

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

THE PERCEIVED INSERVICE NEEDS AND PREFERRED DELIVERY
SYSTEMS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN RELATION
TO ACTUAL INSERVICE PROVISIONS

by

Graham Marvin Hill

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirement for
the Degree of Master of Education

Department of Educational Administration and Foundations
Winnipeg, Manitoba

November, 1981

THE PERCEIVED INSERVICE NEEDS AND PREFERRED DELIVERY
SYSTEMS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN RELATION
TO ACTUAL INSERVICE PROVISIONS

BY

GRAHAM MARVIN HILL

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

© 1982

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVER-
SITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to
the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this
thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to identify the perceived inservice needs of elementary school principals and the delivery systems preferred by those principals, then to relate this information to actual inservice provision.

Twenty elementary school principals were asked to participate in the study which involved answering a questionnaire, then an in-depth interview. Two principals who did not return the questionnaire were considered to have withdrawn from the study, leaving eighteen to both complete the questionnaire and provide information through interview. The principals involved included both male and female respondents with experience as a principal ranging from less than one year to more than sixteen years. Respondents were based in both urban and rural schools with enrolments ranging from less than fifty students to greater than six hundred students.

Questionnaire statistics provided a rank order of importance of the areas of concern for principals within six broad categorizations - curriculum and instruction, working with staff, working with students, working with the community, operations and personal concerns. The need level for an inservice program was considered to be the difference between the desired level of proficiency and the current ability level identified by the principals. These figures were then related to the rank order of importance listing and were also used to provide a separate list of areas of concern showing all fifty-nine items in order from greatest to least need.

In all categories except one, the item ranked most important by the

principals did not register the highest need level for an inservice program, indicating that principals perceive some areas of great inservice need as being of less importance to their daily administrative role than other areas of less need. The one exception occurred in the category of Personal Concerns, where the item 'Leadership techniques' was identified by principals as being both of greatest importance to them and in greatest need of inservice support.

Interview data indicated that principals see a need for inservice programs to be based on local or individual needs identification exercises; professional development programs for principals are a shared responsibility; professional journals are useful; early career support for beginning principals is needed; informal interaction with fellow principals is considered useful; divisional principals' meetings are seen as useful for considering matters of local relevance.

Data from the interviews also provided the opportunity to 1) compare perceived needs with the programs offered within divisions, and 2) compare the programs offered by the central agencies with the need level ratings.

A composite list of inservice needs indentified in the statistical data plus inservice needs identified in the interviews shows twenty-three items of current inservice need. Of these twenty-three items, ten had been offered through inservice programs during the previous school year.

Conclusions were drawn from the research and recommendations concerning inservice programs for elementary school principals are recorded.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply indebted to my advisor, Dr. David Marshall, for the guidance provided during the course of this study and for his practical assistance and support so kindly given on my arrival in Canada. Thanks also to committee members, Dr. Leo LeTourneau and Dr. Winston Rampaul, whose understanding and advice have been greatly appreciated.

The elementary school principals involved in this study found time in their busy schedule to complete the questionnaire and to be interviewed. I am grateful for their understanding and their hospitality.

Mrs. Joan Stewart's efficient typing enabled me to present this study within the time limits available to me and her personal friendliness toward my family has helped to make our stay in Canada a most pleasant experience.

To my wife, Jenny, and my children, Tim, Kirsty and Jon, who left behind them in Australia so much that is important in their lives to enable us to be together this year - thank you for your understanding and your support.

This study was made possible by the Travelling Scholarship program of the Education Department of South Australia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.	1
Overview	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Significance of the Study	3
Method	4
Data Analysis	4
Delimitations	5
Limitations	5
Definition of Terms	5
Summary of Organization of the Thesis	7
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.	8
Introduction	8
Principals in a Changing Society	8
Societal and Professional Change	8
Challenge and the Demand for New Skills	9
Emerging Concerns	13
Inadequacies	14
The Need for Inservice Programs for Principals	16
Effective Leadership and the Quality of Education	16
Three Critical Areas of Competence	17
Symptoms of Personal Concern	18
Questions of Sponsorship and Purpose	18
Barriers Impeding Improvement	19
Conflicting Demands	20
Identifying Needs	21
Desirable Administrator Characteristics	21
Instruments and Descriptive Items	22
Needs and Program Opportunities	24
Human Relations Skills and Management Skills	26
Delivery Systems	27
Aspects of Concern	27
Delivery Features	28
Individual Opportunities	29
Job-Relevance	30

Chapter	Page
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE (cont'd:)	
Delivery Systems (cont'd:)	
Effective and Ineffective Strategies	31
Common Program Practices	32
Obstacles	33
Purposeful Planning	34
The Principal Benefits	35
Role Demands	35
Performance and Reinforcement	35
Inservice Input	36
Outcomes	37
Summary	38
3. METHODOLOGY.	40
Introduction	40
Purpose of the Study	40
Conceptual Framework - Needs Identification	40
Conceptual Framework - Preferred Delivery	42
Description of Respondents	43
Questionnaire Design Modifications	44
Research Methodology	45
The Principals	45
The Sponsors	46
Summary	47
4. RESEARCH DATA.	48
Introduction	48
Respondents	49
Program Attendance	51
Inservice Needs	53
Preferred Mode of Delivery	64
Sponsorship	65
Format	67
Duration	69
Location	70
Time of Year	72
Participation	73
General Comments by Respondents	74
Mode of Delivery Summary	75
Interview Data: Study Respondents	76
Principal #1 -	
Introduction	77
Inservice for Principals	77
Most Important Points	79

Chapter	Page
4. <u>RESEARCH DATA</u> (cont'd:)	
Interview Data: Study Respondents (cont'd:)	
Principal #2 -	
Introduction	80
Inservice for Principals	80
Most Important Points	82
Principal #3 -	
Introduction	83
Inservice for Principals	83
Most Important Points	85
Principal #4 -	
Introduction	86
Inservice for Principals	86
Most Important Points	88
Principal #5 -	
Introduction	89
Inservice for Principals	89
Most Important Points	92
Principal #6 -	
Introduction	93
Inservice for Principals	93
Most Important Points	95
Principal #7 -	
Introduction	96
Inservice for Principals	96
Most Important Points	98
Principal #8 -	
Introduction	100
Inservice for Principals	100
Most Important Points	102
Principal #9 -	
Introduction	103
Inservice for Principals	103
Most Important Points	105
Principal #11 -	
Introduction	106
Inservice for Principals	106
Most Important Points	108
Principal #12 -	
Introduction	109
Inservice for Principals	109
Most Important Points	111

Chapter	Page
4. RESEARCH DATA (cont'd:)	
Interview Data: Study Respondents (cont'd:)	
Principal #13 -	
Introduction	111
Inservice for Principals	111
Most Important Points	113
Principal #14 -	
Introduction	114
Inservice for Principals	114
Most Important Points	116
Principal #15 -	
Introduction	117
Inservice for Principals	117
Most Important Points	119
Principal #16 -	
Introduction	120
Inservice for Principals	120
Most Important Points	122
Principal #17 -	
Introduction	123
Inservice for Principals	123
Most Important Points	125
Principal #19 -	
Introduction	127
Inservice for Principals	127
Most Important Points	128
Principal #20 -	
Introduction	129
Inservice for Principals	129
Most Important Points	131
Respondent Interviews Summary	132
Interview Data: Sponsoring Agencies	135
Manitoba Teachers' Society	135
The Education Department of Manitoba	136
School Divisions	137
Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba	137
Sponsorship Summary	138
Chapter Summary	139

Chapter	Page
5. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.	141
Introduction	141
Research Question #1	142
Answer to Research Question #1	143
Research Question #2	145
Answer to Research Question #2	146
Research Question #3	149
Sponsorship	149
Format	150
Duration	152
Location	153
Time of Year	154
Participation	156
Answer to Research Question #3	157
Research Question #4	158
Answer to Research Question #4	159
Research Question #5	160
Interview Data	160
Questionnaire Data	160
Preferred Delivery Systems	162
Answer to Research Question #5	163
Research Question #6	164
Inservice Needs	164
Delivery Systems	165
Answer to Research Question #6	166
Research Question #7	167
Answer to Research Question #7	167
The Central Study Problem	168
Answer to the Central Study Problem	168
Chapter Summary	170
6. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	171
Summary	
The Purpose of the Study	171
Elements of the Study	171
Inservice Needs	171
Preferred Delivery Mode	172
The Study Problem	173
Summary of Research Findings with Regards to Research	
Questions	173
Inservice Needs	173
Level of Needs	173

Chapter	Page
6. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (cont'd). . .	
Summary (cont'd:)	
Summary of Research Findings with Regards to Research Questions (cont'd:)	
Preferred Delivery	174
Other Factors	175
Experience	175
Geographic Location	175
The Central Study Problem	176
Conclusions	177
General Conclusions	177
The Instrument	177
Limitations posed by the Data	178
Conclusions Based on Interview and Questionnaire Data	180
Recommendations	181
For Current Inservice Needs	181
For Future Inservice Programs	182
For Future Research	182
Bibliography	184

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Overview of Respondents - Grouped Geographically. . .	50
2. Program Attendance.	52
3. Inservice Need Identification - Curriculum and Instruction.	54
4. Inservice Need Identification - Working with Staff. .	55
5. Inservice Need Identification - Working with Students	56
6. Inservice Need Identification - Working with the Community.	57
7. Inservice Need Identification - Operations.	58
8. Inservice Need Identification - Personal Concerns . .	60
9. Rank Order of Importance - Inservice Need Areas . . .	62
10. Need Level of Areas of Concern - Composite List . . .	63
11. Preferred Mode of Delivery Data - Sponsorship	64
12. Preferred Mode of Delivery Data - Format.	67
13. Preferred Mode of Delivery Data - Duration.	68
14. Preferred Mode of Delivery Data - Location.	70
15. Preferred Mode of Delivery Data - Time of Year. . . .	71
16. Preferred Mode of Delivery Data - Participation . . .	73
17. Identified Needs Related to Divisional Inservice Opportunities.	134
18. Program Opportunities 1980-81	140
19. Inservice Need Areas Identified in Interviews Related to Questionnaire Statistical Data.	144
20. Current Inservice Needs of the Respondents Indicating Level of Need.	145
21. Current Inservice Needs of Respondents According to 'Level of Importance' and 'Need Level' Ratings . . .	148

	PAGE
APPENDICES.	190
Questionnaire Instrument	190
Accompanying Letter	199
Key Interview Questions	200

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW

The organization and administration of elementary schools places the school principal in the position of prime responsibility for both the maintenance of the organization and for educational leadership within the organization. Individual principals may choose to delegate organizational tasks or abrogate leadership roles according to his/her individual style of administration, but these decisions in themselves will have a significant impact on the school.

Culbertson (1974:4) found ". . . that the principal was the single most important factor in setting school climate and attaining school goals." Higley (1974:20) agrees ". . . that the principal is one of the key figures in the whole educational process, if not the central figure." The significance of the decisions and actions of the school principal may be seen throughout the school in plant maintenance, human relationships, educational programme and in the reputation that the school enjoys in the community.

With the position of principal being so vital, it is pertinent to question what support services and developmental opportunities are available to help them ensure that their decisions are based on the best and most current information available. According to Lutz and Ferrante (1972:46), ". . . basic to the solution of the critical problems facing education today is the development of planned, systematic, and continuous programs for the continuing education of school administrators."

This study examined the perceived inservice needs and preferred delivery systems of elementary school principals and actual inservice provision in Manitoba.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Did the inservice provisions for elementary school principals in Manitoba meet the perceived needs of those principals and were the delivery systems used those which principals prefer?

In order to answer the main research questions, a number of sub-questions were posed:

- 1) What are the current inservice needs of elementary school principals?
- 2) What are the levels of those inservice needs?
- 3) What are the preferred delivery systems for programs involving
 - technical skills and knowledge
 - human relations skills and knowledge
 - conceptual abilities?
- 4) What other factors does a principal take into consideration when deciding on inservice attendance?
- 5) Are the inservice program needs and delivery system preferences influenced by the number of years experience as a principal?
- 6) Are inservice program needs and delivery system preferences influenced by the geographic location of principals in either urban or rural areas?
- 7) What are the inservice opportunities available to principals?

The availability of inservice courses designed specifically for principals or generally for educators is well-documented and advertised in the appropriate areas. The study categorizes the inservice opportunities made available to principals in 1980-1981 through the various educational institutions or agencies in Winnipeg and reconciles this data with the information offered by principals.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Recognizing the need for inservice development and structuring an opportunity for principals to become involved in a developmental programme does not necessarily guarantee that the programme will either be supported by principals or be effective for those who attend.

Davis (1976:2) criticizes the seemingly standard format of inservice programmes that are based on the assumption that all individuals or groups have similar learning styles, while Lutz and Ferrante (1972:42) stress that investigation is needed to identify the preferred learning systems, conditions, costs and rewards that are most likely to attract participants. The identified needs of the principals may reflect current transient features as well as traditional and continuing problems, so that a needs identification exercise with principals will produce results that are relevant for current purposes only. The temporary nature of some of the needs may also influence the preferred delivery system identified, but the consideration of these features will help to identify the factors that resulted in participation or non-participation, and satisfaction or dissatisfaction within the group of principals selected.

This study has two areas of significance:

(a) Local and immediate relevance: Identifying the needs of principals and the effectiveness of current inservice programmes serves to either reinforce current commitments by those responsible for principal inservice programmes, or cause them to reconsider the basis on which programmes are being designed and delivered.

b) Wider significance. Allowing for the items that reflect purely local or transient interest, the needs and preferred delivery systems

DELIMITATIONS

This study was limited to twenty Manitoba elementary school principals and their inservice involvement during the 1980-81 school year. Similarly, inservice opportunity statistics will also be based solely on the 1980-81 school year and on the institutions or agencies operating in Manitoba.

LIMITATIONS

As the study focuses on a small number of Manitoban elementary school principals, there shall be limitations arising from:

- (a) the sample: The findings will be examples of principal experiences in Manitoba that are specific rather than representative of the entire elementary principal group.
- (b) the individuals: The principals interviewed have volunteered for involvement in further investigation of inservice provision for principals and could therefore be seen as a biased group, possibly more concerned than a broad cross-section.
- (c) geography: The findings will be pertinent essentially to Manitoba.
- (d) the principals: Elementary school principals only will be interviewed, so generalizations for all principals cannot be inferred.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Perceived Inservice Needs

The 'Perceived Inservice Needs' are those items listed as 'Areas of Concern' for the principals where the 'Desired Level of Proficiency' is greater than their 'Current Ability Level'.

Need Level

By calculating the difference between the statistical 'Desired Level of Proficiency' and the 'Current Ability Level', a statistical representation

identified are of interest to programme designers elsewhere for use either in their own programme or as a basis for comparison.

METHOD

Twenty elementary school principals indicated that they were prepared to be involved in an investigation into this area were interviewed. In choosing those to be interviewed, consideration was given to selecting principals from different age groups, career stages and locality (i.e., from rural as well as urban school divisions).

Through an individual interview technique, answers to the needs and preferred delivery system questions were sought, along with further comments of an analytical nature that helped to provide information for general observations relating to the data.

A response sheet was designed for interviewer use during this part of the study.

Statistical information and other data concerning the inservice programmes offered in 1980-81 was sought from the appropriate institutions/agencies in Winnipeg.

DATA ANALYSIS

The emphasis in this study was on the collection of qualitative data which was analysed and presented in detail or as descriptive statistics. General trends arising from interviews concerning the types of needs and delivery systems favoured was presented in quantitative form along with information concerning inservice opportunities. This enabled the establishment of grounds for direct comparison and interpretation.

Comments from principals were also categorized and presented as a qualitative general section.

of 'Need Level' is found. This 'Need Level' figure indicates the extent to which inservice attention is required by a particular item. It does not give an item priority over another item registering less 'Need Level' if the latter item is considered by principals to be of greater importance.

Importance

The 'Level of Importance' at which an inservice item is rated represents the perceived rank order of importance of the item to the principals. In determining inservice needs, items ranking high 'Level of Importance' are considered items of highest priority. In some cases the items ranked highest in importance to principals are not the items of greatest inservice need level. Priority for inservice program requirement is related to the 'Level of Importance', with the extent of program requirement related to 'Need Level' readings.

Preferred Delivery Systems

The methods of relaying the information required or developing the skills needed by principals vary according to the personnel involved, the institution involved and the nature of the information or skill itself. The preferred delivery systems are those which the individual principal has found best satisfies his/her needs and suits his/her learning techniques or are identified as being preferred to other systems he/she has experienced.

Actual Inservice Provision

This refers to the opportunities made available to principals to improve their skills or receive information during the school year September, 1980 - August, 1981, through the recognized institutions or agents providing inservice courses in Manitoba - the University, the Department of Education, the Manitoba Teachers' Society or the local school division.

SUMMARY OF ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

This study commences with an overview of the situation, statement of the problem, comment on the significance of the study, description of the method, proposed data analysis, delimitations, limitations and definition of terms.

Chapter two is a review of the current literature related to the inservice education of principals - both needs identification and delivery systems.

The methodology used for the study is described in Chapter three.

The research findings are presented in chapter four in two sections:

a) reports of the interviews with the principals,

and

b) statistics indicating inservice needs and preferred delivery systems.

Chapter five is an analysis of Research, Results, while a summary, conclusions and recommendations are provided in chapter six.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to review current available literature concerning the provision of inservice programmes for principals.

First, the social, organizational and methodological changes that are effecting schools are considered, then attention is given to the need for inservice programmes for principals who have to face the challenge of those changes. Identifying the inservice needs of principals and the delivery systems for inservice programmes as two critical components of effective programmes are then investigated.

Finally, the benefits of ensuring that inservice programmes are goal-oriented, relevant and effectively implemented are considered.

Principals in a Changing Society

Societal and Professional Change

Today's elementary school principals are themselves products of education systems, sociological networks and philosophical constraints that have existed in the past twenty years or more. Those systems are of a dynamic, turbulent nature rather than static and merely repetitive, so an examination of the inservice needs of principals must pay close attention to the context within which the principal operates. Principals of schools in 1981 have been educated, have undergone professional training, have commenced their career and have assumed administrative responsibility in an

era marked by accelerated societal change. Cobbs (1975:2) refers to immeasurable changes in teaching methods and administrative practises during the past twenty years, along with great differences in accountability and outside scrutiny during the same period. Educational aims, organizational methods, decision-making procedures, and financial obligations have been openly questioned by a better-educated, articulate public - very different public attitudes than those encountered by the principal at the commencement of his teaching career. The pressures of change are felt as much from within the school organization as from without. Davis (1976:2) states that ". . . the decrease in professional mobility, the complexity of educational issues and the rapid expansion of the educational administration knowledge base. . ." are current or emerging problems that the principal must face.

Challenges and the Demand for New Skills

No longer may the principal depend upon his teaching expertise and organizational ability to overcome difficulties even though it was the display of these skills that originally led to his appointment as principal. The complexities of educational issues are no longer solved with easy identification of what is right and wrong or what is of ultimate benefit to every student. As the aims are more diffuse, so are the appropriate methods and procedures, demanding a far broader understanding of alternatives and effective implementation techniques by the principal. Bell (1975:1) claims that ". . . school administrators on all levels are facing new challenges and demands for new skills and capabilities." He refers to the growing complexity of society and of the demand for sophisticated leadership that is capable of responding to changing needs and meeting modern challenges.

Small (1974:18) suggests that the major social changes impinging upon schools have created the need for the principal to develop new skills and to re-think the goal-orientation and the value-base upon which decisions are made. Both Hanlon (1968:202) and Miller (:7) refer to the need for the principal to have knowledge of the structure, function and control of education and society in developing the school's educational climate. This is further highlighted by Fallon (1974:36) who claims that ". . . followers are now better informed, more aggressive and vastly more vocal than ever before; they are demanding and getting a piece of the action in education." The loyalty and obedience once expected of teachers is no longer taken for granted, and principals find that relationships with staff members are based upon grounds other than prescribed regulations. To establish patterns of loyalty and to ensure that he has an impact upon the school's educational program, the principal has to employ a new repertoire of personal skills. As a study by Stern (1979:1) showed, the principal is no longer primarily a facilitator of curriculum, but now must play a broader, more complex role in his school and community. Stout (1973:24) agrees that ". . . administrators are expected to be educational leaders, and leadership is presumed to include system re-orientation and change," and Goldhammer (1966:31) stresses that, to do this, the principal is obliged to know about current educational programs and administrative practices that accommodate such change. The prescribed skills that helped the principal to reach his administrative position are inadequate when the principal is confronted by problems that demand entirely new sets of skills in addition to those already demonstrated. The leadership role that the principal once automatically assumed with his office is now one that must be earned through credibility both with staff

and community.

One of the emerging areas of concern that necessitates the administrative re-direction to which Stout and Goldhammer refer is the reduction in teacher mobility and resignation. Sergiovanni (1979:3) observes that

" . . . dissatisfied teachers are now less likely to leave. . .(so). . ., in the absence of easy turnover, the maintenance and development of job satisfaction, motivation and commitment in teachers becomes more important. Again the burden increasingly falls on supervisors who are closest to teachers and their work."

Whether one looks to blame changing economies, depressed markets, world-wide inflation or the tendency towards zero population growth in some countries for the situation, is not really important. Individual principals, schools or districts cannot hope to change the cause or causes that have brought about the circumstances, but they are all confronted with the tangible evidence and the demand that something be done to preserve or improve the quality of education despite these changes. In a situation where economic pressures force dissatisfied teachers to continue working rather than resign and look for greater satisfaction elsewhere in a depressed employment market, that dissatisfaction becomes a matter of prime concern for the school principal. Similarly, less school-age children in the general population has caused school closures and less job opportunities for teachers, therefore less mobility. The mobility of past years provided the avenues for teachers to seek job-satisfaction, motivation and commitment elsewhere with relative ease, but now these avenues are not as easily accessible and the problem is not as easily solved or avoided. The problem stays, along with the teacher, and the principal finds that the changing mobility pattern has presented him with

a problem of greater proportions than ever before, while at the same time demanding entirely new solutions. When confronted by a situation such as this, the principal who has not received formal training in the human relations, counselling and leadership fields, must depend on the informal network of consultation, reading, writing or travel to find the most appropriate responses. Higley (1974:1) claims that such informal training is inadequate for effective operation in a situation where only formal training will provide both the operating basis plus satisfy the growing call for accountability. Lavin and Sanders (1975:3) support this view with a strong criticism of the deficiency of decision-making at middle-management level in schools and refer to the training of school leaders as ". . . one of the most pressing problems in public school education." Similar concern was also shown in a California State Legislature report (1977:52) which conceded that, although there was evidence to show that desired outcomes had been achieved in some inservice programs, there should be evaluative information regarding a) the settings most likely to produce an effective program and b) the format of an effective program. It is, perhaps, understandable that greatest efforts and finances should be poured into the most tangible areas of educational needs - curriculum development, support materials provision and teacher inservice - as the outcomes are usually highly visible or assessable. Such programs are also often undertaken to bring about a desired change or achieve a desired, identifiable objective. The same cannot always be said for inservice programs for principals. In many cases the skills to be acquired or the attitudes to be changed are related to something very personal and confidentiality must be maintained whether it is the principal who is personally benefitting or whether it is someone in the school community

that the principal is assisting who will eventually benefit from the program. Evaluating the outcomes of programs designed to upgrade technical skills will be relatively easy because of the clearly identifiable goals, but the cry for evaluation should not be so great that it narrows the focus of skill development simply to those skills which allow easy evaluation, to the neglect of other equally important, but less tangible goals.

Emerging Concerns

The danger of uncertainty in educational practice and meeting the inservice needs of principals is criticized by Lucio (1969:77) who claims that this ". . . leads to dependence on serendipity as a way of change." Klopff (1969:25) then extends this theme and suggests that ". . . the older we get the less we catch the chance item, the non-literal, and the 'not-sought-for'. There is less serendipity and less openness and less flexibility ." The implication for principals is that they could move rather rapidly from being effective to depending on serendipity and then to inflexibility if there is not some form of input that effectively meets their needs. The inherent dangers to schools and education through a lack of structured inservice developmental programs for principals is obvious and is becoming more apparent through such studies as "The Manitoba School Principal: Changing Roles and Responsibilities", which was conducted by a task force of the Manitoba Teachers' Society in 1978. This report found that the average number of hours per week worked by principals and vice-principals was 47.7 (MTS, 1978:11) and there was a perceived significant increase in workload in all of the twelve areas defined as principals' responsibilities. The report states that this ". . . suggests possible morale problems amongst the administrative force, and is a matter

which could be of concern to the professional association and to the employers." (MTS, 1978:23). As a result of these findings, the Task Force recommended that inservice opportunities for principals were needed now in curriculum development, teacher evaluation and professional development of teachers, and further recommended that ongoing assessments should be conducted to ensure that the professional development needs of principals are met. (MTS, 1978:37). The three areas of need highlighted in the recommendations each reflect facets of the changes and pressures mentioned earlier - changes in educational program, accountability and personal job satisfaction. At the same time, the report hints that the professional development of principals is more complex and requires closer, more regular attention.

Inadequacies

Creamer and Feld (1972:37-41) refer to the UCEA report on preparatory programmes for school administrators and the criticism contained in that report that five areas in need of change identified earlier were still in need of change as the report was being drafted. The report called for: 1) greater emphasis on non-cognitive qualities in the selection of students of administration, 2) greater emphasis on values and purpose definition, 3) promotion of individual initiative in students, 4) use of field experiences and 5) specialization in departments of educational administration. Both of the preceding studies identify changing needs in an era of change, but despite such studies, ". . . there is reason to believe that much of what we do in the name of staff development, inservice training, or continuing professional education is less than effective." (Cunningham, 1975:2). The difficulty in structuring effective programs is better understood when the shift in emphasis is analysed. The UCEA report

mentioned above referred to non-cognitive qualities, values, purpose definition and individual initiative as being of great importance in the programs of students who are, or are to be, administrators.

These qualities are significantly different to those that bureaucracies have demanded in past years. Obedience, compliance, loyalty, clear role definition and organizational rather than individual initiative were significant characteristics of the work climate in which young teachers commenced their careers. The personal qualities and talents demanded of the principal as a beginning teacher are considerably different to the qualities demanded of the same person as a principal. Inservice program planners are now faced with a situation where they cannot merely explore areas of cognitive skills with a general level of applicability.

Professional development needs of principals have quickly become more individual with greater emphasis on person traits rather than organizational procedures.

The relatively rapid societal changes that have occurred in the past twenty years have changed the arena within which the educational administrator operates. The attitudes and procedures that were part of today's administrator's training twenty years ago are no longer relevant, leaving the administrator in the unenviable position of being more publicly accountable for the quality of the educational program in his school, while at the same time searching for the appropriate personal skills and knowledge that will guarantee such quality.

The Need for Inservice Programs for Principals

Effective Leadership and the Quality of Education

"Although neglected at the present time by most of the preparatory institutions and related agencies, the continuous inservice education of administrators is one of the most imperative needs for the revitalization of education in our society. To provide those experiences which can effectively assist the trained professional to modify his behavior, to obtain the new knowledge which he needs, and to build new skills based upon contemporary technology is probably the greatest challenge facing the field of educational administration and all of its institutions and agencies today." (Goldhammer, 1968:183).

Goldhammer recognizes the influential role played by the principal and the nature of the societal changes that place greater and changing demands on the principal's behavior, knowledge and skills. The importance that he places upon the role of the principal is supported by Burnes (1975:6) who refers to the principal as ". . . a key determinant of the quality of the school," and by Higley (1974:20) who claims that ". . . the principal is one of the key figures in the whole educational process if not the central figure." Randall (1977:3) also claims that ". . . effective leadership is the key to a good school where quality education is provided for students," while Doll (1972:284-285) stresses the importance of the Halpin and Croft study of 1963 which showed that four aspects of the behavior of principals - aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration - were influential determinants of school climate. Similarly, Barrilleaux (1975:5) claims that ". . . reliable studies have consistently revealed the urgent need for quality leadership in the promotion of effective learning." Although his status is widely recognized, the principal's dilemma arises when attempting to meet the expectations of those who acknowledge his status. He finds that his credibility base is being rapidly eroded. His previously recognized teaching ability no longer

reflects currently relevant skills; his abilities to organize according to bureaucratic tradition are no longer the most appropriate methods; relationships based on an aging morality and role prescription are no longer credible. Despite this, the school community maintains expectations of the principal as an effective leader who will ensure the excellence of the educational program at their school.

Three Critical Areas of Competence

With such general agreement on the critical nature of the role played by the principal, it is pertinent to examine the features of that role that inservice programmers may well consider. Lipham and Hoeh (1974:363) identify the competency facets of a principalship as reflecting either conceptual, human or technical skills, and this is supported by Higley (1974:10). Brainard (1975:3-4) pursues the same argument and explains that. . .

". . . for the administrator -

1. New technical skills and knowledge are often necessary as improvements occur.
2. Improved human relations skills and knowledge are often necessary for working productively with faculties, other administrators, students, parents and the public.
3. Improved conceptual abilities are always of extreme importance. These are the competencies necessary to see the larger picture, the purposes of schools, and the thrust of educational change and advancement."

Brainard's identification of three basic fields of expertise provide a useful starting point in analysing a particularly complex role. Each of the fields may be further analysed in great detail, considering both organizational and personal goals, and each field suggests competencies that may be developed under differing sets of conditions.

Symptoms of Personal Concern

Cobbs (1975:34) in a psychiatric study of school administrators facing mid-career crises, found that ". . . in the educational field particularly there can be a great fear of three types of obsolescence. Technological, . . . interpersonal, . . . (and) . . . cultural." This is not only compatible with the three categories listed by Brainard above, but is also of vital importance specifically to principals who face the challenges of principalship and mid-career crisis at about the same stage in life. Cobbs (1975:34) goes on to identify depression, poor health (brought about by emotional turmoil), fear, hostility and retirement on the job as symptoms of mid-career crisis - a crisis that may well be minimized through effective inservice programs. Although mid-career crisis problems are pertinent to the study of principals and their professional development, the study warrants more in-depth analysis than may be provided here, other than to acknowledge the correlation in the studies mentioned above.

Questions of Sponsorship and Purpose

Despite the seemingly common identification of three areas of need for professional development in principals, the tasks of definition and procedure still provide obstacles. Lucio (1969:72) feels that ". . . we are faced with actions to discover needs to be filled rather than with filling needs already discovered", further stressing the shift of emphasis from considering organizational goals to considering individual needs. This shift of emphasis complicates the process of needs identification as personal or local needs may be pertinent only to that particular person or that specific area. Blanket needs identification exercises have limitations and must only be applicable when widespread change has been legislated.

Localized or personal needs identification exercises provide greater relevance for the participants, but, as the focus narrows, so the question of who is responsible for the inservice education of administrators becomes more important. Howsam (1966:25) asks ". . . Is the primary responsibility best placed on the individual? The school district? The state department of education? The professional association? The university?" Lutz and Ferrante (1972:41) claim that ". . . the pressures of faddism often result in workshops and superficial adoptions for the sake of being able to say 'Yes, we have that or do this'. The crisis-centred focus of many continuing education programs serves only to support this faddism." Rapid changes, innovations and the search for viable alternatives to failing programs lead to the superficiality referred to. It is difficult to establish, prove and maintain ongoing support services when the content and methodology are both subject to great fluctuations in credibility and popularity. The unfortunate danger of counter-productivity can easily emerge under these circumstances, with the potential clientele becoming alienated from all professional development programs after having experienced a few that have nothing to offer.

Barriers Impeding Improvement

Goldhammer (1966:33-35) turns from the problems of topical workshops to the traditional barriers that impede improvement in educational administration. He suggests that the following are what may be termed traditional barriers:

"First, the legal structure of education probably constitutes the greatest barrier to the continuous education of administrators . . . second, the school administrator is protected from a great deal of the competitive struggle that characterizes the entrepreneurial professions . . . third, the necessary instrumentalities for inservice education have been

slow to emerge. . . fourth . . . there has been a deep gulf between the administrator in the field and the professor of administration in the college or university. . . finally, the shortage of administrative personnel within the schools has placed overwhelming burdens upon administrators so that they have had little time to devote to their inservice needs."

While acknowledging that there are identifiable difficulties in the five areas outlined by Goldhammer, some questions arise concerning the desirability of the alternatives. Subjecting administrators to the competitive struggle of the entrepreneurial professions would certainly have an impact on the quality and performance of those selected, but the danger of overemphasized political interference would be great. Similarly, the question of necessary instrumentalities that Goldhammer mentions infers that what is needed cannot be done with present staff and structures, ignoring the potential benefits of simply ensuring that existing instrumentalities become more effective. The question of available time is also one in need of greater definition, as it may not infer a shortage of administrative personnel so much as a need for more effective time management skills by those currently employed.

Conflicting Demands

The importance of the time factor is also stressed in a discussion about reality-oriented instructional methods by Wynn (1972-59) who states that ". . . if both cognitive and affective growth are to take place, the importance of total student involvement - intellectually, emotionally and socially - in the learning exercise becomes more evident." Such demands of the principal as student are reflected by Klopf in a discussion of the role of the principal as staff developer. Klopf (1974:33-34) points out the need for the principal to ". . . show enthusiasm and commitment as well as knowledge and ability in the area." Such demands for a visible

display of commitment and enthusiasm are common though not always voiced. Whether voiced as a demand or merely held as an expectation, these behaviours of the principal are of considerable importance in establishing the credibility of the principal in the eyes of those observing his performance.

It is apparent that the need for inservice programs for principals is widely supported with several writers identifying the same three areas of concern - technical skills and knowledge, human relations skills and knowledge and conceptual abilities. The greatest conflict appears to be between the time and commitment demands of the principal's professional duties on the one hand and the principal's personal development on the other. These differences are immediate and must be dealt with at the local level with reference to specific principals. The barriers to improvement in educational administration identified by one writer, however, are general and may only be overcome through wider recognition and treatment as changes here would involve legislation and alterations to organizational and administrative procedure.

Identifying Needs

Desirable Administrator Characteristics

Miner (1967: 82) undertook a study that attempted "... to identify characteristics that might be used in establishing selection systems for administrative positions in school districts." Apart from establishing that verbal ability testing may be used profitably, the study could not satisfy its goal. The difficulties in identifying effective administrator characteristics also points to the difficulty in identifying inservice needs for principals. The wide diversity in opinion of what constitutes

an effective principal evolves from the observed behaviours of those who are considered as being effective. Observed characteristics of administrators plus opinions of those in the sphere of influence of administrators indicate that effective administrators can in some cases be strongly humanistic and in other cases strongly behaviouristic, depending on the task and expectations of co-workers. Obviously, a prescribed list of desired behaviour characteristics for all principals would be a totally unrealistic endeavour as the local conditions and individual personality of the administrator will continue to determine his effectiveness. In attempting to identify the inservice needs of principals, researchers have had to face this problem and thus a considerable variety of instruments and suggested techniques are available, along with results of studies in the field.

Instruments and Descriptive Items

Davis (1978:13) used a forty-seven item 'Experience-Interest Inventory' in which respondents classified their experience according to a four-level continuum and their interest in a similar four-level continuum. Konrad, Long and Small (1976:8-9) used a fifty-five item list in a survey of administrators in two-year post-secondary institutions in western Canada and subgrouped the items into six broad areas. Seger and associates (1980:Form A) used a one hundred and thirteen item list of task statements halved and presented in two separate questionnaires in their survey of principals in Alberta to assess the needs of principals in the areas of administrative skills and knowledge. Randall (1977:1) used ". . . a questionnaire measuring demonstrated skill in decision-making and interest in increasing skill in decision-making." This study found that

". . . elementary principals were interested in increasing their skill in decision-making; the degree of interest differed according to the principal's level of educational preparation, age, years of experience as an elementary principal, and sex; interest was greatest for skills directly involving other people and for evaluating the effectiveness of decisions made; and continuing education provided by local school districts was most valuable."

These results reflect the reality and diversity of need when assessing the inservice question. The needs are real and identifiable, but the level of need varies greatly, according to a considerable number of factors. Also of considerable interest is the claim that programs provided by local school districts are of greatest value, as the venue chosen can have a considerable impact on the success of the program.

Mitchell (1976:2) reports that the ". . . targeted, multi-state, quality-controlled, time and study intensive, three-year doctoral program . . ." at Nova University is designed for school administrators to undertake school improvement projects that result in evidence of change in the school system. This program requires students to undertake two practicums, each of a year's duration and both involving the three-phase process of task definition, resource allocation and product. The product was defined as evidence of change in the school system where the participant worked. This combination of academic commitment and reward, job-oriented training and on-going support is unique in the many program reports available and must rate serious attention from school districts and universities elsewhere when local needs are being assessed. To concentrate programs in an academically-oriented venue would be just as wrong as concentrating programs entirely in the local community, ignoring the benefit of external influences. Mitchell's study illustrates that it is possible to bridge the gap between

the theoretical and the realistic whilst at the same time building in personal reward and recognition for the participants.

Needs and Program Opportunities

Reed (1977:108) in a study of forty-three elementary and secondary principals in Berkeley, California, used an inservice program description and rating instrument and claims that ". . . principals found inservice programs most useful when they were practical rather than theoretical."

A needs assessment conducted in Minneapolis is reported by Nessel and Faunce (1974:8-9) who found that

" . . . the most popularly desired training experiences were related to the general area of management skills. The most popular specific areas were curriculum development, alternative education and strengthening evaluation skills."

Of the twenty items listed, finance and budget management ranked in the last three, while counselling, human relations and communication had middle ranking positions. Needs identification studies such as these emphasize the importance of involving potential participants in establishing, and relating to, their own needs. The topics listed in this study would appear in many other studies, but the ranking of the needs makes this listing of specific relevance to those principals involved in this particular study. This aspect of relevance is of critical importance and is one that must be re-assessed often to maintain reliability as local conditions change frequently, thus influencing the priorities that the principal perceives.

An even more highly individualized program is outlined by Larson (1976:1) who reports that ". . . competency based instruction (CBI) can be used either for preservice or inservice purposes. The impact of CBI on students is to (1) enable them to systematically determine their personal learning needs; (2) increase responsibility for their own learning and

enhance autonomy and sense of personal direction; (3) provide feedback; and (4) assure a better match between student capabilities and the needs of the current or potential job." This program places the greater responsibility directly with the participant rather than with the program sponsor who plays an essentially supportive role in assisting the principal to identify and meet his needs. Once again there is an example of a program that bridges the gap between theory and practice. The discrepancy between what the universities offer and the actual needs of principals is highlighted in the report by Lutz and Ferrante (1972:7-9) of the 1971 Hoffman study which showed that, in a list of inservice topics offered by fifty-five institutions and categorized 1 to 15 in order of frequency offered, only two in the top seven offerings were included in the top seven listed as needs priorities by administrators. Needs rated first, second and third by administrators only rated eighth, tenth and sixth respectively on the frequency of offerings list. This is a serious condemnation of the lack of awareness that program planners have shown when establishing program priorities. Such a failure to meet needs has a widespread effect through administrators and teachers to children within the schools and the quality of education that they are receiving.

Discrepancies between needs and opportunities provided were also highlighted in the study of effective principals conducted by Gorton and McIntyre (1975:62) who report that ". . . the data from the study, strongly support the conclusion that training in program evaluation, curriculum development, school/community communications, teacher inservice education, and time management needs greater attention in the pre- and inservice programs of administrators." Lucio (1969:77) focuses on the common dimension in the expected role behaviour of school supervisors and sees in

that common dimension three elements " . . . (1) the determination of ends to be sought . . . (2) the design of procedures for effecting the ends . . . and (3) the assessment of results." Each of the design elements stipulates a task to be accomplished, but at the same time makes inferences that are of great concern to principals. The determination of ends to be sought is a goal-setting process that involves negotiation and agreement by all of those in the organization. Similarly, the design of procedures or methodology adopted demands considerable philosophical and practical agreement to ensure that approaches are compatible and resources are available. Finally, the assessment of results can only be effective if there have been clearly identified goals, and procedures throughout the process. What initially appeared to be a task-oriented approach actually involves a much broader, more complicated exercise, utilizing a great diversity of skills on the part of the principal, both task-oriented and humanistic in nature.

Human Relations Skills and Management Skills

Whereas Lucio's analysis refers only to the task-oriented aspects of administration, Gorton and McIntyre give equal emphasis to a more humanistic aspect of administrative operation. This dual focus is supported by Lutz and Ferrante (1972:8) who found that

" . . . an examination of current continuing education programs for school administrators suggests two distinct and separate content areas. One area is concerned with the human relations skills needed for effective administration. The other area is concerned with management skills and expertise required to solve current administrative problems."

A cautionary note to this broad classification comes from Stern (1979:1) whose study found that " . . . rural schools have many problems unlike those of urban schools and thus elementary school principals encounter

problems different from their counterparts in urban schools." In striving to achieve organizational efficiency, it is relatively easy to overlook obvious groups who do have unique needs, but it is important to recognize them and cater for them if they see their uniqueness as being one of their areas of need. Differences such as these will continue to demand that the needs identification process is a localized process, designed to assess the needs of a specific group of administrators within a specific geographic location at a specific time.

Principals seek to develop competencies through inservice programs and researchers have identified the two broad fields of concern as human relations and management skills. Certain aspects of both fields of knowledge may be universally beneficial to all principals, but to continue to provide broad programs would be to cater to a shallow level of need. Beyond the common general needs in both fields are more specific needs - either regional, local or personal - that must be first identified and then met. In attempting to do this, researchers have designed a variety of approaches, all of which are relevant in a given set of circumstances.

Delivery Systems

Aspects of Concern

Lucio (1969:78) reminds us that ". . . organizational structures, teaching devices, programs, and the like are always means, never instructional ends." He continues, in a recommended strategy for career development, to suggest that emphasis should be placed upon ". . . precise explication of skills and knowledge appropriate to the supervisory roles which institutions claim to develop . . . (and) . . . upon the ways in which individuals are expected to demonstrate that they can perform with

regard to role objectives." The inherent difficulties in making such demands of inservice programs is recognized by Lutz and Ferrante (1972:41) who find that ". . . problems related to continuing education can be categorized as knowledge problems, delivery problems, and dissemination and adoption problems." The knowledge problems are those involving the content of the programs (topics such as educational finance, politics, communications, etc.); the delivery problems concern the teaching devices or program structures; while the adoption problems are those associated with the transfer of learning from the inservice setting to the work situation.

Needs identification exercises are required to determine the content of the program and to influence the delivery method. Adoption problems pose an entirely new set of questions related to sponsorship and responsibility. Principals involved in school district sponsored programs may be considered accountable to that district, obliged to ensure that there is a transfer of learning, and responsible for providing evidence of the program having been effective. Program involvement in other venues where program sponsorship is not directly related to the employing authority tends to infer less direct accountability, particularly where the program sponsor does not have access to the school. The problems in adoption are closely related to the particular delivery methods that are instituted, so a detailed review of this aspect of inservice programs is certainly justified.

Delivery Features

The delivery methods chosen are critically important to the success of the inservice program and involve not only the direct imparting of information, but also the various organizational aspects that provide the framework for the inservice setting. Lutz and Ferrante (1972:42) raise

pertinent questions concerning the type of delivery system needed to: attract participants; be most effective as teaching methods; be an acceptable cost burden to participants; and find acceptance as far as length of time of program, frequency of participant involvement, type of involvement, cost of implementation, who is involved and who plays a leading role in program planning are concerned. This concern about the broad content of programs is shared by Davis (1976:4) who states that ". . . in addition to offering a program's topic, such matters as the location of the program site, the instructional mode, the reward offered for participation, and the duration of the program are relevant concerns of a needs assessment." As these factors are dependent upon local conditions and needs, it is difficult to identify a universally acceptable procedural format. The inservice organizer must be aware of, and sensitive to, the dominating influences that prevail at the time of planning and structure accordingly.

Individual Opportunities

An acceptable delivery setting will not guarantee a successful inservice program, but it will eliminate factors that are potentially destructive. Of greater importance still is the question of how the identified needs are to be met. Klopf (1969:25) suggests four main factors to be considered when developing competencies and behaviours in people:

- ". . . (1) opportunities for becoming aware, for understanding oneself.
- (2) opportunities to gain a commitment, to change, to acquire an attitude, an interest, a concern.
- (3) opportunities for gaining knowledge, principles, concepts.
- (4) opportunities to have experiences involving interaction and skill."

Such individualized aims should indicate a program format that moves from

the general to the specific, providing for individual, specific needs to a variety of unique circumstances. However, Davis (1976:2) finds that

" . . . with the exception of their topics, most inservice programs fall into a handful of distinct categories . . . workshops, seminars or conferences. . . and exhibit few differences in procedure. This observation seemingly supports the notion that all individuals have the same preferred style of learning and that this style is known . . . a notion unsupported by research."

Where programs are not planned on the basis of expressed need, and without opportunities for individual growth, organizers concede to a considerable element of chance. Potential attendance, relevance to participants and achievement of effective outcomes all become chance factors. Konrad, Long and Small (1976:16) criticize the hit-or-miss basis of inservice activities as having " . . . neither a topical focus nor a specific clientele . . ." and stress that programs should be more relevant and aimed at a specific group of administrators with the intention of meeting their identified needs.

Job-Relevance

Lipham and Hoeh (1974:351) advocate a competency-based approach as " . . . a systematic means for analysing and synthesizing the conceptual, human and technical skills required for effective and efficient performance in the principals' role." This critical element of job-relevance is also supported by Cunningham (1975:5-6) who proposes clinical education which is " . . . the process of learning in field settings where the sustaining emphasis is knowledge application, feedback, appraisal and re-application directly to affect improvements in human performance." In discussing the Colorado Administrator Renewal Programs, Brainard (1975:4) also supports

the need for identifying relevant goals and designing programs that assist administrators to achieve their own individual goals. Bottomly (1975:7) agrees with the need for relevance and claims that ". . . studies have shown that inservice, job-related training is more effective than school or college-based programs." Kozoll and Ulmer (1972:9) also stress the importance of goal clarification and effectiveness of programs in urging that inservice training be geared toward problem-solving and the equipping of participants with carefully defined skills. Culbertson, Henson and Morrison (1974:5-6) agree with this approach and urge that inservice ". . . should be problem oriented and focussed upon skills and understandings needed in practice," while studies involving mid-career courses for school administrators at Ohio State University showed Cunningham (1975:5) that ". . . possessing knowledge is in itself insufficient. People need knowledge application skills." Repeatedly, researchers stress the importance of program relevance based upon identified needs with an outcome that balances newly acquired knowledge with the skills necessary to implement change.

Effective and Ineffective Strategies

Licata (1976:5) reports the development of a Field Oriented Competency Utilization System within the scope of Project ROME (Results Oriented Management in Education) and sponsored by the Georgia State Department of Education where ". . . each program component is designed to help the participant work cooperatively with others in solving real and immediate school problems." Such a program guarantees relevance to the principal as it is based on his own stated needs and it ensures greater effectiveness as it is on-going. Burnes and associates (1975:1) write of the two year developmental program for elementary school principals in New York that took

into consideration individual leadership styles and school needs. For this program, objectives were formulated to overcome observed problems and a variety of strategies including group sessions, individual assistance, role-playing, video-tape analysis and discussion were adopted. This study enabled the researchers to identify four least effective strategies and four most effective strategies as rated by staff and participants. The least effective strategies were:

- 1) ". . . providing reading material in various areas. . ."
 - . . . 2) ". . . enabling participants to register for courses. . ."
 - . . . 3) ". . . providing mini-seminars on various topics. . ."
 - and 4) ". . . making consultants available to visit the schools. . ."
- (Burnes and associates, 1975:36-37).

The most effective strategies were:

- ". . . a) opportunities for experiential learning,
 - b) opportunities to observe other educational programs and models of educational leaders;
 - c) group analysis and problem-solving activities based on real-life situations (such as analysis of videotapes); and
 - d) opportunities for an identification with a group of peers on an ongoing basis."
- (Burnes and associates, 1975:41).

Common Program Practices

This study highlights the demand for job-relevant programs as opposed to theoretical generalizations; for first hand experience and observation as opposed to remote conceptualization; for sharing with peers rather than isolated operation; and for ongoing support rather than intensive, short-term programs. The implications for program designers are obvious, but the modification of traditionally acceptable delivery methods is a slow process. Lutz and Ferrante (1972:21) found in a survey of institutions

involved in educational administration programs that practices could be grouped into six classifications, ". . . workshops (including externships and summer institutes), case studies and self-instruction, university-school district relationships, federally funded leadership development programs, professional associations, and internships." The emphasis on the cost-efficient, organizationally simple methods of structuring programs is apparent. The structures in which the individual's needs dominate the program are in a minority, and even then of dubious effect. Perpetuating standardized program designs such as these means that the frustration of unsatisfactory program involvement that has been felt by past participants will also be continued. Overcoming such dissatisfaction does not necessarily mean abandoning past practices completely, but it does require the provision of alternatives that are designed to meet specific needs and circumvent some of the obstacles and frustrations already identified as being counter-productive.

Obstacles

Kritek (1976:2), reporting on the implementation of a professional development program for principals, defines

" . . . a number of hindrances to successful implementation: abstract or overly-ambitious objectives, the failure to incorporate user input into goal formulation, a tendency to avoid detailed planning, inadequate resources, a failure to appreciate the difficulty of learning new roles, management's failure to help staff deal with the problems of implementation and ineffective monitoring and feedback mechanisms."

These problems reflect organizational, material, human relations and support difficulties that either detract from the effect of the program or undermine the program completely. In addition to these problems, Bottomly (1975:5) also identifies pedagogical methodology as being counter

productive and stresses the importance of androgogy which recognizes that ". . . autonomy, experience, perception of needs, reality orientation or problem-centred concerns are adult characteristics." The simple fact that adults have adult learning characteristics that are different in nature to those of children can easily be overlooked by the most well-intentioned program organizer - particularly when that organizer is content-oriented rather than student-oriented. This relatively obvious facet of delivery methodology can mean the difference between meaningful learning experiences and trite demonstrations as far as the participant is concerned and should therefore receive as much attention as other aspects of the program.

Purposeful Planning

Goal identification and program structure are emphasized by Lynch and Blackstone (1966:24) who claim that inservice education should have ". . . conscious learning purpose . . ." and should be ". . . planned rather than incidental to some other activity." This is supported by Wynn (1972:49) who particularly criticizes learning strategies developed at random without regard to instructional purpose and urges that programs be systematic with learning based on ". . . predesigned concepts and instructional objectives." The goals and objectives have three levels of application - for the general improvement of education, for the specific benefit of a particular school district or for the personal benefit of a particular principal (with the inference that his personal benefits will produce benefits to his school, staff, students, etc.). For each of these levels, different personnel may be involved in establishing the appropriate goals - international, national or provincial expertise for establishing broad educational goals; regional, divisional or provincial expertise for deciding district goals;

individuals, assisted by specialists to establish personal goals. Consultation and definition of objectives must be at the level of application if the program is to be relevant, and programmers must identify and accept the differing needs of participating principals if the programs are to be effective.

The Principal Benefits

Role Demands

Bell (1975:1) writes that ". . . the school administrator must be accepted as a leader, and he must earn this acceptance through his performance." He goes on to hint at some of the complexities of detail needed to acquire that goal by stating that ". . . school administrators need to be bright, articulate, shrewd managers, PR experts, and practical politicians, with a vast knowledge of school curriculum, learning theory, educational tests and measurements, school finance, etc." (Bell 1975:11). A wider view is taken by Gorton and McIntyre (1975:55) who write that the effective principal seems ". . . to understand people, know how to motivate them, and know how to deal effectively with their problems." Heller (1974:19) agrees that the leadership role in schools is ". . . primarily a people-people relationship," while Kauss (1974:46) claims that the qualities of sincerity, credibility and compassion in principals is now considered to be equally as important as a bright, aggressive, dynamic attitude.

Performance and Reinforcement

Bridges further stresses the importance of humanistic behaviour in principals and relates this to the principal's level of work satisfaction. He claims that the four factors affecting work satisfaction are ". . . the amount of personal loyalty and support coming from the staff, the level of

staff interest in innovation and change, the commitment of staff members to their organizational obligations, and the quality of the staff's performance." (Bridges, 1979:18). Overwhelmingly, these factors depend upon the performance of the principal in the first place - his performance influences those factors which then result in work satisfaction if the principal perceives those factors as being positive. Lipham and Hoeh (1974:355) write that ". . . the effective principal may be expected to exert himself energetically; to achieve and improve his performance; to strive for higher status in the profession and in society in general; to relate himself successfully to other people; to view the future with confidence, the present with understanding and the past with satisfaction; and to adjust well to frustrations, irritations, confusions and criticisms in pressure situations." Kauss (1974:46) also refers to the high expectations of ". . . people looking toward tomorrow (who) want their leaders to be able to live with each crisis calmly, cope with its dangers bravely, and see in each crisis an opportunity for progress." The reinforcing power of effective leadership is referred to by Berger (1966:88) who claims that ". . . an administrator whose advice leads others to a successful solution of their problems has enhanced his social power and prestige."

Inservice Input

If the principal performs adequately in the manner expected of him, and if he is seen to be successful in solving problems and getting the job done, his reputation is enhanced and he becomes a more effective leader with recognized credibility. The emphasis is on performance which in itself is not a single, identifiable behaviour, but an interpretive amalgum of a wide spectrum of insights and experiences. Lavin and Sanders (1975:6) claim that ". . . the educational manager should be able to take administrative

theory, successful practices, personal experiences and leadership qualities to perform transformation in his own development." To some degree, this is development that cannot be made in an isolated situation where there is little or no applicable stimulus or guidance from sources of recognized expertise. James (1962:VI-4) wrote that ". . . two processes are involved in successful education for innovative behaviour: a change in set or attitude, and acquisition of the relevant skills." Both attitudinal change and skill development require the stimulus and the guidance made available through effective inservice programs as ". . . these human capacities cannot be maintained at a constantly current level without opportunities from time to time to study, up-date knowledge, and renew one's capability to be a dynamic leader." (Bell, 1975:11).

Outcomes

Providing principals with the opportunity to identify their problem areas, establish inservice needs and become involved in their own 'professional renewal' at several stages in their career provides individual schools and education generally with the dynamic sense of purpose and direction that is so important in ensuring the effectiveness of educational programs. Studies have indicated that improvements can be made where opportunities are provided. The evidence of ineffective programs or entire lack of programs is readily apparent through student and teacher dissatisfaction and public criticism of education and educators.

Summary

This review of literature has found considerable justification for the provision of inservice programs for principals. Social change, the changes in school curricula and teaching techniques, the call from staff members for democratic decision-making policies, decreasing mobility of teachers and the inherent threats to job-satisfaction are some of the more apparent changes that are making new demands on the principal. Community expectations of the role of the principal now demand more leadership skills and awareness rather than merely facilitating the curriculum, while the demand for accountability insists that leadership effectiveness be at least maintained, if not improved. The principal is widely seen as the key figure in the quality of the school's educational program and in the administrative efficiency and staff morale of the school.

The existence of a wide variety of inservice programs for principals is well-documented, but some writers question the effectiveness of many programs. The common desire is for programs that are designed to meet the needs of principals - individualized programs with a specifically local emphasis aimed at assisting principals to find solutions to 'on-the-job' problems. These problems are seen as falling into three broad categories - technical skills and knowledge, human relations and knowledge, and conceptual abilities.

Studies have highlighted and documented both effective and ineffective inservice delivery strategies and also the barriers that must be overcome in order to implement programs. Techniques and instruments for identifying inservice needs have been developed and tried with varying degrees of success.

The benefits of effective inservice programs based on relevant needs assessments and implemented through appropriate delivery techniques will be

widespread. The principal will personally benefit from greater job satisfaction and effectiveness. His credibility, acknowledged by those with whom he operates, will help to bring about a school climate that administrators, teachers, students and parents will all find more satisfying.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In this chapter the purpose of the study and the conceptual framework within which the survey instrument was formed are examined. There is a general description of the respondents used in the study and problems identified through trialling the instrument prior to application are outlined.

Finally, the research methodology is considered, with specific attention to both data collection and treatment.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to identify the perceived inservice needs of a selected sampling of elementary school principals in Manitoba and the delivery systems preferred by those principals, then to relate this information to actual inservice provision.

Conceptual Framework - Needs Identification

A number of studies in this field have provided a variety of instruments and suggested approaches that were considered before this study procedure was finalized.

In their study of school principals in Texas, Beckner and Foster (1980:41) used ten categories grouped into the three broad areas of Operations, Curriculum and Instruction and Personnel, with some items (job description, benefits, organizations and negotiations) ungrouped. The ungrouped items were particularly pertinent to the personal awareness

of the principal and, as such, suggested a new grouping.

McIntyre and Grant (1980:45) selected thirty-two instructional leader competencies grouped into eight key responsibility areas for their study involving school principals in Texas. The key responsibility areas were: community relations, staffing, time and space, goal setting, noninstructional services, materials and equipment, program evaluation and inservice training.

Konrad, Long and Small (1976:8-10) grouped fifty-five need statement categories into six broad areas. They were: institutional maintenance, program development, external contingencies, institutional role and community relationships. Although this study concerned administrators in post-secondary institutions, the categorization was applicable to the role of administrators in general and it was therefore pertinent to consider the areas defined with respect to the role of the elementary school administrator.

Lutz and Ferrante (1972:9) reported the Hoffman study of 1971 that grouped continuing education programs offered by UCEA institutions into fifteen categories. Those categories are: educational administration, integration, supervision, negotiations, theory, curriculum, sensitivity training, long-range planning, student activism, educational finance, staffing, grade organization, urban youth, intergovernment, state/national programs.

The Project ASK (Seger:1980) principal survey lists one hundred and thirteen task statements considered to be applicable to the role of the principal.

Each of the studies considered similar areas using different terminology or groupings, but it was apparent that all studies were

considering the principal in relation to a) students and programs, b) teachers and supervision, and c) plant and administration. It was also apparent that an additional group of concerns for principals could not be easily integrated with these groupings, so a fourth category was established for this study. As this fourth category included skills or concerns related primarily to the principal as a person rather than to his work environment, the category was entitled personal concerns.

Within each of these areas a considerable list of specific duties, activities, responsibilities or concerns could be developed, leaving the researcher the task of realistically limiting his list of items to the number that will best suit his study. Of this study, fifty-nine areas of concern for principals were selected from the studies available and grouped into six categories. The categories selected were an expansion of those identified by Beckner and Foster (1980). The six categories chosen were: curriculum and instruction, working with staff, working with students, working with the community, operations and personal concerns.

The response grid for the needs identification section was presented in three sections. Principals were asked to assess concern according to Importance to You and Your Current Ability on five-point scales. These categories were essentially after those used in Project ASK (Seeger:1980). The third section requested that principals indicate on a three-point scale (familiarity - understanding - application) their desired Level of Proficiency. This categorization was after Joyce and Showers (1980) and Project ASK (Seeger:1980).

Conceptual Framework - Preferred Delivery Mode

Local conditions were analysed to identify aspects of delivery and

opportunities were provided for the respondents to add any unique features that were not readily apparent. The six features of the delivery mode identified were: sponsorship, format, duration, location, time-of-year and participation, essentially after Lutz and Ferrante (1972:42).

The list of areas of concern for principals developed for the needs identification section of the study was too specific and too cumbersome to use in relation to the delivery items, so a three area categorization was adopted. The areas chosen were technical skills and knowledge, human relations skills and knowledge, and conceptual abilities, after Brainard (1975:3-4).

Description of Respondents

Twenty elementary school principals were asked to take part in the study. Names were taken from a list of participants at a summer program for principals, plus the questionnaires returned from a previous enquiry into the professional development of principals where the principal had indicated a willingness to be involved in further research. It was found that the names identified would have given the study a bias towards rural principals, so additional principals were approached at random within a metropolitan school division.

The twenty principals who received the questionnaire

- a) were elementary school principals
- b) were representing both urban and rural interests as ten principals from each group were included,
- c) were people who had a broad range of years of experience as a principal,
- d) comprised three females and seventeen males,
- e) were located in schools with a broad enrolment range.

As personal contact through telephone call and personal interview was planned, principals of schools in southern Manitoba only were considered to ensure the feasibility of this aspect of the study.

Questionnaire Design Modifications

The questionnaire was tested on five fellow students in educational administration. Not all of the students have held the position of principal, so actual answers were considered of less importance than critical comments regarding the design of the questionnaire.

As a result of the trial, modifications were made in the following areas:

1. Part 3. Present School. The original request for fractional time allocation to administration and teaching was replaced by the YES/NO answer with provision for a percentage indication of time allocation if the position was not full-time administration.

2. Part 4. Educational Qualifications. Section a, point 1, had referred to 3 years university or less, but it had been found that the term post-secondary would be more widely applicable than university.

3. Part 6. Your Desired Level of Proficiency. Originally a five-point scale for the sake of uniformity in the three scales, it was pointed out by several participants in the trialling exercise that the five-point scale was somewhat confusing for this section, particularly as there did not appear to be intermediate degrees of proficiency between the three labelled. The five-point scale was then abandoned in favour of the three-point scale, each of which had an explicit label.

4. Section 7. Preferred Mode of Delivery. The original document had provision for one rank order list only for the mode of delivery items. A common criticism from the trial participants referred to the order of preference also depending on the topic under consideration. As a result of this, the new format was adopted where each delivery mode item was considered in conjunction with each of three areas of concern - technical

skills and knowledge, human relations skills and knowledge and conceptual abilities.

Research Methodology

The Principals

Data was gathered through a questionnaire and through interviews of the respondents, either personally or by telephone.

The questionnaire was aimed at identifying inservice needs and preferred delivery systems of the twenty principals involved. When designing the questionnaire, it was considered that the instrument should be one that could be used in future by groups of principals to determine local inservice needs with, or without, minor adjustments to allow for local circumstances.

The twenty principals identified were contacted by telephone to gain a commitment to the study prior to the distribution of questionnaires. All principals contacted agreed to participate and twenty questionnaires were mailed with return addressed envelopes. Eighteen questionnaires were subsequently returned, with two principals not responding. These two were then considered to have withdrawn from the study.

It was felt that a follow-up was needed to validate the interpretation of the questionnaire and to provide additional information regarding professional development, so a group of ten principals was selected for personal interview. The ten chosen represented variation in experience as principal, size of school, age, geographic location and sex. The schools visited for the personal interview were all within one hundred and twenty kilometres of Winnipeg, but in various ethnic and socio-economic localities, north, north-east, north-west, south and south-west

of the city. Six of the schools were within urban Winnipeg - three in a southern suburb and three in northern suburbs.

Interviews were tape recorded and consisted of two phases. The first phase was based on the individual's response to the questionnaire and was aimed at ensuring

- a) a correct interpretation of questionnaire items by the respondent,
- and b) a correct interpretation of questionnaire answers by the researcher.

The tape recordings of the individual's response to questions related to personal involvement in inservice programs were analysed and reports of each interview appear in Chapter 4.

Respondents who were not visited personally were interviewed by telephone, using the same interview guide. Notes were made during each telephone interview and the full reports of each interview also appear in Chapter 4.

The Sponsors

Sponsorship of professional development programs for principals is essentially a cooperative, flexible arrangement involving several agencies. The professional association, with the cooperation of a sub-committee of principals, plays a major role in organizing programs and assisting district groups with local programs. The Department of Education and the University of Manitoba also have an involvement, with the depth of involvement dependent upon the nature of the program itself.

To identify the programs available to principals during the 1980-81 school year, contact was made with the appropriate agencies as follows:

- a) Manitoba Teachers' Society. The Professional Staff Development Officer was interviewed.
- b) The Education Department. An officer in the Program Development and Support Services Division was interviewed.
- c) University of Manitoba. Information was sought from the Department of Educational Administration and Foundations.
- d) Local divisional offices. The divisional office for divisions in which the respondents are located were contacted and appropriate information requested.

Reports of the results of each of these contacts appear in Chapter 4.

Summary

The conceptual framework which led to the development of the survey instrument was presented in this chapter. Reference was made to the major conceptual influences in the design of both of the main research aspects - the identification of inservice needs and the identification of the preferred mode of delivery.

Characteristics that were taken into consideration when selecting respondents are recorded and a report is presented of the modifications made to the questionnaire as a result of testing the instrument on fellow students of educational administration.

Finally, a report is made of the research method used to obtain the required data from the principals and from the sponsoring agencies.

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH DATA

Introduction

In this chapter the research data gained through the questionnaires and from the interviews is presented.

The quantitative data obtained from the questionnaire is presented in three sections:

- a) information about the respondents, their current position and inservice involvement during the 1980-81 school year,
- b) identification of inservice needs, including rank order listings of need items according to their importance to the principals and establishment of a need level rating based on the calculated difference between the desired level of proficiency and current ability level for each item,
- c) identification of the preferred mode of delivery, considering the six delivery aspects that substantially influence the nature of a program.

General comments that were recorded on the questionnaires by the respondents regarding inservice programs for principals are reported.

The interview data is presented in two sections:

- a) data from the interviews with the eighteen principals involved in the study,
- and b) data from the interviews with representatives of the agencies sponsoring inservice programs for principals.

A summary statement follows each of the sections reported and the chapter concludes with an overall chapter summary.

QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

Respondents

An overview is provided of the statistics relevant to the experience, administrative load, school and geographic location of the principals involved. (See Table 1). Principals were grouped according to geographic location to more easily determine locally available programs.

It can be seen that the age range of the principals was from twenty-eight to forty-nine years, with the largest group (twelve respondents) within the thirty-one to forty years old group. Levels of education varied from holding a single Bachelor's degree to holding two Master's degrees, with five principals indicating that they hold a post-graduate qualification in educational administration.

Experience as a principal ranged from less than one year to more than sixteen years, with seven principals indicating that they had less than two years experience as a principal.

Sixteen of the respondents were males and two were females. The two females were based in schools in rural locations and both indicated a teaching load that accounted for fifty percent of their time. Of the nine principals located in urban schools, seven are full-time administrators, while only three of the nine rural principals are committed to full-time administration.

The respondents were located in three broad areas:

- a) Urban Winnipeg, shown as urban north Winnipeg or urban south Winnipeg,
- b) urban in a large country town, shown as country urban A or country urban B,
- c) rural areas. These were small country towns to the southwest, south, north-east, north and north-west of Winnipeg.

Table 1

OVERVIEW OF RESPONDENTS - GROUPED GEOGRAPHICALLY

Principal	Age	Level of Education	Level of Ed. Admin. Qual'n.	Years Exp. as Principal	Total Experience	Sex	Present School		Time Allocation		Locality
							Students	Staff	Admin.	Teaching	
#1	42	2 Bach. degrees	-	2	20	M	244	11	100	-	Urban N.Wpg.
#2	39	Master's	Master's	8	19	M	300	22	100	-	Urban N.Wpg.
#3	47	Master's	Master's	4	24	M	281	14	100	-	Urban N.Wpg.
#4	38	2 Mast. degrees	-	3	14	M	224	15	100	-	Urban S.Wpg.
#5	49	2 Bach. degrees	Pre-Mast.	16	27	M	517	27	100	-	Urban S.Wpg.
#6	44	2 Bach. degrees	-	8	21	M	317	20	100	-	Urban S.W
#7	36	2 Bach. degrees	Pre.Mast.	4	15	M	114	6.5	57	43	Country Urban A(1)
#8	38	2 Bach. degrees	-	2	18	M	354	14.5	100	-	Country Urban B
#9	34	Bach. degree	-	1	10	M	111	6	50	50	Country Urban B
#10	WITHDRAWN FROM THE STUDY										
#11	40	Bach. degree	-	1	16	F	141	11	50	50	S.W. Rural
#12	28	Bach. degree	-	1	7	M	45	4	20	80	S.W. Rural
#13	36	Master's	-	5	14	M	300	16	90	10	S.W. Rural
#14	33	2 Bach. degree	Pre.Mast.	5	10	M	516	27.5	100	-	N.E. Rural
#15	36	Bach. degree	-	1	10	M	169	9	100	-	N. Rural
#16	35	Master's	-	6	17	F	165	11	50	50	N. Rural
#17	34	Bach. degree	-	10	13	M	230	14	82	18	S. Rural
#18	WITHDRAWN FROM THE STUDY										
#19	36	Bach. degree	-	6	7	M	600	N.A.	100	-	N.W. Rural
#20	31	Bach. degree	-	2	13	M	107	5.5	15	85	N.W. Rural

(1) Refers to urban areas in large country towns outside of metropolitan Winnipeg.

Nine of the principals were located in urban schools, either in the city of Winnipeg or in the larger country towns, while nine were located in rural areas.

Program Attendance

Statistics extracted from part 5 of the questionnaire, "Inservice Involvement in the 1980-81 School Year" are presented in Table 2 as follows:

(a) Number of Programs Attended: The figure shown is a total of the programs actually listed in part 5 under "Program Title".

(b) Total duration. This is a total of the number of days involved in all of the inservice programs listed in the previous column. Where a respondent had recorded hours rather than days, appropriate conversions have been made.

(c) Average distance travelled: The total distance listed in the "Distance Travelled" column of the questionnaire was divided by the number of program attendances to arrive at an average distance travelled figure.

(d) Average Cost to Principal: The amounts entered in the "Cost to You" column of the questionnaire were totalled and divided by the number of program attendances to arrive at an average cost to principal figure.

It can be seen that the data available was neither extensive nor definitive. Few principals had kept a concise record of which program had been attended and the indicated costs involved were essentially estimations. Because of the uncertainty involved and the lack of verifiable statistics, it would be difficult for the researcher to draw

TABLE 2.

Program Attendance

PRINCIPAL	NO. OF PROGRAMS ATTENDED	TOTAL DURATION	AVERAGE DISTANCE TRAVELLED	AVERAGE COST TO PRINCIPAL
#1		NIL LISTED		
#2	5	8 days	38 miles	\$22.00 + fuel
#3	Numerous	N.A.	Inestimable	Inestimable
#4	1	3 days	2,000 kms.	NIL
#5	4	4½ days	450 miles	\$70.00
#6	1	4 days	500 miles	\$100.00
#7	14	14½ days	160 kms.	\$5.00 + food and lodging
#8	2	4 days	115 miles	\$12.50
#9	3	15 days	40 kms.	\$104.00
#11		NOT AVAILABLE		
#12	1	12 days	300 miles	\$150.00
#13	4	7 days	175 miles	\$22.50
#14	5	53 days	165 miles	\$35.88
#15	3	14½ days	268 miles	Transportation
#16	4	7 days	16 miles	\$13.00
#17	2	5 days	135 miles	\$10.00
#19	8	17 days	121 kms.	\$200.00
#20	6	7 days	142 kms.	\$18.00

any conclusions other than comparative comment.

The broad range of statistics on which the comparative comment may be made are as follows:

- a) No. of programs attended: from 1 to 14
- b) Total duration: from 3 days to 53 days
- c) Average distance travelled: from 16 miles to 2,000 kms.
- d) Average cost to principal: from \$5.00 + to \$200.00.

Part a) and part b) indicate that some principals take greater advantage, or are able to take greater advantage of inservice programs than others.

Part c) is somewhat distorted as the range maximum reflects a single international conference - the only program attended by that principal during the year.

Part d) is of interest, not only because of the considerable range involved, but also because the principal who reported the average of \$200.00 per attendance also claims to have attended eight programs during the year, while the principal who recorded the lowest, \$5.00, attended fourteen programs. Obviously, professional development for some principals is a greater financial burden than it is for others.

Inservice Needs

The following data refers to part 6 of the questionnaire, Needs Assessment. The needs items are presented in the same order, in the same grouping, as they appeared in the questionnaire. Data from the questionnaire was totalled, giving individual raw scores for each of three grading scales responding to each needs item listed. Each raw score was then averaged and the resulting figure is the one shown in this

report.

In addition, to identify need as being the difference between current level of ability and desired level of proficiency, the average ability score was subtracted from the average desired level of proficiency score. These results indicated that principals consider 'Implementation

TABLE 3

Inservice Need Identification
Curriculum and Instruction

	Importance to You	Your Current Ability	Your desired Level of Proficiency	Need Level(1)
1. Curriculum Organization	3.94	3.17	4.60	1.43
2. Individualized Instruction	3.70	3.29	4.60	1.31
3. Grading Systems	3.43	3.81	4.30	.49
4. Program planning	4.43	3.68	4.88	1.20
5. Program evaluation	4.41	3.41	5.00	1.59
6. Implementation of Program	4.47	3.82	4.80	.98
7. French Immersion Programs	3.00	2.50	3.33	.83
8. Special Education	3.70	3.11	4.20	1.09
9. Use of Computers	3.76	1.41	3.61	2.20

(1) Need level = Your desired Level of Proficiency -
Your current ability.

of Program' to be of greatest importance to them, while French Immersion programs are of least importance. The need level figure indicates that greatest need for inservice support exists in the use of computers, with least program need in grading systems. Although the highest need level recorded is for the use of computers, this item only rates the fifth highest figure in the importance to you rating, suggesting that principals do not consider the use of computers to be a current administrative concern.

TABLE 4

Inservice Need Identification
Working With Staff

	Importance to You	Your Current Ability	Your desired Level of Proficiency	Need Level
1. Staff motivation	4.76	3.64	4.90	1.26
2. Role Clarification of Staff	4.29	3.76	4.40	.64
3. Conflict Resolution	4.29	3.35	4.80	1.45
4. Delegation of authority	4.52	3.70	4.50	.80
5. Shared decision-making	4.52	4.17	4.80	.63
6. Effective Staff meetings	4.64	4.29	4.90	.61
7. Staff evaluation	4.47	3.41	4.90	1.49
8. Dismissal procedures	3.35	2.64	4.11	1.47
9. Teacher accountability	4.11	3.47	4.60	1.13
10. Interviewing and selecting staff	4.64	3.62	4.80	1.18
11. Staff inservice programs	4.41	3.47	4.40	.93
12. Maintenance/service personnel	4.05	3.41	4.40	.99
13. Absenteeism and tardiness	4.18	4.12	4.46	.34

Within the category Working with Staff (See Table 4), twelve of the thirteen items rated high 'Importance to You' scores, indicating that principals consider this general category to be an on-going concern. The one low-scoring item, 'Dismissal procedures', still rated a relatively high need level score, indicating a desire for improvement in performance although the knowledge may not be called upon frequently. Staff motivation rated highest importance reading with a significant need level reading as well. Staff evaluation emerges as the item considered to be in greatest need of inservice support.

TABLE 5
Inservice Need Identification
Working with Students

	Importance to You	Your Current Ability	Your desired Level of Proficiency	Need Level
1. Communicating with students	4.82	4.23	5.00	.77
2. Counselling students	4.47	3.94	4.60	.66
3. The problem child	4.35	3.35	4.68	1.33
4. Modern society's problems for children	4.11	3.17	4.30	1.13
5. Discipline	4.58	3.88	4.90	1.96

All items in the category 'Working with Students' rated high on the five-point 'Importance to You' scale. (See Table 5). 'Communicating with students' was the item considered most important, while 'The problem child' was the item clearly in greatest need of inservice support. It is worth noting that the item 'Communicating with students' not only rated highest on the importance scale, but also rated a very high current ability reading

and a maximum desired level of proficiency score. This item is clearly seen by administrators as being a critical part of their role, requiring their attention and expertise quite often.

TABLE 6

Inservice Need Identification
Working with the Community

	Importance to You	Your Current Ability	Your desired Level of Proficiency	Need Level
1. Community needs assessment	3.68	3.43	4.05	.62
2. Public relations	4.52	4.23	4.70	.47
3. Contact with other schools	4.11	3.94	4.01	.07
4. Utilization of volunteer services	3.75	3.50	4.26	.76

It can be seen that principals consider the 'Public relations' aspect of their job the most important aspect of working with the community. (See Table 6). As well as seeing this as the most important aspect, they also see it as being an area where they already have a high level of expertise, thus a relatively low need level rating emerges. The highest need level was rated by the item 'Utilization of volunteer services', although this item was ranked low in importance. It is interesting to note that all four items in this category had low need level ratings, indicating a possible feeling of satisfaction with performance in these aspects of the principal's role.

TABLE 7
 Inservice Need Identification
 Operations

	Importance to You	Your Current Ability	Your desired Level of Proficiency	Need Level
1. Change process	3.75	3.50	4.26	.76
2. Computerized adminis- trative services	3.05	1.64	3.51	1.87
3. Budget development and control	3.82	3.23	3.61	.38
4. Office filing systems	3.29	3.05	3.61	.56
5. Fund raising	3.05	3.17	3.61	.44
6. Purchasing materials	3.76	3.93	4.26	.33
7. Organizational develop- ment	4.25	3.88	4.80	.92
8. Long-range planning	4.47	3.76	4.80	1.04
9. Administrative accountability	4.41	3.88	4.60	.72
10. Management by objectives	3.76	3.41	4.01	.60
11. Time-tabling	4.18	4.25	4.66	.41
12. Providing equipment, materials, facilities	4.29	3.88	4.60	.72
13. Publication techniques	3.35	2.94	3.61	.67

Of the thirteen items listed in the category of Operations, only five could be seen as being significantly important (See Table 7). The item 'Long range planning' scored the highest importance rating, while 'Computerized administrative services' was considered low in importance but the area of greatest need for inservice support. The current ability rating

for this item is important as it is relatively low, indicating a recognition by principals that they currently have little expertise in this newly developing use of technology. Although the 'Desired Level of Proficiency' reading for this item is not as high as the reading for any of the other items, it indicates that principals recognize a need in this area. The significance of the need is indicated by the need level reading that makes this item one of the areas of greatest need in the entire study.

Also of interest in this category is the 'Need level' rating of the item 'Long-range planning', which is the item that the principals consider of most importance to them. The need level rating of this item is second only to that of 'Computerized administrative services', an item related to newly developing technology. It is significant that 'Long-range planning' rates the highest importance and need level readings if the 'computerized administrative services' item is not considered.

TABLE 8
 Inservice Needs Identification
 Personal Concerns

	Importance to You	Your Current Ability	Your desired Level of Proficiency	Need Level
1. Human relations	4.52	4.23	4.70	.47
2. Clarification of principal's role	4.00	3.56	4.26	.70
3. Time management	4.29	3.29	4.30	1.01
4. Communicating with peers	4.29	4.17	4.40	.23
5. Self-awareness and assessment	4.35	3.76	4.60	.84
6. Leadership techniques	4.64	3.64	4.80	1.16
7. Adjusting to personal stress	4.58	3.88	4.40	.52
8. Counselling skills	4.11	3.88	4.40	.52
9. Supervision techniques	4.29	3.70	4.50	.80
10. Decision-making models	3.76	3.56	4.50	.94
11. Public speaking	3.82	3.64	4.30	.66
12. Career mobility	4.11	3.17	4.20	1.03
13. Working with divisional administrators	3.47	3.88	4.26	.38
14. Working in a small community	3.47	4.00	4.26	.26
15. 'Politics' within school	3.06	3.20	3.66	.46

It is apparent that ten of the fifteen items listed as 'Personal Concerns' for the principal are considered to be significantly important, suggesting that the category of 'Personal Concerns' is worthy of attention.

The most significant aspect of this section is the clear identification

of the item 'Leadership techniques' as being both of greatest importance to the principals and in greatest need of inservice support. This correlation is of critical importance as it is the only item in the study in which such a correlation has emerged, and, as such, indicates a specific item that is clearly in need of inservice support in order to ensure principal effectiveness in a role that they see as being of great importance.

Needs Identification Summary

The needs identification exercise considered both the level of need for inservice program and the level of importance of each item as perceived by the principals.

The level of importance is considered to be the mean rating given to that particular item by the principals on the five-point scale. The need level is the difference between the desired level of proficiency and the current ability mean scores.

The items considered by the principals to be of greatest importance in the six categories are implementation of programs, staff motivation, communicating with students, public relations, long-range planning and leadership techniques (See Table 9). The items identified as being in greatest need of inservice support in the same categories are use of computers, staff evaluation, the problem child, utilization of volunteer services, computerized administrative services and leadership techniques.

A composite listing of all items without regard to category indicates that the ten items identified by the principals as being in most need of inservice support are: use of computers, computerized administrative services, program evaluation, staff evaluation, dismissal procedures, conflict resolution, curriculum organization, the problem child,

Rank Order of Importance
Inservice Need Areas

<u>Rank Order of Importance</u>		<u>Need Level</u>
<u>Curriculum and Instruction</u>		
1	Implementation of Programs	.98
2	Program Planning	1.20
3	Program Evaluation	1.59
4	Curriculum Organization	1.43
5	Use of Computers	2.20
6 (equal)	Special Education/Individualized Instruction	1.31
7	Grading Systems	.49
8	French Immersion Programs	.83
<u>Working With Staff</u>		
1	Staff motivation	1.26
2 (equal)	Effective Staff Meetings	.61
	Interviewing and Selecting Staff	1.18
3 (equal)	Delegation of Authority	.80
	Shared Decision-making	.63
4	Staff Evaluation	1.49
5	Staff Inservice Programs	.93
6 (equal)	Role Clarification of Staff	.64
	Conflict Resolution	1.45
7	Absenteeism and Tardiness	.34
8	Teacher accountability	1.13
9	Maintenance/service personnel	.99
10	Dismissal Procedures	1.47
<u>Working With Students</u>		
1	Communicating with Students	.77
2	Discipline	1.02
3	Counselling students	.66
4	The Problem-child	1.33
5	Modern Society's Problems for Children	1.13
<u>Working With The Community</u>		
1	Public Relations	.47
2	Contact with other schools	.07
3	Utilization of volunteer services	.76
4	Community needs assessment	.62
<u>Operations</u>		
1	Long-range planning	1.04
2	Administrative accountability	.72
3	Providing equipment, materials, facilities	.72
4	Organizational development	.92
5	Time-tabling	.41
6	Budget development and control	.38
7 (equal)	Purchasing materials	.33
	Management by Objectives	.60
8	Change Process	.76
9	Publication techniques	.67
10	Office filing systems	.56
11 (equal)	Computerized administrative services	1.87
	Fund raising	.44
<u>Personal Concerns</u>		
1	Leadership techniques	1.16
2	Adjusting to Personal Stress	.52
3	Human Relations	.47
4	Self-awareness and assessment	.84
5 (equal)	Time management	1.01
	Communicating with peers	.23
	Supervision techniques	.80
6 (equal)	Counselling skills	.52
	Career mobility	1.03
7	Clarification of principal's role	.70
8	Public speaking	.66
9	Decision-making models	.94
10 (equal)	Working with divisional administrators	.38
	Working in a small community	.26
11	'Politics' within the school	.46

TABLE 9

Rank Order of Importance
Inservice Need Areas

<u>Rank Order of Importance</u>		<u>Need Level</u>
	<u>Curriculum and Instruction</u>	
1	Implementation of Programs	.98
2	Program Planning	1.20
3	Program Evaluation	1.59
4	Curriculum Organization	1.43
5	Use of Computers	2.20
6 (equal)	Special Education/Individualized Instruction	1.31
7	Grading Systems	.49
8	French Immersion Programs	.83
	<u>Working With Staff</u>	
1	Staff motivation	1.26
2 (equal)	Effective Staff Meetings	.61
	Interviewing and Selecting Staff	1.18
3 (equal)	Delegation of Authority	.80
	Shared Decision-making	.63
4	Staff Evaluation	1.49
5	Staff Inservice Programs	.93
6 (equal)	Role Clarification of Staff	.64
	Conflict Resolution	1.45
7	Absenteeism and Tardiness	.34
8	Teacher accountability	1.13
9	Maintenance/service personnel	.99
10	Dismissal Procedures	1.47
	<u>Working With Students</u>	
1	Communicating with Students	.77
2	Discipline	1.02
3	Counselling students	.66
4	The Problem-child	1.33
5	Modern Society's Problems for Children	1.13
	<u>Working With The Community</u>	
1	Public Relations	.47
2	Contact with other schools	.07
3	Utilization of volunteer services	.76
4	Community needs assessment	.62
	<u>Operations</u>	
1	Long-range planning	1.04
2	Administrative accountability	.72
3	Providing equipment, materials, facilities	.72
4	Organizational development	.92
5	Time-tabling	.41
6	Budget development and control	.38
7 (equal)	Purchasing materials	.33
	Management by Objectives	.60
8	Change Process	.76
9	Publication techniques	.67
10	Office filing systems	.56
11 (equal)	Computerized administrative services	1.87
	Fund raising	.44
	<u>Personal Concerns</u>	
1	Leadership techniques	1.16
2	Adjusting to Personal Stress	.52
3	Human Relations	.47
4	Self-awareness and assessment	.84
5 (equal)	Time management	1.01
	Communicating with peers	.23
	Supervision techniques	.80
6 (equal)	Counselling skills	.52
	Career mobility	1.03
7	Clarification of principal's role	.70
8	Public speaking	.66
9	Decision-making models	.94
10 (equal)	Working with divisional administrators	.38
	Working in a small community	.26
11	'Politics' within the school	.46

Table 10

Need Level of Areas of Concern
Composite List

<u>Need Level</u> (1)	<u>Item</u> (2)	<u>Need Level</u>	<u>Item</u>
2.20	Use of Computers	.66	Counselling students
1.87	Computerized administrative services	.66	Public speaking
1.59	Program Evaluation	.64	Role Clarification of Staff
1.49	Staff Evaluation	.63	Shared decision-making
1.47	Dismissal Procedures	.62	Community Needs Assessment
1.45	Conflict Resolution		
1.43	Curriculum Organization	.61	Effective Staff meeting
1.33	The Problem Child	.60	Management by objective
1.31	Individualized Instruction	.56	Office filing systems
1.26	Staff motivation	.52	Counselling Skills
1.20	Program Planning	.52	Adjusting to personal stress
1.18	Interviewing and Selecting Staff	.49	Grading Systems
1.16	Leadership techniques	.47	Human relations
1.13	Teacher Accountability	.46	'Politics' within school
1.13	Modern Society's Problem Children	.44	Fund raising
1.09	Special Education	.41	Time-tabling
1.04	Long-range planning	.38	Budget development and Control
1.03	Career mobility	.38	Working with Divisional Administrators
1.02	Discipline		
1.01	Time management	.34	Absenteeism and Tardiness
.99	Maintenance/service personnel	.30	Purchasing materials
.98	Implementation of Programs	.26	Working in a small community
.94	Decision-making models	.23	Communicating with peers
.93	Staff Inservice programs	.07	Contact with other schools
.92	Organizational Development		
.84	Self-awareness and assessment		
.83	French Immersion Programs		
.80	Delegation of Authority		
.77	Communicating with Students		
.76	Change Process		
.76	Utilization of Volunteer Services		
.72	Providing equipment/materials/facilities		
.72	Administrative accountability		
.70	Clarification of Principal's Role		
.67	Publication techniques		

(1) Need Level = Mean Desired Level of Proficiency - Mean Current Ability.

(2) These items are listed according to need level and include all items appearing within the six categories in the need identification section of the questionnaire, i.e., curriculum and instruction, working with staff, working with students, working with the community, operations and personal concerns.

Preferred Mode of Delivery

This section indicates data obtained from Part 7 of the questionnaire - Preferred Mode of Delivery. Responses to this section indicated rank order preference for listed mode of delivery items with regard to three areas of concern - technical skills and knowledge, human relations skills and knowledge and conceptual abilities.

For each response area, first, second and third preferences only were extracted. A numerical loading was then given to the rankings, so that a first preference ranking received a loading of three, a second preference ranking received a loading of two and a third preference ranking received a loading of one.

Table 11
Preferred Mode of Delivery Data
Sponsorship

	Technical Skills and Knowledge	Human Relations Skills and Knowledge	Conceptual Abilities
1. School division	38 ⁽¹⁾	19	27
2. Regional Group	8	9	6
3. Principal's Association	19	29	21
4. Education Department	15	8	24
5. University Education Faculty	17	28	20

(1) This item scored ten first preferences, two second preferences and four third preferences. With three points for each first preference, two points for each second preference and one point for a third preference, the scoring became:

$$(10 \times 3) + (2 \times 2) + (4 \times 1) = 38.$$

Sponsorship: It is apparent that the principals have a clear preference for programs involving the development of technical skills and knowledge to be sponsored by the school divisions (See Table 9). The Principals' Association and the University Education Faculty are both preferred sponsors for programs involving the development of human relations skills and knowledge, with the former being marginally more favoured than the latter. For programs dealing with the development of conceptual abilities, preferences are more evenly spread, with the school division being the most preferred sponsor.

Respondents recorded on their questionnaire the following comments as their reasons for choice regarding sponsorship:

- #1 - Human Relations: Must look at the group which has the resources to get the job done.
- #5 - University supplemented with individuals presently practising in the field. Principals must help in the growth of human relations skills.
Should be a major area of study in preparatory University work. The School Division has a specific responsibility in some of the conceptual areas.
- #7 - In areas of local management activities I would feel that the local division is better able to meet our specific needs (with support from other agencies of course). On the other hand Human Relations would seem to me to be more appropriate on a wider base. Long-range planning etc., is somewhat controlled by external agencies (e.g., Department funding), and so should be delivered by such agencies in close company with the School Division in question.
- #9 - As a new principal I feel the need to share more information with actual practitioners (closer to home).
- #13 - (a) and (c) are often systems based, so inservice within the system would be most effective. Systems based inservicing should help to set up some on-going processes.
To develop human relations skills it is often necessary to remove oneself from a content within which one experiences difficulties in relationships . . . this kind of workshop should be most effective on neutral ground.

- #14 - Always it is easier for formal institutions to deal with the intellectual domain and the less formal institutions to deal with the emotional, and spiritual domains. The physical domain can be readily dealt with in either format and informal situation.
- #15 - School divisions should handle the specifics of the technical skills but any general topics mean thrust should come from Faculty-Department of Education or M.T.S.
- #16 - Tech.-Princ.Council - closer to problems and variables involved. e.g., Unit staffing formula - M.L.P's unique to this division. Human - University - more global - pertains to many situations. Conceptual - Feel MAP should be offering more PD in areas pertinent to Admin.
- #17 - Technical skills should be taught at the university level. If it isn't done there it won't get to the schools. Human relations skills should be introduced at university and supported by those activities in the school settings' human relations - principals.
- If we want anything done in future, it has to be brought about by the Department of Education.
- #20 - School division was a first choice because local concerns oft-times need local solutions. University Education Faculty should be able to provide sound theory to back up the activities of the first.

Table 12
Preferred Mode of Delivery Data
Format

	Technical Skills and Knowledge	Areas of Concern Human Relations Skills and Knowledge	Conceptual Abilities
1. Workshop	37	37	30
2. Lecture	16	15	12
3. Observation visit to another school	24	14	16
4. Travel	5	5	6
5. Professional reading	11	11	15
6. Course for credit	7	11	14
7. Support personnel in your school	8	10	6

Format: For the format aspect of inservice delivery, the principals indicated a strong preference for workshops when considering programs associated with technical skills and knowledge, human relations skills and knowledge and conceptual abilities. (See Table 10). Also of significance are the low ratings given to format items travel and support personnel in your school, indicating that the principals do not care for these formats for programs involving any of the three areas of concern.

Respondents recorded on their questionnaire the following comments as their reasons for choices regarding format:

- #1 - "Hands on" type of situation.
- #5 - Support personnel in own school oftentimes do not have the confidence of fellow workers. Expertise is directly related to distance travelled.

- #7 - Workshop including simulation etc., always allow for some experiential activity. Credit courses and observation visits usually provide me with variety and ideas. I am not always self-disciplined enough to keep up on relevant professional reading.
- #9 - I like the workshop atmosphere.
- #13 - Workshops where there is a blend of presentation and discussion or other kind of work with the material presented seem to me to be the most effective format for growth and learning.
- #14 - Institutions deal best within the "intellectual domain".
- #15 - Truthfully I feel 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, of equal importance. Need more inservice regardless of format and time and finance to attend.
- #16 - Tech - glean whats pertinent - adapt and join ideas and techniques. Human - Begin at home - uses knowledge, experience, etc.
- #20 - Workshops with actual problems solved with colleagues tend to be the most effective. Secondly, more time should be taken to observe effective administrators and to chat with them.
- #17 - Workshops are best for technical skills since one must do in order to understand fully. Lectures were selected as a preference for human relations development skills since the person giving the lecture is capable of getting closer to you and you don't have the university anxieties of writing a term paper and would feel more intent on listening to the content.

Table 13

Preferred Mode of Delivery Data
Duration

	<u>Areas of Concern</u>		
	<u>Technical Skills and Knowledge</u>	<u>Human Relations Skills and Knowledge</u>	<u>Conceptual Abilities</u>
1. One day or less	32	13	16
2. Two days	28	27	24
3. Up to one week	16	20	17
4. Two weeks	2	6	9
5. Longer than two weeks	1	7	9
6. Regular sessions for a term	14	19	16

Duration: The principals recorded a clear preference for programs of short duration in all three areas of concern. (See Table 11). For programs dealing with human relations skills and knowledge and conceptual abilities, the preference was for programs of two days in length, while for technical skills and knowledge the preference was for programs of one day or less.

The statistics clearly show that principals favour programs that do not last longer than one week and where programs do last as long as one week they are considered as favourably as programs that are delivered through regular sessions spread through a term.

Respondents recorded on their questionnaire the following comments as their reasons for choices regarding duration:

- #1 - Deal with one topic individually on short term basis depending on its simplicity.
- #3 - I find this difficult to answer because different specific problems will have a different duration desirable.
- #5 - I think that technical skills lend themselves to a summer institute which could best be organized over a week during the summer. The others I think lend themselves to shorter, more frequent types of delivery.
- #7 - A week seems to be an optimum period of time for a given workshop, conference, etc. It allows for considerable depth, but recognizes that we have other demands on our time.
- #9 - Don't have time for longer workshops.
- #13 - For the most part one needs a short period of time for input and a longer period of time for implementation and practice of what one has learned. One day activities are often too short to get into the substance of things.
- #14- Technical skills can be more readily broken into smaller units lending it to shorter times.
- #15 - One day or less inservices rarely contain enough information to get involved. And in most cases lectures have far too much info. to cover for the time at hand thus leaving no time for discussion.
- #16 - Unless a U. course, 1 day sufficient - need time to assimilate and use.

#17 - The duration of most sessions are of ½-day - 1 day. The sessions are good in most instances but there is rarely a follow-up, that is why I feel that in most areas, the in-service sessions should at least have follow-up sessions. Technical skills can easily be dealt with in our ½-day or 1 day sessions.

Too often, conceptual abilities are dealt with at mini in-service sessions and leave the administrators and/or teachers in a state of confusion.

#20 - Technical skills can be absorbed only in small doses. Frequent 1 day inservices are more helpful. Human relations need longer to try various methods.

Table 14

Preferred Mode of Delivery Data
Location

	<u>Areas of Concern</u>		
	Technical Skills and Knowledge	Human Relations Skills and Knowledge	Conceptual Abilities
1. Within your school	24	11	19
2. At another school	26	16	22
3. A convention centre	16	23	16
4. University	15	30	26

Location: For the location aspect of delivery, the principals indicated a preference for a University venue when either conceptual abilities or human relations skills and knowledge are being considered. (See Table 12). When programs are aimed at developing technical skills and knowledge, the preferred location is at another school. Of significance is the spread of preferences, indicating no strong likes or dislikes with one exception. Principals indicated that they do not favour programs aimed to develop human relations skills and knowledge being held within their own school.

Respondents recorded on their questionnaire the following comments as their reasons for choices regarding location:

- #1 - Whichever is central and convenient.
- #5 - Would like to see the development of a teacher's centre such as is available in other divisions. Failing that, school or university setting would be appropriate.
- #7 - Management and human relations activities are more useful to me within a broader context. In terms of conceptual abilities such as long range planning I prefer to relate them directly to my own school.
- #13 - It is good to get away from your own school. Convention Centre conferences are fun, but often it is not that easy to translate what one hears at large conferences to the work at home.
- #14 - All are institutions best suited for dealing within the intellectual domain.
- #16 - Hard to decide - all areas adaptable.
- #17 - Technical skills can easily be dealt with in your school since your technical skills may not interest other administrators and can be quickly dealt with. Human relations and conceptual abilities must be done at the university level because its one of the only ways a person will be forced to read and discuss fully the problem involved.
- #20 - Local inservicing provides for local needs - technical and planning. Human relations are practised better with others than local staff where too many times the exercises are played for keeps.

Table 15
Preferred Mode of Delivery Data
Time of Year

	<u>Areas of Concern</u>		
	Technical Skills and Knowledge	Human Relations Skills and Knowledge	Conceptual Abilities
1. Fall (Sept. - Oct. - Nov.)	29	27	27
2. Winter (Dec. - Jan. - Feb.)	25	25	22
3. Spring (Mar. - Apr. - May)	15	10	16
4. Summer (June-July-August)	14	21	21

Time of Year: It is apparent that principals favour fall and winter as the best times of year for holding inservice programs, with fall considered as the first preference in each of the three areas of concern. It is noteworthy that these preferences are in the first and second quarter of the school year and may be seen as the best times to ensure that the programs are of some benefit during the current school year.

Respondents recorded on their questionnaire the following comments as their reasons for choices regarding time of year:

- #1 - Usually preferable before school year begins.
- #3 - The earlier in the school year, the more likely the implementation.
- #5 - Beginning and end of the year are poor times for prof. development because there are too many other things demanding your time.
Short (1 wk. - 2 wk.) courses in the summer are very good.
- #7 - Management and human relations activities are best conducted during the school term in which there is a minimum demand on one's time - probably in the winter. Otherwise I appreciate summer and fall activities.
- #9 - I have more time during summer.
- #13 - The reason for my choices here have to do with the cycle in which things happen, e.g., winter is a good time to begin planning for the next school year.
- #14 - Summer and spring best for planning.
- #16 - Fall - able to use info' during school year.
- #17 - The technical skills in the fall so they can be of use to me during the current year. Human relations and conceptual abilities during the summer because principals have more time to concentrate fully on those skills rather than being occupied with everyday school problems.
- #20 - Summer - July and August is preferred in order to prepare a principal for the year ahead. (Also he/she may be able to look back on previous year for guidance).

Table 16
Preferred Mode of Delivery Data
Participation

	<u>Areas of Concern</u>		
	Technical Skills and Knowledge	Human Relations Skills and Knowledge	Conceptual Abilities
1. Principals only	17	14	13
2. Principals with similar interests only (e.g., similar sized schools, urban/rural only)	12	10	37
3. Principals and administrators only	28	23	26
4. All staff involved in that area of concern	29	37	37

Participation: The principals consider that participation in inservice programs should include all staff involved in that area of concern. (See Table 14). For conceptual abilities and human relations skills and knowledge, the preference for the involvement of all staff is most obvious. In the area of technical skills and knowledge, the preference is almost equally divided between the item 'Principals and administrators only' and all staff, with the latter being marginally preferred.

Of some importance is the low preference rating given to the participation of principals with similar interests only. In each of the three areas of concern such limited participation was considered as being the least preferred.

Respondents recorded on their questionnaire the following comments as their reasons for choices regarding participation.

- #5 - Would depend upon the general purpose of the prof.dev. The more technical the more limited.
- #7 - As a "small school" principal, I look forward to the opportunity of sharing experiences with individuals in a variety of circumstances.
- #13 - One benefits most from a broad perspective on things.
- #14 - Technical skills are best learned in homogeneous groups while human relations skills best in heterogeneous groups.
- #17 - All staff involved should be informed on the three areas. This could prepare future principals to do their job more efficiently. This is not always possible but the more often it happens the better.
- #20 - Group decision making is hard to do if you do not have your group with you.

General Comments by Respondents

At the end of the questionnaire, respondents were invited to make any other comment about inservice or professional development for them as Manitoba school principals:

The following comments were recorded in response to that invitation:

- #1 - Clear Lake session one of the best I've attended. Involvement of MTS-MAS and U. of M. excellent. Interested in attending another such session, providing it was held in Winnipeg as it took a good chunk out of summer with the family.
- #5 - In my division we are . . . free to attend and participate in a wide variety of prof.dev. activities.
- Many are scheduled during the teaching week thus necessitating leaving your school if you choose to attend. It is encouraging to see more opportunities provided by Canadian sponsoring organizations. Until recently most were provided or available through American agencies.
- #7 - Inservice has been of paramount importance in my own prof.dev. Opportunities to participate . . . critical to one's prof.dev.
- Has been involved from all angles, including organizational aspects, as a presenter, as a delegate, as a consultant, etc., and feel I have benefitted a great deal. Most principals in Manitoba, I believe, have the opportunity to become involved in a variety of professional development activities if it is their desire to do so.
- #9 - New principal - I feel it is the technical area that I am weak in at this time. However, experience will change this and I will come to recognize other needs. So far I have been quite satisfied with my professional development opportunities.

#13 - It seems to me that in much of our PD activities there is far too much talk and too little action. The more we can structure PD activities in such a way as to

- a) "internalize" concepts, ideas and materials presented to participants,
- b) translate concepts and ideas to administrative practice, the better our PD activities.

In PD we should attempt to nurture growth in professionalism, rather than through ideas of people, as is so often the case, especially in large conferences!

#16 - Not enough at the moment although you can find your own PD.

#17 - The inservice sessions for principals on technical skills are usually fairly well organized and informative, but there aren't many. Most inservices on human relations skills are too short and therefore of little value to us.

Most inservice sessions on human relations are of a few days duration and are costly. It would be nice to go once in a while but the school board doesn't feel its worth the money.

#20 - I am quite satisfied with inservicing I have received in my first year as a principal. Also, at times, inservicing provides a much needed break from the constant, insistent demands of everyday administration.

It is apparent that the respondents have varying needs, with some perceiving that those needs are being met whilst others seek additional inservice opportunities. The local employing authorities are seen as being supportive in some cases, but in one case the school board was seen as providing obstacles to inservice involvement.

Of greatest interest is the general indication of support for inservice programs and a desire to improve certain aspects of the programs.

Mode of Delivery Summary

The respondents considered six aspects of program delivery in relation to three broad areas of concern for principals. The six aspects of delivery were, sponsorship, format, duration, location, time of year and participation. The three broad areas of concern were technical skills and knowledge, human relations skills and knowledge and conceptual abilities.

The data showed that the principals considered sponsorship most preferred by the school division for programs concerned with technical skills and knowledge; by the Principals' Association for programs concerned with human relations skills and knowledge; and by the school division for programs involving conceptual abilities. The most preferred format was one day or less for programs concerned with technical skills and knowledge, but two days for both human relations skills and knowledge and conceptual abilities. For the location aspect the most preferred site for technical skills and knowledge was at another school, while the university was the most preferred site for programs concerned with human relations skills and knowledge and conceptual abilities.

The most preferred time of year for programs in any of the three areas is fall and the most preferred participation in all three areas is that of all staff involved in that area of concern.

INTERVIEW DATA: STUDY RESPONDENTS

In this section reports of the interviews with principals are provided. The information reported here is in answer to specific questions posed by the researcher (see Appendix C), plus general information that the principals offered during the course of the interview.

Each interview report is presented in three sections - introductory comments giving the principals background and current position; comments made by the principal concerning inservice for principals; a summary of the most important points raised during the course of the interview.

PRINCIPAL #1Introduction

Principal #1 is a forty-two year old male who has been a principal for the past two years of his twenty years teaching experience. His school has an enrolment of two hundred and forty-four students, with eleven staff members employed and his position involves full-time administration. He holds two Bachelor's degrees and indicated that his inservice involvement during the 1980-81 school year consisted of attendance at a twelve-day conference for principals held during the summer vacation.

Inservice for Principals

Opening comments expressed considerable praise for a recent twelve-day summer conference where several groups involved in education had been brought together to provide valuable input with enough time for the participants to adequately consider all aspects of the input. New developments and curriculum modifications created demands on the principal's attention and it was felt that an inservice program had to really offer something of great value before a principal would leave other commitments to devote full attention to a limited area. The concept of drawing several input sources together and allowing adequate time was considered to be most worthwhile.

Monthly meetings of principals to look after "housekeeping matters" and business of the division were considered to be most useful. There was also a considerable amount of informal communication between principals when matters of local relevance were being considered. Although there were no professional development programs initiated by the local principals' group, they do organize divisional meetings where principals meet trustees to consider matters related to the division generally and meetings of principals

prior to the opening of the school year when administrative information is discussed.

Although he has had experience as a vice-principal in an elementary school and in a secondary school before his appointment to this school, he felt that there were still matters of concern that were new to him, or had changed in their nature. Many administrative matters known to him as a vice-principal had arisen in his new position as principal, but he did not feel as though he had been fully aware of everything that had subsequently become a matter of concern as a principal.

Initially, matters of greatest concern were operational, but now most of this was handled by the secretary. The educational program and teacher evaluation have now emerged as matters of top priority in the second year of principalship. The public relations aspect was also of concern in both the first and second year and rated high in the principal's priority list of matters requiring his attention. It was felt that the public relations aspect could have even overshadowed all other areas of concern if there had been a crisis situation at the school.

Reference was made to the role model set by principals with whom he had worked as vice-principal. Perceptions of the principal's role as based on those models had been modified during the first year of principalship as staff competencies became apparent. This was particularly true of the relationship between the role of the principal and the role of the secretary, who now handled the majority of the purely operational administrative tasks.

Preference for future professional development was given to job-related conferences where first-hand information may be acquired during a

program lasting a couple of days. It was felt that superintendent and school board should provide opportunities to consider matters of local relevance, while the professional association, the Department of Education and the University's Faculty of Education should provide opportunities across the province where there are matters of general interest.

Particular reference was made to methods of evaluation as a prime example of an area of need for inservice development. He had found that there was a diversity of approaches throughout the division, with schools establishing and modifying their own method through trial and error. He had researched the matter himself and developed a method for his school that seemed to be acceptable, but this had been a time-consuming task and it was felt that there had to be a better way.

Most Important Points

1. Inservice opportunities that bring together several relevant input agencies not normally used by the principal are appreciated.
2. Divisional principals' meetings tend to consider matters of local interest only.
3. Service as a vice-principal did not eliminate a need for inservice support as a principal.
4. In two years the change in emphasis had been from operations and public relations to the educational program, teacher evaluation and public relations.
5. Role models had to be modified according to local circumstances.
6. Professional development of principals should be a shared responsibility, particularly where matters of general concern are identified.

PRINCIPAL #2.Introduction

Principal #2 is a thirty-nine year old male who has been a principal for eight years of his nineteen years teaching experience. There are three hundred students and twenty-two staff members at his school and his position involves full-time administration. He holds two Master's degrees, one of which was gained in Educational Administration. He indicated that inservice programs totalling eight days in length were attended during 1980-81.

Inservice of Principals

It was felt that there were few programs offered locally that provided principals with opportunities to meet their inservice needs. Reference was made to international programs and advertised locally that appeared to offer the type of involvement that was required. These programs did have support from local principals, but cost factors tended to restrict attendance.

Professional development needs were seen to have changed since appointment as principal. Initially needs had been related to curriculum familiarization and administrative details. Before appointment the position held had involved teaching senior elementary students, so the junior school program had been a matter for concern and attention. Student evaluation had also been an area that required much attention at first. Since then there had been a continuing need for curriculum information because of program changes, and greater emphasis had been placed on administrative efficiency and the human relations area. Specifically, supervision techniques and staff development were now important areas of concern in

which professional development opportunities would be welcomed.

Having recently completed a Master's degree in Educational Administration, academic study was not seen as a current need, but it will certainly be considered again at a future date because of the personal satisfaction gained from the exercise. The reinforcing attitude experienced while working with fellow administration students had been a welcome change from the pressures of the principalship. Current inservice needs were seen essentially as being job-related and particularly in the area of the principal's role in staff development.

Responsibility for professional development was considered to be a shared responsibility. The University's Faculty of Education is seen as playing an important role in presenting theoretical constructs and identifying what is practical and worthy of the administrator's consideration. The University was also seen as being the venue for long-range considerations. The local division was considered the best venue for considerations of practical application within the system or within the school.

Professional journals were considered to be most interesting and useful, essentially on a basis of maintaining educational awareness. A personal need for a level of consultation between theoretical awareness and practical application was expressed. It was felt that ideas or techniques advocated in journals could not be tried within the school with any degree of confidence unless there had been consultation with fellow principals regarding the validity of the suggestion.

Although professional development programs for personal benefit were considered worthwhile, far more time was being spent on the professional development of teachers, while his own was neglected. Opportunities for meetings with fellow principals were appreciated. When asked if this meant

the monthly meeting of principals with the superintendent, the answer was negative. Whereas these administrative meetings were valuable and a very busy time, they did not provide the opportunity for principals to exchange ideas or have a professional development input. Such opportunities were thought to be infrequent - no more than two or three times per year.

Future professional development needs have three facets. There is a definite aim to undertake further academic study at some future date. Human relations areas involving staff development, team building and goal identification were seen as current and continuing areas of need which could well get greater attention in the near future. The third facet is related to personal career perceptions. There is some consideration that school administration may be left at some future date in favour for a position in either the field of educational research or special education. Should this happen, the position will not necessarily involve administration, so professional development needs will change in nature.

Most Important Points

1. Needs have changed from curriculum and general administration awareness to administrative efficiency, staff development and supervision.
2. University programs considered necessary for the selection of appropriate theoretical constructs for administrators.
3. Professional journals considered to be useful.
4. Informal interaction with fellow principals considered useful.

PRINCIPAL #3INTERVIEW REPORTIntroduction

Principal #3 is a forty-seven year old male who has been a principal for four years of his twenty-four years teaching experience. His current position involves full-time administration in a school of two hundred and eighty-one students with fourteen staff members. He holds a Master's degree in Educational Administration and records that his inservice involvements in 1980-81 were "too numerous to list", involving some full-day, half-day, evening and Saturday attendances.

Inservice for Principals

The sudden death of the previous principal had led to the appointment of this principal to his present school during October. The suddenness of the appointment and the time of year of the appointment were extraordinary circumstances that influenced the principal's approach throughout his first year at the school. He felt that, as the school was functioning efficiently, his initial role was one of familiarization with the organization, maintenance of the organization's operations and learning about the community and its expectations of the school. Community involvement in school matters is of vital importance at this school, making the public relations aspect one of great importance to the principal.

Responses to the Importance and Desired Level Proficiency categories indicated that this principal feels an obligation to be aware of what is happening in his school and to be able to achieve levels of efficiency that he finds personally acceptable and that he knows will be acceptable to the community. He related this to the size of the school by indicating that

the smaller the school, the more the community expects the principal to be aware of, proficient in, and responsible for, school operation.

It was felt that the divisional office was supportive of professional development for principals, but there was a danger that the more aggressive principals may have more than their share of participation, while less aggressive principals whose needs may be even greater, may miss out. A need was seen for an efficient method of bringing inservice opportunities to the attention of all principals. Responsibility for the professional development of principals was seen as shared by many agencies, with the individual being expected to seek and participate whenever possible. The great variety of options open to principals indicate a need for agencies to compile detailed lists of inservice programs to assist principals in the quick identification of possibilities that are relevant.

The initial concerns with administration and organization on appointment had been replaced by concerns for staff development and the quality of student life at school. A variety of personalities and teaching approaches in staff members was being used to broaden the professional understanding of all teachers at the school. Students, staff and parents were enhancing their relationships through regular school luncheons and sporting events. Public relations remained an ongoing concern because of the nature of the district.

Professional journals coming into the school were circulated according to a 'route list' scheme organized by the principal and the librarian. The principal is included in that list and either browsed through the material circulated or read it in detail according to the degree of relevance of the particular article.

Future professional development needs were seen as being related to

the job rather than academic. Change in curriculum was particularly mentioned as creating inservice needs for principals in addition to the constant need to be in touch with everything that in some way influences education.

Most Important Points

1. Initial concerns involved organization and the community, but the organizational concerns had been subsequently replaced by concerns for staff development and the quality of student life at school.
2. Size of the school influences the levels of Importance and Desired Level of Proficiency identified in the questionnaire.
3. The variety of inservice possibilities available could be used more widely if advertised through central agencies.
4. Future professional development needs will either be job-related or to maintain a high level of awareness of matters concerning education.

PRINCIPAL #4Introduction

Principal #4 is a thirty-eight year old male in his third year as principal out of a total of fourteen years teaching experience. There are two hundred and twenty-four students and fifteen staff members at his present school and his position involves full-time administration. He holds two Master's degrees, with no graduate qualification in educational administration, and indicated that his inservice program during 1980-81 consisted of a three-day international conference plus regular divisional principals' meetings.

Inservice for Principals

It was felt that current professional development needs were being met as well as they could possibly be at the moment. This comment reflected the financial restraints upon the school board that seemed to inhibit attendances to some degree, but at the same time it was thought that the school board and superintendent were supportive of professional development programs for principals. A principal who wished to seek out and pursue a particular type of program was thought to stand a good chance of having his attendance approved and financially supported.

Having been a principal for three years, it was felt that personal professional development needs had changed from those associated with obvious concerns to those related to the more obscure features of the principal's role. Particular mention was made of teacher supervision as being an area in which he had no experience prior to appointment as principal and had therefore considered this to be a major area of personal need in his first year as principal. The more obscure current needs included such features as time management. In addition to the personally identified needs,

he felt that there had been system-initiated changes that had created additional professional development needs for many, if not all, principals in the division. Specific examples of the system-initiated changes that had created needs for him had been the introduction of French immersion programs in the division and the establishment of a special education group at his school.

Preference was expressed for inservice opportunities through both academic studies and job-related courses. No immediate plans had been made for purely academic involvement, but he would be attending a non-credit course in the use of computers which had been arranged through the divisional office. This course was also referred to as an example of the system-initiated need mentioned above, as the school division was apparently favouring the introduction of computers into the area, thereby creating the need for principals to be aware of the potential uses of the new facility.

Responsibility for the professional development of principals was seen as a shared responsibility, but with different sorts of responsibility by different parties. The school board was seen as having a financial responsibility to ensure that principals have access to programs. The responsibility of choice of program or choice of attendance was seen as being the responsibility for each individual principal. It was felt that the individual's choice was a commitment and a greater guarantee that the program would be of benefit. Programs that had been prepared and presented on a topic-centered basis were seen as being the least successful type of program.

Professional development programs were seen as being a worthwhile use of time, particularly where the topic was concise and directed at a small,

identified audience, rather than a division-wide program. Programs that were planned and advertised widely were seen as being useful only when wide change was to be effected.

Future needs are seen as being based on identified areas of need that are relevant to a particular group or individual at a particular time. Emphasis was placed on the importance of providing the individual with the opportunity and support needed to meet personally identified needs. For broad changes of direction within the division, or where general areas of need were identified by groups of principals, there was a place for programs capable of meeting those needs.

Most Important Points

1. Current professional development needs are being met through available programs.
2. Needs had changed from the obvious, when new to the position, to the obscure when more experienced.
3. Divisional policy changes lead to system-initiated professional development needs.
4. Professional development responsibility had several facets, with different individuals or agents being responsible for different facets.
5. Emphasis was placed on meeting the needs of the individual, but there must also be some programs of a general nature when, for example, divisional policy changes are involved.

PRINCIPAL #5Introduction

Principal 5 is a forty-nine year old male who has been a principal for sixteen years of his twenty-seven years teaching experience. At his present school there are five hundred and seventeen students and twenty-seven staff members and his position involves full-time administration. He has two Bachelor's degrees and has completed some study in Educational Administration at the Pre-Master's level. During the 1980-81 school year, he was involved in inservice development programs that totalled 4½ days in length, not including monthly principals' meetings called by the superintendent.

Inservice for Principals

Principal #5 considers that there is a considerable degree of immediacy to the inservice development needs of principals. He feels that what is really relevant are the needs that one identifies as being needs here and now.

Some concern was expressed over the amount of time used for professional development, particularly in a situation where there was no vice-principal at the school. Since the appointment of a vice-principal, this had not been such a great problem, but there was still some concern that there could be a loss of credibility with the staff if too much time was spent out of the school. He believes that the staff want to see their principal attending some professional development programs and keeping up to date, but the principal has to establish an acceptable balance between time away from school and time at school or his absences could become counter-productive.

There was particular pleasure expressed at the development of more

Canadian-oriented opportunities for professional development where Canadians were responsible for mounting valuable conferences for Canadians and they were held within Canada, as opposed to travelling to the U.S. venues for conferences of wide repute. Support was also expressed for professional journals, some of which had been found most valuable. One particular series that provided in-depth material on specific subject areas in individual issues had been found most useful for general awareness of current developments in education.

Future problems that the principal could predict cannot necessarily be covered in inservice programs, but in some cases 'the informal network' of peers provided the support and information that was required to cope with the situation. An example provided here was the predicted fall in school enrolments with the associated redundancy of staff and availability of space within the school.

Principal #5 felt that his inservice needs were currently being met adequately, although there was some hesitation in the answer. He does feel that he would like to return to university for a year to complete a variety of courses that had both a purely academic nature and a job-relevant nature in order to provide for his own personal renewal and at the same time bring him up to date with the latest educational developments. He had found the courses in Educational Administration that he has completed at the Pre-Master's level to be helpful and added that they had been even more helpful with more experience. It was felt that the School Division would help to provide the opportunity to meet any personal needs identified.

The size of the school, the type of school (elementary or secondary), the geographic location and the principal's teaching load were all mentioned as factors that effect the inservice needs of principals. Other features

such as isolation and cost factors tend to reduce inservice involvement, while growth in enrolment and open plan design tend to demand greater inservice support. There had been no opportunities for training, direction, identification or preparation for a specific school prior to taking up appointment at that school. Much of the learning had been 'on-the-job'. Although there were some differences in inservice needs between rural and urban settings, there were also similarities. The strongest identification of changing needs emerged from the consideration of career stages. It was felt that the initial stage was the time of greatest need with the identified areas of need being organizational, administrative and working with people. If this support was not given on appointment, it was certainly needed at the end of the first year to help the principal to make sense of everything that had happened. As time passed, and the principal had 'honed his organizational skills', the method of operation was established, the climate in the school was apparent and there was an understanding of how the principal and staff wanted to treat children, then the inservice programs should provide updates on programming, methodology and human relationships.

In considering who should be responsible for the professional development of principals, it was felt that self-evaluation is important and therefore some responsibility should lie with the individual principal. The principal's immediate superior should also be responsible for making the principal aware of needs and providing opportunities for the needs to be met. It was suggested that this would be done as a matter of course if the evaluation program for the principal is working effectively.

The future programs for principals, a team-building orientation along with particular emphasis on developing personal interviewing skills and

long-term planning for schools were seen as the main needs. School climate was also identified as being in need of regular attention because of the danger of falling into sterile routines.

Most Important Points

1. Providing relevant inservice programs is closely related to identifying immediate needs.
2. It is important to safeguard credibility by maintaining a balance between the time spent on inservice development away from the school with time spent in the school.
3. Professional journals can be of value.
4. Inservice needs change with time, location and type of school.
5. Early career inservice support is desirable.
6. Responsibility for inservice should be shared by principal and immediate superior.

PRINCIPAL #6Introduction

Principal #6 is a forty-four year old male who has been a principal for eight years of his twenty-one years teaching experience. His school has an enrolment of three hundred and seventeen students, with a staff of twenty and his position involves full-time administration. He holds two Bachelor's degrees and his inservice involvement in the 1980-81 school year consisted of a four-day conference at an international venue.

Inservice for Principals

It was felt that professional development needs were being met to some degree, but there was a need for more opportunities. At the time of interview, the principal was preparing to attend a divisional conference to consider the French Immersion needs of the division and locations where classes could be established. His school was being considered as a possible centre for a French program so he saw his own professional development needs as currently being focussed in this area.

On first taking up appointment as principal eight years ago, the professional development needs of this principal had been great and encompassed areas of operational, administrative, management and personnel involvement. Initially there had been no professional development support available other than direct contact with the division's assistant superintendent. Prior to appointment, this principal had been an advisory teacher in mathematics for the division, so felt that he needed considerable support in his first year as principal. He perceives a change in needs from the broad needs of first appointment to more specific current needs of the present. Declining school enrolment is creating interpersonal, organizational and physical space utilization problems that are both

immediate and anticipated, and it is in this area that he sees his greatest current needs.

He does not consider academically-oriented programs as being of any use to him at present and was quite definitely in favour of job-related programs as being most beneficial.

Responsibility for the professional development of principals was considered to lie with the assistant superintendent. It was thought that the assistant superintendent should work at two levels of professional development need: first, the individual needs of principals which could be identified jointly by the assistant superintendent and the particular principal; second, the broader needs of the division, where the assistant superintendent considers the needs as expressed by many individuals or groups and consults with the principals in the division to provide an appropriate program.

Professional journals are considered to be of value and he personally subscribes to several.

Professional development programs were seen as a worthwhile use of time, particularly where the program was related to some extent to his most immediate concern. Examples were given of attendance at a program considering the educational needs of gifted and talented children in another city, then acting as a resource person within his division, and involvement in the division's consideration of French immersion program needs in the area.

Future inservice needs were seen as offering information and involvement opportunities to cope with immediate needs, plus providing a broader awareness of educational issues generally. In referring to the second feature of future needs, the principal mentioned the possibility of moving to another school at some future date and therefore felt that he had to

maintain broader perspectives than could be offered by programs that focussed on local needs only.

Most Important Points

1. Local matters of concern create professional development needs in a variety of areas.
2. Professional development needs change with experience from a broad consideration of all aspects of the principal's role to a more sharply focussed consideration of specific topics.
3. The assistant superintendent is seen as being responsible for both personal and divisional professional development programs for principals.
4. Professional journals are of value.

PRINCIPAL #7Introduction

Principal #7 is a thirty-seven year old male who has been a principal for the past four years of his fifteen years teaching experience. There are one hundred and fourteen students and seven teachers at his school and his position involves administrative duties for fifty-seven percent of the time, with a teaching commitment for the remaining forty-three percent. He holds two Bachelors' degrees and has completed Educational Administration studies at the Pre-Master's level. During the 1980-81 school year inservice programs totalling fourteen and a half days were attended with attendance in two instances also involving him as a resource person and presenter.

Inservice for Principals

It was felt that there were some opportunities available to meet professional development needs, but in general there were insufficient programs to meet all needs. Particular reference was made to teacher observation techniques and teacher evaluation as being areas of universal concern where there was a lack of opportunity for the principal wishing to develop skills.

Changes in inservice needs were related to both a change in divisions on taking up appointment as principal and increasing experience as a principal. The major concerns on appointment had been generally operational. The move from a city school division to a country division had created an initial need for system familiarization. Parallel to this were specifically in-school needs relating to budgetary operations and general office procedures. After four years, the administrative and operational areas are no longer of such concern and the emphasis has changed to personal, human

relations and human management skills. On the personal level, time management skills are seen as an area of prime need, while classroom observation techniques and teacher evaluation techniques are human relations and management areas of concern. It was felt that there is a need for greater support in these areas for principals, as the opportunities available at present are inadequate.

Current needs are seen as being both academically and job oriented. A desire was expressed to have greater access to models that could assist development. These models could either be theoretical constructs that have an application in the field of administration, or they could be realistic role-models involving personal observation, analysis, modification and adoption.

Responsibility for professional development of principals was seen as being divided between local and provincial bodies. The local principals council is considered the most appropriate sponsor of programs involving matters of local concern. An example was given of a coming meeting organized by this group to consider standardized testing in the division - a special problem identified as requiring attention. The provincial professional association, working in cooperation with the professional development committee, was considered the most applicable body responsible for professional development across the province.

Professional journals were considered to be of some value, although the pressures of time restricted activity in this field. Reference was made to a local procedure where the superintendent reviewed many journals and, being aware of the interests and concerns of individual principals in the division, forwarded principals copies of articles of interest. This was considered to be a most helpful way of maintaining a level of professional

reading in the division.

Attendance at inservice programs was considered to be an excellent use of time and a good way of maintaining and developing professional skills and awareness. This principal strongly supported the concept of professional development for principals and actively sought involvement in as many programs as possible.

Future professional development needs were somewhat uncertain, but related to personal ambition. Background experience prior to appointment as principal has been wide, both as a teacher and as a divisional advisor in curriculum. As a result of this experience, it was not felt that curriculum-related input would be needed. The currently available programs for school principals did meet needs to some degree, but there was a definite need for additional human relations programs to meet present and future needs. Personal ambition for future career direction included the possibility of moving to a larger organization at some future date or possibly moving to a position involving facility planning. A series of visitations to examine facilities in other areas had already been undertaken and it was felt that this would be of some help in case of either career direction.

Most Important Points

1. Programs examining teacher observation techniques and teacher evaluation were needed.
2. Changes in inservice needs had been brought about by a change of division, requiring a system familiarization phase on appointment.
3. Further changes in inservice needs had occurred since appointment - from operational needs related to budgetary problems and office procedures to time management, classroom observation techniques and

3. (cont'd:)

teacher evaluation techniques.

4. Responsibility for the professional development of principals is seen as being on two levels - the local principals council where local matters are concerned and the provincial professional association for general matters.

PRINCIPAL #8Introduction

Principal #8 is a thirty-eight year old male who has been a principal for the past two years of his eighteen years of teaching. At his present school there are three hundred and fifty-four students and fifteen staff members. The principal's position involves full-time administration. He holds two Bachelor's degrees and indicated that he attended inservice conferences totalling four days in length during the 1980-81 school year.

Inservice for Principals

It was felt that current inservice needs were not being met because they arose from newly developing educational programs within the school and attention appeared to concentrate on the program rather than the ancillary problems that were emerging. The principal was seen as a vital coordinator of program implementation within the school, so there was an organizational role to be played. He was also seen as being responsible for training his staff in the new materials and methods, but felt that there was no provision of opportunities for the principal to develop proficiency in aspects of staff training before being expected to perform effectively in this area. The training skills required to perform satisfactorily were seen as major inservice needs which, at this stage, were still unmet needs.

Definite changes in professional development needs during the first two years of principalship were perceived. The main areas of need during the first year of principalship had been operational and human relations. The operational tasks associated with school budget was seen as being one major area of concern, while the other main area of need was related to the establishment of a school identity and a school policy. These areas

of need had been replaced in the second year of principalship by areas related to program and supervision. The availability of new teaching materials, plus the introduction of new courses in language arts, social studies, science and maths had created needs as the principal had an increased emphasis on his role as program coordinator, organizer and staff developer. Changes in staff caused by resignation and increased enrolment had further added to the staff development and supervision burden, creating immediate as well as continuing concerns and inservice needs. The principal viewed the introduction of new programs as being a gradual development during the next three to five years and the related development of staff as an on-going need, therefore felt that his own inservice needs in these areas would also be of a long-term nature.

Responsibility for the professional development of principals was seen as essentially with the local professional development committee and the superintendent. An active local principals group arranged planning exercises where the needs of principals and the division were considered, then had follow-up exercises to meet these needs. An example was given of a recent workshop where principals had considered the use of computers in schools. This residential workshop had been supported by both the principal's professional committee and the divisional office.

Professional journals were found to be useful and subscriptions were held for several. Not only did they serve to maintain a general awareness of education, but also provided specific data to support attitudes or ideas that the principal may have held.

Professional development involvement was seen as a worthwhile use of time as many recent programs had been of good value. On a cautionary note, the principal felt that where the inservice involvement was during

school time, he had to take care not to exceed reasonable limits on time out of school. Those limits cannot be defined, but they depend upon the role of the principal in his individual school, teachers' perceptions of the principal's role, current demands on the principal's time and a general tolerance level that can only be felt.

Future needs were seen as being met through continued participation in local, divisional and provincial exercises arranged by the local professional development committee, the professional association and the special areas interest groups. A strong recommendation was made for better inservice support for the new administrator. Suggestions presented were: some form of apprenticeship program prior to appointment; on-the-job support during the first year from a capable and experienced administrator; possible insistence on the principal serving as a vice-principal before being eligible for appointment as principal; time off during the first year to spend with other administrators.

Most Important Points

1. New educational programs create professional development needs for principals in the areas of staff training and supervision.
2. Needs have changed from operational and human relations to staff development and supervision.
3. Responsibility is seen as being shared by the local principals' committee and the superintendent.
4. Professional journals supply useful data.
5. Time given to professional development programs should not exceed the local tolerance level.
6. Improved support programs are needed for newly appointed principals.

PRINCIPAL #9Introduction

Principal #9 is a thirty-four year old male who has been a principal for two months after teaching for ten years. There are one hundred and eleven students and six staff members at his school and his position involves a half-time teaching load. He holds one Bachelor's degree and is currently completing his second Bachelor's degree with an emphasis on administrative studies. During 1980-81 he attended professional development programs totalling fifteen days in length.

Inservice for Principals

It was felt that current professional development needs were being met through University studies, involvement in meetings and informal communication with fellow principals. He is currently an active member of three professional associations and finds that the meetings of each association are of help to him in some way. He values highly the opportunities for informal contact with fellow principals when he is able to discuss matters of concern and seek advice from more experienced colleagues. The divisional office is also seen as being most helpful when he has sought information concerning administrative matters. He considers the school board and the divisional office to be most supportive of programs that cater for the inservice needs of principals and provided examples where he had been given time away from his school for one day per week to attend programs and the board had met the cost of providing a replacement teacher to take his teaching load during that time.

He had perceived a definite change in his professional development needs because his appointment had been unexpected. He had been a classroom teacher for ten years and had not considered the possibility of principal-

ship at some future time. When his present position was offered to him, he accepted and then found that he had to reorient his thinking away from purely teacher concerns to administrative matters. He felt that the principalship had given him a totally new kind of responsibility and he now had to seriously consider group dynamics, budget procedures and his position as instructional leader as critical features of his role. He considered these areas to be his areas of greatest concern and areas of greatest inservice need.

The university studies already commenced are seen as helping to meet an immediate need as far as qualification and administrative input are concerned. This, coupled with the ongoing job-related needs referred to above, indicates a current preference for both academic and work-relevant programs.

The responsibility for the professional development of principals is seen as being a shared responsibility, with a definition of roles. The individual principal is considered to be best aware of what applies to him and what is most likely to meet his needs and so the responsibility for the final choice regarding the course of action to be followed is most properly that of the principal. The school division is seen as being responsible for the necessary opportunities and the financial support required. The professional development committee in this principal's division was active in initiating programs with support from the principals and the divisional office.

Despite the daily pressures of the new role, this principal tries to spend some time each day on professional reading. He considers that many of the journals are interesting, but they are not always helpful. At this stage, the principal explained a personal philosophy that guides his

professional reading and activity. He aims to be the instructional program leader within his school rather than the administrator who devotes an inordinately large amount of his time on administrative matters that are not really of great importance. He wants to work with the people in his school rather than the material things at the school and wants to keep in close touch with matters that are teacher concerns. This personal philosophy, he claims, dictates the type of professional reading that he finds useful and the type of professional development program that he finds relevant.

At the present stage, he has a considerable commitment to inservice programs and finds that, although not all are valuable, most are necessary. This belief is held because of the important role played by meetings in helping to develop a joint philosophy within the division and creating opportunities for people to come together so that there is a blending of personalities within the division, allowing for a group identity to develop.

The direction for future inservice program development is seen as being tied to personal philosophy. As a principal who wishes to establish a position of instructional leadership based on personal expertise, he sees ongoing needs in areas related to program curriculum development and working with people.

Most Important Points

1. Considers both formal and informal communication opportunities to be important.
2. Most apparent areas of need on appointment related to group dynamics, budget and instructional leadership.
3. University studies and job related programs considered important.
4. Professional development seen as a shared responsibility.

5. Personal philosophy determines what is useful reading material and worthwhile inservice program.

PRINCIPAL #11

INTERVIEW REPORT

Introduction

Principal #11 is a forty year old female who is in her first year as principal after having taught for fifteen years. There are one hundred and forty-one students and eleven staff members at her school and her position is considered to be half-time administration, with a half-time teaching load. Currently a Bachelor's degree is held and studies towards a Master's degree have been commenced. It was indicated that a twelve-day professional development program was attended during the summer vacation immediately prior to commencing duties in her new position.

Inservice for Principals

Being in a relatively small country school, this principal saw her main inservice needs as being curriculum-related. In this context, she felt that the school division's inservice programs quite adequately met her requirements. Apart from the needs associated with her own teaching load, or advising other teachers in curriculum-related areas, there were also areas of concern directly related to administrative duties where inservice support was not so readily available. The topic of prime interest was the school budget and it was acknowledged that most administrative problems were somehow linked with the budget. Being in her first year as principal, a general concern for most areas of administration was expressed, and current ability was rated low.

Monthly meetings of principals with the superintendent were found to

be most useful in helping to find solutions to administrative problems. A high level of personal confidence in the divisional superintendent was expressed and this appeared to influence the principal's readiness to contact the divisional office for advice whenever matters of concern arose. A group of principals from the division had attended a summer vacation inservice program, resulting in the development of a high level of camaraderie among the group and a tendency towards greater informal communication and mutual support, particularly in situations where the principal felt alone within their own school because of an administrative decision that the staff did not like.

It was felt that inservice needs related to administrative tasks were not being met on an organizational basis. The principal appeared to be left to find solutions to problems as best she could and develop procedures that she considered appropriate.

Inservice needs had certainly changed since becoming a principal, and two specific areas had emerged as being of greatest concern. One area was the administrative role of the principal, while the other was the human relations aspect of the principal's role. In mentioning the human relations aspect, particular reference was made to the greater need for diplomacy as a principal. This had not been felt as a teacher, but the change in role had brought a realization that great diplomacy was required within the school with staff members and outside of the school with the public.

Future professional development needs are seen as being both academic and job-related, and plans have been made for both types of commitments.

Responsibility for professional development is seen as being a personal responsibility, but in need of support by the school board to

ensure that reasonable requests are granted and financial support is available.

Professional journals had not been considered as a source of relevant information at this stage.

Most Important Points

1. Budget-related administrative problems were areas of greatest concern.
2. Monthly principals' meetings considered very useful.
3. Inservice needs related to administration not being met.
4. Needs have changed, with administrative tasks and human relations emerging as priorities.

PRINCIPAL #12INTERVIEW REPORTIntroduction

Principal #12 is a twenty-eight year old male in his first year as principal at this school after having taught elsewhere for six years. There are forty-five students enrolled at the school and four teachers are employed. The principal's position involves twenty per-cent administrative duties and eighty per-cent teaching. He has a Bachelor's degree and during the summer vacation attended a twelve day inservice course for principals before assuming his new responsibilities.

Inservice for Principals

Most areas of concern rated high levels of importance and high levels of desired proficiency for this newly appointed principal of a small rural school. He considered that he was not in a position where he could specialize in any areas of responsibility, but was involved to a varying degree in all areas and therefore needed a level of proficiency that would allow him to meet the demands of all areas.

With a relatively large amount of his time taken up with teaching duties, this principal saw a need to aim for a satisfactory balance where some of his inservice commitments were for administrative input, while some were curriculum oriented. A strong personal preference was expressed for the workshop format as the most satisfactory learning environment. The format that involved an intensive input session with participants returning to the field to implement ideas was seen as being particularly inefficient.

Informal communication with fellow principals was seen as being useful, but not always satisfactory as the message given could be filtered or affected by personal feelings at a particular time. Involvement in the

twelve day conference during the summer vacation was considered to have been most useful, for both the programmed input and the informal development opportunities that were available.

Current needs were being met by communicating with the most appropriate person who may be able to assist in that particular area, rather than on a planned program of involvement. Referring to an initial divisional meeting where certain administrative paperwork obligations had been explained, he felt that it would have been more useful to have had the opportunity to actually practice completing the forms and get some immediate feedback, rather than be shown something that only becomes meaningful at a later date when the technical skills have been forgotten.

The direction of future professional development for this principal hinges on a personal decision to be made shortly concerning the continuation of his teaching career. He did feel that the responsibility for the professional development of principals should be a shared responsibility, with professional associations, special area groups, the superintendent and school board all playing a role.

Professional journals were considered to be helpful, although many were scanned for pertinent material, rather than read in depth. The pressures of time caused by the teaching load were considered to inhibit professional reading.

Divisional principals' meetings held monthly were considered to be most useful and attendance at these meetings was eagerly anticipated. The opportunity to hear more about matters of local and immediate relevance was considered to be particularly important.

Most Important Points

1. The inservice needs of a newly-appointed principal are general rather than specific and curriculum-related as well as administrative.
2. Workshops are preferred to intensive input programs.
3. Needs reflecting local relevance are usually met through informal communication within the division.
4. Professional reading is hampered by the added pressures of a heavy teaching commitment.
5. Divisional principals' meetings are useful and attendance at these meetings is eagerly anticipated.

PRINCIPAL #13Introduction

Principal #13 is a thirty-six year old male in his fifth year as principal, having had a total of fourteen years teaching experience. There are three hundred students attending the school, with a staff of sixteen. The principal's duties include a teaching commitment for ten per-cent of his time. He holds a master's degree and during the 1980-81 school year attended inservice programs that totalled seven days in length.

Inservice for Principals

During the principalship at this school there had been a move to a new building on a new site, but it was considered that this in itself did not create additional inservice needs. The needs that could be identified were related to program and personnel - the new building merely served to provide more acceptable physical conditions for the implementation of the program.

Having been a principal for five years, he now felt that the inservice programs had designed specifically for principals had little to offer him. He had the impression that each year the programs were designed to meet the needs of new principals and had therefore lost their relevance as far as he was concerned. There was also a strong indication that the gap between conference input and application at the workplace was too great. He challenged the assumption made at many conferences that all participants were able to apply the theoretical input to the practical situation. He advocates a change in approach that would encourage shorter programs, held more frequently, on a theme and with subsequent follow-ups where participants are able to get together again and check with each other. This, he suggests, is in line with the learning theory of input-guided practice - independent practice, then checking.

It was felt that inservice needs generally were being met through the wide variety of conferences and workshops offered. The school board and superintendent were supportive, but the individual principal had to exercise discretion in deciding which programs he would attend, the time that he would be away from his school and the cost involved.

There had been a definite change in personal inservice needs since becoming principal. Initial needs were associated with administration and awareness of programs for grade one and two children as his own teaching background had been in secondary schools. He sees that his current and emerging needs are related to the stimulus of new challenges and being able to foresee problems that may arise at some future time.

Immediate future inservice needs will be both academic and job-related. A personal desire was expressed to have a year at University

at some time in the near future. At the present time a new program in special education at the school is being developed and the principal is experiencing a satisfying level of stimulus and challenge through his involvement in the program. He suggests that a principal in need of challenge in his job will be inclined to create opportunities for that need to be satisfied.

Responsibility for the professional development was seen as being closely related to broad organizational needs and therefore the school division had an important role to play. It was felt that system goals should be identified and pursued on a divisional basis and an example was given where a particular supervisory model found acceptable to all participants could be adopted throughout the division. A strong personal preference for the model approach was expressed, not only for supervision, but for many aspects of administration and school program.

One particular professional journal which was presented in a digest form was found useful in keeping aware of current thought, plus providing articles in time-saving abridged form. On some occasions the abridged article has been of particular interest, so the complete article has been sought. There was an indication that the demands on the principal's time made the idea of wide professional reading a goal rather than a reality.

Most Important Points

1. Perceived needs are strongly people and program oriented, with physical facilities having a minor influence.
2. Advocates professional development learning theory involving input, guided practice, independent practice, than checking.
3. Initially, needs were related to administration and programs, but after five years they are more related to the need for stimulus,

3. (cont'd:)

challenge and anticipating future situations.

4. The importance of identifying systems goals and using a model approach was stressed.

5. Access to a digest-form professional journal was appreciated because of the pressures of time that limit wide reading.

PRINCIPAL #14

Introduction

Principal #14 is a thirty-three year old male who has been principal of this school for five years of his ten years teaching experience. His present school has an enrolment of five hundred and sixteen students and twenty-seven staff members are employed. The principal's position is considered to be full-time administration. He holds two Bachelor's degrees and has completed educational administration study at the pre-Master's level. During the 1980-81 school year he attended inservice programs totalling fifty-three days, thirty-two of which were during week-ends or summer vacation.

Inservice for Principals

Although in a relatively large school, Principal #14 indicated 'low importance' for several seemingly vital areas. Curriculum organization (6.a.1) was rated low because the Education Department was seen as taking care of this, while the principal's role was to ensure that the prescribed curriculum was taught and that teachers were aware of the philosophy behind the curriculum. Dismissal procedures (6.b.8) were seldom needed, therefore of low importance, while Modern Society's problems for Children (6.c.4) were not accepted as part of the school's role. Where children did have

problems a referral was made to a supportive agency outside the school. In some cases, where the problems were disrupting academic achievement, an individual program was planned to help the student to cope with the academic problems.

In the broad area of Personal Concerns (section 6.f), Clarification of the Principal's Role (6.f.2) was rated low as this had happened through experience during the past five years. Public speaking (6.f.11) had been left to a previous vice-principal who had a particular ability in that area. Although that vice-principal was no longer at the school, the principal did not see that area as a concern. 'Politics' within the school (6.f.15) had been misinterpreted as party politics rather than individual behaviour concerning power, influence and leadership, so a low importance grading had been given to this area.

This principal stressed his personal philosophy that it is best for formal institutions to deal with the intellectual domain while less formal institutions deal with emotional and spiritual domains. Either formal or informal institutions may develop programs to deal with the physical domain. As a result of this line of thinking, the more 'formal' organizations were grouped together in answering parts of section 7.

The Education Department, being the formal organization providing curriculum materials, is seen as being obliged to provide principals with opportunities to be made aware of the thought behind curriculum developments and the technical skills required for the interpretation of programs.

After five years as principal, it was felt that the task of meeting inservice needs was becoming more difficult. Initially, the needs had been those of simply coping with the job and establishing human relationships. Now the needs relate more to balancing the professional and

personal sides of life and providing stimulus, challenge and foresight in preparing for change.

Future needs are seen as being both course-oriented and job-related. Time and distance were mentioned as critical problems in considering inservice needs. The possibility of a short-course in computers being held at a town nearby during the current school year was considered an excellent development as previous courses that had involved regular travel to the city were abandoned due to the distance and time involved. As an alternative approach, it was suggested that short-term courses involving a day or half-day attendance weekly would be a most satisfactory development, but it was obvious that this was not feasible at this time.

The school board was seen as hesitating to support professional development involvement for principals. This was considered to be essentially because of the costs involved, but also because of an attitude which tended to support programs that had immediate and visible benefits for the division rather than long-term benefits for individuals.

The difficulty of the number of people involved in programs for principals was seen as being a major problem. In a school of twenty-seven teachers and one principal it was relatively easy to organize a program for the teachers, but a program for the principal was a different matter. It was felt that the school board should decide if the professional development of principals is a matter of concern and, if so, agree to provide the necessary opportunities for inservice involvement.

Most Important Points

1. Local interpretation of the role of the school and the availability of staff members with specific expertise will influence the inservice needs of principals.

2. The Education Department as the supplier of curriculum guidelines has an obligation to keep principals aware of the philosophy underlying curriculum developments.
3. The perceived changes in inservice needs had been from basic skills and relationships within the school context to a broader, more complex areas involving family, home and the future.
4. Local availability and short-term regular attendance were both seen as favourable aspects for future inservice development.
5. The need for school board commitment to support the concept of professional development for principals and to provide the opportunities for such development is seen as being basic to the future success of inservice programs.

PRINCIPAL #15

Introduction

Principal #15 is a thirty-six year old male in his first year as principal after having taught at this school for nine years. There are one hundred and sixty-nine students enrolled, nine full-time staff members employed, and the principal's position involves full-time administration. He holds a Bachelor's degree, with no additional qualifications in educational administration. During the 1980-81 school year he was involved in inservice programs that totalled fourteen and a half days in length. Of this, twelve days were spent at a summer leadership course for principals immediately prior to commencing his principalship.

Inservice for Principals

Being in his first weeks of principalship, Principal #15 currently sees all areas of administration as areas of concern. Two of his inservice

involvements prior to taking up his appointment had been self-initiated, whilst the third involvement had been at someone else's recommendation.

Inservice areas involving the development of technical skills were seen as being most applicable at the local level, while the more universal human relations field and the area of conceptual ability were best considered at University level. Workshops were considered to be the most preferred personal learning format for all three areas of concern as this principal felt that he learnt best in a 'hands on' situation where the conference was longer in duration than one day. The competence of the presenter and the quality of the presentation were also mentioned as being of importance. A preference for summer inservice opportunities was indicated because of the time available during vacation time to provide a program of sufficient length to meet the needs of participants. It was also felt that such programs are more accessible to more principals when held during summer when the pressures of school demands on the principal's time have been removed.

A personal philosophy of staff involvement in decision-making and shared responsibility led to the preference that inservice participation should involve all staff members involved in that specific area.

Difficulty was experienced in analysing whether or not current inservice needs were being met. Although he could see that his needs were many, there was a lack of ongoing planned inservice support. However, it was felt that as a need arose he would seek help from fellow principals locally or from the superintendent and that help would be available. Specific reference was made to teacher evaluation. He had been evaluated as a teacher, but had not really considered the process from the evaluation point of view, so considered that he would have to

seek considerable advice before meeting his obligations in this area.

It was considered that there was an on-going need for awareness in the areas that were teacher-responsibilities and therefore his need for programs such as curriculum development were not greatly different now as a principal to what they were last year as a teacher. Lack of previous awareness of the duties of a principal were mentioned and this area is now seen as being of prime importance. Specifically, the areas of finance, human relations and politics were seen as requiring urgent consideration, while at the same time an awareness of the educational program in the junior grades, where he had no previous experience, was considered as having a high personal priority.

Future needs were seen as combining both academic study and job-related programs and the responsibility for professional development is seen as being a personal matter for each individual principal. Administration, teacher evaluation and programs were seen as future needs areas.

Professional journals had not been considered at this stage, but some interest was expressed along with the need for a descriptive list of the relevant journals that are available.

Most Important Points

1. The inservice support needs of a newly-appointed, inexperienced principal involve many areas of school administration, but there does not seem to be a structured support program available.
2. The local relevance of inservice needs is particularly pertinent in the case of a newly appointed principal.
3. Certain inservice involvements as a teacher were also of use to the

3. (cont'd:)

principal, but there were additional specific needs as a principal that had not been considered as a teacher.

4. Consideration of professional journals could be facilitated through the provision of a descriptive list of the journals available.

PRINCIPAL #16

Introduction

Principal #16 is a thirty-five year old female who has been principal of this school for six years of her seventeen years teaching experience. At her present school there are one hundred and sixty-five students and eleven staff members and this position involves half-time administration and half-time teaching as the school's resource teacher. Her highest qualification is a Master's degree and during the 1980-81 school year she was involved in inservice programs that totalled seven days in length, not including divisional principals' meetings.

Inservice for Principals

Principal #16 indicated 'low importance' in her questionnaire answers 6.a.7, 6.a.9 and 6.e.4. She explained that these three areas involving French programs, the use of computers and office filing systems were being adequately handled in her school by competent staff and she therefore saw no immediate need for her further concern, nor was there a need to raise her own personal level of proficiency. She did feel that her current perceived level of importance of these specific areas could change in time through reasons such as change in staff or program modification. The immediacy of inservice needs of principals was a relevant issue.

The role of the local Principals' Council was mentioned with reference to both professional development programs for principals and routine organizational matters on a division-wide basis, such as levels of staffing and the allocation of additional staff for areas of special need. This group was seen as playing an effective role in these areas, with even greater significance in coming months because of modifications to the principals' professional development program, based on previous experiences.

Having been appointed principal when a classroom teacher at the same school this principal had not held administrative positions elsewhere, nor had she been involved in any administrative studies. The opportunity to apply for the present position had arisen unexpectedly and she had applied for the position without having had previous ambitions to be an administrator. Since her appointment she has not been involved in any administrative inservice programs, nor does she plan to undertake degree-oriented studies in educational administration in the future. Inservice development involvement has been, and continues to be, essentially curriculum oriented. This was further reflected in a suggestion that there would be a willingness to be involved in short-term, non-credit courses such as curriculum development on four consecutive Thursdays, or something similar. It was thought that the local Board would be supportive of such a scheme.

It was felt that inservice needs had changed since appointment as principal. Initial problems in administrative areas such as budgeting and estimates had been overcome by calling upon a variety of sources for assistance. There had been no specific inservice support available during her earliest stages of principalship. The principal felt as though she

had been on her own to work out her own problems.

Professional development of principals was seen as being a shared responsibility. It was a personal responsibility both on a formal and informal basis, but the local principals' council, the superintendent and the provincial association of principals were all seen as having an important part to play in providing inservice opportunities.

Professional journals have been used in the past, but there was a greater need now for journals with a specifically Canadian content and the principal was not aware of the availability of any that would be useful.

Divisional principals' meetings were considered to be a good place for professional development of principals, and this was being done, by alternating administrative meetings with professional awareness meetings, so that there was one of each every four weeks, with meetings two weeks apart. In addition to this, the local principals' council also planned conferences that provided valuable input, and the provincial association also provided inservice opportunities. It was felt that a continuation of such involvement opportunities would adequately meet future inservice needs.

Most Important Points

1. The perceived "level of importance" of needs areas is strongly influenced by the perceived competence of the school staff involved in those areas.
2. An effective local principals' council is able to provide relevant inservice opportunities.
3. A heavy teaching load for this principal is also associated with a perceived high need level for curriculum-oriented inservice involvement.

4. The responsibility for the professional development of principals is a shared responsibility, with an emphasis on local relevance.

PRINCIPAL #17

Introduction

Principal #17 is a thirty-four year old male who has been principal of this school for ten years of his thirteen years teaching experience. At his present school there are two hundred and thirty students and fourteen staff members and his position involves eighty-two percent administration and eighteen percent teaching. He has a Bachelor's degree and is currently involved in study at the Pre-Master's level in Educational Administration. During the 1980-81 school year he was involved in two major inservice programs that totalled five days in length, plus several other unrecorded programs of one day or less.

Inservice for Principals

Principal #17 sees the University as playing an extremely important role in developing the skills and attitudes necessary for effective principalship. He suggests that the University should be able to provide the broad base of general skills needed, with the school division then providing opportunities for the development of skills specific to that area. It was recommended that school divisions should insist that administrators have taken the appropriate courses prior to appointment.

The workshop method was particularly praised for the development of technical skills, while it was felt that a lecture format where participants could move away from their immediate school environment was most appropriate for the development of human relations skills.

The use of support personnel in your own school was criticized as being ineffective as these people rapidly lost their credibility, except in situations such as calling in the divisional treasurer when help was needed to overcome a budget problem. The School Board did not support attendance at programs concerned with human relations development as it felt that this was a waste of time. The Board tended to favour program attendance where outcomes were more tangible - e.g., developments in a maths program. It was suggested that the School Board's attitude towards human relations programs was based upon narrow community considerations and experiences, rather than upon a consideration of what was educationally desirable.

This principal felt that his inservice needs were not really being met. The programs that he would like to attend are offered, but the School Board is hesitant to fund attendance, particularly if the program is a national or international program involving greater expense. Two programs totalling five days in length had been attended in the previous school year and applications had been made for two others, both of which were refused by the School Board.

The principal referred to "being alone" in the position and therefore felt that there was a definite need for a 're-cycling' after a number of years. Personal changes in philosophy were also seen as creating needs for professional development, and he referred to the fact that his own children attended his school and provided a source of personal feedback that made him reconsider his approach and seek alternatives.

Currently working at the pre-Master's level, coursework had been commenced initially to upgrade qualifications, but attendance is now considered to be more than that. He is now attending because he is

interested in the courses, likes what is happening and feels that he will be able to make changes within his school because he has been able to 're-think' certain attitudes.

A recent School Board decision to refuse the application of a newly appointed principal to attend a principals' training seminar was mentioned and criticized. It was felt that support of this nature early in the principal's career was extremely important.

Principals were seen as having personal responsibility for their own inservice, but the superintendent is also seen as being the one to 'push' the principal in certain directions if it is felt that the principal needs upgrading in that particular field. The School Board was also seen as having an obligation to ask the superintendent to categorize the inservice programs offered and recommend to it the names of principals who should be offered the opportunity to attend.

Some professional journals were considered to be extremely good for maintaining a level of awareness. Of the two journals referred to by the principal, the Canadian journal was favoured above the U.S. journal because of its greater relevance to Canadian schools.

For future development in principal inservice programs, the desire is for programs where principals are taught to work with teachers in the classroom in a supportive way and to build the team spirit in the school.

Most Important Points

1. The University is seen as playing an important role in developing the skills and attitudes necessary for effective principalship.
2. School Board determination of inservice attendance denies needed involvement.

its function. At the same time he had a personal desire to succeed at his new job and wanted to prove to himself that he was able to do so. He found that when first appointed principal his time was taken up to a great degree by school matters, both during recognized school hours and outside of normal hours. His personal commitment to his duties and the deep concern he felt for his role and for his staff and students meant that he tended to react quickly to situations that arose in an attempt to bring the situation back to normal as soon as possible. He has found that this was not necessarily the best method of operation and, during his principalship, has changed his attitude and his reaction to problem situations. Linked with this has also been a reduction in the amount of time spent on school matters, while more time is spent on family and personal concerns.

Current preference is for job-related professional development programs only and no interest was shown in programs of an academic nature. Workshops were the preferred format for programs.

Responsibility for professional development programs was seen as being a shared responsibility. It was felt that the school board was supportive of professional development programs and had a role to play in ensuring that principals did have access to programs. The vice-principal of the school was also mentioned as being a key person in supporting the concept of professional development for principals to enable the principal to be away with minimum disruption to the school's routine.

Particular emphasis was given to the importance of beating isolation through communication, and professional development programs were seen as being valuable opportunities to overcome isolation. An example of

3. Changing personal philosophy over time requires inservice involvement, particularly as there is a feeling of 'being alone' in the job.
4. Professional journals are of value.
5. A need is seen for future programs that develop teacher-support skills in principals.

PRINCIPAL #19

Introduction

Principal #19 is a thirty-six year old male who has been a principal for the past six years of a total teaching experience of seven years. The current enrolment at his school is in excess of six hundred students and his position involves full-time administration. He holds a Bachelor's degree and indicated that he attended inservice programs totalling seventeen days in the 1980-81 school year.

Inservice for Principals

This principal indicated that he had become very selective in his choice of inservice involvements and for this reason could say that he found them most helpful. It was also indicated that, on first being appointed principal, programs did not have much meaning and did not clarify things for him at all. Since that time he has been able to relate the program content to his experience as a principal and has found that program content now has far more meaning for him.

He detects a definite change in his professional development needs from first appointment to the present. Original concerns were partly administrative and operational in learning about the organization and

such benefits concerned attendance at a summer residential professional development program where he had met principals of schools in nearby communities for the first time. There is now a follow-up to this meeting and those principals plan to form a local common interest group for mutual support.

Professional journals were seen as being useful both for administrative information and to find articles that may be passed on to teachers to assist in their professional development.

Professional development programs were seen as being useful and time used in attending programs was considered to have been used in a worthwhile manner. The school board supported professional development involvement and did not find obstacles that prevented attendance. The only problem concerned the amount of travel involved, as this school is located in a relatively isolated area several hundred kilometers from Winnipeg.

Future needs were seen as being broadly in most aspects of education as it was felt that there is an on-going need for the principal to maintain a level of personal awareness, plus be able to conduct staff development programs for the benefit of teachers and students. A distant future possibility of career change is considered, but this would not be for some time and does not influence current professional development needs.

Most Important Points

1. Experience added a new dimension of meaning to inservice program content.
2. Needs had changed from those related to operation and role-definition, to maintaining a level of awareness of educational programs.

3. Responsibility for professional development seen as being shared.
4. Professional development seen as valuable means of overcoming isolation through communication.
5. Professional journals were considered useful.
6. Staff development programs were an on-going area of need.

PRINCIPAL #20

Introduction

Principal #20 is a thirty-one year old male who has been a principal for the past two years of his thirteen years teaching experience. At his present school there are one hundred and seven students and six staff members. His position involves administrative duties for fifteen percent of his time and teaching duties for eighty-five percent of his time. He holds a Bachelor's degree and reports that he attended inservice programs totalling seven days in length during the 1980-81 school year.

Inservice for Principals

It was felt that professional development programs came close to meeting current needs, but there were gaps in specific areas where he felt that more could be available. Being in a small country school, there was a need for opportunities to develop skills concerning staff relations and public relations. School/community relations were particularly stressed as being an area of concern in which few professional development programs were available.

There had been a perceived change in needs since appointment as principal. Initially, areas of concern had been mainly related to administrative tasks, with budgeting processes and awareness and operation

of divisional policy being the most pressing problems. Other areas that were now of greatest concern were those related to the management of staff and students, with evaluation procedures causing most concern. The Public Schools' Act was a continuing area of concern, but meetings arranged by a field representative to examine the document were gradually overcoming this problem.

Strong preference was expressed for the workshop style of conference where actual experiences and opportunities to hear from fellow principals were provided. The informal communication with other principals at conferences and meetings were considered to be a most useful ancillary benefit of such sessions.

Responsibility for the inservice of principals was considered to be widely shared between professional association, school division, education department and the individual principal. Particular reference was made to exercises involving familiarization with divisional policies and the law as it related to schools. These areas were considered to be of widespread interest and therefore it was the responsibility of an appropriate organization to provide opportunities for principals to participate in awareness sessions.

Professional journals had been found a useful source of information, not merely on a basis of general awareness, but because certain articles related specifically to matters of interest or concern within his school. One particular journal was mentioned and reference was made to articles contained in a recent issue concerning contract termination, strike issues and teacher concerns.

Most professional development programs were considered to be worth-

while, although there were some that he did not like to attend. In some cases, even though he would have preferred not to attend, he felt that he had an obligation to participate in the identification and acceptance of divisional goals for his own information and for the benefit of his school.

Future needs were seen as being related to human relations areas. Top priorities were given to staff management and staff relations, teacher evaluation and public relations. It was felt that current needs were totally job-related, with no academic studies planned.

Most Important Points

1. Human relations areas were considered to be the areas of greatest need.
2. Needs had changed from administrative and operational to teacher management and public relations.
3. Workshops and opportunities for informal contact with fellow principals were considered most useful.
4. Professional journals were found to be useful.
5. Divisional loyalty at times overshadowed individual choice in attendance at inservice programs.

Respondent Interviews Summary

Eighteen respondents were interviewed in depth, ten during personal visits to their school and eight by telephone. The principals responded to a series of questions posed by the interviewer (see Appendix C), plus added incidental comments and further details relating to inservice programs for principals.

An analysis of the most important points recorded in summary of the interviews with the principals provides some pertinent descriptive data related to many aspects of professional development.

Most principals identified a change in needs from when first appointed to those identified as being current needs. The needs related to the first year of experience were generally operations/administration, with the following being specifically mentioned: curriculum and general administrative awareness, organization and community relations, operations and public relations, system familiarization, budgeting, basic skills and relationships and role definition. Needs related to the following areas are considered to be currently in need of professional development support: teacher evaluation, staff development, staff supervision, teacher observation techniques, time management, group dynamics, budget, instructional leadership, human relations, stimulus and challenge, teacher support skills and maintaining a level of educational awareness.

There were also strong indications that

- local or individual needs identification exercises are seen as important,
- professional development programs for principals are a shared responsibility,
- professional journals are useful,
- early career support for beginning principals is needed,

- informal interaction with fellow principals is considered useful,
- divisional principals' meetings are considered useful for considering matters of local relevance.

These points rated mentions from several principals, so are considered the most significant points in the interview summaries.

Table 17: Identified Needs Related to Divisional Opportunities, further summarizes the current needs identified by the principals during the interviews and lists the needs according to geographic groups, with the programs offered by the division listed opposite. The 'Divisional Inservice Opportunity' listing reflects information obtained from divisional offices concerning the programs offered by the division for principals within the division and does not include some programs that may have been organized by regional groups or local principals' groups.

The information included in Table 16 indicates that some programs are organized within divisions in order to meet the inservice needs of principals, but there are some divisions in which no programs are available at the local level, despite the needs of principals.

Table 17
Identified Needs Related to Divisional
Inservice Opportunities

<u>Needs Identified by Respondents (1)</u>	<u>Divisional Inservice Opportunities (2)</u>
<u>Group #1.</u> Teacher Evaluation Public Relations Educational Program Staff Development	No Divisional Programs Organized - Opportunities for Principals to attend Programs elsewhere.
<u>Group #2</u> Teacher Supervision Programming Methodology Human Relationships Team-building Skills Interviewing Skills	No overall program - Conference Examined Teacher Evaluation and Professional Development
<u>Group #3</u> Teacher Observation Techniques Teacher Evaluation	No divisional programs offered
<u>Group #4</u> Staff Development Teacher Supervision Group Dynamics Budget Procedures Instructional Leadership	Conference: "Influences on Student Behaviour" - Considered Impact of Nutrition, Family, Technology and Teacher on Students
<u>Group #5</u> Budget Procedures Administrative procedures	No Divisional Programs Offered, but cooperative involvement with nearby divisions
<u>Group #6</u> Stimulus and Challenge Re-Design of Inservice Programs	No Divisional Programs offered
<u>Group #7</u> Curriculum Philosophy and Implementation Challenge and Stimulus Preparing for future change Administration	Two Conferences held: "Adventures in Attitudes", involving group dynamics, human relationships and communications. "Organizational Development Laboratory" concerning management styles.
<u>Group #8</u> General Awareness Programs School/Community Relations Staff Relations	No Divisional Programs offered

(1) The needs identified here are those that were mentioned by the respondents during the interviews as being current needs.

(2) The opportunities listed are those reported by the divisional offices.

INTERVIEW DATA: SPONSORING AGENCIES

Manitoba Teachers' Society

The Professional Staff Development Officer of the Society provided the following information during an interview:

The MTS plays a dual role in the provision of inservice opportunities for principals. In some instances MTS, through its Professional Development committee, is an initiator of programs and plays a key role in planning and implementing the program. In other cases, MTS assists a planning group by providing support services or resource personnel.

Some examples for the 1980-81 school year were:

1. "Professional Development for Principals" - a conference held on October 16-17, 1980, at the Holiday Inn, downtown Winnipeg.

This conference was sponsored by the Manitoba Teachers' Society and The Manitoba Association of Principals. The conference featured:

- Development of Leadership Skills
- The Principal and Teacher Evaluation
- The Principal's Role in P.D. for Staff
- Small "P" Politics and the Principal
- Role of Principal in Curriculum Development
- Development of Consultative Skills.

This conference was planned and implemented by the Manitoba Association of Principals with the Manitoba Teachers' Society providing support services and resource personnel.

2. Principals' Leadership Course, July 6-17, 1981, held at Elk Horn Ranch, Clear Lake, Manitoba.

This conference was organized cooperatively by the Manitoba Teachers' Society, The Manitoba Association of Principals,

The Manitoba Association of School Trustees, The Manitoba Department of Education, The Manitoba Association of School Superintendents and the Faculty of Education at the University of Manitoba. The Professional Development Committee of MTS initiated this conference and MTS provided support services and resource personnel.

In addition to these major conferences, the MTS is also involved at times in conferences organized on a School Division or Regional basis. An example of regional involvement would be with the S.W.A.P. group (South West Association of Principals) in which principals in the southwestern part of the province organize conferences to examine matters of mutual concern. The EASTMAN group, NORTHERN group and PARKLANDS group provide similar regional-based opportunities, while the EFM group enables principals of French language schools to meet. In each of these cases the service is initiated by the group involved with MTS providing support services and resource personnel.

The Education Department of Manitoba

An officer in the Program Development and Support Services Division was interviewed to determine the role played by the Manitoba Department of Education in the professional development of principals. This is a report of that interview.

The Education Department plays a support role in helping other agencies with either finance or manpower or both. During 1980-81, there were no inservice opportunities for principals conceived, planned and implemented by the Education Department, but the Department assisted school

divisions and professional groups in providing inservice opportunities for teachers. Whether or not these were applicable to the needs of principals depended on the individual division or organization and its perception of current needs.

An exception to this general policy was the provision of a number of inservice opportunities for the staff of small schools by the Education Department, intended to overcome the problems of isolation and remoteness in program development. These opportunities however, were essentially curriculum-oriented as the principals involved were committed to a teaching load in addition to their supervisory/administrative roles. There was no provision for a program component aimed explicitly at the principal as an administrator.

School Division

The geographic grouping of the respondents resulted in eight school divisions being identified and subsequently contacted to determine if any professional development programs designed specifically for principals had been initiated by the divisional office and held within that division during 1980-81.

The results of this survey are included in Table 17: Identified Needs Related to Divisional Inservice Opportunities.

Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba

The Department of Educational Administration and Foundations is involved in providing inservice programs for principals. The role played by this department involves either assistance in planning and implementing a program, or providing resource personnel to assist a group of principals to achieve their own inservice goals.

An example of the former role was the involvement of the department in the planning and implementing of a recent residential summer course for principals. The department cooperated with the Manitoba Teachers' Society in planning and implementing the course, plus provided resource personnel during the conference.

Essentially the department does not provide a structural continuing program for the inservice support of principals, but it reacts to requests from groups of principals or program organizers to provide the input that is sought.

Sponsorship Summary

Each sponsoring agency has indicated that it plays an essentially supportive role in the professional development of principals. The sponsoring agencies generally respond to local initiatives by groups of principals to provide either support or resource personnel or both. In some instances, programs are agency-initiated, as in the case of programs for principals in isolated areas sponsored by the Education Department.

In many cases, the inservice program is not initiated and implemented solely by the one agency, but is a cooperative exercise with several agencies providing either support or personnel input.

The major program opportunities available to principals during the 1980-81 school year and sponsored by the central agencies presented a variety of topics for the consideration of principals. In some instances, topics of a similar nature were included in more than one program, while other topics were considered only once. (See Table 18). An analysis of the topics included in the three conferences shows that there were twenty-seven identifiable topic areas. Of this number, twelve of the

Table 18
Program Opportunities 1980-81

Need Level	Staff Development for Principals, Oct. 16-17	Annual Conference February 18-20	Leadership Course July 6-17
1.16	Development of Leadership Skills		
1.49	The Principal and Teacher Evaluation		Teacher Evaluation
.93	The Principal's Role in P.D. for Staff		Principal and Staff Development
.46	Small 'P' Politics and the Principal	The Political Circumstances of the Principalship	
1.43 (1.59)	Role of the Principal	New trends in Physical Education Administration Implementation	Curricular Change Curricular Evaluation
N.A. (1)	Development of Consultative Skills		
N.A.		Team Management	
.63			Working with Staff: Group dynamics
1.45			Working with Staff: Conflict situation
.76			Working with Parents: Committees and Interest Groups
.47			Principal and Public Relations
2.20			Micro Computers in Schools
N.A.			New School Finance Package
.52			Dealing with Mid- life Crisis
N.A.			Survival Skills
.72		Evaluation of Administrator	Principal Evaluation
N.A.		Native Awareness	
N.A.		Juvenile Justice	
.49		Student Evaluation	
1.13		Drug Abuse and Adolescents	
.80		Supervision and the Cooperating Teacher	
1.26		Teacher Motivation	
1.13		Adolescent Suicide	
N.A.		Improving the Service (Correspondence)	
N.A.		Retirement and Career Changes	
1.03		Alternate careers	

(1) N.A.: Need level rating not available for this item.

topic areas may be identified in the first fifty percent of the need areas identified in this study, while seven of the topic areas may be identified in the lower fifty percent of the need areas in this study. (See Table 10). The other eight topic areas included in the three conferences did not emerge in this study as being areas of inservice need.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter the questionnaire data and the interview data from principals and sponsoring agencies has been presented.

The questionnaire data was presented in five segments - an overview of information regarding the respondents, details of the attendance of respondents at inservice programs during 1980-81, data related to the needs identification section of the questionnaire, data related to the preferred mode of delivery segment of the questionnaire and, finally, comments recorded on the questionnaires by the respondents.

Interview data was presented in two parts. First, the interview reports of the eighteen respondents are presented in detail, then an account of the role of each of the sponsoring agencies is presented. The topical content of the programs provided by the sponsoring agencies during the 1980-81 is examined and related to the need level of the topic areas identified in the questionnaire data.

CHAPTER 5

Analysis of the Data

Introduction

In this chapter the data presented in the previous chapter is analysed and used to determine answers to the questions posed at the commencement of this study:

- 1) What are the current inservice needs of elementary school principals?
- 2) What are the levels of those inservice needs?
- 3) What are the preferred delivery systems for programs involving
 - technical skills and knowledge
 - human relations skills and knowledge
 - conceptual abilities?
- 4) What other factors does a principal take into consideration when deciding on inservice attendance?
- 5) Are the inservice program needs and delivery system preferences influenced by the number of years experience as a principal?
- 6) Are inservice program needs and delivery system preferences influenced by the geographic location of principals in either urban or rural areas?
- 7) What are the inservice opportunities available to principals?

The answers to these questions then provide the framework for the answer to the central study problem:

Do the inservice provisions for elementary school principals in Manitoba meet the perceived needs of those principals and are the delivery systems those which the principals prefer?

The answer to that question is presented in this chapter following the consideration of the seven sub-problems.

Research Question #1: What Are The Current Inservice Needs of
Elementary School Principals?

The questionnaire data and the interview data clearly identified the current inservice need areas of the respondents.

Questionnaire data enabled the structure of a rank order list of importance for the items within each of the six categories used (see Table 9). The order of importance refers to the level of importance of each item as perceived by the respondents, presented in rank order of preference. These rank order lists indicate that the two most important areas in need of inservice support within the category of curriculum instruction are

- a) implementation of programs
- and b) program planning.

Within the category of working with staff, the most important items are

- a) staff motivation
- b) effective staff meetings
- and c) interviewing and selecting staff.

For the category entitled working with students, the most important items are

- a) communicating with students
- and b) discipline.

The items considered most important within the category working with the community are

- a) public relations
- and b) contact with other schools.

For the category entitled operations, the most important items identified are

- a) long-range planning
- and b) administrative accountability,

while the following items are identified as the most important within

the category labelled personal concerns:

- a) leadership techniques
- and b) adjusting to personal stress.

Interview data also revealed a series of current need areas. The twelve need areas highlighted by the principals during the interviews included four related to working with staff, seven related to personal concerns and one related to operations. When these need areas were related to the need area statistics obtained from the interviews, it was apparent that the majority of them also rated high in the importance level rating, although they ranged from fourth to fifty-third position on the need level composite list. (See Table 19).

The one item that stands out clearly as being in need of inservice support is 'Leadership techniques' which was identified during the interview phase and also emerged in the questionnaire data as being the most important item in the category of personal concerns, plus the item with the highest need level score for that category.

Answer to research question #1. The current inservice needs for the principals involved in the study are programs related to the twenty-three items identified by the statistics and during the course of the interviews as being in need of attention, and as being of importance to the principal. Those items, in order of need level identified in this study, are: teacher evaluation, group dynamics (conflict resolution), staff motivation, program planning, interviewing and selecting staff, leadership techniques, teacher observation techniques, long-range planning, discipline, time management. implementation of programs, staff development, maintaining educational awareness (self-awareness and assessment), staff supervision, communicating

Table 19

Inservice Need Areas Identified in Interviews Related to
Questionnaire Statistical Data

Need Area from Interviewer	Importance Rating	Need Level Score	Need Level Position in 59 items
Teacher evaluation	4th in 13	1.59	4
Group Dynamics (Conflict Resolution) (1)	6th in 13	1.45	6
Instructional Leadership	1st in 15	1.16	13
Teacher Observation Techniques	8th in 13	1.13	14
Time Management	5th in 15	1.01	20
Staff Development	5th in 13	.93	24
Stimulus and Challenge, and Main- taining Educational Awareness (Self-awareness and Assessment)	4th in 15	.84	26
Staff supervision	5th in 15	.80	29
Teacher support skills (Counselling)	6th in 15	.52	45
Human Relations	3rd in 15	.47	49
Budget	6th in 13	.38	53

(1) the most closely-related item used in the questionnaire.

with students, administrative accountability, effective staff meetings, adjusting to personal stress, teacher support skills (counselling), human relations, public relations, budget and contact with other schools.

Research Question #2: What are the levels of those inservice needs?

To establish the level of inservice need in this study, the questionnaire results indicating mean current ability level were subtracted from the mean desired level of proficiency reading. (See Table 10).

The range of readings was from a low of .07 to a high of 2.20, with half of the items rating a level of .08 or higher. The mean need level figure is .85, with the twenty-three items identified as the current inservice needs of the respondents ranging from .07 to 1.59. (See Table 20).

Table 20
Current Inservice Needs of the Respondents Indicating
Level of Need

Item (1)	Level of Need
Teacher evaluation	1.59
Group dynamics (conflict resolution)	1.45
Staff motivation	1.26
Program planning	1.20
Interviewing and selecting staff	1.18
Leadership techniques	1.16
Teacher observation techniques	1.13
Long-range planning	1.04
Discipline	1.02
Time Management	1.01
Implementation of programs	.98
Staff development	.93
Stimulus and Challenge, and Maintaining Educational Awareness (Self-awareness and assessment)	.84
Staff supervision	.80
Communicating with students	.78
Administrative accountability	.73
Effective staff meetings	.61
Adjusting to personal stress	.52
Teacher support skills (counselling)	.52
Human Relations	.47
Public Relations	.47
Budget	.38
Contact with other schools	.07

(1) A composite list of items identified in the questionnaire plus items identified during interviews with the respondents.

On the need level scale a maximum need reading would be 5.00, whilst the minimum reading would be zero. Ideally, inservice programs would reduce the need level reading towards zero.

Answer to Research Question #2

The need levels of the twenty-three items identified as the major areas of inservice need have been identified by calculating the difference between the desired level of proficiency and the current level of ability of the respondents. As the principals specifically pointed to these twenty-three items as being important to them, all of the items should be viewed as worthy of attention, with the items rated numerically highest as requiring the heaviest program commitment.

Answers to Question #1 and #2 Amalgamated

Research question #1 identified the major inservice need items that were revealed by the questionnaire data and the inservice need items that were highlighted during the interviews (See Table 19). These two groups of items were then integrated to establish a list of twenty-three priority inservice items that are the current inservice needs of principals (see Table 20).

While the answer to research question #1 was based on the needs of principals according to their perception of what was most important to them, the answer to research question #2 is based on the statistical results of the questionnaire. The items may now be considered with regard to both 'Level of Importance' as perceived by the principals and 'Need Level' as shown by the statistics.

If the twenty three items are now considered in terms of high or low need level and high or low importance level, twelve of the items

can now be seen to be of both high need and high importance, while nine items are of high importance, but low need and two items of low importance and high need. (See Table 21).

Clearly, the 'high importance/high need' items are the highest priority items requiring inservice support.

Table 21

Current Inservice Needs of Respondents According to 'Level of Importance' and 'Need Level' Ratings

<p><u>High Importance (1)</u> <u>High Need (2)</u></p> <p>Staff evaluation Staff Motivation Program planning Interviewing and Selecting Staff Leadership techniques Long-range planning Discipline Time management Implementation of Programs Staff development Stimulus/challenge (Self-awareness) Staff supervision</p>	<p><u>High Importance</u> <u>Low Need</u></p> <p>Communicating with students Administrative accountability Effective staff meetings Adjusting to Personal Stress Teacher Support Skills (Counselling) Human relations Public relations Budget Contact with other schools</p>
<p><u>Low Importance</u> <u>High Need</u></p> <p>Group dynamics (conflict resolution) Teacher observation technique</p>	<p><u>Low Importance</u> <u>Low Need</u></p>

- (1) High or Low Importance was established by relating each inservice item to the rank order of importance given to that item within its particular category in Table 9. Items ranked in the first half for that category were considered 'High Importance'. Items ranked in the lowest half of the rankings for that category were considered 'Low Importance'.
- (2) The mean 'Need Level' for the fifty-nine items in this study was .80. Items listed in Table 21 rated 'High Need' if they showed a 'Need Level' of .80 or higher. Items showing a statistical 'Need Level' of less than .80 were considered 'Low Need' items.

Research Question #3: What are the Preferred Delivery Systems?

Six delivery variables were considered in this study in relation to the three broad program categorizations of technical skills and knowledge, human relations skills and knowledge and conceptual abilities.

Sponsorship. The principals indicated a clear preference for local involvement and local relevance in their interviews and this was also proven in the questionnaire statistics. First choice for sponsorship in two of the three categories went to school division, while the Principals' Association was first choice in the other category.

For programs involving the development of technical skills and knowledge, the principals ranked their sponsorship preference as

1. School division
2. Principals' association
3. University Education Faculty
4. Education Department
5. Regional Group.

Rankings of the central sponsoring agencies for this item are second, third and fourth, with the local school division ranking first. Surprisingly, the regional group ranked fifth, well below school division even though the regional group must also be considered a local group.

For programs involving the development of human relations skills and knowledge, the principals ranked their sponsorship preferences as

1. Principals' Association
2. University Education Faculty
3. School division
4. Regional group
5. Education department.

Once again, interview data supported the rank order preference shown here as principals indicated a preference for human relations programs to be conducted away from their immediate environment. The universal nature of the skills involved and the level of advisory expertise required for

such programs also helps to explain the grouping of two central agencies as first and second whilst the local agencies ranked third and fourth.

For programs involving the development of conceptual abilities, the principals ranked their sponsorship preferences as

1. School division
2. Education Department
3. Principals' Association
4. University Education Faculty
5. Regional group.

Although essentially a local involvement preference, there is no concise choice pattern which could indicate that principals consider conceptual abilities as best developed by the most applicable agency, depending on the nature of the conceptual material.

Sponsorship preferences generally indicated a need for local relevance, although it is noteworthy that sponsorship by the regional group ranked low in all three categories. Whether this is because such groups do not exist in all divisions and may therefore have rated low in their absence or whether principals see such groups as industrial or administrative rather than professional is not made clear in the data.

Format. The principals are most decisive on both their preferences and their dislikes regarding program format. A workshop format is clearly the most preferred as it ranks first in each category, while observation visits to another school ranked next highest common choice in all three categories.

For programs involving the development of technical skills and knowledge, the format preference is

1. Workshop
2. Observation visit to another school
3. Lecture
4. Professional reading
5. Support Personnel in your school

6. Course for credit
7. Travel.

The first and second preferences indicate the desire for a practical relevance of the inservice program, a feeling that was also expressed during interviews when the question of basic skills was raised.

For programs involving the development of human relations skills and knowledge, the format preference is

1. Workshop
2. Lecture
3. Observation visit to another school
4. (equal) Professional reading
Course for credit
5. Support personnel in your school
6. Travel.

Again, practical relevance is indicated in two of the three top preferences, with second preference of a lecture format recognizing a need for theoretical input for this topic.

For programs involving the development of conceptual abilities, the format preference is

1. Workshop
2. Observation visit to another school
3. Professional reading
4. Course for credit
5. Lecture
6. (equal) Travel
Support personnel in your school.

Perhaps surprisingly, the demand for a local practical approach has also emerged for this topic, relegating other seemingly applicable formats to low preference ratings.

Of particular note regarding format were the obvious preference for workshops or observation visits to another school, while travel and support personnel rated consistently low. Interview data also highlighted the preference for local relevance in programs and the practical orientation

of program material, and mention was also made of the questionable effect of support personnel within schools. Also of interest is the creditable rating of professional reading at fourth, fourth and third preferences respectively. This was also supported by interview data where it was found that principals considered professional journals to be useful, in contrast to some of the claims of other researchers reported in the review of literature as finding professional reading programs of little value in professional development.

Duration. Principals clearly indicated that inservice programs should be of short duration, rating two-days as the best time in two categories and one day or less the best time in the third category. Programs of two weeks duration or longer were considered the least preference in all three categories.

For programs involving the development of technical skills and knowledge, the duration preference is

1. One day or less
2. Two days
3. Up to one week
4. Regular sessions for one term
5. Two weeks
6. Longer than two weeks.

The preference is clearly for shorter programs in this category, despite the suggestion during interviews that programs involving technical skills should be of sufficient length to enable the principal to receive the input and practise the skills before returning to use the skills at school.

For programs involving the development of human relations skills and knowledge, the duration preference is

1. Two days
2. Up to one week
3. Regular sessions for a term

4. One day or less
5. Longer than two weeks
6. Two weeks.

The preference for brief programs is still indicated in this category, although not as conclusively as in the previous category. Programs of two weeks duration or longer are grouped as least preferred, implying that the shorter programs are preferred.

For programs involving conceptual abilities, the duration preference is

1. Two days
2. Up to one week
3. (equal) One day or less
Regular sessions for a term
4. (equal) Two weeks
Longer than two weeks.

Preference is clearly given once again to the shorter duration, although minor preferences are more diffuse. Once again, programs of two weeks duration or longer are least preferred.

It is significant that, in all three categories, programs of two weeks duration or longer were the least preferred. Interview data produced implications concerning the time away from school when attending inservice programs and personal concerns such as family commitments that tended to make the principal avoid longer commitments.

Although the indisputable first preference is for programs of two days or less for all three categories, it is also noteworthy that regular sessions for a term rated fourth, third and third preference respectively, making this duration the one that is most preferred after two days or less. Location. There is a distinct division in location preference according to the type of skill under consideration.

For programs involving the development of technical skills and knowledge, the location preference is

1. At another school
2. Within your school
3. A convention centre
4. University.

Preferences one and two indicate a closely job-related local venue, while choices three and four suggest that locations away from the work environment are least preferred.

For programs involving the development of human relations skills and knowledge, the location preference is

1. University
2. A convention centre
3. At another school
4. Within your school.

The clear preference for programs involved in attaining human relations skills is a venue remote from the actual work situation as the first and second preferences went to such locations, while local venues were grouped in the lowest ranking positions.

For programs involving the development of conceptual abilities, the location preference is

1. University
2. At another school
3. Within your school
4. A convention centre.

Although not definitely polarized, these rankings suggest a need for conceptual ability programs to be held at venues other than the immediate work environment.

The respondents indicated a preference for local, job-related venues for programs dealing with technical skills and knowledge. For programs dealing with either human relations skills and knowledge or conceptual abilities, the respondents preferred venues that were more remote from the immediate work environment.

Time of Year. First preferences for inservice programs were common to all

three areas under consideration with only one variation in the minor preferences in all three categories.

For programs involving the development of technical skills and knowledge, the time of year preference is

1. Fall
2. Winter
3. Spring
4. Summer.

The first two preferences suggest a need for programs to be held early in the school year to enable the participants to put their new skills into effect during the current school year.

For programs involving the development of human relations skills and knowledge, the time of year preference is

1. Fall
2. Winter
3. Summer
4. Spring

Again, the preference is given to the early part of the school year for programs involving human relations.

For programs involving the development of conceptual abilities, the time of year preference is

1. Fall
2. Winter
3. Summer
4. Spring

The early part of the school year is again identified as the most preferred time of year, with summer and spring the least preferred time of year.

These results clearly identify the respondents' preference to hold inservice programs involving any topic during the first part of the school year as first preferences for all three areas went to fall and winter. Spring was the least preferred time of year in two of the three categories,

suggesting that principals see programs held at this time of the year as having little effect in their school.

Participation. The respondents indicated a most definite common opinion regarding participation at inservice programs. For all three areas of concern the rank order of participation preference was identical:

1. All staff involved in that area of concern
2. Principals and administrators only
3. Principals only
4. Principals with similar interests only.

It is of interest that principals consider that all staff involved in that area of concern should be involved in programs that develop technical skills and knowledge or human relations skills and knowledge or conceptual skills. This preference suggests that principals may perceive a change in their role as a key figure in the development of personnel and procedures. Instead of acting as the acquirer of new skills and knowledge for his organization, then conducting his own implementation procedures within the school, the principal may see himself more as a key team member and it is the team that needs the original input without the danger of that input being filtered through personal prejudices or being ineffective through lack of personal commitment from those involved in implementation.

Further implications of this common choice include the time factor and the role of the principal as program developer. As there are more demands made upon the time of both teachers and principals, replication of programs may be seen as unnecessarily time consuming, so a single program for all involved is seen as more time efficient than passing on skills to principals, then expecting the principal to conduct training programs for staff members. It is also possible that principals see their role in staff development as being one where they learn and work supportively with the teachers, rather than impose professional development upon the teachers

from a higher bureaucratic level.

The implications of this first choice are of note as they reflect the attitude of principals towards inservice involvement and their perception of their own role as principal.

Also of note in the rank order of preference are the two lowest ranked preferences. At fourth ranking, the participation of principals with similar interests only is seen as least desirable, possibly because of the potentially divisive nature of the category. Similarly, the category of principals only is seen as less desirable, indicating disfavour for situations where principals may be isolated from others that are critically important in the operation of their school - teachers and administrators.

Answer to Research Question #3: The respondents indicated the following preferences for delivery systems.

a) For programs involving the development of technical skills and knowledge

Sponsorship	:	School division
Format	:	Workshop
Duration	:	One day or less
Location	:	At another school
Time of Year	:	Fall
Participation	:	All staff involved in that area of concern

It is apparent that principals desire local relevance and a practical approach involving all staff members in need of developing the skills, with programs held early in the school year to ensure some benefit to the school within the current year.

Sponsorship	:	Principals' Association
Format	:	Workshop
Duration	:	Two days
Location	:	University
Time of Year	:	Fall
Participation	:	All staff involved in that area of concern.

Principals obviously see the area of human relations as being of wider relevance and in need of input from beyond local boundaries, so seek workshops of two days duration where all staff involved in human relations may attend programs held at the university early in the school year.

c) For programs involving the development of conceptual abilities

Sponsorship	:	School division
Format	:	Workshop
Duration	:	Two days
Location	:	University
Time of Year	:	Fall
Participation	:	All staff involved in that area of concern.

It is apparent that principals see required conceptual abilities as being related to local needs, either in their schools or within their region, as desired sponsorship is by the school division, although the preferred location is the university, suggesting a recognized need for program input from outside of the local area. Program preference also indicates a desire to include all staff involved in the area of concern in programs of two days duration held early in the school year.

Research Question #4: What Other Factors does a Principal take into Consideration when deciding on Inservice Attendance?

This was one of the most difficult questions to answer either by questionnaire or through the interviews.

The questionnaire produced some data related to the number of programs attended, the total duration of the programs, the average distance travelled in attending inservice programs and the average cost to the principal. As this data was not accurately recorded by the principals throughout the year, there can only be observations, rather than conclusions. The great variation in the data suggests that

(a) some principals attend far more inservice programs than other

principals,

(b) some principals are involved in inservice programs totalling a greater number of days than other principals,

(c) some principals travel considerably greater distances than other principals to attend inservice programs, and

(d) attendance at inservice programs is a greater expense to some principals than to others.

Answer to Research Question #4. It does appear as though factors such as distance travelled and the cost to the principal could influence the number of programs attended or the total inservice involvement during the year, but this is not inconclusively shown in this study.

During the interviews, other factors also emerged as being of significance to specific principals. One principal felt that there was a 'level of tolerance' within each school that the principal should not exceed. Within that 'level of tolerance', the absences of the principal for inservice attendance were acceptable, but should the principal exceed that level, his activity may be counter-productive in that there are tangible negative reactions or results within the school.

Another principal indicated that he has become highly selective when considering inservice attendance and only chooses to attend those that he knows will be of direct benefit to him in his school. The implications are that local relevance, applicability of the program and reputation of the presenter may well be further factors influencing inservice involvement.

Although the data is inconclusive, there is adequate indication to suggest that further detailed study of the factors influencing inservice involvement should be undertaken.

Research Question #5: Are the Inservice Program Needs and Delivery System Preferences Influenced by the Number of Years Experience as a Principal?

Interview Data. There was a definite feeling expressed by the principals that inservice needs had changed with experience. Those who were newly appointed principals indicated needs related to administrative awareness, system familiarization and budgeting as being quite different to the inservice needs they had felt whilst a teacher.

Principals who had been in the position for longer than one year claimed that their early career needs had been related to curriculum and community relations, operations and public relations, system familiarization, budgeting, basic skills, relationships and role definition. These items are mainly of an operational nature to ensure that the principal is aware of the administrative and organizational basics that are essential to the operation of the school.

The current program needs identified by the principals during interviews are of a very different nature. They identified teacher evaluation, staff development, staff supervision, teacher observation techniques, time management, group dynamics, budget, instructional leadership, human relations, stimulus and challenge, teacher support skills and maintaining a level of educational awareness. Where early career needs had been essentially of an operational nature, the later needs are more related to personnel management, human relations and personal concerns.

Questionnaire Data. Statistics from the questionnaires revealed that both experienced and inexperienced principals shared many common areas of need, but notable exceptions were apparent in each of the six categories.

In the category of 'Curriculum and Instruction', the inexperienced principals were shown to have considerably higher inservice need levels

than experienced principals in the use of computers, implementation of programs, special education and grading systems, while the experienced principals registered the higher need level for individualized instruction.

For the category 'Working with Staff', inexperienced principals were shown to have higher need levels than experienced principals for staff motivation, effective staff meetings, interviewing and selecting staff, staff inservice programs, role clarification of staff, conflict resolution, absenteeism and tardiness, and teacher accountability.

Only one item, counselling students, showed a higher need level for inexperienced principals within the category 'Working with Students', while two items, utilization of volunteer services and community needs assessment showed similar higher need levels in the category 'Working with the Community'.

The category labelled 'Operations' was the only category in which all items showed a significantly higher need level for inexperienced principals than for experienced principals. The thirteen items listed in this category showed need level ratings consistently much higher for inexperienced principals than the levels for their experienced colleagues, indicating that operational tasks of the principalship are the most urgent inservice need areas during the first two years of appointment.

In the category of 'Personal Concerns' the inexperienced principals rated higher need levels than experienced principals in time management, public speaking, decision-making models, working with divisional administrators and politics within school. Also of interest in this category is the significantly higher need level rating scored by experienced principals for the item 'human relations'.

Preferred Delivery Systems. The preferences regarding various modes of delivery were essentially similar for both experienced and inexperienced principals, with significant differences noted in only seven of the eighteen areas of concern/delivery aspects.

For the sponsorship of programs involving conceptual abilities, experienced principals indicated a preference for school division based programs, while inexperienced principals preferred sponsorship by the University Education Faculty.

Again in the area of conceptual abilities, experienced principals indicated a preference for the 'course for credit' format, while inexperienced principals preferred a workshop format. As this was a close second choice for experienced principals, the overall preference for all principals for this item was clearly the workshop format.

Experienced principals showed a duration preference for 'regular sessions for a term' when considering both conceptual ability programs and human relations skills and knowledge programs, while inexperienced principals preferred two day programs for human relations programs and programs up to one week long for conceptual abilities.

The only notable disagreement concerning program location was for conceptual ability programs where experienced principals preferred a university venue, while inexperienced principals chose 'at another school'.

Significant differences in choice were registered for time of year preferences where programs regarding technical skills and human relations skills were concerned. Inexperienced principals indicated that summer was their first preference for both types of programs, while experienced principals chose fall for technical skills and winter for human relations skills. This is a notable difference in choice that may be closely

related to the perceived benefits of summer programs for newly appointed principals, rather than to the time of year seen as best suiting the school program or having greatest effect within the school.

For the final category, participation, inexperienced principals disagreed with experienced principals in the area of technical skills and knowledge. Inexperienced principals indicated a preference for principals only to attend programs in this category, while experienced principals indicated that all staff involved in that area of concern should attend. This difference is significant as it highlights the area identified as the greatest inservice need area for newly appointed principals - the technical skills or operations area. It could be assumed that experienced principals have a greater confidence in their abilities in this area and are therefore at ease when sharing learning experiences with others on their staff, while newly appointed principals need the opportunity to acquire the skills and the confidence before a sharing environment would be seen as congenial.

Answer to Research Question #5. Both the interview data and the questionnaire data have revealed that there are many similarities in the inservice need level and preferred delivery system preferences of experienced and inexperienced principals. At the same time there are some areas of significant difference in preference that cannot be ignored.

The most notable need level difference is the category of operations, where inexperienced principals rated all items as being at a significantly higher level of need than did the experienced principals. This statistical choice was also most obvious in the interview data, with inexperienced principals indicating that organization and administration are their major areas of inservice need.

The data related to delivery systems also indicate broad areas of agreement of choice, with differences recorded in seven of the eighteen categories. The most noticeable of these appeared within the time of year and participation categories. Inexperienced principals indicated a preference for summer programs in two areas, while the most common preferences placed summer as last choice, indicating that there may be a special need for summer programs aimed specifically at preparing newly appointed principals for their duties. Their participation preference for principals only to be involved in programs where technical skills and knowledge are developed is also a significant request to enable inexperienced principals to gain the expertise and confidence needed before having to prove their expertise to co-workers.

Research Question #6: Are Inservice Program Needs and Delivery System Preferences influenced by the Geographic Location of Principals in either Urban or Rural Areas?

Inservice Needs. Urban and rural principals agreed on the need level for a considerable number of inservice areas in all categories listed. Significant differences in need levels between the two groups were recorded in eighteen of the fifty-nine listed items.

In the category concerning curriculum and instruction, urban principals indicated a greater need for programs concerned with grading systems and implementation of programs. Urban principals also indicated a greater need for programs about dismissal procedures in the category labelled 'Working with Staff', while rural principals showed a greater need for inservice work on effective staff meetings within the same category.

Rural principals indicated that within the category 'Working with Students', the item concerning student counselling was in need of inservice development to a greater extent than was signified by urban principals.

The category related to 'Working with the Community' showed that rural principals have a greater need for programs concerning public relations, contact with other schools and utilization of volunteer services, while urban principals showed a significantly greater need for programs involving community needs assessments.

In the category concerning operations, urban principals showed greater need for programs related to organizational development and fund-raising while rural principals showed a greater need for information related to providing equipment, materials and facilities. These differences provide a particularly interesting insight into some of the differences between urban and rural principalship where the community aspect of the rural school tends to facilitate exercises such as fund-raising, but there are still problems regarding equipment, materials and facilities that the principal must face because of limited budget or isolation.

Rural principals indicated several areas of greater need within the category of personal concerns than their urban counterparts. Urban principals indicated that the item 'adjusting to personal stress' was in greater need than the level at which rural principals rated this item. This may well be related to the tendency for urban principals to be older and in charge of larger schools than the rural principals. The five items rated by rural principals to be in greater need than the rating given by urban principals are leadership techniques, self-awareness and assessment, human relations, working in a small community and politics within school.

Delivery Systems. Urban and rural principals indicated broad agreement on mode of delivery preferences for their inservice programs, with a few exceptions.

Urban principals indicated a preference for human relations programs to be sponsored by the Principals' Association, while urban principals chose the University Education Faculty as their most favoured sponsor. Also in the human relations program area, urban principals chose program duration of two days as most preferred, while rural principals chose a duration of up to one week.

For programs dealing with technical skills, urban principals indicated that their preferred location was at another school, while rural principals showed that they would like these programs to be within your school.

The broadest disagreement appeared in the time of year category where urban principals chose fall or winter for human relations and conceptual ability programs, while rural principals indicated a preference for summer programs in both areas. This choice may well be related to a similar preference made by inexperienced principals as many of these were also located in rural areas.

Answer to Research Question #6. The inservice needs of principals and their preferred delivery systems, whether they are located in urban or rural areas are generally similar. However, there are notable, specific exceptions to this generalization.

Urban principals indicated greater need levels in certain items related to curriculum and instruction and operations areas, while rural principals indicated greater need levels in the categories labelled working with the community and personal concerns.

The major difference in delivery system preference occurred in relation to the time of year. Rural principals indicated preferences for summer programs in two of the three areas, while this time was least preferred by the urban principals. Although this difference may be

related to weather problems or time lost at school, it may equally be associated with the indicated preference of newly appointed principals for summer programs.

Other minor differences in delivery preferences were isolated and specific, but should be considered when planning programs in those particular areas.

Research Question #7: What are the Inservice Opportunities available for Principals?

Interview data indicated that several of the respondents had access to local programs arranged by either local or regional groups of principals. This study did not attempt to itemize these programs, but concentrated on identifying the programs offered by the central agencies - school divisions, Manitoba Teachers' Society, the Manitoba Department of Education, and the University of Manitoba.

The programs offered by the central agencies are detailed in Table 17 and Table 18 . Also shown on Table 18 is the need level assessment for each topic included in the program, indicating that the topics offered through these programs ranged from a relatively low to a very high need level.

Answer to Research Question #7. The inservice programs made available to principals during 1980-81 by the central sponsoring agencies focussed on twenty-six areas of importance. (See Table 18). Of the twenty-six topics covered, eighteen topics appeared in this study as being areas of inservice need according to the respondents. Eight of the twenty-six topics did not appear in this study and could not be given a need level rating.

Need level ratings for the eighteen items included in this study

ranged from .47 to 2.20, or from relatively low need level to the highest need level appearing in the study.

Of the items that did not appear in this study, but were included in the programs offered, several may have been of current interest to a specific group of principals and therefore seen as high need level at that time. Examples of this are the items native awareness, juvenile justice and improving the correspondence service.

The inservice opportunities available to principals are those organized by local groups of principals to meet local needs, or by central agencies to meet assumed common needs, and for 1980-81 these were seen to be the twenty-six items identified in Table 18.

The Central Study Problem

The sub-questions posed in this chapter have led to the identification of the inservice needs of elementary school principals and their preferred program delivery systems. An examination of the inservice programs available to principals has identified the topics that were presented as inservice opportunities to principals during 1980-81.

The central study problem asks - Do the inservice provisions for elementary school principals in Manitoba meet the perceived needs of those principals and are the delivery systems those which the principals prefer?

Answer to the Central Study Problem Data from this study suggests that there are twenty-three areas of inservice need for principals and inservice opportunities provided during 1980-81 catered for ten of those twenty-three needs. The needs areas included as program topics are teacher evaluation, group dynamics, staff motivation, leadership techniques, staff development, staff supervision, administrative accountability,

adjusting to personal stress, public relations and budget. The need areas not included in programs are program planning, interviewing and selecting staff, teacher observation techniques, long-range planning, discipline, time management, implementation of programs, maintaining educational awareness, communicating with students, effective staff meetings, teacher support skills, human relations and contact with other schools.

As less than half of the identified need areas were included in programs held during the past year, it must be seen that the inservice provisions for elementary school principals in Manitoba do not entirely meet the needs of those principals. In addition, as some of the highest need level items identified in this study were actually included in the inservice programs held during the previous year, it can be seen that they are areas in which considerable help is needed. Items particularly included in this category are teacher evaluation, group dynamics, staff motivation and leadership techniques.

The preferred program delivery systems of principals were identified in this study in relation to sponsorship format, duration, location, time of year and participation. Identification of what delivery techniques had actually been used by individuals involved in all of the programs conducted in the 1980-81 school year would have been an extremely difficult task considering the time and budget constraints on this study. Attention was therefore focussed on identifying the preferred delivery systems of principals and presenting the information in a manner that program sponsors may easily adopt as a program goal. Delivery data contained in this study should be seen as goal-oriented presentations rather than analytical comparative data dwelling on past programs.

Chapter Summary

The seven sub-questions posed at the commencement of this study have been answered with reference to the data revealed.

Each question in turn was examined in this chapter and an answer based upon the questionnaire and interview data reported in the previous chapter was presented. The seven sub-questions reflected facets of the central study problem, which was then considered. Answers to the seven sub-questions provided the information required to answer the central study problem, and this is provided in this chapter.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to present (1) a summary of the study and its findings, (2) some conclusions based upon the findings, and (3) recommendations for current and future practices in the field of inservice programs for elementary school principals.

SUMMARY

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceived inservice needs and preferred delivery systems of elementary school principals in relation to actual inservice provision.

Elements of the Study

To identify the inservice needs and preferred delivery systems, an instrument was designed and forwarded to a group of twenty elementary school principals who had indicated their willingness to be involved in the study. The second phase of the study involved interviewing respondents. Ten of the eighteen responding principals were interviewed in their schools in metropolitan Winnipeg and rural Manitoba locations. The remaining eight principals were interviewed by telephone.

Interviews were also conducted with representatives of the sponsoring agencies to identify the inservice opportunities that had been made available to principals during the 1980-81 school year.

Inservice Needs. The questionnaire was designed to identify the perceived inservice needs of the principals. Six broad categories were

identified as grouping all items of inservice need. The six categories selected, an expansion of those identified by Beckner and Foster (1980), were: curriculum and instruction, working with staff, working with students, working with the community, operations and personal concerns. Fifty-nine items considered to identify areas of concern for school principals were grouped in the six categories chosen and principals were asked to rate each item according to three scales. The first two scales were five-point scales to identify 'Importance to You' and 'Current Ability', essentially after those used by Seger (1980). The third scale was a three-point scale on which principals identified their 'Desired Level of Proficiency', after those used by Joyce and Showers (1980) and Project ASK (Seger, 1980).

The statistical data obtained from the questionnaire was in part validated and in part expanded by data obtained through interviews.

Preferred Delivery Mode. The questionnaire contained a section designed to identify preferences of principals for various alternatives related to the mode of delivery. The six features of the delivery mode listed in the questionnaire were: sponsorship, format, duration, location, time of year and participation, essentially after Lutz and Ferrante (1972).

The fifty-nine item list of areas of concern for principals presented in the needs identification section was too cumbersome to use in the delivery mode section, so a three-area categorization was adopted. The areas chosen are technical skills and knowledge, human relations and knowledge and conceptual abilities after Brainard (1975). Principals were then able to choose delivery mode preferences in relation to the three broad areas of concern identified.

The Study Problem

The central study problem was to answer the question

Do the inservice provisions for elementary school principals in Manitoba meet the perceived needs of those principals and are the delivery systems those which the principals prefer?

To answer the central problem, seven questions designed to focus the research were posed:

- 1) What are the current inservice needs of elementary school principals?
- 2) What are the levels of those inservice needs?
- 3) What are the preferred delivery systems for programs involving
 - technical skills and knowledge
 - human relations skills and knowledge
 - conceptual abilities?
- 4) What other factors does a principal take into consideration when deciding on inservice attendance?
- 5) Are the inservice programs and delivery system preferences influenced by the number of years experience as a principal?
- 6) Are the inservice program needs and delivery system preferences influenced by the geographic location of principals in either urban or rural areas?
- 7) What are the inservice opportunities available to principals?

Summary of Research Findings with Regards to Research Questions

Inservice Needs. This study identified areas of inservice need through both questionnaire and interview data. The eleven items identified during interviews (see Table 19) integrated with the inservice items rated as 'most important' by the principals provides a list of twenty-three inservice items that may be considered to be the current inservice needs of these elementary school principals (see Table 20).

Level of Needs. It was possible during the course of this study to establish the current ability level of principals for each item and to find

what they considered to be their desired level of proficiency. By finding the difference between current ability and desired level of proficiency, a statistical reading of 'need level' was identified. This figure indicated that some inservice need items were in greater need of program support than other items (See Table 10). As principals also indicated a 'level of importance' for each inservice item, the items identified as being areas of need were ranked within broad categories to show which items should be considered to be priority need areas (See Table 9). In most cases, the item considered most important in each category did not rate the highest need level reading indicating that some areas of low need are more important to the everyday administrative functioning of principals than other areas of higher need level and therefore should receive attention first. The one exception to this was in the category of 'Personal Concerns' where the item 'Leadership techniques' rated highest in importance and need level.

Preferred Delivery. To identify the preferred delivery system for programs involving areas of inservice need, the need items were broadly categorized into three groups - technical skills and knowledge, human relations skills and knowledge and conceptual abilities. Six aspects of delivery were identified as the most critical concerns for the program planner. They were sponsorship, format, duration, location, time of year and participation. Each delivery aspect contained a group of specific items and principals indicated their preferences for these items according to the area of inservice concern under consideration. The questionnaire data identified preferences of sponsorship, format, duration, location, time of year and participation for programs that were designed to consider technical skills, human relations skills or conceptual abilities (see Tables

11-16).

Other Factors. An attempt was made to identify other factors that principals take into consideration when deciding on inservice attendance but the data produced was inconclusive. There was however, enough variation in the data to suggest that this should be an area of interest to program planners and is worthy of a more detailed analysis.

Experience. Consideration was given to the effect that years of experience as a principal may have upon inservice needs. The interview data and the questionnaire data revealed many similarities in the inservice need level and delivery system preferences of experienced and inexperienced principals. At the same time, there are some significant differences in need level in the items categorized as 'operations', with inexperienced principals indicating greatest need.

Delivery preferences were generally similar for both groups of principals, with the inexperienced principals differing only in time of year choices and participation preferences.

Geographic Location. An examination of the inservice needs and preferred delivery systems of urban principals as compared with rural principals indicated that choices were generally similar, with some specific exceptions. Urban principals indicated greater need levels in certain items related to 'Curriculum and Instruction' and 'Operations' areas, while rural principals indicated greater need levels in the categories 'Working with the Community' and 'Personal concerns'. The major disagreement in delivery system preferences was concerned with the time of year. Rural principals indicated preferences for summer programs in two of the three areas while this time was least preferred by the urban principals.

Available Opportunities. Inservice programs held during the 1980-81 school year were considered in relation to the inservice needs expressed by principals. The programs available focussed on twenty-six areas of inservice concern to the principals, but eight of the twenty-six items did not appear in this study. The eighteen items that did appear range in need level from relatively low need level to the highest need recorded in the study. When compared to the list of twenty-three items of need identified by this study, the programs offered during 1980-81 were seen to be related to ten of the items, indicating that the program opportunities available do not meet the inservice needs of principals.

The Central Study Problem. As less than half of the identified inservice need areas were included in programs held during the past year, it must be seen that the inservice provisions for elementary school principals in Manitoba do not entirely meet the needs of those principals. In addition, as some of the highest need level items identified in this study were actually included in the inservice programs held during the previous year, it can be seen that they are areas in which ongoing program opportunities are needed. Items particularly included in this category are teacher evaluation, group dynamics, staff motivation and leadership techniques.

The preferred delivery systems of principals were identified in relation to sponsorship, format, duration, location, time of year and participation. Practical limitations did not allow direct comparison between perceived preferences and actual delivery systems during the past year, so delivery data contained in the study should be seen as goal-oriented presentations rather than analytical comparative data.

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions are divided into two sections: (1) general conclusions regarding various aspects of the study, and (2) conclusions based on specific aspects of the interview and questionnaire data.

General Conclusions

The Instrument. An examination of the results obtained by the questionnaire suggests that there are some weaknesses in the instrument that should be remedied before further application. Part one of the questionnaire was designed to acquire information regarding factors that may influence a principal's attendance at an inservice program. The data returned was quite inconclusive and indicated that this area could only be thoroughly researched if a group of principals kept accurate records of inservice involvement throughout the school year. This specific area warrants further research as the main focus of a study.

The second part of the questionnaire listed fifty-nine items of potential inservice need related to the 'Level of Importance' of that item to the principal, the 'Current Ability' level of the principal and the principal's 'Desired Level of Proficiency'. It was apparent that the items listed satisfactorily covered the areas of concern to principals, but there were isolated instances where there was a different interpretation made by the principal concerning the nature of an item, or the category within which the item should have appeared. Interview data suggested that such misinterpretation was isolated and would not significantly effect the results.

The mode of delivery section caused some problems for respondents. Instructions to the respondents contained in the questionnaire were not

adequately explicit and should therefore be reconsidered before the instrument is used again. Particular attention should be given to explaining that the three 'Areas of Concern' headings, technical skills and knowledge, human relations skills and knowledge and conceptual abilities, encompass the fifty-nine items listed in the needs identification section of the questionnaire. Attention should also be given to the instructions regarding the completion of this section of the questionnaire, referring to the rank order, the number of preferences to be shown and the consideration of one 'Area of Concern' at a time.

Limitations posed by the Data. Both the interview data and the questionnaire data are based on the perceptions of a small group of principals. As the nature of the study highlights a sense of 'immediacy' of inservice needs, perceptions may change from week to week, or from day to day, depending on what is of immediate concern to the individual principal. To this extent the study results may date quickly and should not be seen as constant over a long period of time.

The data source, a group of eighteen elementary school principals, may also be seen as a limitation of this study. Although the group contained respondent variety concerning sex, experience and location, it was not a clearly definable group that could have programs implemented on their behalf, nor could they be seen as truly representative of principals throughout the province, therefore further research would be warranted before province-wide programs were made available in accordance with the needs identified in this study.

A study involving interviews of respondents must be considered in the light of data interpretation. The combination of questionnaire and interview data has helped in many instances to substantiate findings, but in

some areas comments are based upon one set of data alone. Where this occurs, the problem of data interpretation becomes more acute and must be recorded as a limitation of this study.

The sample of eighteen respondents may also be seen as a limitation, although there is some question as to the effectiveness of a large sample in a study of this nature. The needs identification exercise is essentially an individual or local exercise, so the closer the researcher gets to clearly identifying the individual's needs, the greater the chance of being able to cater for those needs. Larger samples would certainly identify some common need areas, but may do little toward clearly identifying the specific local needs that principals perceive as being of greatest concern.

The research data reported in this study clearly identifies areas of inservice need and preferred delivery systems of the respondents, but data should be considered with respect to the limitations outlined.

Conclusions Based on Questionnaire and Interview Data

The following conclusions arise from the conduct of the study, the data produced and the information offered by principals through the questionnaire data and the interviews.

1. It is possible to design and administer an instrument to measure the professional development needs of principals and identify their preferred delivery systems.
2. Identification of local needs is sought by principals to ensure that programs are relevant.
3. There are programs available that meet some of the identified inservice needs of principals.
4. There is a need for more programs that are based on local needs and arranged by local sponsors.
5. Inservice needs change with years of experience as a principal, therefore professional development program topics should cater for the changing needs.
6. Inservice support is needed in the basic operations areas by principals in their first year of service.
7. Professional journals are considered to be useful sources of information by the majority of respondents.
8. The professional development of principals is a shared responsibility.
9. Opportunities for informal interaction with fellow principals are considered to be useful means for gaining incidental professional development information.
10. Divisional meetings of principals are important for the consideration of administrative matters of local relevance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The need for relevant inservice programs delivered in an effective manner has been clearly identified in this study. Identification of actual individual needs and ensuring local relevance emerge as factors that indicate the need for local sponsorship of programs and local support for principals.

On this basis the following recommendations are made.

For Current Inservice Needs

1. That inservice programs designed to develop leadership techniques be made available to principals under the preferred delivery conditions identified for the area of Human Relations Skills and Knowledge - i.e.,

Sponsorship	:	Principals Association
Format	:	Workshop
Duration	:	Two days
Location	:	University
Time of Year	:	Fall
Participation	:	All staff involved in that area of concern.

2. That inservice programs planned for the current school year include consideration of the following items identified as 'High Importance' and 'High Need' items:

- Staff Evaluation
- Staff Motivation
- Program Planning
- Interviewing and Selecting Staff
- Leadership techniques
- Long-range planning
- Discipline
- Time Management
- Implementation of Programs
- Staff Development
- Stimulus/Challenge (Self-awareness and assessment)
- Staff Supervision

For Future Inservice Programs

1. That inservice program planners include in future programs those items not listed in Recommendation #2 above that were included in Table 20 as current inservice needs -

group dynamics
 teacher observation techniques
 teacher support skills
 human relations
 budget

2. That future inservice programs for principals be based on needs identification exercises prior to implementation, using an instrument similar to the one designed for this study.

3. That employers recognize the need for greater local inservice support for newly appointed principals and provide both the opportunities for program attendance plus personalized on-the-job advice from experienced administrators.

4. That the delivery systems for future inservice programs be planned with due consideration given to the preferred delivery aspects identified in this study.

5. That program planners make particular provision for rural principals who indicated a preference for programs to be held during summer.

For Future Research

The data in this study related to 'Other Factors' influencing the attendance of principals at inservice programs was inconclusive. As the 'other factors' may supercede both program topic and delivery mode as determining whether or not the principal attends a program, it is recommended that research should be undertaken into this area at the earliest opportunity.

As inservice needs change according to the personnel involved, local needs, professional or societal changes, it is further recommended that

inservice need identification exercises on a local basis and on a province-wide basis be undertaken at regular intervals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Argyris, Chris: Executive Leadership: An Appraisal of a Manager in Action. U.S.A.: Harper and Rowe, 1953 (Rep.1967).
- Barrett, Leverne A. and Edgar P. Yoder: "Are You An Administrator or a Leader?" N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, 64:440:56-59, December, 1980.
- Barrilleaux, Louis E.: A Middle-Management Center and Some Early Learnings, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED119286, September, 1975.
- Becker, Gerald and others: Elementary School Principals and Their Schools. Beacons of Brilliance and Potholes of Pestilence. U.S., Educational Research Information Center, ERIC Document ED056380, 1971.
- Beckner, Weldon: Better Inservice Education for Principals of Smaller Schools, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED172428.
- _____ and Jeannine Foster: "Inservice Education for Principals of Small Schools": N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, 64:438: 40-42, October, 1980.
- Bell, T. H.: School Improvement Through Developing Leadership Capacity. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED112476, July, 1975.
- Berger, Robert J.: "Models for Change in School Systems: Reinforcement", UCEA Task Force Seminar: Institutional Roles for In-Service Education of School Administrators, eds. Patrick D. Lynch and Peggy L. Blackstone, U.S.A., University of New Mexico, 1966, pp.80-93.
- Bottomly, Forbes, ed.: Peak Use of Peak Years. Georgia: Georgia State University, 1975.
- Brown, Charles E.: "The Principal As Learner". The National Elementary Principal, 53:5:19-23, July/August, 1974.
- Brainard, Edward: The Colorado Department of Education and the Development of School District Based Administrator Renewal Programs. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED114993, 1975.
- Bridges, Edwin M.: "The Principalship as a Career". The Principal in Metropolitan Schools, eds. Donald A. Erickson and Theodore L. Reller, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1979, pp.1-21.

- Burnes, Judith Crooks and others: Report of the Program for the Development of the Elementary School Principal as an Educational Leader. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED108276, 1975.
- California State Legislature: The School Principal: A Report Pursuant to Resolution Chapter 102 of 1977 (ACR35). U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED145540, 1977.
- Cobbs, Price M.: "Midcareer: Creativity or Decline". Peak Use of Peak Years, ed. Forbes Bottomly, Georgia: Georgia State University, 1975, pp.30-34.
- Creamer, Daniel and Barbara Feld: Some Innovations in the Training of Educational Leaders. New York: The Conference Board, 1972.
- Cross, Ray: "What Makes An Effective Principal?" Principal. 60:4:19-22, March, 1981.
- Culbertson, Jack A., Curtis Henson and Ruel Morrison, eds.: Performance Objectives for School Principals. California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974.
- Cunningham, Luvern L.: Mid Career Study for School Administrators: Programs and Problems. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED102692
- Davis, William J.: A Decision-Support System for Designing Inservice Programs for Educators: Survey Instruments and Guidelines for their Use. U.S., Educational Resources Information Centre, ERIC Document ED159143, 1978.
- _____: Inservice Staff Development Programs for School Principals: Needs Assessment and Inservice Programs. U.S., Educational Resources Information Centre, ERIC Document ED119304, February, 1976.
- Doll, Ronald C.: Leadership to Improve Schools. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1972.
- Erlandson, David A.: Strengthening School Leadership. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers Ltd., 1976.
- Faily, Anwar: "Effective Administrative Behavior". N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, 64:433:30-36, February, 1980.
- Fallon, Berlie J.: The Art of Followership (What Happened to the Indians?). Bloomington, Indiana: The Phi Delta Kappan Educational Foundation, 1974.
- Farquhar, Robin H. and Philip K. Piele: Preparing Educational Leaders: A Review of Recent Literature. Interstate Printers, Illinois: University Council for Educational Administration, 1972.

- Gallo, Vincent A.: Should We Abolish or Retain the Principalship?
U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC
Document ED081076, 1970.
- Goldhammer, Keith: "Notes on Institutional Relationships in the
In-Service Education of the Professional Administrator."
UCEA Task Force Seminar: Institutional Roles for In-Service
Education of School Administrators, eds. Patrick D. Lynch
and Peggy L. Blackstone, U.S.A., University of New Mexico,
1966, pp.31-45.
- _____, John E. Suttle, Gerald L. Becker and William D. Aldridge:
Issues and Problems in Contemporary Educational Administration.
Eugene: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Adminis-
tration, University of Oregon, 1968.
- Gorton, Richard A. and Kenneth E. McIntyre: The Senior High School
Principalship. Volume II: The Effective Principal.
N.A.S.S.P., 1975.
- Hambrick, Bill M. and others: "What's Going On Around Here?"
National Elementary Principal, 57:3:9-19, March, 1978.
- Hanlon, James M.: Administration and Education. Belmont, California:
Wadsworth Publishing Company Inc., 1972.
- Havighurst, Robert J.: Developmental Tasks and Education. New York:
David McKay Company Inc., 1972.
- Heller, Melvin P.: Preparing Educational Leaders: New Challenges
and New Perspectives. Bloomington, Indiana: The Phi Delta
Kappan Educational Foundation, 1974.
- Higley, Jerry.: Inservice Training for Staff and Administration.
School Leadership Digest Series No.8. U.S., Educational
Resources and Information Center, ERIC Document ED099951, 1974.
- Houts, Paul, Tom Koerner and Robert J. Krajewski: "View from the
Bridge: A Discussion". Theory into Practice, 18:1:2-7,
February, 1979.
- Howsam, Robert B.: "In-Service Education of School Administrators:
Background, Present Status and Problems." U.C.E.A. Task Force
Seminar: Institutional Roles for Inservice Education of School
Administrators, eds. Patrick D. Lynch and Peggy L. Blackstone,
U.S.A., University of New Mexico, 1966., pp.8-30.
- Hyman, Ronald T.: School Administrator's Handbook of Teacher
Supervision and Evaluation Methods. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall
Inc., 1975.
- James, Bernard J.: Education for Innovative Behavior in Executives.
Cooperative Research Project No. 975. Illinois: University of
Chicago, 1962.

- Joyce, Bruce and Beverley Showers: "Improving Inservice Training: The Messages of Research." Educational Leadership, 37:5:379-385, February, 1980.
- Kauss, Theodore: Leaders Live With Crisis. Bloomington, Indiana: The Phi Delta Kappan Educational Foundation, 1974.
- Klopf, Gordon J.: "Helping Adults Change". The Supervisor: New Demands, New Dimensions. ed. William H. Lucio. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, N.E.A., 1969.
- _____ : The Principal and Staff Development in the Elementary School. U.S., Educational Resources and Information Center, ERIC document ED108282, 1974.
- Konrad, A. G., J. C. Long and J. M. Small: "Professional Development Needs of Administrators in Higher Education." The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, VI:1:1-18, 1976.
- Kozoll, Charles E. and Curtis Ulmer: In-Service Training: Philosophy Processes and Operational Techniques. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1972.
- Kritek, William J.: The Implementation of a Program for the Professional Development of Urban Secondary School Principals. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED122384, April, 1976.
- Lamb, Gene.: "Programmed Self-Renewal." N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, 56:362:84-87, March, 1972.
- Larson, Robert: The Case for Competency Based Instruction in the Preparation and Renewal of Educational Administrators. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED127717, August, 1976.
- Lavin, Richard J. and Jean E. Sanders: Improving the Performance of Educational Managers. Chelmsford, Mass.: Merrimack Education Center, 1975.
- Licata, Joseph W.: An Internal Evaluation of a Field-Based Training Component for School Administrators. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document, ED135812, September, 1976.
- Lipham, James M. and James A. Hoeh, Jr.: The Principalship: Foundations and Functions. New York: Harper and Rowe, 1974.
- Lucio, William H., ed: The Supervisor: New Demands, New Dimensions. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, N.E.A., 1969.
- Lutz, Frank W. and Reynolds Ferrante: Emergent Practices in the Continuing Education of School Administrators. Illinois, University Council for Educational Administration: Interstate Printers, 1972.

- Lynch, Patrick D. and Peggy L. Blackstone, eds.: U.C.E.A. Task Force Seminar: Institutional Roles for In-Service Education of School Administrators. U.S.: University of New Mexico, 1966.
- Manera, Elizabeth S. and Ardeth P. Cropper: Back to the Classroom: An Invitation to Professional Renewal. N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, 64: 433:20-24, February, 1980.
- Manitoba Teachers' Society, The : The Manitoba School Principal: Changing Roles and Responsibilities. A Report of the Task Force on Job Parameters of Principals. Manitoba: The Manitoba Teachers' Society, 1978.
- Miller, Van: Common and Specialized Learnings for Educational Administrators. U.S.: The University Council for Educational Administration.
- Mills, Troy: The Principal as Catalyst. Theory and Practice, 18:1:21-27, February, 1979.
- Miner, John B.: The School Administrator and Organizational Character. Oregon: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, Eugene, 1967.
- Mitchell, Donald P.: A Different Drummer. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, February, 1976.
- _____: Leadership in Public Education Study: A Look at the Overlooked. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED075896, 1972.
- Moffett, Cordelia: "The Elementary Principal: A First Year Perspective." Theory into Practice, 18:1:8-11, February, 1979.
- Mullican, Frank and Len Ainsworth: "The Principal as Instructional Leader." Theory and Practice, 18:1:33-38, February, 1979.
- McIntyre, Kenneth E., and Ed. A. Grant: "How Principals, Teachers and Superintendents View the Principalship." N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin 64:433:44-49, February, 1980.
- _____: "Training Programs for Principals." Theory Into Practice, 18:1:28-32, February, 1979.
- Nesset, Bonna and R. W. Faunce: Needs Assessment of Administrators' Professional Development. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED109826, January, 1974.
- Perritt, Marshall C.: "Professional Growth in the Shelby County Schools." Theory into Practice, 11:5:324-328, December, 1972.

- Randall, Ruth E.: Assessing the Need of Elementary Principals for Continuing Education in Decision-Making. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED136378, April, 1977.
- Reed, Rodney J.: School Principals: Leaders or Managers? U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED145518, July, 1977.
- Schein, Edgar H. and Diane W. Kommers: Professional Education. U.S.A.: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972.
- Seeger, John E. and associates: Development of Administrative Skills and Knowledge: Summary Report of Project ASK - Phase 1. Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1980.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas: "Rational Bureaucratic Collegial and Political Views of the Principal's Role." Theory and Practice, 18:1:12-20, February, 1979.
- _____ and Robert J. Starratt: Supervision: Human Perspectives. U.S.A.: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1979.
- _____ and Robert J. Starratt: Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.
- Small, James F.: "Initiating and Responding to Social Change." Performance Objectives for School Principals, eds. Jack A. Culbertson, Curtis Henson and Ruel Morrison. California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974.
- Smith, Kevin R.: Professional Development of the School Principal. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED146678, 1977.
- Stern, A. Kenneth: Instruction Ranked Highest by Most Rural Elementary Principals. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED171496,
- Stout, Robert T.: New Approaches to Recruitment and Selection of Educational Administrators, U.S.A.: University Council for Educational Administration, 1973.
- Vanderpol, Maurice: School Administrators Under Stress. Principal, 60:4:39-41, March, 1981.
- Wayson, William W.: A Proposal to Remake the Principalship. The National Elementary Principal, 54:1:28-44, September/October, 1974.
- Wynn, Richard: Unconventional Methods and Materials for Preparing Educational Administrators. U.S.A.: University Council for Educational Administration, 1972.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

INSERVICE NEEDS AND PREFERRED MODES OF DELIVERY.

1. PERSONAL DATA.

AGE: SEX:

2. EXPERIENCE:

Number of years experience as a principal:.....

Total teaching experience (including above):.....

3. PRESENT SCHOOL:

Size:students andstaff.

Is your position full-time administration? YES/NO.

If NO above, :.....% admin., and.....% teaching.

4. EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS: (Please ✓ the appropriate)

a. Highest Qualification:

- 1. 3 years or less post-secondary.....
- 2. Bachelor's degree.....
- 3. Two Bachelor's degrees
- 4. Master's degree
- 5. Two Master's degrees
- 6. Doctorate.....

b. Graduate Qualifications in Educational Administration:

- 1. Pre-Master's.....
- 2. Master's degree.....
- 3. Doctorate.....
- 4. No Graduate qualification in
Educational Administration.....

5. INSERVICE INVOLVEMENT IN THE 1980-1981 SCHOOL YEAR.

Program Title	Duration	Distance Travelled	Cost To You	Topics Covered	Program Sponsor
---------------	----------	-----------------------	----------------	----------------	-----------------

--	--	--	--	--	--

6. NEEDS ASSESSMENT.

Grouped on the following pages are lists of items of concern for principals. The categories are: a) curriculum and instruction, b) working with staff, c) working with students, d) working with community, e) operations, and f) personal concerns. For each item there are three grading scales:

SCALE 1: Importance of the item to you.

Give your assessment of the importance of each item as far as effective performance of your own work in your school is concerned from 1 = minimal importance to 5 = extremely important.

SCALE 2: Your current ability regarding this item.

Give an assessment of your own current level of performance or ability to perform if required. The five-point scale shows from 1 = "low" to 5 = "high".

SCALE 3: Level of Proficiency required.

Give your assessment of the level of proficiency required for each item.

- 1 = Familiarity: You should know about the procedures implied in the item - that is, can discuss them intelligently and can follow related explanations or analyses.
- 2 = Understanding: You should be able to exercise judgement about the adequacy of procedures as well as to explain and analyse them. Can teach others about the task.
- 3 = Application: You can apply or carry out the procedures implied by the statement; can directly demonstrate to and supervise others in performing procedures and making judgements.

	Importance To You					Your Current Ability					Your Desired Level of Proficiency			4.
b. <u>WORKING WITH STAFF (cont.)</u>														
9. Teacher Accountability	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	
10. Interviewing and Selecting Staff	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	
11. Staff Inservice Pgms.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	
12. Maintenance/service personnel.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	
13. Absenteeism and tardiness	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	
14. Other (please specify)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	
c. <u>WORKING WITH STUDENTS</u>														
1. Communicating with students	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	
2. Counselling students	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	
3. The problem child	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	
4. Modern Society's problems for children	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	
5. Discipline	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	
6. Other (please specify)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	
d. <u>WORKING WITH THE COMMUNITY</u>														
1. Community needs assessment	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	
2. Public Relations	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	
3. Contact with other schools	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	
4. Utilization of Volunteer services	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	
5. Other (please specify)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	
e. <u>OPERATIONS</u>														
1. Change process	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	
2. Computerized administrative services	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	
3. Budget development and control	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	
4. Office filing systems	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	
5. Fund raising	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	

e. <u>OPERATIONS (cont.)</u>	Importance					Your					Your		
	To You					current ability					Desired Level		
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
6. Purchasing materials	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
7. Organizational development	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
8. Long-range planning	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
9. Administrative accountability	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
10. Management by objectives	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
11. Time-tabling	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
12. Providing equipment, materials, facilities	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
13. Publication techniques	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
14. Other (Please specify)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
f. <u>PERSONAL CONCERNS.</u>													
1. Human relations	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
2. Clarification of principal's role	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
3. Time management	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
4. Communicating with peers	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
5. Self-awareness and assessment	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
6. Leadership techniques	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
7. Adjusting to personal stress	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
8. Counselling skills	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
9. Supervision techniques	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
10. Decision-making models	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
11. Public speaking	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
12. Career mobility	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
13. Working with divisional administrators	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
14. Working in a small community	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
15. 'Politics' within school	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
16. Other (please specify)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3

7. PREFERRED MODE OF DELIVERY.

In this section, the areas of concern for principals are considered to fall into the following categories:

- a) technical skills and knowledge (e.g. budget development and control, timetabling),
- b) human relations skills and knowledge (e.g. conflict resolution), and
- c) conceptual abilities (e.g. long-range planning).

Consider the list of delivery items below and show your preferences in rank order under each of the three 'Areas of Concern'.

Please give reasons for your choices.

Areas of Concern

	Technical Skills & Knowledge	Human Relns. Skills & Knowledge	Conceptual Abilities
a. <u>SPONSORSHIP.</u>	Rank order:	Rank order:	Rank order:
1. School division.....
2. Regional group.....
3. Principal's Association.....
4. Education Department.....
5. University Education Faculty.....
6. Other (Please specify)

Reasons for choices: _____

Areas of Concern

	Technical Skills & Knowledge	Human Relns Skills & Knowledge	Conceptual Abilities
	Rank order:	Rank order:	Rank order:
b. <u>FORMAT.</u>			
1. Workshop.....
2. Lecture.....
3. Observation visit to another school.....
4. Travel.....
5. Professional reading..-.....
6. Course for credit.....
7. Support personnel in your school.....
8. Other (Please specify)

Reasons for choices: _____

	Rank order:	Rank order:	Rank order:
c. <u>DURATION.</u>			
1. One day or less.....
2. Two days.....
3. Up to one week.....
4. two weeks.....
5. Longer than two weeks.....
6. Regular sessions for a term.....
7. Other (Please specify)

Reasons for choices: _____

8.

Areas of Concern

	Technical Skills & Knowledge Rank order:	Human Relns Skills & Knowledge Rank order:	Conceptual Abilities Rank order:
d. <u>LOCATION.</u>			
1. Within your school.....
2. At another school.....
3. A convention centre.....
4. University.....
5. Other (Please specify)

Reasons for choices: _____

	Rank order:	Rank order:	Rank order:
e. <u>TIME OF YEAR.</u>			
1. Fall (Sept.-Oct.-Nov.)....
2. Winter(Dec.-Jan.-Feb.)....
3. Spring(Mar.-Apr.-May)....
4. Summer(June-July-Aug.)....

Reasons for choices: _____

	Rank order:	Rank order:	Rank order:
f. <u>PARTICIPATION.</u>			
1. Principals only.....
2. Principals with similar interests only (e.g. similar sized schools, urban only/rural only)....
3. Principals and administrators only.....
4. All staff involved in that area of concern.....
5. Other (Please specify)

Reasons for choices: _____



THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
Department of Educational Administration and FoundationsWinnipeg, Manitoba
Canada R3T 2N2
(204) 474-9019

Friday, October 2nd, 1981

Dear

I refer to our recent telephone conversation about my work with Dr Marshall on the professional development of principals. Thank you for agreeing to answer some questions concerning the inservice needs of principals and their preferred mode of delivery. Please find the questionnaire enclosed.

I stress that your answers should reflect your own needs and your own personal preferences, rather than what you think may be the needs and preferences of principals generally.

A stamped, addressed envelope is provided for the return of the questionnaire. I would like to have it back as soon as possible - no later than October 16th.

Questionnaire results will be included in my thesis, but the identity of those completing the questionnaire will remain anonymous. Should you wish to contact me concerning the questionnaire, my home number is

Thank you once again for agreeing to help,

Yours sincerely,

(Graham Hill)

APPENDIX C.

KEY INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Are your current professional development needs being met?
2. Have your professional development needs changed?
3. For your professional development do you prefer academic studies, job-related workshops or a combination of both?
4. Who should be responsible for the PD of principals? Principal? Professional Association? Superintendent? District colleagues? School Board?
5. Do you find professional journals of any value?
6. Is your present PD involvement an imposition on your time or a worthwhile use of time?
7. What direction would you like to see PD for principals take in the future?