitative/qualitative study. "The use of multiple sources of evidence allows an investigator to address a broader range of historical, attitudinal and observational issues" (Yin, 1990, p. 97). "Data from different sources
can be used to corroborate, elaborate, or illuminate the research in question (Rossman & Wilson, 1985).

**Overview of Design**

To test the hypotheses of the quantitative study, a pretest-posttest quasi-experimental design was selected because the researcher had limited experimental control and the true experimental design was not possible or feasible. This design also supported the researcher in controlling when observations were made, when treatment or the independent variable was applied, and which intact group received the treatment. Quasi-experimental designs differ from true experimental designs in the degree to which threats to internal and external validity can be controlled.

The nonequivalent control group design had two groups that were compared on observations before and after the exposure of one group to the treatment (Huck, Cormier, & Bounds, 1974, p. 302). In this study, the Cohort was exposed to the internship or "treatment" while the Alternates were not. "This design differs from the pretest-posttest control group design, in that subjects were not assigned randomly from a common population to experimental and control groups. . . . Thus random assignment of subjects is what distinguishes between the pretest-posttest control group design from the nonequivalent control group design" (Huck et al., 1974, p. 302).

The population for this study was the total intact group selected as either Interns or Alternates for the first CSL program,
and who were not randomly selected. The diagram in Figure 3 shows this nonequivalent control group design.

Figure 3.1

Diagram of the Nonequivalent Control Group Design.

The design in Figure 3.1 shows that: two groups were used (Interns and Alternates); each group (O) was measured at the same time before treatment (X) was applied to the experimental group; each group was measured at the same time after the treatment was applied to the experimental group; the subjects were not randomly assigned to the two groups (no R's in the diagram); and the experimental and control groups did not have pre-treatment sampling equivalence (Huck et al., pp. 302-303). Although the small n in the Alternate group may appear to weaken the comparison, "this design is better than the one-group pretest-posttest design" (Huck et al., p. 303).

Threats to Internal Validity

Although the subjects for this study were not randomly assigned, the population for this study was screened through the same selection criteria and had to meet the same minimum
requirements in each category. The criteria for selection of the carry-over SAT group of Interns and Alternates did not take place at the same time, although similar screening took place during Phases I and II. To reduce the selection bias as a threat to internal validity, this population met similar pre-selection requirements and were studied during the same period of time. History and maturation may pose a threat to internal validity because the researcher cannot be sure that both groups were exposed to the same intra-session events nor that they had the same maturational processes between the pretest and posttest. Experiences prior to selection and during the intra-sessions could not be controlled. However, attempts were made to reduce the threat to internal validity by dropping Interns who did not complete at least three-fourths of their internship and SAT Alternates who were given "On-the-Job Training" (OJT) assignments.

The threat to internal validity was reduced by eliminating the outlier groups or extreme scores in the random selection of the subset. To reduce mortality, as a threat, subjects were not considered in the pre/posttest comparison if they failed to return their pretest; failed to complete at least three-fourths of their internship; or entered into an OJT assignment.

**Qualitative Design**

A qualitative study was conducted to support the quantitative design, and to validate the analyses of the pre/post surveys. The
qualitative approach recognizes the importance of context, setting, and the subjects' frame of reference (Marshall & Rossman, 1989).

Precepts of a qualitative study were followed where the design of the study remained flexible; interviews served as the primary method of data collection; multiple subjects responded at different sites; and the researcher made on-site observations (Marshall & Rossman, 1989).

This component of the study relied on observations of the NEW Interns and Alternates during Phase III, and NEW and SAT Interns during Phase IV. Interviews were conducted with NEW and SAT Interns prior to the internship and again during their cross-training assignments in February-March, 1991. This may be likened to a time-series design for two groups with one group receiving a continuous single treatment.

**Analysis of Data**

**Quantitative Analysis**

Data collected from the pre/post surveys were entered into the Macintosh LC Computer and analyzed by the "StatView + Graphics" statistical program. As noted under the data collection section, pretest scores were compiled and frequency distributions related to the Mean scores were used in the selection of the subset of nine individuals.
This section describes the statistical analyses for each hypothesis and related sub-hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 1:** There are no significant differences in Interns' perceptions of interpersonal communication abilities among three relationship levels as measured by the Johari Personnel Relations Survey (JPRS) instrument.

To test the first null hypothesis, the related $t$-test was used. This form of the $t$-test is appropriate to use when data observations in the first group are logically tied to the scores in the second group (Huck et al., 1974). In this study, a single group of Interns was measured twice, once prior to the program treatment and once at the end of the internship. The $t$-test was used to measure any significant change in the Mean gain scores for each of the six sub-hypotheses. These sub-hypotheses separated out the Exposure and Feedback scores in each of the relationship levels.

**Hypothesis 2:** There are no significant differences in Alternates' perceptions of interpersonal communication abilities among three relationship levels as measured by the Johari Personnel Relations Survey (JPRS) instrument.

The second hypothesis was measured by the related $t$-test for the same reasons as stated under the first hypothesis. Alternates served as the control group for this study, because they did not experience the internship or "treatment."
Hypothesis 3: There are no significant differences in Interns' and Alternates' perceptions of interpersonal communication abilities among three relationship levels as measured by the Johari Personnel Relations Survey (JPRS) instrument.

The nonparametric Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare posttest scores of Interns and Alternates. This test is equivalent to the parametric independent samples t-test and measures significant differences between two independent samples. It serves as a nonparametric alternative to the t-test. The null hypothesis for the Mann-Whitney U is that the two samples are from the same distribution and like the independent samples t-test, can be used with two samples of unequal number (Huck et al., 1974, p. 209). This test ranks the data across both groups from the lowest to the highest. The null hypothesis would be that the sums of the ranks for each group are equal, or R1 = R2. From these sums of ranks (R) the calculated U value was compared to the table for critical values of U. The z value was required of the Mann-Whitney test since one of the sampled groups was larger than 20 (Huck et al., p. 209).

Hypothesis 4: There is no relationship between the Interns' perceptions of interpersonal communication abilities and the demographic factors of gender, ethnicity, years of educational experience, administrative school district, and pre-selection interview scores.
Multiple Regression was used to test this relationship between the Interns' perceptions regarding Exposure and Feedback and a combination of the noted demographic factors. The results of this analysis may indicate the percent of the criterion (post-scores) variance that can be explained by the predictor variables (demographic factors).

Ancillary Questions

Responses to the three ancillary questions were analyzed as described below.

**Question 1** - Were there any shifts from the pre- to post-internship in Interns' perceptions of the development of interpersonal communication skills?

Hall and Williams (1987) noted that two things needed to be considered: size of the Arena and shape of the Arena. An 80 x 80 percentile Arena (Type D) was identified by Hall and Williams (1987) as the *ideal* Arena. These authors stated that:

Based on the model itself, as well as substantial empirical data, an *ideal* Arena should be on the order of an 80 x 80 percentile plot. That is, while the Facade and Blindspot need to be minimized, they should not be completely eliminated. If they were, it could leave the Self vulnerable and the relationship could actually be damaged by the brutal honesty denoted by such a window. (p. 4)
Hall and Williams (1987) identified Arena size as linked to the *quantity of production*, and made the assumption that Arena shape affects the *quality of work*. They stated that:

> It is the shape of the Arena that has implications for the feelings . . . likely to be experienced by parties to a relationship. Since feelings affect the degree to which an individual engages in activities and assumes responsibility for them, the quality of production is largely a function of those feelings. Therefore, the nature of the feelings likely to be experienced . . . can be inferred from the shape of (one's) Arena. (p. 4)

Pre-post raw scores, converted to percentile scores, were used to determine the Interns' Arenas. A difference of less than 20 percentile points between Exposure and Feedback scores indicated a balanced Arena in a Type A or Type D interpersonal style. Types B and C were indicated if the difference between Exposure and Feedback scores was greater than 20 percentile points and in the direction of either Feedback (Type B) or Exposure (Type C).

Interpretation of the individual Arenas was used to support the findings of the statistical analysis of the first hypothesis. The descriptive analysis identified and explained any shifts in the Interns' Arenas from pretest to posttest.

On-site observations notes, program assessments, taped and transcribed interviews were analyzed to answer the following ancillary questions:
**Question #2** - What components of a principal training program led to increased development of interpersonal communication abilities, as perceived by selected principal Interns?

**Question #3** - How did selected Interns perceive their interpersonal competence in interactions with employees (teachers, staff, students, parents); colleagues (cohort, vice-principals); or supervisors (mentors, professors, CSL program staff).

**Qualitative Analysis**

"In qualitative studies, data collection and analysis go hand in hand to promote the emergence of substantive theory grounded in empirical data" (Marshall & Rossman, 1989, p. 112). "The strengths of qualitative studies should be demonstrated for research that is exploratory or descriptive and that stresses the importance of context, setting, and subjects' frame of reference" (Marshall & Rossman, p. 46).

Permission was granted by the respective individuals to tape each of the interviews. Responses were transcribed and coded under significant categories relevant to the study, such as leadership skills; interactions with superiors (mentor principals), colleagues (other cohort members), employees (teachers, staff), and others (students, community members); process/activities; identified areas related to improvement; roles and responsibilities of interns; and descriptions of situations or events. The process of coding remained
flexible and was the result of responses from the subset which provided the framework for final classification. Coded categories support one of the most fundamental operations in the analysis of qualitative data of discovering classes of things, persons, and events, and the properties which characterize them (Schatzman & Strauss, 1973).

The objective of qualitative data analysis is to search for general statements about relationships among categories of data which lead to build ground theory (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). The purpose of the qualitative analysis was to explore and explain the patterns of interactions among the various constituent groups, as perceived by the selected Interns.
Summary

To study the impact of a principal preparation program upon the interpersonal communication abilities of aspiring principals, pre/post surveys were administered to 43 Interns and 9 Alternates who comprised the total population of the first Cohort of aspiring principals in the Cohort School Leadership (CSL) program.

Quantitative analyses were used to test four major hypotheses to determine any significant differences in and between Interns' and Alternates' perceptions of interpersonal communication abilities among three relationship levels as measured by the Johari Personnel Relations Survey (JPRS); and any relationship between Interns' perceptions of interpersonal communication abilities and selected demographic factors of gender, ethnicity, years of educational experience, administrative school district and pre-selection interview scores.

Responses to ancillary questions were analyzed to determine any significant shifts in Interns' perceptions of interpersonal communication abilities from pre- to post-internship; to identify any components of the program, perceived by Interns as leading to increased development of interpersonal communication abilities; and to note how Interns interacted with groups among three relationship levels. Qualitative analyses of these responses were used to expand and explain the findings of the quantitative analyses.
Chapter IV
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings and discussion of the results of this study to determine the impact of a principal preparation program on the interpersonal communication abilities of aspiring principals. This chapter is delineated into four sections: statistics describing the distributional characteristics of the study population; findings for each hypothesis; findings for the ancillary questions; and discussion of the findings. Observations and interviews with selected Interns offered another perspective, thus giving additional perspectives and insights as to what aspiring principals think and feel about themselves and the program and in improving their interpersonal communication abilities and leadership styles.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics are used to describe the population for this study because they serve as an "efficient way to describe and summarize data" (Klugh, 1974); and "as a tool to . . . reduce to manageable form the properties of an otherwise unwieldy mess of data" (Glass & Hopkins, 1984).

From the initial population of 52 interns and alternates, 36 interns and 5 alternates comprised the final population for which the results of this study are reported. The following Tables describe the
adjusted population of 36 Interns by gender, ethnicity, years of educational experience, and administrative school districts.

Table 1
Number and Percent of Interns by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERNS BY GENDER</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows that female Interns outnumbered male Interns by 4:1, which is also reflective of the gender distribution of the initial population for this study.

Table 2
Number and Percent of Interns by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNIC BACKGROUND</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Hawaiian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the highest frequency of ethnic distribution to be Japanese (53%) followed by White or Caucasian (25%). These two ethnic groups make up 78% of this population of interns. A
representation of Chinese, Filipino, Part-Hawaiian and Mixed ethnic groups makes up the balance of this group of interns.

Table 3 presents the distribution of interns by intervals of five years of educational experience.

Table 3

Number and Percent of Interns by Years of Educational Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES: YEARS OF EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5-9 yrs.)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10-14 yrs.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15-19 yrs.)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20-24 yrs.)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25-29 yrs.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of this group of 36 interns, the largest representation in years of experience was between 15 and 19 years. Interns with between 5 and 9 years of experience had the second highest representation. About 80% of this group of interns had between 5 and 19 years of educational experience.
Table 4 shows the seven Hawaii State DOE school districts from which aspiring principals came, prior to their selection as a Cohort intern or alternate.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICTS</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Island of Oahu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeward</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windward</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbor Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molokai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About 64% of the interns were from three urban districts on Oahu while the others were from four neighbor islands, considered to be rural districts. There were no representatives from the Windward District on Oahu for this first Cohort.
The following table shows the subset of nine individuals as represented in each of the following five categories.

### Table 5
**Distribution of Nine Selected Interns by Gender, Ethnicity, Years of Experience and Administrative School District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>ELEMENT</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Hawaiian</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeward</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windward</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui/Molokai</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauai</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade/School Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (K-6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (7-8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate/High School (7-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (9-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This group of nine selected individuals reflected a balanced representation by gender and school district. The ethnic balance among this group, with Japanese being the highest, reflected the balance within the total cohort as well as the general teaching force within the State of Hawaii (HI State DOE, 1990). Regarding years of
educational experience, four individuals had between 5 and 9 years, and three individuals had between 15 and 19 years of experience. Only one Intern in this subset had more than 19 years of experience. There were also more teachers with experience at the elementary level than at the intermediate or high school levels.

Findings for the Hypotheses

The first hypothesis and related sub-hypotheses were developed to ascertain whether the new Cohort School Leadership (CSL) program contributed to any significant differences in the interpersonal communication abilities of interns. The Johari Personnel Relations (JPRS) pre/post-survey examined the individuals' responses on two dependent variables "Exposure" and "Feedback" in three categories of relationships with employees, with colleagues, and with supervisors.

The first hypothesis and its related sub-hypotheses are stated below in null form.

Hypotheses 1

There are no significant differences in Interns' perceptions of interpersonal communication abilities among three relationship levels as measured by the Johari Personnel Relations Survey (JPRS) instrument.
Sub-Hypotheses

a. There is no significant difference between pre/post Johari Exposure scores among Interns in their relationship with employees.

b. There is no significant difference between pre/post Johari Feedback scores among Interns in their relationship with employees.

c. There is no significant difference between pre/post Johari Exposure scores among Interns in their relationship with colleagues.

d. There is no significant difference between pre/post Johari Feedback scores among Interns in their relationship with colleagues.

e. There is no significant difference between pre/post Johari Exposure scores among Interns in their relationship with supervisors.

f. There is no significant difference between pre/post Johari Feedback scores among Interns in their relationship with supervisors.

The related t-test was used to compare the means of raw scores of both Exposure and Feedback in the three relationship levels. Table 6 presents the findings of the t-test on the pretest and posttest scores of 36 interns.
Table 6

Results of Paired t-test on Interns' Perceptions of Exposure (Ex) and Feedback (Fe) in Relationship with Employees (Emp.), Colleagues (Col.), & Supervisors (Sup.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre/Post</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Paired t-Value</th>
<th>Tabled t-Value (p&lt;.05)</th>
<th>Probability 2-tail</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex - Emp.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-.214</td>
<td>2.031</td>
<td>.8316</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe - Emp.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.031</td>
<td>.1888</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex - Col.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>2.031</td>
<td>.8386</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe - Col.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-.319</td>
<td>2.031</td>
<td>.7514</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex - Sup.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>2.031</td>
<td>.8717</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe - Sup.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.031</td>
<td>.9841</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The t-values do not warrant rejecting the first null hypothesis and related sub-hypotheses. The negative sign in the "Paired t-Value" column indicates that the mean of the post scores was less than the mean of the pretest scores. No significant difference was indicated. The results show that any difference between the pretest and posttest scores was due solely to chance fluctuation as noted in the probability column. None of the comparisons met the alpha level of .05.

The second hypothesis and its associated sub-hypotheses were constructed to assess whether or not there were any significant differences between the pretest and posttest scores of Alternates who did not go through the CSL internship program. The second hypothesis and sub-hypotheses are re-stated below in null form.
Hypothesis 2
There are no significant differences in Alternates' perceptions of interpersonal communication abilities among three relationship levels as measured by the Johari Personnel Relations Survey (JPRS) instrument.

Sub-Hypotheses
a. There is no significant difference between pre/post Johari Exposure scores among Alternates in their relationship with employees.

b. There is no significant difference between pre/post Johari Feedback scores among Alternates in their relationship with employees.

c. There is no significant difference between pre/post Johari Exposure scores among Alternates in their relationship with colleagues.

d. There is no significant difference between pre/post Johari Feedback scores among Alternates in their relationship with colleagues.

e. There is no significant difference between pre/post Johari Exposure scores among Alternates in their relationship with supervisors.

f. There is no significant difference between pre/post Johari Feedback scores among Alternates in their relationship with supervisors.
Table 7 summarizes the results of the related $t$-test on the pretest/posttest scores of Alternates.

**Table 7**

Summary of Paired $t$-test Results Comparing Alternates' Perceptions of Exposure (Ex) and Feedback (Fe) in Relationship to Employees (Emp.), Colleagues (Col), and Supervisors (Sup.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre/Post</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Paired $t$-Value</th>
<th>Tabled $t$-Value ($p&lt;.05$)</th>
<th>Probability (2-tail)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex - Emp</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>2.776</td>
<td>.4402</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe - Emp</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.459</td>
<td>2.776</td>
<td>.6702</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex - Col</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>2.776</td>
<td>.8149</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe - Col</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>2.776</td>
<td>.6903</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex - Sup</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.739</td>
<td>2.776</td>
<td>.5012</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe - Sup</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>2.776</td>
<td>.4402</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second null hypothesis and its related sub-hypotheses were not rejected since none of the results met the alpha level of .05.

The third hypothesis examined significant differences between Interns' and Alternates' perceptions of interpersonal communication abilities.

**Hypothesis 3**

There are no significant differences in the Interns' and Alternates' perceptions of interpersonal communication abilities among three relationship levels as measured by the Johari Personnel Relations Survey (JPRS) instrument.
Sub-Hypotheses

a. There is no significant difference between Interns' and Alternates' post Johari Exposure scores in relationship with employees.

b. There is no significant difference between Interns' and Alternates' post Johari Feedback scores in relationship with employees.

c. There is no significant difference between Interns' and Alternates' post Johari Exposure scores in relationship with colleagues.

d. There is no significant difference between Interns' and Alternates' post Johari Feedback scores in relationship with colleagues.

e. There is no significant difference between Interns' and Alternates' post Johari Exposure scores in relationship with supervisors.

f. There is no significant difference between Interns' and Alternates' post Johari Feedback scores in relationship with supervisors.

The Mann-Whitney U test was used as the non-parametric version of the unpaired t-test to determine whether a significant difference existed between two independent samples. Both Interns and Alternates took the pretest and posttest but only Interns experienced the year-long internship. The Mann-Whitney U allowed
for a comparison of groups of unequal size and specifically if one of the groups was larger than 20. Table 8 includes U scores, z scores corrected for ties (N for Interns was > 20), and probabilities.

Table 8
Summary of Mann-Whitney U Results of Interns and Alternates Exposure and Feedback Scores in Three Relationship Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship with Employee</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interns</td>
<td>Alternates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>-1.219</td>
<td>-1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>.2228</td>
<td>.1053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In their perceptions of relationships with colleagues, Interns' and Alternates' scores showed significance in Exposure (z = -2.24; p = .0251) and Feedback (z = 2.455; p = .0141). Both were significant at the .05 level and therefore led to a rejection of two null sub-hypotheses (3-c and 3-d) that there are no significant differences between Interns' and Alternates' Exposure and Feedback post scores in relationship with colleagues.
The $z$ score of -2.179 with a probability of .0294 was also significant to warrant rejecting the sub-hypothesis (3-f) that there is no significant difference between Interns' and Alternates' post-Feedback scores in relationship with supervisors.

Hypothesis 4
There is no relationship between Interns' perceptions regarding Exposure and Feedback, and the demographic factors of gender, ethnicity, years of educational experience, administrative school district, and pre-selection interview scores.

Separate multiple regression prediction equations were developed for each of six criterion variables (post-scores of Exposure and Feedback) in relationship with employees, colleagues and supervisors. The five predictor variables were gender, ethnicity, years of educational experience, administrative school districts, and composite scores on pre-selection interviews. Tables 9 and 10 summarize any variances explained by the predictor variables and the Beta coefficient and probabilities of the demographic factors.
Table 9

Multiple Regression Prediction Results of Gender, Ethnicity, Experience, School District, and Interview on Six Posttest Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Variables</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposure in Relationship with Employees</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.4372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback in Relationship with Employees</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.8492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure in Relationship with Colleagues</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.4873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback in Relationship with Colleagues</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.3805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure Relationship with Supervisors</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Relationship with Supervisors</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.0174 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percent of variance (R²) that is predictable by the five predictor variables was low. The highest percent was noted for the post-score of Feedback in relationship with supervisors. Probability on the related F-test (.0174) was significant at the .05 level.

Moreover beta coefficients shown in Table 10, revealed only the composite score on the pre-selection interview figured prominently in the prediction.
Table 10

Beta Coefficients and Probabilities of Selected Demographic Factors Appearing in Exposure and Feedback Post Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Variables</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Educational Experience</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Pre-Selection Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposure Relation w/ Supervisor</td>
<td>.002 (0.9927)</td>
<td>.084 (.6295)</td>
<td>-.174 (.3974)</td>
<td>-.038 (8532)</td>
<td>.434 (.0395)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Relation w/ Supervisor</td>
<td>-.139 (.4423)</td>
<td>.157 (.3168)</td>
<td>-.034 (.8522)</td>
<td>-.2 (0.2824)</td>
<td>.469 .0148*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Findings for the Ancillary Questions

Extended interpretation of converted raw scores on the pre/post survey and on-site interviews gave additional insight to explain the quantitative findings of this study and answer the following ancillary questions.

Question #1
Were there any shifts from the pre- to post-internship in Interns' perceptions regarding the development of interpersonal communication skills?

Although the first hypothesis for this study was not rejected, the results offered an opportunity for further interpretation. The individual's interpersonal communication tendencies and leadership styles were identified through the conversion of raw scores to percentile scores on the JPRS. The individual's Arenas and/or
leadership styles, from the pretest to posttest, were determined by percentile scores plotted on the JPRS grid.

A balanced Arena was indicated when Exposure and Feedback were used in near equal amounts or showed a difference of less than 20 percentile points between these two measures. Such an Arena indicated more positive interpersonal feelings (Hall and Williams, 1987, p. 5). An imbalanced arena reflected a difference of more than 20 percentile points and suggested an overuse of one of the processes at the expense of the other. For each set of pretest and posttest scores in the three relationship categories, the differences between the percentile scores of Exposure and Feedback were calculated to determine if an Intern's Arena was balanced or imbalanced. Following this determination, Interns were identified according to four types of interpersonal styles (Hall & Williams, 1987) as reviewed below:

Type A: minimal use of both Exposure and Feedback processes with impersonal approach to interpersonal relationships. Dominant region is the "Unknown." (< 20 percentile point difference between Exposure and Feedback, and less than 40 x 40 Arena on the JPRS grid)

Type B: aversion to Exposure with overuse of Feedback by individuals who appear to be quasi-supportive. "Facade" region is dominant in this style. (> 20 percentile point difference in direction of Feedback)
Type C: overuse of Exposure and neglect of Feedback by individuals who are ego-striving and distrust others' opinions. The "Blindspot" region is dominant in this style. (> 20 percentile point difference in direction of Exposure)

Type D: Balanced use of Exposure and Feedback where openness is coupled with a sensitivity to others' needs to participate. The "Arena" is the dominant region and productivity is expected to increase. (< 20 percentile point difference between Exposure and Feedback, and greater than 40 x 40 Arena on the JPRS grid.)

Table 11 represents the percentage of Interns under each interpersonal style (Type A, B, C, D) within each relationship category (with employees, colleagues, and supervisors).
Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th># on Pre-Survey</th>
<th>% on Pre-Survey</th>
<th># on Post-Survey</th>
<th>% on Post-Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with Employees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type C:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type D:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with Colleagues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type C:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type D:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with Supervisors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type C:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type D:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relationship to employees, Interns showed a higher preference for Type B on both the pretest and posttest. There was an increase of 9% which showed a tendency for Type B ("Facade"). This style reflects a difference between Exposure and Feedback of more than 20 percentile points, with a tendency towards an aversion to Exposure and an overuse of Feedback.
Interns showed the least preference for Type C ("Blindspot") on the pretest (6%) and posttest (3%) which indicated that Interns, in interacting with employees, did not show a preference for overuse of Exposure at the neglect of Feedback. Although both Types B and C represented an imbalanced Arena, Interns' preference was towards an overuse of Feedback rather than an overuse of Exposure. According to Hall and Williams (1987) such preferences indicate leadership that is "quasi-supportive" rather than "ego-striving" and "distrusting of others' opinions." These descriptions suggest a more positive style in Type B, although both styles refer to an imbalanced Arena. Type A which indicates a limited but balanced use of Exposure and Feedback, showed a decrease from pretest to posttest in all three relationships: with employees (22% to 17%); with colleagues (22% to 14%); and with supervisors (33% to 31%).

Under the category of "Relationships with Colleagues," a higher percentage of Interns showed a preference for Type B on the pretest. Although this percentage remained the same on the posttest, there was an increase of 11% shown for Type D from pretest to posttest. This gain also reflected a decrease in preference for Type A (22% to 14%); and Type C (8% to 6%) from pretest to posttest.

In "Relationships with Supervisors," there was an increase of 14 percentile points in Type D, from pretest to posttest. This increase reflected a decrease in Intern preference for Type A (33% to 31%), Type B (36% to 33%), and Type C (11% to 3%).
As with the Interns, the raw scores of Exposure and Feedback for Alternates were converted to percentile scores and plotted on the Johari Window grid. Since there were only five Alternates, the actual number of shifts in Types A, B, C, and D are presented in Table 12.

Table 12
Comparison of Alternates' Interpersonal Styles within Three Relationship Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Type</th>
<th>Pre-Survey</th>
<th>Post-Survey</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rel. w/Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel. w/Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel. w/Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentile scores for Alternates on the Johari Window reflected a negative shift in Arenas from pretest to posttest. A negative shift is one that goes from a balanced to an imbalanced Arena or from Type D (< than 20-point difference between Exposure and Feedback %ile scores; > than 40 x 40 %ile Arena on the JPRS Grid) to either Type B or Type C (> than 20-point difference between Exposure and Feedback %ile scores). In relationships with employees, there were two shifts from balanced to imbalanced Arenas on the posttest. In
relationships with colleagues, the one Type D on the pretest, shifted to Type A on the posttest. There were no Type D Alternates noted in relationships with supervisors; and one Type A shifted to a Type B on the post-survey.

Interviews

On-site observations and interviews with nine selected Interns offered additional insight to interpret and explain the findings of this study. A general set of questions served as a guide to the interviews, although specific questions evolved through the "Shadowing and Reflective Questioning" process (see Appendix A and B for the "Guide to Interview Questions"). Responses to these questions which were coded and categorized, showed some general patterns and trends.

Interns' responses to the first question were categorized according to the following interpersonal communication abilities: problem-solving; active listening; communication; and time management. These skill areas were selected as a combination of competencies noted in the literature, as well as those noted by the interns as important to interpersonal competence.

A. Problem-solving

All nine interns felt they had improved during their internship in the skill area of problem solving. A summary of responses describing ways in which problem solving skills improved during the internship showed that interns felt they:

• took more time to gather information before reacting;
• involved more people in the problem solving process;
• looked at problems more systematically;
• had a greater awareness of the larger picture;
• were more reflective;
• used more systematic approaches;
• were more sensitive to how problem solving affects more than the people involved.

Although three interns indicated they improved because they took more time to gather information in working through the problem solving process, one intern saw her improvement as related to making immediate decisions "on the spot." This intern was referring to an experience of working with student discipline and handling a situation with an irate parent. This intern also noted a difference between problem solving on the job, which may warrant immediate decisions, and problem solving in the Leadership Skills Development (LSD) sessions, where more time was needed to collaborate with other members of the group.

B. Active Listening

All nine interns indicated that they needed to work harder in the area of active listening, although several reflected on positive growth in this area. These Interns felt competent in this area and stressed the importance of active listening through the following positive statements.

Kolu -- I thought I was real good at that. I think now I've even come or moved a step higher and I'm not saying I'm really good at it. I began to listen a little bit more about the
kinds of things not only the content but the things that are in
the middle of the communication, within that context.

Walu -- I still feel they're [listening skills] very important as
they were in the LSD sessions. I guess for this week since I
really was listening, actually shadowing my principal, I see it
as being more important. [Expanded through an example]
There's an irate parent screaming at me, very upset. And just
listening to him and just saying, "I understand, it sounds like
you're very upset." You know, you're going through that
validation of his feelings and then he'll calm down. So instead
of me reacting, and just not listening to what he was really
saying, and just thinking, "What am I going to say? ... What
rule can I bring up [to show] that I was right?" But just really
listening to him and trying to understand where he's coming
from. And I think that helped to diffuse the situation.

Iwa -- I've realized through my experiences also that you
have to listen a little bit more than when you're in your own
classroom. In administration, a lot of times you need a bigger
picture and you need to find out more of what's in the
background. You also have to think more about future
problems the decision might make, so listening is really
important ... when you're dealing with school problems, school
community type problems, you have to do even more of the
listening. . . . I feel like I've had to learn to become a more patient listener. It's not just listen and act, or listen and solve. It's listen and really think about things and see if you need more information from another source or a wider picture before decisions are made. So that's why I think I've changed in the listening area.

Kahi -- I think now I'm more of an active listener than before. Maybe in terms of the class (coursework), I didn't pay attention. It wasn't important. But now because you're involving people in decisions of what I'm doing, I have to listen a little bit more before reacting and doing something.

Hiku -- [Didn't identify growth but noted tremendous active listening during the cross-training experience.]

The following responses suggested that more work is needed to develop a higher level of competency in active listening.

(Question: What have you found out about listening skills and applying good listening skills?)

Lua- [Laugh] That I need to do more. This is really difficult.

(Question: What do you think is necessary for active listening?)

Oh, that's tough. . . . To be able to focus on what the person is saying. To be able to disregard what your perspective is while
you're listening, and just concentrate on what that person has to say and then react to it. I think a lot of us have a tendency, including myself. We have such strong convictions that we want to just jump right into it and pose what we feel is right.

**Ha** -- I'm hoping they've [active listening skills] improved. I know there have been times when my mind just starts thinking. You know how the mind works and it clicks on something and you think 'Oh no, I'm supposed to get that done.' And then you kind of lose it but I'm hoping I'm becoming a little bit more aware, being able to focus more now to what is being said. Maybe if a person doesn't say things directly, you can kind of pick up on their tones or maybe they're trying to say some things without really coming out with it.

**Lima** -- I have to listen more.

**Ono** -- I don't know, it's hard for me to measure in that area [active listening skills] because mainly I'm a counselor and I always feel like I'm actively listening. . . . It may have gone down even a bit because I've been so busy because the stress is higher at this level and I tend not - my concentration level is lower when I'm under stress. I just distract a lot easier. I'm not sure in that sense. That's an area I've worked hard in so I
really have to say that I'd be happy if that was status quo in that area.

Responses, in general, emphasized the importance of: focusing on what the person is saying, both verbally and non-verbally; eliminating extraneous distractions; curbing intrinsic convictions; and considering the content of the communication in light of its context.

3. Communication

It was difficult to isolate this particular area since it seemed to incorporate the other skill areas of problem solving and active listening. The intent was to solicit responses from Interns as to how they gave and received feedback to possibly align such responses with the JPRS variables of "Exposure" which referred to information that was known or unknown by others, and "Feedback" which was information known or unknown by the self.

Responses to questions on communication were more general than specific, and touched on such topics as sources of feedback, reactions to feedback, and importance of communication. Perceived growth in this area was expressed through statements as summarized below:

**Lua** -- More objective and open to constructive criticism. Prior experience helped develop communication skills like feedback.

**Kolu** -- Little more sensitive about people's feelings. Able to keep objective perspective.
Iwa -- Communication is extremely important for all to see a bigger picture of the school. I've always been a very open person, a very verbal person. The program has nurtured the way I've always felt and the way I've always been, so that's been good.

Three individuals in the subset stated that they felt comfortable with giving and receiving feedback but did not specify improvement in this area. The remaining individuals did not respond directly to questions on communication and/or feedback.

4. Managing Time

Although responses may have implied competence in the area of time management, several interns voiced their concerns regarding the requirements and numerous activities involved with the CSL program. For instance the following responses describe a situation where the intern felt competent in this area but his/her mentor did not agree.

Lima -- My principal indicated to me that I had a time management problem. I indicated [that] I did not, but [principal] felt I did. I think we're being pulled in three different directions to fulfill their [school's] obligations; the coursework and cohort program [for which] we have to maintain logs and prepare for a narrative in preparation for the SIP, etc. So I'm not able to do any of the reading for the
coursework. I haven't done any of that since the last week of first quarter. I have three courses so I find it very difficult to do that. I am able to maintain the cohort logs and also try to maintain what is required of me in school. But also which made it very difficult for me is that I'm working on a school improvement plan daily, that I started way back in the last week of October. And I've been working on it ever since, Monday through Friday, including Saturdays and Sundays. And I'd even work up on it till now and I've still gotta prepare for more. I find that it's taking up a lot of my time and I don't know - it's very difficult for me right now. I felt like I don't have the time management but I'm doing the best that I can do, being pulled in those directions.

[Although this individual indicated competence in this area, the example given may identify a problem with time management.]

A general view of the coursework was that it was an overload which at times impeded successful time management.

Hiku -- In this area, I would say that it's remained the same since the beginning and the reason is because I'm just taking two courses and I'm working on my master's paper. If I was taking all the courses, I wouldn't be able to manage my time. It would be too much of a load. But it's kinda rough sometimes. I wouldn't advise doing a master's paper while you're going
through this but because I have less courses to take, I can manage somewhat.

**Question #2**

What components of a principal training program led to increased development of interpersonal communication abilities, as perceived by selected principal Interns?

The group of selected Interns identified the following program components as having a positive impact on the development of problem-solving skills.

1. **Internship/Cross-training**

   **Hiku** -- I would say definitely I have improved through exposure and experience, as I'm handling the problems myself. I've been exposed to many problems particularly in the cross-training.

   **Walu** -- I'm more confident and my comfort level in this area has improved. I have more opportunities now, more practice. I'm thinking this experience (OJT-Internship) has helped because there's been times when decisions have to be made (quickly). There's a problem, you need to solve it.

   **Kahi** -- Training and OJT. I was going on my merry way, getting all these things planned but really people weren't
buying into it. And so I needed to involve more people which I did eventually.

2. **Case Studies/Saturday Seminars**

Lua -- I'm looking at the problem more systematically. It seems to me that I'm more aware, consciously aware of the framework from which I'm working so that my decisions are set within this framework.

(Question: Where did you develop that framework?)

From case studies, starting with summer, the LSD sessions and then now as they're giving us more case studies in our Saturday seminars. Instinctively I think my actions have been aligned with this kind of process and yet I was just not thinking about it. Now it has become so automatic [systematic approach to problem solving].

3. **Leadership Skills Development (LSD) Sessions**

(Question: In what ways did the LSD help you in solving problems?)

Lua -- It's just brought this process to a conscious level of awareness. Instinctively I think my actions have been aligned with this kind of process and yet I was just not thinking about it. It has become so automatic, with the systematic approach to problem solving. I think we have a little more knowledge to work with at this point.
Walu --LSD has really helped; reflective time.

4. **Mentors**

(Question: How did you handle problem solving before, if you now perceive yourself as doing it differently?)

Kolu -- Now I need to look at not only the student and the other party involved, but (at) how that decision affects the whole school, the community, in the future too. My scope has broadened.

(Question: Has there been anything in particular from the program or training that led you to interact differently?)

I think the awareness of what can happen with certain decisions, also being able to reflect with the principal (mentor), not only being able to observe my mentor and other people, but some of the seminars on Saturday.

5. **Coursework**

Coursework was identified as both a contributing and non-contributing factor in the development of problem solving skills, as shown respectively, in the examples below.

a. **Contributing**

(Question: From the beginning of your cohort training until now, how do you think you've improved in problem solving?)
Ono -- My theoretical base in problem solving (is) on a bigger scale. I'm not talking about individual case by case student. But I think in terms of problem solving, let's say school wide, problems on a theoretical basis through a lot of the coursework, has improved. The knowledge of cycles, school improvement plan, all those things are interrelated and a lot of open systems theory, I see them as interrelated rather than isolated portions that help. In terms of how I've developed in the area of problem solving is seeing it (on) a wider basis, seeing the bigger picture and how it applies to the specific situation.

b. Non-Contributing

(Question: Were there other aspects of the CSL program that led to your development in problem solving skills?)

Ha -- It's difficult to say the coursework did. I think only at this point I'm starting to internalize the things that have been given to us. . . . You know, you go through the coursework - for me, I felt overloaded with it because I had no courses when I started off the program. All I could think of as far as the coursework. . . was getting the requirement done. I know the focus of the whole thing was to internalize what we learned in the coursework to what was going on in school (but) because it's (the coursework) so theoretical, there really isn't anything at school that you can tie it into yet.
Regarding specific program activities which contributed to active listening skills development, the on-the-job experiences of the internship and observations of mentors, seemed to offer the most to this area of development. Two interns noted their background as counselors and therefore felt that they had these skills already. In one case the intern felt he/she had risen to a higher level as a result of experiences in the program, while the other stated that he/she would be happy if it was status quo in this area.

Question #3

How did selected Interns perceive their interpersonal competence in interactions with employees (teachers, staff, students, parents); colleagues (cohort, vice-principals); or supervisors (mentors, professors, CSL program staff)?

The following word tables highlight interactions within the three relationship groups, as described in interviews with selected Interns. Interns' responses were charted according to the type of interaction; purpose of interaction; positive (+) or negative (-) perception; and results of the interactions with supporting comments. Comments noted in brackets [ ] indicated the researcher's summary of Intern's perceptions or the researcher's observations.
**Table 13**

Summary of Interns' Interactions with Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purpose of Interaction</th>
<th>(+) Results of Interaction with Supportive Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Kahi   | Counselors | To improve services to all students, not just selected few. | (-) Backfired, very controversial because counselors felt they were doing an excellent job. Didn't like others telling them what to do.  
"If the counselors don't believe they should change, there will not be change. It has to come from them, because when we move out, it reverts back. One counselor told me: 'You're going to be here only for a year, why are we making these changes? This has been occurring for 15-20 years and I don't think we can change it overnight.' "  |
|        | Teachers   | To provide benches on school grounds for students.          | (-) Miscommunication. [Intern felt teachers had been involved because teachers were asked for their input on project.]  
"However, teachers reported to principal, that intern told them they had to do this project. [Intern was surprised by misinterpretation of intent.] Teachers felt 'pushed upon'"  
[Intern assumed teachers' support because project met students' need.] |
Table 13. (Continued) Summary of Interns' Interactions with Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purpose of Interaction</th>
<th>(+/-)</th>
<th>Results of Interaction with Supportive Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lua</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>To conduct data assessment of school for faculty. Given 2 days to prepare for presentation to faculty.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>Teacher resented Intern coming and telling the group how they were doing when they'd taught there for &quot;x&quot; number of years. Intern had only been there a few days. Teacher also resented taking a whole staff meeting to cover this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;A day later, one of the teachers came to me and just shot me, skinned me and hung me out to dry. I did everything wrong in the eyes of this person. My way of dealing with that at first was not the best because I started to react. And then I soon discovered that I wasn't communicating with her, so I just sat back and gave her that time to vent. When she was finished and had calmed down, then I was able to get my point across.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lua</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>General comments</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>&quot;Maintaining my composure, it's really important. I found that to be effective for myself. But I also feel there is a point at which you have to assert. I'm not always sure yet when that time is right.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>&quot;I feel that I've handled them positively. Parents usually left on a positive note (e.g., 'We'll see you later, thank you very much').&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13. (Continued) Summary of Interns' Interactions with Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purpose of Interaction</th>
<th>(+)</th>
<th>Results of Interaction with Supportive Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Discipline playground behavior.</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>[Related that experiences have been positive.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Facilitate school improvement plan with teachers to integrate curriculum.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>[Some teachers needed more structure than Intern expected.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I've learned there's some things you cannot take for granted. I wanted to give (teachers) as much flexibility as possible. I found that some of the teachers really needed something concrete. I couldn't just say that these are the areas we should work on and have a discussion. They wanted to see it on paper with examples, before they could start. It's funny, I didn't think that was necessary.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolu</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>To discipline students.</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>[Observed students following Intern's directions in a positive way.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;In a vice-principal's role, you become more of a child advocate. I think stepping into administration, I find that I need to be sometimes more cold-hearted, fast... one of the things I had to get used to.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolu</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>General comments</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>[Related how difficult it is to give directives to teachers who are considered to be Intern's peers. Against Intern's nature and therefore struggled with this aspect.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I don't think I'll ever come to the point and say, 'you will do it'.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13. (Continued) Summary of Interns' Interactions with Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purpose of Interaction</th>
<th>+ -</th>
<th>Results of Interaction with Supportive Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ono</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>[May not always be positive but Intern stressed necessity of treating students with respect.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I'd like to think of myself as being reasonable most of the time, respectful, always looking for the interest of the student and balancing that with what's best for all. A lot of my interactions . . . I do a lot of explaining. It takes a long time, but in the long run, it appears to foster better relations with students when I explain why I do things and the rationale for a lot of my actions. I try to model the behavior I expect of my students.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ono</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>General interactions</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>&quot;I've had long interactions with parents. I just enjoy those interactions. It's been very positive, that's all I can say.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiku</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>To interview staff for information and to establish a rapport.</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>&quot;I had the freedom to learn on my own which was wonderful and I was able to tap into all areas of the school. &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Observed librarian's daughter bringing in a gift for Intern as a positive gesture.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiku</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>To encourage students to participate in program.</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>[Students excited and anxious to perform.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Hopefully it'll help the students because some of them like to cut out of class and with this, I told them that 'You've got to keep your grades up so that your teachers will allow you to miss a class just for that time period'.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13. (Continued) Summary of Interns' Interactions with Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purpose of Interaction</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>Results of Interaction with Supportive Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hiku   | Students | To have student to return to class. | (−)/ (+) | [Boy sassed back and was sent to the vice-principal's office because Intern identified student out of class who could possibly be having a personal problem.]  

"The problem was too great. So he's under this heavy stress and he apologized and I shook his hand and told him, 'Now you know why I kept following you because I knew something was wrong and that we do care.' So then we settled that so I let the vice-principal handle the rest." |
| Hiku   | Teachers | To discipline a child in the lunchroom. | (−) | [After reprimanding a student, teacher came and rescinded consequence.]  

"The teacher came along and said, "'No, no... he has to eat his lunch now. You get a cafeteria worker to do that.'" So nonchalantly, I said "'Oh, all right,'" rather than cause such a fuss in front of all the kids. But after that kid got in trouble again, I took the reins strong and told the teacher in no uncertain terms that he (the student) did this and therefore, this is the consequence and he must follow through. I had no problem with the teacher after that." |
Table 13. (Continued) Summary of Interns' Interactions with Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purpose of Interaction</th>
<th>+/(-)</th>
<th>Results of Interaction with Supportive Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiku</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>To observe an SCBM Council meeting.</td>
<td>(+/-)</td>
<td>&quot;One of the officers threw a paper at me across the table and said, 'Oh here, sign your name, since you're another parent'.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I looked at her and smiled although I was shocked to see that happen. Then the vice-principal came in and introduced me and said, 'This is _, our new Cohort vice-principal.' I think the lady swallowed her throat. She realized that you don't throw paper regardless of whether that person is in administration or another parent. Today that person treats me very well with respect.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walu</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>To inform parent about his son's detention.</td>
<td>(+/-)</td>
<td>[Father was screaming mad. Threatened to call the lawyers. Used foul language.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I listened. He calmed down and we worked it out. I feel good about how I handled the situation because I felt that had I reacted to his anger and just said, 'I'm not going to listen to you, like stop yelling at me, and hang up the phone, it sure wouldn't help any'.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwa</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Follow-up on discipline referrals of students</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>&quot;I talk to the teachers when I do discipline referrals. I always follow up and get back to teachers. . .talk to the teachers about different areas that they may be working on or children they're servicing.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13. (Continued) Summary of Interns’ Interactions with Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purpose of Interaction</th>
<th>(+)</th>
<th>Results of Interaction with Supportive Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walu</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>To diffuse a mob scene of students.</td>
<td>(-)/ (+)</td>
<td>[Students arguing and ready to fight.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Students warned me not to touch one of the girls because that may add to the situation. I gave the responsibility to these students to bring the quarreling students to my office. I told the girls, 'Then you be responsible and you take her down to the office. You don't want me to touch her, I won't. But you have to take her down.' You know there was this big scene and it turned out okay when she came to the office. It was so cute because I told her, 'You know when you get really mad, do you like go blind or something?' . . . I'm glad it happened because it gave me an opportunity to see what I would do.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walu</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>To follow up on PATH evaluations.</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>&quot;[Teachers] have been very open . . . and give me feedback. They're very up front and they'll just say, 'Oh you know you're very different because in the past our Performance Evaluations were never changed, they were just accepted.' They give me opportunities to explain why I'm doing this. They're not just guinea pigs and accept everything. They question, so they give me opportunity to explain and to validate my philosophy.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13. (Continued) Summary of Interns' Interactions with Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purpose of Interaction</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>Results of Interaction with Supportive Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iwa</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Monitoring during recess</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>[Observed students obeying instructions when given by Intern. Observed Intern in many interactions with students and adults. Interactions seemed to be positive.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>General responses re: interactions w/ parents.</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>&quot;Parents seem more open to suggestions and following through. I feel if the parents were comfortable with me and they know that I sincerely want to help their children and work with them . . . [interactions would be positive]. I feel I'm a patient person, an open listener. I don't pass judgment. I want parents to feel that the school and the parents are on the same side to work together. I always try to let them know that whatever we can do, we will do and . . . &quot;let me know how you feel because I want to work with you.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>To accompany students on field trip.</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>[Nothing specific related but gave generalizations about interacting with students.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"I found that they (elementary students) are very impressionable, that they look up to you. They have a model and they'll believe anything and everything you tell them. They're very reactionary."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purpose of Interaction</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Results of Interaction with Supportive Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Lima   | Teacher  | To reassign teacher duties | (-) |    | [Typographical error on form. Teacher upset with assignment and complained to counselor but not straight-forward with Intern. When Intern responded jokingly to teacher, it was not perceived as a laughing matter.]

"It came back to the principal that I showed that I wasn't sensitive enough and that I showed a lack of caring."

[Conflict with teacher seemed to be indirect. Direct reaction came from principal/mentor.]

"I think with elementary teachers, it's really like I said they're very sensitive, a lot more sensitive than secondary teachers. I've picked up this feeling that they're [elementary teachers] inferior to secondary teachers. There's this feeling that secondary teachers don't think highly of them. I try to change that perception. Being that they are like that, you really have to be careful how you say things and who is saying things."
Table 13. (Continued) Summary of Interns' Interactions with Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purpose of Interaction</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>Results of Interaction with Supportive Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Lima   | Students | To direct project      | (-)| [On the surface, comments indicated positive interaction. However, students didn't always follow through on assignments and negative graffiti, directed at Intern, was found on wall. Miscommunication with teachers resulted in teachers reporting to principal that Intern gave approval to students writing on the wall.]  
  
  "I tried to empower them as much as I could. But I found that sometimes it goes in one ear and out the other." |

In the twenty-three interactions with employees noted here, the overall results of the interactions were described as positive, especially in relationships with students and parents. Those interactions with students and parents which may have had the potential for negative altercation, were described as shifting to positive resolutions. The more frequent negative interactions seemed to be in relationships with teachers. The shared examples highlighted specific negative encounters. Examples of positive interactions with teachers were noted in more general terms. Interpretation of these results will be presented in the section on "Discussion of the Findings."
The following Table 14 describes Interns' interactions with Colleagues which include vice-principals and fellow Cohort members.

**Table 14**

Summary of Interns' Interactions with Colleagues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purpose of Interaction</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>Results of Interaction with Supportive Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kahi</td>
<td>Vice-principal</td>
<td>General Discussion/Orientation</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>[Share a lot; go home late.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I think that's really important at the end of the day because we have to feed off each other to see where we're going and what we're doing. As a unified body, we have to stick together.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>(+)/(-)</td>
<td>&quot;There's a core of people that we have gotten close to. But the rest are so superficial. You got some on a 'Hi/Bye' basis because we don't see them as frequently. So there's a core of people that stick together that's pretty strong. There are some key people that pull the group together. The suffering together has built a pact. 'We all try to help each one to make it. When you suffer together you love each other more.' &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'There are some people on the fringes that are not involved. I think the interpersonal relationship skills for the ones who are on the fringes are because they don't want to get (close) to anybody. I'm speaking frankly now. It is not as close as people think it is.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. (Continued) Summary of Interns' Interactions with Colleagues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purpose of Interaction</th>
<th>(+)</th>
<th>Results of Interaction with Supportive Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lua</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>[Relationship with cohort has been great]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I think the bonding in that even now, even if we're not principals yet, we call each other up. If I need some ideas or just need to bounce it off somebody, you know to get some feedback from that person...even on personal things. That's going to continue and that's important because in today's world there's so much information, that we're going to have to learn to depend on each other's strengths, and cover each others' weaknesses.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolu</td>
<td>Vice-principal</td>
<td>To learn how to open a school at beginning of school year.</td>
<td>(-)/ (+)</td>
<td>[Found it difficult because vice-principal was new and also learning to open up the school year.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;To be honest, it was difficult in the beginning. Now that's she's more familiar with what goes on during this part of the year, it has become easier for me to learn. The relationship has been real good in that we try to work together as a team.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. (Continued) Summary of Interns' Interactions with Colleagues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purpose of Interaction</th>
<th>(+)</th>
<th>Results of Interaction with Supportive Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lwa</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>Reflection on relationship w/ Cohort</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>[Several examples given about follow-up with students at different schools through the Cohort.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"The Cohort is a very close group. I feel real comfortable with the other participants and I feel that there is support there and when we do talk . . . you end up learning more."

| Ono    | Cohort  | General Comments | (+) | "I think the relationship with the cohort has been one of support and closeness. There's been a bonding. I feel I've bonded with most if not all of them in terms of talking, supporting, caring, interacting on a professional or informal level. It's been a very supportive network . . . a special relationship." |


Interactions with cohorts as colleagues were described as extremely positive. Some general comments which are not noted above suggested a strong camaraderie among the Cohort where they count on each other for professional as well as personal support. In another instance, an Intern did note that (he/she) "stays pretty much to (him/herself) because of own preference and a feeling that Cohort may have some cliques.

In regards to interactions with vice-principals, the reviews were mixed. Some described very positive interactions with vice-principals while in some cases, these interactions revealed potential
points of conflict. Comments made by regular vice-principals and On-the-Job Training (OJT) vice-principals indicated that the CSL program training was different from theirs. In some aspects this was positive; Interns were learning about budgets, personnel, which they (v-ps) wish they had had. In other aspects, negative connotations implied that "Interns were the lunch bunch that got to go with the principals to all these luncheon meetings. Some resentment was evident through other comments from "employees" as well as "colleagues" in that the Interns should not expect to make drastic changes in the schools during their short stay with them. These comments referred to special projects which Interns were expected to do (e.g., School Improvement Plan assigned as a requirement for the CSL program; special projects assigned by the mentors.)

Table 14 presents Interns' interactions with mentors, and the Interns' perceptions of the results of these interactions.
### Table 15

**Summary of Interns' Interactions with Superiors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purpose of Interaction</th>
<th>(+)</th>
<th>Results of Interactions/Supportive Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kahi</td>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>Seek guidance &amp; answers to questions.</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>&quot;My mentor is always open to talk to me.&quot; [More involved with mentor at elementary school.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>To learn about administration</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>&quot;I really appreciate my mentor. He takes the time to make sure I understand concepts, like budgeting, personnel, etc. Some of the other vice-principals had no idea what the budgeting process is like. It's nice to be able to ask questions, to have someone take the time to really walk you through it.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiku</td>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>Shadow Observation</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>[Observed positive ways of principal dealing w/ parents, students, teachers, &amp; staff.] &quot;I think that the most important part of dealing with staff interrelations that I've gathered from this principal is that you've got to maintain the dignity of the human being. I believe that way also. This had been a wonderful experience, wonderful.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15. (Continued) Summary of Interns' Interactions with Superiors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purpose of Interaction</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Results of Interactions/Supportive Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walu</td>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>Internship development</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The intern/mentor relationship is ideal, very ideal. I feel Principal (1) is very committed to this program. The reason I feel is that he gives me so much of his time. He blocks off periods because if I say, 'I need to ask you these questions,' we block off time and he sits with me. He gives me feedback, wants to help me to give me practice, opportunities to be independent. He's warm, compassionate, willing to share. . . . I think his commitment to the program has made this work for me. And he really enjoys it too because he's learning a lot too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwa</td>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>Reflection on relationship</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The responses from (mentor) whenever questions were posed were very quick answers, something you could possibly find out on your own. There has not been as much positive feedback or any kind of feedback, for that matter.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 15. (Continued) Summary of Interns' Interactions With Superiors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intern</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purpose of Interaction</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>Results of Interaction with Supportive Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ono</td>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>Reflections</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>[Relationship basically one of teacher/pupil.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I feel like a pupil learning, there's so much to learn. The quality of interaction has been very positive and it's been one of respect.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mentor is honest and tells intern what strengths are, and how to improve on weaknesses.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>Reflections on</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>&quot;I feel I failed my experience. I would really like and feel that the best thing for me right now is to pull out but I have a feeling that they don't want me to do that.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;There's some things that were said that it kind of hindered our relationship. [Mentor] sees I'm deficient in certain areas, but I think [mentor's] view is colored by what [mentor] has heard from other principals. [Mentor] was telling me, &quot;I don't want you to do this and you disappointed me very much,&quot;&quot; laying this heavy guilt trip on me.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Several negative exchanges between principal and mentor shared but general gist is noted above.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>Reflections on</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>&quot;I feel this warmth. . .the principal will pull me in and sit for 2-3 hours just talking about everything. . . on what I need to learn.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interactions with superiors were generally positive. However, some real problems were noted in two cases regarding interpersonal relationships with assigned mentors. The resulting action in one case was that the Intern withdrew from the program with less than two months remaining in the program.

**Discussion of the Findings**

**Hypothesis 1 and Additional Considerations**

There are no significant differences in Interns' perceptions of interpersonal communication abilities among three relationship levels as measured by the Johari Personnel Relations Survey (JPRS) instrument.

In analyzing the first hypothesis, no significant difference was found, which would suggest that no change occurred in the Interns' perceptions regarding Exposure and Feedback. Although the $t$-values themselves did not indicate any significant change, conversion of raw scores to percentile scores and their application to the Johari model did indicate that shifts in perceptions did occur. A comparison of the four regions of the Johari Window offered another consideration for comparison.

Perhaps, it is in the dynamic character of the Johari model itself that is the critical factor. Rather than a simple comparison of Exposure and Feedback as individual dependent variables, it may be their relationship to each other that is critical for meaningful comparison. According to Hall and Williams (1987), the individual's
interpersonal style is determined by the relationship of Exposure to Feedback in one's Arena. Therefore, it may be that the interpretation of an individual's Arena be described more qualitatively. Hall and Williams (1987, p. 1) stated: "To fully appreciate the implications that each region has for interpersonal effectiveness, we need to consider the size and shape of each region, and the reasons for its presence in the interpersonal space."

Interpretation of the comparison of raw scores alone may be limiting, which may also lead the researcher to commit a Type II Error of accepting the null hypothesis when it should be rejected.

Type B interpersonal style in relationships with employees, represented the highest frequency of Interns' Arenas on both pretest and posttest, increasing by 9% on the posttest. This type of imbalanced Arena shows a preference for the solicitation of Feedback and withholding of Exposure. Type B indicates the leader's preference for creating a climate of undue permissiveness which might offer the leader a way to circumvent potential negative interactions with their peers. Typically, according to Hall and Williams (1987), this is a sign of insecurity, which may lead to feelings of suspicion and mistrust. High representation of this style may suggest that Interns, throughout their internship, still perceived their relationship with employees or teachers to be at a peer level. Several indicated feeling uncomfortable in their Intern role with teachers because role clarification had not been established nor accepted by Interns or teachers. The decrease of Type A and Type C
on the post, accounted for the increase in Type B. Frequency
distribution of Type D remained the same for the pretest and
posttest, although there may have been shifts among individual
Arenas either towards or away from Type D.

In relationship with Colleagues (cohort, vice-principals), the
greatest number of shifts from pretest to posttest was towards
Type D (increase of 11%). This implied that in relationship with
other cohort, Interns used Exposure and Feedback solicitation to a
great and balanced extent. Responses from interviews with selected
Interns indicated that the strongest developed relationships were
with other Cohort members. The increase in Type D accounted for
the decrease in Type A and Type C, with Type B remaining at the
same frequency distribution on both pretest and posttest.

In relationships with supervisors, the increase of 14% towards
Type D accounted for the decrease in Types A, B, and C. Supervisors
were generally referred to as mentors for the purpose of this study.
In most cases, Interns regarded their relationships with their
respective mentors as very positive. From the interviews, the
discussion in two cases suggested that the cross-training mentors
offered a kind of respite for Interns who were experiencing
problems with their assigned mentors. One of these Interns
withdrew from the program following the cross-training experience,
to avoid returning to the regular internship assignment.

The shifts noted for interactions with colleagues (cohort and
vice-principals) and supervisors (mentors, CSL staff, university
professors) may indicate that the Interns "felt" more competent in interacting with these two school groups. The Interns related to their colleagues at a peer level and shared their hardships and joys with each other to form an overall positive bond. During the internship, the greatest number of shifts toward Type D was indicated in relationships with supervisors. This relationship was also noted as key to a positive internship experience. Interns with positive relationships with their mentors reflected on their internship experiences in positive ways. Others who experienced negative interpersonal relationships with their mentors depended on other individuals or relationship group for support to "get through the program;" while others decided that the relationship was not worth fighting and exited from the program.

If an objective of the CSL program is to develop participative leaders with strong interpersonal communication abilities, then a "Balanced Arena" in the direction of Type D would have been ideal.

**Hypothesis 2**

There are no significant differences in Alternates' perceptions of interpersonal communication abilities among three relationship levels as measured by the Johari Personnel Relations Survey (JPRS) instrument.

The finding of no significant differences in Alternates' perceptions regarding Exposure and Feedback was consistent with those findings for Interns.
Interpersonal styles of Alternates from pretest to posttest reflected a negative shift from a balanced (Type A or Type D) to an imbalanced Arena (Type B or Type C); or a shift from a more open Arena of Type D, to a more limited Arena of Type A. The implication may be that the negative shift or non-movement of interpersonal styles may have been the result of Alternates not experiencing the Internship. However, the stronger indication is that these shifts were due to chance error.

Interviews were not conducted with Alternates and therefore additional information was not available to support or negate the findings of this hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 3**

There are no significant differences in Interns’ and Alternates’ perceptions of interpersonal communication abilities among three relationship levels as measured by the Johari Personnel Relations Survey (JPRS) instrument.

The comparison between Interns’ and Alternates’ perceptions on the Mann-Whitney U showed significant differences regarding Exposure and Feedback in relationship with colleagues and for Feedback in relationship with supervisors. A significant difference between Interns and Alternates at the (p < .05) level, in relationships with colleagues, may indicate that the group of Interns were positively influenced by their experiences as a Cohort in the year-long internship. The Mean Rank score was higher for Interns in all
comparisons of the Mann-Whitney U test. The significant difference 
(p < .05) in perceptions of Interns and Alternates regarding Feedback 
in relationship with supervisors, may be attributed to the influence 
of mentors on the Interns during the year-long internship.
Alternates who did not experience the internship may not be as 
trusting of their relationship with supervisors. Therefore they may 
exhibit an overuse of the solicitation of Feedback resulting in the 
Facade which is a dominant feature of a Type B interpersonal style. 
Other comparisons of the Mann-Whitney U did not indicate any 
significant differences.

Hypothesis 4

There is no relationship between Intern's perceptions of 
interpersonal communication abilities and the demographic 
factors of gender, ethnicity, years of educational experience, 
assigned school districts, and pre-selection interview scores.

Through this hypothesis, an attempt was made to determine 
the extent to which five demographic factors of gender, ethnicity, 
educational experience, administrative school district, and interview 
scores could explain any variation in Exposure and Feedback through 
multiple regression analysis. The only significant predictor was the 
pre-selection interview score on Exposure and Feedback in 
relationship to supervisors. Since the pre-selection interview was 
adapted from an instrument that emphasized interpersonal 
competence, the implication was that this predictor variable should
account for a high percentage of variance on the criterion variables in all relationship categories. However, the only significant and positive predictors of both Exposure and Feedback were the interview scores only in relationship with supervisors.

Ancillary Questions

Question #1: Were there any shifts from the pre to post internship in Interns' perceptions regarding the development of interpersonal communication skills?

Analysis of the first question showed that Interns perceived a positive gain in their interpersonal communication abilities during their year-long internship. All nine selected Interns felt they had improved in specific areas, as noted in their interview responses: problem solving; decision-making; and communication skills. Although some improvement was noted under active listening, almost all Interns indicated a need to improve in this area.

As Interns broadened their perspective in the decision making process, from a narrow focus of the classroom to a broader vision for the school, an assumption would be that their Arenas would also open up towards Type D. Several responses indicated that Interns perceived themselves as being more open and competent in interpersonal relationships and communication skills. However, among this group, there were no shifts towards Type D on the post-surveys, with a higher number indicating a preference for Type B, in all three relationship categories. It appears, therefore, that the
Interns differed in their perceptions as reported on the paper/pencil survey and in their interview responses.

Question #2: What components of a principal training program led to increased development of interpersonal communication abilities, as perceived by selected principal Interns?

In response to the second question, Interns identified CSL program components that may have led to increased development of interpersonal communication abilities. The Interns were unanimous in identifying the internship as the major component having a positive impact on the development of interpersonal competence.

**Kolu** - The internship has been the most beneficial of anything.

**Kahi** - I think the actual doing of things...actually working with people, the experience is great.

**Lua** - I think the hands on experience (internship) and having mentors provide the kind of background information that you need in terms of rationale, in terms of processes, in terms of parameters. Its real, it's there, it's practical.
From their responses, it appears that interpersonal skill development resulted more from an experiential base than from any particular aspect of the training. One Intern noted the following:

Ono - That's [interpersonal skill development] one area which I feel that I haven't really gotten training in. I've always been told what we should be doing and these are strengths of an administrator. But I can't remember when somebody has really worked on this with us."

The following illustrates a conflict in perceptions regarding the LSD sessions as a contributing factor:

Ono - I didn't see the LSD sessions as developing people skills at all. I just saw it as a stress factor. What little feedback I got--which is to me working on people's skills--was very confusing. It was never explained to me. I didn't have a sit-down session with the person and say, "Could you explain this to me.... What was this all about?... What specifically did I do or not do?" And there was no interaction except that one sheet of paper that we got the next day. Although the focus could have been to look at certain people skills, I didn't know what to work on because I didn't know if I was doing wrong or good.
Hiku - (to develop people skills) I think the LSD sessions, in interacting with others and accepting what people say. Learning to interact with others and to make each one feel worth their self worth—that I thought was very important. The LSD was the most important because it gave respect to all members. I would like to see the LSD training constantly emphasized in every single seminar.

Interns identified the coursework and case studies as the cause of their increasing levels of stress and frustration. In sharing their perceptions, Interns noted their feelings of being overburdened or overwhelmed; feelings of hopelessness in not having input into the development of the program; feelings of helplessness that their problems were not being addressed. Most of the comments related to the coursework and case studies were in a negative vein as shown in the examples below:

• "The classwork is important but it's so theoretical. I guess it gives you a framework from which to work. In a lot of cases, it's not realistic."
• "If case studies were so important it should have been a learning process, meaning that it should have been spread out throughout the entire year—but it's not a growing thing. It's kind of a one-shot deal, you need to pass three out of the four."
Question #3: How did selected Interns perceive their interpersonal competence in interactions with employees (teachers, staff, students, parents); colleagues (cohort, vice-principals); or supervisors (mentors, professors, CSL program staff)?

The third question referred to Interns' perceptions of interactions with employees (teachers, parents, students, and others); with colleagues (cohort, vice-principals); and with supervisors (mentors, CSL staff, professors). The Interns' perceptions of interpersonal competence and confidence seemed to be highest in relationships with other cohort members. This relationship was described by several Interns, as being a strong supportive bond and their main support in the CSL program.

Relationships with mentors were also noted as a major contributing factor in the Interns' overall professional development. Observations and interviews with the Interns indicated that this relationship is probably the key to the Interns' perceptions of their own interpersonal competence or incompetence. An interpretation of this observation implies that if the relationship between Intern and mentor is positive, then the Intern's perceptions of how she/he interacts with others, is also positive. If the relationship is perceived as negative, the impact on interpersonal relations with others is perceived as difficult or problematic. Tables 13 -15 highlight some of the Interns' interactions with employees, colleagues, and supervisors which were described during the interview sessions.
The observations and interviews did offer additional insight into the findings of this study, particularly through the various examples of interactions that were shared by the Interns. In addition, Interns offered recommendations on how the CSL program could be improved. These recommendations were based on the findings in this study and incorporate other ideas expressed by the selected Interns on the following topics.

Interns' Recommendations

On Mentorship

- "There should be some kind of safeguard for the Intern/mentor relationship experience to accommodate situational conflicts."
- "Encourage positive reinforcement for the cohort."
- "Need to have consistent feedback from mentors whether positive or negative so that more learning can take place."
- "Clarify roles of mentors and monitor on a regular basis."

On Field Experience or Internship

- "Cross-training should be extended because there's not enough time at the site."

On the Requirements of the Program Coursework

- "Take the introductory courses before entering the program because the coursework is overwhelming."
- "Reduce the number of courses taken during the internship from 18 credits to 12."
- "Coursework should be integrated across content areas."
On Leadership Skills Development (LSD) sessions

- "Include the LSD training constantly."
- "Discuss the criteria for evaluation and include discussion sessions related to areas for improvement. Take the guesswork out of these sessions."

On Communication

- "I understand that it's a new program and I understand we need to be flexible as a cohort. I think they need to communicate to us more on a timely basis meaning letting us know what's going on, letting us know what's going to come down on us. Some of the concepts they talk about like collaboration, informing community, etc. are some of the things that they emphasize in the program yet in the decisions for us, it's very minimal."

General Program Recommendations

- "Include a session on time management; coping with stress."
- "There needs to be more collaboration between the segments, mentors, professors and the DOE personnel in charge. Communication seems to be a problem where one arm knows what it's talking about but the other doesn't."
- "There also needs to be more involvement of the cohort in aspects of program development. It seems to be to go through the motions where things are open to the cohort but the bottom line is 'I'll make the decisions.' I feel a little powerless in the whole program. I think the people going
through the program kind of get forgotten. They feel they need to have control over the whole program. I think kind of impersonal at times and I'm a people person."

- "There needs to be more time allotted in the program for reflection among cohort."

Conclusions and recommendations based on the findings of this study are presented in Chapter V.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of Chapter 5 is to review and summarize the problem, methodology and major findings; present conclusions and recommendations; and pose topics and questions that may lead to further research studies.

Summary

Statement of the Problem

As an overview, Chapter I established the context of the problem for this study by establishing the need to improve schools, recognize the changing roles of principals and redesign principal preparation programs. The principal's role, identified as a key factor in school reform, was seen as moving towards transformational leadership where administrators share their leadership with teachers and others in pursuit of higher level common goals. This shift in the school principal's role aligns with the movement of schools in the direction of site-based management which requires competency in communication skills and interpersonal relationship. Interpersonal competence was identified as key to successful and effective leadership through the ability to involve empathy and insight; to heighten awareness in interactions; to give and receive feedback; to
be open in discussing feelings; to depend on trust and shared decision making.

Although shifts have been occurring in the principal's roles and ways in which schools are organized and governed, principal preparation programs have been criticized for not addressing these emerging roles. In Hawaii, as in several other states, the need to redesign its principal preparation program was noted as critical. The Cohort School Leadership (CSL) program was developed through the collaborative efforts of the Hawaii State Department of Education (DOE) and the University of Hawaii's Educational Administration Department. Activities in this administrative training program included a one-year clinically-based field experience or internship with selected mentors; university coursework; case studies; and a series of reflective seminars. Although several studies noted the importance of the human dimension of leadership, not much attention was given to interpersonal competence. In the new CSL program, interpersonal competence for aspiring principals was highlighted as a major area of focus.

The purpose of this study was to test whether or not the Cohort School Leadership (CSL) program had an impact on the development of interpersonal communication abilities of aspiring principals.

A set of research questions led to the development of four null hypotheses. The first three hypotheses were tested for significant differences between the pretest and posttest ratings of Interns and of Alternates; and between Interns and Alternates posttest ratings.
The fourth hypothesis was tested for any relationship between Interns' post-scores and selected demographic factors.

Three ancillary questions guided the interviews and shadow-reflective sessions with nine selected Interns. Responses from these interviews helped to identify general patterns and trends and offered some explanation for the tested hypotheses.

Review of the Literature

In Chapter II, a review of the literature substantiated the changing roles of the principals towards a more transformational leader who must share leadership with others and work more collaboratively to bring about school improvement. Interpersonal competence was identified as fundamental to effective leadership although investigating this phenomenon has been difficult (Bass, 1990). Chapter II also supported the need to identify better models for preparing principals, and better screening techniques to identify a cadre of highly competent school principals. A review of the literature also showed the diversity of principal preparation programs appearing to have no consensus as to what direction they should go (Stover, 1990). Recent studies identified major themes in the preparation of aspiring principals which were incorporated into the CSL program. These were: integrated theory and practice (Anderson, 1990); expanded field experience (Daresh & Playko, 1992; Richards & Fox, 1990); internships under guidance of qualified mentors (Barnett, 1990; Playko, 1990); and problem-based learning
(Bridges & Hallinger, 1991). An overview of the CSL program was presented in Chapter II.

**Methodology**

From the initial population of fifty-two, 36 Interns and 5 Alternates (return of 89%) comprised the final population for which results of this study are reported. A stratified random selection process identified nine Interns for on-site observations and interviews.

The two dependent variables were:

- **Exposure**: interpersonal information known by others or unknown by others in one's relationship with others;
- **Feedback**: interpersonal information known to the self or unknown to the self in one's relationship with others (Luft, 1969; Hall & Williams, 1987).

The Johari Personnel Relations Survey (JPRS), a commercial instrument (Hall & Williams, 1987), was selected for this study because of its intent to measure the interpersonal communication tendencies of individuals through the two variables of Exposure and Feedback. The JPRS was designed to provide the opportunity for managers to assess their own interpersonal style by identifying their communication tendencies in interactions with employees, colleagues and supervisors.

A pretest/posttest quasi-experimental design was used for the quantitative approach to the study. On-site observations, interviews,
and program documents were involved in the qualitative approach to the study. In addition, the JPRS raw scores, converted to percentile scores, identified the individual's interpersonal Arena which extended the interpretation of the quantitative findings. The Arena reflected the leader's tendencies for Types A, B, C, or D where Type D was identified as a balance between the use of Exposure and Feedback and where productivity was expected to increase. Any shift in leadership style towards Type D was considered to be a positive shift in interpersonal competence.

Findings and Discussion

Chapter IV presented the findings and discussion of the hypotheses and ancillary questions.

The related t-tests found no significant differences between the pretest/posttest ratings of Interns' and of Alternates' perceptions of interpersonal communication abilities among three relationship levels. Therefore the first two null hypotheses were not rejected.

The Mann-Whitney U was used to test the third hypothesis and results showed that Interns and Alternates differed (p = .05) in perceptions of Exposure and Feedback in relationships with colleagues and in their perceptions of Feedback in relationship with supervisors. Therefore, three related sub-hypotheses were rejected. The Interns' experiences as a Cohort member, where close bonds with other cohort members or colleagues were indicated, may have accounted for the positive responses of Interns in relationship with
colleagues. Interns' positive perceptions of relationships with supervisors may be attributed to positive experiences with respective mentors in the program. Alternates who did not experience the internship as a cohort assigned to mentors, may not be as open in their relationship with colleagues or as trusting in their relationships with supervisors.

Multiple Regression prediction equations were developed to test the fourth hypothesis and to identify any percentage of variance on the Interns' post-survey scores which could be explained by the demographic factors of gender, ethnicity, years of educational experience, administrative school district and pre-selection interview scores. The beta coefficients revealed that only the composite score on the pre-selection interview figured prominently in the prediction, and only with regards to Feedback in relationship with supervisors. One would have expected the pre-selection interview to be a positive predictor in all relationship categories, since the "Ventures in Excellence" instrument was heavily weighted towards positive human relationships. The significance of the pre-selection interview to Feedback scores in relationship with supervisors indicated the Interns' willingness to deal openly and candidly with supervisors.

Responses to the first ancillary question indicated that Interns perceived a positive gain in their interpersonal communication abilities during the year long internship, especially in the areas of problem-solving, decision-making and communication skills. All noted that they needed improvement in active listening skills. There
were no observed shifts to Type D or a balanced Arena in Interns' relationships with employees.

With regards to the second ancillary question, the field-based experience or internship was noted by all who were interviewed as the major component contributing to the development of interpersonal competence. This was not reflected in the JPRS self-assessment survey. Conflicting perceptions of the Leadership Skills Development (LSD) sessions, as both a positive and negative factor in the development of interpersonal communication skills, were expressed. On one hand Interns felt the LSD sessions provided them with opportunities to interact with others, accept other people's ideas, gain a sense of self worth, and develop a sensitivity to the needs of others. On the other hand, a few Interns felt "stressed out" by the activity because of the structure and lack of meaningful feedback. Several commented on the fact that they did not know what they were being evaluated on and therefore did not know what to work on for their self-improvement.

Coursework and case studies were identified by several Interns as the cause of increasing levels of stress and frustration. They noted feelings of being overburdened and of hopelessness that problems were not being addressed. In some cases, classwork was noted as important but too theoretical and in many cases, not realistic nor relevant to the field experience.

Perceptions of interactions with employees, colleagues and supervisors were revealed in the Interns' responses to the third
ancillary question. The most frequent reference to positive interactions were noted in interactions with other cohort Interns. Relationships with mentors were also referred to as key to the Interns' overall professional development. In addition, the relationship of the Intern with the mentor was critical to the success of the internship.

The following section presents conclusions drawn from the findings of this study.

Conclusions

The primary conclusion of this study is that the Cohort School Leadership (CSL) program did not have a significant impact on the development of interpersonal communication abilities of Interns, as indicated by the quantitative analyses of the Johari Personnel Relations Survey (JPRS) results. However, extended interpretation of these results and responses to interviews showed that positive shifts in the development of interpersonal communication abilities were noted for Interns. Therefore, the secondary conclusion of this study is that positive gains in the development of interpersonal communication abilities of Interns did occur as a result of the CSL program.

Interns responses on the self-assessment survey showed positive shifts toward Type D or a large balanced Arena, especially in
relationship with colleagues (11% increase) and in relationship with supervisors (14%). The qualitative study supported this positive perception as Interns indicated that the internship gave them the opportunity to develop close bonds with other cohort members or colleagues, and with their mentors or supervisors. Further support for this conclusion showed that while positive shifts toward interpersonal competence were noted for Interns, negative shifts were noted for Alternates. Results of their survey responses showed a decrease in Type D (large balanced Arena) with a preference for Type B (overuse of feedback solicitation, quasi-supportive of others) in relationship with employees and supervisors; and for Type A (minimal use of feedback and exposure processes, impersonal approach to interpersonal relationship) in relationship with colleagues. The Type B preference of Alternates reflected a preference to create a climate of undue permissiveness as a way of avoiding potential negative interactions with employees and supervisors. Alternates did not experience the internship where opportunities to bond with other colleagues or mentors may have taken place.

While positive shifts were noted for Interns in relationship with colleagues and supervisors, there was some indication that Interns still felt uncomfortable in their interactions with teachers because they perceived their relationship with these employees to be at a peer level. It was further indicated that the roles of Interns in
interactions with teachers were unclear on the part of both Interns and teachers.

The difference between the conclusions drawn from the quantitative and qualitative analyses of this study may indicate what Interns "know" or do not know about themselves and others in relationship with others. However, the JPRS may not be a sufficient enough instrument to identify how Interns "feel" about their interpersonal relationships with others. The findings may also imply that individual knowledge of interpersonal competence may not be consistently translated into appropriate interpersonal behaviors when interacting with others. An individual may have knowledge of interpersonal communication, but competence may not be achieved unless individuals have the opportunity to practice the related and appropriate behaviors. Interns noted in the interviews that interpersonal skill development resulted more from an experiential base rather than from any particular aspect of the training. In light of this, program developers may have to determine if interpersonal communication abilities can be acquired at the cognitive level through direct curricular components, and if so, make adaptations to the CSL program as necessary. If not, then what experiences should be provided to support the development of interpersonal communication abilities?

The concept of time may also be a way of perceiving the impact of a principal preparation program on aspiring principals. Interns indicated a lack of time for desired interactions or reflections with
others, especially with other cohort members. Some teachers indicated a lack of time for Interns to implement their "School Improvement Plans" (SIP) at the schools in such a short period of time. The conclusion of this study may come into question if one asks, "Is it feasible to expect a positive impact after a year-long internship?" Perhaps the positive impact can only be measured over a longer period of time. The implication is that in the long term, positive results may be forthcoming with regards to the impact of a principal preparation program on the interpersonal communication abilities of aspiring principals.

If we value interpersonal communication abilities of school administrators, then some relevant changes need to address this important skill development. Although the CSL program professed to be highly human relations oriented, it may not have provided the necessary instruction or experiences to directly support interpersonal relationship development.

In light of the conclusions drawn from this study, the following recommendations are offered.
Recommendations

The major recommendation of this study is to conduct an assessment of the curriculum itself in order to identify the behavioral aspects of the principal preparation program which lead to the development of interpersonal communication abilities. Such professional preparation programs should be flexible enough to allow for continual improvement through the involvement of program developers as well as program participants. An environment needs to be created which supports and encourages program staff and participants to share their experiences and knowledge and interact with each other in positive and meaningful ways.

The following recommendations are offered for the improvement of preparation programs for aspiring principals:

• Create a climate for open communication where program leaders and participants can trust their professional relationships and feel safe in sharing their successes as well as their areas for improvement.

• Clarify the roles of mentors and interns with regards to the year-long internship.

• Establish a mechanism for changing cohort/mentor assignments during the internship as appropriate and/or necessary to promote a "win/win" situation for both cohort and mentor.
• Require introductory coursework for aspiring principals which would give them an overview of the field with an emphasis on the human factors in educational administration. These courses would be a prerequisite to applying to the administrative preparation program.

• Integrate coursework across major program strands and consistently relate the theoretical coursework to the field-based internship.

• Provide consistent monitoring and feedback which would allow individuals to develop a high level of competency in interpersonal communication.

• Include a leadership skills inventory which emphasizes interpersonal relationships as part of the initial screening process for aspiring principals.

• Allow for more reflective time among cohort members, interns mentors and program developers/evaluators.

Implications for Further Research

Further research is required to contribute to this field of leadership study. Instruments which go beyond self-perception to include the perceptions of others would strengthen the validity of such studies. Research on other aspects of interpersonal communication abilities should be undertaken to guide aspiring
principals to effectively work with and lead others in the school/community. A follow-up of the first cohort in their assigned principalships would extend the findings of this study.

Future experimental design studies can be implemented to incorporate and identify intervening variables like the human factors addressed in this study. The integration of quantitative and qualitative research can provide the opportunity to evaluate the leadership curricular component in light of how it addresses values which may be an integral part of interpersonal competence.

The following questions could also serve as the basis for further research:

• Should administrative preparation programs continue to place a heavy emphasis on human relationships?
• How can training programs ensure a balance of leadership tendencies towards exposure and feedback in interpersonal communication?
• What tools do school leaders need to enhance their ability to deal with diversity in working with their respective school communities?
• What role does the mentor play in the development of an intern's interpersonal communication abilities?
• What competencies of interpersonal communication impact on transformational leadership?
Further studies would contribute to the improvement of training programs for aspiring leaders and emphasize the responsibility of professional preparation programs to develop effective school leaders for the 21st century. As principals are key to the success of school improvement, interpersonal communication may be the key factor of effective and transformational leadership.
APPENDIX A

COHORT SCHOOL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

INTERVIEW GUIDE: Phase IV, 2nd Summer Session
Approximate time: 30 minutes

Date of Interview: ______________
Name of Interviewee: ________________________

Background Information Concerning the Interviewee

A. Professional Background
   1. Prior position
      a. Level (check one)
         Elementary
         Middle/Ir. High
         High School
         District Level
         State Level
      b. District/Island
         __________________________
      c. Length of time with DOE
         ________ years

   2. Length of time as an educator
      ________ years
      a. Other positions held in education
         __________________________
      b. Level(s)
         __________________________

   3. Length of time with HI State DOE
      ________ years

B. Educational Preparation
   1. Undergraduate Degree
      ________ Yr. ______
      Major
      Minor

   2. Graduate Degree
      ________ Yr. ______
      Major
      Cognate
Questions Related to Experience in Leadership Skill Development (LSD) sessions: Phase III.

A. What criteria do you think were used to assess your performance in the LSD sessions? (Identify if any of the following are discussed)
   - show interest in statements made by others
   - has sense of humor
   - values people and helps them grow, develop, and attain high levels of achievement and performance
   - works well with group members
   - is accepting of different perceptions
   - participates in attainment of group objectives
   - sensitive to group or individual feelings and ideas
   - enables others to contribute
   - has ability to respond positively to others
   - gains cooperation of others
   - facilitates and helps others to conceptualize
   - is sought after by others for direction
   - is sincere and supportive
   - is diplomatic, tactful, and considerate
   - uses high level of interaction with all to maintain open communication.

B. How do you know this?

C. Please describe your feelings or reactions to these sessions.

D. How did you know what to do in order to improve your performance in the LSD sessions?
   1. In what ways do you feel you made positive gains during the LSD sessions?
   2. What type of feedback did you receive?

E. As you worked in groups:
   1. What strengths did you feel you brought to the group sessions?
   2. What do you think you need to improve in order to be a positive member of the group?
   3. What behaviors did you like in others as they interacted with the group?
   4. What negative behaviors in others did you observe during the group sessions?
F. In your role as group leader, what strategies or skills did you use to promote group and/or individual effectiveness?

1. How did these strategies of skills differ in your role as a participating member of the group and your role as a group leaders?

**Questions related to interpersonal communication abilities/competence.**

A. What are some of the key elements of interpersonal communication/competence?

B. Why do you feel these are important?
   - sensitivity towards others
   - multi-dimensional communication
   - positive relationships

C. How does an individual acquire or develop these skills?

D. Do you perceive any differences in the ways members of the "new" cohort and the "SATP" group interact with one another?

E. In Phase IV or the second summer session, describe one activity which you felt enhanced positive interpersonal relationships among the cohort.
APPENDIX B

COHORT SCHOOL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

INTERVIEW GUIDE: Phase V, Mid-Internship (Cross-Training)
Approximate time: 60 - 90 minutes
(Shadow-Observation/Reflection)

The following questions are examples of those asked of the selected group of Interns at their respective sites during their cross-training assignments. Questions were guided by an interest in identifying interpersonal communication abilities/skills, interactions with various groups, and components leading to skill development. However, specific questions were related to on-site shadowing/observations and Interns' responses during the interviews.

- Since the beginning of the Cohort School Leadership Program, how do you feel that you've improved in the following areas like problem solving?
  - How do you explain...?
  - Where did you gain that kind of knowledge...experience...?
  - Please describe one of those incidents.
  - How did you find that out...?
  - (example of clarification question) But nobody came directly to you? Okay, what about in the area of active listening?
  - What leadership skills do you identify as important in being a good listener...? So therefore, what do you think is necessary for active listening? Now you said before that you could improve in this area?
  - Have you been in a situation where you've had to deal with controversy? Now this could be with students, with staff, with mentors or cohort, with anybody that you've come into contact? Would you describe...?
  - So the approach was such where you...?
  - If you were the administrator in that situation, what would you do?
Do you see other resources that you could introduce to that group to help them?

As you reflect back on how this went from the time you got there until now, is there a different approach that you could have taken whether it be during this year or in years past?

Have any questions come up from them in regards to your training?

So the feedback you're getting from the vice-principals who came through a different kind of training . . . has been more positive or negative?

Have you had any other interactions with teachers from your first site or from here?

What happened . . . ? And so what follow-up did you have with them?

In what ways have you been involved in supervision?

Can we go back to something you said earlier.

What about your interactions with your former mentor?

Have you interacted with the community members here?

Were there other committees that you served on? What role did you play on that committee?

Can you describe a positive interaction between a teacher and students that you would be looking for?

One of the things that you noted as being important in supervising teachers was to see their interactions with students. What would you say was important in observing and evaluating principals?

So whose interactions do you think are important in watching the principal. With whom should the principal be interacting?

In thinking about your experience in the program from the summer until now, what kinds of things or what aspects of your training have contributed to your professional development?

Do you see any difference in the way that you've been working with people from the beginning of your training to now?

Why is that?

Okay, you mentioned interactions with several people as being important in several instances. Can you identify anything particular in the program
That has led to that development? What do you think has led to that kind of development?

• As a cohort, what part of your training would you identify as leading to positive interpersonal communication?

• Has your internship met your expectations?

• Is there any aspect in your professional development that you feel the training program still needs to address? (e.g.- Oh, how to work with people, especially staff...how to move a large group of people with only a minority of people believing in what you're doing and moving in the same direction)

• What things did you pick up in your training that you feel were really important?

• What would you say about your relationship with the cohort?

• Whose responsibility do you think that might be?

• And you also said that one of the things that you did pick up in your training had to do with interpersonal relationships. What in the training do you feel led to that? (e.g.- The suffering itself together has built a pact. We all try to help each one go to make it. That's basically it...you know when you suffer together you love each other more. You come from the same background...).

• Do you see any difference in the first group of new cohort members as being any different from the carryover SAT group?

• Is there anything you would like to talk to me about with regards to your training or do you have any questions for me?
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