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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was twofold. The first objective was to determine what practicing school administrators felt constituted appropriate administrative training for new administrators. The second objective was to determine if school administrators would recommend that potential administrators undergo the type of preparation that they themselves received.

The survey was confined to all principals who worked in the eleven Winnipeg based school divisions in the spring of 1989. Data were collected on the professional background of principals, the administrative functions in which they felt administrators must display competency, and what they felt to be the best approach in the development of a number of administrative competencies.

The general conclusions were that practicing school administrators felt that skills related to the human relations and instructional management functions of administration were highly important to effective administration. Skills related to the development of a positive school climate and evaluation were also viewed as important. Principals did not identify any one approach as being superior for the development of administrative competency in potential administrators. Instead, they recommended that a combination
of approaches be employed, with primary emphasis on on the job training, and secondary emphasis on experience as a teacher and inservice training.

The hypotheses that principals would recommend that prospective administrators should undergo the same type of training that characterized their own backgrounds were not supported.
CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Rationale

In determining the content of a program for the certification of administrators, it is important to first determine what administrators do, and then develop a means by which the ability to carry out administrative tasks may be developed in prospective administrators. There has been a great deal of research on both of these topics. Most literature on the identification of essential administrative tasks has followed the approach of either systematically analyzing the functions fulfilled by practicing school administrators, or of surveying school administrators to determine what tasks they feel are central to their positions. Similarly, research has been conducted to determine the best means of developing administrative competency. Formal university study, on-the-job training, and a practicum in school administration have all been cited as effective approaches to school administrator preparation (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1985).

Numerous surveys have been conducted to determine what principals feel are important aspects of their work, what contributed most to their success as a principal, and what characterizes the typical school principal. In some surveys,
data have been collected which permit one to begin examining the relationship between administrators' own professional backgrounds and their perception of what constitutes appropriate administrative training. However, there had not been any studies carried out for the specific purpose of determining if such a relationship exists.

Similarly, there had not been any major surveys undertaken to determine what Manitoba school administrators feel is the best approach to developing administrative competency. However, with the introduction of programs for the certification of school administrators, there appeared to be a need to survey the opinions of practicing administrators. Certainly, it appeared that the information gathered by such a survey could provide some valuable information on the type of training in which practicing administrators feel prospective administrators should engage.

The purpose of this study was twofold. Firstly, practicing administrators were surveyed to determine what they feel constitutes appropriate administrative training. This was followed with an examination of principals' backgrounds to study the relationship between background and recommendations for administrative training.

**Significance of the Study**

Manitoba has recently introduced a non-compulsory
certification program for school principals and administrators. Currently, there is no fixed content for the program (Breckman, 1987). That is, candidates must complete a number of hours in workshops, conferences, or other professional development activities examining such general topics as the mechanics of administration. There are no guidelines in place which indicate the specific administrative areas in which prospective administrators must receive training. Likewise, the means by which the training is to be delivered are not specified. One likely way to determine appropriate content, as well the best approaches to developing administrative training is to survey administrators already in the field, as is recommended in the literature (NASSP, 1985).

The 1950's and 1960's were periods of rapid expansion for a number of school jurisdictions, and many principals who were appointed during those decades are now approaching retirement (Lawton & Musella, 1986; Lawton & Musella). With the prospect of an exodus of school administrators from their positions as they reach retirement age (Leithwood, 1987), and the need for new administrators to fill the vacancies, it is conceivable that Manitoba, as well as other provinces, will embark on the development of mandatory administrative training programs. Given this scenario, a study which collects information on the views of practicing administrators regarding
appropriate administrative training proves timely.

Statement of the Problem

What do school principals view to be the best approach to developing administrative skills important to effective administration? Also, is there a relationship between principals' professional backgrounds and their perception of the best approach to developing administrative competency? This study secured information from practicing school administrators on what they consider to be the best way to develop administrative skills, and attempted to determine the degree to which principals' levels of formal education, inservice education, experience as a teacher, and experience as a principal were reflected in their responses to questions on the development of administrative competency skills.

Delimitations of the Study

In examining the data that were collected in this study, one must be mindful of the following delimitations. Firstly, the survey population was limited to Winnipeg area school principals. Other administrators, such as vice-principals, assistant superintendents, and superintendents were not included. Additionally, by limiting the population to the Winnipeg region, one cannot generalize the results to principals in rural areas, where in-service formal education is less accessible, or to urban centers outside of Manitoba.
where different provincial requirements for the principalship exist.

Secondly, this was a mailed survey with two mailed reminders sent to non-respondents. Further follow-up was not conducted to determine the reason for non-response.

Thirdly, this study focussed on what administrators viewed to be the best approach to developing administrative skills. Other components of administrative competency, such as knowledge, understanding, and attitude were not addressed.

Fourthly, while there are principals whose professional backgrounds may be characterized by a number of variables, this study grouped respondents according to the single variable which was most characteristic of their background. Surveys were individually examined using a systematic evaluation to determine if the respondent's background was characterized by a high level of formal study, inservice training, experience as a principal, or experience as a teacher.

Finally, only four independent variables were considered. Other variables which could have affected results, such as age, gender, or area of undergraduate study were not examined.

Definitions

The following definitions apply throughout this study:
High education - This term is used to denote that group of principals whose professional background is characterized by a high level of formal education.

High inservice - This term is used to denote that group of principals whose professional background is characterized by a high level of inservice training.

High teaching - This term is used to denote that group of principals whose professional background is characterized by a high level of experience as a teacher.

High principal - This term is used to denote that group of principals whose professional background is characterized by a high level of experience as a principal.

Principal - This term is used to refer to both full time school principals as well as teaching principals. It is used interchangeably with the terms administrator and school administrator.

Formal study - This term refers to the completion of university level courses.

Inservice training - This term refers to the completion of professional development activities such as conferences and workshops.

Hypotheses

It was expected that the approach to developing administrative competency which administrators feel to
be the most effective would reflect the administrators' own backgrounds. Specifically:

1) Principals whose background is characterized by a high level of formal education would view formal study as the best approach to developing administrative competency;

2) Principals whose background is characterized by a high level of inservice training would view inservice training as the best approach to developing administrative competency;

3) Principals whose background is characterized by a high level of experience as a teacher would view gaining experience as a teacher as the best approach to developing administrative competency; and,

4) Principals whose background is characterized by a high level of experience as a principal would view gaining experience as a principal as the best approach to developing administrative competency.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of the Literature

Review of Related Literature

Approaches to administrative training.

The school principal plays a leading role in the development of an effective school. It has been presented that, given this leadership role, focusing attention on the professional preparation of school administrators is justified (Manasse, 1982). Strong central leadership and the principal serving as an instructional leader have been widely cited as important components of an effective school (Sweeny, 1982; Barth, 1982; Piñero, 1982).

Lusthaus (1982) identified three types of training systems: formal, non-formal, and informal. Lusthaus defined formal training as institutionally bases programs leading to a degree. Non-formal training includes planned educational activities which do not lead to a degree, and informal education is composed of one's daily experiences which lead to acquiring a variety of skills and abilities. Lusthaus cited the difficulties associated with administrative training, the greatest being that the boundaries of the field of educational administration are unclear, making it difficult for school administrators to choose appropriate graduate level study. Additionally, most administrators only pursue administrative training once they have already secured an administrative position.
However, as long as there remains very little mandatory pre-service training for Canadian school administrators, this is unlikely to change (Lusthaus, 1982).

**Traditional approach.**

The preparation of school administrators has taken many forms. Historically, success in teaching has been used as an indicator of one's suitability for administration (Stanton, 1980). This has occurred despite the fact that teaching and school administration are distinct activities, and success as a teacher does not serve as a reliable indicator of one's potential to be an effective administrator (Carlin, 1982).

More recently, an intermediate step of being appointed to a vice-principalship has been introduced. The vice-principalship is frequently viewed as the entry level to school administration (Vidger & Devereaux, 1980). However, in this hierarchical progression from classroom teacher to vice-principal to principal, effectiveness at one level may lead to promotion to the next level where different skills and abilities are central to effectiveness. Yet, this traditional route to the principalship is the one that is currently followed in most jurisdictions.

Within the traditional approach to principal preparation, there are no formal rules that one must follow to become
a principal (Baltzell & Dentler, 1984). The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) surveys of 1969 and 1978 found that principals and assistant principals had a range of professional experience. All had been teachers at one point in their careers, but length of service as a teacher ranged from as little as one to over twenty years. Additionally, the principal selection process greatly varies from one jurisdiction to another (Baltzell & Dentler, 1984). Hence, no general recommendations can be made on how to go about securing a principalship. Instead, prospective school administrators would do well to study their local school district to determine how administrators have been noticed in the past, and pursue a similar approach (Baltzell & Dentler, 1984).

The use of the vice-principalship as a training level for the principalship has a great deal of potential. It is the principal who is responsible for the division of duties between the principal and vice-principal (Kelly, 1987). Often, the principal assumes responsibility for the instructional aspects of the school, while the vice-principal is saddled with tasks that are primarily administrative in nature. This division of duties results in two distinct positions. The principal could make the vice-principalship a more valuable learning experience if he or she delegated responsibilities
to the vice-principal that are more related to instruction and academic improvement (Kelly, 1984; 1987).

In a survey of vice-principals, Norton and Kriekard (1987) found that most vice-principals feel that they have received an inadequate amount of training in the areas of school management, instruction, personnel, community relations, and student activities to be effective in their positions. In another survey which examined the role of the vice-principal, Gorton and Kattman (1985) found that many vice-principals wanted more responsibility in the areas of curriculum and supervision. Those who currently hold principalships could do much to help meet the training needs of vice-principals, and help them to develop the skills and abilities they will need to be effective when they assume a principalship.

Simulations.

A trend that has emerged in the training of American school administrators has been the inclusion of a component whereby the performance of prospective administrators in practical administrative situations is observed and evaluated. Indeed, a person's performance in simulated exercises has proven to be a reliable means of determining suitability for an administrative position (Hersey, 1986). The last decade has seen a wealth of literature produced on the use of Assessment Centers to evaluate administrative skills
(Lawton & Musella).

The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) has long supported the inclusion of a practical component within administrative training programs (NASSP, 1978; 1985). Surveys conducted by the Association revealed that most preparatory programs that were in place in the United States during the mid-nineteen seventies were characterized by a collection of courses with "no consistent purposes or systematic design" (NASSP, 1985, p.2). It was clear that a more thorough, valid approach was needed to prepare school administrators.

The first NASSP Assessment Center was established in 1975. The function of the Center was to provide a 'proving ground' for prospective administrators (Lepard, 1986). In addition to following courses of academic study in preparation for assuming administrative positions, candidates enter an Assessment Center where they engage in activities that see them presented with situations in which real-life school administrators would typically be found (NASSP, 1985). The way in which candidates function, that is, their behavior in varied situations, is observed and evaluated in twelve skill areas (Hersey, 1982). The twelve skill areas were identified by the NASSP (1985) as being essential for effective administration. The areas are:
problem analysis - data collection and analysis; (b) judgment (sic) - critical evaluation and decision making; (c) organizational ability - planning and scheduling personnel and resources; (d) decisiveness - acting when a decision is needed; (e) leadership - guiding others to act; (f) sensitivity - awareness of others' needs; (g) stress tolerance - performing under pressure; (h) oral communication - speaking skills; (i) written communication - writing skills; (j) range of interests - awareness of and competence to discuss a variety of subjects; (k) personal motivation - tasks and goal orientation; and (l) educational values - a consistent educational philosophy and openness to change (NASSP, 1985, p. 16).

The use of simulated experiences, as opposed to having a candidate complete a practicum in a real school, provides the opportunity for the prospective administrator to practice skills without the fear of the consequences of mistakes he or she might make (NASSP, 1985). Additionally, the simulation serves as a bridge; it is not a practicum and it is not classroom study, but rather it is an attempt to provide, in a safe setting, features of both. In this way, administrators may practice their skills and yet analyze their actions and have their actions analyzed by others in a way that would not be possible in a practicum or internship.
Formal education.

Other approaches to administrative training include inservices, formal university courses, and other educational activities. In Canada, there are few jurisdictions where prospective administrators must follow a certification program before securing a principalship (Lusthaus, 1982; Canadian Education Association, 1984). Where such requirements do exist, either at the provincial or local level, the certification program is frequently characterized by a combination of required formal and informal courses. However, the appropriateness of education as the sole means of preparing school administrators is unclear.

Early studies on the value of formal education found no relationship between academic preparation and administrative performance (Hemphill et al., 1962). Gross and Herriot's (1965) study of school leadership concluded that the number of graduate courses one had completed was negatively related to leadership skills. However, these findings have not been substantiated by recent studies which have found academic preparation to indeed be of value to school principals (Page & Page, 1984).

Formal university education is frequently viewed by principals as the least important factor contributing to their effectiveness (Barth, 1982; Beck, 1987). Yet, the
The major difficulty associated with developing a formal education program for the preparation of school administrators is determining appropriate program content.

Lusthaus (1982) identified two general but related views concerning appropriate content. First, there are those who favour "the intellectual development of administrators and are concerned with scholarly inquiry and abstraction" (Lusthaus, 1982, p. 5). The second view favours "the development of pragmatic administrative skills particularly geared to the work of administrators" (Lusthaus, 1982, p. 5). It is unclear what constitutes appropriate program content. However, the task of determining appropriate content is complicated by the fact that there does not appear to be such a thing as a typical school (Albrecht, 1984), and specific content may be beneficial to one administrator and irrelevant to another.

Additionally, the value of formal education programs is unclear. Kelly (1986) found that:

The 'state of the art' in administrator preparation programs offered by colleges and universities is an integrated collection of content-oriented courses. These 'programs' may or may not have content validity related to on the job performance requirements: and
performances in them may not be predictive of on the job performance. (p. 49)

Informal education.

Informal education activities are rarely used as the sole preparation for school administrators. While prospective administrators may attend inservices and take part in other informal activities which focus on school administration, informal education activities, specifically inservices, are more related to on the job training than to pre-service training for school administrators.

Most principals feel that their training did not provide them with all the skills and abilities they need to carry out their work (Olivero, 1982). Hence, inservice activities fulfill a remedial function, in that the content of inservice programs is often based on the perceived needs of the administrators (Olivero & Armistead, 1981). It is primarily in this supplementary function that inservice education plays a valuable role for in-service and pre-service administrators.

On the job training.

On the job training has been identified as a useful form of learning (NASSP, 1985), however, there are numerous obstacles which complicate the effective use of on the job training for principals. Peterson (1985) examined the activities of school principals in juxtaposition to Kolb's (1984)
experiential learning model. Peterson found that the work of a principal is characterized by a variety of brief tasks and a high degree of fragmentation or interruption. Peterson feels that this makes it difficult for the principal to analyze tasks and learn from them. As the next decade will see a high rate of turnover in the principalship, Peterson believes that there is a need to provide new principals with training in experiential learning. Helping principals to see the patterns within their work, establishing communication channels between principals, and developing principals' 'sense making skills' could be effectively carried out in formal education settings and provide principals with that which they need to analyze and learn from their experiences. Peterson suggests that on the job training can be an effective approach to principal development, if principals are first taught how to learn on the job.

There are benefits associated with each approach to administrative training. It appears, however, that no single approach provides comprehensive training to ready prospective administrators for the principalship. It is possible that a certain approach to training is appropriate for the development of a specific competency, so that a comprehensive training program would be made up of a number of training approaches. Given this, one must then focus on the content of an administrative
training program by examining the question of what competencies are essential to effective administration.

**Administrative competencies.**

There are numerous lists of the essential characteristics or attributes of a school administrator, with much attention focussed on the core or generic skills essential for success. There is also the contention that there is a great deal of variability in how a person can function, and still be a successful administrator (Bolton, 1980). It appears as though the appropriateness of the content which makes up a certification program is dependent upon what are perceived to be the essential prerequisite skills, abilities, and characteristics of a successful school administrator.

Lopresti (1982) examined the required competencies for fostering an appropriate learning environment and identified eight areas in which an administrator must possess knowledge and ability. For a positive learning environment, a principal must possess: (a) knowledge of students' growth and development patterns, (b) knowledge of learning theories and practices, (c) knowledge and ability to put into practice, and help others to put into practice, effective classroom management techniques, (d) knowledge or subject matter to help others in organizing content for effective instruction, (e) ability to observe in the classroom and provide criticism and support,
(f) ability to evaluate staff, (g) knowledge of where to find resources to assist with all educational tasks, and (h) knowledge of legal and fiscal matters.

Cawelti (1982), in an examination of essential administrative abilities, alluded to the importance of skills related to group leadership. He proposed the creation of a human resource development program for administrators that would include components of leadership management and traditional, or generic, course topics. Cawelti implied that skills in these areas could be learned and developed. In the field of management skills, he advocated training in the areas of planning, organizing, directing, and controlling. Training in these areas is readily available from university faculties of administration, educational administration, and management. Cawelti referred to Fayol's (1949) acronym "POSDCORB": planning, organizing, staffing, directing, co-ordinating, reporting, and budgeting as being appropriate in listing essential management skills for school administrators.

Review of the Research

Essential administrative competencies.

In an effort to identify the competencies essential for effectiveness, Graff and Street (1956) did a systematic analysis of the critical tasks faced by educational administrators, and the qualities they must possess. They defined competence
as the desired quality of job performance.

In evaluating previous attempts to identify those qualities or abilities essential to effective administration, they found to be inadequate those methods which focussed on a single area. For example, the qualities approach, that is, listing the personal qualities one must possess to be an effective administrator, is ambiguous in that a specific quality may be perceived differently by different people. Similarly, a list of competencies may be of limited use if the competencies are of such general application that they do not take into account those areas that are job specific. A person who possesses general competencies may not possess those which are critical to carrying out a specific task.

Graff and Street approached the question of what competencies must be displayed by an effective educational administrator by first determining which areas are the focus of a large number of administrative tasks. They suggested that administrative tasks largely fell into seven operational areas: (a) curriculum and instruction, (b) student personnel, (c) staff personnel, (d) school plant, (e) organizational structure, (f) finance and business organization, and (g) transportation. For each of the seven areas, Graff and Street listed the behaviors in which they felt a competent administrator would engage. However, they found the seven areas to be an inappropriate
framework from which to build a list of competencies, as there would be a great deal of overlap between the areas. Competencies essential to one operational area may also be essential in another. They found that it was more appropriate to group the desired behaviors into eight task groups:

1. Groups of tasks involving cooperative endeavor in the design, execution, and improvement of the total program of education.
2. Groups of tasks involving curriculum design.
3. Groups of tasks involving the providing of a permissive learning and working atmosphere—materials, space, time allotments, and like items.
4. Groups of tasks involving the actual improvement of instruction—demonstrations, use of teaching aids, and selection of learning experiences.
5. Groups of tasks involving promotion and stimulation—public and professional understandings, student interests, and the like.
7. Groups of tasks involving routine administrative duties—record keeping, inventories, grades, purchasing, and so on.
8. Groups of tasks involving evaluation activities—program
effectiveness, total effectiveness of the learning experience, and the assessment of student progress. (Graff & Street, 1956, p. 223).

Graff and Street examined these task groups by identifying the 'know-how items' associated with each of the following areas: (a) skills, (b) attitudes, (c) knowledges, and (d) understandings. By systematically examining the 'know-how items' related to each of the eight task groups, they identified approximately three hundred competencies essential for effective educational administration. Unfortunately, there were no major immediate follow-ups to Graff and Street's work (Campbell & Holdaway, 1970).

Campbell (1969) conducted a survey of Alberta superintendents and school board chairmen to determine the degree to which superintendents were expected to possess specific competencies. Campbell arbitrarily selected fifty competencies from Graff and Street's (1956) extensive list. These competencies were then divided into the eight major competency areas utilized by Graff and Street (1956). Survey participants were asked to rate the importance of each competency on a four point scale. Competencies that were graded as either 'important' or 'very important' by at least eighty per cent of the survey group were considered to be required competencies. Three lists of required competencies were then developed:
(a) those listed by superintendents as being required competencies, 
(b) those listed by school board chairmen as being required 
competencies, and (c) those listed by both superintendents 
and school board chairmen as being required competencies.

The results of the survey indicated that superintendents 
viewed thirty-two of the fifty competencies as being required 
competencies, and chairmen viewed twenty-one of the fifty 
competencies as being required competencies. The combined 
results of the superintendents and chairmen surveys were 
the same as those of the chairmen survey, except in the area 
of instructional improvement. It was found that superintendents 
perceived competencies related to understanding human behavior 
to be of the greatest importance, while chairmen viewed 
supervisory skills to be the most important.

There were essentially three main findings of the study: 
(a) superintendents who were effective group leaders would 
likely be viewed as more competent than those who were 
not effective group leaders, (b) the knowledge required 
of a competent superintendent could likely be gained through 
advanced university study--such as graduate programs in 
educational administration, and (c) given the competencies 
superintendents are expected to possess, a broad social sciences 
background appeared to be important.

Campbell's work, though limited in scope, provides
useful information on the required competencies of superintendents secured from those in superintendent positions, and from those whose positions saw them in a great deal of contact with superintendents. The perceptions of people in these positions could provide a valuable guide to those engaged in hiring superintendents (Campbell & Holdaway, 1970), and could give some insight into what the content of an administrative training program should be.

Ellett (1975-75) conducted an extensive systematic analysis of school administrative operations. Project R.O.M.E.: Results Oriented Management in Education, was one of the largest studies to identify, verify, and validate a comprehensive list of competencies for educational administrators (Robertson, 1982).

By synthesizing nearly four thousand competency statements identified by principals, professional literature reviews, and other sources, Ellett developed a list of three hundred and six statements of principal competencies, duties, roles, functions, and responsibilities. These three hundred and six statements were then classified into seven functional areas of responsibility: (a) curriculum and instruction, (b) staff personnel, (c) pupil personnel, (d) support management, (e) school community, (f) fiscal management, and (g) system-wide policies and operations. In each of these areas, six
administrative operations were identified: (a) collecting information, (b) planning, (c) decision making, (d) communicating, (e) implementing, and (f) evaluating. Finally, the list of three hundred and six competencies was narrowed to eighty competency statements by having administrators examine the list and rate the importance of each. The list was refined on the basis of importance and frequency.

Ellett's functional areas bear a marked similarity to Graff and Street's (1956) eight task groups; the six administrative operations are similar to Fayol's (1949) 'POSDCORB'. However, by having practicing administrators verify his list of competency statements, Ellett's work gains some measure of validity.

Klopf et al. (1982), in examining the role of school principals, developed a taxonomy of functions and competencies. In addition to determining the general characteristics of principals, these researchers identified seven general areas in which a school principal must display competency. Within each area, specific essential skills were cited. The seven general function and competency areas were: (a) the learning environment, (b) the learning needs of children, (c) the instructional program, (d) staff development, (e) community resources, (f) building management, and (f) financial management.

A close examination of the work of Klopf et al. reveals
a marked similarity to the work of Graff and Street (1956) and Ellett (1975-76). Of the ninety-two specific competencies listed by Klopf et al., only sixteen of them were not identified by Ellett (Robertson, 1982). Also, the general competency areas listed by Klopf et al. are highly similar to those listed by Graff and Street. This similarity indicates that Graff and Street (1956) and Ellett (1975-76) have produced reliable lists of essential competencies (Robertson, 1982).

Olivero (1982) surveyed California school principals in an effort to determine what they viewed to be the most important of ninety-one specific competencies. The five competencies ranking the highest were: (a) school climate, that is, the ability to analyze factors that affect school climate, (b) personnel evaluation skills, (c) team building skills, (d) internal communication skills, and (e) supervisory skills. Each of these competencies is directly related to the interpersonal skills of the principal (Olivero & Armistead, 1981). The results of this survey appear to be congruent with earlier studies which cited the importance of principals' group leadership ability.

Norton and Harrington (1987) conducted a national survey of vocational and technical school administrators to determine essential competencies. Designed as a follow-up to a similar study conducted ten years earlier (Norton et al., 1977),
this study began by convening eleven experts in the field of vocational education. This panel collaborated to develop a list of two hundred and ten tasks in twelve duty areas important to technical and vocational administrators. This list was subsequently sent to one hundred and eighty-eight vocational administrators for verification. Of the two hundred and ten tasks, two hundred and one were verified as important. The twelve duty areas for the training of vocational administrators remained relatively unchanged from the 1977 study. The following duty areas were identified as important: (a) program planning, development, and evaluation, (b) curriculum and instructional management, (c) student services, (d) personnel management, (e) business and financial management, (f) facilities and equipment management, (g) professional and staff development, (h) resource development, (i) marketing vocational-technical education, (j) public relations, (k) economic development, and (l) program articulation.

Background and perceptions of administrators.

Surveys have been carried out to determine what school administrators view to be required competencies for effective school administration. However, rarely is enough information about respondents collected so that the link between respondents' background and their perceptions of appropriate administrative training can be examined.
The Department of Elementary School Principals (1968) conducted an extensive survey of American school principals which, in addition to securing data on the characteristics of respondents, asked principals what preparation or experience most contributed to their success in school administration. Those who had served over fifteen years as a principal felt that on the job training was most important, while those who had served less than five years as a principal felt their experience as a teacher was the most important contributor to their success. While the data are insufficient to draw any conclusions as to why respondents answered the way they did, it appears that in this survey, high-experienced and low-experienced principals viewed the factor which was most characteristic of their own careers at that point as being the biggest contributor to their success.

In 1969, the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) conducted another survey, this time of assistant principals in elementary schools. Using a survey similar to that employed in 1968, it was found that American assistant principals typically had a high level of school experience, yet had only been an assistant principal for three years. Despite this low level of on the job experience, over sixty-five per cent of respondents credited on the job training with a competent principal as the factor most
contributing to their success as an assistant principal. Slightly more than twenty-eight percent credited their experience as a teacher as the reason for their success, and only three per cent cited their education background.

The statistics in this study are not presented in a manner that permits one to determine if experienced assistant principals cited on the job training as the reason for their success more frequently than did less experienced assistant principals. However, one may speculate on why the results of this survey differ from those of the survey of elementary school principals conducted by the Department of Elementary School Principals in 1968. Firstly, the role of the assistant principal is quite different than the role of the principal (Kelly, 1984; 1987). Subsequently, assistant principals and principals are likely to view different experiences as being the main contributor to their success. Secondly, the respondents in the 1969 survey typically spent far more time carrying out administrative and clerical tasks than on activities related to curriculum. It is frequently through teaching experience that one develops skills in curriculum development and instruction. Hence, teaching experience appears to be less relevant to assistant principals than to principals, who are more involved in instructional functions. Finally, the assistant principalship is often a temporary
largely felt graduate education was of much value (56.1%), while those with a B.A. degree were less likely to feel this way (18.6%). Principals with less than five years of experience were also more likely to identify graduate education as having much value than were principals with more than five years of experience. Additionally, experienced principals more frequently indicated that graduate education had little value than did principals with a low level of experience.

These surveys of American school administrators provide some indication that principals favorably view those approaches to preparation which reflect their own backgrounds. However, this does not appear to apply to assistant principals.

Recent surveys have found that there have been some changes in principals' backgrounds over the last decade. Principals typically have five years of teaching experience before they enter the principalship (Sweeney & Vittingolf, 1986), down considerably from an average of ten years in 1969 (NAESP, 1969). It is possible that principals would rate the contribution their teaching experience had on their success as a principal lower than they did ten or twenty years ago. However, few studies, other than those carried out by the Department of Elementary School Principals and the NAESP, have collected data which would allow one to
begin to examine the link between principals' background and their perception of appropriate training for potential school administrators.

Walters (1979) conducted a survey of school principals and superintendents to determine what they viewed as being required competencies, what contribution they felt their academic program had on their success on the job, and if the competencies they viewed as important were developed through their studies or on the job. Respondents rated their academic background as being of 'some assistance' in acquiring ninety-one per cent of the competencies presented in the survey. While the survey did not secure demographic data which would permit an examination of respondents' background, the NAESP's (1978) survey, conducted a year earlier, found that over seventy-five per cent of principals possessed at least a Masters degree. Given this formal education background of the typical American elementary school principal, it may come as no surprise that, in Walter's (1979) study, academic background was viewed as important in the development of a wide range of competencies.

In an extensive survey of Texas school administrators, Beck (1987) secured data on what principals perceived to be: (a) the source of their expertise, (b) the skills essential for success, (c) their own level of expertise in specific
skill areas, and (d) the adequacy of the preparation they received in university programs in educational administration. The skill areas examined by Beck were: (a) instructional leadership, (b) campus leadership, (c) interpersonal relations, (d) student management, (e) public relations, (f) teacher evaluation, (g) staff development, (h) curriculum development, (i) physical plant management, and (j) budget and finance.

Respondents felt that instructional leadership, campus leadership, and interpersonal relations were essential for success. The respondents indicated that the areas in which they felt they had the highest level of expertise were student management, campus leadership, and interpersonal relations. On the job training and common sense were largely rated as being the source of respondents' expertise. University preparation programs received the second lowest rating in this category, ahead only of 'expertise gained outside of education'.

Nearly seventy-five per cent of respondents had over five years of experience as a principal, and over forty-two per cent held assistant principalships prior to becoming principals. This may account for the high rating of the value of on the job training. Yet, the value of university education was rated relatively low. On a five point rating scale where on the job training received a mean rating of
4.62, university education received a mean rating of 3.61. This occurred despite the respondents' high level of education; state regulations require principals to complete forty-five graduate credits in educational administration.

Unfortunately, Beck had respondents rate general areas such as instructional leadership and interpersonal relations, rather than specific functions within these general areas. It is therefore impossible to determine, in Beck's study, if respondents truly felt a general area such as curriculum development was not as important to their success as expertise in instructional leadership; possibly certain specific components of curriculum development would have received higher ratings.

The data collected by Beck indicate that respondents, who generally had a high level of principal experience, highly rate the value of on the job training. Their rating of the value of university education, however, was not congruent with their own backgrounds, which were characterized by a high level of education.

Surveys as needs analyses.

There is a recommendation in the literature that, when designing a program for the training of school administrators, practicing administrators should be surveyed to determine program content (American Association of School Administrators, 1979; Musella, 1983; NASSP, 1985). However, there is an
indication that surveys which are carried out to determine training needs identify training areas that are both central to and irrelevant to the job.

Graham and Mihal (1986) carried out a study in which first, middle, and executive managers were given lists of tasks, areas of expertise, and competencies which they were asked to rate in terms of their importance to job performance. With this, the researchers were able to develop job descriptions for each level of management, comprised of fifty-two tasks, forty-five areas of expertise, and twenty skills and traits. When the researchers surveyed the managers to determine perceived training needs, it was found that approximately one out of four training requests were not relevant to the job descriptions. Next, the supervisors of each level of management were given their subordinates' training plan and were asked to make it more relevant. However, supervisory review did not reduce the number of irrelevant training requests.

This appears to indicate that surveying managers to determine training needs may result in the identification of numerous irrelevant needs areas. Possibly, surveying practicing school administrators to determine the content of an administrative training program may result in the identification of training areas irrelevant to effective administration. While a survey may be used to determine program content, principals' job
descriptions, which may vary from one jurisdiction to another, should be taken into account.

Clearly, there are specific competencies which are important to effective administration. However, it was unclear as to which of the four approaches, or combinations of approaches, is the most efficient means of developing administrative competency. In previous surveys of school administrators, there appeared to be a link between principals' perceptions of the contribution an aspect of their preparation had on their success, and the degree to which that type of preparation characterized their own background. Essentially, there appeared to be a relationship between what principals did before becoming principals, what helped them the most in becoming principals, and what they felt others should do in becoming principals. This apparent link begged further examination.
CHAPTER THREE
Methodology

Subjects
All Winnipeg area school principals were surveyed. This included all principals from the following divisions:
- Winnipeg School Division No. 1
- St. James Assiniboia School Division No. 2
- Assiniboine South School Division No. 3
- St. Boniface School Division No. 4
- Fort Garry School Division No. 5
- St. Vital School Division No. 6
- Norwood School Division No. 8
- River East School Division No. 9
- Seven Oaks School Division No. 10
- Transcona Springfield School Division No. 12

The number of schools within these divisions is 256.

Instrumentation
This was a mail-out survey. In order to collect data on respondents' professional backgrounds as well as on their perception of the best approach to developing administrative competency skills, the survey was divided into two parts. Part A secured information on the respondents' background in four areas: (a) level of formal education, (b) amount and type of inservice training they received,
(c) level of teaching experience, and (d) level of experience as a principal. Additionally, respondents were asked which of eight competency skill areas they felt were the most important to develop in prospective administrators. The eight competency skill areas were related to those which were identified as important by Graff and Street (1956) and supported by Campbell (1969), Klopf et al. (1982), and others. These areas were: (a) human relations, (b) curriculum design, (c) school climate, (d) instructional improvement, (e) utilization of community resources, (f) guidance, (g) administration, and (h) evaluation.

The twenty-four competency skills used in this survey were randomly selected from Graff and Street's (1956) extensive list of administrative skills. In the survey, the first three questions in Part B of the survey were related to skills in the first competency area: human relations. The next three questions were related to the second competency area of curriculum design. Three questions related to skills in each of the remaining six competency areas resulted in a total of twenty four questions in Part B of the survey.

Procedure

Questionnaires were mailed to Winnipeg area school principals immediately after the March break in the spring of 1989. The follow-up consisted of two additional mailed contacts. Contacts were carried out according to the following schedule:
(1) Mailing of questionnaire.
   - eight day waiting period
(2) Post card reminder to those who had not returned the survey.
   - twenty-two day waiting period
(3) Post card reminder and additional copy of the survey to those who had not returned the survey.
   - fourteen day waiting period

Once the data were secured, respondents were distributed into groups according to the professional characteristics of each respondent. Surveys were individually examined to determine the variable which was most characteristic of the respondents' background. Specifically, respondents whose background was characterized by a high level of experience as a principal were placed in the high principal group; respondents whose background was characterized by a high level of experience as a teacher were placed in the high teaching group; respondents whose background was characterized by a high level of formal education were placed in the high education group; and, respondents whose background was characterized by a high level of inservice training were placed in the high inservice group. The method by which respondents were placed in their respective groups is illustrated by the flow chart in Figure 1.
Figure 1. Flow chart illustrating the means by which respondents were placed in groups.

- Does respondent possess a degree beyond the Masters level?  
  - Yes: High education  
  - No: Yes

- Are the number of years of experience as a principal greater than the number of years of experience as a teacher?  
  - Yes: High principal  
  - No: Yes

- Does the respondents possess a graduate level degree?  
  - Yes: High education  
  - No: Yes

- Has the respondent completed inservice training in all eight competency skill areas?  
  - Yes: High inservice  
  - No: High teaching
While, indeed, respondents' background may be characterized by a number of variables, this study sought to classify them on the basis of the single most characteristic variable. Permitting respondents to choose the variable which was most characteristic of their own background may potentially have seen some respondents selecting more than one variable, requiring a contingency plan whereby the surveys of respondents who chose more than one variable would be evaluated to determine the most characteristic variable. This would have resulted in an unacceptable inconsistency whereby some surveys would have been examined by the researcher to determine which variable was the most characteristic of the respondent's background, while others were classified according to the single variable identified by the respondent.

Instead, all surveys were classified using the same approach. In examining the responses to questions on professional background in Part A of the survey, it was noted if the respondent had pursued university study beyond the Masters level. If the respondent had completed, or was in the process of completing a doctorate degree, he or she was placed in the high education category. If the respondent possessed a Masters degree or less, then the number of years of experience as a principal that the respondent had was compared with the number of years of experience he or she had as a teacher.
If the respondent had spent the majority of his or her career in the principalship, then he or she was placed in the high principal group. If the person spent the majority of his or her career as a teacher, then that person's education and inservice background was examined. If the person possessed a Masters degree, he or she was placed in the high education group. If the respondent did not possess a Masters degree, but had completed inservice training in each of the eight competency skill areas, he or she was placed in the high inservice group. Finally, if the respondent had not received inservice training in all eight competency skill areas, did not possess an advanced degree, and had spent the majority of his or her career as a teacher, then his or her background was deemed to be most characterized by teaching experience, and the respondent was placed in the high teaching group. By using this approach, respondents were grouped on a consistent basis according to the variable which was most characteristic of their background.

The next step involved compiling the data gathered in part A of the survey to determine the typical background of principals in each group. The group of principals whose background was characterized by a high level of inservice (N=3) was insufficient in size to tabulate responses for that group, however, these surveys were included in the
exercise of tabulating the responses of all principals, so as to determine the characteristics of the typical school principal.

In Part A of the survey, the percentage of respondents who chose a specific response was determined. In some cases percentages did not add to 100, as respondents may have selected more than one response, or not have selected any response. Mean years of experience as a principal, vice-principal, and teacher were also calculated for each group.

The next step involved calculating the percentage of respondents in each group who selected a specific response in Part B of the survey. Percentages were calculated for all groups except that in which respondents background was characterized by a high level of inservice training. The low number of respondents in this group rendered the data inconclusive. Once again, in examining the data from Part B of the survey, it may be noted that percentages do not necessarily total to one hundred, as respondents may have selected more than one response, or may not have selected any response for some questions.

Next, modal responses in Part B of the survey were identified. Modal responses in Part B of the survey were examined in juxtaposition to responses in Part A of the survey to determine if respondents most frequently identified
the best approach to developing administrative competency
as that which was most characteristic of their own backgrounds.
CHAPTER FOUR
Analysis of the Data

Response Rate

Of the 256 surveys that were sent to Winnipeg area school principals, 194 useable responses were received for a response rate of 74 per cent. Respondents were grouped according to background into four groups: high principal (N=98), high teaching (N=55), high education (N=38), and high inservice (N=3).

Data Summary

Figure 2, which follows, is provided to give a summary of the modal responses to each question. Responses for each of the three groups are shown. These are: high education (H.E.), high teaching (H.T.), and high principal (H.P.). Additionally, modal responses across groups are given (Totals). In tabulating the modal responses across groups, principals in the high inservice group (N=3) were included.

Professional Characteristics of School Principals

There were a number of similarities across groups with regard to professional background. Respondents, on the whole, had a far greater level of administrative experience at the elementary level than they did at the junior or senior high level. Slightly less than one third of respondents had been employed as teaching principals. Principals in
**Figure 2. Summary of Survey Responses.**

### Question: Percentage response by group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H.E.</th>
<th>H.T.</th>
<th>H.P.</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **How many years of experience do you have as a full time principal at the following grade levels?**

   (1) elementary (grades K-6) | 4.5  | 3.3  | 9.4  | 6.7   |
   (2) junior high (grades 7-9) | 2.1  | 1.0  | 5.0  | 3.1   |
   (3) high School (grades 10-12) | 2.1  | 0.3  | 3.0  | 1.8   |

2. **Have you ever been employed as a teaching principal?**

   (1) yes | 29% | 38% | 31% | 32% |
   (2) no - if you answered no, please skip the next question. | 71% | 62% | 69% | 68% |

3. **How many years of experience do you have as a teaching principal at the following grade levels?**

   (1) elementary (grades K-6) | 4.0  | 1.1  | 1.7  | 2.5  |
   (2) junior high (grades 7-9) | 1.4  | 0.4  | 1.9  | 1.7  |
   (3) high School (grades 10-12) | 2.0  | 0.02 | 0.5  | 0.6  |

4. **Have you ever been employed as a vice-principal?**

   (1) yes | 67% | 80% | 77% | 75% |
   (2) no | 33% | 20% | 23% | 25% |
Figure 2 (continued).

Question: Percentage response by group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H.E.</th>
<th>H.T.</th>
<th>H.P.</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=38</td>
<td>N=55</td>
<td>N=98</td>
<td>N=194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How many years of experience do you have as a vice-principal at the following grade levels?

(1) elementary (grades K-6) 2.5 2.0 1.5 2.0
(2) junior high (grades 7-9) 1.4 1.2 1.6 1.5
(3) high school (grades 10-12) 1.3 1.0 1.1 1.2

6. Prior to your initial appointment as a principal, in what educational capacity did you serve?

(1) classroom teacher 34% 35% 53% 43%
(2) guidance counsellor 16% 2% 2% 5%
(3) librarian 0% 0% 0% 0%
(4) special education teacher 8% 6% 4% 6%
(5) vice-principal 39% 56% 49% 49%
(6) central office admin. 8% 2% 2% 3%
(7) other 30% 18% 7% 16%

7. How many years of experience do you have as a full time teacher of the following grade levels?

(1) elementary (grades K-6) 4.9 8.0 3.3 4.9
(2) junior high (grades 7-9) 3.8 3.0 2.8 3.2
(3) high school (grades 10-12) 5.0 2.8 2.2 2.9
8. Which of the following university degrees do you hold? Please circle the number next to each degree you hold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Percentage Response by Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>H.E. 79%  H.T. 67%  H.P. 83%  Totals 76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Commerce</td>
<td>3% 0% 1% 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Education</td>
<td>82% 78% 87% 83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Physical Ed.</td>
<td>5% 7% 4% 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
<td>16% 16% 16% 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts</td>
<td>18% 4% 4% 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Education</td>
<td>79% 4% 38% 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Science</td>
<td>0% 0% 1% 0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>34% 11% 8% 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No degree held</td>
<td>0% 2% 0% 0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Which of the following academic programs have you completed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Percentage Response by Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pre-Masters in Arts</td>
<td>H.E. 13%  H.T. 5%  H.P. 4%  Totals 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-Masters in Education</td>
<td>34% 38% 26% 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-Masters in Science</td>
<td>3% 2% 1% 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8% 0% 4% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None completed</td>
<td>5% 31% 28% 24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2 (continued).

Question: 10. In which of the following areas have you engaged in professional development activities (such as inservices, conferences, or workshops) in the last year? Circle the number beside all topic areas that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>H.E.</th>
<th>H.T.</th>
<th>H.P.</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) human relations</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) curriculum design</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) school climate</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) instructional improvement</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) utilization of community resources</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) guidance</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) administration</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) evaluation</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) none of the above</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2 (continued).

Question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage response by group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. A principal must possess skills and abilities in many areas to be an effective administrator. Of the following 8 areas, please circle the number beside the THREE that you most feel a principal must be proficient in to be an effective administrator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>H.E.</th>
<th>H.T.</th>
<th>H.P.</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) human relations</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) curriculum design</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) school climate</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) instructional improvement</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) utilization of community resources</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) guidance</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) administration</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) evaluation</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Getting people to work together harmoniously as a group:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H.E. N=38</th>
<th>H.T. N=55</th>
<th>H.P. N=98</th>
<th>Totals N=194</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Stimulating group thinking:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H.E. N=38</th>
<th>H.T. N=55</th>
<th>H.P. N=98</th>
<th>Totals N=194</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Learning to recognize ability in others - contributions they can make toward group effectiveness:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H.E. N=38</th>
<th>H.T. N=55</th>
<th>H.P. N=98</th>
<th>Totals N=194</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Recognizing developmental levels of students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H.E.</th>
<th>H.T.</th>
<th>H.P.</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) formal study</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) inservice training</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) experience as a teacher</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) experience as a principal</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Formulating learning experiences appropriate to the interests and abilities of students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H.E.</th>
<th>H.T.</th>
<th>H.P.</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) formal study</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) inservice training</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) experience as a teacher</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) experience as a principal</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Incorporating the use of available community resources into the curriculum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H.E.</th>
<th>H.T.</th>
<th>H.P.</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) formal study</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) inservice training</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) experience as a teacher</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) experience as a principal</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2 (continued).

Question: Percentage response by group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H.E.</th>
<th>H.T.</th>
<th>H.P.</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=38</td>
<td>N=55</td>
<td>N=98</td>
<td>N=194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. In arranging resource materials so as to provide maximum use, safety, and flexibility:

(1) formal study  
(2) inservice training  
(3) experience as a teacher  
(4) experience as a principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>11%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Selecting materials appropriate to students' learning needs and activities:

(1) formal study  
(2) inservice training  
(3) experience as a teacher  
(4) experience as a principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18%</th>
<th>16%</th>
<th>14%</th>
<th>16%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Providing for the repair, upkeep, and general maintenance of the school and resources:

(1) formal study  
(2) inservice training  
(3) experience as a teacher  
(4) experience as a principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2 (continued).

Question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage response by group:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Motivating teachers to pursue professional development:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) formal study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) inservice training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) experience as a teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) experience as a principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Getting teachers to participate in the planning and work of the school:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) formal study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) inservice training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) experience as a teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) experience as a principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Identifying factors which obstruct curriculum improvement:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) formal study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) inservice training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) experience as a teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) experience as a principal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2 (continued).

Question:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage response by group:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Stimulating students to think about their future:

| (1) formal study          | 3%    | 4%    | 8%    | 6%     |
| (2) inservice training    | 21%   | 22%   | 26%   | 24%    |
| (3) experience as a teacher | 76%  | 75%   | 65%   | 70%    |
| (4) experience as a principal | 8%   | 15%   | 21%   | 16%    |

25. Working with community members to clarify the role of the school within the community:

| (1) formal study          | 8%    | 5%    | 4%    | 5%     |
| (2) inservice training    | 16%   | 22%   | 19%   | 20%    |
| (3) experience as a teacher | 11%  | 5%    | 9%    | 8%     |
| (4) experience as a principal | 68%  | 82%   | 79%   | 77%    |

26. Identifying the 'power structure' - key and influential persons and groups withing the community and securing aid and program support from this group:

| (1) formal study          | 5%    | 9%    | 8%    | 8%     |
| (2) inservice training    | 16%   | 15%   | 13%   | 14%    |
| (3) experience as a teacher | 11%  | 7%    | 7%    | 8%     |
| (4) experience as a principal | 74%  | 82%   | 83%   | 80%    |
### Figure 2 (continued).

#### Question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage response by group:</th>
<th>H.E. N=38</th>
<th>H.T. N=55</th>
<th>H.P. N=98</th>
<th>Totals N=194</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

27. Observing and interpreting behavior:

- **(1) formal study**
  - **H.E.** 15%
  - **H.T.** 42%
  - **H.P.** 29%
  - **Totals** 36%

- **(2) inservice training**
  - **H.E.** 21%
  - **H.T.** 27%
  - **H.P.** 36%
  - **Totals** 36%

- **(3) experience as a teacher**
  - **H.E.** 45%
  - **H.T.** 38%
  - **H.P.** 34%
  - **Totals** 37%

- **(4) experience as a principal**
  - **H.E.** 29%
  - **H.T.** 29%
  - **H.P.** 28%
  - **Totals** 28%

28. Establishing rapport with teachers and students through the building if a feeling of mutual confidence:

- **(1) formal study**
  - **H.E.** 5%
  - **H.T.** 2%
  - **H.P.** 2%
  - **Totals** 3%

- **(2) inservice training**
  - **H.E.** 18%
  - **H.T.** 18%
  - **H.P.** 20%
  - **Totals** 19%

- **(3) experience as a teacher**
  - **H.E.** 32%
  - **H.T.** 25%
  - **H.P.** 22%
  - **Totals** 25%

- **(4) experience as a principal**
  - **H.E.** 68%
  - **H.T.** 71%
  - **H.P.** 73%
  - **Totals** 71%

29. Securing and making available various diagnostic tests:

- **(1) formal study**
  - **H.E.** 63%
  - **H.T.** 58%
  - **H.P.** 53%
  - **Totals** 57%

- **(2) inservice training**
  - **H.E.** 24%
  - **H.T.** 40%
  - **H.P.** 35%
  - **Totals** 34%

- **(3) experience as a teacher**
  - **H.E.** 21%
  - **H.T.** 22%
  - **H.P.** 19%
  - **Totals** 20%

- **(4) experience as a principal**
  - **H.E.** 5%
  - **H.T.** 5%
  - **H.P.** 11%
  - **Totals** 9%
30. Keeping adequate and useful records without becoming overburdened with useless details and 'paper work':

(1) formal study  11%  4%  6%  6%
(2) inservice training  16%  36%  36%  32%
(3) experience as a teacher  21%  20%  16%  18%
(4) experience as a principal  66%  53%  60%  59%

31. Utilizing records which show school growth and progress:

(1) formal study  21%  27%  12%  18%
(2) inservice training  29%  38%  34%  35%
(3) experience as a teacher  11%  15%  15%  14%
(4) experience as a principal  50%  36%  55%  48%

32. Reporting to parents, school staff, and other interested individuals and groups:

(1) formal study  5%  13%  3%  6%
(2) inservice training  24%  24%  21%  22%
(3) experience as a teacher  26%  27%  31%  28%
(4) experience as a principal  71%  64%  67%  68%
### Figure 2 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question:</th>
<th>Percentage response by group:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=38</td>
<td>N=55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 33. Selecting evaluation activities which will help to determine the degree of program effectiveness:

- (1) formal study | 32% | 47% | 34% | 26% |
- (2) inservice training | 42% | 45% | 48% | 46% |
- (3) experience as a teacher | 21% | 24% | 21% | 22% |
- (4) experience as a principal | 34% | 18% | 26% | 29% |

#### 34. Interpreting evaluation results to interested groups and persons:

- (1) formal study | 37% | 40% | 35% | 36% |
- (2) inservice training | 21% | 45% | 39% | 38% |
- (3) experience as a teacher | 11% | 18% | 13% | 14% |
- (4) experience as a principal | 53% | 27% | 38% | 37% |

#### 35. Translating evaluation findings into plans for action aimed at school improvement:

- (1) formal study | 24% | 24% | 10% | 16% |
- (2) inservice training | 18% | 42% | 37% | 35% |
- (3) experience as a teacher | 13% | 7% | 8% | 9% |
- (4) experience as a principal | 58% | 62% | 71% | 66% |
the high education group had the greatest amount of experience as teaching principals at the elementary level (4 years) and senior level (2 years). Three quarters of respondents had been employed, at one time, as vice-principals, with the average number of years of experience for all groups being 2 years at the elementary level, 1.5 years at the junior high level, and 1.2 years at the senior high level.

Prior to their initial appointment as principal, respondents were likely to have served as vice-principals (49%), and / or classroom teachers (43%). Additionally, respondents had, on average, more teaching experience at the elementary level (4.9 years) than at the junior high (3.2 years) or senior high (2.9 years) levels.

With regard to academic background, the majority of respondents held a Bachelor of Education degree (83%), and / or a Bachelor of Arts degree (76%). Slightly over one third of respondents also possessed a Master of Education degree (35%), and slightly less than one third had completed a pre-Masters in Education (31%).

Results

There was no evidence to suggest that principals recommend that new administrators undergo the same sort of preparation that they themselves followed. It appears that administrators' professional backgrounds do not influence
their perceptions of appropriate administrative training.

**Hypothesis 1, Data and Findings.**

The hypothesis that principals whose background is characterized by a high level of formal education would view formal study as the best approach to developing administrative competency was not supported. Principals in the high education group chose formal study as the best approach to developing administrative competency on four of the twenty-four questions in Part B of the survey. Interestingly, two of these four were on questions related to the competency area of guidance - learning how to provide support and direction to teachers and students. Principals in this group most frequently chose 'experience as a principal' as the best approach to developing administrative competency.

**Hypothesis 2, Data and Findings**

Hypothesis 2 stated that principals whose background was characterized by a high level of inservice training would view inservice training as the best approach to developing administrative competency. There were an insufficient number of respondents whose background was characterized by a high level of inservice training to determine the effect of this variable on recommendations for the preparation of administrators.

**Hypothesis 3, Data and Findings.**
The hypothesis that principals whose background is characterized by a high level of experience as a teacher would view gaining experience as a teacher as the best approach to developing administrative competency was not supported. Principals in this group chose experience as a teacher as the best approach to developing administrative competency on five of the twenty-four questions in Part B of the survey. Respondents selected the response 'experience as a teacher' for all questions related to curriculum design. Most frequently chosen as the best approach to developing administrative competency was the response 'experience as a principal'.

Hypothesis 4, Data and Findings

The hypothesis that principals whose background was characterized by a high level of experience as a principals would view gaining experience as a principal as the best approach to developing administrative competency was supported. Principals with a high level of administrative experience most frequently chose the response 'experience as a principal' on questions on the best way to develop administrative competency. This response was selected for thirteen of the twenty-four questions in Part B of the survey. Additionally, principals in this group most frequently selected 'experience as a principal' in response to at least one of the questions
related to each of the eight competency areas.

Inservice Training and Recommendations for Inservice Training

Respondents were asked to indicate the competency areas in which they had engaged in professional development activities in the last year. They were then asked to indicate in which of these three areas they felt an administrator must be proficient. This part of the survey gathered data to determine if: (a) the inservice areas that practicing school principals identified as important to effective administration were the same areas in which they themselves had undergone professional development, and (b) what inservice areas practicing school principals viewed as important.

The three areas in which most respondents had engaged in professional development activities were evaluation (80%), instructional improvement (76%), and human relations (71%). The three competency areas that respondents most felt were important to effective administration were human relations (86%), instructional improvement (78%), and school climate (59%). Interestingly, while 80% of respondents had engaged in professional development activities related to evaluation, only 46% felt that this was one of the three most important areas in which to engage in professional development for effective administration.

In examining respondents by group, it was found that there
was little variation in the percentage of each group that engaged in a specific professional development activities. Similarly, there was little variation between groups in response to the question of which three areas they felt were most important to effective administration. Human relations was identified by the largest percentage of respondents in the high education, high teaching, and high principal groups as being important to effective administration. The next largest percentage of the high teaching and high principal groups identified instructional improvement as important. The third largest percentage of these groups identified school climate as important. For the high education group, the second largest percentage selected school climate, and the third largest percentage selected instructional improvement.

Approaches to Administrative Training

In Part B of the survey, responses were examined by competency area. The first three questions in Part B were related to the human relations competency area; the next three were related to the curriculum design area. There were three questions related to each of the eight competency areas.

Human relations.

Inservice training and experience as a principal were identified as the best approaches to developing competency
in human relations. Experience as a principal was the least often selected response by the high education and high teaching groups on the question asking respondents to identify the best approach to developing the ability to stimulate group thinking.

This competency area was most frequently identified by respondents as being important to effective administration. Inservice training and on the job experience appear to be the best ways to develop competency in this area. For each question related to the competency area of human relations, the most frequently selected response was the same for all groups: experience as a principal. Modal responses to questions related to the human relations competency area are shown in Figure 3.

**Curriculum design.**

Responses to questions related to the curriculum design competency area are shown in Figure 4. Experience as a teacher was consistently identified as the best approach to developing administrative competency in curriculum design. On the question on asking respondents to identify the best approach to developing the ability to incorporate the use of available community resources into the curriculum, experience as a teacher was most frequently selected by all respondents (39%), but only marginally ahead of experience as a principal (38%) and inservice training (36%).
Figure 3. **Responses to questions related to the human relations competency area.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question:</th>
<th>Percentage response by group:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.E. N=38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting people to work together harmoniously as a group:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) formal study</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) inservice training</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) experience as a teacher</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) experience as a principal</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating group thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) formal study</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) inservice training</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) experience as a teacher</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) experience as a principal</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning to recognize ability in others - contributions they can make toward group effectiveness:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) formal study</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) inservice training</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) experience as a teacher</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) experience as a principal</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4. **Responses to questions related to the curriculum design competency area.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question:</th>
<th>Percentage response by group:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recognizing developmental levels of students:**

(1) formal study 55%  44%  33%  41%
(2) inservice training 5%  18%  14%  13%
(3) experience as a teacher 47%  62%  65%  60%
(4) experience as a principal 0%  4%  8%  5%

**Formulating learning experiences appropriate to the interests and abilities of students:**

(1) formal study 21%  15%  10%  13%
(2) inservice training 18%  29%  29%  26%
(3) experience as a teacher 74%  78%  71%  72%
(4) experience as a principal 0%  4%  10%  6%

**Incorporating the use of available community resources into the curriculum:**

(1) formal study 0%  11%  10%  9%
(2) inservice training 42%  40%  32%  36%
(3) experience as a teacher 42%  42%  37%  39%
(4) experience as a principal 24%  35%  44%  38%
School climate.

Figure 5 shows the responses to questions related to the school climate competency area. Experience as a teacher and experience as a principal were most frequently identified as the best approaches to developing administrative competency related to school climate. Formal study was the least frequently selected response. There was some variation between groups on the question regarding the best approach to developing the ability to arrange resource materials so as to provide maximum use, safety, and flexibility. Respondents in the high education and high principal groups most frequently selected the response 'experience as a teacher', yet over half of the respondents in the high teaching group selected 'inservice training'.

Instructional improvement.

Experience as a principal and inservice training were most frequently selected as the best approaches to developing administrative competency skills related to instructional improvement. The only exception to this was the high education group, which selected formal study as the best approach to developing the ability to identify factors which obstruct curriculum improvement. Overall, however, there was little variation between groups on this question. Formal study was the least frequently selected response to the remaining
Figure 5. Responses to questions related to the school climate competency area.

Question: In arranging resource materials so as to provide maximum use, safety, and flexibility:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal

Selecting materials appropriate to students' learning needs and activities:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal

Providing for the repair, upkeep, and general maintenance of the school and resources:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal
questions related to this competency area. Modal responses are shown in Figure 6.

**Utilizing community resources.**

Experience as a teacher and experience as a principal were most frequently selected as the best approaches to developing competency in the utilization of community resources. In response to the question on the best way to develop the ability to stimulate students to think about their future, there was some degree of variation between groups. While experience as a teacher was the most frequently selected response for all groups, a smaller percentage of the high principal groups selected this response (65%) than did those in the high education group (76%) and the high teaching group (75%). Formal study was the least frequently selected response by all groups for each question. Modal responses for each question related to this competency area are shown in Figure 7.

**Guidance.**

There was a great deal of variation within and between groups in response to questions on the best approach to developing competency skills related to guidance. In response to the question on the best approach to developing the ability to observe and interpret behavior, experience as a principal was the only response that was not selected by the largest
Figure 6. Responses to questions related to the instructional improvement competency area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question:</th>
<th>Percentage response by group:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating teachers to pursue professional development:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) formal study</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) inservice training</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) experience as a teacher</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) experience as a principal</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting teachers to participate in the planning and work of the school:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) formal study</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) inservice training</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) experience as a teacher</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) experience as a principal</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying factors which obstruct curriculum improvement:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) formal study</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) inservice training</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) experience as a teacher</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) experience as a principal</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7. Responses to questions related to the utilization of community resources competency area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question:</th>
<th>Percentage response by group:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=38</td>
<td>N=55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stimulating students to think about their future:

1. formal study  
   - H.E.: 3%  
   - H.T.: 4%  
   - H.P.: 8%  
   - Totals: 6%

2. inservice training  
   - H.E.: 21%  
   - H.T.: 22%  
   - H.P.: 26%  
   - Totals: 24%

3. experience as a teacher  
   - H.E.: 76%  
   - H.T.: 75%  
   - H.P.: 65%  
   - Totals: 70%

4. experience as a principal  
   - H.E.: 8%  
   - H.T.: 15%  
   - H.P.: 21%  
   - Totals: 16%

Working with community members to clarify the role of the school within the community:

1. formal study  
   - H.E.: 8%  
   - H.T.: 5%  
   - H.P.: 4%  
   - Totals: 5%

2. inservice training  
   - H.E.: 16%  
   - H.T.: 22%  
   - H.P.: 19%  
   - Totals: 20%

3. experience as a teacher  
   - H.E.: 11%  
   - H.T.: 5%  
   - H.P.: 9%  
   - Totals: 8%

4. experience as a principal  
   - H.E.: 68%  
   - H.T.: 82%  
   - H.P.: 79%  
   - Totals: 77%

Identifying the 'power structure' - key and influential persons and groups within the community and securing aid and program support from this group:

1. formal study  
   - H.E.: 5%  
   - H.T.: 9%  
   - H.P.: 8%  
   - Totals: 8%

2. inservice training  
   - H.E.: 16%  
   - H.T.: 15%  
   - H.P.: 13%  
   - Totals: 14%

3. experience as a teacher  
   - H.E.: 11%  
   - H.T.: 7%  
   - H.P.: 7%  
   - Totals: 8%

4. experience as a principal  
   - H.E.: 74%  
   - H.T.: 82%  
   - H.P.: 83%  
   - Totals: 80%
percentage of any group. The high education groups selected formal study (45%) and experience as a teacher (45%) as the best approaches. The high teaching group most frequently selected formal study (42%), and the high principal group selected inservice training (36%) at only a marginally greater rate than they selected experience as a teacher (34%).

In response to the question on the best approach to developing the ability to establish a rapport with teachers and students through the building of a feeling of mutual confidence, all groups most frequently selected the response experience as a principal.

In response to the third question related to guidance, which asked respondents to identify the best approach to developing the ability to secure and make available various diagnostic tests, all groups selected formal study. Modal responses for each question related to this competency area are shown in Figure 8.

Administration.

In response to questions on the best approach to developing competency in administration, respondents in all groups most frequently chose experience as a principal in response to all questions, with one exception. In response to the question on the best approach to developing the ability to utilize records which show school growth and progress, the
Figure 8. **Responses to questions related to the guidance competency area.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage response by group:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Observing and interpreting behavior:

1. **formal study**
   - H.E.: 15%
   - H.T.: 42%
   - H.P.: 29%
   - Totals: 36%

2. **inservice training**
   - H.E.: 21%
   - H.T.: 27%
   - H.P.: 36%
   - Totals: 36%

3. **experience as a teacher**
   - H.E.: 45%
   - H.T.: 38%
   - H.P.: 34%
   - Totals: 37%

4. **experience as a principal**
   - H.E.: 29%
   - H.T.: 29%
   - H.P.: 28%
   - Totals: 28%

### Establishing rapport with teachers and students through the building if a feeling of mutual confidence:

1. **formal study**
   - H.E.: 5%
   - H.T.: 2%
   - H.P.: 2%
   - Totals: 3%

2. **inservice training**
   - H.E.: 18%
   - H.T.: 18%
   - H.P.: 20%
   - Totals: 19%

3. **experience as a teacher**
   - H.E.: 32%
   - H.T.: 25%
   - H.P.: 22%
   - Totals: 25%

4. **experience as a principal**
   - H.E.: 68%
   - H.T.: 71%
   - H.P.: 73%
   - Totals: 71%

### Securing and making available various diagnostic tests:

1. **formal study**
   - H.E.: 63%
   - H.T.: 58%
   - H.P.: 53%
   - Totals: 57%

2. **inservice training**
   - H.E.: 24%
   - H.T.: 40%
   - H.P.: 35%
   - Totals: 34%

3. **experience as a teacher**
   - H.E.: 21%
   - H.T.: 22%
   - H.P.: 19%
   - Totals: 20%

4. **experience as a principal**
   - H.E.: 5%
   - H.T.: 5%
   - H.P.: 11%
   - Totals: 9%
high teaching group most frequently selected inservice training (38%), but at only a marginally greater rate that they selected experience as a principal (36%). Modal responses for each question related to this competency area are shown in Figure 9.

**Evaluation.**

Respondents most frequently engaged in professional development activities related to evaluation. Similarly, they largely recommended that the best approach to developing competency in evaluation is through inservice training, and experience as a principal.

In response to the question on the best approach to developing the ability to select evaluation activities which will help to determine the degree of program effectiveness, the high education group and the high principal group most frequently chose formal study (47%), though only marginally over inservice training (45%).

In response to the question on the best approach to developing the ability to interpret evaluation results to interested groups and persons, the high teaching group most frequently chose inservice training (45%), as did the high principal group (39%), though only marginally over experience as a principal (38%). The modal response for the high education group was experience as a principal (53%), followed by formal
Figure 9. Responses to questions related to the administration competency area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage response by group:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping adequate and useful records without becoming overburdened with useless details and 'paper work':</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) formal study</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) inservice training</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) experience as a teacher</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) experience as a principal</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizing records which show school growth and progress:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) formal study</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) inservice training</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) experience as a teacher</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) experience as a principal</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting to parents, school staff, and other interested individuals and groups:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) formal study</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) inservice training</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) experience as a teacher</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) experience as a principal</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
study (37%).

On the final question related to evaluation, that is, the best approach to developing the ability to translate evaluation findings into plans for action aimed at school improvement, the modal response for all groups was experience as a principal. Modal responses for each question related to this competency area are shown in Figure 10.
Figure 10. Responses to questions related to the evaluation competency area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question:</th>
<th>Percentage response by group:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting evaluation activities which will help to determine the degree of program effectiveness:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) formal study</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) inservice training</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) experience as a teacher</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) experience as a principal</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpreting evaluation results to interested groups and persons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage response by group:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) formal study</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) inservice training</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) experience as a teacher</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) experience as a principal</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translating evaluation findings into plans for action aimed at school improvement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage response by group:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) formal study</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) inservice training</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) experience as a teacher</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) experience as a principal</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion

Influence of Background on Perception of Appropriate Training

It does not appear that Winnipeg area school principals' perceptions of the best approaches to developing administrative competency in new administrators is influenced by their own backgrounds to the degree that one may predict their responses to questions on approaches to developing administrative competency. There was little variation between modal responses between principals whose backgrounds are characterized by a high level of formal study, a high level of experience as a teacher, or a high level of experience as a principal on questions on the best approach to developing administrative competency skills. When viewing the responses of all groups, it becomes apparent that respondents feel that there is no single best approach for the training of new administrators. Instead, they suggest that a combination of approaches is preferable, with primary emphasis on on the job training, and secondary emphasis on inservice training and experience as a teacher.

It has been suggested that soliciting the opinions of practicing administrators is a good way to determine what the content of an administrative training program should be. This has been uncritically accepted as a valid
way to determine program content. This study found that
the approach to administrative training that respondents
recommended was not linked to the respondents' own background.
While, perhaps, there were other factors that influenced
respondents' perception of appropriate administrative training
which were not examined in this study, the finding that professional
background did not significantly influence perception of
appropriate administrative training lends some empirical
support to the recommendation to survey practicing administrators.

Implications for Approaches to Administrative Training

Formal study.

Formal study was least frequently identified by respondents
in this survey as the best approach to developing administrative
competency skills. Must one have a high level of formal
education in order to be an effective administrator?
Respondents to this survey may not consider it to be
the best approach to training new administrators, but it
may have its place administrative training.

Graff and Street (1956) wrote that there are four 'know
how' areas of administrative competency: skills, understanding,
knowledges, and attitudes. This survey only focussed on
the first area. While Winnipeg area school principals may
not generally view formal study as being the best approach
to developing administrative skills, its value may be
related to the development of the remaining 'know how' areas.

Formal study may indeed be of little practical use to school administrators, and principals may often view it as not being the best approach to developing administrative competency skills. Its value may be more indirect; formal study may not provide administrators with practical solutions to administrative problems they encounter, but may instead provide them with the opportunity to develop the intellectual skills they need to develop practical solutions on their own.

Respondents' infrequent selection of formal study in response to questions on the best approach to developing administrative competency skills indicates only that respondents to this survey feel that there are more efficient approaches to developing competency skills in potential administrators. However, formal study can play an important role in the formation of school administrators.

Inservice training.

Inservice training was one of the two most frequently selected responses on questions related to the best approach to developing administrative competency skills. It appears that this can be an effective approach to developing the skills of new administrators. However, the professional development activities in which practicing school administrators engage, and the professional development areas in which they
feel a principal must be proficient in to be an effective administrator are not the same.

Over 70% of respondents in this survey had engaged in professional development activities in the areas of evaluation (80%), instructional improvement (76%), and human relations (71%). This is in stark contrast to what respondents felt to be the areas important to effective administration. A vast majority felt that a principal must be proficient in the area of human relations (86%) to be an effective administrator. The next most frequently identified area was instructional improvement (78%), followed by school climate (56%). Only 46% of respondents felt that the professional development area of evaluation was important to effective administration.

If inservice training is used as an approach to developing new administrators, it would appear that there is a need to review the professional development activities that are offered, and to focus activities on the areas relevant to effective administration.

**Experience as a teacher.**

Experience as a teacher was often selected as the response to questions on the best approach to developing administrative competency skills. The relationship between teaching and school administration is a curious one. An examination of
the tasks performed by a teacher and those performed by an administrator would likely reveal that teaching and school administration are distinct activities. Yet this study found that principals feel, to some degree, that gaining experience as a teacher is the best approach to developing certain specific competency skills. While it can be seen that a school administrator must have an understanding of teaching, and may have to possess a number of skills and abilities common to teaching, there does not appear to be a justified reason for experience as a teacher to be a prerequisite for school administration. However, the selection of the response 'experience as a teacher' as the best approach to developing administrative competency indicates that respondents to this survey feel that there is value to gaining experience as a teacher to develop competencies important to effective administration.

Experience as a principal.

Experience as a principal was most frequently identified by respondents as the best approach to developing administrative competency. The overwhelming preference of respondents for this approach to developing administrative competency perhaps indicates that there is a need to introduce a practical component into the provincial administrative training program.

Vice-principalships, which may or may not provide appropriate
training for the principalship, have long been considered
the entry point to school administration. However, there
are alternate models which may be employed to provide prospective
administrators with practical experience. Assessment Centers,
in place in the United States and referred to earlier in
this paper, provide candidates with the opportunity to practice
administration in a simulated setting. Assessment Centers are an
effective way of providing on the job training, however
the cost of setting up such training centres may be prohibitive.
Alternately, practicums or internships could be established
whereby prospective administrators are provided with the
opportunity to serve as administrative assistants under
the guidance of practicing administrators. This relatively
inexpensive approach to administrative training could provide
prospective administrators with the 'on the job training'
that practicing administrators so frequently identified
as the best approach to developing administrative competency.

**Implications for Administrative Training**

Manitoba's administrative training program calls for
candidates for certification to complete a number of contact
hours in inservices, workshops, and / or conferences. Alternately,
one may be eligible for a certificate if one has completed
a Master of Education degree in Educational Administration.
However, respondents to this survey largely identified
inservice training and gaining experience as a principal
as the best ways to develop administrative competency skills.
The current program's focus on formal study and inservice
training is at odds with principals' recommendations for
more practical approaches to training. There appears to
be a need to re-evaluate how principals should be trained
in Manitoba. Clearly, what practicing administrators recommend
prospective administrators do is not congruent with that
which prospective administrators must currently do to satisfy
provincial requirements.

Recommendations for Training

The current provincial administrative training program
appears to be in need of periodic review to ensure that
professional development needs are being met. The current
program primarily specifies the means by which training
should be delivered, and only the general content areas,
such as "mechanics of administration". In order for the
administrator certification program to play a highly valuable
role in the formation of school administrators, an ongoing
needs analysis must be conducted which will help to determine
program content. This study found that professional development
in the areas of human relations and instructional improvement
were perceived as most important to effective school administration.
Perhaps, then, professional development offerings should
focus on these areas in the immediate future. An annual needs analysis would yield information on the types of professional development activities that practicing school administrators feel important to effective administration. Additionally, an annual needs analysis would be desirable as administrative needs may not remain constant, and specific professional development activities may gain or lose significance over time.

Similarly, attention must be focussed on the process involved in administrative training. It was clear from this study that certain approaches are desirable in the development of skills related to a specific competency area. If practicing administrators perceive gaining experience as a teacher as the best way to develop competency skills related to curriculum design, for example, then perhaps that approach should be employed in developing such skills.

Most frequently identified as the best approach to developing a number of competency skills was experience as a principal. Presumably, a number of competency skills could be developed through on the job experience as a vice-principal. The vice-principalship provides appropriate training for the principalship only in those instances where the principal has divided administrative duties so that the vice-principal is responsible for not only routine
administration, but also for tasks related to instructional supervision, evaluation, and human relations. To ensure that the vice principalship provides an opportunity for potential administrators to develop competency skills important to effective administration would require that the parameters of the vice-principalship be provincially defined. A provincial mandate which specified the duties of a vice-principal, and the areas of school administration in which vice-principals are to be involved would do much to begin turning the vice-principalship into a position which would provide relevant training for the principalship.

In those schools where there are no vice-principal positions, on the job training could be alternatively provided through a provincially regulated internship program. Serving a brief apprenticeship or internship prior to receiving certification is hardly a new idea; it is currently in use in a number of trade and professional areas, and has proved to be an effective means of developing competency. Introducing such a component to the principal certification program could provide prospective administrators with the on the job training that practicing administrators so highly recommend.

Allowing potential administrators to select their own approach to administrative training through the completion of a combination of conferences, workshops, and formal courses
may see the potential administrator gain exposure to a number of administrative issues. A self-directed training program may see the individual pursue professional development in the areas that he or she feels are important to effective administration. However, the current certification program has the potential to compel prospective administrators to pursue currently relevant professional development through the most effective means. The content of the administrative training program must be reviewed, as must the means by which training is delivered. The development of a program whereby relevant content is delivered through the most effective means would do much to strengthen the current administrator certification program, and provide potential administrators with the opportunity to develop competency for effective administration.
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Appendix A

Room 128
Department of Educational Administration
and Foundations
Faculty of Education
University of Manitoba
WINNIPEG, Manitoba
R3T 2N2

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am writing to request your participation in a research study on principal background and approaches to developing administrative competency.

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between the professional characteristics of Winnipeg school principals and their perception of approaches to training new administrators. I am carrying out this survey in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

In reporting results, only statistical summaries of the responses will be cited. In no case will the identity of individual respondents be revealed. Additionally, you may request to have your completed survey withdrawn from the study at any time.

This survey will take approximately twenty minutes to complete. When you have finished the survey, please return it in the enclosed postage-paid envelope at your earliest convenience.

Should you have any questions about the survey, or be interested in obtaining information on the results of the survey, feel free to contact me at 1-376-2605.

Your co-operation in this study is greatly appreciated.

[Signature]

Thomas M. Kowalchuk
Appendix B

Question Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cover Page</td>
<td>D*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>C*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>B*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>B*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>B*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A - Original Question


* - Question adapted from original source for this questionnaire.
Appendix C

Sample Questionnaire
Perceptions of Required Administrative Competencies Survey

Your questionnaire is identified by the label on the right. It is not necessary to sign or place your name on the questionnaire. In reporting results, only statistical summaries of the responses will be cited. In no case will the identity of the individual be divulged. You are urged to make every answer a sincere one.

Please attempt to answer every question. For some of the questions, none of the alternatives may correspond exactly to your situation or to the opinion you hold. In such cases, mark the alternative which comes the closest to the answer you would like to give.

If you change a response, please make the change distinctly so that there is no doubt about how you wish to answer.

Place your completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and return it at your earliest convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance with this study.
Part A

1. How many years of experience do you have as a full time principal at the following grade levels?

   Number of years experience:

   (1) elementary (grades K-6) ____________________________
   (2) junior high (grades 7-9) ____________________________
   (3) high school (grades 10-12) ____________________________

2. Have you ever been employed as a teaching principal?

   (1) yes       (2) no - if you answered no, please skip to question no. 4

3. How many years of experience do you have as a teaching principal at the following grade levels?

   Number of Years experience:

   (1) elementary (grades K-6) ____________________________
   (2) junior high (grades 7-9) ____________________________
   (3) high school (grades 10-12) ____________________________

4. Have you ever been employed as a vice-principal?

   (1) yes       (2) no - if you answered no, please skip to question no. 6
5. How many years of experience do you have as a vice-principal at the following grade levels?

Number of years experience:

(1) elementary (grades K-6) _______________
(2) junior high (grades 7-9) _______________
(3) high school (grades 10-12) _______________

6. Prior to your initial appointment as a principal, in what educational capacity did you serve?

(1) Classroom teacher
(2) Guidance Counsellor
(3) Librarian
(4) Special Education Teacher
(5) Vice-Principal
(6) Central Office Administration
(7) Other: _______________________

7. How many years of experience do you have as a full time teacher of the following grade levels?

Number of years experience:

(1) elementary (grades K-6) _______________
(2) junior high (grades 7-9) _______________
(3) high school (grades 10-12) _______________
8. Which of the following university degrees do you hold? Please circle the number next to each degree you hold.

(1) Bachelor of Arts
(2) Bachelor of Commerce
(3) Bachelor of Education
(4) Bachelor of Physical Education
(5) Bachelor of Science
(6) Master of Arts
(7) Master of Education
(8) Master of Science
(9) Other: _______________________
(10) No degree held

9. Which of the following academic programs have you completed?

(1) pre-Masters in Arts
(2) pre-Masters in Education
(3) pre-Masters in Science
(4) Other: _______________________
(5) None completed
10. In which of the following areas have you engaged in professional development activities (such as inservices, conferences, or workshops) in the last year?

Circle the number beside all topic areas that apply.

(1) human relations - learning how to get people to work together to design and improve the total school program.

(2) curriculum design - learning how to design and develop curriculum.

(3) school climate - learning how to foster a positive climate conducive to learning.

(4) instructional improvement - learning how to improve the effectiveness of teachers; learning how to identify obstacles to instructional improvement.

(5) utilization of community resources - learning how to make use of the community in support of the school.

(6) guidance - learning how to provide support and direction to teachers and students.

(7) administration - learning how to deal with routine administrative tasks.

(8) evaluation - learning how to evaluate the effectiveness of the educational program and teaching personnel.

(9) none of the above
11. A principal must possess skills and abilities in many areas to be an effective administrator. Of the following 8 areas, please circle the number beside the THREE that you most feel a principal must be proficient in to be an effective administrator.

(1) human relations  - learning how to get people to work together to design and improve the total school program.

(2) curriculum design  - learning how to design and develop curriculum.

(3) school climate  - learning how to foster a positive climate conducive to learning.

(4) instructional improvement  - learning how to improve the effectiveness of teachers; learning how to identify obstacles to instructional improvement.

(5) utilization of community resources  - learning how to make use of the community in support of the school.

(6) guidance  - learning how to provide support and direction to teachers and students.

(7) administration  - learning how to deal with routine administrative tasks.

(8) evaluation  - learning how to evaluate the effectiveness of the educational program and personnel.

(9) other: ____________________________
Part B

The following is a list of administrative skills that have been identified as important to effective administration. There are a number of approaches to developing these skills in those who wish to become principals. These include:

(1) formal study - taking university level courses,

(2) inservice training - taking part in professional development activities such as workshops and conferences,

(3) experience as a teacher - working as a classroom or specialist teacher, and

(4) experience as a principal - on the job training.

If these skills can be developed in prospective administrators, which of these four do you feel is the best approach to developing administrative competency? A space is provided after each question in case you wish to elaborate on your response.

12. Getting people to work together harmoniously as a group:

(1) formal study

(2) inservice training

(3) experience as a teacher

(4) experience as a principal
13. Stimulating group thinking:
   (1) formal study
   (2) inservice training
   (3) experience as a teacher
   (4) experience as a principal

14. Learning to recognize ability in others - contributions they can make toward group effectiveness:
   (1) formal study
   (2) inservice training
   (3) experience as a teacher
   (4) experience as a principal

15. Recognizing developmental levels of students:
   (1) formal study
   (2) inservice training
   (3) experience as a teacher
   (4) experience as a principal
16. Formulating learning experiences appropriate to the interests and abilities of students:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal

17. Incorporating the use of available community resources into the curriculum:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal

18. In arranging resource materials so as to provide maximum use, safety, and flexibility:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal
19. Selecting materials appropriate to students' learning needs and activities:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal

20. Providing for the repair, upkeep, and general maintenance of the school and resources:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal

21. Motivating teachers to pursue professional development:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal
22. Getting teachers to participate in the planning and work of the school:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal

23. Identifying factors which obstruct curriculum improvement:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal

24. Stimulating students to think about their future:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal
25. Working with community members to clarify the role of the school within the community:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal

26. Identifying the 'power structure' - key and influential persons and groups - within the community and securing aid and program support from this group:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal

27. Observing and interpreting behavior:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal
28. Establishing rapport with teachers and students through the building of a feeling of mutual confidence:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal

29. Securing and making available various diagnostic tests:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal

30. Keeping adequate and useful records without becoming overburdened with useless details and 'paper work':

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal
31. Utilizing records which show school growth and progress:
   (1) formal study
   (2) inservice training
   (3) experience as a teacher
   (4) experience as a principal

32. Reporting to parents, school staff, and other interested individuals and groups:
   (1) formal study
   (2) inservice training
   (3) experience as a teacher
   (4) experience as a principal

33. Selecting evaluation activities which will help to determine the degree of program effectiveness:
   (1) formal study
   (2) inservice training
   (3) experience as a teacher
   (4) experience as a principal
34. Interpreting evaluation results to interested groups and persons:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal

35. Translating evaluation findings into plans for action aimed at school improvement:

(1) formal study
(2) inservice training
(3) experience as a teacher
(4) experience as a principal

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS SURVEY.