**CHERYL GRANADE SULLIVAN**

**Theory Z for Supervisors**

The supervisor is the one in the middle—the individual responsible for receiving information from one source and passing it on to others in a way that makes them willing to respond. William Clark and Henry Houser suggest that under Theory Z assumptions, this middle role becomes more positive: the supervisor serves as a coordinator rather than a buffer or information block.

Theory Z has been defined in many ways. Most sources agree that essential components include clearly defined organizational goals and objectives that are determined and pursued in a participative atmosphere. The supervisor who subscribes to Theory Z must balance concern for organizational needs with concern for individuals. Clark and Houser cite M. Scott Myers' work in describing the Theory Z supervisor as one who:

- Participates with people in problem solving and goal setting.
- Gives people access to information they want.
- Creates situations for optimum learning.
- Explains the rules and the consequences of violation and mediates conflict.
- Allows people to set goals.
- Teaches improvement techniques to employees.
- Enables people to pursue and move into growth opportunities.
- Recognizes achievements and helps people learn from their failures.
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**ROLAND S. BARTH**

**The Professional Development of Principals**

The world seems to have rediscovered the school principal. Central office administrators, state department officials, and university researchers have come to recognize what most teachers, parents, and students have known right along—the quality of a school is related to the quality of its leadership. Three responses to this realization are becoming growth industries across the land: a move to strengthen the preservice training and certification of aspiring principals so that those who move into the principal's office are prepared to use it wisely and effectively; renewed attention to the process for selecting principals so that those most likely to be successful leaders are given the opportunity; and the proliferation of activities to promote the professional development of practicing principals.

Heretofore the repertoire of staff development activities for principals has been meager. When asked how they find professional replenishment, principals report informal activities such as reading and conversations with fellow principals, university course work, inservice programs within a district, programs offered by national organizations such as the National Associations of Elementary and Secondary School Principals, and activities devised by private foundations.

Several factors now promise to expand this list dramatically. Principals' longevity on the job continues to far exceed that of superintendents and even teachers. Time invested in principals will pay off over time. And the central message from the burgeoning field of adult development is that grown-ups continue to grow. Rather than being completed or finished, adults learn and change and develop throughout their lives. Furthermore, every principal has a context for learning, access to primary source material—a school—and motivation to learn. Most want to do the job better and perhaps with greater ease. The school, then, can be an important locus for adult learning.

The current surge of interest in the professional development of principals is accompanied by many encouraging signs. Most staff development for principals has been something done to principals by others. Inservice has commonly been prescribed from outside; it has frequently met with resistance and resentment from inside. Now more and more principals are voluntarily engaging as learners. Moreover, many are exercising leadership and ownership in their professional growth. At the Harvard Principals' Center we are assembling a directory of such activities around the country. We
are finding principals involved in creating and helping to run their own staff development activities; others who design their own programs and formats; and, perhaps most important, many who are enlisting themselves as resources for others so they may share their enormous and often concealed craft knowledge. Taboos that have long discouraged one school leader from openly sharing ideas and problems with others are giving way to heartening forms of collegiality.

Why is it so vital to support and sustain these emerging forms of professional growth? Because the more the principal learns, the better the principal performs. The better the principal performs, the better teachers and students will perform. Support the learning of principals so scores go up, parents remain satisfied, and discipline problems decrease. That is compelling reasoning. It is the reasoning of policy makers such as Senator Chafee of Rhode Island, who has introduced a bill to support the creation of principal centers in all of the federal regions.

Compelling as this logic may be, I find it a small answer to a bigger question; important but not sufficient. The higher ground is to support the learning of school principals because learning is in and of itself a precious value that too many principals have been deprived of by the burden of ascribed omniscience. Principals are people, and one of the noblest characteristics of humans is the capacity to learn. Learning is a sign of life. Nineteenth century feminist Elizabeth Cady Stanton put it squarely, "Self-development is a higher duty than self-sacrifice."

A school is above all a community of learners. Principals are members of that community and entitled to engage in its most important enterprise. When a principal is alive and growing, so are teachers, so are students, and so is the school. Indeed, there is no more potent way for a principal to create a community of learners than by engaging in and modeling learning.
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Humanities Education—

long the subject of vigorous debate in the United States, is currently undergoing renewed, even impassioned, scrutiny. Indeed, although most educators agree that English, history, and foreign languages should be taught in American high schools, heated—frequently skeptical—discussion of the place and purpose of the humanities in the curriculum has become a significant focus of the growing national concern with excellence in education.

In response, Holmes & Meier is pleased to offer two new works that examine this very topic.

AGAINST MEDIOCRITY
The Humanities in America's High Schools
edited by Chester E. Finn, Jr., Diane Ravitch, and Robert T. Fancher

Distinguished scholars, educators, and educational policy makers assess existing high-school humanities programs and suggest workable means of improving the quality and value of teaching.

"The essays in Against Mediocrity are excellent. All of them are written in English, not educationese, and several of them...are deeply moving...The strong language and blunt conclusions of Against Mediocrity are welcome." —The New York Times Book Review

276 pp. cl. $29.50 pa. $11.50

CHALLENGES TO THE HUMANITIES
edited by Chester E. Finn, Jr., Diane Ravitch, and Holley Roberts

In this provocative volume, the fundamental challenges to the humanities are addressed by leading scholars and educators. As in the related work, Against Mediocrity, their spirited yet purposeful examination of such topics as the humanities and democracy in America, the humanities and our cultural heritage, and the humanities vis-a-vis the social and natural sciences consistently links sound humanities teaching to an overall rise in educational quality.

spring 1985 250 pp.

SCHOOLING FOR THE PEOPLE
Comparative Local Studies of Schooling History in France and Germany, 1750-1850
Mary Jo Maynes

new 250 pp. $35.00 est.
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