"Machiavelli and education: the principal of power."

Jarold Frederic Tomas

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1

Recommended Citation
https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1/3818

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.
"MACHIAVELLI AND EDUCATION:
THE PRINCIPAL OF POWER"

A Dissertation Presented
By
Jerold Frederic Tomas

Submitted to the Graduate School of the University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
Organizational Development/Higher Education/Leadership and Administration

April 1973
MACHIAVELLI AND EDUCATION:
THE PRINCIPAL OF POWER

A Dissertation

By

Jerold Frederic Tomas
B.S. University of Bridgeport
M.Ed. University of Massachusetts

Approved as to style and content by:

[Signatures of faculty members with dates]
DEDICATED TO

Marjorie McKee Blanchard
whose enthusiasm and support
served as an inspiration for
this undertaking.

Kenneth H. Blanchard
whose effectiveness as a
colleague, instructor and
counselor is overshadowed
only by his friendship.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part I: The Evolution of Leadership Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part II: The Difficulty of the Principal's Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>THE PRINCIPLE OF POWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHAPTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>ON INSTITUTIONALIZATION AND ESPECIALLY THAT OF EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTES ON CHAPTER I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>THE POTENTIAL FOR COMPLACENCY IN THE PRINCIPALSHIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTES ON CHAPTER II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>OF SCHOOLS WITH ADMINISTRATORS OF MIXED MOTIVATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTES ON CHAPTER III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>WHY THE STAFF OF A SCHOOL DID NOT REJECT A COMPETENT PRINCIPAL'S SUCCESSOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTES ON CHAPTER IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>THE WAY TO PRINCIPAL A SCHOOL THAT PREVIOUS TO A NEW ADMINISTRATION LIVED UNDER ITS OWN RULE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTES ON CHAPTER V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>OF CALLOUSNESS AND SENSITIVITY AND LOOSENESS AND TIGHTNESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTES ON CHAPTER XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>OF CONSISTENCY AND CLEMENCY AND WHETHER IT IS BETTER TO BE LOVED OR FEARED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTES ON CHAPTER XVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>IN WHAT WAY A PRINCIPAL MUST KEEP FAITH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTES ON CHAPTER XVII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>WHETHER FORTRESSES AND OTHER THINGS WHICH PRINCIPALS OFTEN CONTRIVE ARE USEFUL OR INJURIOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTES ON CHAPTER XVIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>HOW A PRINCIPAL MUST ACT IN ORDER TO GAIN REPUTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTES ON CHAPTER XIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>OF THE ASSISTANTS AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF OF THE PRINCIPAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTES ON CHAPTER XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI</td>
<td>HOW FLATTERERS MUST BE SHUNNED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTES ON CHAPTER XXI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII</td>
<td>WHY PRINCIPALS HAVE LOST THEIR SCHOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTES ON CHAPTER XXII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII</td>
<td>HOW MUCH FORTUNE CAN DO AND HOW IT MAY BE OPPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTES ON CHAPTER XXIII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXIV EXHORTATION</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTES ON THE EXHORTATION</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV CONCLUSION</th>
<th>212</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Blind Men and the Leader*

It was six men of Academe
To Learning much inclined,
Who went to see the Leader
Though each of them was blind
That each by observation
Might satisfy his mind.

The first approached the Leader
And happening to fall
Upon procedure manuals,
At once began to bawl,
"God bless me but the Leader
Is mighty like a wall."

The second, hearing of his wrath
Cried "Ho! what have we here--
A tongue which sometimes lashes out.
To me, 'tis mighty clear,
This creature of a Leader
Is something we should fear!"

The third approached the Leader
And happening to note
A change in policy so soon
Without the chance to vote,
"I see," quoth he, "the Leader
Does also have a moat!"

The fourth reached out an eager mind
To see what he could glean
From studying him at work and play.
"Tis mighty plain. It seems
This wonder of a Leader
Is only a machine."
The fifth who chanced to chat with him
  Said, "E'en the blindest man
Can tell what this resembles most--
  Deny the fact who can.
This marvel of a windbag
  Is very like a fan!"

The sixth no sooner had begun
  To study from anear
Than seizing on his goal
  Shouted as would a nickelodeon
"Tis obvious to anyone--
  Behold the custodian!"

And so these men of Academe
  Chorused loud and long
(Each in his own opinion
  Exceeding stiff and strong)
"A Leader is as we thought."
  And all were in the wrong!

So oft in academic halls
  The chorusers, I ween,
Rail on in utter ignorance
  Of how the real world's seen
And prate about a Leader
  Not one of them has been!

*Adapted from an anonymous poem entitled "The Blind Men and the Manager" that appeared in the March-April 1971 Harvard Business Review.
Statement of the Problem

The bulk of what is being added to the growing field of leadership study has had as its origin the administrative thought of the past 70 years. At the same time, recent developments in research capability have made complex research designs and statistical data almost a necessity for the construction of modern theory. Yet, the leadership ideas of one man, espoused more than 450 years ago are increasingly developing greater significance.

The purpose of this study is to bring to today's practitioners the basic leadership theory of Niccolò Machiavelli in a form which will make it more useful to them, as well as substantiate a claim that current leadership theory is to a large extent a restatement of Machiavelli's theories as expressed in The Prince. These goals are to be accomplished by placing the examples of leadership behavior outlined in The Prince into current circumstance and by integrating selected modern leadership theories into that of The Prince.

Need for the Study

In one respect Machiavelli's leadership theory stands apart from nearly all other pioneer efforts in leadership study in that he deals with the issues of power
and compliance in a way that has made his name synonymous with that of the Devil.¹ Born more than 500 years ago, Machiavelli observed the methods and performance of Savonarola, Caesar Borgia, Emperor Maxmillian, and Charles VIII of France.

It was thus that Machiavelli was in a position to become the first modern analyst of power. Where others looked at figureheads, he kept his eyes glued behind the scenes. He sought the ultimate propulsion of events.²

For most of his life, Machiavelli was a strategist, advisor, braintrustee, or what we would call today a consultant. The conceptual base of his contribution to leadership is, for the most part, contained in The Prince. Machiavelli's importance to the study of power has been noted by Lerner, who states

It has become a truism to point out that Machiavelli is the father of power politics. Whether a truism or not, it is still true. Machiavelli, as ambassador and administrator, could not afford to do any wishful thinking. If he did, the penalty was swift and merciless—failure. Which may not be a bad idea as a school for political theorists. But to say that he was the father of power politics may have curiously erroneous implications—as if we were to say that Harvey was the father of the circulation of the blood. Power politics existed before Machiavelli was ever heard of; it will exist long after his name is only a faint memory. What he did, like Harvey, was to recognize its existence and subject it to scientific study. And so, his name has come to be associated with it.³

Machiavelli's thought, transposed into modern terms, diagnosed the need for strong, decisive management and the strict delegation of power to achieve the effective operation of an organization.
The disciple of Machiavelli, we are led to believe, is one who is a schemer, one who is a deceitful and wicked plotter against authority, one who wields power efficiently and without mercy. It is unfortunate but "it is true that a good book, like a sound scientific discovery, may be put to humanly undesirable uses without vitiating its central truth."\(^4\)

It is felt that Machiavelli's observations of leader behavior are truly exceptional, and that current leadership theory is, to a large extent, predated by similar observations made by him. The Prince highlights, for the behavioral scientist as well as the practitioner, similar social and psychological complexities of leadership.

Koontz's statement concerning input of this type is of interest. In reference to the overwhelming flood of literature on leadership and administration during the recent past, he states his concern about "the tendency for many newcomers in the field to cast aside the significant observations and analysis of the past on the grounds that they are a priori . . ."\(^5\)

Koontz further states

To make the assumption that distilled experiences of men such as these represent a priori reasoning is to forget that experience in and with managing is empirical. While the conclusions that perceptive and experienced practitioners of the art of management make are not infallible, they represent an experience which is certainly not 'arm chair'. No one could deny, I feel sure, that the ultimate test of accuracy of
management theory must be practice, and management theory and science must be developed from reality.

Lee, in a recent article in the Harvard Business Review, goes on to explain that

Most behavioral theorists have known for years how an organization and its management style should be changed to bring about tremendous improvement in morale and productivity. Executives, managers, and administrators who have been exposed to Modern Human Resource Management Theories appear to have adopted their findings not at all.

The significance, practicality, and timeliness of The Prince should become apparent in the course of this study.

Related Research

References to The Prince appear frequently, most of them are made by people who have never read more than a line or two. However, the more knowledgeable commentators place The Prince in the context of political science. There appears to be little treatment of the relationship of The Prince (or Machiavelli for that matter) to the concepts which, collectively can be called Leadership Studies. Research in the index of periodicals, such as the Harvard Education Review, Harvard Business Review, Administrative Science Quarterly, The Education Index, as well as the Reader’s Guide to Periodical Literature, reveals no attempt to integrate the leadership theory of The Prince with current leadership studies or vice versa.
What is done directly or indirectly reinforces the notion that Machiavellianism is a decided evil. Yet, the most broadly defined concept of leadership equates it with the process of interpersonal influence. Formulations by French, French and Raven (1959), Etzioni (1961), and others imply such a definition.

Definition, Assumptions, and Limitations of the Study

The use of the terms Leader, Leadership, Leadership Theory, and Practitioner are for the purpose of this study defined as follows:

Leader - The individual who directs and coordinates the relevant activity and thus assumes the primary responsibility for the performance of these functions.

Leadership - The process by which individuals are induced to attain goals.

Leadership Theory - A codified set of assumptions about the process of leadership from which a set of principles are derived, so that the nature of the leadership act can be explained.

Practitioner - Individuals whose major activity on a daily basis includes, while working with others, planning, controlling, and coordinating the allocation of resources in order to facilitate the accomplishment of the task. (Synonymous with executive, headmaster, principal, supervisor, administrator, manager, Dean).
It is important to realize that for the purpose of this study all leaders are practitioners, but all practitioners are not leaders, although they have the potential.

The use of the term "leader" and its derivatives implies a certain commonality among the types of leadership and the locale in which it occurs; that is to say, it is believed that there are universals at the most common level that apply to these functions, regardless of the circumstance in which they are exhibited.

Example: A "decision-making" theory which attempts to explain leadership behavior by using a set of decision making concepts and assumptions would be valid for the investigation of the ways decisions are made and carried out in schools, business, or country clubs. Those that apply this theory could come up with entirely different information for the school, business, or country club based on the circumstances in each case.

Therefore, the theories of leadership that will be integrated will be utilized in part on the basis of their currency, rather than their inclusion in the formal discipline of educational administration.

The Leadership theory of Machiavelli is incorporated in The Prince. As indicated, much of what he had to say has never been carefully analyzed in terms of the usefulness for today's practitioners. Indeed, it would seem that
today's leadership students are disinterested in Machiavelli's thoughts as they pertain to leadership theory. It is the intention here to transpose Machiavelli's observations into educational examples and integrate current leadership theory in order to enhance its utility to educational practitioners.

No attempt at biography is intended, for the limitations of this study preclude such an endeavor.

**Design of the Study.**

The study is basically comparative and analytic. The transposition of The Prince into educational examples will be based on the following: The currency of the example taking into account how well it compares to the situation Machiavelli relates; the interdisciplinary value of the example, i.e. on the degree that it is representative of and approximates real situations, as well as to the extent the example would be helpful to students of educational administration. This latter qualifier confines the proposed study to the area of immediate interest and helps establish a suitable framework for its achievement.

The current leadership theories that will be integrated will be selected on the following basis: The degree they serve as tools of analysis for The Prince as transposed, their interdisciplinary value, that is, on the degree that it is representative of leadership theory regardless of the
discipline, and the extent that they would be helpful to students of educational administration on a re-occurring basis. This latter qualifier also serves to confine the study to the area of immediate interest, as well as establish a suitable framework for its achievement.

The study will commence in the following sequence: first, an overview of leadership studies, followed by the transposition of The Prince into an educational framework, including the integration of current leadership theory. The final chapter will be a summary and an attempt to validate the claim that Machiavelli's work in this area predated and includes many of the current theories.
FOOTNOTES


3Ibid., p. XLII-XLIII.

4Gauss, op. cit., p. 8.


8Lerner, op. cit., p. XXXV.


The term "leadership" has come into increasingly greater use in recent times, and as a result it has undoubtedly lost much of its original meaning. As noted earlier, for the purposes of this paper, leadership is defined as "the process by which individuals are induced to attain goals." Consequently, this chapter, entitled, "Survey of the Literature," deals with the following areas:

1) a survey of the evolution of leadership studies tracing the development of the "trait" or "characteristics" approach through the evolution into the "situational" approach.

2) an overview of the difficulties of the role of principals in schools.

PART I: The Evolution of Leadership Theory

Leadership Studies

Many of the problems confronting those inquiring into the phenomenon of leadership can be traced to the realization that concepts of leadership have continually evolved and changed throughout the course of history. Although leadership as a subject of systematic, scientific study has only been explored in depth for about 50 years, it would appear that an exhaustive body of information has been developing. That which has been submitted as "evidence" concerning leadership has come from numerous disciplines and a wide range of
orientations. It becomes evident that there is no uniform agreement concerning the leadership "function" or the leadership "process."

As this paper is concerned with the process of leadership, the literature was surveyed in order to trace the development of "modern" leadership studies.

**Trait or Characteristics Approach**

"Early" researchers of the leadership phenomenon concerned themselves with the personal qualities of the leaders they studied. In this way those who studied leadership concentrated on traits per se, suggesting that there were certain qualities that were essential for effective leadership. These inherent qualities were transferable from situation to situation.

It was postulated that leaders were "born" and resulting, in any situation a leader would emerge. Thus the "secrets" of leadership were thought to be the characteristics of those who induced others to attain goals. The early studies tried to discover the traits of leaders that differentiated them from followers.

Research was designed and undertaken to measure the intellectual, physical and emotional traits of leaders. These studies tended to concentrate on the leader to the exclusion of subordinates and/or the situations in which leaders and followers were found. Observations as follows were often made:

...leaders were older, taller, heavier, more athletic, better appearing, and brighter than followers. Leaders can be considered superior to followers in scholarship, knowledge, insight,
originality, adaptability, initiative, responsibility, persistence, self-confidence, emotional control, sociability, tact, popularity, prestige and cooperativeness.

From the foregoing one is able to discern that the early studies paid close attention to leadership as a personal quality or a special combination of personal characteristics.

Lee Gordon Peters sees as an inherent problem of the trait approach the lack of a constant definition of leadership. Peters observed that without a common definition investigators couldn't possibly agree to "what was being studied," and traits or characteristics that were studied were often unilaterally selected by the investigator. As a result, the important characteristics were apt to be no more than someone's opinion of the traits a leader should possess.

Traits of Leaders

Gerald Zimmerman analyzed 50 books and magazine articles concerning leadership and generated a list of more than 200 traits he felt writers pinpointed concerning leadership. In all, courage was listed by 30 per cent of the writers; intelligence by 28 per cent; vision by 26 per cent, initiative by 16 per cent; insight, personality, openmindedness, each listed by 14 per cent; knowledge was listed by 12 per cent; self-confidence, sympathy, energy and sincerity were each listed by 10 per cent. An examination of trait lists developed over the years such as the one developed by Zimmerman allows one to see that there are very few items of commonality.
Charles Bird, after making an exhaustive study of research pertaining to leadership, concluded that only .5 percent of the discovered characteristics were actually common in the research he examined.  

Ralph Stogdill examined 124 studies concerned with identifying personality traits of leaders and their relationship to leadership. He concluded that:

A person does not become a leader by virtue of some combination of traits, but the pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relationship to the characteristics of the followers. Thus, leadership must be conceived in terms of interactions of variables which are in constant flux and change.

A survey of 200 leadership studies by Robert Meyers came to a conclusion similar to Stogdill's. Meyers suggests that leaders appeared slightly higher in intelligence. In addition, Meyers suggests that traits such as initiative, originality, insight, knowledge, judgment, emotional stability, popularity, persistence, cooperation, and good communication skills seemed to be significant to leaders and "These characteristics denote qualities of an interactional nature," and "no single characteristic is a possession of all leaders."  

Trait Approach--Conclusion

Literature reviews of research using the trait approach reveal few significant findings or as Eugene Jennings states: "Fifty years of study have failed to produce one personality trait or set of qualities that can be used to discriminate
leaders and non-leaders."\textsuperscript{10} Thus it would seem that leadership is not the possession of specific traits that are applicable in all situations at all times. It appears that individuals do not become leaders because they possess traits, for the "pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities and goals of the followers."\textsuperscript{11} The foregoing impresses upon us that leadership is a way of acting that induces individuals to attain goals.

**Situational Leadership**

From the preceding it would seem that studies that attempt to analyze leadership would do well to examine the situations leaders are involved in, groups they are involved with, as well as the leader's actions, for

A situational-functional orientation to the leadership phenomenon literally cries out for some description of leadership as an act or process . . . leadership situationally and functionally can be viewed as the performance of acts which assist a group in achieving . . .\textsuperscript{12}

Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard go on to say that:

The focus in the situational approach to leadership is on observed behavior, not on any hypothetical inborn or acquired ability or potential leadership. The emphasis is on the behavior of leaders and their group members (followers) and various situations. In situational leadership, the discussion is in terms of leader behavior rather than leadership traits, thus emphasizing the situational approach to leadership.\textsuperscript{13}

Krech and Crutchfield\textsuperscript{14} restrict leadership to a set of functions dealing specifically with fourteen tasks as follows:
executive, planner, policy maker, expert, external group representative, controller of internal relationships, purveyor of rewards and punishments, arbitrator, exemplar, group symbol, surrogate for individual responsibility, ideologist, father figure and scapegoat.

The point is not whether the above list is all-inclusive but rather that all these functions are vital to a group. If some fall under the heading of leadership the multiplicity of leader functions becomes obvious. Therefore, we must concern ourselves with what the leader is to do, when he is going to do it and the manner in which he is going to behave.

As a result leadership emerges as a process, and it becomes apparent that the leader must be cognizant of the importance of both goal achievement and the maintenance of human relationships if he is going to influence goal attainment. In short we are concerning ourselves with leadership style.

**Leader Style**

Prior to the Ohio State Leadership Studies, leader behavior was portrayed as mutually exclusive style but depicted as a continuum with the extremes variously labeled as "autocratic" and "democratic," "authoritarian" and "equalitarian," "employee-oriented" and "production-oriented," "goal achievement" and "group maintenance," "task-ability" and "likeability," "instrumental" and "expressive," or "efficiency" and "effectiveness."
In the Leadership studies initiated in 1945 by the Bureau of Business Research of Ohio State University it was revealed that successful leaders appeared to engage in one or both of two behavioral categories: "Initiating Structure" and/or "Consideration" and can be defined as:

**Initiating structure.** The extent to which a leader is likely to organize and define the relationships between himself and the members of his group (followers), characterized by a tendency to define the role which he expects each member of the group to assume, endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication and ways of getting the job done.

**Consideration.** The extent to which a leader is likely to maintain personal relationships between himself and the members of his group (followers) in terms of socio-emotional support, opening up channels of communication; characterized by friendship, mutual trust, and respect for followers.

By definition initiating structure reflects the task aspects while consideration reflects concern for interpersonal relationships.

In successive leadership studies, the Ohio State staff found that leadership styles differ considerably from one leader to another. The behavior of certain leaders was characterized by the structuring of activities for followers in terms of task accomplishments. Other leaders concentrated on building and maintaining good personal relationships between
themselves and their followers. A third group of leaders had styles characterized by both tasks and relationships behavior. The studies pointed out that the behavior of some leaders tended to provide little structure or development of interpersonal relationships. No dominant style appeared, instead, various combinations became evident. Thus, it was submitted that task and relationships were not either/or leadership styles as an authoritarian-democratic continuum might suggest. Instead, it was observed that patterns of leader behavior had two separate and distinct dimensions which could be plotted on two separate axes, rather than a single continuum. The Ohio State studies resulted in the development of four quadrants to illustrate leadership styles in terms of "Initiating Structure" and "Consideration." \(^{18}\)

\[\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
  & \text{High Consideration} & \text{High Consideration} \\
  \text{Consideration} & \text{Low Initiating Structure} & \text{High Initiating Structure} \\
  \text{Low} & \text{Low Consideration} & \text{Low Consideration} \\
  \text{High Initiating Structure} & \text{High Initiating Structure} \\
\end{array}\]

\[\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
  & \text{Low Initiating Structure} & \text{High Initiating Structure} \\
  \text{Initiating Structure} & \text{Low Consideration} & \text{High Consideration} \\
  \text{Low} & \text{Low Consideration} & \text{Low Consideration} \\
  \text{High Initiating Structure} & \text{High Initiating Structure} \\
\end{array}\]

Ohio State Leadership Behavior Quadrants
Managerial Grid

Another development of the two dimension approach was proposed by Robert Blake and Jane Mouton. Their Managerial Grid proposes five different leadership styles, based on the two dimensions of "concern for production" and "concern for people" located in quadrants similar to those presented by the Ohio State staff.

The horizontal axis illustrates "concern for production." As production becomes more important to the leader, his rating increases on that axis. The vertical axis represents "concern for people." Advancing toward the 9 on this axis illustrates increasing concern for interpersonal relationships.

The Managerial Grid (Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton, The Managerial Grid (Houston, Gulf Publishing, 1964)).
Managerial Grid Styles

**Impoverished Leader** (1-1) Typified by the exertion of minimum effort to get required work done as the way to appropriately sustain organizational membership.

**Country Club Leader** (1-9) Thoughtful attention to needs of people for satisfying relationships leads to a comfortable, friendly organizational atmosphere and work tempo.

**Task Leader** (9-1) Efficiency in operations results from arranging conditions of work in such a way that human elements interfere to a minimum degree.

**Middle of the Road** (5-5) Adequate organization performance is possible through balancing the necessity to get out the work while maintaining morale of people at a satisfactory level.

**Team** (9-9) Work accomplishment is from committed people; interdependence through a "common stake" in organizational purpose leads to relationships of trust and respect.\(^\text{21}\)

Conclusion - Ohio State Studies and Managerial Grid

The emphasis that both the Ohio State staff and Blake and Mouton placed on leadership being something other than an either/or continuum of behavior, allowed the study of leadership to move forward toward the notion of the "Adaptable Leader."

In both theories, however, a most appropriate dominant style was hypothesized. Andrew Halpin,\(^\text{22}\) of the original Ohio
State staff, in a study of school superintendents, pointed out that according to his findings "effective or desirable leadership behavior is characterized by high ratings on both "Initiating Structure" and "Consideration." Conversely, ineffective or undesirable leadership behavior is marked by low ratings on both dimensions." Thus, Halpin seemed to conclude that the High Consideration and High Initiating Structure style is theoretically the ideal or best leader style, while the style low on both dimensions is theoretically the worst.

Blake and Mouton, in their managerial grid, also imply that there is a most desirable leadership style, "team management" (maximum concern for people and production). In examining the dimensions of the Managerial Grid it is easy to see that they are attitudinal, for concern is a feeling or an emotion toward something. While high concern for both production and people is desirable, it may be inappropriate in all situations to initiate a great deal of structure and provide a high degree of socio-emotional support.

**Effectiveness Dimension**

While some theorists suggest that there is an "ideal" style, in recent years others have contended that there is no "best" style of leadership. One of the first people to add an effectiveness dimension to the "task" and "relationships" dimensions of earlier models was William J. Reddin.
Hersey and Blanchard, whose Tri-Dimensional Leader Effectiveness Model was greatly influenced by Reddin's work, point out that

By adding an effectiveness dimension to the task and relationships dimension we . . . integrate the concepts of leader style with situational demands of a specific environment. When the style of a leader is appropriate to a given situation it is termed "effective"; when the style is inappropriate to a given situation it is termed "ineffective."  

They then go on to say

If the effectiveness of a leader behavior style depends upon the situation in which it is used, it follows that any of the basic styles may be effective or ineffective depending upon the situation. The difference between the effective and the ineffective styles is often not the actual behavior of the leader but the appropriateness of this behavior to the situation in which it is used. You might think of the leader's basic style as a particular stimulus, and it is the response to this stimulus that can be considered effective or ineffective. This is an important point because theorists and practitioners who argue that there is one best style of leadership are making value judgments about the stimulus, while those taking a situational approach to leadership are evaluating the response or the results rather than the stimulus.  

Korman offers evidence which nicely illustrates that there is not a single all-purpose leadership style. After reviewing over twenty-five studies he concludes,

Despite the fact that "Consideration" and "Initiating Structure" have become bywords in American Industrial psychology, it seems that very little is now known as to how these variables may predict work group performance and the conditions which affect such predictions. At the current time, we cannot even say whether they have any predictive significance at all.
Korman's findings indicating that the use of "Consideration" and "Initiating Structure" were not of value in predicting effectiveness under changing situations, can only reinforce the point sought by the study, that leadership style must vary as does the situation in which the leader is involved.

Other writers\textsuperscript{28} have concluded that different leadership situations require different leader styles.

In summary, the case for an "adaptive style" of leadership is based on the premise that successful leaders are those who can adapt their leader behavior to meet the needs of their followers and the particular situation, or in Hersey's words, "the more a manager adapts his style of leader behavior to meet the particular situation and the needs of his followers, the more effective he will tend to be in reaching personal and organizational goals."\textsuperscript{29}

Effectiveness

Rensis Likert\textsuperscript{30} identifies three classes of "variables" which are of use in analyzing organizational effectiveness.

1. Causal Variables - Factors which influence the course of events within an organization and its outcome. Causal variables by definition are independent variables which can be changed or altered by the organization. Examples would be leadership strategies, decisions made by management, the structure of the organization.
2. **Intervening Variables** - These variables represent the "internal state" of the organization and are reflected in personnel loyalty, commitment to objectives, motivation, morale, communication patterns.

3. **Output Variables** - These are Dependent variables which reflect achievements of the organization. Most evaluations of effectiveness are based on the measures of "production."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal Variables</th>
<th>Intervening Variables</th>
<th>Output Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Perceptions</td>
<td>Production,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Strategies</td>
<td>Expectations, Role Concepts, Attitudes,</td>
<td>Costs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>Workgroup Tradition,</td>
<td>Sales,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Objectives</td>
<td>Values and Goals, Motivational Forces,</td>
<td>Earnings,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology, etc.</td>
<td>Behavior, etc.</td>
<td>Union-Co. Relations,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turnover, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationship between causal, intervening, and output variables. Hersey and Blanchard, p. 109.

The relationships among the types of variables can be thought of as stimuli (causal variables) acting upon the organism (intervening variables) and eliciting certain responses (output variables). 31
Intervening variables are those concerned with building and developing an organization, and attention to these tend to build long-term goals. Most organizations base rewards and promotion on the basis of short-run output variables such as increased production and earnings and neglect the long-run organizational development. Attention to intervening variables and emphasis upon long-run goals is critical to organizational effectiveness over time.

Evaluating For Organizational Effectiveness

Warren Bennis submits the following three "hallmarks" as means by which to assess organizational effectiveness:

1. **Adaptability** - The ability to react, with flexibility, and solve problems in a changing environment.

2. **Identity** - Insight and knowledge on the part of the organization's members as to what the organization is, what its goals are, and what it is to do.

3. **Reality Testing** - The ability to seek, accurately perceive, and correctly interpret the "real" properties of the environment, particularly those which have relevance for the functioning of the organization.

The leader, in his efforts to develop an effective organization, must become cognizant of personal and environmental variables that are operating at all levels.

As has already been stated, all the basic leader behavior styles may be effective or ineffective dependent upon the situation.
The leader must be able to diagnose his own leader behavior in light of his environment. Some variables which he should examine include the organization, superiors, peers, followers, and job demands.

Interacting Components of an Organizational Setting (Hersey and Blanchard, 1969, p. 92).

It is crucial, then, that the leader understand the situational variables of the organizational environment in order to be effective.

For greater specificity, the interacting components of the leader's environment are listed below.

- Leader's personality
- Leader's expectations
- Followers' personalities
- Followers' expectations
- Superiors' personalities
- Superiors' expectations
- Associates' personalities
- Associates' expectations
- Organization's personality
- Organization's expectations
- Job demands
- Time

\[ \text{Time} = 34 \]
**Personality** - Generally synonymous with style, the recognized behavior patterns of an individual as perceived by others. These patterns emerge as an individual begins to respond in the same fashion under similar conditions.

**Expectations** - Perceptions of appropriate behavior for one's own role or position or one's perception of the roles of others within an organization.

**Leader's Personality and Expectations** - The leader's personality (style) is one of the more important elements of the leadership situation. The personality is not how he thinks he behaves, but rather how others perceive his behavior. He ought to know how he is perceived. The difficulty in obtaining this information comes from people's reluctance to be open with one another.

How people interpret the expectations of the leader most often determines their behavior.

**Followers' Personalities and Expectations** - At least one writer believes that the followers are the most crucial factor in any leadership act. Acceptance or rejection of the leader (personal power) is determined by the personality of the group. For this reason, the leader may find that even if he wants to change their styles, he might instead do better to adapt his style to their present behavior.

A leader should know the expectations followers have about the way he should behave in certain situations. If a problem arises between leader style and follower expectations,
then either the leader must change his style, or change the followers' expectations.

Superiors' Personalities and Expectations - Meeting your superior's expectations is an important factor affecting a leader's style. Operating with a style contrary to your boss's expectations of how you should operate may limit your effectiveness.

Peers' Personalities and Expectations - The styles and expectations of one's associates are important to be understood when a leader has frequent interaction with them.

Organization's Personality and Expectations - The personality and expectations of an organization are determined by the history and tradition of the organization as well as by the organizational goals and objectives which reflect the style and expectations of top management.

Members of an organization soon become conscious of a value system operating within the institution and guide their actions from many expectations derived from these values. The organization's expectations are most often expressed in forms of policy, operating procedures and controls, as well as informal customs and mores developed over time.

Job Demands - Another important aspect of the leadership situation is the demands of the job the leader's group has been assigned to perform. The nature of the task to be performed may have dramatic implications for the leader style necessary to effectively complete that task.
Time - The variable refers to time duration available for decision-making. If that span of time is short (emergency or crisis situation), the leader's style might well be task-oriented while on the other hand, longer time spans allow a variety of possible styles.36

Though there most certainly are other situational variables to be considered, the preceding list conveys the intent, that organizational effectiveness is also dependent on far more than simple leader action.

Effectiveness results from a leader using a behavior style which is appropriate to the demands of the environment. Therefore, an effective leader must be able to diagnose the demands of the environment, and then either adapt his leader personality (style) to fit these demands, or develop the means to change some or all of the other variables.37
Before we can deal with the question of leader adaptability or organizational change any further, we must reflect about the people with whom the leader interacts, for the assumptions one holds about the nature of man will certainly influence his behavior.

To enhance the practitioner's understanding of human nature so that he will become better able to adapt his leadership behavior to meet the needs of the situation in which he finds himself we must explore the following topics:

Basic Assumptions About Motivation and Behavior
Basic Assumptions About Man and Work

Motivation and Behavior

It is widely held that individuals initiate activity in order to attain certain goals. The type and extent of an individual's actions are said to be determined by the strength of the need within the individual as well as the nature of the goal. In this manner goals can be thought of as rewards or incentives. Hersey and Blanchard suggest that behaviors can be distinguished in terms of "goal directed activity" (those activities that lead toward the goal) and "goal activity" (engaging in the goal itself). They point out the strength of the need tends to increase as one engages in goal directed activity but decreases while one engages in goal activity.38
In *Personality and Organization*, Argyris suggests that when needs go unmet they cause the individual to experience tension. The levels of tension within each individual vary depending upon the strength of the need. Argyris refers to what Hersey and Blanchard have called "goal directed activity" as "needs in action." Argyris goes on to say that "By watching people behave we can infer from their behavior what need system is in action" and that there are people "... who believe that the basic reason for life is to seek reduction of tension" although more mature individuals are able to "accept temporary frustration if it will help them in the long run."

It is helpful when trying to understand "motives" if one keeps in mind that for each individual their strength is influenced by (that individual's) past experience. Simply stated, one does not engage in goal directed activity if experience has shown that activity will not help in reaching the goal.

**Identification of Needs**

As pointed out, an individual's behavior is linked to his strongest need. Leaders need to develop an understanding about needs most commonly important to people in order to develop a repertoire of behaviors that will enable them to lead effectively. A key to leadership therefore, is an understanding of motivation.
Abraham Maslow suggests a framework that is helpful when considering the types and strengths of human needs. He suggests that man's needs exist in a hierarchy.

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (Hersey and Blanchard)

In the preceding diagram Physiological needs are shown as most prepotent because they tend to have the greatest strength until they are satiated. These needs are most easily recognized as basic human needs—food, shelter, clothing. Unless these needs are satisfied to an acceptable degree, most of an individual's activity will remain at this level and little else will have his attention.

Upon gratification of the physiological needs, the need for Security tends to become predominant. Security needs are the need for self preservation, freedom from fear of physical harm and freedom from the fear of losing food, shelter, etc. for until one can feel safe and secure, other things tend to remain less important.
With respect to the Affiliation need, people have a desire to "belong," to be accepted by others. This gives them the opportunity to interact and gain support for their beliefs, values and activities.

An individual's need to receive recognition and respect from his group is classified as a need for Esteem. This is often reflected by one's need for power and/or prestige. An individual may gain power from the formal position he holds or as a consequence of the "forcefulness" of his personality.

In Maslow's hierarchy, Self-Actualization represents the final need level. It is most easily understood as an individual's need to maximize his potential.

It should be pointed out that one level of the hierarchy does not have to be absolutely satiated before an individual "advances" to another level of concern, for all levels can, to a certain degree, be accommodated concurrently. In addition, the degree of satisfaction and strength of each need can vary within each individual as well as between individuals dependent upon prior personal experience, abilities, etc.

Motivation-Hygiene

Frederick Herzberg has espoused a Model of Needs which has become known as Motivation-Hygiene Theory. Herzberg concludes that while on the job man is governed by
two independent but interacting conditions. One set of conditions, essentially environmental in nature, includes the policies and procedures one works under, the nature and scope of supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relationships, pay, status, job security, etc. Herzberg calls all these foregoing "Hygiene Factors" for they are conditions which serve to prevent job dissatisfaction. The second category includes those factors that stimulate achievement such as recognition for accomplishment, challenging work, and increased responsibility leading to an individual's growth and development. Herzberg calls this group "motivators." It is important to understand that the presence of "good" hygiene factors does not stimulate achievement, their absence preclude achievement, and that the presence of "motivators" will not guarantee higher productivity. They will enhance the likelihood of its occurrence.

In relating Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs and Herzberg's Hygiene-Motivation Theory, Hersey and Blanchard suggest that the physiological, security, affiliation and (part of) the esteem need(s) are hygiene factors while recognition and self-actualization are motivators. Hersey and Blanchard divide the esteem level, classifying those esteem needs inherited through family etc. as unearned and therefore hygiene factors while recognition acquired through personal achievement is a motivator.
Relationship between Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs and Herzberg's Motivation Theory with Self-Actualization as most prepotent (Hersey and Blanchard)

Immaturity-Maturity

Chris Argyris suggests that an individual's level of "maturity" has direct bearing on the type(s) of needs he desires to satiate. Argyris recognizes seven trends that tend to characterize the growth of an individual and are easily translated into a continuum.

IMMATURITY ————-> MATURITY
PASSIVE ———— INCREASED ACTIVITY
DEPENDENCE ———— INDEPENDENCE
BEHAVES IN FEW WAYS ———— CAPABLE OF BEHAVING MANY WAYS
ERRATIC SHALLOW INTERESTS ———— DEEPER AND STRONGER INTERESTS
SHORT TIME PERSPECTIVE ———— LONG TIME PERSPECTIVE
Although people grow in their maturity few if any reach absolute maturity on all these dimensions. In a variety of ways cultural norms and social institutions inhibit one from fully maximizing himself. An understanding of the "maturity" level of various individuals will enable a leader to better diagnose their needs and better adapt his leadership style. Argyris points out as individuals mature they will become more active than passive, more independent than dependent, have increasingly longer perspective with regard to time, occupy higher position than their peers and become increasingly able to express many of their important abilities.46

People who develop their maturity in an organization that permits a commensurate degree of activity, independence etc. will generally become more favorably disposed to the organization and its goals. Conversely, institutions that inhibit growth and/or the exercise of mature behaviors can expect increasingly less supportive behavior from their employees.
Four Views of Man

Edgar Schein submits other perspectives for looking at individual needs and their resultant behaviors. Schein discusses four separate sets of assumptions about man.

Rational-Economic Man

To Schein, this perspective suggests that man acts in his own self interest and that this view has generated the following types of assumptions

1. Man is motivated by economic incentives and will only do those things from which he will gain the greatest economic rewards.

2. Man is in essence passive therefore he can be manipulated, motivated and controlled by those who provide the economic payoff.

3. Man's feelings are essentially irrational; man must be prevented from allowing feelings from interfering with calculated self interest.

4. Organizations must be designed to control man's feelings and neutralize them so that his unpredictable traits may be extinguished.

5. Man is lazy by his nature and is only motivated by outside incentives.

6. Man's natural tendencies are in opposition to those of the organization, therefore man must be controlled in order to insure that he accomplishes the organization's goals.

7. Due to feelings that are irrational by their nature, man is incapable of self control and self discipline.

8. Men essentially belong to two groups: those that fit the foregoing assumptions and those who are self motivated, self controlled and less dominated by their feelings. Members of the latter group must manage responsibilities for the other.47
Scientific Management

Frederick Taylor, Henri Fayol, and others pioneered what has become known as the "Scientific Management" school of thought and as such gave impetus to what Schein has called the "Rational-Economic" View. Essentially, Taylor's principles combined a study of the physical capabilities of workers with an approach that viewed man as driven by a fear of hunger and a search for profit. The central theme was that material rewards are necessarily related to work effort. Taylor's principles required time and motion studies and the breaking down of work into its simplest components.

Fayol, like Taylor, saw the problem of productivity as one closely related to supervision and rewards. He proposed a clearly delineated chain of command and rigid channels of communication. He pushed for matching the employee to the position as a key element of efficiency.

Social Man

Research undertaken subsequent to Taylor and Fayol has suggested that man appears to be motivated by his need for group acceptance. This view has been termed by Schein as the Theory of Social Man, and holds as its tenets that

1. Man obtains his basic sense of identity through interaction with others.

2. A result of the industrial revolution and "job simplification" most meaning has gone out of work and as a result man seeks gratification through social interactions on the job.
3. Man is less responsive to the incentives and controls of management and more responsive to the social forces of his peer group.

4. Man is only responsive to management to the extent that his immediate superior can meet his social and acceptance needs.50

Self-Actualizing Man

Schein calls a third view of man "Self-Actualizing" for in this manner some of man's needs have given rise to the following assumptions:

1. Man needs a degree of autonomy and independence for he seeks to demonstrate maturity.

2. Man is primarily self motivated and self controlled.

3. Extensive controls and incentives can threaten man's self regulation and thus stifle maturity.

4. There exists no inherent conflict between self actualization and effective organizational performance for man, if given the chance, will integrate his personal goals with those of the organization.51

Human-Relations School

The proponents of the "Social Man" comprise what has become known as the "Human Relations" school of thought. The Human Relations theorists have drawn heavily upon the research of Elton Mayo.52 In studies conducted at the Hawthorne Plant of Western Electric, Mayo concluded that individuals had psychological drives and social needs and that "output" was quite closely linked to the social satisfaction of workers. The central theme of the Human Relations School can be
stated as follows: Management can help motivate man towards increasingly productive work by assisting him in the fulfillment of his social and psychological needs, rather than by simply furnishing external rewards. These assumptions are in direct opposition to the "classical view" and have been summed up by Douglas McGregor's now famous Theory X and Theory Y.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory X</th>
<th>Theory Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work is inherently distasteful to most people.</td>
<td>1. Work is as natural as play if the conditions are favorable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Most people are not ambitious, have little desire for responsibility and prefer to be directed.</td>
<td>2. Self-control is often indispensable in achieving organizational goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Most people have little capacity for creativity in solving organizational problems.</td>
<td>3. The capacity for creativity in solving organizational problems is widely distributed in the population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Motivation only occurs at the physiological and safety levels.</td>
<td>4. Motivation occurs at the social, esteem, and self-actualization levels as well as physiological and security levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Most people must be closely controlled and often coerced to achieve organizational objectives.</td>
<td>5. People can be self directed and creative at work if properly motivated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of assumptions about the nature of man that underline McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y (Hersey and Blanchard).
Complex Man

As a response to the preceding theories, Schein identifies a fourth view which he has termed "complex man." Schein states that

Man is a more complex individual than rational-economic, social or self-actualizing man. . . . It has always been difficult to generalize about man, and it is becoming more difficult as society and organizations within society are themselves becoming more complex and differentiated. 54

The theory of complex man assumes that

1. In addition to the complexity of man, his needs are highly variable. Each individual's needs are somewhat different than anyone else's needs and as such they fluctuate from situation to situation.

2. Individual needs are often altered depending upon each individual's organizational experiences. Therefore, man is capable of developing new motives depending upon his unique organizational situation.

3. Satisfaction is influenced by social and environmental forces as well as the needs of the organization itself.

4. Man can respond to a variety of managerial strategies depending upon his skills, the nature of the task and concurrent needs. There is no one strategy that will work at all times. 55

Schein is careful to point out that the complex man perspective does not imply that any of the other views and their related managerial strategies are wrong. He suggests that it must be concluded that "any one of these approaches may be wrong in some situations and with some people." 56

At times one may need to be highly directive; and on other occasions different styles may be needed, for the effective leader
must have the sensitivity and diagnostic ability to be able to sense and appreciate differences. ... he must also learn to value differences and to value the diagnostic process which reveals differences. ... he must have the personal flexibility and the range of skills necessary to vary his own behavior.57

Revisionist Perspective

Harold Leavitt58 in a vein similar to Schein's "complex man" theory attempts a reexamination of the Human Relations School. His theme is not that human relations theory is correct or incorrect but rather it is insufficient for it is too narrow a perspective to view the management of organizations. However, he also does not feel that we should return to scientific management beliefs but advance "... by viewing large organizations as differentiated sets of subsystems rather than as unified wholes. Such a view leads to management by tasks—with the recognition that many sub parts of the organization may perform many different kinds of tasks, and therefore call for many different kinds of managerial practices."59

The Revisionists attempt to reconcile the ideologies of Scientific Management and the Human Relations.

In combining the positive values of the mechanists who emphasized the organizational goals, and those of the Human Relationists who emphasized the social goals of individuals, the Revisionists attempt to consider both individual and organizational goals in their proper perspectives. They recognize that the individual goals must be focused through commitment and leadership activity; and they hold the view that external economic factors must be considered along with productivity and
formal status, but not to the exclusion of the human elements that the scientific theorists neglected.\textsuperscript{60}

The Revisionists hold that work is a natural activity of man, that the goals of the organization can be used as incentives to intelligent work, that lack of control is undesirable in any organization, and that employee participation in decision-making is harmonious to organizational goals. They propose environments which reflect individual and institutional purposes and needs. Singular strong emphasis on the needs of either the individual or organization should be deweighted, but neither should be devalued at the expense of the other. More theoretical approaches to ways of integrating the task serving and needs serving purposes of organizations ought be pursued by school people in the business of creating or dealing with change.\textsuperscript{61}

Leader Adaptability

Given the foregoing assumptions about behavior and motivation as well as some basic assumptions about man and work it seems that the following question is most appropriate.

What type of leader is effective with individuals (and groups) that have changing needs and are to be found in changing environments?

Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard respond that an adaptive leader is—"an individual who has the ability to
vary his leader behavior appropriately in differing situations.\textsuperscript{62}

To enable leaders to diagnose their environments and aid in the development of an understanding of the relationship between an appropriate leadership style and the maturity of one's followers, Hersey and Blanchard have developed the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership.

Life Cycle Theory is based on a curvilinear relationship between "consideration" and "initiating structure" behaviors and the maturity of the followers.\textsuperscript{63} Life Cycle Theory emphasizes the importance of the followers and the leader's diagnostic ability. Definitions are necessary before elaborating upon Life Cycle Theory.

The quadrants formed by plotting the dimensions of "consideration" and "initiating structure" originate, as previously mentioned, from the Ohio State Leadership Studies. In Life Cycle Theory the behavioral dimensions are defined similarly.

Consideration

The extent to which a leader is likely to maintain personal relationships between himself and the members of his group (followers) in terms of socio-emotional support; characterized by friendship, mutual trust, and respect for followers' ideas.
Initiating Structure

The extent to which a leader is likely to organize and define the relationships between himself and the members of his group (followers); characterized by a tendency to define the role which he expects each member of the group to assume, endeavoring to establish well defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting jobs done.

Maturity

In Life Cycle Theory, maturity is defined in terms of three dimensions. They are achievement-motivation, independence and responsibility. These dimensions may be influenced by each individual's level of task relevant education and work experience.

a. Achievement-Motivation - David McClelland suggests that there is a type of person who works on solving a problem rather than letting it solve itself. These people, McClelland states, are interested in tasks that are challenging but not impossible, ones that can be solved if the person works to the maximum of his efforts and talents and once goals are achieved these people set new, distant but achievable goals. Achievement motivated people tend to be concerned with experiencing a sense of accomplishment rather than with attaining money or recognition; they prefer concrete task-related feedback rather than attitudinal feedback.
b. **Independence** - Characterized by a reliance on one's own potential, a preference to select and define one's own activities (rationally) and an ability to at times transcend one's immediately controlled physical and social environment.

c. **Responsibility** - Characterized by an ability to take responsibility, to accept task assignments and carry them through to fruition.

![Life Cycle Theory of Leadership](chart.png)

*Life Cycle Theory of Leadership (Hersey and Blanchard)*
d. Education and work experience - These are both important only in as much as they are task-related.

Life Cycle Theory - Effective Leader Styles

Life Cycle Theory hypothesizes that the appropriate style for working with very immature followers (quadrant 1) is a behavior that is high task (Initiating Structure) and low relationship (Consideration) in nature. The styles suggested by quadrants 2 and 3 seem appropriate for moderately mature followers and quadrant 4 suggests a style only appropriate for very mature followers.

With Life Cycle Theory the leader has the responsibility to diagnose the maturity of the group, in terms of the situation the group is in, and then apply the appropriate leader behavior in terms of structure (task) and/or considera-
tion (socio-emotional support). Therefore, effectiveness would be reliant upon adaptive leader behavior based on the maturity of the group in the particular situation.

Quadrant 1 is a high task leader style which the theory assumes appropriate for working with immature people. As the maturity of the group or individual increases, so should the leader style differ reflecting the diagnosis of increased maturity of the followers.

Life Cycle Theory suggests that leader behavior should move through the four quadrants as the followers progress from immaturity to maturity.

To summarize, the emphasis in this literature review has been on the development of situational models which are helpful in assessing appropriate leader behavior in a dynamic organization. Schools have been forced to move from their former position, one of stagnation. This results from schools being expected to take a larger role in dealing with complex social, economic and political problems. One consequence of this new thrust is that schools and their leaders have been forced to look outside the pedagogical framework of the past toward the dynamics of effective leadership so that new plans, new policies and new procedures can be both designed and implemented.
PART II: The Difficulties of The Principal's Role

The term "school" generally calls to mind a host of personalities (teachers, students, taxpayers, etc.) who, it is hoped, intentionally attempt to coordinate their activities, utilize resources and enter into an arrangement for the purposes of education. Theoretically the result of their labor is the establishment of a climate in which resources are developed and deployed in a manner that students learn and teachers teach. (Taxpayers usually foot the bill.) At best, experience has shown that circumstance and differences need to be mediated into a collaborative effort if the educative process is to be earnestly attempted and brought about with reasonable economy. Towards these ends, plans have to be formulated and resources need to be commanded, coordinated and allocated. In short, the need for "...a power or force which gets the organization set up; a force that defines the jobs to be done and assigns them; a force finally to direct and coordinate the individual efforts," was recognized. This need, acted upon, has given rise to the principal, and to him has fallen the solemn duty of insuring the accomplishment of these objectives.

As society moved from the middle 1960's into the 1970's, unparalleled concern over the goals and operation of schools developed.
This attitude is almost a complete departure from that of a few years ago, when education was acclaimed as the panacea for all social ills. Slums, juvenile delinquency, unemployment, international conflict—even insanity, venereal disease, illegitimacy and dental caries—were blights that could be removed by appropriate programs of education. . . . failure to deliver the promised paradise has caused a loss of faith in the professional educator. 66

Much of what the public sees as failure to bring about the "promised paradise" has been blamed on the school administrators. Formerly these administrators responded to their critics with

. . . a few well chosen words prefaced by the unspecific "they." "They" do not understand our principles, our practices, or our purposes. "They" do not appreciate the handicaps under which we are struggling. . . . In spite of the elements of truth in these counter charges, the concerns of the critics are now becoming so poignant and particularized that specific answers are demanded. 67

So crucial is the principal's role in leading the school's educational endeavors that it has been pointed out that:

No other single person does as much to set the tone and basic direction of a school or school system as the administrator. 68

Again, in a recent study of the relationship of teacher innovativeness and the actions of principals it was stated

. . . data substantiates the assumption that the principal plays an important role in stimulating creative classroom teaching. There is a high and significant correlation between the amount of staff inventiveness, as measured by the mean number of new practices developed by each teacher and the staff's perception of the principal's support for innovative teaching. There is an even higher correlation between the teacher's perception
of his principal's support and his perception of his colleagues' support for innovation. The first finding substantiates the notion that the principal can have a direct influence upon his staff. The second finding substantiates the notion of an indirect role—the principal may encourage an atmosphere where the entire staff publicly supports innovation. Thus the principal's attitudes influence staff norms, and both his orientation and peer standards combine to influence actual staff innovativeness.69

Yet change, innovation and improvement are not always synonymous. While some fear change or innovation, most like the idea of improvement. A major reason for this difference in attitude is that administrators, teachers, students and taxpayers have all come to the realization that not all innovations have been improvements. Some highly touted changes have only amounted to an alteration of jargon, other innovations were simple neglect of certain issues in favor of others. In reaction, many school administrators avoid evaluating their practices, or fear failure in undertaking new enterprises. Thus they continue to operate on the supposition that it is enough to do that which is tried and true.

To the public it is becoming increasingly more obvious that educators are failing to deliver the "promised land" and "that if the professional educator is either unwilling or unable to provide leadership it will be sought elsewhere."70

No doubt industrious administrators balk at such a severe indictment, and for apparent good reason. School
principals generally put in long hard hours while performing their duties. In a national survey of secondary school principals it was found that the average principal put in 54 hours per week on the job. In Pennsylvania, where 500 principals were studied, it was found that in addition to the regular 40 hour week, a typical principal put in an additional 520 hours (equivalent to 3 years) a year on the job.

The literature on school administration is filled with numerous theories about the administrative function, details of administrative and organizational patterns as well as general maintenance techniques that may be employed. While some have concluded that there is not enough known to determine the knowledge and competencies that principals must have to provide effective leadership for their schools, others ask:

Is the principal a manager or an educator? Is he a change agent or a maintainer of the status quo? Is he expected to identify new needs and directions for the community, or is he supposed to keep the schools entirely in accord with the communities' expectations? Is he the director of the enterprise, head teacher, guidance counselor, facilitator obtaining necessary equipment and supplies, public relations agent, selector of lunch menus, supervisor of custodians, repairer of pencil sharpeners, counter of lunch money, propagandist for school finance campaigns, mediator between the school and the central bureaucracy, chauffer to sick children, advisor to troubled teachers, psychiatrist for disturbed parents, disciplinarian for overpressed children, defender of the educational faith ... or what?

Certainly we would agree that a principal ought to be concerned with all things for with him lies the final
responsibility for all the functions of his school. Yet the most crucial problem faced by principals today is the ambiguity of the position and the lack of viable, systematic expectations for performance. No generally agreed upon criteria exists through which performance can be measured.\textsuperscript{74}

In a study of the problems facing school administrators it was revealed that they feel they are faced with problems that they are inadequate to handle. They feel that they do have the technical abilities to deal with ordinary school problems but lack the necessary knowledge and abilities to deal with major social issues, changes in educational technology and the complex organizational and interpersonal problems within their schools.\textsuperscript{75}

It is no small wonder that some principals are ineffective, others find their employment terminated and countless numbers live in fear of losing their jobs.

It is the attempt of this work to provide usable knowledge for educational practitioners so that they may better become able to deal with the complex organizational and interpersonal issues with which they are confronted. In so doing, we attempt to provide a framework from which better knowledge of leadership can be utilized.
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NICCOLO MACHIAVELLI
TO
PRACTITIONERS NEAR AND FAR

It has happened that those who recognize the difficulties of current educational practice offer much to ease the plight of school principals. University faculties, educational consultants, schools of education, call them what you will, offer much in the way of talent and ideas. It is in this way that you, the practitioner, are often presented with flexible scheduling, modular curricula, program planning, budgeting systems, audio-visual devices, computer terminals, grandiose school buildings, administrative assistants and sabbatical leave. Such things are, truly, worthy of your attention. However, it is my desire to offer somewhat more basic advice, in an attempt to unite leadership theory and practice for you, who work within the setting of our schools, the educational administrators.

I have begun to realize that the collective experience and knowledge gained by observing the deeds of great practitioners which I have acquired through a long experience with modern events and a constant study of the past may indeed be of help in dealing with those unforeseen problems of educational administration that from time to time rise within each and every school.
This advice should prove to be an alternative to, in 25 years of service, experiencing the same problems 25 times, (once each year) and having learned little or nothing useful in their occurrence; an alternative, too, to no other tool than "seat of the pants" reasoning, when trying to deal with the perplexity of problems that one is confronted with on a day to day basis.

With the utmost diligence I have long pondered and observed the actions of others. With the utmost sincerity I offer the results to you within this short volume. I do not deem this work as a "cure-all" or as a "cookbook of solutions" to current problems. My confidence is in your desire to become potent leaders, and effective change agents within your system and so I am assured that you will receive my words, my thoughts and my observations with favor, knowing that it is not possible to present absolute solutions to you. Rather it is my intent to offer you a great gift. The gift of enabling you to understand and utilize in a short time all those things that I have learned in the course of my many years. I have not included long heavy phrases, or high and mighty theory or any of those superficial arguments which are so common to us. It is not my attempt to embellish this work as would many writers, with truisms and such, as I desire nothing other from this work than knowing that those who recognize the gravity of its concern are able to utilize it.
effectively within their locale; and so students and parents could be better satisfied with the operation of their schools, and school systems would feel and develop greater vitality.

I trust that you will accept this tiny volume for it, indeed, may prove to be of value to you. In its form and substance, if you choose to peruse it, you will recognize my ardent desire that you attain that grandeur which your training and experience, your willingness to take leadership as a change agent and your desire to do an effective job, a job well done, would on their merits, allow you to become all you are capable of being. It is necessary for the practitioner to know thoroughly the nature of the people and the populace to know the nature of the practitioner.

You, from your lofty height, gaze down upon this work, recognize the attempt to open the doors of effective leadership to you. Should you not turn to gaze down, thereby casting aside this humble work, you will unfortunately lay open the gates to great and merited sufferings. A cruel fate falls upon those who have no knowledge of or seek not effectiveness in their endeavors.

HARKEN, ALL YE PRACTITIONERS. HARKEN.
PREFACE

The introduction presented here is very similar to the forward Machiavelli wrote to *The Prince* in order to gain the attention of Lorenzo the Magnificent, son of Piero DiMedici. The major differences are that the original author was writing about civic principalities and his style is more humble and reserved. This is likely due to a dissimilarity of the personalities of the writers and/or the times. This writer, having formally studied behavioral science theory and research and schools, is much more empathetic to the plight and trials of administrators than one might suspect. However, it remains that many administrators have been dealing with problems "off the seat of their pants" for years, and could use some forceful advice. It is recognized that this strategem although viewed as appropriate in a work of this fashion may not be the most appropriate "intervention strategy" for dealing with school administrators on site.
CHAPTER I

ON INSTITUTIONALIZATION AND ESPECIALLY
THAT OF EDUCATION

It is impossible to speak of all education for the process takes place in a variety of forms and in many places. Hereafter, when we speak of education, we refer to that part which takes place in schools and academies and is formally recognized and codified as an Educational System. As such, schools which have influenced or desire to influence, generally fall, it would seem, into two categories. Lacking specific and familiar definitive adjectives we shall call them "Historical" and "Emergent."

Historical schools are generally well established, that is their authority is passed down through a succession of laws. School boards and superintendents seem durable enough, yet they come and go. More noticeably laws tend to have greater longevity, but not nearly that of the school buildings themselves. The buildings, one might observe, tend to outlast us all.

Of the other type, the one we have called "emergent," is most usually of recent thought and philosophy as are, say the Montessori schools; or they may be grafted onto the older system as are the "alternative" schools; or in another sense, they may be the "community controlled" schools. The alternative schools or the community controlled schools,
it can be said, represent the annexation of ideas and potency into the historical system. These types may have been grafted onto the formal system as a means of assuring the populace of openness, vitality and concern for reform. However, it seems each in its own way becomes the formal system. Perhaps this occurs by consensus of the public followed by the capitulation of the apparent structure which, indeed, lacked vitality to serve the public and thereby, of its own accord, doomed itself.

In any case, the Historical type continues to endure and the "emergent" type(s) (in and of themselves) solidifies and fills the role of educational institution for the community it serves.

For the purpose of this treatise then, the schools of which we speak, regardless of their origin share a basic commonality; that is, they are institutions of education. These institutions have been accustomed, over time, to administrations of one of the following two types. In the first case they have become accustomed to administrators who, over time, were essentially interchangeable and thus were perceived as 'maintainers' rather than 'changers'. In the second instance it is common that they would be governed by founding administrators. In each case, the school principal finds himself responsible to others outside the school, for what occurs within the school, whether they be superintendent of schools or the board of directors.
Chapter of *The Prince* entitled: "The Various Kinds of Government and the Ways in which they are Established"

This chapter elaborates Machiavelli's concept of two basic types of organization--Repunics and Monarchies. In relating these concepts to schools, this writer observes "emergent" and "historical" educational institutions and, as Machiavelli would state, schools have either been accustomed to prior administrators or are so recent in establishment that they have not yet evolved a systematized form of government. In the case of civil principalities, Machiavelli says that one becomes Prince by force of arms, good fortune or special ability. In the case of the principal, we observe that one gets promoted as a consequence of skill, fortune or longevity. There appears to be an interesting similarity.
CHAPTER II

THE POTENTIAL FOR COMPLACENCY
IN THE PRINCIPALSHIP

We are concerned here with those schools which have been "institutionalized" and as such are part of a given power structure as well as having their own. We are concerned with how various kinds of power within the school can be governed and maintained.

First, in the long established system which is accustomed to its own line of succession it is far easier to maintain one's position. In this case it is enough not to transgress well worn procedures and to hide behind them when unforeseen circumstances arise. A principal of generally inferior capability can thus maintain his position, but precious little else. Eventually something extraordinary will occur which will have the force to unseat him such as a change in administration above him, or problems in the school, or perhaps both.

Thus, the newly promoted one, the principal, if he has risen from the ranks within the established system, may find it easier to maintain his position by complacency even though he may have had cause to be innovative. By not making waves he is frequently not an object of dislike unless he has some extraordinary vices of his own. The principal may be lulled into complacency by remembering or being
forced to remember to whom he owes fealty; or realizing what other principals do to those in their midsts they do not like; or due to the fact that he remembers from whose ranks he sprang. In any case, it may be natural that in the comfortable, well-worn workings of the system he should be esteemed for he gets on well with others by not rocking the boat.

The memories of his promotion, predicated by his espousal of change, of doing things differently (which at one time made some people uncomfortable) are, increasingly, forgotten as the years go by. One spark of innovation leads gradually to a cliche which is again absorbed into the comfortable routine before the next arises.
NOTES ON CHAPTER II

Chapter of *The Prince* entitled: "Of Hereditary Monarchies"

Machiavelli indicates that a Prince has less cause to give offense if the longevity of his rule, in the eyes of the populace, provides him with "legitimate" power. He then goes on to say that in such cases it is sufficient not to transgress ancestral usages and to adapt oneself to unforeseen circumstances. In this way, a Prince with ordinary abilities will be able to maintain his position, unless some exceptional circumstances arise.

This writer has modified Machiavelli's statements so that the foregoing is useful to describe a principal who seeks not long-term effectiveness, but rather is complacent and prefers the status quo to dynamic action. We do, however, agree that one must adapt oneself to unforeseen circumstances, for a posture of high adaptability will help to prevent the unexpected from unseating one's goals and objectives. As regards the transgression of old and accustomed ways, we feel that this depends on the leader's method, the specific case, the overall situation and the leader's diagnosis, for one must be cognizant of change and when necessary develop appropriate strategies. We do not advocate at this time change for change's sake.
CHAPTER III
OF SCHOOLS WITH ADMINISTRATORS
OF MIXED MOTIVATION

It is most common that a new principal will encounter those who taught and worked under the tenure of the old principal as well as teachers who are new to the school and/or new to the system. It is in this setting that potential difficulties really exist. It is with this mixed membership, as it were, disorders spring forth from a natural difficulty which exists with regards to this changeover. Specifically, the various expectations on the part of all parties tend to come into play, for it is hoped that with the change in administration significant things will occur within the school. It is this anticipation, that when not addressed may make the school staff rebel and protest against the new principal. When this occurs, the staff perceives the school (and themselves) going from bad to worse. If he does take action and rearranges the school, the staff may balk because they feel they have played no part. The "mandate" given has encouraged him to use his own ideas as well as his own methodology.

Another reason that these difficulties spring forth may in part be due to the feelings of the old teachers that the new principal is going too far; or that he stepped on
toes to get his position. Others may feel that the principalship rightfully belonged to another, one in their midsts. For all those reasons cooperation may be refused and unthinkingly, the new principal may extenguish his staff's potential contribution or rekindle old hostilities on a host of issues.

Thus you may find enemies in all those to whom you gave rise in expectations as well as to those who feel their toes stepped upon. In addition you may not maintain the pleasure of those who helped in your nomination as you may not be in a position to fulfill all their requests, nor can you turn your back upon them being obligated to them. No matter how strong your mandate, you will always need the help of the new teachers as well as those who have been in the school previous to your arrival.

John Murphy, based on good credentials and without much objection, became principal of River School. Some time later we find his school in open rebellion, for the staff who once willingly sought his direction felt he had promised significantly more than he delivered and thus they did not obtain what they had anticipated. Not receiving their "just" rewards, they tried to oust him.

It is true that after this episode, John Murphy maintained his position and vowed that a rebellion would not flare anew. Having experienced this lack of cooperation, he
began to secure his position by unmasking suspects and punishing those who acted against him. He thereby reinstated his authority. Nevertheless, after a time, the rebellion reoccurred.

The general cause of the first incident has been mentioned. It remains now to be seen what the causes of the second were and by what means John Murphy could have avoided it; or better what measures might have been taken by another principal given this school.

Be it observed therefore, that this school, upon the arrival of the new principal, had within it a staff that worked together previously. As such, they had an accustomed way of acting as well as procedures to work within. If this were not the case, it would have been easier to hold them, especially if populated by new teachers or those who lacked tenure. It can be said that all one need do was drive out the vestiges of leadership, that which was left by the old principal. If this were the case, the old conditions could have been disturbed and a routing of former leadership might have proven effective. The teachers would have thus settled down under the new principal.

However, if one becomes principal in a school with an established staff and wishes to assume authority and give direction, he must recognize two things; what vestiges of the old power structure exist; and that schools are accustomed to their own folkways. Recognizing the power of
these prior associations, he will, in a very short space of
time, acculturate and unite both old and new teachers.

When the principalship is acquired in a school with
great internal strife, interdepartmental rivalry, and result-
ing mistrust, it requires the development of strategy
grounded in systematic observation and implemented with
great skill to unite the staff. One of the best and most
certain means of doing this would be for the principal to
interact with all the factions with great frequency. The
principal, by being on the spot can quickly remedy disorders as
they arise. For him to remain at a distance is unwise and
will only assure continued internal disorder. The school
would remain in a state of havoc if it were left in the hands
of department heads and others. It is unlikely that they
would be unable to resolve what they brought on in the first
place. By the principal being ever present, teachers and
students are able to obtain satisfaction by direct recourse
to him. As the principal is near at hand, they have more
reason to display their loyalty. Should they, however, try
to be otherwise they will have greater cause to fear him.

Therefore, anyone who wishes to oust the principal
will be less disposed to do so as long as he continues to
recognize problems and deal with them. In this way the
principal will become very hard to dispossess.
While the foregoing is good, a less exhausting method is to place competent personnel whose trust is beyond reproach, into each of the school's major departments to form, as it were, the key thinkers. It is necessary to do this or to deal with problems personally, on a continual basis.

The personnel that the principal hires and places in the key positions will cost little in the way of antagonism if they are chosen in addition to loyalty, on the basis of great competency. If the principal chooses wisely those to be replaced, slight wrath will be incurred, and if so it will be only from those replaced, but they are only few in number and are no longer in the school.

When injecting new personnel you must do it in such a way that you do not cause antagonism in the process for then the utility of your replacements becomes marginal.

By dealing with each and every problem yourself, you will spend much time. You will then be unable to plan or fulfill the nominal obligations of principal, thereby insuring that superiors and others will have cause to complain. If it goes on too long, even those who at first were supporters, may look aside and not rally to your defense. Be wary of this, my principal.

Further, the new principal as described should make himself the leader and defender of the less heard groups within the school. So doing, the principal should endeavor to weaken the strongest groups and take care that they do
not become led by someone with power equal to his. If 'tis done as recommended, it will be the case that the principal will be invited to intervene at the request of those who are discontented and in whatever capacity he intervenes it will always be at the request of others.

The rule is that when a new principal takes over in the school, he should realize that all the teachers look to him. Moved by their expectations, the principal should take steps so that the vestiges of power under the old regime collapse and new and old teachers alike willingly join and unite. The principal has merely to be careful that the old teachers do not assume too much power over the new ones based on their longevity. If this does occur, he can easily, with the authority of his position, redirect those who are leading others astray. In this way the principal remains arbiter of the school.

He who does not govern well in this way will soon lose the respect he has acquired as well as that to which his position is entitled and while he holds on he will meet with infinite difficulty and trouble.

I have observed that many principals always followed this policy; they hired loyal and competent personnel who understood the principal's goals and their roles. The principals involved the less powerful without increasing their strength and they replaced where necessary the most powerful with good cause. Most importantly, they did not allow the disenchanted
the opportunity to find leadership other than their own. The principals of which I speak did what all wise principals should do, they considered not only the present but also future discords and diligently guarded against them. Being foreseen, these difficulties can more easily be remedied. If one waits 'till difficulties are at hand, the medicine may no longer be in time, as the malady has become incurable. It happens with this, as it does with those hectic fevers, as doctors say, which at their beginning are easily cured but difficult to recognize and treated become easy to recognize, but difficult to cure. It happens in matters of administration too, for knowing afar off (which is given to the prudent to do) the evils that are brewing, they can be more easily cured. But when, for the want of such knowledge, they are allowed to grow so that everyone can recognize them, there may no longer be any remedy to be found. Therefore, principals who observed potential disorders while still remote were able to find a remedy. Those who, at all costs, avoided a confrontation, in so doing, allowed their difficulties to increase. We know that confrontation is at times not to be avoided and can be diffused only to the advantage of others. Therefore, these principals confront on issues of immediacy, which when done with sensitivity and care, will straighten out the affair with a minimum of friction and will resulting not allow frustration and hostility to boil over into issues of greater importance.
At times, these stands might have been avoided. The principals of which I speak did not choose to do that which is now everyday to be heard in the mouths of wise men, namely, to enjoy the advantages of delay, for they preferred to trust their own virtue and prudence. They knew that time brings with it all things and may produce indifferently either good or evil.

Let us return to the River School and examine it. I will not speak of John Murphy solely, but of the assistant principal appointed by him as well. In this way you can better see the course of events, and come to recognize that John Murphy did the opposite of all those things which must be done when one assumes the principality.

Tom Green became assistant principal at River School by the ambition of John Murphy who wished to be free to politic in order to become assistant superintendent. I will not blame Tom Green for coming nor for the part he took, because he wished to gain administrative experience and thusly a school of his own. Green did not know the right people in the central office, so he was forced to accept what opportunity brought. Murphy's scheme would have speedily been successful if he had made no mistakes in his proceedings.

Tom Green shortly after becoming assistant principal won over the new teachers to his side. One by one the older staff joined the ranks of his supporters and after a time
the department heads, guidance counsellors and secretaries all approached him as though he were the principal. John Murphy might have seen the effects of his employing Tom Green but was always down at the central office. Murphy, by seeking Green's assistance, in fact put him in the position of principal.

Stop and consider for a moment how little difficulty Murphy could have had in maintaining his position in the school if he had observed the aforementioned rules, and kept a firm and sure hold over Green. The school staff being many in number and given to their own assumptions, would have recognized Murphy as the principal. Had Murphy hired some key personnel, perhaps a guidance counsellor, a department head, who were obliged to hold fast to him and by whose aid he could easily make sure of any who had visions of power for their own ends. Murphy was hardly in the school before he did the absolute opposite by giving Green the responsibility and authority to deal with crucial matters. Murphy by not dealing with the expectations of those within the school who saw greatness with his leadership, weakened himself. In addition, he did not perceive that he was adding authority to Green's personal charm.

Having made these first mistakes he was obliged to follow them up by firing Green to put a stop to his ambitions. Where Murphy might have employed an assistant principal who was loyal to him, he proceeded to appoint
another assistant principal who, like Tom Green, had his own motives. So, in fact by eliminating one problem by firing Green, Murphy employed another person who he was to find out was even stronger and more capable than Green. This compounded by the anamosity of the staff due to the firing of Green, was bound to cause new problems.

The desire for promotion, to better one's lot, is a very natural thing. When men do this successfully they are praised and not blamed, but when they cannot and yet want to do so at all costs, they make mistakes deserving of great blame.

Murphy, on the basis of competency, would have become an assistant superintendent. Thus, the installation of a powerful assistant principal deserves blame for it did not have the excuse of necessity. The principal of River School had made these mistakes. He did not recognize or deal with the expectations of the staff; he did not deal with the staff or school problems personally; he did not establish loyal personnel in key positions; and he increased the power of the assistant principal over his own.

Still these mistakes might not have injured him had he not made these others.

Murphy removed Green at an inopportune time. A new project was to be implemented, one which, if it had gone well, would have insured Murphy's superintendency. The principal had strengthened Green and developed no power of
his own. The staff developed an allegiance to Green and refused its cooperation to Murphy because he had fired Green and in addition the staff began to sabotage the new project.

If Murphy had not allowed Green to develop authority and had developed his own power instead, it would have kept the staff from developing great allegiance to Green. I say this because when Murphy first became principal, the staff was looking for direction and would have consented to measures that they recognized as being instrumental in developing their feeling of competency. In addition, the teachers would not have wanted to risk a confrontation with Murphy because they would not have had the courage to attack both the principal and his plan.

If anyone urges that Murphy should not have fired Green in order to avoid the teachers' hostility and sabotage on the new project, I reply with reasons already given, that one ought not avoid decisive action. The firing of Green could not really have been avoided but deferred to a later time. In this time, Green would have developed greater power and thereby been harder to dislodge.

If others allege the tacit promise of Murphy to Green to recommend his promotion to principal for implementing the new project might have made Green fall in line, I reply with what I shall say later about the faith of principals and how it is to be observed.
In addition, the principal committed the worst of offenses—he did not learn by his mistakes.

Thus John Murphy lost his school by not observing any of those conditions which have been observed by others who become principals and wished to remain. I observe that Murphy was ignorant of power and Green knew nothing of politics, for if they did, they would never have found themselves in this predicament. Experience has shown that greatness of schools has been caused by the principal, assistant principal and the staff and the ruination of schools has proceeded by the bungling of principals and assistant principals.

We may draw from this the following rule. Whomever is the cause of another becoming powerful is ruined, for that power is produced by either craft or force and both of these are suspect by the one who has been raised to power.
NOTES ON CHAPTER III

Chapter of The Prince entitled: "Of Mixed Monarchies"

In this section Machiavelli discusses "mixed monarchies", a term he uses to describe a state in which the (previous) Prince has been deposed and a (new) Prince takes control. The transposition of this chapter is entitled "Of Schools With Administrators of Mixed Motivation" for, as in the original, a most salient point is that the goals of administrators may differ in both intensity and scope from the goals of the staff.

We believe that Machiavelli points out that when a new administrator assumes control he must realize that when going into the situation he interferes with accustomed mores, folkways, interaction patterns, values etc. In this way, Machiavelli pin points the importance of "organizational personality" as a situational variable as well as the leader's behavior and the subordinates' expectations. It is important to point out the necessity to understand the relationship between causal, intervening and output variables.

Another major point is Machiavelli's statement that confrontation is at times not to be avoided and can be diffused only to the advantage of others. In this way Machiavelli recognizes the importance of diagnosis. We augment this dictum by suggesting that in addition to
timing, more crucial factors are the way in which one interacts with others and the issues one confronts others on. It is believed that if situations are allowed to go unattended they may ultimately result in severe win-lose situations later on. Explosive conditions of this type may make any interaction more volatile and resultingly may increase anger and hostility whatever is done. When "confrontations" occur over relatively minor issues or occur to nip potential difficulties before they become serious, the potential for severe win-lose conflict is minimized.

The concluding statement of this chapter warns the Prince (principal) not to allow another to become powerful or ruination is sure to follow. Again, we believe that this is situational. In terms of a linking role, the leader is simultaneously a superior to his staff and a subordinate to the next level of hierarchy. If the leader spends much time linking his unit to the next higher level and less time supervising his subordinates he can be effective or not depending upon the maturity of those left in charge. Another way to look at maturity is to estimate if the individual left in charge is more interested in satisfying his own needs than the needs of the organization. In this way it would seem that the act of consecrating another "powerful" may cause one's own power to become suspect if: it is a poor choice and superiors "punish" as a consequence; the individual who
is left in charge neglects the organizational goals but
insures a goal of maintaining his new-found power, one may
actually promote another into his job; or the "temporary"
leader becomes so powerful that former subordinates refuse
to accept the returning administrator's leadership. We
suggest that conditions such as these result from a mis-
alignment of roles, a probable lack of clarity of goals and
poor diagnostic ability of the leader. More simply stated,
another variable is whether or not the "power" we make
reference to is recognized as explicit or is felt as implicit;
or is personal or positional in the context of the organiza-
tion.
CHAPTER IV

WHY THE STAFF OF A SCHOOL DID NOT REJECT
A COMPETENT PRINCIPAL’S SUCCESSOR

Considering the difficulties in becoming a principal and administering a new school, some may wonder how it came to pass that when Mark Harvey, an extremely competent principal, retired shortly after reorganizing Scholastic High School, there was no general discontent among the staff about his successor’s administration. The new principal maintained his administration and encountered few difficulties in doing so, although some might have supposed that the whole school would have rebelled.

I reply that schools known to history are invariably governed in one of two ways: by an autocratic principal with cronies and subservient teachers assisting in administration; or by a more democratic principal with the aid of the indigenous staff, who hold their position not by favor but by competency.

In the latter case such personnel are teachers and administrators who are admired and trusted by others and as such have freedom within their spheres of influence. The other teachers generally recognize and acknowledge their leadership and like them as people. In schools run in an autocratic fashion, the principal alone has power. In the whole school it is only the principal who is
recognized as being entitled to authority; for others are obeyed as his tools. No liking is felt for those who are recognized as tools.

Examples of these two kinds of school administration are, in our own time, Windgate and Seabright High Schools.

Jeff Jones, the principal of Windgate, is a recognized autocrat. As such, he divided the school into the house plan without so much as speaking to the teachers. In so doing, the principal governs the school by himself, even though he has installed his cronies and subservient teachers as administrators. Jones transfers or fires administrators at will, and no one is certain about the reasons.

Steve Smith is the principal at Seabright and has surrounded himself with a large number of administrators and teachers who are judged by others in the school as most competent. These teachers and administrators are esteemed by their peers and as such have perogatives of which the principal cannot deprive them without danger.

Whoever now considers these two schools, will see that it would be difficult to take over from Jones at Windgate; but having done so, it would be very easy to maintain one's position. In many respects, on the other hand, it would be easier to take over from Smith at Seabright, but there would be great difficulty in holding one's position.

The cause of the difficulty of taking over from Jones is that the outsider could not gain meaningful help
from the other administrators, nor hope to gain the aid of the subservient teachers as they would not be able to carry the staff with them for reasons mentioned. Therefore, whoever attempts to take over from a principal like Jones must be prepared to meet with little administrative support and must rely on his own strengths rather than internal order of things. Yet, having taken over from an autocrat one must make sure of the cronies of the old principal who view themselves as the heirs apparent are dealt with in all despatch. The other left-overs have no credit with the staff and as such the victor, before the victory, could place no hope in them, so he need not fear them.

The contrary is the case in schools like Seabright because it is easier for a new principal to win over some unhappy administrators and teachers, there being always malcontents. These people can, for the reasons stated, open the way and facilitate the development of an administration. If they alone wish to govern, infinite difficulties arise, both from those who aided you as well as those who wish a continuance of the old system. It is not sufficient to suppress the supporters of the old system for there remain those noble ones who will take the lead in rebellion. The new principal, being neither able to completely content both groups nor transfer out all those of a like mind, will lose the school whenever an occasion arises.
If you consider the administration of Scholastic High School prior to Mark Harvey's principalship, you would have found it to have been similar to that of Jones at Windgate. Accordingly, Mark Harvey had to first overthrow the old administration completely after which he moved toward a system not unlike that at Seabright and the school remained loyal to him. It would be impossible to assume the principaship of Scholastic High School today and do the same owing to the staff's loyalty to key personnel. As long as the memory of Mark Harvey's principalship lasts, a new principal could not govern in an absolute manner. Resultingly, the new principal would never be sure of the extent of his authority. When the teachers and administrators fall out among themselves, any one of them could count on the support of those with whom they have credibility. The new chief administrator in guiding cohesion alone is recognized as arbiter, as principal.

The opposite could have happened at Scholastic High School even if the new principal might have won over a few malcontents and soon gained control. However, in further attempts to extend his authority, he might well run into difficulty with both those who helped and those whom he is trying to control. Since he can't satisfy them or get rid of them, he would never be able to establish authority.

Given these things, let no one be surprised at the facility with which the new principal was able to govern as
well as the difficulties another might encounter given lesser ability to recognize conditions and deal with them. And so we see that success may not depend upon the man as upon his ability to recognize and deal with the conditions in the school to which he is appointed.
NOTES ON CHAPTER IV

Chapter of The Prince entitled: "Why the Kingdom of Darius, Occupied by Alexander, Did Not Rebel Against the Successors of the Latter After his Death"

Machiavelli observes that one gains power in one of two ways: power gained by antiquity of blood; or power given a ruler by his ministers. We recognized schools wherein the principal transmits orders downwardly utilizing only the power of his position as well as recognizing schools wherein the principal derives his power through the staff and students' willingness to cooperate.

As regards schools, we infer that Machiavelli suggests that when a new principal takes over in a school formerly governed by an "autocrat" it will be very difficult to win over the staff, but once succeeding, loyalty would be easy to maintain. In the same way, we infer that Machiavelli would say that when a new principal takes over from a "democratic" principal it is easy to initially gain the loyalty of the staff, but very difficult to maintain it. This writer submits the reasons for the foregoing are as follows:

In the first case those who have been ruled by an autocrat never had the opportunity to make joint decisions and are unaccustomed to making their own decisions. A school with a staff in this state, in the absence of a leader would, in a short time, become chaotic. This is part due to the
exercise of individual potency as well as the absence of clearly defined authority. If the new principal be autocratic, he would still have a difficult time in coordinating the efforts of this staff. If he be democratic, he may never coordinate the staff. Democratic leadership in such a situation would seem inappropriate.

In the second case, in a school permitted often to operate on its own, the new principal would find the school operating with relative effectiveness. If, after the new principal takes over, he manifests authoritarian tendencies or desires to go in new directions and does not consult the staff, he is liable, as time goes on, to develop increasing friction. As this style is a radical departure for the staff, they will likely resent it. If the new principal be democratic but provides too little structure, the staff is likely to wallow in indecision and the principal to avoid the vices of "authority" may not be able to intercede effectively.

All the foregoing illustrates the importance of a principal's diagnosing his environment and adapting his leadership style dependent upon both the maturity level of the staff and the state of the organization upon his arrival.
CHAPTER V

THE WAY TO PRINCIPAL A SCHOOL THAT PREVIOUS
TO A NEW ADMINISTRATION LIVED UNDER
ITS OWN RULE

The staff of a school has been without a principal for some time prior and has thus become accustomed to go its own way. The new principal in assuming his duties will find three ways to deal with this situation: the principal can break up the staff, their relationships and interdependence, thusly forcing new modes of interaction upon them; or he can impose a rigid and active program of supervision; or he can mold some of the present into his new administration.

A school used to little direction from above is most easily led by means of its own staff working in concert with the principal and key personnel than in any other way. The new administrators appointed from within owe their positions to the principal and if their needs be met by him, will perform ably and capably for this they must do to retain their posts. A principal who adopts this methodology must be certain of his staff's ability to deal with freedom as well as decision-making responsibility. Disorganization and confusion are sure to plague such a school if those promoted are not capable and have not a wide range of talent, and the
principal does not intercede. Yet there are cases, however, where principals faced with the same situation at first tried to adopt a low profile but found, due to the staff's inability to carry through, that this was indeed inappropriate. These same principals then attempted to initiate tasks and supervise their accomplishment. All this was to no avail as the school began to rebel maintaining all the while that their freedom and rights were being denied. The fact that no one was doing what they had agreed to was of little concern.

I observe that a school will never forget the taste of joint decision-making, management by objectives if you will, no matter how short its duration or inappropriate it may have been for them to experience it.

Schools which were accustomed to an autocratic principal before being left on their own usually do not present such problems. The staff of such a school never before having to make decisions, or held accountable or involve themselves in designating mutual objectives, would tend to be at a loss in dealing with freedom. Thus the staff, recognizing chaos and their own frustration, will welcome the new principal and his rule as an alternative to these very conditions. The principal will therefore have little difficulty in establishing and gaining allegiance. As time goes on and only when appropriate, a principal, bit by bit, may be inclined to turn over certain decisions to the staff if they are deserving.
In the case of a staff, accustomed to its own rule and unable to accomplish, yet eschews the new principal's administration, I advocate the first two alternatives, hand in hand, initially. By following this regimen utilizing the power vested in his office, the principal can destroy old and humble the staff by transfer, and firings, as well as change by design accustomed modes of operation. Of those who remain, and as they begin to comply and change, the principal can slowly slacken punishment or its feared imposition and promote those most visibly able to adjust and work best under the new ways.

All this I have observed and commend its consideration to you. For many schools rebel and in thus doing have lost their heads; it has been on occasion, that principals too have lost their heads when the staff rebels.
Chapter of *The Prince* entitled: "The Way to Govern Cities or Dominions that, Previous to being Occupied, Lived under Their Own Laws."

In this chapter, Machiavelli begins an exploration of the concepts of situational leadership and change. He suggests three ways to govern dominions that previously experienced self-rule. The first method is to despoil them; the second is to live with them under their own rules, and take tribute for this; the third is to establish for those friendly to you a place in the government.

In schools, these three modes may be successful depending upon conditions. In a school whose staff is relatively mature (that is, they have ability, willingness to take responsibility, and ample relevant education or experience) the principal if he is wise will employ key personnel promoted from the ranks. If the staff is disorganized, it may be appropriate to provide close supervision while upgrading their skills at the same time. If the staff is comprised of incompetents who are so deficient that firings or transfers are in order, the principal ought to do so. Indeed, in a real situation all three methods, in concert, may be what is called for. A school would tend to have a full range of personalities on its staff, and different
leadership styles appropriate for each would seem to be
what is called for.

We have indicated that instrumental in this plan is
the behavior modification concept of "successive approxima-
tions" whereby as the individuals mature and their behaviors
become increasingly appropriate, the leader slackens in
providing close supervision and high structure accordingly.
We believe this exemplifies adaptable leader behavior, for
as circumstances change, the leader engages in new behaviors
which he engages in to assist the staff members to maximize
their potential.
CHAPTER VI

OF THOSE NEW TO THE PRINCIPALSHIP WHO HAVE ACQUIRED SUCH BY THEIR OWN ABILITY AND MERIT

Let no one marvel if in speaking of new administration, both in terms of the principal and of the school, I bring forward very exalted instances. Principals tend to govern only in the way they were once governed, thereby proceeding in their actions by imitation. A prudent principal must realize that he cannot attain the greatness of others while copying as it were, their deeds, for he is a decidedly different person by the nature of things. Resultingly that which works for one may not necessarily be wise for another. To try to attain greatness or govern a school in this manner, by replicating the acts of others, is fraught with peril. One cannot do overtime and with pressure that which is not his nature. Eventually the staff will become confused by the inconsistency of actions and thoughts and will therefore slacken in its cooperation.

Thus a new principal ought do as the most prudent do; continually recognize differences in circumstance and augment basic styles with things learned by experience; as well as do for himself and others that which archers do. When the place the bowmen wish to hit is far off, they knowing their skill, are content to traverse the distance
after several trials. Gradually, each time, they shoot further and further. In so doing they never lose sight of the final goal and never stop striving for greater and greater distance.

When a principal takes charge of a school where the need for change in policies and procedures is great and yet uncertain how and with whom to mount the challenge, he should emulate the archers. In so doing, he should first identify the changes needed in order, and follow this path: slowly set attainable goals, slowly increase them in order to maintain high ideals. In this way he may actually achieve the final goal even though he at first is uncertain. Effectiveness, and thus his longevity, depends upon the ability to harmonize that which he has learned yesterday with that which he experiences today.

The fact of maintaining oneself as a principal presupposes great technical, human and conceptual abilities; or good fortune in getting the right school; or both. It is the case that these in conjunction with the archers' method will mitigate difficulties. Nevertheless, those who have been less beholden to good fortune in the schools they govern have maintained themselves well. The matter is also facilitated by the principal who, uncertain of his inherited staff, is obliged to deal with problems personally, having no one to trust.
There are few really great principals worthy of admiration and thus worthy to speak of. If their particular actions and methods are examined, they will not appear very different from that which I have spoken. In such an examination, it will be seen, that they owed nothing to fortune but the opportunity to assume the principalship of a school. Without this opportunity, their knowledge and skill, their willingness to take charge and the wanting to do the best job possible would have been wasted. Yet without their knowledge, expertise, commitment, the opportunity would have come in vain.

Those who, by the exercise of abilities such as these became the principals in a school with great difficulties. The problems they have in developing their administration arise in part from new rules and regulations that they have to introduce. It must be considered that there is nothing more difficult to carry out, nor more doubtful of success, nor more dangerous to handle well than the initiation of a new order of things. The reformer has enemies in all those who profit from the old order, and only lukewarm defenders in all those who would profit by the new order. The lukewarmness arises partly from fear of adversaries and partly from the incredulity of mankind who do not truly believe in anything new until they have had actual experience of it. Thus it arises, that on every opportunity for attacking the reformer, his opponents do so with zeal, while the others
only defend him half-heartedly. As such, the danger really exists being caught between. It is necessary, however, in order to investigate thoroughly this question, to examine whether these innovators are independent, or whether they depend upon others; whether in order to carry out their designs they have to entice or are able to order. In the first case, principals invariably succeed in the short run and accomplish nothing in the long term. When principals can depend on strength and truly understand the dynamics of compliance, they rarely fail for in addition to what has already been said, the character of people varies, and it may be easy to persuade them of a thing, but difficult to keep them in that persuasion. Knowing this, it is necessary to order things so that when they no longer want to continue in the change cycle because of the strain of learning anew, they can be made to.

It has happened in our own time that a principal failed entirely in his new school when the multitude began to disbelieve in him for he had no means of holding fast those who had believed nor of compelling the unbelievers to believe. Therefore, men such as these with no knowledge of the foregoing have great difficulty in making their way and are overcome by their own lack of abilities. Once a principal overcomes those who begin to disbelieve, he, in utilizing his skills and experience, is on his way to remaining honored, secure and powerful.
To the foregoing examples I will only add one more, that of one who from a teacher's position became principal without aid of fortune beyond the opportunity after months of delay and indecision in naming a new principal. The teachers in this school were given the opportunity to select a new principal and elected one of their own. As a teacher, this individual's skills were such that it was oft said of him that he lacked nothing to be a principal but a school. Shortly after being conferred as principal of the school, this former teacher abolished old rules and established new ones; he abandoned his old friendships and raised new ones; and as he had thus friends of his own choosing, he was able, in his foundation to build securely. While he had great trouble in acquiring his position, he thus had little in maintaining it.

Yet with all these proceedings, I caution thee, o principal, if you do not know the rhyme or reason behind your succession to the principalship of a given school; or that you do not have sufficient information about the state and nature of the school, I caution you to remember the ways of the archer.
Chapter of The Prince entitled: "Of New Dominions which Have Been Acquired by One's own Arms and Ability"

There are several ways in which men become Princes. One way, as this chapter points out, is a result of possessing arms and ability. If one gets promoted as a consequence of being able, the individual is capable of overcoming the initial difficulties that would overwhelm others. In this way an able principal ought to learn from the example of others. At the same time, Machiavelli cautions, one must not limit himself to the methods of others for each of us has specific needs and a unique personality which manifest themselves in unique behaviors. The concept of the uniqueness of individuals supports a criticism of those who advocate a single "best style" of leadership. Even if we could discover the "best style" how many could always behave in the desired way? To suggest that we ought to behave in a specific way when this behavior may not be in our repertoire is to suggest that changing behavior or personality is easy, Machiavelli offers caution to adherents of this naive approach.

Although one has ability and is promoted accordingly, we are reminded not to eschew good fortune, for each of us must be able to recognize luck when it occurs and harmonize
its occurrence with our methods and goals. However, we are warned not to rely on luck, for it also can, when it changes, unmake the best plans.

Perhaps the most important statement is Machiavelli's diagnosis of the problems of change. He recognizes that the innovator, by definition, implements new things. We recognize that people invariably resist change because they either profit from the old ways or are afraid of failure or because they do not believe that the new ways have been proven. It is easy to discern similarities in school personnel. Machiavelli further states that even though people might like the idea of change and initially go along, old behaviors are hard to change and consequently when pressure and frustration build, people might revert back to old behaviors which are familiar and comfortable. We submit that this really establishes the utility of both position and personal power for it might take personal charm to initiate a change but authority to keep it going, or vice-versa, depending upon the needs of the situation.
CHAPTER VII

OF OBTAINING ONE'S POSITION BY KNOWING
THE HIGHER UPS AND BY SIMPLY
BEING LUCKY

Those who become principal by being lucky and knowing the right people have little trouble initially, but will never stand the test of time. These people meet with little difficulty on the way up as they fly over it. All their problems arise when they are established. Such are they who only hold their position by the grace of the superintendent that they work only for his security and glory. Those that rise to the principalship by feeding the ambitions of members of the Board of Education depend absolutely on their pleasure and good will. In either case, they must depend solely on the whims of others, which can be extremely inconsistent and unstable. Principals who rise in this manner are generally neither good co-workers nor good teachers and moreover lack sufficient education and experience to deal with the array of issues and problems facing schools today. As such, these people are not likely to know how to lead for they have been and will continue to be subservients. They have been strangers to the problems, successes and accomplishments of leadership as well as knowing nothing about the conduct of human affairs. Individuals such as these, it is generally felt, have stepped
upon others who more rightfully, on the basis of experience, commitment and energy, were entitled. Such principals take on a new school, enter a new environment, and are restrained from the outset, for in a short time the school learns that hard work and advanced education and experience count for little and reduce their cooperation. Other principals will not give aid and counsel for they worked hard and long for their positions and feel resentful. The principals in question resultingly are unable to maintain themselves because they possess few friendly to them.

In this fashion, a principal like other things of rapid beginnings and growth cannot have deep roots and wide ramifications. The first storm will destroy them utterly, for it is rare that such as these have studied and observed the deeds of the great so that they would have learned to be able to take proper immediate steps to maintain that which has fallen into their laps and lay foundations in the manner that those with great knowledge and experience would do.

With regard to these methods of attaining the principalship—by knowing the right people and by simple luck—I will here present two examples.

Frank Sforza, after a little advanced study and some experience, was able to gain the principalship of Juniper Elementary School upon the retirement of Mr. Adams. Juniper School was regarded as the best in the system due to its physical appearance, the benevolent administration
under Adams, and the high morale of both teachers and students. In a short time after Sforza took over the school, teacher turnover and absenteeism tripled and vandalism was rampant. Sforza, in dealing with these problems, began to be called "the vicious incompetent one" by his staff, with just cause. When Sforza's family lost its influence on the school board as a result of the election, he found himself promoted to the Directorship of the Book Disposal Unit at the central office. Frank Sforza was ignorant of those things that a capable man might have done to establish himself firmly. To no avail, were the favors of others provided. The teachers, sickened at Sforza's sight, feeling corrupted by his presence, proceeded to find successful means to rid themselves of him. The other principals in the system, at every opportunity, spoke of his lack of ability for they were not about to share the pride of their profession and despoil their vocation in the eyes of the community for one so incompetent. Teachers and principals in their own way had vengeance, for he who does not lay his foundations beforehand, may only with exceptional ability, do so afterwards, although it is still fraught with great peril both for oneself and one's school.

Charles Borgia graduated from State Tech with the highest honors in Electrical Engineering. Due to the shortage of vocational teachers, he was soon able to find a good job at Technical-Vocational High School. As Charles
took graduate courses, he increasingly realized that he wanted to become a school principal. He knew that with I.M. Rigid as principal of Tech-Voc, there was little he could do to realize his ambition. Charles proceeded towards a Master of Education and took on the duties of Coordinator of the Adult Education Center two nights a week. Charles got experience in dealing with adults, in preparing budgets and sundry other things. This experience and the realization of the Masters degree made Charles increasingly envious of Rigid. After a time, the job of Assistant Principal opened under Rigid. Inasmuch as Charles, unknowingly, took most of his graduate courses from the superintendent's new neighbor, he got the promotion. In his new capacity he began to see which teachers were in the hands of Rigid and the reasons. Daily, Charles wrote down the things he thought were reasons that he should be the principal as well as the obstacles to this ambition.

After a time, Charles presented to the principal a major reorganization plan for the school. It was very easy to get Rigid's ear, for unknown to Charles, the superintendent facilitated its occurrence by suggesting to Rigid that he loosen. Rigid, too, could not adjust to any plan and soon went on early retirement. Hardly had the vacancy been advertised when the superintendent's wife heard of Charles' plan over a bridge game and suggested to her husband that Charles take over the school. After several weeks, in an
attempt to quiet his wife, the superintendent appointed Charles to the principalship.

Charles Borgia thus became principal and was hindered in developing the potential of the school by his lack of knowledge and experience; by teachers whose cooperation, flexibility and concern were in doubt; as well as an unspecified mandate from the superintendent. Charles feared that which made him principal, his plan, should it fail, would not only hinder his credibility but, moreover, take from him the principalship. Charles decided to no longer depend on his being in the right place at the right time.

The first weeks on the job, Charles did the following: he provided literature and voluntary inservice training about new methods to the staff. Slowly, ever so slowly, he instituted a policy of field trips to other schools and granted to those teachers who went, increasingly less corridor and bus duty. When teachers had visited five schools, he released them from study hall duty to plan other field site tours and make arrangements. Their attachments to the old ways were gradually extinguished. In this way the staff was almost, in its entirety, talking about different schools and philosophies.

After doing all this, Charles awaited an opportunity when the balance of attitude switched from the pervasive norm of rigidity to valuing different approaches. Finally the opportunity came. A few teachers who did not change the
ways in which they did things were viewed, by others who experimented, as not caring. When this occurred, Charles made good use of it by forcing the recalcitrant teachers to stay after school for bus duty. This they did and began to plan to oust Charles, for even they were not able to enforce their own policies. The principal, without the aid of the other teachers, or the knowledge of the superintendent, put down the rebellion. Having recourse to strategy, Charles explained to the rebellious teachers that it was good to have beliefs and values no matter how different from his own, and that teachers should fully hear other points of view before rejecting them. In this way Charles was able to force the rigid teachers into observing the more innovative teachers. The use of force in this regard met with no resistance for the teachers felt it a small price to pay for the rebellion as they expected to be fired or transferred. The principal proceeded to disarm the teachers with every courtesy, presenting them with released time to go on field trips as soon as they began to innovate. At times Charles even reimbursed their travel expenses. In this way all the teachers at Technical-Vocational High School were induced to consider new things and as time went on, try new ways.

When the school got Charles as its new principal, it was known for its incorrigible students, who rather than go to class fought in the hallways and generally tore up the
school. This behavior gave cause to the staff's low opinion of students in such a way that successively, teachers did less and less and students became more and more incorrigible. Charles judged the necessity to change this. He employed Remi DeOrco, a strong and able man to whom he gave the fullest authority. Remi knew that the job was only to last one year and so in a short time and in a highly rigid manner forced students into classes and physically broke up the fights. Over time, the students began to comply with DeOrco's edicts out of abject fear of him. The principal, deeming such authoritarianism expedient and knowing the need for it, gave DeOrco free reign for several months. As time went by, Charles met with student groups and told them of his concern that they like school and that if he could make things more pleasant he would do so, all they need do was ask. The students were terrified of the assistant principal. They gradually let Borgia know it in many ways. The principal knew that the manner of DeOrco had, by design, engendered hatred. In order to purge the minds of students and to win them over, Charles resolved to show that his offer was real. Having found the opportunity, he toned down the assistant principal who appropriately used less and less force. Finally, at year's end, DeOrco was transferred to another school. This change caused the students to know that the principal meant what he said.
During the same year, a new superintendent was installed with the mandate of saving the taxpayers money. Borgia assumed that the new superintendent, who had recently taken office, would not give him any help, so he began to seek fresh assistance from teachers and students alike. His intention was to insure himself of them and not give cause for rebellion. These were the measures taken by him with regard to the present.

As to the future, Borgia feared that the new successor to the superintendency might not be friendly to him and might seek to deprive him of what the old superintendent had given him. He sought to provide against this in four ways. First by transferring all those who wanted out as well as those he wanted out. Secondly, by gaining the friendship of the parents. Thirdly, by obtaining as great a hold on the school as he could so that he would become virtually indispensable. Forthly, by acquiring as much in the way of resources as he could before the new superintendent took office. Of the four things that were attempted, he accomplished three and the fourth he had almost accomplished. Of the teachers who wanted out or the ones he wanted out, he transferred as many as he could without raising suspicion and very few remained. He had gained to his party the parents as well as having become indispensable to the school. As to the resources, he planned to gain an overflow of supplies and already possessed the best audio-
visual devices and films, and had an abundance of new furniture and equipment.

Had Borgia succeeded as well as he hoped, he would have gained such strength, become so well known and indispensable that he would endure. His valor and ability were such that he knew well how to win men over or vanquish them, and so strong were the foundations that he had laid in this short time that if it had not been for two mistakes he would have survived every difficulty. That his plans were so good is seen from the fact that the new superintendent waited to move against him for more than two months as he could find only a few to oppose the principal. Borgia had planned for everything, or so he thought.

The first mistake Borgia made was that he allowed the superintendent to appoint a new assistant principal. This assistant principal told the superintendent of the over-ordering of supplies as well as the slush fund used to pay teachers for field trips. The superintendent, who wanted so much to gain credibility as a money saver, attacked with all ferocity.

You might ask what of the students, parents and teachers? Why did they not rally? The answer, and Borgia's second mistake, is that most of the vocal and ardent students had graduated. The teachers who were innovative either got moved to other, better positions outside of the school, or left the system for better jobs elsewhere. The parents'
heads turned on the thought of tax savings. Borgia's errors were such that although he recognized the conditions and provided good mechanisms, he did not realize that the change effort must be continuous and that he could not merely sit back after the process had begun.

Reviewing thus all the actions of Borgia, I find little to blame, on the contrary, I feel bound, as I have done, to hold him up as an example to be observed by others who by fortune and by knowing the right people, rise to power. With his great courage and high ambition, Borgia could not have acted otherwise. His designs were only frustrated by poor lessons of short experience.

Whoever, therefore, deems it necessary in his new school to bring about change, must secure himself against enemies, therefore must gain new devotees, understand his mandate, know his own strengths and limitations, check out subordinates, learn the ways of the school, make himself followed and revered, transfer or subdue those who he can be injured by, introduce changes consistent with expectations, suppress old ways and create new ones, maintain and develop friendships with other principals in such a way that they are glad to be of benefit and fear to injure. Such a man can find no better example save one—he who does these things consistently.

The only thing Borgia can be accused of is that he did not oppose the selection and imposition of the new
assistant principal. As has been surmised, not being able to choose his own assistant was the weak link. For reasons stated, the principal ought, above all things, have created his own assistant. Not continuing to develop his staff and students was what ultimately caused his ruin.

All this can be blamed on short experience and no knowledge of effectiveness. It is true that he who does not lay his foundations beforehand may only, with exceptional ability, do so afterwards, although it is still fraught with great peril.
NOTES ON CHAPTER VII

Chapter of The Prince entitled: "Of New Dominions Acquired by the Power of Others or by Fortune"

Other means by which one may gain the principalship is through connections with the "right" people or by being lucky. In some cases, the absence of ability but the presence of luck will enable one to become principal. The problem of relying on luck has been already discussed. The problem of relying on others while possessing no great ability is that personal power may be lacking and position power depends upon the good favor of others which you may not be able to maintain. In addition, we recognize additional situational variables, namely, the expectations of the "patrons" peers and subordinates. As outlined in the chapter, if one is promoted solely due to "connections" he runs the risk of alienating others.

Machiavelli points out that leaders, like trees, in order to stand adverse circumstance, need to have deep roots and wide ramifications, clearly what he is stating is that without knowledge and experience, one's willingness will not serve well in the long run if the leadership style is not appropriate to the situation. We believe this is because the exercise of effective leadership is something that is learned through experience with people and problems.
CHAPTER VIII

THOSE WHO COME TO POWER BY TURNING
CIRCUMSTANCE TO THEIR OWN ADVANTAGE

There is another way of becoming a principal which cannot be attributed entirely to fortune, ability or knowing those in powerful positions. This additional method is taking and making conditions to one's own advantage. I will give example without entering further into the merits of this, as I judge it to be sufficient for anyone obliged to imitate it.

Agath Sicil, son of a rural farmer, had already in his collegiate studies shown definite tendencies toward controlling the situation to his own end. Realizing that he seemed to be in danger of failing literature, Agath soon found himself in love with Moby Dick, which was also the literature instructor's favorite novel. Rather than study anything else, Agath became an expert on The White Whale. At every opportunity, both within class and without, to the exclusion of other conversation with the instructor, Agath engaged in a heated discussion of Melville's novel. The upshot of this was that he passed literature. As Agath approached graduation, it became obvious that he had mastered this technique for his fellow classmates voted him "Most likely to Succeed."
Agath recognized that the educational system was a particularly ripe ground for his talents because it did not have any clarity of goals. Given his talents, he could become an expert with the jargon and thus exploit each development as it arose. Through several adroit moves in the background, Agath soon rose to the position of assistant principal at the high school. Appraising the situation as he was apt to do, he realized that the principal, although reasonably successful, had no real relationships with the staff and student body and was reluctant to suggest to others what ought to be done. In addition, the principal had become a thorn in the side of the superintendent because he knew nothing of the latest educational issues and methods. Agath proceeded to become expert on in-service education (knowing that it was a high priority of the superintendent) as well as human relations skills. Because he performed his tasks so well as assistant principal, he ferreted out every mistake the principal had made as well as in which circumstances he was most ineffective. During this planning time, if you will, no one knew of Agath's blossoming knowledge of in-service education. After a time a message came to the principal from the superintendent, a decree to develop an in-service program. The principal asked Agath if an in-service program was desirable as well as if he should announce one to the staff and implement it after the school day. To these questions, Agath responded
that it would be difficult to do in this way. The principal
decided to invite the superintendent to the meeting so he
could observe his effectiveness.

The day before the meeting, Agath realized that the
staff pot was boiling as they bemoaned after-hours programs
during the winter months. The morning of the meeting, he
casually asked two teachers if they had heard of the
principal's idea about the workshops. By the noon hour
there was a teacher walk-out which the principal was incapable
of understanding and thus he simply ordered the teachers back
to classes. With his nerves rather jangled, the principal
headed for the staff meeting. By this time, the teachers
were not only upset over old grudges, but both the workshop
and the way they were to be implemented. The superintendent,
meanwhile, was listening with one ear while he read a file
concerning accounting errors, etc. in the school's budget.
No sooner had the principal delivered his proposal than the
teachers began complaint after complaint as well as including
side references to the principal's irritability perhaps
being caused by drugs used for bad nerves. Agath used this
opportunity, all his skills in human relations as well as
his knowledge of staff training to moderate the meeting.
After a time, the principal was called to the superintendent's
office and was granted a leave of absence. Agath was asked
to assume the principalship and agreed if several of the
teachers he requested to be transferred were. Once in office,
he immediately called a staff meeting at which he assured
the teachers who remained that they would in fact remain
and that their requests for materials, teacher aids and
the like would be honored. Agath got the teachers involved
in planning the in-service training program with students as
well as a dance in honor of the new principal.

Some may wonder how it came that Agath Sicil and
others like him could, after taking advantage of circum-
stances in this way, maintain themselves as principals and
deal with the multitude of problems facing the school
without being conspired against by the staff. For it is
recognized that other principals, owing the principalship
to dealing with circumstance in the same general way, have
been unable to maintain their administration in relatively
calm times, not to speak of the uncertain times that give
rise to great problems. I believe longevity arises from
whether or not the skill in recognizing and dealing effec-
tively with circumstance is exploited well or badly. Well
utilized, it may be called, when done for the need of
securing one’s position and which afterwards is done for the
staff and students. Ill committed, it can be said, is when
done only for the glorification of the doer. Those who use
their talents in the former way may do good by others and thus
insure their position. As to the other, it is impossible to
maintain their schools in such a manner.
Whence it is to be noted that in taking over a school one must overcome his enemies, both potential and real, at once so as not to have every day bring with it misunderstanding and so to reassure others of their security, affiliation, and esteem under the new regime. Whoever acts otherwise, either through ego or by trying to motivate others by force, is always obligated to bend with the wind. In so doing, all it does is force more anxiety on those presently insecure and thus they are unable to depend on him and he is unable to depend on them. For providing good circumstances in which to do one’s job should be done initially so that being tested will give one greater credibility. Benefits should be granted little by little so that they may be better associated. Above all, the principal must allow the staff to identify with him and his concerns and in such a way that no accident can deflect them from their course. Necessity, arising in adverse times, is such that one may lose his devotees unless the good he does is not judged to be forced upon him for then he will derive no benefit whatever from it.
NOTES ON CHAPTER VIII

Chapter of The Prince entitled: "Of Those who have Attained the Position of Prince by Villainy"

Machiavelli suggests that once a new principal takes over leadership, how his intentions are perceived by others is all-important. If the principal is perceived as manipulating circumstances for his own individual goals, his behavior may engender hostility, because the staff may see themselves as mere pawns in his ambitions. If however, the new principal gains and maintains control of a school and is perceived as having only the good of the school and its staff and students in mind, then people will become committed to him and will be motivated to work toward goal accomplishment. Here it is important to stress the word perceived, because how a principal really behaves is not as important as how people perceive he is behaving. For example, teachers and students behave on the basis of this perception of reality not the principal's! Thus a principal can feel that he is "Mr. Human Relations", but if the staff and students see him as a hard-nosed, inflexible autocrat, they will respond to him as if he was a hard-nosed, inflexible autocrat. For this reason, we believe that leader personality is correctly defined as behavior patterns developed over time as perceived by others.
Machiavelli provides another helpful insight for change agents in the latter part of this chapter. He suggests that very soon after securing the principalship, the office holder if he wants to implement change, should do all his evil at once. That is to say, firings, transfers and demotions should be done all at one time for piecemeal rejections and punishment will cause all members of the staff to become insecure. When security is a high strength need, attention and energy may divert from effective performance to time-consuming counter-attacks; or in addition, the staff, due to a preoccupation with security, may fail to initiate activity unless closely supervised. This close supervision may in turn increase insecurity. Hence an ineffective cycle.

Although Machiavelli does not suggest this (due perhaps to a limitation of his times) a methodology once all the ineffective staff that can be removed are removed, is to articulate high goals and reward those that begin to approximate them. It is important to reward and encourage everyone when appropriate, including those one was not able to transfer for reasons of tenure, political favor, etc. This ought to be done in order to help individual staff members lose their insecurity, in order that they can begin to maximize the talent that they have. This is important for political reasons too, for if the principal's superior is removed or
leaves, and one who is not his partisan takes over, those that were unremovable, if sufficiently outraged, might find a powerful ally.
But we now come to the case where one becomes principal by the favor of his fellows. To attain this position depends not entirely on worth or entirely on fortune, but rather on cunning assisted by fortune. One attains it by help of popular favor or by the favor of the department heads. For in every school these two parties are to be found, arising from the desire of the teachers to avoid the oppression of the great, and the desire of the department heads to command the teachers. And from these two opposing interests arise in the school one of the three effects: either absolute government, liberty, or licence. The former is created either by the populace or the department heads, depending on the relative opportunities for when the department heads see that they are unable to resist the staff they unite in exalting one of their number and creating him principal so as to be able to carry out their own designs under the shadow of his authority. The teachers, on the other hand, when unable to resist the department heads, endeavor to exalt and create a principal in order to be protected by his authority. He who becomes principal by help of the department heads has greater difficulty in maintaining his power than he who is raised by the teachers, for he is surrounded by those who think themselves his equals and is
thus unable to direct or command as he pleases. But one who is raised to leadership by popular favor finds himself alone, and has no one, or very few, who are not ready to obey him. Besides which, it is impossible to satisfy the department heads by fair dealing and without inflicting injury on others, whereas it is very easy to satisfy the mass of teachers in this way. For the aim of the teachers is more honest than that of the department heads, the latter desiring to order, and the former merely to avoid oppression. It must also be added that the principal can never insure himself against hostile teachers on account of their number, but he can against the hostility of the department heads as they are but few. The worst that a principal has to expect from hostile department heads is to be abandoned. From hostile teachers he has to fear not only desertion but their active opposition, and as they are more far-seeing and more cunning, they are always in time to save themselves and take sides with the one who they expect will conquer. The principal, moreover, cannot transfer or fire all the teachers yet he can easily undo some of the department heads, being able to make and unmake them at any time, and improve their position or deprive them of it as he pleases.

And to throw further light on this part of my argument, I would say, that the department heads are to be considered in two different manners; that is, they are either to be ruled so as to make them entirely dependent on
your fortunes, or else not. Those that are thus bound to you and are not cowardly, must be honoured and loved; those who stand aloof must be considered in two ways, they either do this through disrespect and natural want of courage, and in this case you ought to make use of them, and especially such as are of good counsel, so that they may honour you in prosperity and in adversity you have not to fear them. But when they are not bound to you of set purpose and for ambitious ends, it is a sign that they think more of themselves than of you; and from such men the principal must guard himself and look upon them as secret enemies, who will help to ruin him when in adversity.

One, however, who becomes principal by favour of the teachers, must maintain its friendship, which he will find easy, the teachers asking nothing but not to be oppressed. But one who against the department heads' wishes becomes principal by favour of the teachers, should above all endeavour to gain their favour; this will be easy to him if he protects them. And as men, who receive good from whom they expected evil, feel under a greater obligation to their benefactor, so will soon become even better disposed towards him than if he had become principal through their favour.

The principal can win their favour in many ways, which vary according to circumstances, for which no certain rule can be given, and will therefore be passed over. I will only say, in conclusion, that it is necessary for a principal to
possess the friendship of the teachers; otherwise he has no resource in times of adversity.

Nabis, principal of Spartan High School, sustained a move to oust him by the new superintendent and newly elected conservative board of education, and defended his school against them and maintained his own position. It sufficed when the danger arose for him to disarm the opposition within his school, which he could not have done if a majority of the teachers had been hostile to him. And let no one oppose my opinion in this by quoting the trite proverb, "He who builds on the teachers, builds on mud"; because that is true when a principal relies upon the teachers but does little to ensure their loyalty, deludes himself that they will aid him if he is oppressed. In this case he might often find himself deceived. But if a principal who founds himself on this basis is also one who can command and is a man of courage, and does not get frightened in adversity, and does not neglect other preparations, and one who by his own valour and measures activates the mass of the teachers, he will not find himself deceived by them, and he will find that he has laid his foundations well.

Usually these principals are in danger when from the position of a democrat, changes to demagogue. Principals either command themselves or command by means of department heads. In the latter case his position is weaker and more dangerous, for he is at the mercy of those who are appointed
department heads, who can, especially in times of adversity, with great facility deprive him of his position, either by acting against him or by not obeying him. The principal in such time is in danger if he tries to assume absolute authority, for the teachers and students who are accustomed to take their orders from the department heads are not ready in these emergencies to obey his, and he will always in difficult times lack men whom he can rely on. Such a principal cannot base himself on what he sees in quiet times, when the department heads and teachers have need of him; for then every one is full of promises and each one is ready to die for him when death is far off. In adversity, when the principal has need of his staff, then he will find but few. This experience is the more dangerous, in that it can only be had once. Therefore a wise principal will seek means by which his school will always and in every possible condition of things have need of his government, and then they will always be faithful to him.
NOTES ON CHAPTER IX

Chapter of The Prince entitled: "Of the Civic Principality"

In this section Machiavelli discusses two sources of power for the Prince. One source is the Nobility, the people the Prince gathers and to whom he delegates authority. Another source of power is that which comes from the masses of people who live in the dominion. Machiavelli sensibly suggests that the Prince must have control over the Nobles because they are fewer in number, better educated, more organized and cunning than the masses and are quickly able to see what one is about to do, and therefore may present greater danger.

During Machiavelli's time the differences between the backgrounds, education, experience and 'maturity' of the Nobles and masses was great. Much of what the Prince wanted to do would not effect the motivation of the masses, for they were essentially working with only food, shelter and clothing as high strength needs, and consequently, were not afforded the luxury of having the time to worry about the Prince, his policies or procedures.

In drawing a parallel to schools, we do not find such a tremendous difference between Department Heads and
teachers. Each group has a similar educational experience, as well as a position of great responsibility. In this way a principal may find himself in an organization that can be determined to a large extent by the action or inaction of the 'masses.' Due to this a principal must develop and maintain favor with the teachers as they are larger in number, their impact is potentially greater.
OF SUCCESSFUL AND EFFECTIVE PRINCIPALS

In examining the deeds of principals such as I have related, it is necessary to consider another point. Whether the staff (and thus the school) is in such a state wherein each knows the role and purpose of the other, understands what ought to be done and as circumstance demands spring forth into action. In this way, with faith, flexibility, knowledge, everyone knows that no matter the difficulty, they will not succumb to defeat for they are able to handle situations as they arise. To better explain this, I would say that I consider those principals, who nurture their staff and assist them to develop an abundance of skill and knowledge, capable of holding the school against anything that assails them, I consider to constantly and consistently intervene, to direct and command an evil that will preclude a staff's development and maturation.

A principal can overcome difficulties by raising the hopes of his staff that evils will not last long, impressing them with the fear of transfer or firings and by assuring himself of those who appear too bold. It will be the case that while the staff is still hot and eager to defend itself the principal will have less to fear. This administrator would not try innovations for they are fraught with potential problems and thus are too risky. Individuals of this type
generally possess a strong account of their daily activities and view their major responsibility as that of keeping and preparing budgets and records. They spend little time working with staff and students.

An effective principal is one who in addition to being an advocate for his staff and students and making sure that records, budgets and such are accurate and correct, adds to the growth of the staff and thus to each pupil. This reservoir of strength, the unity of purpose, will blunt any attack. An effective principal thus is one who has put much of himself into the school and has allowed his staff and students to do the same. In this way, others feel and share a sense of commitment and sacrifice. Whomsoever strongly fortifies his school by developing capability will never be attacked for people are adverse to the defeat of such an endeavor. The staff and students in such a school are free from the interference of outsiders for the principal can meet such challenges without the fear of chaos and rebellion in his absence. The staff and students do not fear circumstance for they are equipped to deal with it. The wise principal will keep the staff and students developing and provide conditions so that they will be able to experiment and learn from their endeavors. If the staff fails, the damage is done, the evil has been suffered and they recognize no remedy. In this way, they will more readily unite and learn from the principal. Should they be
successful it appears that the principal is under obligation to them. It is the nature of men to be as much bound by the benefits that they confer as by those they receive.

It follows that, everything considered, a principal who has faith in his staff, develops and upholds high expectations of them, nurtures their courage and skills, both initially and during times of trouble, will be termed effective.
Chapter of The Prince entitled: "How the States of All States should be measured"

Machiavelli argues in this chapter that it is important for the Prince while governing his dominion to nurture and care for the populous so that they feel a part of the Principality and therefore have commitment to it. The reason he feels this is important is that if the Principality comes under attack the people will fight and work to protect it because it is something that is important to them. This is just as important in schools. The principal who takes time to nurture and kindle good human relations in his school does not have to fear attack from people who are trying to undermine his position because the staff will tend to come together and rally around him. In both the case of Machiavelli's principality and in the school if this is not done and teachers and staff do not feel committed to the leader or his plans, in times of trouble they will mentally or physically desert. Therefore either the Prince or principal will be overrun by the opposition and whatever was going to be accomplished will be destroyed. It is interesting to look at the distinction between output and climate as two variables that should be taken into consideration in evaluating the effectiveness
of a school. Since there is no easily observed or measurable output in schools, often keeping things 'under control' becomes the goal. Yet we would warn that a leader who emphasizes only output, such things as obeying rules and regulations, will entirely miss a crucial element of organizational effectiveness, "intervening variables."

If a principal does not take heed and does not concentrate or commit energy to maintaining a good human organization, he may survive in the short run but eventually, in times of trouble, the deteriorating intervening variables will cause his doom. The staff's loyalty and commitment will wane and organizational stability will falter. It is very important, when evaluating the effectiveness of a principal to not only examine school output in terms of easily measured results but also to observe communication and decision making patterns, commitment to objectives, morale and other intangible factors.
CHAPTER XI

OF THE DIFFERENT KINDS OF PERSONNEL

Having discussed means of attaining the principalship and partially considered the overt causes of one's prosperity or failure, it now remains to treat specific areas of concern so that administrators can better consider effectiveness and thus longevity. We have stated already how necessary it is for a principal to have his foundations good, otherwise he is certain to be ruined. The chief foundation of any school, whether it be new or old, is the human resources within it. There cannot be effective principals where human resources are being wasted and there cannot be optimum utilization of resources when the principal is ineffective. I will not now discuss the principal but will speak of human resources.

I say that in each school each principal will have in his employ both teachers and non-teachers. These two groups are, when underutilized and in disharmony, dangerous as I shall later point out. If one supports his principalship or otherwise hopes to profit by either developing friction between these groups or permits friction to exist unchecked, he will never stand firm or serve. The system adopted by such groups, in the first place, is to increase their reputation by discrediting the others. They use every means including absenteeism and the shirking of former
responsibilities to spare themselves any hard work or forethought. They tend to do the most expedient rather than the best. They take into account only the present rather than past, present and future. They always respond in a lethargic manner rather than energy appropriate to the issue. All these things they permit themselves to do in order to avoid intergroup contact and thus trouble and danger. In this way they reduce the effectiveness of the principal.

Ruin is only deferred as long as the problems of uniting these groups are postponed. In times of calm, one's administration can be rendered ineffective by this inner group hostility, tension, lack of trust and lack of interdependence. In troubled times the principal has this condition in addition to contending with exergent problems. Compounding this is that individuals begin to experience loss of motivation for they are unable to develop their potential and thus begin to work only for the trifling wage. When a principal attempts to remedy such a state by removing benefits and threatening the removal of wages, he can only force compliance to edict, but does not deal with the larger issues of cohesiveness. Circumstances such as this have caused the downfall of many and resultingly caused others to rise to the principalship. When principals did not deal with this issue they showed their worthlessness,
for some it has come about, were not even aware of intergroup conflict as a potential problem, let alone of its existence in their school.

I will explain more fully the defects of intergroup hostility and its deleterious effect on one's longevity as principal. The school's staff is composed of either the capable or not capable, regardless of their formal role. If the school is dominated by the very competent, the principal cannot fan discord at length for the staff will see through him and rebel, thus forcing him out. If the school be dominated by incompetents, a principal cannot rely on competition to develop productivity, for both groups will shirk responsibility and commit no energy to school problems. The most capable in the foregoing circumstances will try to ruin the principal in the hopes of filling the position themselves.

The only way to maintain one's position is by taking and developing inter-group trust, openness and interdependence. This will increase each individual's motivation to work. This can occur by developing opportunities for each group to work together thus giving rise to positive sentiments, one for each other. This procedure tends to break down isolation. Only in a like manner can principals become effective and thus secure, for unchecked friction and distrust cause people to put out less than the maximum. An unhappy
staff, one that is frustrated, submits less easily to the principal, whether he formerly be one of them or otherwise.
NOTES ON CHAPTER XI

Chapter of The Prince entitled: "The Different Kinds of Militia and Mercenary Soldiers"

Machiavelli writes about mercenaries and other outsiders that may be hired and brought in to help protect a principality from attack. When we read what is stated about mercenaries, we draw some interesting inferences concerning "consultants."

We believe that Machiavelli would say that bringing in outside consultants is useless and dangerous; and if anyone tries to support his organization through the use of consultants he will never stand firm for they are "disunited, ambitious, without discipline, faithless, bold amongst friends, cowardly amongst enemies. They have no fear of God, and they keep no faith with men." Machiavelli downgrades consultants and cautions us against their deployment. It is interesting to compare this thought with what Robert Townsend has stated in his book Up The Organization. Townsend warns that managers should never hire outside consulting firms. He claims that consultants come in, borrow your watch, tell you what time it is and then take your watch home with them. Machiavelli warns us to be very leary of outsiders.

Machiavelli might suggest that rather than devote
time and energy to locating and employing consultants it might be better for leaders to develop their own resources. Very often in schools, for example, we hardly ever give credit to our teachers and other staff members for being able to solve many of the problems by themselves. A result of utilizing native personnel and getting them involved is that one has a much better chance of securing their commitment to objectives.

Presently, most school principals do not have an opportunity to deal with consultants very often. Consultants to schools tend to work mainly with the superintendent and the central staff. Rather than write about consultants of the different kinds of personnel in schools, we take considerable license and discuss things that Machiavelli never really touches. The rewrite centers on how one gets the different kinds of personnel in a school to work well together. We suggest that a school has what might be called the teaching or instructional staff and non-teaching or service staff. Often these two groups have no respect for each other. If these two groups are going to work well together, they must understand each other's role. That is, understand and respect the need for what the other does and not interfere or downgrade it.

Another important element is that the groups need to have common goals. Both groups must feel that they are
working toward the same end—a better educational and learning environment. These two elements—understanding the other groups role(s) and having common goals are part of what is called "compatible expectations."

When there is conflict between these two groups, the principals' role may become one of a harmonizer, the person who intervenes and tries to bring things back into perspective. It is during these crises that the principal must help define the roles of each group and open up channels of communication so that they can develop an understanding and appreciation of each others contribution.
Volunteers and substitute teachers are involved in a school when the principal calls upon them at home. Many principals have tried, in recent years, to develop strong parent lobbies by employing volunteers in various capacities. These auxiliary staff members, as it were, are usually assigned non-professional duties due to their lack of experience or lack of "certification." As such, they do little else but "baby sit," a task which, over time, is worthless to them as well as being uninspiring.

In and of themselves, volunteers and substitutes can prove useful and reliable, but for the principal who calls them in they are generally a disaster. A principal is left with serious problems if they are unsuccessful and in their debt if they succeed. Examples could be given of chaotic conditions due to the incompetence of substitutes as well as due to volunteers utilizing their position to win concessions regarding pet projects or individual children.

Wise principals therefore, generally shun empowering volunteers and make use of their own staff in coordinating and deploying non-paid help. These same principals with good cause have preferred to abandon plans or programs in times of budget cutbacks rather than execute them solely with volunteers. These principals believe that no true
accomplishment can be made when individuals in such circumstance have divided loyalties for volunteer help is generally given out of the desire to help a particular child, not for the good of the school or educational program. Inevitable conflict results.

Principals using volunteers have also had to face the problem of terminating the work of a volunteer whose activities within the school have been less than satisfactory, as well as having to try and explain to such volunteers why their services are no longer required; but their neighbors are. In both these instances, alienation of parents is bound to occur and with it the utility of a parents' lobby is reduced. In some cases, volunteer help has also proven to be very undependable after the initial period of enthusiasm has worn off. At this point, it becomes very easy for a volunteer to substitute a dental appointment for the responsibilities at school because the school job, without pay, really isn't that important. Finally, the regular staff has a certain amount of responsibility to and for the school because they are professionals and it is where their bread and butter is earned. If necessary, the principal can appeal to them on these grounds and thus bring a maverick teacher into line. With unpaid staff, this method is completely lacking and the principal has one less tool to run his school in the manner he believes necessary.
The employment of substitutes is also fraught with difficulties for similar and additional reasons. Substitutes, new to the school, are generally employed on a per diem basis and as such most commonly do little other than "supervise" rather than become intimately involved with the educative process. If they be incompetent, students suffer, and you have little chance to develop the substitute's skills by the nature of the employment arrangement. If they be competent, they will not remain available on a per diem basis for they will seek longer term employment. If the substitute be also a parent of one of the students, or formerly worked as a volunteer, your difficulties are compound. The regular teachers will become disenchanted by the additional work for they be forced to help prepare materials as well as explain rules to the newcomers.

If the volunteers (and substitutes) work with the regular staff for long duration, teachers become obliged to them for their assistance and being accustomed to their help feel they cannot work without them. Whence it comes that teachers believe that without aid of these others, they are unable to venture into something new.

Let all this be sufficient, for a school staff will be productive if their organization and unity is maintained. But principals with a lack of prudence initiate novelties and finding the first taste good, do not notice the poison within. As I pointed out previously in regard to wasting
fevers, the principal who does not recognize potential troubles in his school as they might arise from the deployment of volunteers and substitutes, is not truly wise. With such example there is no need to belabor the point.
NOTES ON CHAPTER XII

Chapter of *The Prince* entitled: "Of Auxillary Mixed and Native Troops"

Machiavelli recognizes that in an organization there are many opportunities to employ what we could call extra help. In schools, it is not uncommon for a principal to have at his disposal numerous volunteers and substitutes. All too often a principal, because of financial problems, may seek benefit from per deim and unpaid help. The principal is cautioned that because of the nature of schools such help may prove to be a burden, for there may be conflicting expectations and goals between members of the regular staff and the adjunct personnel. In addition the principal may have little means at his disposal to control the activities of such personnel. In this way one who is only concerned with "output" may all too eagerly employ such personnel and not consider or take into account the possible effect of this upon "intervening variables" school-wide.
CHAPTER XIII

OF THE PRINCIPAL AND SCHOOL MANAGEMENT

A principal should have no other thought or object so much at heart and make no other things so much his special study as the art of management, organization and leadership, as well as the discipline of education, for effectiveness in determining the educational climate of a school is the main art expected of him. Such is the power of effective management that it not only maintains in their position those who are now principal, but it enables teachers to rise to the level of administrators. On the other hand, principals who have neither thought about nor have taken the opportunity to learn effective management skills have become unemployed.

Thus the neglect of the art of management is the main cause of the ouster of a principal, while a proficiency in it enables one to become a principal or, if a principal already, to develop effectiveness.

Among the other causes of evil that will befall a principal who is destitute of management skills is that he is incapable of developing his staff and thereby incapable of achieving the goals of the school. In such a case, he will be scorned by parents and students alike, a disgrace a principal ought especially to guard against. There is
no sort of proportion between one who is effective and one who is not, save dealing with adverse circumstance. In such times it is not reasonable that teachers and others, be they competent or not, should obey an incompetent principal. Thus, a principal who is without management skills will not develop security among the superintendent, his fellow principals, his teaching and non-teaching staff, volunteers and other parents, as well as students and substitutes. Where there is mistrust on one side and disdain on the other it is impossible that they all should work together well.

A principal then, who is not master of the art of effective management, cannot be respected and revered by these groups, nor can he depend upon them. Therefore, the practice of management should ever be uppermost in the principal's thoughts. He should study the practice of effective management both by taking scientific courses and by practical exercise. He must become involved in all phases of the organization and with all groups both within and without the school. Thus he will be able to keep his staff as well as himself up to date on new educational thought and other developments. He will thus become familiar with the character of his school, staff and notable others. This knowledge is valuable in many ways to the principal, who thereby learns to know his own circumstance and therefore better understands how to defend himself against the catas-
trophes of adverse times. Again, by complete practical knowledge of the forces within and without a school, he will, with great facility, comprehend the character of other schools and principals which, if he is prudent, may be necessary for him to understand, because the management practices of others may bear certain resemblances to his own. This knowledge of others' skills will assist in improving his own. A principal who is lacking in this experience lacks the very first essential which a leader should possess, for such knowledge teaches him to know the difference between effectiveness and ineffectiveness, between different people in the same circumstance and the same people in different circumstances. Without such knowledge a principal will never come to learn differences in his personnel and neither be able to develop appropriate strategy nor utilize the appropriate behavior when dealing with others, in order to regulate events and order programs efficiently. It is such that people and circumstances change and what was formerly appropriate and prudent to do may not be so for the present or the future.

Different writers have noted that principals who constantly study the art of management by planning what to do if different situations arise, and discussing such possibilities with other principals, teachers, parents and superiors while taking into account their own strengths
and weaknesses, are never at a loss for they have formulated a host of contingency plans.

Principals should also read extensively the written records of effective principals noting their actions in various situations, what they did that was productive and why and what they did that was counter-productive and why, so that the former can be learned and the latter avoided.

A wise principal, one who seeks effectiveness, should elicit meaningful feedback about his actions and philosophies, so that as time goes on he will be able, through his own industry, to develop methods that are increasingly effective.
NOTES ON CHAPTER XIII

Chapter of The Prince entitled: "The Duties of a Prince With Regard to the Militia"

We have retitled this chapter "Of the Principal and School Management." Clearly what we are suggesting is that the ability to effectively manage any enterprise requires an understanding of people and motivation. We submit that many variables including parents, superiors, subordinates, peers, job expectations and demands, all interacting, become forces that determine school's climate.

Machiavelli suggests that only through diligent study can one learn the art of management. We add to this by suggesting that through experience combined with feedback one can develop greater understanding of his effect upon people.

Toward the end of this chapter Machiavelli establishes his understanding of the dynamics of circumstance. He states that people and circumstances change, and what is formerly appropriate and prudent to do may not be so for the present of the future. Clearly what he is stating is the need for situational/adaptive leadership, for as circumstances and people change many forces come into play; a consequence is that the leader must adapt his skills
and abilities to fit the needs of the time. We are warned in this statement that we who are concerned with effectiveness must have a constant vigil over changes in circumstances and react appropriately, otherwise, we will be inundated by adversity.

The last paragraph is most important because it suggests the difference between how others see your actions and the fact that they behave on their own perception of reality not yours. Consequently, it is appropriate to solicit feedback, so that one may be better able to understand the relationship between what is intended and what is perceived by others.
CHAPTER XIV

OF THE THINGS FOR WHICH PRINCIPALS ARE Praised OR BLAMEd

It now remains to be seen what are the methods and rules for a principal. I know that many (oh, so many) have written of this, I fear my writing about it may be deemed presumptuous, differing as I do, especially in this matter, from the opinions of others. My intention is to write something of use to those who understand so it appears proper to go to the real rather than to fantasy. Many have imagined rules of conduct and administration which have never and will never be utilized because they have no basis in reality. The way we do things is far removed from the ideal way in which they ought to be done. He who simply abandons what is done for what ought to be done will bring about his own ruin, rather than his preservation. A principal who wishes to be totally honest, always candid and without reservation, trusting in everyone, must necessarily come to grief among so many who are not. Therefore, it is necessary for a principal who wishes to maintain himself, to learn when not to be honest, candid, trusting and open and to use this knowledge and not use it according to the necessity of the case.

Leaving on one side, then, those things which concern only an imaginary principal, and speaking of those that are
real, I state that all men and especially principals are reputed for certain qualities which bring them either praise or blame. One may be considered liberal or another traditional; one a spendthrift another a miser; one rigid another flexible; one approachable another not so; one a breaker of his word another trustworthy; one knowledgeable another ignorant; one lascivious another chaste; one frank another astute; one serious another frivolous; one who defines roles for others, thus explains what activities each is to do and when, where and how tasks are to be accomplished, another who maintains personal relationships between himself and others by opening up channels of communication delegating responsibility thus giving subordinates the opportunity to use their potential; one characterized by socio-emotional support, friendship and mutual trust another by callousness. One is invariably viewed by others as possessing some, all or none of these characteristics in varying proportions. I know that everyone will admit that it would be highly praiseworthy in a principal to possess all the above named attitudes and behaviors that are reputed good. But as attitudes can only be recognized through resultant behavior and that human conditions being such, it is prudent that a principal avoid the scandal of those behaviors which would be inappropriate and thus guard himself against the loss of his school. Yet he must not mind incurring the scandal of those behaviors without which it would be
difficult to manage the school. If one considers well, it will be found that some things which seem right to do, if followed, lead to one's ruin, and some others which appear ruinous result in great effectiveness in the long run.
NOTES ON CHAPTER XIV

Chapter of *The Prince* entitled: "Of the Things for Which Men and Especially Princes are Praised or Blamed"

Clearly the message of this section is the difference between fantasy and reality. Machiavelli submits that the way we do things tends to be very different from the way they ought to be done. A clear parallel is what we might call the differences between Theory X and Theory Y. Assumptions about people. In the original, Machiavelli, points out that total honesty, total trust are ways we ought to operate; however, a principal who always acts in these ways must necessarily come to grief among the many who do not. Machiavelli suggests that one who wishes to become effective must learn when not to be honest, candid, trusting and open and learn to use this knowledge and not use it according to the necessity of the case—clearly another statement of situational leadership.

One finds a series of traits and behaviors which may suggest ranges of behaviors that one may engage in. Machiavelli suggests that these behaviors, depending upon the situation, may be appropriate or not. We agree, for the key element is the leader's diagnosis of what is occurring and his ability to adopt new behaviors according to the necessity of the case.
In the conclusion of this segment, Machiavelli states that it is most important to realize that what was formerly right to do at one time may not be right to do at another, and consequently, what may have been inappropriate at one time may now be appropriate to apply. We submit that this relies heavily on the leaders' diagnostic ability.
CHAPTER XV

OF CALLOUSNESS AND SENSITIVITY AND
LOoseness AND TIGHTNESS

With the qualities above named, I say most would wish to be considered sensitive. Nevertheless sensitivity as the world understands it will injure you because this attitude without display will not be known to others and you will incur the disgrace of the contrary term. One who wishes to obtain the reputation of sensitive to others must be careful so not to become easy prey, for others will abuse him. A principal of this character will be forced by necessity, if he wishes to remain, to impose heavy work assignments on those that do their job efficiently in order to make up the slack created by those who, while gaining sympathy, shirk their duty. This will bring about intergroup conflict and thus the staff will grow to hate the principal. He will be little esteemed for poor judgment, so that having by his sensitivity incurred the wrath of many and benefited but a few. This principal will feel the first little disturbance and be endangered by every peril. If he recognizes this and wishes to change his system he incurs at once the charge of insensitivity and inconsistency.

A principal therefore is not able to exercise this virtue without great risk. He therefore must not, if he be prudent, object to being called firm and at times even callous.
He can undertake enterprises without overburdening all his staff, and defend himself from those who would take advantage of him. It is seen that he is really sensitive to all those he does not overburden, who are many in number, and callous to those he does not allow to use him, they become increasingly fewer in number.

In our times we have seen nothing great or lasting done by those who are simply callous or simply sensitive; those only loose or only tight, for they have been ruined along with their plans. Yet we have seen great changes brought about by those who understood the appropriateness of each behavior and acted accordingly. One individual, although he made use of his reputation for tightness in order to attain the principalship, did not choose to retain it. He chose with equal care those with whom to be loose and with whom to be tight, depending upon each staff member's ability, responsibility and motivation with a given task. Another principal who did likewise was also able to make and maintain great changes without incurring unnecessary hardship because his actions were viewed appropriate and just. A third principal if he had been thought loose and sensitive would not have been effective because the staff and the school with its peculiar history would have become and remained chaotic.

For these reasons a principal must have in his inventory sensitivity and firmness, looseness and tightness so that he can do that which is appropriate and become more
effective. In this way he will avoid the disasters of inappropriate responses and not be seen as contemptible. If you were to say that a principal maintained his school through sensitivity and tightness and that others have reached the highest positions through being both loose and firm or being thought so, I would reply that you either have developed knowledge of effectiveness or are on the way to doing so. And should anyone reply that there have been many effective principals who viewed themselves as being only callous and tight or only sensitive and loose, I would answer by saying that it matters not how the principal views himself but how others view him, both as to action and as to its time. For the principal's view of himself is not reality for others they view as real that which they see.

Of all things that a principal ought guard against is engaging in inappropriate behavior or ill timed actions for it produces both disgrace and hatred.
NOTES ON CHAPTER XV

Chapter of The Prince entitled: "Of Liberality and Niggardliness"

In the restatement of this chapter we suggest, as does the title, two ranges of what might be called affective behavior, callousness and sensitivity, looseness and tightness. We suggest that if given the choice it would be more desirable to become known as sensitive; however, we warn that sensitivity in addition to being inappropriate at times may cause one's ruination. The reasons are as follows: depending upon the maturity level of subordinates, that is to say their willingness to assume responsibilities and ability to perform capably, they may misunderstand your gentleness and sensitivity; consequently, they may take advantage of it. In another way if this occurs one may be forced into a position of assigning the work of slackers to others. In this way one's sensitivity will cause disharmony. On the other hand to remain callous to the needs of others is a disgrace that ought to be avoided.

In the same way looseness and tightness as examples of leader behavior may or may not be appropriate depending on the circumstance. Once again all this suggests that a leader must understand his effect upon the expectations and performance of others as well as understanding the different
needs of different people under changing circumstances. For a principal must vary his leadership style contingent upon subordinate's maturity for a given task.

At the conclusion of this chapter, Machiavelli suggests that there is nothing worse than doing the wrong thing at the wrong time. We augment this by suggesting that a leader must have a wide range of behaviors so that he can select the most appropriate and thereby increase his effectiveness.
CHAPTER XVI

OF CONSISTENCY AND CLEMENCY AND WHETHER IT IS BETTER TO BE LOVED OR FEARED

Proceeding to other qualities, I say that every principal must desire to be considered committed and consistent in this stance. One principal was considered thus and the severity with which he pursued effectiveness was considered by some unjust, but his means brought order to the school, united it and increased interdependence among the staff. If this is considered well, it will be seen that his actions were appropriate much more than some others who rather than take decisive consistent action, avoid the name of forceful and thus allowed their school to become inactive and the staff unproductive in its labors. It will be seen that, with very few examples that contradict, a principal that is consistent in his actions will be on the right step towards effectiveness. Better is he, than those who, from excess tenderness allow disorders to arise, from whence springs disaster. These tender principals injure the whole community while the former temporarily blunt and humble a few. As it is with all principals, especially those new, it is dangerous for them to be indecisive and inconsistent as it is impossible for them to escape a reputation for forcefulness, if they are committed, for schools are always in the need of priorities. Nevertheless, he must be cautious
in believing and acting, and must not be afraid of his own shadow, and must proceed in a temperate manner with prudence and humanity, so that too much confidence does not render him incautious, and too much diffidence does not render him intolerant.

From this arises the question whether it is better to be loved more than feared, or feared more than loved. The reply is, that one ought to be both feared and loved, but as it is difficult for the two to go together, it is much safer to be feared than loved, if one of the two has to be wanting. For it may be said of a school's staff in general that they are ungrateful, voluble, dissemblers, anxious to avoid change, and covetous of gain; as long as you benefit them, they are entirely yours; they offer you their faith, their loyalty, their gratitude, and their friendship, as I have before said, when the necessity is remote; but when it approaches, they revolt. The principal who has relied solely on their words, without making other preparations, is ruined; for the loyalty which is gained by purchase and not through grandeur and nobility of spirit is bought but not secured, and at a pinch is not to be expended in your service. And teachers have less scruple in offending one who makes himself feared; for love is held by a chain of obligation which, people being selfish, is broken whenever it serves their purpose; but fear is maintained by a dread of punishment which never fails.
Still, a principal should make himself feared in such a way that if he does not gain love, he at any rate avoids hatred: for fear and the absence of hatred may well go together, and will be always attained by one who abstains from interfering with the classes of his teachers and when he is obliged to redirect any one, let him do so when there is a proper justification and manifest reason for it; but he must shy from taking the livelihood of others, for men forget more easily the death of their father than the loss of their income. Then also reasons for redirection are never wanting, and one who begins to live by effectiveness will always find good reason for changing the status quo, whereas causes for firings are rarer and more fleeting.

But when the principal is in his school and has a large number of his staff under control, then it is extremely necessary that he should not mind being thought forceful for without this reputation he could not keep school united or disposed to any duty. Among the noteworthy actions of one principal is numbered this, that although he had an enormous school, composed of all types of people and there never arose any dissension either among them or against the principal, either in good fortune or in bad. This could not be due to anything but his constant forcefulness, which together with his infinite other virtues, made him always venerated and feared in the sight of his staff, and without it his other virtues would not have sufficed to produce that effect.
Thoughtless writers admire on the one hand his actions, and on the other blame the cause of them.

And that it is true that his other virtues would not have sufficed may be seen from the case of another principal whose school rebelled against him in time of trouble, which arose from nothing but his excessive kindness, which allowed increasing license to the staff. He was reproached with this by the superintendent of schools at a Board of Education meeting, who called him unfit and told him he had faulty judgment.

I conclude, therefore, with regard to being feared and loved, that men love at their own free will, but fear the will of the principal and that a wise principal must rely on what is in his power and not on what is in the power of others, and he must only contrive to avoid incurring hatred, as has been explained.
NOTES ON CHAPTER XVI

Chapter of *The Prince* entitled: "Of Cruelty and Clemency, and Whether It's Better to be Loved or Feared"

The terms loved or feared in this context we have taken to mean whether it is better to have position power or personal power. Ideally we would agree with Machiavelli that it would be most desirable to have both. Unfortunately, there are few of us that have both. If given one choice of one, we would suggest, as does Machiavelli, that it would be better to possess position power. The reasons for this are, that due to the fickle nature of man, what causes him to love you one day, may not be present the next. As a consequence of this condition, one would never be sure or be able to make sure of his followers. If one does have the power of authority he can, if only through the fear of punishment, control and order the activities of others. We are cautioned to understand that there is an incredible difference between being feared and hated, if only recognized by morale or over concern with 'hygiene' factors.

As regards consistancy and clemancy we suggest that if given the choice of only one, we should choose to be regarded as consistent for in this way stated criteria for acceptable performance tends to help subordinates structure appropriate activity. It is important to take the preceding
in combination with principles of behavior modification so that appropriate behaviors will continually become elicited as a consequence of being rewarded and inappropriate behavior may be allowed to become extinct.
CHAPTER XVII

IN WHAT WAY A PRINCIPAL MUST KEEP FAITH

How laudable it is for a principal to keep only good faith and live not by astuteness. Still the experience of our times shows those principals to have done great things who have had little regard for good faith alone and have been able by astuteness to become increasingly effective and have ultimately overcome those who have made blind loyalty to old ways their foundation.

You must know then, that there are two methods of change; one by knowledge, the other by force; but as the first method is often insufficient, one must have recourse to the second. It is therefore necessary for a principal to know well how to use both participation and force. This was taught to administrators by ancient writers, who relate how ancient principals were brought up and educated with group process and authority. The moral of this is meant to indicate that a principal must know how to use both and that the one without the other is not durable.

A principal being thus obliged to know well how to act as a beast must imitate the fox and the lion, for the lion cannot protect himself from traps, and the fox cannot defend himself from wolves. One must therefore be a fox to recognize traps, and a lion to frighten wolves. Those that wish
to be only lions do not understand this. Therefore a prudent principal should not commit himself to one strategy when by doing so would be against his interest or when the reasons for doing so no longer exist. If school staffs were all committed to change and thus effectiveness, this precept would not be a good one; but as they may be bad, and thus will not observe their faith with you, so you are not bound to keep faith with them. Nor have legitimate grounds ever failed a principal who wished to show colourable excuse for a change in procedure. Of this one could furnish an infinite number of modern examples, and show how many times peace has been broken, and how many promises rendered worthless, by the faithlessness of others, and those that have been best able to imitate the fox have succeeded best. But it is necessary to be able to disguise this character well, and to be a great feigner and dissembler for men are so ready to obey present necessities, that one who uses both methods will always find those who allow themselves to be changed.

I will only mention one modern instance. One principal did little else but employ the planned change approach, he thought of nothing else, and found the occasion for it; no man was ever more able to give assurances, or affirmed things with stronger oaths, and no man observed them less; however, he always succeeded, as he well knew this aspect of things.
It is not, therefore, necessary for a principal to have all qualities, but it is very necessary to seem to have them. I would even be bold to say that to possess them and always to observe them is dangerous, but to appear to possess them is useful. Thus it is well to seem merciful, faithful, humane and sincere, and also to be so; but you must have the mind so disposed that when it is needful to be otherwise you may be able to change to the opposite qualities. And it must be understood that a principal, and especially a new principal, cannot observe all those things which are considered good in men, being often obliged, in order to maintain the school, to act quickly, in the best interest of all. And, therefore, he must have a mind disposed to adapt itself according to the wind, and as the variations of fortune dictate, and, as I said before, not deviate from what is possible, but be able to do evil if constrained.

A principal must take great care that nothing goes out of his mouth which is not full of the above-named four qualities, and, to see and hear him, he should seem to be all mercy, faith, integrity and humanity. And nothing is more necessary than to seem to have this last quality, for men in general judge more by the ear than by the eyes, for every one can hear, but very few have to see. Everybody sees what you appear to be, few feel what you are, and those few will not dare to oppose themselves to the many, who have the majesty of the school to defend them; and in the actions of
men, and especially of principals, from which there is no appeal, the change may justify the means. Let a principal, therefore aim at effectiveness of school, and the means will always be judged honourable and praised by every one. A certain principal of the present time, whom it is well not to name, never does anything but preach tradition and slow change, but he is really a great enemy to both, and either of them, had he observed them, would have lost him effectiveness on many occasions.
Chapter of *The Prince* entitled: "In What Ways Princes Keep Faith"

In this chapter, which has been changed considerably from Machiavelli's work, we suggest that high expectations tend to yield high performance. This "effective cycle," once it is established, may be a reasonable and appropriate attitude for a principal. However, high expectations alone, if they be significantly higher than subordinates' ability to reach them, may cause poor morale, thus inefficiency and chaos. We must realize that a leader must diagnose the readiness of his subordinates to assume responsibility based upon their performance on preceding assignments.

We have indicated in the text that in order to change the organization, one by definition, has to deal with changes in individual's expectations and behaviors. We suggest here that there are essentially two methods of change, one we might call 'participative' change. That is to say, one starts by increasing the knowledge level of individuals thereby changing their attitudes causing them to experience changes in what they do. Ultimately, over time, many individuals acting in concert will change the complexion of the organization.
The other change strategy, that which we call 'structural change' generally takes less time. The process starts by changing the organizational interaction patterns and procedures, thereby forcing individuals to behave in new ways. As a consequence, their knowledge of change and expectations for change resultingly causes them to behave in new ways. It would be safe to say that these two methods although they are extremes would best benefit an organization if they were employed simultaneously. It is important to realize that when attempting any change difficulty may occur. For this reason we suggest that the leaders provide socio-emotional support as well as appropriate rewards for their personnel when the desired changes are approximated.

In this way a principal can use personal and positional power, protect himself from engaging in inappropriate behaviors as well as defend himself against natural resistance to change. We submit that although a totally adaptable leader, that is one with an infinite range of behaviors, may be indeed the "best" leader an organization can possess; few, if any of us, have such flexability. Consequently, it may be appropriate at times to restrain from action when one's behavior would only be inappropriate. It is suggested that under such circumstances one find and employ others whose behavior style will augment the principals. In this
way we suggest that one ought to resist the temptation to hire others whose behavior and attitudes tend to duplicate others. On the contrary, we ought to consider hiring others who have a good grasp of the goals of the organization, and understand their roles in reaching them and can serve to fill the void as it were. The only behavior a principal ought to hold tenaciously to is that of being righteous and honorable so that effectiveness becomes paramount.
CHAPTER XVIII

WHETHER PORTRESSES AND OTHER THINGS WHICH PRINCIPALS OFTEN CONTRIVE ARE USEFUL OR INJURIOUS

Some Principals, in order to hold their schools securely have disempowered their staffs and thus not allowed them to make any decisions of consequence. Other principals have kept their schools divided into countless departments and their staffs into countless committees. While a few principals have fomented hatred against themselves, others have endeavored to win over those whom they suspected to be enemies to them or their plans. In these ways some administrators have constructed bureaucracies while others have cast them down and destroyed them. Although one cannot pronounce a definite judgement as to the effectiveness of these methods without going into the particulars of the school to which such a deliberation is to be applied, I will speak in such a way as the matter will permit.

The effective Principal has never been known to allow his staff to remain powerless. On the contrary, when a staff has been found to be impotent, a principal concerned with effectiveness has always developed their potential, for by doing so, those in a school that were heretofore
ineffective became effective and those that were loyal and effective remained so. And so the school staff, from being merely subjects of the Principal became partisans of his plans. Since all staff members are not equally motivated, or have equal skill or experience, when a Principal develops the potency of some, he is better able to work more closely with others. This initial differential treatment renders a school in the long run more effective if the most effective staff members understand this method. (By necessity one must work more closely with the less able from the outset in order to develop their skills, yet not lose sight of all the schools' staff and their needs as well.) But when a Principal deliberately restricts his staff's development, he commences to offend and shows that he distrusts them, thinks them lazy and unreliable and not capable of performing their duties effectively and worse--shows that they, no matter what, will not change his opinion. These assumptions, generating a principal's behavior, engender hatred against him.

If a principal is continually concerned about his own success but has not taken the time and trouble to develop the competencies within his staff, he in his own thinking, is obliged to resort to complex control and supervision mechanisms. Such mechanisms, although implemented with great rationality, generally remain in service with equally great
rationality regardless whether the necessity for them is past or not. In this way, a Principal may have a debilitating effect upon the morale, productivity and ingenuity of his staff. The complex control patterns that are implemented usually take the form of hierarchical reporting levels, impersonal relations with the staff, rigid job specifications, inflexible standardized operating procedures, formalized task roles and communication that flows only downward through the organization and is perceived as highly authoritarian in nature and substance.

The aforementioned practices tend to lead to the following problems—staff members feeling isolated from one another, the feeling that ideas and creativity are not desired, the feeling that ingenuity is not valued and thus goes unrecognized and unrewarded. Over time, the staff becomes resolute in these feelings because they are not able to participate in goal setting or implementation methods. In addition, individuals feel a lack of upward mobility, and so they do not share ideas among themselves and do not "own up" to responsibilities. The foregoing leads to the development of poor morale and an unhealthy competitive spirit. All this tends to reaffirm the Principal's need to impose even greater control and standardize operating procedures, for his original opinions, as he sees them, tend to be justified.
While these methods may maintain order and some semblance of efficiency in the short run, a Principal, in the long run the cure may be worse than the ailment. Therefore, as I have said, a principal should always develop the effectiveness of his staff (by doing so he will develop his own as well) for his concern must not be only the maintenance of order and efficiency but also the development and deployment of personnel in ways that will be growing to them and beneficial to the organization.

When a school takes on, in addition to its more usual functions, new or special duties such as an experimental program, and there is no precedent to follow, the principal must help his staff to see that past policies and procedures may, in the new circumstances, be unproductive or inappropriate. At this occurrence, when time and opportunity serve, the principal must arrange things so that the staff can realize that it may be dealing with changes in circumstance, changes in interim goals and changes in methodology. It is recognized that there are generally three ways that this can be attempted: the first is through coercion, that is to say, by forcing the staff to blindly adhere to commands from above. To do this, one must impose close supervision on their activities and punish those that deviate. The second and less common practice is to strategically place competent personnel in key positions throughout the program
in order that others can observe their methods and learn accordingly. The third and least tried method is to let the staff grapple with the new situation and its resultant problems, until they discover and internalize the new appropriate behaviors.

Since in all the foregoing one is dealing with change and natural resistance to it, all these methods are fraught with difficulty. As such, all the methods potentially hold great problems for the implementor. In the first case, one can force compliance in the short run. Indeed, this method may prove successful initially, yet as time goes on and the staff matures, this procedure may prove inappropriate for managing them. As I have mentioned before, if one continues to use this process, not recognizing and allowing for individual, natural growth, one may develop and fan dis-harmony and disunity. The result is ever decreasing efficiency and effectiveness. In the second case, it is not easy to find key personnel or retain them. When key people leave for other challenges, the remaining staff may have problems maintaining the new behavior for they have lost their models. As a result they may find it difficult to carry on by themselves and may reject new personnel employed to fill the void. An attempt at having the staff internalize new behaviors using the grapple method takes a great deal of time and patience. Those who evaluate a principal's
performance may lack patience for these proceedings and thus demand immediate results. Under pressure of this type, many principals find themselves given to intervening to speed change along. The difficulty with this is that the principal may do things that are inappropriate and ill timed given the state of this process. In this way one's actions may be counter-productive. The staff may view the delination of job responsibilities as an imposition of structure, whereas the principal formerly allowed the staff to progress at its own rate, he is now perceived as not trusting them and thus punishing. As we all know, it is much more difficult to tighten up once you have already loosened up. As previously mentioned, a staff will not soon forget the taste of freedom.

Our forefathers and other principals who were esteemed wise, used to say that it is necessary to hold a school by means of departments and committees and the principalship through the use of control mechanisms as previously described. For this purpose, such principals forced difficulties and hostilities through "channels" before taking any action. By doing thus, they hoped to demonstrate the efficacy of their governance and thus possess their schools more thoroughly. In olden times, when the public felt that educators could do no wrong, and that circumstances allowed for indecisive
action, this might have served them well. It does not seem to me to be a good precept for the present time, for I do not believe that the poor morale and decreasing effectiveness that would result would allow a principal to remain as arbiter of his school. It is certain that when adverse circumstance occurs the problems thus created will then cause a principal to lose his school. The frustrated, if they are great in number, will always agitate against such a principal, and the others, smaller in number, will not be sufficient to allow the principal to stand.

One principal using the preceding method and worried by the aforesaid concerns, fomented the "footdragger" and "swinger" factions within his school. Although he never allowed them to come to bloodshed, he encouraged and fanned the differences between them. This principal did this so that the teachers being occupied in their own quarrels might not act against him. This methodology did not avail said principal anything as was seen after severe criticism by the Superintendent. At this time a group of teachers, many in number, took courage given the principal's weakened state. They seized the school, barred the principal's entry and repudiated his administration.

These methods, as utilized by the principal, argue his weakness and a lack of concern with effectiveness. A principal concerned with growth and effectiveness would
neither allow dissensions of the type previously mentioned to be flamed, nor would he tolerate them in such a heated state. These divisions are only profitable when learning can occur from individual to individual and one group to another.

Without doubt principals become great when they overcome difficulties and opposition. Therefore, fortune, especially when it wants to render a new principal great, raises up problems and compels the principal to take action so that he may overcome them and thus become increasingly effective by means of the ladder which fate has brought. Thus there are many who think that a wise principal ought, when given the chance foment astutely some enmity, so that, by suppressing it, he will augment his greatness.

Certain principals, especially new ones, have found more faith and more usefulness in other methods. At the beginning of their administrations, they found that there were some in their employ whose efforts they felt to be marginal. In such cases they persistently communicated high but achievable expectations for performance. In such a manner, Peter Petrucci, Principal of Island High School, governed his school more by those of whom he was uncertain than by others. But of this we cannot speak at large for it strays from the subject. I will merely say that these people who, at the beginning of a new administration, were
faithless and shirkers of both duty and responsibility, and yet if they are a kind to need support to maintain their position, they can be gained by the Principal. Those of whom I am speaking are more compelled to serve and perform faithfully as they know they must by their deeds, cancel the bad opinion previously held of them. Thus a school will always derive greater effort from them than from those, who serving in the school with greater security, neglect it.

And as the matter requires it, I will not omit to remind one who has newly become principal of a school with the secret help of its staff, that he must consider well the motives that have induced those who have favored him to do so. If it is not the other's natural affection that made him principal, but only the fact that they were those who were not contented with the school as it was, the new administrator will have great trouble and difficulty in maintaining the friendship of such staff members, because it will be impossible for him to content them. And on well examining the cause of this in the examples drawn from ancient and modern times it will be seen that it is much easier to gain the friendship of those who were contented with the previous condition and were therefore at first adversaries, than that those who not being contented, immediately became his partisans and helped him to occupy it.

It has been the custom of principals in order to be able to hold their schools securely, to develop complex
control mechanisms and closely supervise their staff as a bridle and bit to those who would shirk responsibility, and in order to be sure of some actions against adverse circumstances. Control and close supervision may or may not be useful according to the times; if they do good in one way, they do harm in another. The question may be discussed thus: a principal who trusts less in his own staff than fate or others ought to closely supervise, but he who has more trust in his own staff can afford to control increasingly less. The system built by one principal has given and will give more trouble to his school than any other disorder that could occur. Therefore the best fortress is to be found in developing the effectiveness of the staff, for although you may have your own "procedures," they will not save you. So, it is safer for a principal to have developed appropriate managerial behavior than to have total, tight control. Having considered these things I would therefore praise the one who closely supervises and controls when appropriate and the one who does not when it is inappropriate, and would blame anyone who, caring about effectiveness, does not recognize this issue.
NOTES ON CHAPTER XVIII

Chapter of The Prince entitled: "Whether Fortresses and Other Things Which Princes Often Contrive are Useful or Injurious"

Each principal, in his own school, we observe, implements his own procedures based at least partially on his own values. What is important is the manifestation of such procedures to others. Often based on a concern for success a principal will establish formalized interaction patterns and standardize job specifications. In some senses, the resulting condition may closely resemble that of classical bureaucracy. The chapter proceeds to outline some of the possible effects of the bureaucratic form. In this way a principal's procedures may indeed resemble the walls of a fortress, thereby isolating staff members and students from the principal although they were not originally implemented for this purpose.

With regard to the issue of power that is inherent in such a situation, it is important to understand that people, often, enjoy the opportunity to display mastery and have control over what they do. In this way we suggest that a principal ought to work very hard at establishing and developing competency within his staff. In this way each individual is able to grow and develop. To keep people in-
tentionally from growing is by its nature dehumanizing. If a principal acts in this way he will only hamper his effectiveness. If people do not grow and mature, and thus become better able to handle responsibility, the principal will find that most of his time is spent in supervision, for he cannot rely on the performance of others.

To facilitate change we suggest three possible procedures. The first, coercion, the second identification, and the third we have entitled the 'grapple method.' All three depending on the circumstances may be useful. As regards the 'fortress,' a bulwark against adversity, we suggest that one ought to rely upon effectiveness and competency rather than upon routinization. For above all, the school is a human organization.
CHAPTER XIX

HOW A PRINCIPAL MUST ACT IN ORDER TO GAIN REPUTATION

Nothing causes a principal to be so much esteemed as great prowess and resultingly effectiveness in leading his school. A principal especially a new one, should be prepared to take the initiative in introducing some striking innovation. This will not only reassure the staff but will win publicity for all, throughout the system and in the community. There are countless examples of principals who at the beginning of their tenure introduced, after great study, an innovation such as team teaching or flexible scheduling and such enterprise became the foundation of their excellent reputation. These principals kept the minds of the staff and parents occupied on the innovation so that thinking of their benefits they did not think of opposing. This technique when it achieves good ends will be so sensational that the students, superintendent, parents and staff will be in a state of awe and admiration so as they have no time to settle down and act against the principal or his other ideas. Thus some principals acquire reputation and power. This technique is also called putting the school on the map.

If a principal decides to take this course of action he should do so wholeheartedly, and if possible, quickly. When unforeseen difficulties occur, the principal cannot allow himself to falter. Any hesitation on his part will
cause the innovation to fail. If it fails, he will lose all around. He will be regarded as ineffective by his superiors, controllable by those who oppose him, and undependable by those who supported him. This occurring he will no longer be able to contrive great things for his staff and they will become uncertain and keep from following him. These actions rise one out of the other so that opponents will have time to settle down and act against him.

The foregoing method will also help a principal to analyze his staff. He will quickly become aware, under the stress of change, which people have ideas, are reliable, have energy, and are productive. He should openly reinforce these by giving approval, for above all he must endeavor by every action to bring about greatness and excellence. In this way the principal will have established the strength of his internal control.

A principal is further esteemed when he becomes involved with groups outside his school. In such groups it will be advisable for him to put forward his ideas and philosophy and be willing to stand up for them. A principal who tries to hide his views or sit on the fence will be considered to have no views, to be incompetent or to be weak and sniveling. If he puts his views with vigor and is defeated he will have the sympathy of those like minded and the respect of those by whose hands he was defeated. If he wins he will have enhanced his reputation and stature. A
principal who expresses no views will have the support of no one. Some parents will think him ill equipped for the job and others will fear that he is too cunning. Yet it is not supposed that a principal can ever adopt a course that is entirely safe, for to the contrary he must at times make up his mind to take the chance of doubts and uncertainties and thus he must be prudent to discriminate among bad positions and accept the least evil for good. In this way it is not poor policy for a principal to take a stand against others, for if he is agreed with, his stock will rise immeasurably, yet if it is one that most others oppose, it is more likely than not that they will respect a man who can make up his mind.

A principal should always show himself to be a lover of quality, industry and virtue and must reward those who do such things. If he has a staff and students who implement successful projects and operate independently, he must encourage them. If parents and citizens contribute aid, he must recognize them. For all this will reflect well and add immeasurably to his effectiveness. Conversely where there is incompetency, he must confront it both because confrontation can never be avoided only postponed to less favorable times, and that by permitting it he allows himself to be branded incompetent. The principal should be present at these occasions for he will help set an example and thus by association add righteousness and concern to his reputation.
Besides this, as every community has many groups and organizations, he ought at convenient times, mingle with them from time to time and give example of his humanity, always upholding his dignity, which must never be allowed to falter.
Chapter of The Prince entitled: "How a Prince Must Act in Order to Gain Reputation"

As outlined previously the expectations of the various parties in and around the school should be of importance to the principal when he considers effectiveness. One way Machiavelli suggests that people may come to hold high expectations for themselves, is for the principal to undertake something that might be called dramatic. Such a plan if in the best interest of the school and its staff and if it succeeds will establish the efficacy of the principal's administration.

The remainder of this section deals with the expectations and attitudes that a principal ought to have if he is to move his organization forward. The behaviors that he exhibits however must be in line with the situational approach. The expectations of others will to a great extent determine the principal's future. For as change is a difficult process, we can say that people like to align themselves with winners and thus commit energy to a winning team.
CHAPTER XX

OF THE ASSISTANTS AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF
OF THE PRINCIPAL

The choice of a principal's assistants is a matter of no little importance; they are either good or not according to the prudence of the principal. The first impression that one gets of an administrator and of his ability is from seeing the men that he has about him. When they are competent and faithful one can always consider the principal wise, as he has been able to recognize their ability and keep them faithful. But when they are the reverse, one can always form an unfavourable opinion of the principal, because the first mistake that he makes is in making these poor choices.

There are three different kinds of principals, one is effective unassisted, another effective with help, the third is neither effective alone nor with the help of others. The first principal is most excellent, the second also excellent, but the third useless. It is therefore evident that if a principal is not of the first kind, with competent and loyal help he will at any rate be the second.

For one to be able to know assistants there is this method which never fails. When the principal sees the assistants thinking more of themselves than of the school and what the principal is trying to do, and in all their actions seek their own glory, such a person will never be
a good assistant, and they can never be relied upon; for whoever has a hand in the school of another must never think of himself but must think of the principal's goals for the school and not mind anything but what relates to them. And, on the other hand, the principal in order to retain this fidelity ought to think of his assistants, honouring and enriching them, doing them kindnesses, and conferring on them honours and giving them responsible tasks, so that the great honours and riches bestowed on them cause them not to desire other honours and riches. When principals and their assistants stand in this relation to each other they can rely the one upon the other. When it is otherwise, the result is always injurious either for one or the other of them.
NOTES ON CHAPTER XX

Chapter of The Prince entitled: "Of the Secretaries of Princes"

As a consequence of organizations growing larger it is wise that a principal employ those to whom he can appropriately delegate responsibility and authority. All this depending upon the ability and the talents of those whom he chooses. Machiavelli states that there are three different kinds of princes, one who is effective without help, those that are effective with help, and a third kind, one who is ineffective with or without help. A crucial point as suggested is what are the makings of a good assistant. A useful definition of maturity entails the belief that one who is mature will be able to think of organizational goals and act upon them rather than acting upon his own needs exclusively. In this way the principal must become adept at integrating individual and organization goals so that individuals in his employ find their own needs fulfilled while they at the same time pursue the organization goals.
CHAPTER XXI

HOW FLATTERERS MUST BE SHUNNED

I must not omit an important subject, and make mention of a mistake which principals can avoid, if they are very prudent. And this is with regard to flatterers, of which schools are full. Men take such pleasure in their own things and deceive themselves about them that they cannot without difficulty guard against this plague. However, by wishing to guard against it they run the risk of becoming contemptible. There is no other way of guarding one's self against flattery than by letting men understand that they will not offend you by speaking the truth, yet, when every one can tell you the truth, you lose their respect. A prudent principal must therefore take a third course, that is he must choose for his council wise men, and give them alone full liberty to speak the truth to him, but only of those things that he asks and of nothing else. A wise principal must ask such men about everything and hear their opinion, and afterwards deliberate by himself in his own way. With each of these men he must comport himself so that they may see that the more freely they speak, the more they will be acceptable. Beyond these he should listen to no one, go about the matter deliberately, and be determined in his decisions. Whoever acts otherwise either acts precipitately
through flattery or else changes often through the variety of opinions, from which it follows that he will be little esteemed.

I will give an instance of this. Luca, an assistant of Maximilian, the principal, speaking of him said he never took counsel with anybody, and yet that he never did anything as he himself wished. This arose from his following the contrary method. As this principal was a secret man he did not communicate his designs to any one or take any advice, but as to putting his ideas into effect they began to be known and discovered. Thus the ideas began to be opposed by those the principal had about him, and he was easily diverted from his purpose. Hence it came to pass that what he did one day he undid the next, no one ever understood what he wished or intended to do, and no reliance was placed on his deliberations.

A principal, therefore, ought always to take counsel, but only when he wishes, not when others wish; on the contrary he ought to discourage, absolutely, attempts to advise him unless he asks it, but he ought to be a great asker, and a patient hearer of the truth about those things of which he has inquired. Indeed, if he finds that any one has scruples in telling him the truth he should be angry. And since some think that a principal who gains the reputation of being prudent is so considered, not by his nature but by the good staff he has about him, they are undoubtedly deceived.
It is an infallible rule that a principal who is not wise himself cannot be well advised, unless by chance he leaves himself entirely in the hands of one man who rules him in everything, and happens to be a very prudent man. In this case he may doubtless be well governed, but it would not last long, for that governor would in a short time deprive him of the school. By taking counsel with many, a principal who is not wise will never have united councils and will not be able to bring them to unanimity. The staff will all think of their own interests, and he will be unable either to correct or to understand them. And it cannot be otherwise, for men may be false to you unless they are compelled by necessity to be true. Therefore it must be concluded that wise counsels, from whoever they come, must necessarily be due to the prudence of the principal.
Chapter of *The Prince* entitled: "How Flatterers Must be Shunned"

At first glance much of the advice of this chapter may seem to be paradoxical in nature. As we look more deeply into the content clearly the message is that the best advise is given when asked for. Because of the nature of the job, the principal has to take into account an incredible number of variables. It would be wise for him to ask for advice often. However, he must be careful of whom he asks as well as be sure to weigh the advise thus given.

Machiavelli would say that when anyone can give the principal advice he looses their respect, and the opposite would be true as well. We infer that in order to prohibit the possibility that a principal would find himself surrounded with yes men and fall prey to vanity, he must be careful to establish that he is interested in both evaluative and non-evaluative feedback regardless of how difficult it may be for him to hear it. Indeed this is quite difficult to do. Yet good feedback is essential both when trying to appraise conditions and forment a plan of action, as well as trying to adapt one's behavior to fit the necessity of the times. This re-establishes the need to hire subordinates who do not replicate one's own skills, abilities, attitudes and interest.
CHAPTER XXII

WHY PRINCIPALS HAVE LOST THEIR SCHOOLS

The aforementioned things, if prudently observed will make a new principal effective beyond his dreams and will render him at once more secure and firm in his position than if he had been one of the founding fathers of pedagogy. A new principal is more observed in his actions than one who has served since time immemorial. When the principal is recognized as carrying out his duties with sincerity and justice, honor and conviction, he wins over more and more become bound to him. The staff of the school and others are more taken by the present than by past things. When the community finds the school strengthened with sound educational practice, aims and objectives and the staff and students are able to maximize their potential, they enjoy it and they will do all they can to defend their principal so long as he is not in other things deficient. A principal will thus have double glory; having a good school and productive staff and longevity. He who is principal will have double shame who for want of prudence and effectiveness gives rise to a troubled school and thus gives cause to be removed.

If one considers those principals who have lost their schools, one will find in them a common defect in one or more of the following: willingness to assume responsibility, great motivation or ample relevant skills and knowledge and for reasons discussed at length have become
removed from their position. In this way we observe that some had teachers or students or superiors or parents hostile to them or if they were agreeable to all parties, they lacked in ability to secure loyalty and productivity. Those without such defects have had enough strength to keep their schools. It is not reasonable to expect that one can be all things to all people continually, but although he loses control over some situations, he will still be able to keep his school.

Therefore, those of our principals who have had their schools must not accuse fortune for having lost them, but rather their own remissness. These principals having never in quiet times considered that things might change (as it is a common fault of men not to reckon on storm in fair weather) when adverse times came were at a loss and did nothing. They hoped that this would either go unnoticed or that the staff outraged by its own inability to handle challenging times, would seek them out.

This measure, when others are wanting is good; but it is very bad to have neglected the other remedies for this one, for no one desires to fall because they believed they would then find someone to pick them up. This may or may not take place, and if it does, it does not afford one security for you have not helped yourself but been helped like a coward. Only those defenses are good, certain and durable which depend on yourself alone and your own ability.
NOTES ON CHAPTER XXII

Chapter of *The Prince* entitled: "Why the Princes of Italy Have Lost Their States"

The reasons why princes of Italy have lost their states bear marked similarity to why principals may lose their schools. We have interpreted these reasons as follows: a lack of willingness to assume responsibility, a lack of motivation and a lack of relevant skills and knowledge. In another way it might be said that people who find themselves removed from such positions are devoid of knowledge of leadership, motivation and change.

In this way with ability, one may maintain his position for an understanding of people, and their needs can only add to effectiveness. The lack of good fortune alone does not turn one out to pasture.
CHAPTER XXIII

HOW MUCH FORTUNE CAN DO AND HOW IT MAY BE OPPOSED

It is not unknown to me how many have been and are of opinion that schools are so governed by fortune that principals cannot by their prudence and abilities change them. Others may be of the opinion there is no remedy whatever, and for this they may judge it to be useless to toil much about schools, but let things be ruled by chance. When I think about schools, at times I am partly inclined to share these opinions. Nevertheless, that our free-will may not be altogether extinguished, I think it may be true that fortune is the ruler of half our actions, but that she allows the other half or thereabouts to be governed by us. I would compare her to an impetuous river that, when turbulent, inundates the plains, casts down trees and buildings, removes earth from one side and places it on the other; every one flees before it, and everything yields to its fury without being able to oppose it; and yet though it is of such a kind, still when it is quiet, men can make provision against it by dikes and banks, so that when it rises it will either go into a canal or its rush will not be so wild and dangerous. So it is with fortune, which shows her power where no measures have been taken to resist her, and directs her fury
where she knows that no dikes or barriers have been made to hold her. And if you regard schools those that have been the seat of many problems, and what has given the impulse to them, you will see them to be generally without dikes or banks of any kind. If schools were administered by those seeking effectiveness and had developed proper measures they would not be in a state of chaos and desperation.

This must suffice as regards opposition to fortune in general. But limiting myself more to particular cases, I would point out how one sees a certain principal to-day fortunate and to-morrow ruined, without him having changed in character or otherwise. I believe this arises in the first place from the causes that we have already discussed at length; that is to say, because the principal who bases himself entirely on fortune is ruined when fortune changes. I also believe that he is happy whose mode of procedure accords with the needs of the times, and similarly he is unfortunate whose mode of procedure is opposed to the times. For one sees that principals in those things which lead them to the aim that each one has in view, proceed in various ways; one with circumspection, another with impetuosity, one by violence, another by cunning, one with patience, another with the reverse; and each by these diverse ways may arrive at his aim. One sees also two cautious principals, one of whom succeeds in his designs, and the other not, and in the same
way two succeeded equally by different methods, one being cautious, the other impetuous, which arises only from the nature of the times, which does or does not conform to their method of procedure. From this it results, as I have said, that two principals, acting differently, attain the same effect, and of two others acting in the same way, one attains his goal and not the other. On this depend also the changes in prosperity, for if it happens that time and circumstances are favourable to one who acts with caution and prudence he will be successful, but if time and circumstances change he will be ruined, because he does not change his mode of procedure. Few principals are found so prudent as to be able to adapt themselves to all conditions, either because they cannot deviate from that to which their nature disposes them, or else because having always prospered by walking in one path, they cannot persuade themselves that it is well to leave it. Therefore, the cautious principal when it is time to act suddenly, does not know how to do so and is consequently ruined. If one could change one's nature with time and circumstances, fortune would never change.

One principal acted impetuously in bringing about a change and found the times and conditions so in conformity with his mode of procedure, that he obtained a good result. This principal by his impetuous move achieved what no other with the utmost human prudence would have succeeded in doing, because, if he had waited till all arrangements had been
made and everything settled, as another might have done, it would never have succeeded. For the staff or the parents would have found a thousand excuses, and they may have become inspired with a thousand fears. I will omit mention of this principal's other actions, which were all of this kind and which all did not succeed well, and the shortness of his tenure. When times followed in which it was necessary to act with caution, his ruin resulted, for he was never to deviate from the methods to which his nature disposed him.

I conclude then that fortune varying and men remaining fixed in their ways, they are successful so long as these ways conform to circumstances, but when they are opposed then they are unsuccessful.
NOTES ON CHAPTER XXIII

Chapter of The Prince entitled: "How Much Fortune Can do in Human Affairs and How it May be Opposed"

Fortune invariably comes in one of two ways—good and bad. We agree with Machiavelli that part of what we do is given to luck, yet there is sufficient opportunity if we are knowledgeable and adaptable to accommodate its occurrence. Good fortune is always welcomed and bad fortune is to be avoided. The advice that is given is that the only preparation one ought make in order not to be overcome totally by bad luck is to develop the potential of the staff and help them to acclimate themselves to changing procedures in constant times and thus to become able in changing times to develop appropriate plans and behaviors. Machiavelli provides in summary form a reminder that one ought not to rely on past practices whether they be good or bad because circumstances change. Consequently, blind adherence to what was formerly good may lead to one's ruination.
CHAPTER XXIV

EXHORTATION

Having considered all the things I have written, and thought whether or not there is at present a need for thoroughgoing change in the affairs of schools and whether or not the state of educational administration is such that it offers hope and opportunity to the prudent and capable to introduce a new order of things, it seems to me that many things concur to favor a new type of principal (one who is knowledgeable of effectiveness, modern human resource management, and power and fortune and fate). In fact I do not know of any time more fitting for such to rise. Schools and their staffs, it would seem, are without order having been beaten by many, and so are despoiled, lacerated, and at times even overrun. Schools now suffer ruin of every kind, from every quarter.

Before now gleams of hope have appeared which gave hope that principals might learn how to effect longlasting change, yet at the highest summit these changes were thrown aside by fortune, so that now, almost lifeless, schools await those who can effectively lead and thus put a stop to their ridicule, and cure them of those sores which have long been festering. Behold! parents and taxpayers pray for
someone to redeem students from barbarous cruelty and insolence inflicted in the name of education. Behold! teachers are ready to become motivated and assume responsibility if only there would be someone to lead them. There is nothing now that school systems hope for more but illustrious principals, being by skill and knowledge so exalted. Nor will administration be terribly difficult, if one calls to mind the actions and lives of those I have named. Although effectiveness is rare and marvellous, the principals of which I have made mention had less opportunity than the present affords to you for right now there is the greatest willingness. Besides this, unexampled wonders have been seen, grant money, alternative schools, in service training to but mention a few. It would seem that the seas have been opened, the sun shows the road, and everything has contributed to your potential greatness, the remainder must be done by you. Circumstance will not do everything, in order not to deprive you of the glory that would fall to you by your own ability.

It is no marvel that few principals can do that which it is hoped your illustrious administration may do. If with so many failures, it seems that motivation is extinct, this is because the ancient methods were not good, and no one has risen who knew how to implement new ones. Nothing does so much honor to a principal than developing effectiveness by
introducing new ideas and measures. These things when they are well based have greatness in them and render the principal revered and admired. There is not lacking in the field of education the opportunity to be recognized for the development of excellence. Hence there are great opportunities in school administration if you are not wanting in the head and in the heart. But look how with theory many would appear talented but when it comes to practice they make a poor show. The same can be said for those hundreds with experience who make the same mistakes annually and learn nothing from their occurrence. It is the combining of them both, which only few can manage, that render superior strength, dexterity and longevity.

Whomsoever wishes to follow in the steps of those great principals who redeemed their schools, it is before all things, necessary to lay the true foundations and by so doing, develop competency and effectiveness. There is not a truer, more faithful or better plan. If you hear these prayers, and have the mettle this opportunity you must not pass. I cannot express the love with which you will be received for schools have suffered under incompetence too long. With schools thirsting for effectiveness, what doors would be closed against you? What teachers would refuse your leadership? What parents would withhold allegiance? What superintendents would refuse support?
May you therefore seek knowledge and skills and with pure motivation take the responsibility, assume the task, so that under your guidance schools may be raised up and flourish.

Harken ye practitioners. Harken to destiny.
EXHORTATION

As in the Preface the exhortation presented here is quite similar to that presented in the original. The differences again being primarily that of the differences in the times as well as the styles of the respective writers.

Machiavelli attempts to provide an opportunity for princes to act upon their intentions so that they may maintain themselves in the power, and glory in which they find themselves. We, on the other hand, attempt to provide suggestions for those who are considering a career in educational administration or those who are presently in administration. We urge them to seize the opportunity given the present state of affairs, to mount the battlements and proceed to establish effectiveness in their endeavors.
CONCLUSION
SECTION IV

SUMMARY

Recent emphasis in the study of leadership asserts that leadership is a function of the leader, the follower(s) and numerous situational variables and suggests that the interaction of these components determines the appropriate leadership style for a given situation. While the predominance of a situational approach to leadership only began to appear in the literature in the last decade, this approach is not new. In fact, the purpose of this dissertation is to support the contention that Niccolo Machiavelli in his classic 15th century work The Prince was one of the first writers to argue that effective leadership is situational in nature. Machiavelli identifies the need for strong decisive leaders who are knowledgeable, possess a wide range of behaviors and have great diagnostic ability. Thus, while the observations of leader behavior noted in The Prince were written centuries ago they have meaning and application for practitioners today in that The Prince highlights many of the social and psychological complexities of leadership.

It was from this perspective that Machiavelli and Education was undertaken and a search for fundamental leader behaviors was begun. The first step in the process was to survey the literature in terms of both the role of the principal and leader behavior. It became evident from this survey
that principals have varying degrees of control over circumstances and factors operating within schools; while some are clearly under their control and some are not, others are at least marginally under their control. This insight stimulated the need to develop a greater understanding of the situational approach to leadership.

The core of *Machiavelli and Education* is essentially *The Prince* transposed chapter by chapter into current leadership theory and educational examples. In most cases the leadership theory of Machiavelli as well as his style of presentation was preserved while appropriate changes in terminology and translation into educational examples were made. Where Machiavelli's theories did not seem relevant to schools, other leadership theories were integrated into the work. In such cases, the leadership theories included were chosen on the basis of their consistency with the theories presented by Machiavelli, their generalizability across disciplines, and their usefulness to students of administration on a recurring basis. The educational examples used went through a similar screening. These filters helped focus the work on what Machiavelli has to share with educational administrators. At the end of each chapter, notes were included to highlight the relationship between Machiavelli's theory and modern behavioral science theory. As such this work is basically comparative and analytic.
It must be noted that the foregoing qualifiers are quite subjective. Although implications drawn for this work are founded in 'objective' evidence pointed out by literature and research, the product is a development of the writer's thinking. For example, Chapter II, "Of Ecclesiastical Principalities," and Chapter 19, "That We Must Avoid Being Despised and Hated," of The Prince have been deleted. In the case of the former, it was felt that no adequate transposition to a school setting could be made. As regards the latter, it was felt that much of what was stated was adequately represented elsewhere and what remained was not transferable to schools.

ASSUMPTIONS

This work is predicated upon the following:

1) That schools need to and can be improved.

2) That a challenge facing school administrators is learning how to develop and apply effective leadership so that schools will become increasingly better able to meet the needs of the rapidly changing society.

3) That man, by his nature, is not only complex but also highly variable and that his needs may differ under various conditions even in the same organization.

4) That there is no managerial strategy that will work with all people at all times.
5) That a leader must vary his behavior according to the needs of the individuals and the needs of the situation.

QUESTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

A number of issues are raised as a result of this work. This section outlines several anticipated questions and responds to them.

How complex is the role of the principal?

It is easy to get the impression that all a principal need do is diagnose the school environment, discover the situational variables and adapt his leadership style to meet the needs of the circumstance. This is a very simplistic statement of the principal's leadership role. In reality the job of the principal is almost unbelievably complex. Machiavelli and Education attempts to provide a theoretical framework for only one aspect of this job. We realize that there are many factors that influence a principal's performance such as the 'community,' the school board, parents, et al. We recognize that this work does not deal with many of these factors. In essence, this work has as its concern only some of the internal aspects of a school and does not deal with many of the social complexities or various roles and resulting conflicts that face a principal. This becomes
increasingly evident when we consider that school administrators are expected to be able to blend theory and practice, the possible and the ideal, the individual and the organization, humane-ness and efficiency, the present and the future, and institutional stability and change. In addition we must recognize that an administrator's reality usually means that he has little opportunity to think and plan, hardly any control over how he spends his time, little legitimized authority or credibility and in some sense, no chance for success. Considering all these complexities, we have attempted to help the administrator gain an understanding of some of the situational variables that confront him as well as provide some assistance so that he may be better able to diagnose his environment and make some predictions about the effect of his behavior(s) upon the course of events.

We admit that the theories that are presented are not as complex as reality and that many issues facing an administrator are not dealt with in this text. We submit that if the theories were as complex as reality and if all the variables were dealt with, this work would be as complex as reality and would therefore be just as immobilizing. We hope that administrators will be better able to deal with some of the complexities of their environment as a consequence of the simpler-than-life frameworks presented here.
What is meant by "effectiveness"?

The term effectiveness is defined and used throughout this work, yet its meaning may not be clear. We suggest that an organization's effectiveness is not only determined by 'output' or productivity, but should also include consideration of the 'condition' of its human organization over time. We should emphasize though, that developing interpersonal satisfaction and morale may not always be important; sometimes the job has to be done and there is not time to consider all the human factors. We mean to suggest that if emphasis on output alone continues for long periods of time both morale and productivity may decrease to a point that they may not recover. In this way we suggest that an administrator must be continually concerned with his behavior and its impact upon productivity and workers' satisfaction and morale. The mix depends upon both the situation and his concerns. As the leader ponders the quality of his group he is advised to consider the group's productivity and morale. If he discovers that his style of leadership is not yielding results he may want to consider changing his behavior according to the necessity of the case.
Is MACHIAVELLI AND EDUCATION a cookbook of solutions?

As this work is broken into many short sections and covers numerous topics it may give the appearance of a 'cookbook of solutions.' This is not the intention. The contention is that there is no one 'best' way of doing things. The emphasis throughout this work has been upon the diagnostic ability of leaders so that they may better determine the needs of the situations in which they find themselves. What has been attempted through the use of this format is reinforcement for this approach.

Is this work value free?

A question that may immediately come to mind is whether or not there are values inherent in this work. Central to the situational approach to leadership is the ability to diagnose various situations and determine appropriate leader responses. To the extent that we do not advance a specific course of action, one that is applicable in all situations, this work is value free. On the other hand, one may get the impression that the condition of the human organization--i.e., workers' morale and satisfaction--is a paramount issue. This is a value held by the author and to the extent that this work advances this concern it is value laden.
Is this work serious or not?

The style of writing used is at times tongue-in-cheek, humorous and amusing, and yet the work is, by intent, a serious endeavor. While its message is transmitted in a light and easy-to-read manner, it is hoped that it will prove to be insightful and helpful to practitioners as they struggle to stay in control of their environment.

FUTURE RESEARCH

There has been very little research undertaken in the area of leader adaptability. In fact, the only long-term research in the area of situational leadership has been done by Fred E. Fiedler.

According to Fiedler's Leadership Contingency Model, there are three major variables that determine whether a situation is favorable to a leader. They are as follows:

(1) The quality of the leader's personal relationships with work group members.

(2) The degree of structure in the task that the group is to perform.

(3) The leader's position power.

Accordingly, the most favorable situation for a leader is one in which he has position power, is well liked by subordinates and is directing a well defined task. The most unfavorable situation is one in which the leader has little
or no position power, is not well liked by the work group and has a task that is not structured. Having developed this model for classifying situations, Fiedler attempts to determine the leadership style that would be most effective.

While Fiedler's work is important with regard to situational variables it does not deal with the issue of adaptability.

It seems appropriate that future research concern itself with leader adaptability for we need to determine (at least) whether or not people are adaptive, whether its occurrence is common and whether people can learn to be adaptive.

If it is found that people are not adaptive or are only adaptive within certain limits we need to learn much more about team-building, for if a leader is limited in his range of behaviors he may well need to augment his style. What conflicts will arise when people with different behaviors work together? Do 'personalities' get in the way? Undoubtedly these questions just scratch the surface.

In conclusion, we recognize that at best Machiavelli and Education is incomplete. In it we do not mean to suggest that any individual can display all the skills that we describe. We have attempted to isolate specific conditions and study them so that practitioners can gain new knowledge about the impact of their behaviors upon others.
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