

PERCEIVED FACTORS THAT AFFECT THE PARTICIPATION OF  
PRINCIPALS OF A SUBURBAN WINNIPEG SCHOOL DIVISION  
IN INSERVICE PROGRAMS

BY

CAROL JANE HUSACK

A THESIS  
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF EDUCATION

AUGUST 1989



National Library  
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service    Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada  
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-63328-X

Canada

PERCEIVED FACTORS THAT AFFECT THE PARTICIPATION  
OF PRINCIPALS OF A SUBURBAN WINNIPEG SCHOOL  
DIVISION IN INSERVICE PROGRAMS

BY

CAROL JANE HUSACK

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

MASTER OF EDUCATION

© 1989

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

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

## ABSTRACT

This study investigated the perceived factors that affected the professional development of principals in a suburban school division in Winnipeg, Manitoba. The principals of all fifteen schools in this school division consented to complete a multiple choice questionnaire and to comment orally about the factors that they felt affected their involvement in their own professional development. Results showed that principals perceived that the size of the school, the amount of other administrative support available to these principals, the number of years in the school, the time of year, the existence of special needs students in the school, the increased number of division committees and meetings, administrative transfers, and the dual tracking of schools had an affect on their professional development. Need and the financial support of the school division were the main factors that encouraged participation, while increased workload and time were the greatest deterrents to participation.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express appreciation to her advisor, Dr. Hal May, for his assistance, and advice. Appreciation is also extended to the members of the committee, Dr. John Young, and Dr. Harvey Williams. A thank you also to Dr. Dave Marshall and to Dr. Tony Riffel who encouraged the initial topic.

Thanks must also be extended to the Superintendent from the school division studied for permitting the researcher to approach division principals. A special thanks must go to the principals of the division who so candidly and willingly shared their perceptions and their time with the researcher, especially when the research suggested that they had no free time to give. Their input, especially during the interviews, was the most interesting and enjoyable part of the experience.

The researcher would also like to thank her fellow staff members for their understanding and encouragement.

Thanks must also be extended to the researcher's parents, family, and friends for their encouragement. A special thanks goes to Ed Husack for his understanding and patience.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
LIST OF FIGURES.....	viii
<u>CHAPTER</u>	
1. NATURE OF THE STUDY.....	1
Rationale.....	1
The Manitoba Scene.....	5
Orientation to the Problem.....	7
Statement of Purpose.....	8
Research Questions.....	9
Delimitations.....	10
Limitations.....	10
Definition - Professional Development.....	11
Significance.....	12
Local and Immediate Relevance.....	14
Wider Significance.....	16
The School Division.....	17
Professional Development for Principals.....	17
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	22
Why Inservice?.....	23
Characteristics of Inservice Programs.....	28
The American Scene.....	30
The Canadian Scene.....	33
Responsibility for Design of Programs.....	35
Inservice Format.....	38
Scheduling of Programs.....	46
Location of Inservice Activities.....	48
Responsibility for Costs.....	50
Factors Affecting Attendance.....	54
School Based Factors.....	54
Administrator Based Factors.....	59
Adult Learning Theory.....	59
The Principal As Learner.....	61
Experience.....	63
Principal Needs and Interests.....	65
Needs Assessment.....	66
Actual Attendance in Programs.....	69
Time.....	69
Summary.....	72
3. RESEARCH DESIGN.....	75
Instrumentation.....	76
Data Collection.....	78
Data Analysis.....	80
4. RESULTS.....	84
High Interest.....	86
Principal #2.....	86
Principal #4.....	87
Principal #5.....	89
Principal #6.....	91

Principal #7.....	93
Principal #8.....	95
Principal #9.....	97
Principal #10.....	98
Principal #12.....	100
Principal #14.....	101
Principal #15.....	103
Medium Interest.....	105
Principal #1.....	105
Principal #3.....	107
Principal #11.....	108
Principal #13.....	109
Comparison of Principal Responses.....	111
School Based.....	111
School Size and Level.....	112
Administrative Allocation.....	114
Language of Instruction.....	116
Administator Based.....	117
Years Principals Were Teachers.....	118
Years as a Vice Principal.....	119
Years as a Principal.....	120
Administrative Experience.....	122
Years in Present School.....	124
Academic Training.....	126
Interest vs. Actual Participation.....	128
Interest in Participation.....	128
Total Number of Days.....	130
Total Number of Programs.....	133
Design Responsibility.....	136
Scheduling.....	139
Months of Participation.....	141
Scheduling During School Year.....	145
Responsibility for Costs.....	147
Type of Inservice.....	149
Location - Distance.....	151
Location - Facility.....	154
Mode of Instruction.....	156
Factors.....	160
Summary.....	164
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS.....	166
Summary of Research Findings.....	168
School Based Factors.....	168
Administrator Based Factors.....	171
Perceived Preferred Characteristics.....	173
Conclusions.....	176
Recommendations.....	177
Recommendations for Further Study.....	181
REFERENCES.....	185
APPENDICES.....	199
A. Letter to Superintendent.....	200
B. Letter to Principals.....	202
C. Questionnaire.....	205
D. Definitions.....	208

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Summary of School Size by Principal Number.....	112
2	Summary of Administrative Allocation by Principal Number.....	114
3	Summary of Language of Instruction by Principal Number.....	116
4	Summary of the Number of Years of Teaching Experience Before Assuming an Administrative Position.....	118
5	Summary of the Number of Years of Experience as a Vice Principal Before Becoming a Principal by Principal Number.....	119
6	Summary of the Number of Years as a Principal as of the End of the 1987 - 1988 School Year by Principal Number.....	120
7	Summary of the Type of Administrative Experience by Principal Number.....	122
8	Summary of the Number of Years Principals Had Been in Their Present School as of the 1987 - 1988 School Year by Principal Number.....	124
9	Summary of the Academic Training of Principals by Principal Number.....	126
10	Summary of How Principals Rated Their Interest in Participating in Inservice Programs by Principal Number.....	128
11	Comparison of the Total of Number of Days Principals Were Willing to Participate in Inservice Programs to the Number of Days of Actual Participation in the 1987 - 1988 School Year by Principal Number.....	130
12	Comparison of the Number of Programs in Which Principals Were Willing to Participate to the Number of Programs that Principals Actually Did Participate in the 1987 - 1988 School Year By Principal Number.....	133
13	Comparison of the Agencies that Principals Felt Should Have Primary Responsibility for Designing Inservice Programs to the Agencies Actually Involved in Designing Inservice Programs Attended During the 1987 - 1988 School Year by Principal Number.....	136
14	Comparison of When Principals Preferred to Attend Inservice Programs to When Inservice Programs Were Actually Attended During the 1987 - 1988 School Year by Principal Number.....	139

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Summary of School Size by Principal Number.....	112
2	Summary of Administrative Allocation by Principal Number.....	114
3	Summary of Language of Instruction by Principal Number.....	116
4	Summary of the Number of Years of Teaching Experience Before Assuming an Administrative Position.....	118
5	Summary of the Number of Years of Experience as a Vice Principal Before Becoming a Principal by Principal Number.....	119
6	Summary of the Number of Years as a Principal as of the End of the 1987 - 1988 School Year by Principal Number.....	120
7	Summary of the Type of Administrative Experience by Principal Number.....	122
8	Summary of the Number of Years Principals Had Been in Their Present School as of the 1987 - 1988 School Year by Principal Number.....	124
9	Summary of the Academic Training of Principals by Principal Number.....	126
10	Summary of How Principals Rated Their Interest in Participating in Inservice Programs by Principal Number.....	128
11	Comparison of the Total of Number of Days Principals Were Willing to Participate in Inservice Programs to the Number of Days of Actual Participation in the 1987 - 1988 School Year by Principal Number.....	130
12	Comparison of the Number of Programs in Which Principals Were Willing to Participate to the Number of Programs that Principals Actually Did Participate in the 1987 - 1988 School Year by Principal Number.....	133
13	Comparison of the Agencies that Principals Felt Should Have Primary Responsibility for Designing Inservice Programs to the Agencies Actually Involved in Designing Inservice Programs Attended During the 1987 - 1988 School Year by Principal Number.....	136
14	Comparison of When Principals Preferred to Attend Inservice Programs to When Inservice Programs Were Actually Attended During the 1987 - 1988 School Year by Principal Number.....	139

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1 The Professional Development of Principals In a Suburban Winnipeg School Division.....	27

## Chapter 1

### NATURE OF THE STUDY

#### Rationale

Staff development, like many trends in education, is not new. In fact as early as the 1600's universities employed staff development training as preparation for elite professionals (Habeshaw, 1977:51).

A fundamental characteristic of professionals is that their professional education is never finished. Goldhammer (Lynch, 1966) hypothesized that the less tangible the content with which professionals dealt, the greater the need for continuing education throughout their careers. He also suggested that of all professionals, educational administrators may deal with the least tangible and the least specific content. Lynch argued that there should be, therefore, a constant concern for further professional development activities for school administrators. He further suggested that educational administrators were both managers and educational leaders and as such it should be an administrator's task to maintain currency of knowledge both of administrative practices and educational programs (Lynch, 1966:31).

Recent literature on school effectiveness emphasizes the critical influence of the principal in determining how

effective a school is (Austin, 1979; Emonds, 1979; Leithwood and Montgomery, 1986; Manasse, 1982; Rutter et al., 1979; Shoemaker and Fraser, 1981). Consequently according to this literature if we wish effective schools we are inextricably bound to, and dependent upon, administrative leadership within the school.

Champagne (1980) suggested that the only alternative to professional development through inservice training was to hire only those people who already had the skills required. He suggested that such people did not exist as no preparation programs could ever be that specific and that even if such individuals were located and hired, the people having the skills required today would be partly incompetent by tomorrow and in five years they would have to be fired because the needs would be different.

Housam (Lynch, 1966) suggested that the beginning inadequacies of people were compounded many times over as the years passed. Further, in times of rapid change the advantage of experience tended to be lost; the newcomer to an organization was a serious threat to the well established since their recent training was more up-to-date.

A recent study in California (Olivero, 1982) asked principals to consider a list of ninety-one job-related competencies and to indicate which competencies were appropriate for pre-instruction and which were appropriate for inservice. Amongst other findings, it was noted that

the actual number of competencies identified for inservice development exceeded those at the pre-service level by a ratio of nine to one. This suggests that most people are not aware of what they need until they are in a position where they become cognizant of a void.

Olivero (1982:342), after analyzing over a hundred programs across the United States felt that inservice education should enable principals to anticipate changes and challenges to their job instead of being just a remedial action. He suggested that continuing professional development of school administrators was an important obligation that faced both the individual and the school division.

Houle (1980:34) suggested that the lifelong learning that goes hand in hand with being a professional must have many goals in the active years of practice. He discussed fourteen characteristics broadly associated with the professionalization process. The educational goals established by these characteristics needed to be sought in various ways throughout the lifespan of the professional. He went on to maintain that too few principals continued to learn throughout their lives, and that the opportunities provided to aid and to encourage them to do so were far less abundant than they should be. He suggested that in times of rapid change, the need for continuous learning and relearning increased dramatically.

Housam (Lynch, 1966:10) went on to suggest that a significant increase in both interest in and demand for professional development opportunities of practicing administrators in the past was affected by three factors:

1. The increasing complexities of the job cause problems and anxieties which lead administrators to seek to update their competence.
2. Educational and technological advances present clear signals of the need for new knowledge and skills.
3. Education preparation programs have changed so fundamentally in many institutions that the practitioners feel themselves out of touch with developments in the profession. Since many could not reasonably expect to undergo further extensive formal preparation, they sought the only available alternative -- inservice education.

Goldhammer (1968:183) stated that one of the imperative needs for the revitalization of education in the society of the United States was the continuous inservice education of administrators. He felt that it was neglected in 1968, and Farquhar and Piele on the Canadian scene still felt that it was neglected in 1972. Liltz and Ferrante (1972:4) supported this notion and suggested that inadequate amounts of money provided for staff development prevented many school administrators from taking advantage of the continuing education opportunities that did exist. Yet even recently, James Olivero (1982:340) after investigating available

programs, observed that "it is incredible that inservice opportunities are so deficient".

Wimpelberg (1986:179) stated that "what has become particularly noticeable since 1980 is the expanding impulse for principals' inservice, the diversity of formats it has taken, and the range of advocates it has attracted".

The greatest single problem is that even if principals in this particular school division have a desire to participate in professional development activities then are there factors that prevent attendance or encourage them to participate in these activities?

#### The Manitoba Scene

In a recent study in Manitoba, Hill (1981) questioned principals in twenty schools from eight different school divisions, about their inservice needs. Of these, their preference was for school divisions to offer them their inservice programs based upon their needs. However, in only two out of the possible eight divisions, were divisional programs being offered to administrators.

More recently, in 1984, the Manitoba Teachers Society in conjunction with the Manitoba Association of Principals conducted a number of studies related to principals. In a survey examining working conditions, less than half the respondents indicated that they had attended only one professional development activity each year. About one third indicated they had more frequent opportunities. This

survey concluded that "considering the rapid developments in curriculum, educational theory and management theory it is startling to note that about twenty percent of the respondents to this survey attended only once during a two or three year time frame" (Wadelius, 1984:13). In this same study about half of the respondents saw no change in the number of professional development opportunities, slightly over one third believed there was an increase while about one fifth felt there were fewer opportunities available.

Also on the Manitoba scene, Marshall (1982:14) concluded in his study and ultimate recommendations on Principal Certification in Manitoba that "there appears to be support for the notion that inservice activities be directed towards the practical rather than the theoretical." He went on to suggest that "inservice and professional development activities did have a focus on the skill continuum and that this focus is upon the technical skills and knowledge end of the proposed skill continuum". When Marshall discussed the result of experience without professional development he suggested that experience represented the broadest focus but in consideration of maximum effectiveness there was a point of diminishing returns where experience in the absence of higher order analytic skills probably did not increase effectiveness. Marshall argued that the need for professional development on the local scene was therefore well established based upon his study of certification

practices and ultimate recommendations for the province of Manitoba.

#### Orientation to the Problem

In the school division studied here, the Superintendent's Department has adopted an organization for the inservice professional development of administrators within the Division. The goals of this program, the philosophy, and the approach were initiated in 1975 and has been ongoing. Presented here is the organization adopted by this school division. The research study of what factors affected principal's involvement in their own professional development through this program organization is presented.

This division, when planning its activities for principals, conducted needs assessments in a very informal manner. That is, discussion of topic possibilities evolved at a committee level. This committee included the Superintendent and two or three volunteer representatives from the division principals. Once topic choices occurred, seldom did the other elements such as learner experience or format preference enter the planning stage. The format was essentially standardized and taken for granted. In a school division where the Superintendent's Department suggested that professional development was of such importance this study was initiated to look at what factors principals perceived either encouraged or hindered involvement so that

activities could be planned to take these factors into consideration.

#### Statement of the Purpose of the Study

This study examines the impact of selected factors upon the attendance of principals in a suburban Winnipeg school division in their own inservice professional development programs.

Upon examination of the literature and other research conducted in the area of professional development for principals it becomes evident that there are factors that could affect the participation of principals in their own professional development although these factors are not always acknowledged in the actual planning of programs.

An individual summary of the perceptions of each of the fifteen principals is presented here. These summaries are based upon the written questionnaires (Appendix C) completed by all principals in the school division. The responses from these questionnaires are summarized, compared, analyzed and interpreted based upon a comparison of preferred characteristics of inservice programs that principals perceived as being important to the characteristics of those inservice programs actually attended. Along with their written responses, a verbal clarification of the responses was completed in a personal interview when the written section of the questionnaire was returned to the researcher. This interview summarized and further clarified the comments

about the factors that each principal perceived had an affect on their involvement in inservice programs.

### Research Questions

In order to address the main research question, a number of subquestions are posed.

The research questions direct themselves to the factors that might cause the discrepancies between what is perceived as desired participation by principals in the area of inservice professional development activities and what programs principals actually participated in the 1987 - 1988 school year.

1. What are some of the characteristics of inservice professional development programs that are perceived as most important to principals? Examples include: mode of instruction, topic, participation by peers, scheduling, expertise of the presenter, cost, and location.
2. What perceived factors affect attendance in professional development activities?
  - a. School Based Factors: size, level, administrative support, special needs programs, language of instruction (English, French or Dual Track)
  - b. Administrator Based Factors: experience, training, interest, need, learning style.
3. What is the actual inservice attendance of the principals compared to their desired attendance?

DELIMITATIONS

Participants: This study is limited to principals of the fifteen schools of one suburban Winnipeg school division.

Duration: Participation in inservices is based on attendance in organized professional development inservice programs for one school year, 1987 - 1988.

Data: Data collected is limited to the areas presented in the multiple - choice questionnaire. However, one open - ended question was answered in writing and then clarified during a personal interview added to the response data.

LIMITATIONS

The individuals: There are only fifteen principals in this school division with a varied number of years in the division and in Administration. All fifteen principals consented to participate.

Geography: The division is a suburban school division and the study may only be pertinent to suburban schools.

The data: Information involving the actual participation or attendance of principals is based upon the recollection of these principals.

DEFINITION

In Canada, Lusthaus (1982) suggests that educational administrators are turning more and more to non-formal modes of inservice training. These activities focus on practical issues, fad topics, and administrative skill development. They are usually more practical than theoretical and are geared to the immediate perceived needs of administrators. Administrators receive their training through three different training systems: formal, non-formal, and informal training. Formal systems refer to institutionally based degree programs. Non-formal systems refer to planned educational activities that are usually carried on outside a degree program i.e. workshops, conferences. Informal systems refer to the life processes by which people acquire and accumulate knowledge, skills, and attitudes from their daily experiences and exposure to their environment. In the questionnaire constructed for this paper questions regarding preferences in formal and non-formal modes are incorporated as the research suggests that administrators are turning more to non-formal modes. The informal characteristics are investigated in the section about school and administrator based background later in the second chapter.

While the researcher acknowledges that there are definitely other recognized and acceptable means of professional development, for the purposes of this research

professional development involvement is restricted to the actual participation or attendance of principals in non-formal, structured inservice programs officially sponsored by a related agency. As the basis of this research is the recollection of the principals over a time span of a year it is necessary to select those activities where records of participation such as attendance might be available to them. The formal and informal involvement of principals is also examined in the questionnaire in an attempt to identify response patterns.

#### Significance

Research in the area of professional development for principals offers little information concerning the effectiveness of different instructional procedures or a strategy for matching an individual's preferred style of learning to a particular instructional procedure. Because most inservice programs are designed for a specific and relatively small group of learners, inservice programs should be able to tailor a program to its intended participants by determining their preferences and acting accordingly (Davis, 1976).

With relatively few exceptions, Worth (1985) suggests that research in the area of professional development for principals most recently has been in the form of needs assessment questionnaires. After examining available questionnaires in the United States Worth concludes that

they deal solely with either identifying the level of interest which prospective participants have for attending an inservice program centered about a particular topic or by identifying which amongst a number of topics generates the most enthusiasm for holding a program. That is, most of these needs assessments are topic-oriented. Consequently little beyond the topic of concern is ascertained and decisions as to all other details of the program are made on the basis of distinctly limited knowledge as to what participants find most attractive and/or educationally profitable. For example, although a program's intended participants may have a great desire to learn more concerning the chosen topic, they may have little desire to attend the type of program which has been structured and/or the program may not be totally effective in instructing its participants (Worth, 1985).

A needs assessment (Davis, 1976) attempts to deliver information which assists the decision-making involved in designing an instructional system. Therefore, needs assessments should gather the preferences of prospective participants concerning all aspects of an inservice program which are modifiable in light of these preferences. In addition to affixing a program's topic, such matters as the location of the program site, the instructional mode, the reward offered for participation, and the duration of the program are relevant concerns of a needs assessment.

Worth states that since inservice programs are developed through needs assessment devices, "this would be an excellent device for obtaining learning needs and preferences in the form of demographic and developmental data" (Worth, 1985:180). Once this information is gathered the learning styles and preferences of the individuals in each group are examined to determine what types of training would be most effective. The chosen subject areas and the inherent learning needs of a particular group dictate strongly the type of instruction and the learning design they need.

Local and immediate relevance:

By conducting a study of a school division where the professional development of its administrators is given a priority and a significant degree of encouragement then the intent of this study is to summarize questionnaire responses given to multiple-choice questions and to written and verbal comments relating to the characteristics of programs and perceived factors that affect attendance at inservice programs and then interpreting these responses. This analysis may be important in planning inservice possibilities for its individuals.

By identifying the factors that impact upon the involvement of principals in professional development activities, professional development activities could be better planned to meet the needs of these principals. As

an example, if those individuals responsible for planning and implementing inservices for principals are aware that certain times of year are preferable, or that other times of the year present a major problem then scheduling might be improved. It might also be found that there are some aspects of a school that do have an impact upon participation. The size of the school, the level, or the kinds of special programs offered within the school may have an impact.

As the literature suggests, it is more effective when professional development is planned to meet the individual experiences and learning styles of its participants. In a division the size of the one in this study, individual responses based upon the perceptions of the principals are summarized and responses are organized, analyzed and interpreted.

There may be response patterns based upon the individuals themselves such as the number of years of experience. It may also be found that situational factors such as the number of years in a school has a bearing upon inservice participation. Adult learning theory suggests that not only is change a process as it is experienced by the individual within an organization but that there are identifiable steps in terms of growth through which an individual could move. Bents and Howey, in Dillon-Peterson (1981) suggest that staff developers must take into account

an individual's Stage of Concern in deciding what staff development might be appropriate.

Looking at the inservice format itself, some approaches could encourage participation while other format choices could discourage participation. Once this information is summarized, this study suggests that the format of future inservices could be planned to better meet these personal choices based upon the responses.

Wider significance:

The literature is plentiful when it comes to discussing the necessity of meeting the needs of principals where inservice is concerned. However usually only in the area of the choice of topic is there ever any consideration given. The literature is extremely sparse when one tries to discover if there are any reasons why principals might or might not have participated in inservice activities.

Once a summary and an interpretation based upon the responses was completed for this study of one school division, this may also be an indicator of the factors that could affect participation of principals in other school divisions. It might at least spark an awareness that there are other factors that could predictably affect participation and that they should be kept in mind when planning any inservice activity.

### The School Division

At the time of the study, the school division used in this thesis study is a suburban school division located in the city of Winnipeg, Manitoba. There are fifteen schools in this division: two secondary (10-12), one of which is dual track (French and English); two junior highs (7-9), one of which is dual track; two Kindergarten to grade 9, one of which is a dual track at the primary level; ten elementary (K-6), two of which are dual track, one is French track only, and seven are English track only.

The Division employs approximately 450 professional staff of which fifteen are principals. This school division registers approximately 6500 students at the time of the study.

### The Professional Development of Principals in this School Division

The Professional Development program developed in this school division has grown with the intention of meeting the needs of the Division and also the needs of the principals themselves. The emphasis in this division is attendance at formal organized inservice programs. There are a number of formal avenues available to principals mainly through the superintendent's department.

#### 1. Retreat

Each school year, all principals, vice-principals, coordinators, and some central office support staff are

provided with an intensive three day inservice at a retreat facility within easy driving distance from Winnipeg. Topics have included: Communication Skills, Conflict Resolution, Decision Making, Management Theories, Teacher Evaluation, Situational Leadership, and Program Evaluation. The Assistant Superintendent of Personnel, suggested in 1985 that one of the major objectives of the retreats was to develop Division norms related to management. Another objective was to develop a mutual trust level.

The first programs were organized in 1975. Initially inservice topics were chosen by the superintendents and were frequently presented by the superintendents. Outside workshop leaders have occasionally been used. In the past number of years, a subcommittee of principals has been responsible for soliciting topic suggestions from the principals. This has resulted in a sharing session and in some cases, Division principals have also been involved in presenting parts of the program. The Division assumes all funding responsibility. As the topic of each inservice is of greatest concern, other factors are not often considered.

## 2. Major Conferences

The superintendent's department budgets for a number of principals to attend national and international conferences. A subcommittee of principals occasionally works with the Superintendent to choose which conferences should be made available and then all Division principals are asked which of these conferences they wish to attend. The superintendent then chooses who would be attending which conferences based upon Division need and individual need. The Division is 100% responsible for what the superintendent feels are all realistic and related expenses for conference attendance.

At other times, principals might find a major conference that would meet an individual or a school need. At these times, depending upon availability of funds, and the extent to which the need is well established, all or partial funding is made available. Funding for such conferences is also available through the local teacher's association to a maximum of \$250.

Occasionally, if an individual need is identified by the superintendent's department, the superintendents or the principal might seek a conference to meet the principal's need and the principal is sent at Division expense.

### 3. Local Conferences

Funding to local conferences such as the Manitoba Association of Principals is made available to all principals on a partial funding basis.

### 4. University Attendance

Based upon the division's collective agreement, sabbaticals can be requested from the Board. Where the Board sees a need the principal can be granted leave and two-thirds of the teaching portion of the principal's salary is available. Another possibility is the Deferred Salary Leave Plan which allows administrators, with prior permission of the Board, to bank a percent of their salary and then take a prearranged leave of absence. In either case however the Division has no other financial responsibility for fees or accommodation but guarantees a position upon return to the Division.

Release time for university study can also be made available on a short term basis i.e. two weeks. The cost of university courses is still the responsibility of the principal but release time is made available at the discretion of the Superintendent and the Board.

Figure 1  
THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
OF PRINCIPALS IN A SUBURBAN WINNIPEG SCHOOL DIVISION

NEED	IDENTIFIED BY	LOCATOR OF PROGRAM	POSSIBLE PROGRAM	POSSIBLE FUNDING AVAILABLE
Individual	Principal M	Principal M	-major conference :local :international	Division m
	Superintendents m	Principal M Superintendents M	-Local Workshops -Local Conferences -University Programs -Other	Principal M A.S.T.A. m
School	Principal M	Principal M	-Major Conferences :Local :International	Division M
	Superintendents m	Superintendents M	-Local Workshops -Other	Principal m
Division	Board m	Superintendents M	-Retreat	Division M
	Superintendents M	Superintendents M Principal m	-send one principal to major conference	
	Principal(s) m	Superintendents M Principals M	-other	

RESPONSIBILITY  
M = MAJOR  
m = minor

## CHAPTER I I

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

For the purposes of this study, the literature and research relating to the reasons why professional development is important to administrators, the characteristics of professional development inservice programs, and the literature relating to the factors that could affect the participation of principals in their own inservice professional development programs are presented.

The literature available that relates to the professional development of principals before the 1980's is not extensive. More recently however with the advent of the studies related to effective schooling, the professional development of principals has become more widely acknowledged. Not only is the selection of professional development programs not well developed but the needs of principals also change. What has become particularly noticeable since 1980 is the "expanding impulse for principals' inservice, the diversity of formats it has taken, and the range of advocates it has attracted" (Wimpelberg, 1986:179).

### Why Inservice For Principals Is Necessary

Before one investigates a topic it is necessary to know why one needs to do so. In this case there is a body of literature and research that has established why inservice in general and inservice for principals specifically is necessary.

Sweeny (1982) suggests that the need for inservice education for administrators is clearly greater than ever before. In part, this is due to the technological advances in our society, the knowledge explosion especially in the area of effective schools, changing social norms, and financial constraints. Sweeny further suggests that due to the growing empirical base certain administrative characteristics and skills were important to the effectiveness of schools.

Based upon the statements made by the Assistant Superintendent from the division studied it would appear that the reasons for implementing a professional development program in the division would support Sweeny's notions above. This study however is intended to provide information as it relates to only two areas of Sweeny's statements. The study of this school division investigates the formats and practices that the fifteen principals in this division prefer to make inservice programming effective for the individuals involved.

Olivero (1982) states that the primary purpose of any effective administrator development effort is to increase professional and personal effectiveness while simultaneously increasing organizational effectiveness. The aim should be to help principals do those things that were both effective and efficient -- things that benefit students.

Weiner (1984) finds that the degree of enthusiasm with which teachers participated in professional development activities within the schools seemed dependent upon the principal's own level of understanding and attitude towards programs. If principals are therefore not in a position to attend programs to better understand particular topics this could have a negative affect on teacher involvement.

Wood, Thompson, and Russell (1981) present a five-stage approach to inservice education based upon a number of beliefs about why professional development is required. The beliefs include:

1. All personnel in schools, to stay current and effective, need and should be involved in inservice throughout their careers.
2. Significant improvement in educational practice takes considerable time and is the result of systematic, long-range staff development.

3. Inservice education should have an impact on the quality of the school program and focus on helping staff improve their abilities to perform their professional responsibilities.
4. Adult learners were motivated to risk learning new behaviors when they believe they have control over the learning situation and are free from threat of failure.
5. The school principal is the gatekeeper for adoption and continued use of new practices and programs in a school.
6. Professional growth requires personal and group commitment to new performance norms.
7. Organizational health includes factors such as social climate, trust, open communication, and peer support for change in practice influence the success of professional development programs.
8. School districts have a primary responsibility for providing resources and training necessary.
9. Educators vary widely in their professional competencies, readiness and approaches to learning.
10. Effective inservice programs must be based upon research, theory and the best educational practice.

These beliefs establish the need not only for inservice professional development but also why a systematic study of inservice, such as the one suggested in this paper, is necessary so that time spent on professional development is effective.

While forty-four percent of principals in a Manitoba Association of Principals survey (MAP-MTS, 1983) express the opinion that professional development opportunities sponsored by their boards had remained the same in recent years when compared to the 1970's, thirty-three percent believe there had been an increase in opportunities, and twenty-two percent felt there had been a decrease in opportunities. This survey also suggests that efforts are required by school boards to prevent a further decline in the provision of relevant professional development opportunities or access to them. To do less would be to handicap the school administrators' ability to maintain a level of competence in an increasingly complex and changing role. As part of the recommendations, it also suggests that trustees and superintendents should be made more aware of the complexity of the principalship and the professional sophistication needed by school administrators which required frequent, ongoing opportunities for professional development. As this is a survey of the Manitoba situation it substantiates the need for a study such as the one being reported here.

In a survey of principals conducted by the Manitoba Teacher's Society (1982) for a preponderance of topics that principals indicated as needs in this study, their desire was for inservice to be offered at the division level.

In a study conducted by the Manitoba Association of Principals and the Manitoba Teacher's Society (1983) seventy-nine percent of principals responding described the prevalent practice to be one of the principal selecting personal professional development activities and then requesting authorization of the superintendent or the school board to attend. Only five percent of principal respondents felt they were not encouraged to submit such requests for personal professional development activities. The majority of respondents indicated that board approval was required for attendance at professional development activities held outside the province due to the increased time allocation involved.

If this 1983 study by the Manitoba Association of Principals and the Manitoba Teacher's Society still holds ground and if principals do have input into what inservice programs they choose then an investigation that isolates what perceived preferences principals have in regard to these programs could help to better attract participants and to better meet their needs during participation.

When one examines these studies it becomes evident that the Board, through a superintendent's department, had a

significant control over what professional development programs principals attended. If that control does exist then programs offered within a school division should be a target of study. The research in this thesis while looking at factors that could affect involvement is an attempt to fulfill this need for one suburban school division in Winnipeg, Manitoba.

#### Characteristics of Successful Inservice Programs

The first subquestion in this thesis directs itself to the possible characteristics of inservice professional development programs that might be important to principals. Existing inservice programs that principals attended were first dissected to decide what were the characteristics of those programs that made them successful in getting principals to attend them. Once successful programs had been studied then the different aspects of these programs were identified for study.

Wood, McQuarrie, and Thompson (1982) view inservice education as having five distinct but related stages. These stages included:

1. Readiness - This stage mobilizes support for change in professional practice and the leadership. The initiative for readiness is to come from central office.
2. Planning - This includes the setting of clear, specific objectives and the use of a needs assessment. The

development of expertise to conduct activities within the division should be considered.

3. Training - The inservice plan is conducted and the content, skills, and attitudes needed to implement the changes in professional behaviour are learned. The elements of choice and experiential learning should be evident and feedback, a plan of commitment to implementation, and evaluation data should be generated.

4. Implementation - A written plan for implementation should be in the participant's hands, and follow up assistance should be available.

5. Maintenance - Monitoring of new behaviours should exist whether it be self-monitoring or done by another.

The research in this thesis addressed itself to the planning stage of the Wood, McQuarrie, and Thompson model. This research intended to identify the preferred characteristics that would make the training stage and implementation stage of inservice professional development programs more effective for one particular school division.

An examination of the literature concerned specifically with staff development (O'Connell and Meeth, 1978; Rhodes, 1980) reveals two general "evaluative models" which could be used as the basis for assessing quality of development programs and activities. The first of these may be termed the "output" model. In this model, the standards of achievement and success of the staff development focus upon

the activities performed and the efforts made. Quality is directly related to the amount of work that is carried on. The second model could be called the "outcome" model. In this model, the standards for achievement and success focus upon the effects or impact of the staff development program. Quality is determined by measures of the amount of impact on participants, the degree of change toward some desired end, or by some combination of the two (Habeshaw, 1977; Rhodes, 1980; Rothman and Robinson, 1977).

#### The American Scene

In studies conducted on the American scene it is suggested that a prime prerequisite to successful inservice training is a positive attitude on the part of the participants. Often, however, this criterion is not met because inservice training proposed by the central administration is not congruent with the principals' perceptions of their needs. If participants are involved in selecting content and planning inservice education it would do much to improve the program's chances for success (McIntyre, 1979; N.E.P. Editors, 1978). The notion that the needs assessment is the key has been proposed by McCleary (1976), Smith (1977), Arends (1978), Beckner (1979), Howey (1980), Yarger, Howey, and Joyce (1980), Swenson (1981). Olivero (1982) concurred with this but added that any model should enable principals to anticipate changes and

challenges to their job and Bruce Joyce (1980) also supported this principle.

Wiener (1984) looks at a three phase model for principal professional development. It is based upon needs and is designed to provide meaningful on-site professional development programs. There exists a three-phase inservice program format including an Awareness and Skill Acquisition phase, an Application phase, and a Follow-up phase. The result is the formulation of I.S.P.'s (Individual School Plans). Principals who participated in the development and field testing of the Three Phase Program indicated they felt that the self-directed approach utilized by the project was more effective than a large group or workshop type of inservice program because they were provided with a mechanism to work on problems pertinent to their own school.

Arends (1978) discusses a linking-agent model for professional development where field agents travel from school to school helping clients on an individual basis.

The Technical Assistance Approach to Inservice (Howey and Joyce, 1977; Trohanis, Jackson, 1980) offers a systematic framework for planning, conducting, and evaluating inservice training. The five-step process takes the agent and the client from the initial analysis of the problem through the various stages of delivering activities to a final evaluation of the methods and results.

Brainard (1975) looks at effective administrator renewal programs specifically at the division level. These are three year programs which are school district based, are largely of interest to administrators who had completed their formal graduate work, and are related to on-the-job concerns, are individualized, are related to school improvement projects organized and conducted by the principals, are on-going instead of consisting of 'one shot' events, are based on small group and individual learning processes, and are based on the goal of improved performance on the job as opposed to only providing principals with new or additional information.

The questionnaire developed for the study of this school division (Appendix C) takes into account some of the factors that Brainard suggests are effective and also looks at principal preferences in the areas mentioned. The factors suggested in Brainard's study were incorporated into the questionnaire developed for this thesis.

In New York, a group of high school principals under the leadership of a superintendent developed a model for professional development where each principal becomes a presenter on a theme. Discussion and interaction followed. According to Salmon (1974) if such sessions serve as nothing more than a stimulus to thinking in areas of professional responsibility, then this inservice program for principals proves to be a most successful endeavor.

### The Canadian Scene

In a Canadian study, Worth (1985) discusses a strategy for individualized inservice. To adequately meet specialized learning needs, this model is particularly relevant. It is based upon the idea of offering a number of training possibilities. The administrators involved are then encouraged to select from the options and devise a plan for their particular area of concern. Plans are coordinated and encouraged by supervising administrators. The plan is formalized through the use of a contract which is kept on file by the participant, the administrator, and the trainer until the training is complete.

In New Brunswick, the School Administrators Leadership Training program (S.A.L.T.) started functioning in 1979 (Kielty, 1982). Here the majority of seminar topics deal with issues and practical skill development related to the role of the school administrator as instructional leader.

In Thunder Bay, Ontario (Taylor, 1982) a model for the development of principal leadership was developed. This works through the Plan, the Action or Implementation, and the third step of the Program, the Evaluation. Seventy-seven percent found the skills developed helpful.

Project A.S.K. (Administrative Skills and Knowledge) in Alberta is a systematic approach to the planning and implementation of pre and inservice training. Its purposes are to develop strategies and procedures for assessing the

training needs of administrators and learning resources for use in pre and inservice settings. Caldwell and Magnan (1981:19) suggest it is a welcome contrast to the haphazard and eclectic activities which frequently characterize the educational scene. This program was a result of a needs assessment that looked at 'High Ideal' and 'Low Real' inservice needs.

When examining the models cited here it became evident to the researcher that for the needs of principals to be truly met through professional development that needs assessments should be conducted. Elements of choice should be incorporated into programs, programs should be ongoing, and these programs should be done at the division level. This information should therefore be accessed before Division professional development activities are organized.

Of all the models just cited each developed an individualized program for principals based upon a needs assessment. These assessments were not only of needs but in some cases also of interests and preferred learning styles. Each program was found to be successful by its participants although there were many differences in the characteristics of the programs such as their organization, format, duration of activity, size of group, and presenter. What this tended to indicate was that if the needs and preferences of the principals in a division are identified an appropriate inservice program could be initiated to meet the individual

and collective needs of the principal group. If professional development is to meet principal needs at the division level then an appropriate needs assessment must be devised and implemented. This assessment should also be other than a topic oriented assessment and should examine the characteristics of what all participants perceive as being best for them. This study attempts to meet this situation.

#### Responsibility for Design of Inservice Programs

When Leithwood and Montgomery (1986:194) looked at typical inservice programs in Canada they suggested that the "most impressive feature of existing inservice programs for principals was their number". In 1986 there was a wide variety of programs offered by "extra-board" agencies such as McGill's Division of Education Leadership, the Ontario Council of Leadership in Education, Alberta's Council on School Administration, the Canadian Education Association and the Atlantic Institute of Education. They also suggested that "in-board" training of school administrators was extensive not only in Canada but also in the United States and in Europe. They also suggested that there were major weaknesses in existing programs. They concluded that fully individualized instruction of principals might be necessary to make them effective. This therefore became one of the incentives included in the research designed for this study and was intended to answer this need for one suburban

Winnipeg school division. An inservice program cannot be individualized unless it is known what the individuals perceive as desirable.

Musella (1982) states that training decisions must be based on extensive input from persons representing many levels of the organization. However, he believes that leadership responsibility rests with those at the higher levels. Although it is well known that commitment, willingness and desire to change come from the self and that little change takes place unless one wants to change.

However, once all the necessary input is available and had been considered, action and direction from the top of the organization is necessary. This is supported by Arends (1978), by Brainard (1975), and by Lutz and Ferrante (1972) when they suggest that school districts should be designing programs to meet their specific needs. Merullo (1974) strongly encourages principals to make better use of the talent within their own divisions and organizations.

Swenson (1981) describes three emerging patterns for organizing inservice education. The first is the "consumer" model. This involves the consumers of the inservice in planning, decision-making, and evaluation of the program. Colton (1975) sees this as the only effective pattern. The second model sees one person from the central office level working with subgroups within the district to organize the program. The third model is the traditional 'top-down'

planning and decision-making arrangement. Participants may be consulted for ideas but they seldom participate in the decision-making. Of all the models the key appears to be the needs assessment.

The in-district academy approach is one that could capitalize on intrinsic incentives and organizational context. They are based on the assumption that administrator development should be designed to help school leaders cope with real problems and improve their management skills in relation to the goals and objectives of the district and their schools. In addition, the programs are based on the belief that the school district has the responsibility to provide for the professional growth of its employees.

In Manitoba, Peer-Assisted Leadership (PAL), has been initiated. This professional development program for principals and vice principals is sponsored by the Manitoba Teachers Society with its first programs offered in the fall of 1988. The program is designed to analyze instructional leadership behaviour, gain insight from working with colleagues, and learn what administrators are doing in other schools. The program also offers credit toward the Principal's Certificate for the Province of Manitoba.

In Quebec, the Ministry of Education negotiated a sum of money given to universities to give nonformal programs in three stages to school administrators (Emonds, 1982). They

believe they have been successful because there is relevance for the client. In Ontario and British Columbia, universities, administrative associations and school commissions have been assisted by a Kellogg Grant to join together to offer programs (Lusthaus, 1982).

The literature supports the idea that inservice offerings should originate at the division level but it also suggests that there are many possible agencies who should be responsible for inservice design. This study therefore asked all principals who they felt should be responsible for their inservice design as compared to who had been responsible for inservices attended.

#### Inservice Professional Development Format

Wimpelberg (1986) observed that since 1980 there has been a diversity of formats. According to studies of the state of the art of principals' inservice programs in the United States, typical renewal opportunities include programs sponsored by professional organizations and foundations, university-based courses, and mandated inservice connected with funding. The content deals with immediate concerns and contains topics selected to have general interest and wide appeal. Most of these programs are off-site conferences and seminars. Very few district-based programs are identified and those few were found primarily in large urban districts (Caldwell, 1986).

Sarah Caldwell went on to suggest that common practices in staff development for principals are programs that are topic specific, content loaded, short term, held out of district, and appropriate for awareness-level conceptual development but not of the ongoing nature necessary to build skills or lead to substantial behavior change. Caldwell, in a study completed for the National Association of Secondary Principals (1986:175) suggests that when a new program is installed in a school district "it was frequently accompanied by very thorough and intensive training for teachers, while principals would most likely receive only an executive summary".

In an attempt to reward participants and/or to motivate their attendance, certain features may be incorporated into an inservice program. Rather than guessing as to what features prospective participants may value, the issue should be addressed in the needs assessment. In the Davis study (1976) the most frequently mentioned feature is the presence of a recognized scholar in the field. Other features which were highly supported were widespread participation by peers, and school district credit for pay purposes. The least valued feature is a certificate of achievement, while obtaining release time and receiving university credit received little support. This literature therefore suggested to the researcher that for this study instead of guessing what features the principals of this

school division would prefer these features were incorporated into the questionnaire.

With the exception of their topics, Davis (1976) felt that most inservice programs fell into a handful of distinct categories -- workshops, seminars, or conferences -- and exhibited few differences in procedure. This observation supported the notion that all individuals or groups of individuals had the same preferred style of learning and that this style of learning is known. This notion that all individuals have the same learning style however is not supported by research and will be considered further in the chapter when administrator factors and adult learning theory are discussed.

After looking at many professional development approaches, Lucio (1969) looked at the implications for designing and carrying out programs. His report suggests that:

1. Programs of block or unit training such as institutes, seminars, courses, and conferences need to be designed so that the length of the program would be adequate to give the adult the opportunity to test new skills and to get feedback, support, and guidance.
2. In any concentrated seminar, time blocks for being alone are requisite.

3. A year, with certain periods of intensity and communication appears to be minimum if new competencies are to be incorporated.
4. In any training process, the use of a range of activities , including a large component of actual experience within one's own assignment, is essential to permit adults to test new behaviors.
5. Opportunities to see operating "models", to observe other simulated cases and situations, to see and to hear tapes and films, are essential in showing the adult that the new ways do work.
6. Self-reference groups of people with varied backgrounds and very divergent points of view should share their learnings and experiences and provide necessary reflection and contemplation of the new.
7. Elements of "shock" and the dramatic in a program might be important to give some adults the necessary "jolt".
8. Actual field activities where individuals are in real performance situations are ideal. A real operation such as a training laboratory is ideal, and role playing and specific skill sessions are important for use in this regard.

Although it is important to offer a program at a time and a place which permits and attracts the attendance of intended participants, an inservice program could not be considered effective unless it maximizes learning.

Therefore, the choice of instructional activities and the conditions which surround them is crucial. A 1976 study (Davis) found that sixty-one percent selected discussion techniques as their most preferred mode of instruction, and all but 15 per cent either preferred or strongly preferred this option. Other instructional modes selected as being most preferred were site visitations with nine per cent, while eighty-four per cent either preferred or strongly preferred site visitations. Internship experiences scored fifty-four per cent and lectures scored sixty-four per cent. Also seventy-one per cent of the respondents preferred or strongly preferred simulation techniques but only six per cent selected this technique as their most preferred mode of instruction.

On the other hand, supervised reading was most frequently cited as being least preferred thirty-five per cent, followed by role-playing with eighteen per cent, and independent study thirteen per cent. Thirty-eight of the principals indicated that they disliked being instructed through supervised readings, while thirty-six per cent disliked role-playing and independent study. Seven percent expressed dislike for the lecture method and four per cent went so far as to claim it as their least preferred instructional mode. It was preferred that these activities be led by a school administrator, while only twelve per cent felt that this responsibility should be given to university

professors. In summary, principals preferred to take an active rather than a passive role in their learning and that although principals were willing to listen to lectures, they would prefer that the lecture serve as a supplement or stimulant to participant discussions which was seen as more productive.

In Canada, Lusthaus (1982) suggests that educational administrators are turning more and more to non-formal modes of inservice training. These activities focus on practical issues, fad topics, and administrative skill development. They are usually more practical than theoretical and are geared to the immediate perceived needs of administrators. Administrators receive their training through three different training systems: formal, non-formal, and informal training. Formal systems refer to institutionally based degree programs. Non-formal systems refer to planned educational activities that are usually carried on outside a degree program i.e. workshops, conferences. Informal systems refer to the life processes by which people acquired and accumulated knowledge, skills, and attitudes from their daily experiences and exposure to their environment. In the questionnaire constructed for this paper questions regarding preferences in formal and non-formal modes are incorporated as the research suggests that administrators are turning more to non-formal modes. The informal characteristics are

investigated in the section about school and administrator based background later in this chapter.

Joyce and Showers (1980) analyzed more than two hundred studies in which researchers investigated the effectiveness of various kinds of training methods. They conclude that to be most effective, training should include theory, demonstration, practice, feedback, and application.

Joyce (1980) and Wood and Thompson (1980) suggest that research tells us adults learn best through concrete experiences where they apply what is being learned and in informal situations where social interaction takes place. Adult learning style will be examined more closely in the section dealing with administrator based factors.

Brainard (1975) examines professional growth opportunities and reports that one method is that of providing renewal through a collegial team which provides each other with support for their growth goals and serve each other as consultants, thus reducing the cost of and the need for hiring consultants from outside the school district.

Manasse (1983: 37) suggests there is a recent move toward the establishment of principal centers especially in the United States which are organized and managed by principals to allow networking with colleagues, access to training and resources, and a relaxed setting away from the building to allow "distance and perspective in the pursuit

of vision". She goes on to say that principals need the opportunity to perceive their own and others' biases, to recognize patterns, to make comparisons, and to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of options. Howard and Arnez (1982) also found that networking was the most preferred as having the most impact on inservice participants. They provide the variety in the development of principals' inservice. One explanation for their formation is that some "education executives, ... certain university and foundation based scholars, and some reflective school principals are taking things into their own hands" (Wimpelberg, 1986:180). If variety is required then the areas in which this variety is necessary needs to be addressed and was considered when the questionnaire (Appendix C) was designed.

However recently a new approach to principal inservice has been the concept of coaching (Barth, 1986; Caldwell, 1986; Daresh, 1987; Gible and Lawrence, 1987; Joyce and Showers, 1982; Levine, 1987). Coaching occurs immediately after learning a new skill and is guided by experts or accomplished by other trainees who are organized into learning teams for this purpose. In addition to providing companionship and technical feedback, coaching allows trainees to analyze the application of a skill and to determine the appropriate occasion to use the newly learned strategies, understanding both the long and the short term effects. A benefit of taking training beyond the awareness

level to the application phase of inservice lies in the fact that coaching experiences remove some potential barriers to change. Since adult learners are often afraid to take necessary risks associated with attempts to change behavior coaching can assist in this area. Gibble and Lawrence (1987) see this approach as a professional mentoring process. Kline (1987) sees this approach as enhancing moral and stimulating professional ambitions.

When all the possible formats for programs cited were analyzed it became very evident that not one program or approach is the best approach. What did become evident was that principals need to be involved, their needs must be acknowledged, and that the best approach or format for one principal may not be the best approach for another. As stated, a prime prerequisite to successful inservice training is a positive attitude on the part of the participants. These studies suggested to the researcher that perhaps one way to develop this positive attitude would be to analyze the ideal inservice activity for each individual and capitalize upon trends that may become evident in the research so that programs could be better developed and implemented.

#### Scheduling of Programs

Wimpelberg (1986:183) states that the most critical interplay among incentive categories from the point of view of the inservice provider wishing to increase participation

concerns time demands and their role in social and learning activities. "No degree of excellent programming by the inservice organization would succeed if it was mistimed relative to principals' workdays and school calendars or if it required a larger investment of time than significant numbers of principals were willing to make".

In the Davis study (1976) of the fifty-four per cent of principals who stated that they did not attend as many inservices as they would had liked, thirty-four per cent blamed this occurrence on their inability to locate a program which was scheduled at times they could attend. Thirty-three percent felt that their job responsibilities would not permit any additional absences while another seven per cent could not obtain the necessary release time. Opposed to these issues which seem to cluster about a time-scheduling factor, eleven per cent of the respondents indicated a willingness to attend additional programs but could not locate a program of interest. This was further substantiated by the responses of seventy-one per cent of principals who failed to attend a particular inservice because it was scheduled at a time when their job responsibilities required their continuous attention. However, fourteen per cent of the respondents did not learn of the program until it was too late to make the necessary arrangements, while an additional eleven per cent could not secure the necessary funds for travel and fees. Thus

according to the principals in this study, the scheduling of inservice programs had been a major obstacle to their more widespread participation.

When further asked to consider scheduling of inservices, eighty-five per cent preferred that inservices be scheduled during the school year, and January, February, March, and April were identified as the months which would be most convenient. May, June, and especially December were cited as the least convenient times. Moreover, eighty per cent of the respondents preferred that programs be held during the day. If these preferences are to be accommodated, the availability of release time became a crucial concern. In this regard, seventy-nine per cent of the principals estimated that they could obtain at least three days of released time per year which they could devote to their inservice education, which was also in line with the gross amount of time they were willing to devote to inservice. Thirty-three percent felt that the provision of release time was a factor which strongly affected their decision to attend an inservice program. Also disclosed was that seventy-five per cent of participants preferred intensive programs, involving only one gathering of the participants and lasting for one or more days. If a program had to be offered on a continuing basis, fifty-five per cent preferred that the meetings be held weekly.

Location of Professional Development Activities

In the Davis (1976) study it was felt that travel time should be cut to a minimum unless an additional traveling distance brought extra benefit to the program. In this regard, sixty-nine per cent of the respondents preferred that an inservice program of three days duration be held within easy commuting distance and seventy-one per cent considered a one-way distance of fifty miles to be within easy commuting distance. However, thirty-one per cent of the principals preferred that such a program be held in a distant city known for its tourist facilities. In fact, eighteen per cent indicated that an opportunity to travel was a factor which would strongly attract them to an inservice program, and another fifty-two per cent felt it was a nice feature to have attached to a program. Whether the program site was located near or far, seventy per cent of the respondents felt that an attractive location was more than an inconsequential feature of an inservice program. The most frequently preferred site for housing a program was a nearby university (thirty-two per cent), followed by a nearby retreat facility (twenty-five per cent), a nearby convention facility (sixteen per cent), a school within easy commuting distance (fourteen per cent), and an attractive city at some distance (fourteen per cent). Thus, it appears that the wide majority of principals surveyed prefer that inservice programs be held locally; however, a smaller but

substantial number of principals prefer that some travel be incorporated into the design of inservice programs.

The most common location of professional development sessions attended by principals was within Manitoba, followed by other provinces, in turn followed by the United States (MAP-MTS, 1983). This provincial norm was not sustained across all school divisions and districts suggesting that there must be factors that affected the different responses.

Although the literature often mixes site with governance (local people defining local needs and conducting the training they need on their own ground), the issue of where training is held is frequently mentioned. Showers, Joyce, and Bennett (1987) suggest that judging from studies, site per se is not particularly important. Bennett (1987) comments that some of the most and some of the least effective training takes place both on and off site. Showers, Joyce, and Bennett comment that after studying research available that site is less an issue of effectiveness of training than it is one of convenience and ease of involving participants. As the emphasis in the research here is to discover the characteristics of inservice programs that might encourage attendance the questionnaire (Appendix C) included location of programs as one of its characteristics to be studied.

Cost of Attendance at Professional Development Activities

Another possible characteristic of inservice programs found in the literature was the cost of attendance and who paid this cost. Approximately sixty-three per cent of principals in Manitoba in a 1983 report (MAP-MTS, 1983) responded that the expenses for their attendance at professional development sessions were shared on some proportionate basis between the school board and the individual principal. Twenty-five percent of principals reported their expenses were fully paid by the school board and approximately twelve per cent received no funding from their school board for their professional development. A recommendation of this study was that the Society should suggest to trustees and superintendents that adequate funding be provided by all school boards to assist administrators in taking advantage of professional development opportunities. As cost could have a significant affect on ability to attend inservice programs this became one of the characteristics incorporated into the research.

Clark (1986) suggests that one consideration in the debate over the best training method is that there may not be one best method. Based on the complexity of the job, the best training approach might involve using multiple methods and tools. In addition, diversification of the focus of the training might be helpful.

The Davis study along with Caldwell's research above suggested possible characteristics of inservice programs that could be investigated when constructing the questionnaire. The factors incorporated include preferences in instructional mode, design responsibility, preferred style of learning, rewards, and length of programs.

Sadler (1984) suggests that the success of professional development programs depends on both the quality of the original offering and the availability of subsequent support services. Considering the Sadler information this study proposes to discover what constituted quality for the individual principals so that all factors that could affect their participation could be considered in future planning in this school division.

Showers, Joyce, and Bennett (1987:83) suggest that despite gaps in the knowledge base and the remarkably low incidence of studies investigating the variables in which practitioners had an investment they thought it is a safe bet to:

1. involve participants in all aspects of governance,
2. expect differential responses to any training option  
but have confidence in carefully designed training
3. build strong organizational contexts to support  
training
4. assume that role designation has little to do with  
competence as a trainer, and

5. worry little about where training is held or when, as long as all personnel are involved in the selection of times and places.

The thesis questionnaire developed for the study within this one school division seeks to identify the perceived preferences of the individual principals so that the information learned might take these five statements into account and add to what Showers, Joyce, and Bennett suggest is a low incidence of studies available.

If inservice had greater opportunity for success when participants are committed to change because of intrinsic motivation to become more effective (Caldwell, 1986:176), the challenge for inservice planners becomes one of designing experiences that take these intrinsic motivators into consideration. Affiliation, joining with others in common pursuit, "can be a strong incentive to participation. Since most principals live comparatively isolated lives, they may only occasionally confer with colleagues and rarely engage in a formally constructed collaborative venture. Inservice experiences that allowed for a great deal of interaction, problem solving, sharing, and small group work could meet the need for affiliation as an incentive". Characteristics such as affiliation, and group work were therefore included in the questionnaire in the section regarding format preference in this study.

### Factors Affecting Attendance

The second subquestion in this study addresses itself to the factors that could affect attendance in inservice professional development activities. Frequently within the literature, participation and attendance are used synonymously. The literature examines factors which are school based such as size, level, administrative support, and specialized programming. The other factors examined are administrator based such as experience, interest, need, and training.

#### School Based Factors

McPherson, Salley, and Bachr (1975) conducted a nationwide job functions inventory, seeking to describe key dimensions of the principal's job under varying circumstances. They found that principals did adapt themselves to the varying organizational, collegial, and community environments in which they worked. Organizational structure variables such as the size of the school system, the size of the school, and the number of grade levels in the school were found to be particularly important in constraining and influencing the job of the principal.

Similarly, Pharis and Zakariya (1979) surveyed the job characteristics and viewpoints of elementary school principals nationwide and found evidence of relationships between organizational structure and the role of the

principalship. Although this survey was completed almost ten years ago it may still have relevance today.

Barth (1986:156) stated that conditions in one school are seldom similar to those in another and that "treating schools as a generic class was easier said than done". Barth also suggests that with the choice to attend an inservice program comes an openness to learn. He observes that too many attempts at professional development for principals are attempts at group growth although the group may come from many different school backgrounds.

In the Manasse study (1983) the largest difference between elementary principals and secondary principals is that secondary principals spend relatively more of their time or seventeen per cent in scheduled meetings. Elementary principals spend more time, twenty-two per cent, with students than the fifteen per cent that secondary principals spend, although both spend more time with students than with any other group. Here then is an example where there are differences where school level could have an affect on perceived principals preference in inservice topic and format.

In a study by the Manitoba Teacher's Society (1978) it was found that an administrator's work week appears to be determined by the size of school, teaching responsibilities, type of school, and years of administrative experience. To summarize their findings:

1. Principals in secondary (junior high, senior high) schools have longer work weeks and the study questioned whether these schools are then more demanding on administrators.
2. Principals from schools of over two hundred students seem to work considerably longer hours than those in smaller schools.
3. Special education classes are a factor in determining the workload of school administrators.
4. Principals would like to spend more time on educational leadership activities with professional development activities, including their own professional development, being the most significant difference between desired time and actual time spent.
5. Principals want to spend more time in professional development and curriculum work, and that those areas are the ones to which they have allocated the greatest increase in their time.
6. Principals perceive significant increases in the time spent on almost all aspects of their work.
7. Principals with six or more years of administrative experience show that professional development has increased more in time spent than any other area.
8. Although principals at all levels of the system, K-6, 7-9, 10-12 all show the greatest increase in time spent

1. Principals in secondary (junior high, senior high) schools have longer work weeks and the study questioned whether these schools are then more demanding on administrators.
2. Principals from schools of over two hundred students seem to work considerably longer hours than those in smaller schools.
3. Special education classes are a factor in determining the workload of school administrators.
4. Principals would like to spend more time on educational leadership activities with professional development activities, including their own professional development, being the most significant difference between desired time and actual time spent.
5. Principals want to spend more time in professional development and curriculum work, and that those areas are the ones to which they have allocated the greatest increase in their time.
6. Principals perceive significant increases in the time spent on almost all aspects of their work.
7. Principals with six or more years of administrative experience show that professional development has increased more in time spent than any other area.
8. Although principals at all levels of the system, K-6, 7-9, 10-12 all show the greatest increase in time spent

on professional development, the time spent on other tasks varied from level to level.

This information greatly affected the researcher's opinion that there could be school based factors that could impact upon principal involvement in inservice professional development activities and was a valid and required part of the information to be incorporated into the research design of this paper. The questionnaire (Appendix C) therefore included a section to gather information in this area.

In a more recent study (MAP-MTS, 1983) it was indicated that during a five-year period preceeding its study there had been a significant increase in new student programs. The only increase in program area that was of consistant ranking across elementary, junior high, and secondary schools was in the area of computer education. The elementary and junior high schools had a more significant increase in French language instruction and Resource programs, while the secondary schools experienced a greater increase in Business Education, Work Education, and Counselling. This therefore suggested to the researcher that on the Manitoba scene there are differences in inservice needs based upon level.

#### Administrative Assistance

If an administrator has seen the increase in programs to be implemented at the school level, an increase in administrative assistance may be necessary. One of the

methods to increase this assistance is the use of a vice principal. In 1983 (MAP-MTS) it was found that fifty-nine per cent of principals responding to a questionnaire indicated their school had no vice-principal, and that one of three principals had a vice-principal assigned in the school on a part-time basis. Only nine per cent of principals had a vice-principal assigned in a school on a full-time basis.

It was also found that eleven per cent had experienced the elimination of the position of vice-principal from the school, another thirteen per cent reported that more teaching time had been added to the schedule of the vice-principal, and one in four principals indicated that the availability of a vice-principal in the school has been reduced in recent years. While ten and a half per cent of principals said the position of vice-principal had been introduced into the school, eleven and a half per cent said that a reduction in the teaching schedule of the vice-principal had occurred. Of principals, twenty-two per cent reported the availability of a vice-principal in the school had increased in recent years. Sixty-nine percent of principals considered the vice-principal allocation to be sufficient, while thirty-one per cent regarded the time allocation as insufficient.

This study perceives that the vice-principal's time allocation is insufficient and that it warrants review.

They recommend that a formula for allocation of administrative time based on criteria which includes size of school, level of school, and number and types of programs offered be incorporated into Department of Education regulations. This suggested to this researcher that there were school based factors that could affect the administrator.

#### Administrator Based Factors

One of the recommendations of a Manitoba Teacher's Society study (1978) was that it was essential that principals should have opportunities to determine what role they could and should play in this area of professional development.

#### Adult Learning Theory

One assumes that one of the reasons inservice is necessary is to learn something. There are a number of theorists summarized by Oja (1980) and Wilsey and Killion (1982) who have extended or projected cognitive, social, and affective development theory into adulthood. The concept that adults have particular learning traits, styles, and preferences is well supported in their literature. In addition, there have been many adults served in the educational process. From research studies associated with these services, clear and usable learning principles have evolved. Worth (1985) argues that some important factors to consider in instructing adults are to:

1. Take into account past negative experiences, remoteness of past schooling and the self doubts of adults.
2. Provide at the earliest possible time in the class/training for an experience of success.
3. Take into account the relationship between a pleasant social atmosphere and a satisfying educational experience.
4. Consider the need for frequently recurring successful experiences.
5. Recognize the adults themselves as a prime teaching resource.
6. Recognize the need for involvement.
7. Recognize the concreteness and immediacy of most adult goals.
8. Take into account the key position that motivation holds in the learning process.
9. Take into account the learning speed of adults.
10. Recognize physical and mental fatigue as a deterring factor in adult learning.

However, learner preference should not furnish the sole basis for the structure of an inservice program. As in all complex institutions, a number of equally important concerns must be balanced. Davis (1976) states that the goal of an instructional system is the maximum promotion of learning; learner preferences for an instructional system are a valid basis for action only in those instances when they assist in

the attainment of this goal. He goes on to state that since it is true that enjoying the instructional process promotes more effective learning, given the choice between incorporating either of two nearly equivalent instructional options, the one which is more preferred by the intended learner should be implemented.

This information lead the researcher to consider that principals, as adults, may have preferred characteristics and formats for inservice programs based upon their learning styles.

#### The Principal As Learner

Klopf (Lucio,1969:19-28) looked at developing competencies and behaviors in adults and found four major factors when developing professional development activities:

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

Caldwell (1986) suggests that many inservice programs fail to recognize and capitalize on the diversity that exists within the group of participants. As with any group principals vary widely in their professional competencies,

readiness, and approaches to learning. Staff development activities should allow for individual differences and capitalize on the background and richness of experience of the group.

Principals, like other learners, have preferred learning styles, varied attention spans, and different interests and needs. Consequently he feels that activities should consider several important dimensions: long and short term; size of the group (small, large, individual participation); and degree of risk (large group addresses, small group discussions, writing groups, pairing to exchange school visits). Principals could match their styles as practitioners and as learners to these different formats. Barth concludes that there are conditions under which school administrators were not only educable but took responsibility for and voluntarily engaged in activities which promoted their learning.

Using this information suggested by Caldwell and Barth the questionnaire (Appendix C) developed for this study sought to look at the preferences in group size, duration of activities, and preferred inservice format. This information could be used to treat the principals as individuals instead of as a generic class so that inservices might appeal to the differences identified.

In summary, from what educators say about staff development and from what is known about the adult learner effective inservice should:

1. Include more participant control over the "what" and "how" of learning;
2. Focus on job related tasks that the participant considers real and important;
3. Provide choices and alternatives that accommodate the differences among participants;
4. Include opportunities for participants in inservice training to practise what they were to learn in simulated and real work settings as part of their training;
5. Encourage learners to work in small groups and to learn from each other;
6. Reduce the use and threat of external judgments from one's superior by allowing peer-participants to give each other feedback concerning performance and areas of needed improvement.

#### Principal Experience

Barth (1986), as stated earlier, suggests that time is the greatest factor affecting participation. However he went on to explain that a second impediment was principals' experience as learners. District inservice and university course work have left principals "unsatisfied and turned off". Few principals retain much confidence that staff development would be engaging let alone helpful to them in

running their schools. Bridges (1979), Carmichael (1982), and Wimpelberg (1986), support this notion and suggest that traditional administrative preparation and inservice in the university is generally insufficient to meet the principal's professional needs on the job. When Marshall (1982:14) looked at his recommendations for Principal Certification in Manitoba in regard to university graduate work he suggested that "it would be reasonable to conclude that the avowed focus of these programs was what might be loosely termed as theoretical considerations in educational administration and ...it was not unreasonable to propose that the focus of University programs was towards the development of conceptual skills".

If the Manitoba Teacher's Society study (1978) still has significance where the principal's work week is concerned then perhaps these are the same factors that can affect the principal's involvement in professional development activities. Specifically, the study suggested that principals would like to spend more time on professional development activities. It also indicates that the number of years of experience has an affect. This study indicates that a more in depth study of the factors affecting this involvement should be conducted.

Based upon the information suggested by Barth, Bridges, Carmichael, Wimpelberg and Marshall, the questionnaire also

requested information about academic training and background as part of the administrator based information.

#### Principal Needs and Interests

Wimpelberg (1986) argues that one factor of significance for the inservice provider who wants to enhance participation is the nature of needs and interests of the potential participants. Some principals especially like informal opportunities to visit with other administrators and find the most enjoyable forms of learning comes from inspirational speakers. Other principals are stimulated by "how-to-do-it" seminars. Still others like to take a holistic view of the school as a human organization and like to study its people and processes from sociological, anthropological, and philosophical points of view. The latter two groups would be enticed by professional learning incentives. These three audiences make very different demands on inservice providers. When the questionnaire (Appendix C) was constructed for the study in this school division preferences regarding program characteristics such as visitations and speakers were incorporated.

Of two hundred and ninety-six principals who responded to a Manitoba Teacher's Society survey in 1982, it showed that as times change, so do the needs of principals. Of forty topics available in the survey, the top six topics include: supervision of instruction, evaluation of teachers, improving school effectiveness, computers in education,

motivation of staff, and evaluation of programs. Evaluation in various forms appears to top the list. Also an indicator of the times, is the topic of computers in education ranking as the number four need.

#### Needs Assessments

Needs assessments (Dillon-Peterson, 1981) customarily take one of three forms:

1. Persons in supervisory positions determine needs from their assessments of the quality of work being performed by those reporting to them.
2. Individuals are asked to state their own perceived needs or to respond to a checklist or similar interest.
3. Groups of individuals (teams, departments, schools) respond to various internal or external pressures by planning collaboratively to bring about specific changes.

However she goes on to say that most principals feel that their autonomy and professional judgment is abridged if someone else, even in a superordinate position, diagnoses and prescribes for them, and that the ability of the superordinate to make a judgment is sometimes suspect. Therefore the second form, asking individuals, is most frequently used. However the third form above, collaborative planning, supported by research on change, builds on the idea that individuals are more committed to

and which they had helped to develop. The intent of this research is to incorporate the needs of principals as they perceive them so that inservice programming in the division can respond to and be prepared for change.

With relatively few exceptions, most recent needs assessment questionnaires have dealt solely with either identifying the level of interest which prospective participants had for attending an inservice program centered about a particular topic or by identifying which amongst a number of topics generated the most enthusiasm for holding a program. That is, most needs assessments were topic-oriented. Consequently little beyond the topic of concern was ascertained and decisions as to all other details of the program were made on the basis of distinctly limited knowledge as to what participants would find most attractive and/or educationally profitable. For example, although a program's intended participants may have had a great desire to learn more concerning the chosen topic, they may have had little desire to attend the type of program which had been structured and/or the program may not have been totally effective in instructing its participants. The school division studied in this thesis addressed itself to this situation. Inservice programs seldom took into account any factors that might affect principal's desire to attend particular inservice programs other than topic.

It is being suggested here that a needs assessment could be used to deliver information which could assist the decision-making involved in designing an instructional system. Therefore, this needs assessment should gather the preferences of prospective participants concerning all aspects of an inservice program which are modifiable in light of these preferences. In addition to affixing a program's topic, such matters as location of the program, site, timing, instructional mode, reward offered for participation, and duration of the program are relevant concerns of this needs assessment.

Research offers little information concerning the effectiveness of different instructional procedures or a strategy for matching an individual's preferred style of learning to a particular instructional procedure. Because most inservice programs are designed for a specific and relatively small group of learners, inservice programs should be tailored to its intended participants by determining their preferences and acting accordingly.

This section of the chapter addressed itself to those factors which are administrator based such as experience, interest, need, or training and school based factors such as school size, level, or time of the year that the literature suggests could affect participation. These are therefore incorporated into the research design of the questionnaire (Appendix C) for the study of this school division.

### Actual Attendance In Inservice Programs

The third and final subquestion addressed itself to differences between the perceived desired inservice attendance to actual inservice attendance. This final section of this literature review investigates this area.

Wimpelberg (1986) suggests that the most accessible measure of success is participation and that voluntary participation could be affected by three kinds of incentive/disincentive features:

1. time and money costs
2. social identity and prestige
3. professional learning

He suggests that these features not only determine rates of participation but also the nature of the learning fostered and has a direct relationship to the potential for principals' inservice to facilitate individual growth in principals and improvement in elementary and secondary schools.

### Factors Related to Time

Manasse (1983) summarized recent studies related to principal effectiveness. One of the areas studied was that of principal time. In general, the work life of principals is composed of many short, unplanned verbal interactions in the course of a day. Elementary principals in the study spend eighty per cent of their workday in face-to-face interchanges with staff, faculty, pupils and others, an

additional eight per cent of their time in telephone interactions, and twelve per cent on desk work. A school day could consist of anywhere from fifty to over one hundred separate events, and as many as four hundred separate interactions. Level therefore is a factor worth considering.

Other studies concerning when training is held found that training schedule did not appear to matter as much as the substance, process, and social context. (Showers, Joyce, and Bennett, 1987). In fact much of the practitioner-generated literature manifests deep concern with the extent to which participants select and believe in the training they would receive. The McKibbin-Joyce study (Joyce and Showers, 1987) is the closest to an experimental study. It found that personal characteristics and quality of training had overridden the governance options (individual, collective, and system-directed).

Barth (1986) goes on to suggest that if principals engage in a learning experience and do learn something they are then faced with having to do something with it. They are rewarded for learning by additional work. Some principals contemplating participation in professional development activities hesitate because they fear it would further deplete both their time and energy, already in too short supply. He concludes that one of the paradoxes of

professional development is that it could be both energy and time depleting and energy and time replenishing.

In a survey of principals conducted by the Manitoba Teacher's Society (1982) for a preponderance of topics that principals indicated as needs in this study, principals were not willing to spend more than a half-day to a day on any particular topic.

Barth goes on to discuss why it was so difficult for school leaders to become learners. First he suggests that one of the reasons given is the lack of time. More is expected with less. Barth (1986:157) also states that for principals, "protesting a lack of time was another way of saying other things are more important and perhaps more comfortable". Time therefore becomes a factor that is incorporated into the questionnaire design (Appendix C) in this study.

In a Manitoba Association of Principals study (MAP-MTS, 1983) forty-three per cent of principals indicated they attended an administrator's professional development activity once each year. Thirty-seven percent of principals attended such a session more frequently than once each year. Almost twenty percent of the principals indicated they attended such a session only once during a two-to-three year time frame. As a result of this study it was recommended that considering the rapid developments in the areas of curriculum, educational theory and management theory that

the Manitoba Association of School Trustees and Manitoba Association of School Superintendents should be approached to highlight the complexity of the principalship and the professional sophistication needed by school administrators which requires frequent, ongoing opportunities for professional development.

A study by the Danforth Foundation (Colton, et al:1975) found that despite initial misgivings about being involved in a professional development program that took them out of the building for about twenty or twenty-five days throughout the year, it was not that difficult to do so. Some things were delayed and minor problems occurred, but generally a number of the principals involved felt that their absence from the building provided a good learning experience for the person(s) they asked to "cover" for them. It was also found that in most cases other professionals were supportive and helpful when the principals were absent from their buildings for professional development.

#### Summary

Much research has been conducted about principal professional development. However many of the studies have looked at only one or at most a few of the factors that could have had an effect on principal participation. If professional development programs are to truly meet the needs of the participants then these factors should be

studied in light of each other. It is necessary to study desired characteristics for professional development along with the factors that could affect participation even if the characteristics of the programs are what principals perceive as desirable. Location of the activities, the format of these activities, the timing of the activities, the funding availability, the availability of time of the participants, the experience of the participants, and the individual school situation should be considered.

After studying the literature and the research available this researcher believed that unless all factors are taken into account participation in professional development activities may be hindered. By looking at which factors are deemed more important by a significant number of individuals then appropriate professional development activities could be planned for their future. Although Davis suggested that learner preference should not furnish the sole basis for the structure of an inservice program, if you cannot get principals to participate, then any planning of an inservice program would be a waste of time.

Finally, a serious weakness in the nonresearch literature was the tendency of the investigators to concentrate on one category of variable at the expense of others. Showers, Joyce, and Bennett (1987) suggested that excessive concentration on one particular characteristic without balanced consideration of others could lead to the

wrong impressions about what should consistute an effective inservice program.

A needs assessment should be administered to all principals in a school division so that it would be possible to take into account and capitalize upon the diversity of the group. It was concluded from the research cited that like other learners, principals have preferred learning styles, varying attention spans, varying experiences, and different interests and needs that must be addressed.

## Chapter 3

### Research Design

The purpose of this study was to identify the factors that affect the participation of principals in their own professional development. Although professional development can be studied in many ways, this study focused on attendance at informally organized inservice programs was the focus.

This chapter describes the subjects and the methodology, including instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis used in the study.

#### Subjects

All fifteen of the principals in the school division were asked to participate in the study and all fifteen consented to do so. These principals represented all levels including elementary, junior high, and senior high. As well the division had single tracked English or single tracked French schools as well as dual tracked French and English schools. The experiences and number of years in administration and the school division were varied.

## Instrumentation

I. The multiple choice questionnaire devised by the researcher (see Appendix C) was divided into four sections:

1. Section S. School Based Information - this identified characteristics of the school including size, level, administrative allocation and support, and language of instruction.
2. Section A. Administrator Based Information - this identified the experience and training of the principals.
3. Section I. Interest in Participation in Inservice Programs - this identified the characteristics of the inservice programs that principals preferred such as scheduling, the number of programs, the format of the programs, location of programs.
4. Section P. Actual Participation in Inservice Programs - this identified the actual participation in the recollection of the principals and mirrored section I, Interest in Participation in Inservice Programs, in the types of questions asked and their organization.

This questionnaire was devised based upon the information learned from the review of the literature and a review of existing research about the characteristic of successful inservice programs, perceived preferred format of programs, and factors that could affect participation in them. The literature suggested that various administrator based factors such as years of experience, level of administration, and training all had an affect on principal activity. The literature summarizing research done within the province of Manitoba suggested that school based factors had an affect on principal activity. It further suggested that preferences in time of year, inservice format, length of the activity, or location of the activity could have an effect on participation.

The questionnaire was organized so that there was a direct relationship between the questions asked about desired participation in professional development programs and actual participation in professional development programs.

II. Only one open ended question was asked. This related to what principals felt were the factors that had the greatest affect on their involvement in professional development during their years as a principal. This could have been answered in written form or could have been answered in an interview situation when the questionnaire was returned to the researcher.

Before the final draft of the questionnaire was completed two principals from a school division other than the one intended for the study were asked to pilot the questionnaire for their impressions and suggestions about the format, the length of time to complete the questionnaire, and ease of interpretation of the questions asked. Suggestions regarding the spacing of questions and the necessity to begin each section on a different page were suggested and incorporated into the physical design. It was also suggested that principals should be instructed to think about what programs they had participated in before they started the questionnaire as it made it a simpler and speedier task if the information was readily available. The questionnaire took about thirty minutes for each of the pilot principals.

#### Data Collection

A request for permission to conduct a study in the School Division was arranged in a personal interview with the Superintendent. At that time, a brief discussion of the professional development program for principals in the Division occurred. Also at that time a formal letter of intent (Appendix A) with a request to conduct the study in the Division and a copy of the proposal, the letter distributed to principals (Appendix B) and a copy of the questionnaire (Appendix C) were delivered to the Superintendent. Once the Superintendent had read the

proposal, verbal consent was given to proceed with the study with his permission to approach Division principals as an information source. The Superintendent also verbally indicated his permission and support of the study at a monthly meeting of principals.

Following individual phone calls to all fifteen possible participants, a study package was delivered to each of the principals in the School Division during December of 1988. This package included a Letter of Consent (see Appendix B), and the questionnaire. Principals were asked to complete the questionnaire at their earliest possible convenience. At that time arrangements were made for a mutually convenient date when the researcher could meet with the principal to pick up the questionnaire and to clarify the written answers to the one open ended anecdotal question that appeared at the end of the questionnaire. Principals were told that they could contact the researcher at any time to clarify any questions or to say that they chose not to participate. All fifteen of the Division principals agreed to participate in the study once they had seen the questionnaires. As principals individually completed the questionnaire they contacted the researcher to make arrangements for the questionnaire responses to be discussed with the researcher. Six of the interviews were conducted in December of 1988 and the remaining nine were conducted in January and early February of 1989.

A multiple choice questionnaire format was used to save the time of the principal participants and to assure that all factors being investigated were covered. During the individual interviews there was a discussion of any questions that the principals either had forgotten to answer or that required further explanation or clarification. Principals were also asked if there were any questions where the multiple choice options were not applicable or another response was more appropriate. Also at this time the researcher went over the open ended question at the end of the questionnaire to clarify either the intent of the comments or to encourage the respondent to elaborate on answers that were given in point form.

Principals were also asked if the researcher had permission to check back with them at a later date if further clarification or perception checks were necessary. In all fifteen cases this permission was granted. Each of the respondents was given a number, from 1 to 15, as all principals agreed to participate.

#### Data Analysis

Demographic data were summarized in tabular form and a comparison of principal responses was presented. This data included administrator experience, experience as a principal, level of administrative experience, and academic training. The data also included school based information such as the size and level of the school, the number of

years in that school, and administrative time allocation and availability of administrative support personnel such as vice principal or department heads. Other comments from principals were incorporated as they related to the information presented in the tables and as they related to the specific factors being analyzed.

The emphasis in this study was on the collection of data which is presented in table summaries. These summaries included information relating to general interest in inservice programs such as the number of programs and duration of each program, where and when they should be offered and which agencies should be responsible for designing the inservice programs. Preferred format and possible features of an inservice program were also summarized. A written description of the multiple choice responses and the anecdotal comments that compare to the actual inservices in which each respondent participated was presented.

Once each principal questionnaire had been summarized then an attempt was made to see if any response patterns were evident. Tables showing each of the identified factors were constructed. For each table, the number of the principal was noted in each category so that response patterns could be identified. Comparisons of the responses were made from the two sections:

I. Interest in Participation in Inservice Programs

P. Actual participation in Inservice Programs

Tables were then constructed to compare:

1. Amount of time principals were willing to spend on inservice: amount of time actually spent on inservice.
2. Number of programs in which principals were willing to participate: the numbers of programs in which principals actually participated.
3. Amount of release time principals could expect to receive: the amount of release time actually received.
4. "Agencies" perceived responsible for planning inservice: agencies actually planning inservices attended.
5. Perceived responsibility for paying for the cost of inservice: who actually paid for inservices attendance.
6. Preferred time of year to attend inservice: time of year of actual attendance.
7. Preferred type of inservice : type of inservices actually attended.
8. Preferred length of inservice programs: length of inservices actually attended.
9. Preferred location for inservice: actual locations of inservices attended.
10. Preferred modes of instruction: actual modes used in inservices attended.

11. Ranking of factors that would affect inservice attendance.

12. Ranking of reasons for nonattendance at inservices.

Once the individual summaries of open-ended comments and the tables were studied response patterns were identified. Demographic responses were then studied in light of the data presented in the tables above. Based upon the individual principal summaries and the response patterns indicated by the tables above, an analysis was made.

Because principal responses were always indicated in the tables by the same designated number it made it easier to follow the responses of each principal participant through the tables. For ease of interpretation, tables comparing perceived preferred response choice to actual participation response choice symbols were frequently used in the column showing the actual response. The use of the symbol (=) designated that the perceived preferred and the actual participation were the same or equal. The use of the (+) symbol designated that the actual response was greater than the perceived preferred response. An example of this would be that a principal spent more days on inservice attendance than preferred. The use of the (-) symbol indicates that the actual response was less than the perceived preferred response. An example of this would be that a principal spent less days on inservice attendance than was perceived as being preferred.

## Chapter 4

### THE RESULTS

The purpose of this study, as previously stated, was to investigate the perceived factors that affected the participation of principals in a suburban school division in their own inservice professional development. All fifteen principals were asked to complete a multiple choice questionnaire. At the end of the questionnaire one open-ended question asked principals to suggest what they felt greatly affected their own attendance in inservice programs.

This questionnaire was based upon the literature that suggested there are characteristics of successful inservice programs and that there are factors that can affect principal participation. It asked principals information about their schools such as size, level, and language of instruction. It also asked principals to provide information about their experience and training. This information is presented in table format in the second part of this chapter.

Principals were also asked multiple choice questions about their interest in participating in professional development programs and the preferred format of these programs, along with the actual participation and actual formats of all programs in which they had actually participated in the 1987 - 1988 school year. This

information is also presented for each principal in table form. Each table also indicates the number of the principal making each response so that response patterns can be identified. Participants were also asked to respond in writing and/or orally to an open-ended question about what factors they perceived had an affect on involvement in their own professional development. These were listed as Factors Having An Effect and are identified by individual principal number.

#### Open-Ended Question Results

All fifteen of the principals responded to the open-ended question regarding what factors they felt had an effect on their participation in inservice programs. Although there were four possible responses, high interest, medium interest, low interest, or no interest, only two of the responses were chosen. The responses have been grouped into these two categories, high interest and medium interest.

Within the summaries of the open-ended responses an attempt was made to categorize the responses into subheadings that best related to the research questions, namely 'Characteristics of the Inservice Program', 'School Based Factors' and 'Principal Based Factors'. Within each of these categories no ranking of importance was indicated.

#### High Interest in Inservice Programs

The following eleven principals felt that their interest in participating in inservice programs was high. Their comments regarding the factors that they felt had had an effect on their participation in inservice programs are summarized below.

#### Principal #2

##### Characteristics of the Inservice Program

1. The quality of the presenters was a most important variable.
2. The opportunity to interact with a recognized scholar in the field had significant impact.
3. The use of instrumentation based upon research had been found useful to him and he felt that one of the more memorable inservices had been one given in the division by visiting superintendents from Saskatoon who had used this method.
4. Professional development was more meaningful if attended with someone else so that discussion when the program was finished was possible. Programs were not as meaningful when attended alone.

##### School Based Factors

1. The first year in a school or being in a newly built facility made it difficult to participate in personal professional development. Professional development with teaching staff took precedence.

2. Semester break made it very difficult to participate in professional development activities.
3. He felt that the meetings he should be attending were always increasing.
4. He was concerned about the impact that the High School Review could have on future time and professional development due to possible changes.
5. Special needs students in the school required additional administrative time.

#### Principal Based Factors

1. Moving administrators created increased need for personal professional development.
2. Although he had been a principal in high school for five years he still felt like a "rookie" at senior high administration because he had no experience at that level before he was moved there. He still required level specific professional development.

#### Principal #4

##### Characteristics of Inservice Programs

1. It was very important that he attend conferences with someone else, not on his own.
2. Attending conferences in another city gave one the opportunity to actually think about the content of the program because there was no commitment back at school and it was not possible to go back to the

school in the evening to catch up on what needed to be done due to the absence.

3. Personal choice of conference meant commitment.
4. Timing of conferences had significant influence on ability to participate.

#### School Based Factors

1. Opening a new school took one hundred fifty percent of one's time, therefore there was no time for personal professional development. Weekends and evenings were already filled with other school responsibilities.
2. Because of the dual track it was necessary to attend specific conferences that he would not have chosen to attend otherwise. With not having experience or background in French Immersion programming the conferences were a school need as there was no one else to attend them from the board level.
3. The presence of special needs students within the school required additional administrative time.

#### Administrator Based Factors

1. The experience of being the Coordinator of Special Services just before becoming a principal provided significant professional development in the area of special needs students. This therefore relieved the additional requirement of professional development in this area once he became a principal. Otherwise

special needs students would have had a considerable impact.

2. Administering a building was a full time job and then participating in required division committees was another quarter time job. This had significant impact on time, energy, and ability to participate in professional development.
3. As a result of additional division initiatives, professional development in administrative use of computers had become part of his personal professional plans. His experience as Computer Coordinator had given him the background and had developed the interest in improving the division's computer system. There was no time to do so however.
4. There was no time to persue the French language although it was a significant personal need in a dual track school. Summer was the only time to spend with his family seen as evenings and weekends were often consumed with school responsibilities.
5. He would have liked to attend ASCD in Boston but his job and family responsibilities made attendance impossible.

#### Principal #5

#### Characteristics of Inservice Programs

1. Helpful factors included the divisional support in the area of finances and release time.

2. The opportunity to go away to conferences was a positive feature. When he was away he was free from work and home responsibilities and was there to learn and to meet with colleagues from other locations.

#### School Based Factors

1. A major motivator was a school need to be involved in shared experiences with staff in his first year in the school.
2. Having a vice principal with whom he could share ideas from a professional development activity was a positive situation.
3. When he didn't have a vice principal it was difficult to not only be absent from the school but it was difficult to truly concentrate on the program content.
4. There were more and more meetings to attend at the division level than there had been in the past. This depleted the time required at the school level.
5. Special needs students demanded considerable administrative time that had not be required in his other schools.

#### Administrator Based Factors

1. One major motivator to participate was a personal need to keep current in changes in the profession

and to eliminate the gap in his background in primary Language Arts.

2. He had developed skills and expertise working with junior high students that were different from the needs in his present school which was elementary.
3. The transfer of principals created changes in needs. He had very little background in or experience with special needs students. It created a feeling of going from having the answers to not having the answers. A transfer to a high school would have significant impact.
4. There needed to be some acknowledgement in the division that professional development needs were very individual.

#### Principal #6

##### Characteristics of Inservice Programs

1. Timing of inservice programs was crucial. He would like to be in a position to choose which programs he would attend instead of being obligated to attend because of their relationship to French Immersion programming.

##### School Based Factors

1. School and divisional need always seemed to come first, only then if there was time did personal need get priority.

2. Having a vice principal in the building would mean that he could attend with a freer conscience and would be able to concentrate better.
3. As there were no designated special needs students in the school he at least did not have a need in this area.
4. There was such a lack of time that survival was a priority. A small school still had many of the same obligations as a large school requiring the same amount of time no matter what the school size might be, but a small school warranted only a half time principal.

#### Administrator Based Factors

1. As a principal and the French Immersion Coordinator at the same time he had to attend curriculum workshops whether he chose to or not. Both roles were full time ones and both roles suffered at times.
2. The increase in the number of committees in the division had created even less time to do the job at the school level, never mind the effects it had on time to participate in his own professional development.
3. He would like to examine his own professional development needs and participating in a study such as this gave him the opportunity to do so.

Principal #7

## Characteristics of Inservice Programs

1. He would like to pursue a Master's program but felt that would not occur until the division was willing to give him what he suggested was a well deserved sabbatical.
2. He felt that when he had concerns or professional development needs regarding special needs students because his wife had her background in this area he met these needs through discussion at home. There was no other time to do it any other way.
3. Timing was crucial to attendance.

## School Based Factors

1. Last year he did not attend as many programs as he would have liked because other school duties were of higher priority to the division.
2. The supervision of staff was a major time factor, especially when it takes as long to complete an evaluation of a part time teacher as it does to supervise a full time teacher. There were many part time staff in this building because it was a small school.
3. He felt that the demands were the same as a larger school but there was no acknowledgement of this time left to do the crucial elements of the job.

4. He felt that being an administrator in the division was like an hour glass. At the top, the board office was adding personnel and for each addition there were addition meetings and additional expectations and paper work. At the bottom there were greater program demands such as the mainstreaming of special needs students. The principal was the neck of the hour glass and although available time had not expanded here there was more and more 'sand' from the top passing through.

#### Administrator Based Factors

1. The greatest factor affecting involvement was the other demands on his time. As it was, he put in at least three evenings a week and a half day on the weekends just to keep up with the crucial elements of the job.
2. During the summer he just needed a break and with having to be back in the school two weeks before school opens there was no time for summer involvement. He had spent many years doing summer university courses and had no desire at the time to go back during the summer.
3. When he was also a coordinator he did a lot of personal professional development both locally and out of town because he had no background in the area

in which he was coordinator before acquiring the position.

4. A principal, no matter what the size of the school, had the same number of division meetings and division committees, or evening commitments but he had only one half the time to fulfill these fulltime obligations.

#### Principal #3

##### Characteristics of Inservice Programs

1. This school division provided greater encouragement and support in the form of money and release time than her experience in other school divisions.
2. Peer congregation was extremely important to this principal.
3. She would make every effort to attend specific programs of interest if the topics met personal needs and school needs, especially if the speaker had a good reputation.
4. Administrative professional development at the division level was too narrow and needed a much broader perspective.
5. Professional development in the division generally was not particularly creative and needed attention.
6. There needed to be some emphasis on the training of prospective administrators.

7. The location of the program in an attractive location could have some impact on her decision to attend.
8. Funding by The Manitoba Association of Principals (M.A.P.) had allowed participation in national conferences.

#### School Based Factors

1. Over the year she found that school commitments caused her to cancel participation in some programs.
2. Last year she did not attend as many programs as she would have liked because the program desired occurred at a time when her job responsibilities required her continuous attention. As a newcomer to the division, being in the school for her first year affected her ability to attend.

#### Administrator Based Factors

1. This division had many committees that required administrative time. She felt that the division needed to define a direction in some areas so that administrator time could be used more productively.
2. Involvement in M.A.P. at the executive level impacted upon her time.

Principal #9

## School Based Factors

1. Some participation was not a result of choice but the school had "bought into" particular programs the year before she had become its principal.
2. There were fourteen special needs students in this school. This had a significant impact on the principal's time. This included dealing with the pressure on staff and parents. There was a realization that the traditional ways didn't work.

## Administrator Based Factors

1. Personal needs had been created because this had been her first year in this school and this had also been her first year as a principal. A personal need was support in the area of how to get a staff to pull together and learn together. Another need was in the area of staff evaluation.
4. She felt that the division needed to do some direction setting for the division as a whole and for the principals individually.
5. There needed to be involvement with the individual principals on the part of the superintendents. There was a feeling that no one even knew or cared what she had done in the area of professional development.

6. The large number of division committees consumed a considerable amount of time.

#### Principal #10

##### Characteristics of Inservice Programs

1. He would have liked to attend C.E.L. and M.A.P. as well as a couple of topical sessions such as Problem Solving in Mathematics. Topic was important.
2. In the past it had been possible to attend programs for the simple pleasure of "being there" and meeting with colleagues. Division meetings and committees have left little time for this recently.
3. For many years, visitations were a major approach that he enjoyed.
4. Other school divisions did not seem to allow the kind of release time for professional development as this division did.
5. Cost could be a problem if the division had not supported him as much as they had.
6. The need to travel for attendance has always been an attractive incentive to participate.

##### School Based Factors

1. New thrusts by the school division required him to improve his knowledge base. Examples included his proficiency in French and French Immersion programming and his knowledge of special needs students.

2. Changes in curriculum have always affected his need.
3. Societal changes and pressures had significant impact on need to become involved in some topics.
4. There never seemed to be just one area of need any more, it seemed to be two or three at the same time.
5. Moving to a new school had significant impact. It had been many years since he had any junior high experience. The biggest help had been that he had a knowledgeable and supportive vice principal who knew the school generally and junior high specifically.
6. This had not only been the first year of dual tracking in the school, and his first experience with dual tracked and French Immersion Programming but also his first year in the school. All of this had considerable impact on his time.
7. A significant number of maternity leaves, occurring at generally the same time of year had an overall impact on available time.

#### Administrator Based Factors

1. A number of skill areas such as evaluation of various components of staff required enhancement.
2. Getting to know new students, staff, community, and programs greatly affected available time.

Principal #12

## Characteristics of Inservice Programs

1. He wanted to attend the Madeline Hunter workshop on Effective Instruction in Grand Forks, North Dakota, last spring. Topic and presenter were the incentives but time of year and board office demands were the deterrent.
2. The division had always placed a high value on professional development and had provided motivation including financial support and approved release time to attend.
3. The system supports in terms of time and money made attending workshops and conferences more attractive.
4. Visitations or meeting with another principal was important.

## School Based Factors

1. He had been in the same school for a number of years and because he knew most of the staff well and there had been few changes in the kinds of programs in the school this gave him more available time to participate. A move to another school, could change this situation for him.
2. Although he had a vice principal he was anticipating that due to the dropping size of the school this support may not always be available. This would

greatly impact on his time and desire to be out of the school.

#### Administrator Based Factors

1. He felt that he had always felt the responsibility to keep as current as possible in the area of administration and education generally.
2. There was less and less time more recently because it seemed like he was always responding to the board office for something.
6. More and more administrative time was being taken up because of mandated programs.

#### Principal #14

##### Characteristics of Inservice Programs

1. The school division was financially and philosophically very supportive of professional development.
2. She believed that the recent move towards the certification of principals was the best thing that ever happened in the area because it had forced principals to make professional development more of a personal priority.
3. She liked to choose sessions where there was a recognized scholar in the field but this would not be the only deciding factor if the topic met her needs or her school's needs. If a lecture with

group discussion format was employed then her participation was most frequently keen.

4. The idea of Principal Centres in the province was becoming appealing.

#### School Based Factors

1. She had been in her school for many years so was more comfortable attending programs away from the school.
2. There was little time in her first couple of years in a new school but even less time in the first few years as a new principal.
4. A full time vice principal made it easier to become involved.
5. When her school had first added a French Immersion track she had made the attempt to work on the language but there was just not the time to do it properly and deal with controversy and parents regarding the initiation of French Immersion programming. The addition of a bilingual vice principal helped in this area.
6. Special needs students added not only to the need for inservice but also to available administrative time.

#### Administrator Based Factors

1. Her involvement at the provincial level (M.A.P.) had made her realize how difficult it was to get

principals to share their time preparing and presenting programs.

2. When she had been a first year principal she had no idea what she needed for professional development.
3. Division meetings have become more frequent and have affected available time.

#### Principal #15

#### Characteristics of Inservice Programs

1. The division was usually extremely supportive of principals where professional development was concerned.
3. Release time in June then a sabbatical for a half year helped him to complete a doctorate in educational administration. He felt that this training made his needs and choices for professional development programs more discriminating and preferred to participate when there was a scholar in the field offering the program.
4. Organizations with the resources to offer quality programs should be responsible for principal professional development. M.A.P. was the closest possible organization in Manitoba but his experience on the M.A.P. executive led him to believe that as an organization they were not given all the resources they needed to truly meet needs. He felt that organizations such as A.S.C.D. and N.A.S.S.P.

- had the resources to offer quality programs with scholars in the field. He had found these organizations to be more effective with programming.
5. The particular program he would have liked to attend but didn't was A.S.C.D. because of the difficulty of being out of the building.
  6. Programs where principals just sat and discussed may fullfill the need to informally meet with peers but they should not be disguised as professional development activities.
  7. The division retreat no longer met inservice needs.

#### School Based Factors

1. Once this principal has been in a school for a number of years and therefore knew the community and the school it was easier to find the time to participate in professional development programs.
2. The principal needed a competent and compatible vice principal so that an administrative team could evolve and information learned during programs could be put into place. This had been possible before the 1987 - 1988 year before his vice principal had been moved due to division policy regarding movement after a number of years in a school.
3. Board policy about administrator movement created uncertainty in the school and a new vice principal 'just for the sake of change greatly impacted upon

the school and the available time for inservice activities.

4. Someone at the board office level needed to become knowledgeable about French Immersion curriculum and programming to set direction, to make decisions, and to have an overall picture of programming for the division.
5. French Immersion programming had necessitated French courses. These were difficult during the year because they often conflicted with school events scheduled during the evening, especially given the number that occurred at the high school level. This only left summer and involvement would leave little or no holiday time available.

#### Administrator Based Factors

1. Division committees were taking up more and more of the principal's time but decisions were seldom made at these meetings.

#### Medium Interest in Inservice Programs

The last four of the fifteen principals felt that their interest in participating in inservice programs was medium. Their responses to the open-ended questions were as follows.

#### Principal #1

#### Characteristics of Inservice Programs

1. The further away the program, the less likely it would be that this principal would want to attend.

When he had travelled to attend inservices in the past it was not by choice.

2. He felt that money could be better spent on other things than the large amount it cost to send principals long distances to major conferences.
4. This principal must see a need and be interested in the conference topics or he was not likely to participate.
6. The timing of programs had a great effect on participation.
7. The extent of the financial support from the school division would have some effect.
8. He would prefer to read journals and books instead of participating in most inservices that he had attended in the past due to the quality of the programs.

#### School Based Factors

1. First special needs students became a major focus and then the dual tracking of the school followed immediately behind. In the last two to three years he found that the changes in the building's programs made attendance at professional development activities virtually impossible due to lack of time.
2. The dual tracking of the school created a critical personal need so he had to take French courses during the summer. This was not a preferred time.

#### Administrator Based Factors

1. Although he attempted to work on his French skills there were always other commitments getting in the way whether they be personal or of a school nature.

#### Principal #3

#### Characteristics of Inservice Programs

1. Specifically, he wished to attend N.A.S.S.P. but he could not secure the necessary funds for travel or fees and the program also occurred at a time when his job responsibilities required his continuous attention.
2. The scheduling of inservice activities in the most inconvenient months for administrators often had an inhibiting affect.

#### School Based Factors

1. There was an increasing number of mandated programs that required implementation.
2. There seemed to be less time to do more and more.
3. A move to a new school made it difficult to participate in all programs that might be available or desireable. A new school requires additional time getting to know staff, community, students, and programs.
5. The initiation of French Immersion in the Division had necessitated the improvement of his own French language skills.

6. Special needs students in the school meant additional professional preparation.

#### Administrator Based Factors

1. He had attempted to work on his French skills but it was too time consuming.

#### Principal #11

#### Characteristics of Inservice Programs

1. The division needed to become more futuristic in its planning and decision making. In other words they should be setting a direction and planning for that direction instead of reacting to a crisis situation. Inservice topics should reflect this long term planning.

#### School Based Factors

1. The most significant factor that prevented his participation was that there was no vice principal to take on some of the administrative load and also to leave in charge when he was absent. Loneliness was also created because there was no one with whom he could share ideas and possible directions as a result of the new information learned at an inservice.
2. Over a third of his focus had been on special needs students, their parents, and the pressures that their presence caused.

3. He could not even get to all the meetings or be on all the committees that he should have because of events in the school.
4. Even if he did attend programs it was not valuable time spent because of the worry that small problems could become larger during his absence.
5. Because he had some say in staff selection he had confidence in classroom activity.
6. Opening a new school created organizational demands and time demands that were not present in an established school.

#### Administrator Based Factors

1. He had not had the opportunity to attend a major conference since 1984.
2. It was becoming increasingly difficult to attend all the meetings created by the board office personnel.

#### Principal #13

#### Characteristics of Inservice Programs

1. The division was outstanding for financial support of professional development programs.
2. One program he wanted to attend was in curriculum evaluation but it occurred at a time that his job responsibilities required his continuous attention.

### School Based Factors

1. When special needs students were clustered they took a lot of time that affected the principal's workload.
2. The expectations of society and the board of trustees required that the schools had to do more and more with less and less.
3. He needed more quality time with his teachers first.
4. Because of the dual tracking of the school there were two of everything but there needed to be one school philosophy and this took time.
5. Until there was someone with power in the board office responsible for French Immersion, not just a coordinator, there was the extra burden of all the French Immersion committees.
6. There was a lack of knowledge of the everyday needs of schools at the board office level.

### Administrator Based Factors

1. In his twenty-five years of experience he had never been busier. Time for professional development was therefore decreased. Although the board office personnel encouraged involvement in professional development they also created so many meetings and committees that it made it very difficult to attend inservice programs.

2. Lack of any long range planning had resulted in more and more division committees requiring too much time away from the school.

3. The division was spending too much time wallowing in philosophy and was not proactive, especially in the area of French Immersion.

#### Comparison of Principal Responses

In the remainder of this chapter a more specific comparison of information from the questionnaire and the responses from the personal interviews is presented. Tables are presented using the numbers allocated to each principal and correspond to the numbers used in the previous principal summaries. The information is based upon data relevant to the 1987 - 1988 school year.

#### School Based Information

Principals were asked to provide background data about their schools. Summarized information includes size, level, tracking (English, French, or Dual), administrative allocation, and administrative support. Questionnaire information and written comments were augmented from the information given to the researcher during the time used to clarify information during the interviews.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF SCHOOL SIZE AND LEVEL BY PRINCIPAL NUMBER AND  
(TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES) PER CATEGORY

Number of Students	Level by Principal Number				
	K - 6	K - 9	7 - 9	10 - 12	(Total)
=====					
SMALL					
< 200	7	-	-	-	
200 - 300	6 11	-	-	-	(9)
300 - 400	4 5 9 12	8 10	-	-	
-----					
LARGE					
400 - 500	-	-	-	-	
500 - 600	1 13 14	-	-	-	(6)
> 600	-	-	3	2 15	

In this school division there was only one school that had less than two hundred students, two schools that had from two to four hundred students, six schools that had four hundred to five hundred students, three schools that had from five hundred to six hundred students, and three schools that had over six hundred students. In other words there were nine small schools with less than four hundred students and six large schools with over four hundred students.

Of these schools there were nine kindergarten to grade six schools, two schools that had kindergarten to grade nine

students, two junior highs, and two senior high schools. Generally, the elementary schools were the small schools and the elementary dual tracked schools (see Table 3) and the junior high and senior high schools were large schools.

In the interview comments made by the principals, and summarized at the end of each principal summary, it was noted that principals in smaller schools felt that although their schools were smaller they still were required to fulfill many of the same tasks as principals in larger schools with more time, more support, or both. In this school division, the information suggested by principals of smaller schools did not support the results of a 1978 study by the Manitoba Teacher's Society study that suggested that principals of small schools seemed to work considerably less hours than those of larger schools. Indirectly, the size of school did have an effect on inservice activity. In this division the size of school affected the amount of administrative time and administrative support which principals felt had an effect on available time for inservice activities.

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF ADMINISTRATIVE ALLOCATION BY PRINCIPAL NUMBER  
AND (TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER CATEGORY)

Vice Principal Allocation	Principal Allocation			
	Full	Half Princ. Half Teach.	Half Princ. Half Other	(Total)
No V.P.	11	7	6	(3)
Half Time	4 5 8 9 10 12 13	-	-	(7)
Full Time	1 3 14	-	-	(3)
Full Time and Part Time Dept. Heads	2 15	-	-	(2)
Total	(13)	(1)	(1)	

When the administrative support for these fifteen principals was examined it was found that three principals had no vice principal, seven principals had half time vice principals, three principals had full time vice principals, and two schools had full time vice principals and part time department heads. Although principal #1 and principal #3 had department heads assigned to them, there was no official release time allocated to them and neither principal included them in their response. These two schools however did have full time vice principals.

During the interviews all principals who had no vice principal, or who had experienced a time when they had no vice principal, or who had other responsibilities other than full time principal mentioned that it had a considerable negative affect upon participation in professional development activities. One of the major reasons given and listed in the comments made by these principals in their individual summaries was lack of time, and the other reason given was that there was no one in authority back at the school level during their absence and it made it difficult to concentrate on the content of the program. Although the Danforth Foundation Study (Colton, et.al:1975) suggested that it was not difficult to be out of the building it appeared that this group of principals was affected by other factors that prevented their desire to be absent. One of the events that had changed since this study in 1975 was the recent mainstreaming of special needs students into the schools.

TABLE 3

SUMMARY OF LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION BY PRINCIPAL NUMBER  
AND (TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER CATEGORY)

Track	Principal Number	(Total)
Single Track English	2 5 7 8 9 11 12	(7)
Single Track French	6	(1)
Dual Track	1 3 4 10 13 14 15	(7)

When the language of instruction was examined, it was found that seven of these schools were English track, one was French track, and seven were dual track. Without exception principals of dual tracked schools suggested that a dual tracked school was like two schools in one where paperwork was concerned and there was the added responsibility of setting one school direction. The time that this consumed affected available time for other activities. Only three of the seven principals who were in French Immersion or dual tracked schools were already bilingual or had been prepared in the language before assuming their position. Although they did not have the added responsibility of a personal need to upgrade their skills in the French language, because they were conversant in the language, and because there was no board office individual responsible for French Immersion programming, these three principals found that much of their professional

development time was spent in meetings related to division programming in the area. In all three cases this attendance was not by personal choice.

#### Administrator Based Information

This section examined the information provided to the interviewer from the questionnaire responses based upon information up to and including the 1987 - 1988 school year and the comments that related to administrator based information made during the personal interviews.

Information such as the years of experience as a teacher before an administrative position was assumed, the years experienced as a vice principal, the years experienced as a principal, the years experienced as an administrator, the number of years in that particular school, and academic training were considered.

TABLE 4

SUMMARY OF THE NUMBER OF YEARS PRINCIPALS WERE TEACHERS  
BEFORE THEY ASSUMED AN ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION  
AND (TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER CATEGORY)

Number of Years	Principal Number	(Total)
0	New 15	(1)
1	-	(-)
2 - 4	6 10	(2)
-----		
5 - 9	Established 1 2 5 7 11 12 13	(7)
10 +	3 4 8 9 14	(5)

When the length of time that these fifteen administrators had been teachers before becoming administrators was examined it was discovered that one principal had no teaching experience before becoming a teaching principal, two principals had taught for two to four years, seven had been teachers for five to nine years, and five had more than ten years of teaching experience. Principals in this school division generally had experience at the classroom level. It was also observed that the individuals who had been principals for the longest period of time had less experience as teachers. Recently teachers spent more time in a teaching situation before they became principals.

TABLE 5

SUMMARY OF THE NUMBER OF YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS A VICE PRINCIPAL BEFORE BECOMING A PRINCIPAL BY PRINCIPAL NUMBER AND (TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER CATEGORY)

Number of Years	Principal Number	(Total)
0	15	(1)
1	12	(1)
2 - 4	3 5 6 8 10 14	(6)
5 - 9	1 2 4 7 9 11 13	(7)
10 +	-	(-)

The number of years that these principals had been vice principals was as follows: one principal had never been a vice principal, one principal had one year of experience, six principals had two to four years of experience, and seven principals had five to nine years of experience. It was concluded that principals had some administrative training and experience before becoming the chief executive officer in a school. Table 5 and Table 6 established that the principals in this school division did have an experience base.

When Marshall (1982) discussed the result of experience without professional development, he suggested that experience represented the broadest focus but in consideration of maximum effectiveness there would be a

point of diminishing returns where experience in the absence of higher order analytic skills would probably not increase effectiveness. He concluded, based upon his research, that the need for professional development was well established.

TABLE 6

SUMMARY OF THE NUMBER OF YEARS AS A PRINCIPAL AS OF THE END  
OF THE 1987 - 1988 SCHOOL YEAR BY PRINCIPAL NUMBER

Years as a Principal	Principal Number	(Total)
-----		
New		
1	4 9	(2)
2	-	(-)
-----		
Established		
3 - 4	1	(1)
5 - 9	6 7 8	(3)
10 - 15	2 3 5 11 13 14	(6)
16 - 20	-	(-)
> 20	10 12 15	(3)

When their experience as principals was examined it was found that for two principals it had been their first year as a principal, one principal had three years of experience, two principals had five to nine years of experience, six principals had ten to fifteen years experience, and four principals had over twenty years of experience.

The principals with over ten years of experience all indicated that the introduction of mainstreaming of special needs students into the schools had a significant impact upon their need for professional development in the area. They also indicated that the amount of time spent in relation to this area greatly affected their administrative time.

All principals who had over five years of experience also indicated that the amount of time they were required to participate in division committees and meetings had increased significantly over the last few years. This impacted on the time they had to complete other administrative duties at the school level.

Principals with from one to four years of experience all indicated that their experience greatly affected their personal needs and that school needs greatly affected their available time to perform their duties.

The Manitoba Teacher's Society study (1978) suggested that the number of years of experience had an effect on participation and suggested that a more in depth study of the factors affecting this involvement should be undertaken.

TABLE 7

SUMMARY OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE BY PRINCIPAL NUMBER AND  
 (TOTAL RESPONSES PER CATEGORY)

Level or Track	Principal Number	Total
Elementary	1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(14)
Junior High	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 10 11 12 13 14 15	(14)
Senior High	2 3 8 11 12 13 15	(7)
English Track	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(15)
French Track	6	(1)
Dual Track	1 3 4 6 10 13 14 15	(8)

When level specific experience as a principal was examined it was found that fourteen of the principals had elementary experience, fourteen principals had junior high experience, seven principals had senior high experience, all fifteen principals had experience in English track schools, only one principal had experience in a French track school, while eight principals had experience in dual tracked (English and French) schools. This group of administrators had a wide range of level specific experience. Movement of administrators to provide this varied experience had occurred within this division over the last eight years. This suggested that when principals commented about factors that had an effect at the different levels of schools they

were valid because they were based upon experience and not just impressions.

Observations of principals who had been moved to a level of school where they had no prior experience suggested that this greatly impacted upon their need for level specific professional development especially in the area of curriculum. Even principals who had prior experience at another level suggested that due to the rapid changes over the last number of years in the area of Department of Education requirements and curriculum that a move in level would be difficult and would greatly impact upon their needs. Their other observations also suggested that movement also created the need for personal professional development in the area of staff development.

TABLE 8

SUMMARY OF THE NUMBER OF YEARS PRINCIPALS HAD BEEN IN THEIR  
PRESENT SCHOOL AS OF THE 1987 - 1988 SCHOOL YEAR BY  
PRINCIPAL NUMBER

Number of Years	Principal Number	(Total)
New		
1	4 5 10 11	(4)
2	8 9	(2)
Established		
3	-	(-)
4 - 5	2 6 7	(3)
6 - 7	1 14	(2)
8 - 9	12 13	(2)
> 10	3 15	(2)

The number of years that these principals had been in their schools broke down as follows: six principals had been in their schools for only one year, four principals had been in their schools for four to five years, two principals had been in their schools for six to seven years, two principals had been in their schools for eight to nine years, and three principals had been in their schools for over ten years. This established that there was a variety in the years principals had been in their schools so that the information

base provided by these principals for this thesis was also varied.

Principals who had experienced a move suggested that for the first year in a different school there was little time to pursue professional development activities. Due to the time that was required not only to get to know their teachers, school programs, and students but to also get to know new curriculum and level specific concerns there was no time for participating in inservice activities outside the school. But at the same time, their need for level specific professional development programs was a great need.

Professional development outside the school in some cases was limited to the Division's yearly retreat, due to this lack of available time.

A Manitoba Teacher's Society study (1978) suggested that an administrator's work week appeared to be determined by the size of school, teaching responsibilities, type of school, and years of administrative experience. Perhaps these principals would like to add that a move to a different level also affected the principal's workload. Based upon the comments of these fifteen principals, increased workload had an effect on available time for attendance at inservice programs.

TABLE 9

SUMMARY OF ACADEMIC TRAINING OF PRINCIPALS BY PRINCIPAL  
NUMBER AND (TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER CATEGORY)

Field	Principal Number			(Total)
	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctorate	
Elementary Teaching	2 6 10	-	-	(3)
Secondary Teaching	3 9 13	-	-	(3)
Educational Administration	7 13 14	1 4 5 8 11 12	15	(10)
Other Education Specialty	-	-	-	(-)
Other	-	-	3	(1)
Total	(9)	(6)	(2)	

Academic training was then examined and it was found that seven principals had a Bachelor's degree, six principals had a Master's degree, and two principals had their Doctorates. More specifically, two principals had a degree in elementary methodology, three principals had degrees in secondary methodology, eleven principals had degrees in educational administration, while one had a degree in history.

Principals in this school division had varied experiences and academic backgrounds. It was noted that of the fifteen principals, eleven had degrees in their

... profession, educational administration. When Marshall  
(1982) made his recommendations regarding a Principal's  
Certificate he suggested that university courses in the area  
of Educational Administration were mandatory. University  
courses fall into the category of formal inservice programs.  
It appeared that a large number of these principals had  
already completed the formal part of their inservicing.  
These principals were generally supporting Marshall's notion  
that university courses in Educational Administration were  
an important part of a principal's training.

#### Summary

The background data given in the questionnaires  
suggested that there were a variety of school sizes,  
structures, and levels within this school division. The  
data also established that for the most part these  
principals had varied backgrounds and were generally  
experienced in their administrative role.

From the questionnaire responses, the written comments,  
and the verbal comments made by the principals involved in  
the study it was concluded that the number of years of  
experience, the number of years in a school, or movement to  
a different level or a different school were factors that  
principals perceived affected either principal need for  
professional development of programs or available time to  
participate in programs.

### Interest and Actual Participation In Inservice Programs

As a result of the questionnaire completed by principals and their comments in a personal interview, and summarized at the end of each individual principal summary, factors that affected principal participation in inservice programs were examined.

This section examined the interest that principals perceived they had for participating in inservice programs.

It also compared the desired interest that principals perceived they possessed to the actual participation of these same principals during the 1987 - 1988 school year.

Characteristics such as the duration of the programs, their location, scheduling, time of year, responsibility for costs, type, format, mode of instruction, and format were analyzed.

TABLE 10

SUMMARY OF HOW PRINCIPALS RATED THEIR INTEREST IN PARTICIPATING IN INSERVICE PROGRAMS BY PRINCIPAL NUMBER AND BY (TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER CATEGORY)

Interest	Principal Number	(Total)
High Interest	2 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 14 15	(11)
Medium Interest	1 3 11 13	(4)
Low Interest	-	(-)
No Interest	-	(-)

The research showed that of the fifteen principals who participated in the study, their responses summarized in Table 10, eleven perceived that their interest in attending inservice professional development programs was high, and the remaining four principals felt that their interest was medium, while none of the principals feel that they had no interest or low interest.

The researcher felt that from this response and the comments made in the open ended written and verbal responses noted in the individual principal profiles it was possible to conclude that interest in participating in some form of inservice programs was fairly well established. The research done by Barth (1986) suggested that with the choice to attend comes an openness to learn. When the responses given by this group were examined, it was concluded that there was an interest in attending and there was therefore an openness to learn. Not one of the fifteen suggested that their interest was low or that they had no interest at all. Barth also suggested that if principals engaged in a learning experience and did learn something they were then faced with having to do something with it. They were rewarded for learning by additional work. His research suggested that some principals contemplating participation in professional development activities hesitated because they feared it would further deplete both their time and energy, already in too short supply. From the interest

indicted in Table 10 and the comments from the principals during the interviews about their perception that there was a decreasing amount of time, Barth's statement had some importance to the tables to follow.

TABLE 11

COMPARISON OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF DAYS PRINCIPALS WERE WILLING TO PARTICIPATE IN INSERVICE PROGRAMS TO THE NUMBER OF DAYS OF ACTUAL PRINCIPAL PARTICIPATION IN INSERVICE PROGRAMS IN THE 1987 - 1988 SCHOOL YEAR BY PRINCIPAL NUMBER AND DISCREPENCIES BETWEEN PREFERRED AND ACTUAL

Number of Days	Principal Number	
	Preferred	Actual
> 10 days	5 6- 11-	9+ 14+
8 - 10 days	4 9 14 15	5- 6-
6 - 8 days	2 7 10 15	2= 3+ 4- 8+ 13+
4 - 5 days	3 8 11- 12- 13- 14-	1+ 7- 10- 12= 15-
2 - 3 days	1	11-
1 day	0	0
0 days	0	0
Total +		(6)
Total -		(7)
Total =		(2)

+ means this principal spent more time than preferred  
 - means this principal spent less time than preferred  
 = means this principal spent the amount of time preferred

Table 11 indicated that there were seven principals who participated less days than they were willing to spend on

programs, two principals participated for the number of days that they had wished to, while six principals spent more days on programs than they had wished.

When examining which individuals had not participated as much as they would have liked from Table 11 and the comments shared with the researcher, four of the seven principals were in their schools for the first year, the two part-time principals in the division constituted another two of the principals, and the seventh had an inexperienced vice principal. Also upon examination of Table 1 it was observed that five of the these seven principals were in small schools.

At the same time when Table 8 and Table 11 were examined in conjunction with Table 12 it was noted that the other two principals who were in their schools for the first year participated in more professional development activities than they were willing to participate. In one case, principal #9, this was also her first year as a principal. She had been required to participate due to commitments that had been made by her school before she became its principal and she also needed inservice in the area of supervision and evaluation of staff. Her comments during the interview supported the observations of Olivero (1982) when he suggested that most people are not aware of what they need until they are in a position to be cognizant of a void. In the second case, principal #8 was an

an experienced principal but this was her first year in this school division, and was involved at the executive level of the M.A.P. which resulted in external inservice commitments. There were only two principals who participated for exactly the number of days they wished and in both cases these principals had been in their schools for between four and nine years.

The Danforth Foundation study (1975) suggested that at that time it was not difficult for principals to be out of their schools. Perhaps there were situational factors in this school division in 1988 such as the introduction of French Immersion programming or the mainstreaming of special needs students into the system that suggested the ability to be out of one's school did not apply to all schools at the time of this thesis study.

TABLE 12

COMPARISON OF THE NUMBER OF PROGRAMS IN WHICH PRINCIPALS WERE WILLING TO ATTEND TO THE NUMBER OF PROGRAMS IN WHICH PRINCIPALS ACTUALLY DID PARTICIPATE BY PRINCIPAL NUMBER AND DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN PREFERRED AND ACTUAL ATTENDANCE

Number of Programs	Principal Number	
	Preferred	Actual
>5	5	9+ 14+
5	6 14 =	6=
4	0	3+ 5- 7+ 8+
3 13	4 7 8 15 +	2+ 4= 11+ 12+ 13+
2 12 11 10 9	1 2 3 10 11 12 13	1= 10= 15-
1	9	0
0	0	0

+ means attended more programs than preferred

- means attended less programs than preferred

= means attended the number of programs preferred

When a comparison is made in Table 12 it became apparent that nine of the fifteen principals attended more programs than they had shown a preference to attend, while four principals attended exactly the number of programs as they had indicated a willingness to attend, and two principals attended less programs than they were willing to attend.

When the results of Table 11 and Table 12 were compared principals #5, #7, and #15 participated for less days and #5 and #15 attended less programs than they were willing.

Principal #10 participated in less programs than he had desired but had spend his preferred maximum number of days participating in them. Principal #4 and principal #6 participated in the desired number of programs in which they were willing to participate but spent more days on them than they were willing. Principal #11 spent less than the number of days but in more programs than he was willing to participate. Principals #2 and #12 spent the number of days they had been willing to spend but participated in more programs than they were willing. Principals #3, #8, #9, #13, and #14 spent more days than they had been willing to spend and they participated in more programs than they were willing.

These many inconsistencies just cited between desired participation and actual participation in this area appeared to be that programs attended did not last for the length of

time preferred. In some cases the programs were scheduled for too long and in other cases the programs attended were too short. However there must have been other factors that affected participation as these principals attended these inservices whether they were longer or shorter than the preferred duration. Wimpelberg (1986) suggested that the best measure of success of programs was participation. Voluntary participation was obviously encouraged by factors that had affected the high participation of this group of principals.

TABLE 12

TABLE 13

COMPARISON OF THE AGENCIES THAT PRINCIPALS FELT SHOULD HAVE  
 PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY FOR DESIGNING INSERVICE PROGRAMS TO THE  
 AGENCIES ACTUALLY INVOLVED IN DESIGNING INSERVICE PROGRAMS ATTENDED  
 BY PRINCIPAL NUMBER AND BY (TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER CATEGORY)

Possible Agency	By Principal Number																			
	Should Have Responsibility (Total)										Did Have Responsibility (Total)									
local school division	1	2	3	4	5	7	8	9	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	15
Department of Education			2	4	6	11	13				6	9	11	12	13	14				(6)
local principals	1	2	4	5	8	9					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	(15)
university-related			2	4	5						1	2								(1)
professional educational			2	4	9	13	15				5	6	9							(3)
other				8	14						2	8	9	15						(4)

Before Table 13 was examined it was noted that principals could choose more than one response to this question should their preferences deem it necessary to do so. The discrepancies between who these principals felt should design professional development programs and who actually had designed the programs in Table 13 suggested that although these principals were attending programs during the 1987 - 1988 year, they were often designed by agencies who these principals had not preferred to design

It also suggested that although all principals attended the yearly division retreat primarily designed by the division and local principals, for four of the fifteen principals the feeling was that agencies other than the school division should be responsible and five principals felt that local principals should not have primary responsibility for inservice design. The similarities suggested that the division retreat, primarily planned by the school division in conjunction with the local principals, was what ten of the possible fifteen principals from this group preferred. It is not however accommodating to one third of its principals.

Research by Arends (1978), Lutz and Ferrante (1972), and Musella (1982) all suggested that leadership responsibility, action, and direction rested with those at the higher levels to meet the specific needs of principals. A full ten of the fifteen principals indicated that other agencies beyond the school division should have primary responsibility, which would support the literature reviewed.

Five principals felt that the Department of Education should have primary responsibility for program design but only three of these same principals participated in programs designed by this agency while three other principals attended programs designed by the Department of Education while they felt that this agency should not have the responsibility for program design. Other factors other the

designer of program must have had an affect on participation in these programs. It was noted that nine principals indicated that more than one agency should have primary responsibility. This may indicate that the professional development of principals was a more complicated issue and that it does need addressing by many agencies.

Caldwell's (1986) study of programs for principals suggested that "in-board" training of principals was extensive but felt that there were major weaknesses in existing programs. For two-thirds of the principals in this school division, even if there were weaknesses in the programs offered there was still a preference for the Division to be providing programs. Musella (1982) stated that all levels of an organization should have input but that leadership responsibility, action and direction, rested with those at the higher levels.

Barth (1986) also suggested that district inservice and university course work had left principals unsatisfied and turned off and that few retained much confidence that staff development would be engaging, let alone helpful to them in running their schools. In this school division only three preferred university-related agencies to offer programs and in only one case did a principal in the division actually attend such a program. However, ten of the fifteen principals in Table 9 had at least one university degree in Educational Administration at the time of this study so

perhaps these individuals had felt differently earlier in their career and had approached this formal route at that time.

Although there were six principals who felt that other professional agencies such as A.S.C.D. or M.A.P. should have primary responsibility for inservice program design only one principal attended such a program. Here also other factors must have had more affect on participation.

TABLE 14

COMPARISON OF WHEN PRINCIPALS PREFERRED TO ATTEND INSERVICE PROGRAMS TO WHEN INSERVICE PROGRAMS WERE ACTUALLY SCHEDULED BY PRINCIPAL NUMBER AND BY (TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER CATEGORY)

When Scheduled	Principal Number																										
	Preferred (Total)							Actual (Total)																			
During the School Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
On School Year Holiday																											
During the Summer																											

Table 14 indicated that all fifteen principals preferred inservice programs to be held during the school year and all principals attended programs during this same time. Of the three principals who preferred to attend during school year holidays,

only one did so. However two principals who had not preferred to attend on holidays did anyway. The same principal who preferred not to attend and did attend during school year holidays also preferred to attend during the summer and did attend during the summer. However two principals who had preferred not to attend during the summer did attend during this time. These two principals both participated in French programs, and this participation was based on personal need.

TABLE 15

COMPARISON OF THE MONTHS WHEN PRINCIPALS PREFERRED TO PARTICIPATE IN INSERVICE PROGRAMS TO MONTHS CONVENIENT TO PARTICIPATE TO MONTHS INCONVENIENT TO PARTICIPATE TO MONTHS OF ACTUAL PARTICIPATION DURING THE 1987 - 1988 SCHOOL YEAR BY PRINCIPAL NUMBER

Month	Principal Number			
	Preferred	Convenient	Inconvenient	Actual
Sept.	4 5 8 10	7	1 2 3 5 6 8 9 11 12 13 14 15	6 8 11 13 14 15
Oct.	1 2 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	-	5 6 7 8 10 12 13 14
Nov.	4 8 9 12 15	6 8 9 12 15	4 7 10	2 4 5 6 7 8 9 11 13
Dec.	4 8	8	1 3 4 6 7 9 10 11 12 13	13
Jan.	3 4 6 7 8 9 10 11 14	3 4 5 6 7 8 10 11 14	2 12 13 15	3 6 7 9 13 14 15
Feb.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 13 14 15	1 3 4 5 7 8 11 13 14	2 12 15	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
Mar.	1 5 8 9 14 15	1 2 8 9 12 15	3 7 10	1 6 9 11 13 14
Apr.	6 7 8 9 10 15	5 7 8 10 12 13	3 4 9	4 5 13
May	6 7 8 9	7	3 4 9 10 12 13 14	2 6 8 9 14
June	8	-	1 2 3 4 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 15	13
July	14	3 8 10 11 12 13	-	12 14 15
Aug.	-	-	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	12 15

When the time of year for inservice participation was examined in Table 15 a number of observations came immediately to the fore. For the month of October fourteen of the fifteen principals would have preferred programs to be scheduled, it was convenient for all fifteen principals to attend during this month and in fact there were eight of these principals who actually attended inservice programs during this month. Of all twelve months of the year October would have been the ideal month to offer an inservice program for this group of principals.

September was an inconvenient month for twelve of the fifteen principals. However six of these twelve principals did participate in a program. Other factors obviously encouraged this participation.

When the results relating to the month of February were examined it became evident that all principals attended at least one program that month. The division retreat occurred during this month and required all principals to participate. This was a preferred month for thirteen of the fifteen principals, although it was only convenient for nine of the fifteen principals. A preferred month was a time when principals would like to participate, ignoring the realities of the school to which they were assigned. Therefore for six principals there were factors related to their schools that made it a month that was not convenient.

School based factors therefore must have had some affect on attendance.

It was noted that of the three principals who said on the questionnaire that February was inconvenient, upon further examination of the comments made by principals during the personal interviews both of the senior high principals mentioned verbally that not only was early February inconvenient it caused considerable difficulty to attend at this time. Both of these principals suggested that as the end of January and the beginning of February was the end of the first semester and the beginning of the second semester that they would never choose to attend at this time. Upon examination of the literature available on this topic, Barth (1986) suggested that with the choice to attend a program came an openness to learn. If enough principals did not choose to participate at this time but did participate out of necessity, this researcher would question whether quality learning would go on at sessions offered at inconvenient times.

June also presented an obvious trend. All fifteen principals suggested that this was an inconvenient month for participation. Tasks related to school closing and organizing for the new year likely affected this response. However one principal did participate in a program because it was curriculum related in the area of French Immersion and someone from the division had to attend.

July was preferred only by one principal and she attended a program during this month. However two other principals attended programs during July although they did not prefer this month. In both cases principals were attending French programs, a result of French Immersion programming in the division. These same two principals continued these programs in August although they not only did not prefer to participate during this month it was also inconvenient to attend. In this case these two principals were concerned with a personal need to improve their French skills. August was a month where no principals preferred to participate and in fact it was an inconvenient month for all fifteen. As principals were expected to open their school offices two weeks before official school opening, therefore attending programs during this month meant that holiday time was minimal for these two principals. Barth (1986) suggested that conditions in one school were seldom similar to those in another and that they should not be treated as a generic class. Here however there were many similarities of month preference in all schools.

Showers, Joyce, and Bennett (1987) suggested that of all the programs they had examined it was not necessary to worry too much about when or where training was held as long as all personnel were involved in the selection of times and places. It appeared however that only a committee of these principals made this decision.

The information presented in Tables 14, 15, and 16 could be relevant for this school division in their planning of future programs.

TABLE 16

COMPARISON OF WHEN DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR PRINCIPALS PREFERRED INSERVICE PROGRAMS TO BE SCHEDULED TO WHEN INSERVICE PROGRAMS WERE ACTUALLY ATTENDED DURING THE 1987 - 1988 SCHOOL YEAR BY PRINCIPAL NUMBER AND (TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER CATEGORY)

When	By Principal Number			
	Preferred	(Total)	Actual	(Total)
On Weekends	1 2 14	(3)	2 6 13 14	(4)
After Working Hours	1 2 5 8 9 13 14	(7)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(15)
During the Working Day	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(15)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(15)

Upon examination of when during the school year principals preferred to participate in inservice programs in Table 16 it becomes evident that the highest preference was for during the working day. All fifteen of the principals preferred this time and all fifteen of these principals participated during this time.

Although only seven of the fifteen preferred to participate after hours, all fifteen principals had attended programs scheduled at this time. This response may have

been given however because all principals were required to participate in a division retreat where some programs were scheduled after regular working hours. This was therefore not a good indicator of whether there were other programs attended after regular working hours without further research in the category.

Three of the principals preferred to participate on weekends, and of the three principals, two had participated during this time. However two other principals who had not preferred to participate during this time did so anyway. Other factors must have facilitated or encouraged this participation.

It was also noted that three principals were not only willing to participate at any time but had actually participated in programs at all possible scheduled time.

Barth (1986) suggested the greatest reasons principals find it so difficult to become learners was the lack of time. More was expected with less. Many of the principals in this study made this exact suggestion in the open-ended section of the questionnaire.

TABLE 17

COMPARISON OF WHO PRINCIPALS FELT SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR COSTS RELATED TO PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TO WHO WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE COSTS OF PARTICIPATION DURING THE 1987 - 1988 SCHOOL YEAR BY PRINCIPAL NUMBER AND (TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER CATEGORY)

Cost Responsibility	Principal Number					Actual (Total)		
	Preferred (Total)							
Only the School Division	3	7	13	(3)	1 2 3 4 6	(9)		
Mainly the School Div. Minor Support from the Principal	1	2	4	5	6	(11)	2 5 6 7 12 13 14 15	(8)
Mainly the Principal Minor Support from the School Division	14			(1)	3 8 9 14	(4)		
Only the Principal	-			(-)	9 14	(2)		

Comments made by the principals during the interviews suggested that this school division was extremely supportive where financial support for participation was concerned. Table 17 suggested that although only three principals felt that the division should be solely responsible for the costs related to principal professional development, nine of the fifteen principals attended a program where the school division completely funded their participation. However two of the three who felt that the school division should fund the entire cost were required to provide minor financial support.

However eight of the nine principals who were completely supported felt that they should be responsible for a minor part of the cost. It was also noted that three of the principals who attended programs at only division cost also attended programs where they paid the entire cost themselves at another time. The questionnaire responses suggested that the school division, in many cases, was financially supporting participation even more than many of the principals expected.

The more programs that principals attended the more varied was the funding distribution. Both principals who had assumed the cost of some inservice participation also attended more programs than they preferred. Obviously there were factors that necessitated this.

Although Liltz and Ferrante (1972) suggested at one time there had been inadequate financial support for principal inservice, this was no longer applicable to this school division. Most principals suggested that participation in professional development was not only encouraged but also facilitated by financial support through the Superintendent's Department.

Research conducted in the province of Manitoba reported by the MAP-MTS research (1983) suggested that funding for principal inservice was not adequate or readily available. This study as cited in Table 17 showed that in this division there was considerable financial support available.

Table 17 also supported the written and verbal comments made by many of the principals in the questionnaire that they perceived that this school division was financially very supportive of principals in the area of professional development.

TABLE 18

COMPARISON OF THE TYPE -INTENSIVE OR CONTINUING- OF INSERVICE PROGRAM PRINCIPALS PREFERRED TO THE TYPE OF INSERVICE PROGRAMS PRINCIPALS ACTUALLY ATTENDED DURING THE 1987 - 1988 SCHOOL YEAR BY PRINCIPAL NUMBER AND (TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER CATEGORY)

Type	By Principal Number												
	Preferred (Total)					Actual (Total)							
Intensive (One gathering)	1	3	4	5	6	7	(10)	*1	2	*3	*4	*5	(15)
	10	11	13	15				*6	*7	8	9	*10	
								*11	12	*13	14		
								*15					
Continuing (Series of gatherings)	2	8	9	12			(6)	7	*8	*9	*12	(6)	
	13	14						*13	15				

\* means Actual Attendance was the same as Preferred Attendance

An intensive inservice program has only one gathering of the participants which may last for one or more days. A continuing inservice program is a series of gatherings on a weekly or monthly basis. Table 18 illustrated that although all fifteen principals attended inservice programs that were intensive only ten preferred this format. As the divisional retreat was intensive and mandatory for all principals this information may not have provided much direction for comment

other than one third of the division principals did not support this type of format. Of the six principals who indicated they preferred continuing programs only four of the six participated in an inservice of this type. Two principals participated in a continuing program although this was not their format preference.

Only one principal indicated that he preferred either an intensive or a continuing program. In this area, although preferences may not all have been for one format, there was a distinct preference. Davis (1976) suggested that as a result of his study thirteen years ago that because most inservice programs were designed for a specific and relatively small group of learners, programs should be able to be tailored to its intended participants. Therefore the preferences of the individuals in this school division should be taken into account.

TABLE 19

COMPARISON OF WHERE PRINCIPALS PREFERRED TO PARTICIPATE IN AN INTENSIVE PROGRAM TO WHERE PRINCIPALS ACTUALLY PARTICIPATED IN INTENSIVE PROGRAMS DURING THE 1987 - 1988 SCHOOL YEAR BY PRINCIPAL NUMBER AND (TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER CATEGORY)

Location	Principal Number				Preferred (Total)	Actual (Total)
	Preferred	(Total)	Actual	(Total)		
Within Easy Commuting Distance	1 2 3 4 6 9 10 11 12 13 14	(11)	*1 *2 *3 *4 5 *6 7 8 *9 *10 *11 *12 *13 *14 15	(15)		
In a Distant Tourist City	5 7 8 13 15	(5)	2 *8 14	(3)		

\* means Actual Attendance was the same as Preferred Attendance

Table 19 illustrated that when principals were asked to indicate whether they preferred to attend an intensive inservice program at a location within easy commuting distance or in a distant city known for its tourist facilities, eleven principals indicated that they preferred it to be located within easy commuting distance. As the division retreat was intensive and located within easy commuting distance there was not a true indication of how many principals actually attended intensive programs in this category. It also had to be kept in mind that six of the fifteen principals had indicated in Table 18 that they had not preferred intensive inservice programs.

Of the five who indicated a preference for a location in a distant city only one actually attended such a program. Even this individual participated mainly at the expense of

the Manitoba Association of Principals. Principal #2, who attended a program in a distant city, indicated on the questionnaire that his preference was to participate in a program within easy commuting distance, and had also verbally commented that he did not like to attend such programs if there were no other participants familiar to him also attending. As this principal had indicated that either mainly the school division or the school division with minor support from the principal was responsible for his inservice attendance last year it lead the researcher to conclude that this might have been one of the few principals who had attended a major program funded mainly by the school division in a distant city. Principal #14 who had also attended a program in a distant city noted on the questionnaire that her preference was to participate in programs within easy commuting distance. Because she had indicated that all funding possibilities applied to her actual funding received it was not possible to conclude that the school division was responsible for the funding for this particular program.

What was possible to conclude was that no principals who preferred to participate in programs in a distant city were funded by the school division.

What was also possible to conclude however, based on this information, was that most programs financially supported by the division were within easy commuting

distance. Other factors, other than funds being available, might have played a role in this area. Although the Division made these funds available and because principals suggested that the Division was supportive financially there must have been factors that prevented those principals who would have liked to attend from doing so. Half of the principals had indicated that there were programs they wanted to attend but their job responsibilities had prevented them from doing so. An examination of programs principals would have liked to attend but had not will be examined further following Table 23.

TABLE 20

COMPARISON OF THE LOCATIONS THAT PRINCIPALS FOUND MOST EFFECTIVE FOR HOUSING INSERVICE PROGRAMS TO THE LOCATIONS OF ACTUAL PROGRAMS ATTENDED DURING THE 1987 - 1988 SCHOOL YEAR BY PRINCIPAL NUMBER AND (TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER CATEGORY)

Possible Location	By Principal Number			
	Preferred	(Total)	Actual	(Total)
Division School	8 9	(2)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 11 12 13 14	(12)
Nearby University	4 9	(2)	12 13 14 15	(4)
Nearby Convention Facility	2 4 6 8	(4)	2 3 4 5 6 8 9 12 13 14 15	(11)
Nearby Retreat Facility	1 2 3 4 5 6 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	(13)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(15)
Non-local School	2	(1)	6 14	(2)
Non-local University	-	(1)	14 15	(2)
City at Some Distance	4 5 7 8 15	(5)	2 8 14	(3)

Table 20 showed that a majority of principals preferred inservice programs to be located at a nearby retreat facility. As the division retreat was scheduled at such a location, it was obviously a good choice for location. However two principals, #7 and #15, were the only two principals who had not attended any programs in a location that they had preferred. All other principals attended at least one program at a location they preferred. At the same

time all but two principals, #1 and #8, attended at least one program situated at a location that was not their preference. It was concluded that factors other than location must have affected principal participation.

Showers, Joyce, and Bennett (1987) suggested that judging from studies, site per se was not particularly important. The Bennett research (1987) suggested that some of the most and some of the least effective training took place both on and off site. Showers, Joyce, and Bennett felt that after studying research available that site was less an issue of effectiveness of training than it was one of convenience and ease of involving participants. This researcher, based upon information found in this study, would agree with these statements and given that the emphasis in this research was to find the characteristics of programs that might encourage attendance, site could be a valid concern for inservice planners.

TABLE 21

COMPARISON OF PREFERRED MODE OF INSTRUCTION BY THE RESPONSES HIGH, MEDIUM, LOW  
BY PRINCIPAL NUMBER AND (TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER CATEGORY)

Mode	Preference By Principal Number					
	High	(Total)	Medium	(Total)	Low	(Total)
Lecture	2 3 6 8 14 15	(5)	1 4 5 7 9 10 10 11 12 13	(10)	-	(-)
Discussion	2 4 5 9 10 12 14 15	(8)	2 6 7 8 11	(5)	15	(1)
Simulation	2 4 9	(3)	3 5 7 10 11 14 15	(7)	1 6 8 12 13	(5)
Gaming	-	(-)	4 7 9 10 15	(5)	1 3 5 6 8 11 12 13 14	(9)
Computer-Assisted Instruction	-	(-)	1 2 3 8 9 13 14 15	(8)	4 5 6 7 10 11 12	(7)
Programmed Learning	8	(1)	1 3 6 13 15	(5)	2 3 4 5 9 10 11 12 14	(9)
Independent Study	1 3 6 8 13 14	(5)	4 7 9 10 11 12 15	(7)	2 5	(2)
Television Lecture	15	(1)	1 5 6 8 10 13	(6)	2 3 4 7 9 11 12 14	(8)
Films	10	(1)	1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 11 12 13 14 15	(13)	2	(1)
Case Studies	1 4 8 9 10 13 14	(7)	2 3 5 6 7 11 12 15	(8)	-	(-)
Site Visits	8 9 15	(3)	1 4 5 7 10 12 13 14	(8)	2 3 6 11	(4)
Role Playing	4	(1)	2 8 9	(3)	1 3 5 6 7 10 11 12 13 14 15	(11)
Supervised Readings	-	(-)	3 5 6 8 9 10 11 12 14 15	(10)	1 4 7 13	(4)

TABLE 22

COMPARISON OF THE MOST PREFERRED MODE OF INSTRUCTION, THE LEAST PREFERRED MODE OF INSTRUCTION, TO THE MODES USED IN ACTUAL INSERVICE PROGRAMS ATTENDED DURING THE 1987 - 1988 SCHOOL YEAR BY PRINCIPAL NUMBER AND (TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER CATEGORY)

Mode of Instruction	Principal Number					
	Most Preferred (Total)		Least Prefer. (Total)		Actual (Total)	
Lecture	3 5 6 7 11 12 13 15	(8)	-	(-)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(15)
Discussion	4 5 7 10 11 12 13 14	(8)	-	(-)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(15)
Simulation	2	(1)	8 13	(2)	2 7 11	(3)
Gaming	-	(-)	11 12 13	(3)	-	(-)
Comp.-Assist. Instruction	5	(1)	5 7 11	(3)	-	(-)
Programmed Learning	-	(-)	4 5 7 9	(4)	-	(-)
Independ. Study	12 13	(2)	5	(1)	6 10	(2)
Television Lecture	5	(1)	12	(1)	6 7 10 11 14	(5)
Films	-	(-)	-	(-)	6 10	(2)
Case Studies	1 8 9 11	(4)	-	(-)	8 14	(2)
Site Visits	2	(1)	-	(-)	8 14	(2)
Role Playing	-	(-)	1 3 5 6 10 11 12 13 14 15	(10)	-	(-)
Supervis.Read.	-	(-)	2 13	(2)	2 11 13	(3)

When Table 21 and Table 22 were examined it became evident that the most preferred modes of instruction for these principals were the lecture and the discussion group. Of the eight principals who had chosen the discussion group as their preferred mode of instruction, four added however that they preferred expert input into the group, and if that situation was not evident then it was no longer their preferred mode of instruction.

These tables also indicated that only one of the fifteen principals was subjected to a mode of instruction that was a least preferred mode. Principals #1 and #9 however, did not attend even one program that was presented in their most preferred mode. Either principals participated in programs because of their format or inservice planners happened to have chosen modes of instruction that best fit the preferences of these fifteen principals for topics that met their needs.

There was also a trend for this group to dislike role playing as a mode of instruction. Of the thirteen possible modes of instruction, ten of the fifteen principals indicated that this was their least preferred mode of instruction. Over half of the principals also had a low preference for gaming, programmed learning, or television lectures. Lucio (1969) suggested that field activities where individuals were in real performance situations were ideal. Role playing was one format suggested that would fulfill

this ideal. Not only had these principals not preferred that approach, it was not used in any programs attended. Either these principals were not aware of the value of this approach or they have not experienced enough of this approach to become comfortable with it.

What this result indicated was that there was an extremely varied preference where mode of instruction was concerned once the typical modes of lecture and discussion groups were incorporated into an inservice program. Joyce and Showers (1980), after analyzing more than two hundred studies in which researchers investigated the effectiveness of various kinds of training methods, suggested that learner preference should not furnish the sole basis for the structure of an inservice. However in support of Davis (1976) who suggested that if the goal of an instructional system was the maximum promotion of learning then learner preference for an instructional system was a valid basis for action, but only in those instances where they assisted in the attainment of the goal of the inservice.

TABLE 23

COMPARISON OF FACTORS THAT PRINCIPALS FELT WOULD HAVE AN AFFECT ON THEIR PARTICIPATION IN INSERVICE PROGRAMS BY PRINCIPAL NUMBER AND TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES PER CATEGORY (T)

Factors	Principal Number							
	Strongly Attractive	(T)	Attractive	(T)	Inconsequential	(T)	Detract.	(T)
Division Identified Need	1 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	(12)	2 3 15	(2)	-	(0)	-	(0)
School Identified Need	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(15)	-	(0)	-	(0)	-	(0)
Personal Identified Need	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(15)	-	(0)	-	(0)	-	(0)
Release Time Given	3 4 7 11 15	(5)	1 2 5 6 8 9 12 14	(8)	10 13	(2)	-	(0)
University Credit	-	(0)	1 6 7 8 9 14	(6)	2 3 4 5 10 11 12 13 15	(9)	-	(0)
Certification Requirements	3	(1)	1 5 6 7 8 9 13 14	(8)	2 4 10 11 12 15	(6)	-	(0)
Certificate of Achievement	-	(0)	1 3 13	(3)	2 4 5 6 7 9 10 11 12 14 15	(11)	8	(1)
"Attractive" Location	5 7 15	(3)	3 4 6 9 11 12 13	(6)	1 2 8 10 14	(5)	-	(0)
Widespread Part. By Peers	5	(1)	1 2 4 6 7 8 9 11 12 13 14 15	(12)	3 10	(2)	-	(0)
Division Pays	1 3 5 7 9 13 15	(7)	2 4 6 8 10 11 12 14	(8)	-	(0)	-	(0)
Principal Pays	-	(0)	-	(0)	2 6 8 14	(4)	1 3 4 5 7 9 10 11 12 13 15	(11)
Travel	5 7 13 15	(4)	4 8 11 12 14	(5)	2 3 6 9 10	(5)	-	(0)
Presented by Scholar in Field	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 10 12 13 15	(11)	1 9 14	(3)	11	(1)	-	(0)

(T) = the total number of responses in this category

Upon examination of Table 23 it became immediately evident that it was possible to identify trends for this group of principals. All fifteen principals felt that if a program was offered that met a school identified need or personal identified need then it would have been a strongly attractive reason to attend. From comments made by principals, the advent of special needs students mainstreamed into the school setting definitely affected the school identified needs of their principals. A personal identified need or a school identified need was created with the introduction of French Immersion into the division as it required administrators to either learn the language or to improve their skills in the area.

Table 23 also indicated that a division identified need was also of importance. Twelve of the fifteen principals identified that this area would be a strongly attractive factor while the remaining three felt that this would be an attractive factor. Table 23 also indicated that wide spread participation by peers could be a positive influence upon principal participation. Twelve of the fifteen principals indicated that this would be an attractive factor. It was therefore concluded that need had a major affect upon principal attendance.

Another positive influence upon attendance was indicated. If a program was presented by a scholar in the field, eleven principals felt that this was a strongly

attractive feature while three felt that this was an attractive feature and only one felt that it was inconsequential. The existence of such an approach would obviously be an encouragement for this group to become involved.

An attractive location was also an encouraging factor for this group of principals. Two-thirds of the principals indicated that this was a strongly attractive or attractive feature of a program.

Another factor that appeared to have some influence was in the area of cost of attendance. Seven of the fifteen principals felt that if the division paid all related expenses this would be a strongly attractive feature and the remaining eight principals felt that this would be an attractive feature. When a comparison of Table 23 and Table 17 was considered it was discovered that eight of the principals fell into the category where they preferred the division to pay the cost and nine of these principals had attended programs where the division had paid the entire cost of program participation. For this group payment of related costs of attendance appeared to be an important factor.

At the other end of the spectrum, eleven principals felt that if they had to pay all related costs of participation in a program it would be a detractive feature. Of the four principals who said this would be inconsequential, principal #8 and principal #14 did attend programs where they had

financially supported their own attendance in programs. When Table 15 was also examined it became evident that principal #14 felt that it was desirable for the principal to be mainly responsible for funding. She was the exception however, not the norm. At the same time she had indicated that if the division paid all expenses it would be an attractive feature. Therefore paying the cost of inservice would not be detractive to her, it would be an incentive, as it would have been for the other fourteen.

A 1982 survey by the Manitoba Teacher's Society showed that as times changed, so did the needs of principals. While most principals in the school division studied here strongly indicated that the introduction of special needs students and French Immersion programming had greatly affected their time and professional development needs this was the greatest factor that affected their involvement in professional development activities. Movement to other schools within the division also affected the needs of these principals. In the open-ended section of the research principals overwhelmingly mentioned one factor that greatly affected their attendance. This change was that the number of meetings and committees had increased considerably over the last number of years. This greatly depleted the amount of time that these same individuals had left to them so that they might participate in these needed programs. This was an indicator of the

changes that have occurred within this specific school division studied.

#### Summary

From the information presented it was concluded that the needs of principals, whether it be division identified need, school identified need, or personal identified need had the greatest positive affect upon principal participation.

Other positive factors identified included: if there was widespread participation by peers, if the division paid all the expenses, if the program was presented by a scholar in the field, or if the program was located in an attractive location.

However it was also evident that if the principal had to pay all the expenses it would have a negative affect upon attendance. It was also evident that principals in new assignments, especially if it was to a different level, if there was the presence of mainstreamed students, if it was an introduction to French Immersion programming, or if there was a lack of inschool administrative support it affected the perception that principals did not have enough time for inservice program attendance.

Wimpelberg (1986) suggested that the most accessible measure of success was participation. Voluntary participation could be affected by time and money costs, social identity and prestige, and professional learning. He suggested that these features not only determined rates of

participation but also the nature of the learning fostered and had a direct relationship to the potential for principals' inservice to facilitate individual growth in principals and improvement in elementary and secondary schools. He also suggested that another factor of significance was the nature of the needs and interests amongst potential participants. The different audiences made very different demands on inservice providers.

McPherson, Salley, and Bachr (1975) suggested that principals did adapt themselves to the varying organizational, collegial, and community environments in which they worked. Organizational structure variables such as the size of the school, and the number of grade levels in the school were found to be particularly important in constraining and influencing the job of the principal. The 1982 survey by the Manitoba Teacher's Society showed that as times changed, so did the needs of principals. More recently (MAP-MTS, 1983) it was indicated that there had been a significant increase in new student programs in Manitoba. Principals from the school division of this study suggested that programming for special needs students and French Immersion programming had greatly affected their need for inservice programs and also affected the amount of time available to participate in programs. Although principals saw a great need in these areas they felt there was no time to pursue these needs.

## Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND  
RECOMMENDATIONSSummary

A review of the literature suggested that the need for inservice education for administrators was clearly greater than ever before. In part this was due to the technological advances in our society, the knowledge explosion especially in the area of effective schools, changing social norms, and financial constraints.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceived factors that affected the attendance of principals in professional development inservice programs. Discrepancies between the preferred characteristics of programs to actual characteristics of programs were examined. These characteristics included areas such as format, topic, participation by peers, and expertise of the presenter, location, scheduling, funding amongst others. Then factors which might be school based such as size, level, tracking, and available administrative support or which might be administrator based such as number of years in a school, experience, training, or need were investigated. Finally this study sought to make recommendations as to what would encourage participation in inservice professional development activities for this group of principals in this suburban Winnipeg school division.

To explore this topic permission was first granted by the superintendent of the school division in question, and all fifteen of the principals in this division agreed to

participate in the study. Principals were then assigned a number from one to fifteen. A multiple choice questionnaire based upon the characteristics of inservice programs which the literature suggested should be considered and the possible factors that research suggested had an affect on principal involvement was constructed. Questions regarding school based information, administrator based information, professional development interest, and actual participation in professional development programs during the 1987 - 1988 school year were included in these multiple choice questions. At the end of the questionnaire principals were asked to discuss either in writing or in a personal interview the factors that they felt had an affect on their attendance in inservice programs during their experience as a principal.

Questionnaires were individually delivered to the principals and upon their completion a personal interview was conducted to clarify the interpretation of each principal's answer to the open-ended final question. This question related to what factors they perceived had affected their participation in inservice programs. Individual principal summaries were presented for each of the fifteen participants responses. A clarification of these responses was completed in a personal interview.

Following this, tables summarizing school based information such as size, level, administrative allocation, and tracking were included. Also summarized in table format were administrator based factors such as experience and training. Comparison tables were presented to show the

differences and similarities between principal preference and actual programs attended in areas such as program format, location, program design, cost, and timing. The numbers assigned to each principal were used in these tables so that response patterns could be visually determined.

#### Summary of Research Findings

##### School Based Factors

One of the areas explored was that of school based information. This included categories such as size, level, tracking (English or French), and administrative support.

When school size was examined, it was concluded that based upon the perceptions of the principals in this school division, size itself was not a factor affecting participation, however the other factors that related to size did have an effect. The larger the school, the more administrative time in the form of principal time, vice principal time, and department head time was allocated. Principals in the small schools or principals who had been in a small school suggested that there were many aspects of a principal's job that in this division were the same no matter what the size of the school. Some examples cited were attendance at meetings, information required by the board office, staff professional development, and parent councils. These same principals also suggested that in small schools it often meant that there were comparatively many more part time teachers due to the requirements in specialty areas. The more individuals who worked in the school, the more evaluations had to be completed, the more time was consumed.

The most obvious trend in regard to level of school was that the level affected the time of year that participation was inconvenient. As an example, the high schools in this division were on a semester system which created two start-up times during the year while all other schools had one. Also the junior high and senior high schools tended to be larger and have more administrative time allocated to the school. It was difficult with such a small number of schools to make any responsible conclusions based upon the questionnaire responses, however comments related during interviews with principals involved at these levels were consistent in this regard.

Language of instruction also had some impact. In dual tracked schools where administrators were not bilingual, it meant that upgrading their French language skills became a personal need. Also in dual tracked schools administrators felt that they were running two schools within one as many administrative duties such as budgeting had to remain separate. At the same time it was necessary to set one school philosophy to meet the needs of all teachers, all students, and all parents. It was concluded that because there was no one at the board office level with French Immersion experience a considerable amount of extra meeting time was added to the job of the principal in an all French or dual tracked school. Such a position needed to be considered.

Without exception, schools with mainstreamed special needs students found that their work was greatly affected by the amount of time required to deal with both internal and

external professional staff, the parents of these children, the familiarization with the programs and the needs of these children. It also created a school need and a personal need for professional development in the area. It was concluded that because appropriate inservicing in topics related to this problem had not been considered by the division before mainstreaming was put into place that programs presented more recently were reacting to a 'crisis' situation and were a remedial action. Although long term goal setting with a planned direction may have existed it was not evident in this division.

Principals who were assigned to newly constructed schools also found that their time was greatly affected by the start-up responsibilities that went with a new building. If long-term planning was considered, principals could be tentatively assigned to a school a year before the actual move so that some prework could be accomplished.

Without exception, all principals mentioned that there was an ever decreasing amount of time available for attending inservice programs. This could have been a way of suggesting that other things were of more importance. However given that most principals indicated that the board office was one of the major contributors to the increased time demands it may not have been readily possible for these principals to decide to make professional development activities a priority over board office requirements. Given that the principals felt they themselves were interested in professional development, that the board office was supportive of professional development, that there were

finances available to the principals, and that the board office felt that they were supportive of professional development for principals, perhaps the board office needed to be made aware of the perceived situation. Especially when principals unanimously perceived that need had the greatest affect on their professional development involvement, the board office should be made aware that their policies were creating the needs. Division committees, inadequate administrative support personnel at the school level, the movement of administrators to different schools, and the decentralization of French Immersion programming and mainstreamed students into community schools were all the result of board office decisions.

#### Administrator Based Factors

When administrator based factors such as experience and training were examined there were a number of possible conclusions.

It was found that respondents who were first year principals had personal needs that they had not anticipated such as staff team building, curriculum background and staff evaluation. Experienced principals who commented about what it had been like to be a first year administrator supported this notion. Perhaps Marshall's rationale for the Province of Manitoba's implementation of a Principal's certificate had merit here. If principals had attended practical professional development sessions in this area before they assumed the position they would have been better prepared.

Administrators who had been in their schools for more than four years found that they had more time for professional development because they knew their staff, students, and community, felt more comfortable being out of the school, and had an easier time being absent than principals who were in their schools for especially their first year.

Administrators who had experienced a move to a different level of school found that they required professional development in the area of curriculum and program that was specific to that level. Principals suggested that in their first year of a different building, no matter how many years of experience they had as principals, they required inservice in the area of staff building or team development techniques. All principals who had experienced a move had commented about the workload that was created with a move and the time difficulty this created in attending inservice programs. It was unfortunate that the move not only created the need for inservice but also put up road blocks to attendance at this time of critical need. This was a situation that required attention. It was concluded that if principals could be informed of an impending move at least a year in advance while they had more time as the established administrator of a building who had more time to attend inservice programs they would be better prepared for the move.

Without exception, principals all felt that there was a considerable increase in the amount of time that was being required for division meetings and committees no matter what

size, level, or tracking might exist in the school. What was a paradox here was that although the school division had developed a model for assisting and encouraging the inservice training of its principals it was also the school division that had thrown up the road blocks that also prevented this participation. Without exception, principals suggested that frequent meetings and the ever increasing number of committees occurred as a result of board office direction or lack of direction. These meetings removed them from their schools too frequently and made it more difficult also to be absent for inservice training. Barth (1986) suggested that time was the greatest factor affecting participation and Worth (1985) argued that it was imperative that inservice planners recognize physical and mental fatigue as a deterring factor in adult learning. In order to improve the possibilities that principals might attend more programs to meet their needs the suggestions of Barth and Worth should be taken into account and action should be taken to alter the situation.

Perceived Preferred Characteristics of Inservice  
Professional Development Programs

Principals attended inservice programs even if they were not designed by those agencies that these principals preferred. Other factors played a more important role. Perhaps there was a feeling that other expertise existed through these other agencies which should make them designers of more meaningful programs.

All fifteen principals suggested that October was a convenient month to participate in inservice programs.

August, September, and June were not preferred months. For high school principals, the end of January and the beginning of February were also extremely inconvenient. Fourteen of the fifteen principals did not prefer to participate during July or August, although two principals participated in French classes, a personal need and a school need based upon the introduction of French Immersion programming in the division. Here again, need had a tendency to override all other factors. A needs assessment was definitely warranted in this division.

All fifteen principals felt that inservice programs should be scheduled during the working day, while only half the principals felt that they wanted to participate after working hours. Two thirds of the principals preferred intensive inservice programs with one gathering of the participants to continuing programs with a series of gatherings. Frequent comments in the open-ended section of the questionnaire indicated that their role frequently required evening and weekend commitments related to the job. Perhaps this group was not prepared to further add to this load by choosing to attend sessions other than for need.

Eleven of the fifteen principals felt that they preferred to participate in an intensive program within easy commuting distance and thirteen of the principals preferred a nearby retreat facility for its location. It was concluded that although principals were interested in travel, the further time that it required took them out of their schools for longer than they could manage. Showers, Joyce, and Bennett (1987) suggested that inservice planners

should worry little about where training was held or when, as long as all personnel were involved in the selection of times and places. The information provided by this thesis should provide this involvement.

Only one principal felt that she should have a major responsibility for the cost of professional development. Three principals felt that only the school division should be responsible. As eleven of the principals felt that the division should assume the major cost of participation, with minor support from the principal, it was concluded that this was the preferred trend in this division. Another trend was that if the division paid for participation in a program it was an incentive to attend and at the other end of the spectrum if a principal had to pay the cost of attendance it was a detractive feature of a program. Principals, did however attend programs even if their preferred amount of financial support was not available for some programs. Other factors such as need obviously had more impact. However with such a strong response, it was obvious that the provision of funds for inservice attendance was one successful approach that the school division had undertaken to encourage participation seen as these principals generally attended more programs than the provincial norm.

When preferred inservice format was examined there was a trend for lectures in conjunction with discussion groups. It was further suggested that discussion groups should have external input or should relate to the lecture material presented and if this input was not evident that the discussion group was no longer a preferred mode of

instruction. Another overwhelming trend was the dislike of this group for role playing situations to be incorporated into inservice programs. As role playing was an approach suggested by Caldwell (1986) as being important for adult learners to practice what they were to learn in simulated real work settings, either principals as a group have had negative experiences with this format or they have had no experience in this area and were uncomfortable attempting it. However between the strong preferences and the strong dislikes of this group it was evident that there were many learning styles and preferences and that individualized attention would be necessary if learner preference were to be taken into account.

Need had the greatest effect on the participation of this group of principals in professional development programs. School need and personal need were unanimously expressed as having an effect, while division need followed closely behind. Worth (1985) had suggested that it was necessary to recognize the concreteness and immediacy of most adult goals and the key position that motivation held to the learning process. Based upon this thesis research it was concluded that need was certainly immediate in this situation.

Another consideration of this group was that if a program was presented by a scholar in the field then it was a strong incentive to attend. Also if there was widespread participation by peers it was an incentive to attend. Worth further had suggested that it was necessary to take into

account the relationship between a pleasant social atmosphere and a satisfying educational experience.

### Conclusions

The principals in this school division perceived that they were extremely interested in attending professional development inservice programs. Eleven of the fifteen stated that their interest was high and the remaining four principals indicated that their interest was medium. Their attendance in inservice programs is considerably higher than a Manitoba Association of Principals - Manitoba Teachers Society study (1983) suggested was average participation for the province.

Principals who participated in less inservice programs than they desired were principals in the smaller schools without administrative support such as a vice principal, or they were principals who were only part time principals. Also principals who had recently been assigned to a new building or a different school or level participated in less programs than they preferred.

### Recommendations

As a result of this research study and the literature available for analysis the following recommendations based upon the research questions are made.

The first research question directed itself to the characteristics of inservice professional development programs that were perceived as important to principals.

1. It is evident that learning styles and preferences were different and what is perceived as ideal for one principal is not perceived as the ideal for

another. This researcher concludes that an alternate approach to inservice should be attempted and recommends that Wiener's (1984) three phase model could help meet the professional development needs of principals. It is based upon needs, the factor that these fifteen principals unanimously agreed had the greatest impact upon their involvement. It is designed to provide meaningful on-site professional development and provides a three-phase program format including an Awareness and Skill Acquisition phase, an Application phase, and a Follow-up phase. The result would be the formulation of I.S.P.'s (Individual School Plans). Principals who had participated in Wiener's approach had indicated they felt that the self-directed approach utilized was more effective than a large group or workshop type of inservice program because they were provided with a mechanism to work on problems pertinent to their own school. To further support this researcher's recommendation, Brainard (1975) suggested that administrator renewal programs specifically at the division level where administrators had completed their formal graduate work should be related to school improvement projects. These should be organized and conducted by the principals, should be on-going instead of consisting of 'one shot' events, should be based on small group and individual

learning processes, and should be based on the goal of improved performance on the job as opposed to only providing principals with new or additional information.

2. From what the literature suggested about adult learners, effective inservices should include more participant control over the "what" and "how" of learning and focus on job related tasks that the participant considers real and important. To that end it would be necessary to complete a thorough needs assessment including a learning styles inventory for all principals involved. This would further improve the possibility that not only the perceived needs of these principals would be met but that actual needs of these principals would be met since the perceived needs and the actual needs could be somewhat different.

The second subquestion directed itself to the factors that affected attendance. The following recommendations are made based upon school based and administrator based factors:

1. The results of this thesis supports the idea that the conditions in schools and the backgrounds and experiences of principals may be very diverse. As suggested by Barth (1986) principals should not be treated as a generic class and a more individualized approach is therefore recommended.
2. Diverse learning styles should be considered when inservices are organized.

3. Adult learning theory suggests that most adult goals are concrete and immediate. As this thesis found that principals were more inclined to attend inservices that responded to their immediate personal needs or school needs, a needs assessment is an essential component of any inservice plan for principals and is therefore recommended.
4. As adult learning theory suggests that physical fatigue and mental fatigue are deterring factors, this thesis research suggests that level specific school activities that occur at different times of year should be considered so that optimum times for inservice activities could be discerned.
5. A formula for allocation of administrative time based on criteria which includes size of school, level of school, and the number and the types of programs offered should be incorporated into Department of Education regulations.

Based upon the final subquestion, when the actual attendance of the principals is compared to their desired attendance the following recommendations are made:

1. Financial support and school time should be made available to principals who wish to participate in inservice programs that meet their personal needs, school needs, or division needs.
2. A coaching situation for principals such as the approach advocated by the PAL program initiated by the Manitoba Teachers Society and Manitoba Association of Principals should be encouraged and

supported. School divisions should provide the release time for principals who wish to become involved during the school day.

As a result of this research study the perceptions of these fifteen principals and the literature already available for consideration the following recommendations specifically for this school division are suggested:

1. A formal needs assessment should be conducted with this group of fifteen principals, and should include a learning styles inventory.
2. A minimum of a full-time principal should be allocated to every school to provide the time required to attend to professional development needs.
3. Schools accommodating special needs students should be allocated more administrative time than exists, especially if these students are clustered in one school.
4. If the policy of principal moves continues principals should have a year's notice so that they could be better prepared, especially if the move were to be to a different level or track or to a newly constructed school.
5. Principals who need to improve their skills in the French language should be given the release time to do so during the regular school day. This would require more vice principal assistance.
6. An individual with French Immersion expertise and experience at all levels, elementary, junior high,

and senior high, with the power and authority that goes with a board office position should be considered in this division.

7. There needs to be long range planning at the board office level so that principals could be prepared for changes instead of inservice professional development activities being a reaction to "crisis" situations and being a remedial action.
8. The board office needs to examine the number of committees and meetings requiring principal attendance and make some decisions regarding direction in some areas as soon as possible instead of continually meeting.
9. A coaching situation should be considered in this school division. Principals perceived that they possessed a positive attitude about professional development but because of the diverse learning styles and preferences some individualization in the area of professional development with the principals should be considered.
10. This division should continue to provide the financial support already evident for the professional development of its principals.
11. If all trends are taken into consideration and one inservice program were to be planned or one inservice was to be located to include all fifteen principals in this school division, it should occur during October, last from two to three days at a retreat facility within easy commuting distance. It

should be conducted only during working hours, have widespread participation by their peers, be solely funded by the school division, and planned by the local school division with input from local principals. It also should be presented by a scholar in the field with lectures and discussions related to the lectures, and be based upon a topic of school need or personal need. Although a more comprehensive needs assessment would have to be conducted, the area of special needs students was mentioned by more principals than any other factor in the open-ended part of the research.

#### Recommendations for Further Study

The following concerns need to be taken into consideration when interpreting the findings in this research:

1. The data used for this thesis was based upon the recollection of these principals based upon a completed school year. Given the stated activity of these principals some of the information and perceptions given to the researcher may not have been completely accurate given the time lapse.
2. The specific results of this study should be considered only relevant to this school division. If this study is done again it should be presented at the beginning of the school year with principals keeping a record of all professional development activity, formal inservice programs as well as other professional development activity.

3. A more longitudinal study should be conducted so that other situational factors might become evident.
4. A larger school division could be considered for this study. More trends could become evident with a much larger group. However because this study had one hundred percent participation a larger school division may not furnish as thorough a study if full participation were not evident.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Arends, R.  
1978 "Inservice Education and the Six O'Clock News". OSSC Bulletin. 21:7 (7-18).
- Austin, G.R.  
1979. "Exemplary Schools and the Search for Effectiveness". Educational Leadership. October (10-14).
- Barnett, Bruce G.  
1985 "Peer-Assisted Leadership: Using Research to Improve Practice". Urban Review. 17:1 (47-64).
- Barth, Roland S.  
1986 "Principal Centered Professional Development" Theory Into Practice. 25:3 (156-160).
- Barth, Roland S.  
1985 "The Leader as Learner". Educational Leadership. 42:3 (92-94).
- Barth, Roland S.  
1985 "Principal Centered Professional Development". ED 254 946.
- Barth, Roland S.  
1981 "A Principals' Center". Journal of Staff Development 2:1 (53-69).
- Beckner, Weldon  
1979 "Better Inservice Education for Principals of Smaller Schools -- A Pilot Study". ED 172428.
- Bennett, Barrie.  
1987 "The Effectiveness of Staff Development Training Practices: A Meta-Analysis". Doctoral Dissortation, University of Oregon.
- Berman, Paul and M.W. McLaughlin  
1978 "Federal programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol.VIII: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations". Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation.
- Boyd, William I. and Robert L. Crowson  
1981 "The Changing Conception and Practice of Public School Administration". Review of Research in Education, 9:7, (311-373).

- Brainard, Edward  
1975 "The Colorado Department of Education and the Development of School District Based Administrator Renewal Programs:. ED 114 993.
- Bridges, E.M.  
1979 "The Principalsip as a Career". In D.A.Erickson The Principal in Metropolitan Areas. Berkley, California, (1-21).
- Caldwell, Sarah  
1986 "Effective Practices for Principal Inservice". Theory Into Practice. 25:3 (174-178).
- Caldwell, B.J. and D. Magnan  
1981 Project ASK: New Directions in Pre and In-service Training". The Canadian School Executive. 1:1 (19).
- Caldwell, Sarah and Jon C. Marshall  
1982 "Staff Development - Four Approaches Described, Assessed for Practitioner, Theoretician". NASSP Bulletin. 66:451 (25-35).
- Carmichael, Lucianne  
1982 "Leaders as Learners: A Possible Dream". Educational Leadership. 40:2 (58-59).
- Carvelti, Gordon  
1982 "Training for Effective School Administrators". Educational Leadership. February (324-329).
- Champagne, David W.  
1980 "Does Staff Development Do Any Good?" Educational Leadership February (400-403).
- Clark, Vivian  
1986 "The Effectiveness of Case Studies in Training Principals, Using the Deliberative Orientation". Peabody Journal of Education. 63:1 (187-195).
- Coleman, Peter  
1982 "Administrative Leadership Change, and Training Program for Administrators". Canadian Journal of Education. 7:1 (44-56).

- Colton, David, W. Husk, S. Krchniak, W. Kritek, and J. LaPlant  
1975 "Professional Development for Urban Administrators". NASBP Bulletin. March (13-20).
- Cowan, John  
1980 "A Participant's View of Staff Development" in Rhodes, D. and D. Hounsell, Staff Development in the 1980's: international perspectives. Chicago: Illinois State University Foundations.
- Cross, Ray  
1981 "What Makes an Effective Principal?" Principal. 60:4 (19-22).
- Darish, John C.  
1987 "The Beginning Principalsip". ED280196.
- Davis, W.J.  
1976 "Inservice Staff Development Programs for School Principals: Needs Assessments and Inservice Programs". February: ED 119 304.
- DeLacy, Janice C. and Jeannine D. Rogel  
1981 "A Professional Development Program for Administrators". Journal of Staff Development. 2:1 (116-140).
- Dillon - Peterson, Betty (Editor)  
1981 "Staff Development/Organization Development". Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Dvorak, Stephen  
1988 Personal Interview
- Edelfelt, Roy A. and Edward Gollnick  
1981 "The State of the Art in Inservice Education and Staff DEvelopment in Professional Organizations". Journal of Research and Development in Education 15:1.
- Edelfelt, R.A. and M. Johnson  
1975 "Rethinking Inservice Education". Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

- Emond, Paul  
1982 "L'ENAP et le perfectionnement des administrateurs scolaires". The Canadian School Executive. 2:6 (13-15).
- Emonds, R.  
1979 "Some Schools Work and More Can". Social Policy. March/April (28-32).
- Farnsworth, Briant J.  
1981 "Professional Development: Preferred Methods of Principals and Teachers". ED 251 436.
- Farquhar, R.H. and P.K. Piele  
1972 "Preparing Educational Leaders: A Review of Recent Literature". University Council for Educational Administration.
- Fielding, Glen D. and H. Del Schalock  
1985 "Promoting the Professional Development of Teachers and Administrators". ED 260 489.
- Firestone, W.A. and R.E. Herriott  
1982 "Prescriptions for Effective Elementary Schools Don't Fit Secondary Schools". Educational Leadership. December 40:3 (51-53).
- Gazda, George  
1973 "Human Relations Development: A Manual for Educators". Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Geering, Adrian D.  
1980 "An Inservice Plan for School Principals in a School District in Minnesota, U.S.A.". ED 201 035.
- Geering, Adrian D.  
1980 "A Prescriptive Model for Determining Professional Development Needs of Principals". Sept. ED 199 929.
- Geering, Adrian D.  
1980 "An Examination of the Use of Assessment Centres to Select and Develop Principals". Nov. ED 201 033.
- Geering, Adrian D.  
1982 "Professional Development Needs of School Principals". ED 239 370.

- Gibbles, Jacques L. and James D. Lawrence  
1987 "Peer Coaching for Principals". Educational Leadership. November (72-73).
- Goldhammer, Keith  
1966 "Notes on Institutional Relationships in the Inservice Education of the Professional Administrator". UCEA Task Force Seminar: Institutional Roles for Inservice Education of School Administrators. Eds. Patrick D. Lynch and Peggy L. Blackstone, U.S.A.: University of New Mexico (31-45).
- Goldhammer, Keith and J.E. Suttle  
1968 "Issues and Problems in Contemporary Educational Administration". ED 014 787.
- Good, T. L.  
1982 "How Teachers' Expectations Affect Results". American Education. 18:10 (25-32)
- Habeshaw, Trevor  
1977 "A Report on Two Contrasting Methods of Evaluating Attitudes of Staff to Development Programs". Assessment in Higher Education. 3:1 (49-72).
- Hendrickson, Andrew  
1966 "Adult Learning and the Adult Learner". Adult Leadership. 2:6 (75-78).
- Hersey, Paul W.  
1982 "The NASSP Assessment Center Develops Leadership Talent". Educational Leadership. February: (370-371).
- Hill, G.  
1981 "The Perceived Inservice Needs and Preferred Delivery Systems of Elementary School Principals". unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, University of Manitoba: Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- Holtman, Howard  
1985 In an interview with the researcher.
- Houle, Cyril O.  
1980 "Continuing Learning in the Professions". San Francisco, California: Jossey - Bass Inc.

- Howard, Bessie C. Nancy L. Arnez  
1982 "School-Based Administrator Networking and Professional Development Program for More Effective Schools". ED 219 854.
- Howey, K. R.  
1980 "Improving Teacher Education". Washington, D.C.: Association of Teacher Educators.
- Howey, K. and B. Joyce  
1978 "A Data Base for Future Directions in Inservice Education". Theory Into Practice. June (206-211).
- Howsam, Robert B.  
1966 "Inservice Education of School Administrators: Background Present Status, and Problems". in P. Lynch, (ed.). Continuing Education of School Administrators. New Mexico: University of New Mexico: (8 - 30).
- Isherwood, G.B. and J.D. Beneteau  
1982 "In Quebec They Believe in R & R: Renewal and Revitalization". The Canadian School Executive. December (15).
- Johnson, William L. and K.J. Snyder  
1986 "Instructional Training Needs for School Principals". The Journal of Educational Administration. XXIV:2 Summer (237-251)
- Joyce, Bruce  
1980 "A Memorandum for the Future". in Staff Development/Organization Development. Alexandria Virginia: A.S.C.D. (113-127).
- Joyce, Bruce and Beverly Showers  
1980 "Improving Inservice Training: The Messages of Research". Educational Research. 37:5 (375-385).
- Joyce, Bruce R., Kathleen M McNair, M.D. McKibbin  
1976 "Perceptions of Professionals and Policy Makers". Stanford, California: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford, University.
- Kielty, G.C.  
1982 "Leadership Seminars in N.B.". The Canadian School Executive. December (16).
- Kline, William A.  
1987 "A Collegial Approach to Developing Leadership". Educational Leadership. November (70-71).

- Klopf, G.J. E. Scheldon, and K.Brennan  
1982 "The Essentials of Effectiveness: A Job Description for Principals". Principal. March, 6:4 (35-36).
- LaPlant, James  
1981 "Inservice Education for Principals.(The State of the Art)." ED 186 994.
- Lawrence, G.  
1974 "Patterns of Effective Inservice Training: A State of the Art Summary of Research on the Materials and Procedures for Changing Teacher Behaviors in Inservice Education". Tallahassee, Florida: Florida State Department of Education.
- Leithwood, Kenneth A. and Deborah J. Montgomery  
1986 "Improving Principal Effectiveness: The Principal Profile". Toronto, Ontario: The Ontario Institute of Studies in Education.
- Levine, Sarah L.  
1987 "Peer Support for Women in Middle Management". Educational Leadership. November (74-75).
- Licata, Joseph W.  
1980 "Systematic Appraisal of Educational Leadership Personnel. Informal Publications". ED 197 423.
- Little, Ann M.  
1986 "Developmental Needs Data as Determinants for Professional Development Offerings in University Settings". ED 277 096.
- Long, Claudia  
1985 "Yellow Pages for Principals: Networks in Action". Phi Delta Kappan. April (574-575).
- Lucio, William (Editor)  
1969 "The Supervisor:New Demands New Dimensions". ASCD Commission on Problems of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers. ASCD, NEA.
- Lo Presti, Peter L.  
1982 "Building a Better Principal". Principal. March, 6:4 (32-34).
- Lusthaus, Charles S.  
1982 "Administrative Training in Canada". The Canadian School Executive. 2:6 (2-7).

- Lutz, Frank W. and Reynolds Ferrante  
1972 "Emergent Practices in the Continuing Education of School Administrators". Illinois University Council for Educational Administration: Interstate Printers.
- Lynch, Dr. P. (Editor)  
1966 "Continuing Education of School Administrators". Task Force Seminar on Continuing Education of School Administrators. University of New Mexico: Dept. of Ed. Admin. and Foundations.
- Manasse, A. Lorri  
1983 "Improving Conditions for Principal Effectiveness: Policy Implications of Research on Effective Principals". ED 245 355.
- Manasse, A. Lorri  
1982 "Effective Principals: Effective at What?" Principal. 61:4 (10-15).
- Manera, Elizabeth and Ardeth P. Cropper  
1980 "Back to the Classroom: An Invitation to Professional Renewal". NASSP Bulletin. 64:33 (20-24).
- Manitoba Association of Principals and Manitoba Teacher's Society  
1983 "Working Conditions of Manitoba Public School Administrators". Manitoba: Manitoba Teacher's Society.
- Manitoba Teachers' Society  
1978 "The Manitoba School Principal: Changing Roles and Responsibilities". A Report of the Task Force on Job Parameters of Principals. Manitoba: The Manitoba Teachers' Society.
- Marshall, D.G.  
1980 "Survey for the Identification of Inservice Needs and Preferred Delivery Mechanisms: Manitoba School Principals". University of Manitoba: Department of Educational Administration and Foundations.
- Marshall, D.G.  
1982 "Principal Certification: Issues and Questions Department of Educational Administration and Foundations". University of Manitoba: Department of Educational Administration and Foundations.
- McCleary, Lloyd  
1976 "Assessing Competency Needs in Administration". ED 112 488.

- McIntyre, Kenneth  
1979 "Training Programs for Principals". Theory Into Practice. February 18:1 (28-32).
- McKenzie, Floretta Dukes  
1985 "Leadership: The Critical Variable". ED265621
- McKibbin, Michael and Bruce Joyce  
1980 "Psychological States and Staff Development". Theory Into Practice. 19:4 (248-255).
- McPherson, R.E., C. Salley, and M.E. Bachr  
1975 "What Principals Do: Preliminary Implications of a Nationwide Analysis of the School Principalship". Consortium Quarterly 2(1) (1-19).
- Merullo, Emanuel A.  
1974 "Inservice Programs for Principals". NASSP Bulletin. May 58:382 (142-147).
- Michigan Institute  
1985 "The Michigan Institute for Educational Management Assessment Center Program". ED 253 565.
- Musella, Donald  
1982 "Planning is Needed". The Canadian School Executive. December (8).
- N.E.P. Editors  
1978 "What's Going On Out There?" National Elementary Principal. March 57:7 (9-19).
- Null, Eldon  
1970 "The Hierarchy of Personal Needs: Its Significance to School Principals". Peabody Journal of Education. 47:6 (347-351).
- Oja, Sharon N.  
1980 "Adult Development is Implicit in Staff Development". Journal of Staff Development. 1 (7-56).
- Olivero, James L.  
1982 "Principals and Their Inservice Needs". Educational Leadership. February (340-344).
- Orlich, Donald C.  
1982 "Some Considerations for Effective Inservice Education". The Clearing House. 56:5 (197-201).

- Pharis, W.L. and S.B. Zakariya  
1979 "The Elementary School Principalship: A Research Study". National Association of Elementary School Principals, Arlington, Virginia.
- Rhodes, D. and D. Hounsell  
1980 "Staff Development for the 1980's: International Perspectives". Chicago: Illinois State University Foundation.
- Rothman, Arthur and Sarah Robinson  
1977 "Evaluating a Training Course for University Teachers". Canadian Journal of Higher Education. 7:1 (19-37).
- Rutter, M. et al.  
1979 "Fifteen Thousand Hours; Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children". Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Mass.
- Sadler, D. Royce  
1984 "Follow-up Evaluation of an Inservice Programme Based on Action Research: Some Methodological Issues". Journal of Education for Teaching 10:3 (209-218).
- Salmon, Daniel A.  
1974 "Inservice Programs for Principals". ED 089 425.
- Seagren, Alan T. and Adrian D. Geering  
1980 "A Process to Determine Professional Development Needs of Principals in a School District". ED 197 485.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J.  
1982 "Ten Principles of Quality Leadership". Educational Leadership. February (330-336).
- Sharp, Kenneth J.  
1983 "I/D/E/A Program Emphasizes Principal as Number One Learner". NASSP Bulletin. January. 67:459 (96-101).
- Shoemaker, J. and H. W. Fraser  
1981 "What Principals Can Do: Some Implications From Studies of Effective Schooling". Phi Delta Kappan 63:3 (178-182).

- Showers, Beverly  
1984 "Transfer of Training: The Contribution of Coaching". Center for Educational Policy Management, Eugene, Oregon.
- Showers, Beverly, Bruce Joyce, and Barrie Bennett  
1987 "Synthesis of Research on Staff Development: A Framework for Future Study and a State-of-the-Art Analysis". Educational Leadership. November (77-87).
- Silver, Paula F., Colin R.J. Moyle  
1984 "The Impact of Intensive Inservice Programs on Educational Leaders and Their Organizations". Planning and Changing. Spring (18-34).
- Smith, Kevin R.  
1977 "Professional Development of the School Principal". ED 146 678.
- Spooner-Smith, A.  
1975 "User Needs and the Development Process". ED 102 713.
- Stanton, Michael  
1980 "Issues in the Professional Development of Secondary-School Principals". ED 247 084.
- Stevens, Kelline W.  
1986 "Collaborative Action Research: An Effective Strategy for Principal Inservice". Theory Into Practice. 25:3 (203-205).
- Sweeney, James  
1982 "Research Synthesis on Effective School Leadership". Educational Leadership. 39:5 (346-353).
- Swenson, Thomas L.  
1981 "The State of the Art in Inservice Education and Staff Development in K-12 Schools". Journal of Research and Development in Education. 15:1 (2-7).
- Taylor, Gib  
1981 "A Leadership Development Program That Works". Canadian School Executive. 1:9 (16-20).
- Thompson, Steven R.  
1982 "A Survey and Analysis of Public School Personnel Perceptions of Staff Development Practices and Beliefs With a View to Identifying Critical Problems or Needs". Pennsylvania State University.

- Rohanis, Pascal and Elouise Jackson  
1980 "The Technical Assistance Approach to Inservice". Educational Leadership. February (386-389).
- Valentine, Jerry W.  
1986 "Performance/Outcome Based Principal Evaluation: A Summary of Procedural Considerations". ED 281 318.
- Wadelius, Vaughn  
1984 "Administrators Have Their Say". The Manitoba Teacher. 63:2 (13-15).
- Wiener, William  
1984 "A Research and Development Approach for the Development of an In-Service Program for School Administrators". ED 253 968.
- Wilsey, Cathy and Jo Ellen Killion  
1982 "Making Staff Development Programs Work". Educational Leadership. 40:1 (36-43).
- Wimpelberg, Robert K.  
1986 "The Business of Principals' Inservice: Incentives for Participation". Theory Into Practice. 25:3 (179-184).
- Wimpelberg, Robert K.  
1984 "Administrative Inservice and Theories of Groups". ED 245 322.
- Wood, Charles L.  
1974 "Preparation, Inservice for School Leaders". NASSP Bulletin. September 58:383 (110-117).
- Wood, Fred H. and Steven R. Thompson  
1980 "Guidelines for Better Staff Development". Educational Leadership. February (374-378).
- Wood, Fred H., F. O. McQuarrie, Jr., and Steven R. Thompson  
1982 "Practitioners and Professors Agree on Effective Staff Development Practices". Educational Leadership. October (28-31).
- Wood, Fred H, Steven R. Thompson, and Sister Frances Russell  
1981 "Designing Effective Staff Development Programs". in Staff Development/Organization Development, A.S.C.D. Alexandria, Virginia: A.S.C.D. (59-91).

- Worth, Maria Menconi  
1985 "Considering the Needs of Educators as  
Learners: Implications for Individualizing  
Staff Development". Education. Winter 106:2  
(179-182).
- Yarger, S., A. Howey, and B. Joyce  
1980 "Inservice Teacher Education". Palo Alto,  
California: Booksend Laboratory.
- Zigarmi, Drea  
1981 "Leadership and School Climate: A Data-Based  
Approach to Administrative Training".  
Journal of Staff Development 2:1 (93-115).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A  
LETTER TO THE SUPERINTENDENT

833 Elmhurst Road,  
Winnipeg, Manitoba,  
R3R 0V3  
December 1, 1988.

Superintendent of Schools,  
SCHOOL DIVISION X,  
Winnipeg, Manitoba

Dear Sir,

I am presently working on my Master's Thesis in Educational Administration. My proposal has formally passed the Ethics Review Committee at the University of Manitoba.

Although we have informally discussed the possibility of doing a study in Assiniboine South School Division, I wish to formally request your permission to proceed. Enclosed is a copy of my proposal titled:

PERCEIVED FACTORS THAT AFFECT THE ATTENDANCE OF PRINCIPALS  
IN A SUBURBAN WINNIPEG SCHOOL DIVISION IN  
INSERVICE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Principal participation in this study will be voluntary and the school division name and the names of individual participants will not be used. It is anticipated that the questionnaire should consume approximately twenty to thirty minutes of each participant's time. Results of the study will be made available to the participants if they choose, and it is anticipated that the study should be completed by June, 1989.

If you have any questions or concerns I would be more than willing to discuss them with you. I will not proceed with the study until I have your approval. I look forward to your consent at your earliest convenience.

Yours truly,

Carol Husack

APPENDIX B  
LETTER TO THE PRINCIPALS

833 Elmhurst Road,  
Winnipeg, Manitoba,  
R3R 0V3  
December ,1988.

Dear ,

I am presently working on my Master's Thesis in Educational Administration. My thesis title is:

PERCEIVED FACTORS THAT AFFECT THE ATTENDANCE OF PRINCIPALS  
OF A SUBURBAN WINNIPEG SCHOOL DIVISION IN INSERVICE  
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

I have written permission from the superintendent to approach principals about their participation in this study. This thesis proposal has cleared the Ethics Review Committee at the University of Manitoba.

The following information may clarify this request:

1. No names will be used in the thesis, you will be identified only with a number.
2. The complete questionnaire should take approximately THIRTY minutes to complete. The questionnaire is composed of multiple choice questions with only one question requiring a point form response. Because the information requested is based upon the 1987-1988 school year it will be an even quicker task if you mentally note in what professional development activities you did participate before you begin the questionnaire.
3. All questionnaires will be collected by January 15 where possible and results of the study should be published by June, 1989. Although the January date is a goal it will certainly be modified to fit your own schedule.
4. The questionnaire will ask information about your training and experience up until and including the 1987 - 1988 school year, your desired participation in your own professional development activities, and your actual participation in professional development activities in the last school year.
5. Should you decide to discontinue your participation once you have consented to participate you are free to do so.

My intent is to isolate factors that create the differences between inservice professional development programs in which principals would like to participate and the actual programs in which they do participate. The results of the study will be available to all principals requesting feedback.

Your consent to participate would be greatly appreciated. If I can answer any further questions please give me a call at River West Park School, 895 - 7225 during the school day or after 5:00 at home, 837 - 8295.

Yours truly,

Carol Husack

APPENDIX C  
QUESTIONNAIRE

FACTORS THAT AFFECT  
THE PARTICIPATION OF  
PRINCIPALS IN THEIR OWN  
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES YOU WILL FIND MULTIPLE CHOICE QUESTIONS WHICH RELATE TO YOUR OWN EXPERIENCE, YOUR INTEREST IN PARTICIPATING IN INSERVICE PROGRAMS, AND YOUR ACTUAL PARTICIPATION IN INSERVICE PROGRAMS DURING THE 1987 - 1988 SCHOOL YEAR.

THIS ACTIVITY SHOULD TAKE YOU APPROXIMATELY 30 MINUTES TO COMPLETE. IT COULD SAVE YOU TIME IF YOU RECALL ALL THE INSERVICE ACTIVITIES IN WHICH YOU PARTICIPATED BEFORE YOU BEGIN THE QUESTIONNAIRE. REMEMBER ONLY THOSE ACTIVITIES IN WHICH YOU PARTICIPATED DURING THE 1987 -1988 SCHOOL YEAR ARE NECESSARY FOR THE SECTION ON ACTUAL PARTICIPATION.

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS PLEASE GIVE ME A CALL AT RIVER WEST PARK SCHOOL. I WILL BE BACK TO YOU BEFORE THE END OF THE DAY. 895 - 7225

WHEN YOU ARE FINISHED THE QUESTIONNAIRE IT WOULD BE GREATLY APPRECIATED IF WE COULD PERSONNALLY DISCUSS THE LAST QUESTION AT YOUR CONVENIENCE.

THANK YOU.

SCHOOL BASED

ALL QUESTIONS IN THIS SECTION REFER TO THE SCHOOL IN WHICH YOU WERE PRINCIPAL DURING THE 1987 - 1988 SCHOOL YEAR.

## S1. SIZE

1. less than 200 students
2. 200 - 300 students
3. 300 - 400 students
4. 400 - 500 students
5. 500 - 600 students
6. 600 or more students

## S2. LEVEL

1. K - 6
2. K - 7,8, or 9
3. 7 - 9
4. 10 - 12

## S3. ADMINISTRATIVE allocation

1. full time principal
2. half time principal, half time teacher
3. half time principal, half time other

## S4. ADMINISTRATIVE support in your school

1. no vice principal
2. half time vice principal
3. full time vice principal
4. full time vice principal and part time department heads

## S5. LANGUAGE of instruction

1. Single Track - English
2. Single Track - French
3. Dual Track - French and English

## S6. Did you have SPECIAL NEEDS students in your school?

1. yes
2. no

ADMINISTRATOR BASED

THIS SECTION RELATES TO YOUR OWN EXPERIENCE AND INTERESTS

A1. YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE prior to taking an administrative position.  
(Do not include years as full-time administrator).

1. 1 year
2. 2-4 years
3. 5-9 years
4. 10 or more years
5. no prior teaching experience

A2. Total years as VICE - PRINCIPAL

1. 1 year
2. 2 - 4 years
3. 5 - 9 years
4. 10 or more years
5. no experience

A3. Total years of EXPERIENCE AS A PRINCIPAL as of the end of JUNE, 1988.

1. 1 - 2 years
2. 3 - 4 years
3. 5 - 9 years
4. 10 - 15 years
5. 16 - 20 years
6. more tahn 20 years

A4. Circle ALL numbers which indicate your administrative experience

1. Elementary
2. Junior High
3. Senior High
4. English Track
5. French Track
6. Dual Track

A5. Number of years IN THAT SCHOOL in which were principal as of JUNE, 1988.

1. 1 year
2. 2 years
3. 3 years
4. 4 - 5 years
5. 6 - 7 years
6. 8 - 9 years
7. 10 or more years

A6. Highest level of ACADEMIC TRAINING. (Circle one number)

1. no degree
2. Bachelor's degree
3. Master's degree
4. Graduate work beyond Master's

A7. MAJOR FIELD of study.

1. methodology - elementary teaching
2. methodology - secondary teaching
3. educational administration
4. some other educational specialty
5. other (please specify).....

GENERAL INTEREST IN INSERVICE PROGRAMS

In this section you will be asked to give information about your INTEREST in participating in inservice programs. Although it may be difficult to remove the realities of your present job responsibilities, please try to answer as if you could control most factors.

I1. In general, which of the following represents your INTERESTS in attending inservice professional development programs?

1. high
2. medium
3. low
4. not at all interested

I2. Assuming that programs concerning topics of your interest were available, approximately how much TIME would you be willing to spend attending inservice professional development programs during a school year?

1. 1 day
2. 2 - 3 days
3. 4 - 5 days
4. 6 - 8 days
5. 8 - 10 days
6. more than 10 days
7. no time at all

I3. How many inservice professional development programs would you be willing to participate in during a year?

1. no programs
2. one program
3. two programs
4. three programs
5. four programs
6. five programs
7. more than five programs

I4. How much RELEASED TIME could you realistically expect to obtain during a school year that you would be willing to devote to your own inservice training?

1. 1 day
2. 2 - 3 days
3. 4 - 5 days
4. 6 - 7 days
5. 8 - 10 days
5. more than 10 days
6. no time at all

I5. In general, which of the following agencies do you think should have PRIMARY responsibility for DESIGNING inservice professional development programs for principals? (Circle the appropriate numbers)

1. local school district
  2. Department of Education
  3. local groups of principals
  4. university-related agencies
  5. professional educational agency
  6. other (specify please)
-

16. Who should be responsible for the major COST of principal professional development?

1. only the school division
2. only the principal
3. mainly the school division, with minor support from the principal
4. mainly the principal, with minor support from the school division

17. IGNORING THE REALITIES OF YOUR JOB RESPONSIBILITIES in what months would you prefer to attend inservice programs?

Circle ALL months preferred

- |              |             |            |
|--------------|-------------|------------|
| 1. September | 5. January  | 9. May     |
| 2. October   | 6. February | 10. June   |
| 3. November  | 7. March    | 11. July   |
| 4. December  | 8. April    | 12. August |

In answering the questions in this section, please assume that we are discussing the elements of an inservice program on a topic of STRONG INTEREST to you. That is, assume that you are committed to participate in an inservice program and we are now trying to fit the FORMAT of that program to your preferences. If possible these preferences should NOT be tempered by the realities of your job responsibilities.

18. When should inservice programs be held?

1. during the school year
  2. on school year holidays and vacations
  3. during the summer
  4. other
- 

19. If an inservice program were held during the school year, when should it be scheduled?

1. on weekends
2. after working hours
3. during the working day

110. Generally speaking, which type of inservice programs do you prefer?

1. intensive (only one gathering of the participants which may last for one or more days)
2. continuing (a series of gatherings on a weekly or monthly basis)

111. If you were to participate in an inservice program which had only one gathering of the participants, (i.e. intensive) what is the maximum number of days which you feel you could/prefer to leave your job and attend the program?

1. 1 day
2. 2 days
3. 3 to 5 days
4. 6 to 10 days
5. more than 10 days

I12. If you were to participate in an inservice program of three days duration, which location would you prefer?

1. within easy commuting distance
2. in a distant city known for its tourist facilities

I13. Which of the following locations do you find most effective for housing an inservice program?

1. division school
2. nearby university
3. nearby convention facility
4. nearby retreat facility
5. non-local school
6. non-local university
7. attractive city at some distance from home

I14. Assuming that each of the following modes of instruction is presented expertly, please indicate your degree of PREFERENCE for each:

	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
1. Lecture _____	_____	_____	_____
2. discussion group _____	_____	_____	_____
3. simulation _____	_____	_____	_____
4. gaming _____	_____	_____	_____
5. computer-assisted instruction _____	_____	_____	_____
6. programmed learning _____	_____	_____	_____
7. independent study _____	_____	_____	_____
8. television/lecture _____	_____	_____	_____
9. films _____	_____	_____	_____
10. case studies _____	_____	_____	_____
11. site visitations _____	_____	_____	_____
12. role playing _____	_____	_____	_____
13. supervised readings _____	_____	_____	_____
14. other (please specify) _____	_____	_____	_____

I15. From the list of instructional modes ABOVE in Question I14, which is the number(s) of your MOST PREFERRED mode? \_\_\_\_\_

I16. From the list of instructional modes ABOVE in Question I14, which is the number(s) of your LEAST PREFERRED mode? \_\_\_\_\_

I17. Please indicate the extent to which the presence of each of the following features would effect your decision to attend an inservice program. CIRCLE a number in one column for each of the items listed below according to the following descriptors:

- 4 Strongly attractive - would AFFECT my decision to attend
- 3 Attractive - a "NICE" feature to have attached to a program, but would not affect my decision to attend
- 2 Inconsequential - would have NO AFFECT upon my decision to attend and I would not care if it were present or not
- 1 Detractive - would have a NEGATIVE affect upon my decision to attend

1. division identified need.....	1	2	3	4
2. school identified need.....	1	2	3	4
3. personal identified need.....	1	2	3	4
4. release time given.....	1	2	3	4
5. university credit.....	1	2	3	4
6. meet certification requirements.....	1	2	3	4
7. written certificate of achievement.....	1	2	3	4
8. program held in an "attractive" location.....	1	2	3	4
9. widespread participation by peers.....	1	2	3	4
10. Division pays all expenses.....	1	2	3	4
11. principal pays all expenses.....	1	2	3	4
12. opportunity to travel.....	1	2	3	4
13. presented by recognized scholar in field.....	1	2	3	4

P. ACTUAL INSERVICE PARTICIPATION

When answering these next questions please keep in mind the reality of your job responsibilities of the school where you were principal during the 1997 - 1998 school year.

P1. If an inservice program were scheduled during the school year,

\* CIRCLE any three months in which it would be CONVENIENT to attend

\* CROSS OUT any months in which it would be INCONVENIENT to attend

- |              |             |
|--------------|-------------|
| 1. September | 6. February |
| 2. October   | 7. March    |
| 3. November  | 8. April    |
| 4. December  | 9. May      |
| 5. January   | 10. June    |

P2. Excluding regular coursework at a university, approximately how many DAYS did you devote to organized inservice professional development programs last year? (Circle one number)

1. 1 day
2. 2 - 3 days
3. 4 - 5 days
4. 6 - 8 days
5. 9 - 10 days
6. more than 10 days
7. no time at all

P3. Did you take any classes at a university last year? (Circle one number)

1. yes, during the summer
2. yes, during the school year
3. yes, during both the school year and the summer
4. no

P4. Excluding coursework at a university, how many DIFFERENT INSERVICE PROGRAMS did you attend last year?

1. no programs
2. one program
3. two programs
4. three programs
5. four programs
6. five programs
7. more than five programs

P4. Considering ALL inservice programs in which you participated last year, circle all the descriptors that would be applicable.

1. division identified need
2. school identified need
3. personal identified need
4. release time given
5. university credit
6. met certification requirements
7. written certificate of achievement
8. program held in an "attractive" location
9. widespread participation by peers
10. Division paid all expenses
11. principal paid all expenses
12. opportunity to travel

P5. Did you attend as many inservice programs last year as you would have liked to attend?

- 1. yes
- 2. no    If your answer is no then answer the next question (P6)

P6. If your answer to the preceeding question (P5) above was "no", which of the following responses best describes your REASON for not attending any (or any other) inservice programs?

(Circle ALL the numbers which apply)

- 1. I could locate no (or no other) programs which were of INTEREST
- 2. I could locate no (or no other) programs which met my NEEDS
- 3. I could locate no (or no other) programs which were scheduled at a TIME OF YEAR I could attend.
- 4. I did not care for the FORMAT of the inservices being offerred.
- 5. I could not obtain any (or additional) support FUNDS for travel/fees.
- 6. I could not obtain any (or additional) RELEASE TIME.
- 7. My JOB RESPONSIBILITIES would not permit any (or any additional) absence.
- 8. Other (please specify).

.....

P7. Within the last year, was there a PARTICULAR inservice program which you would have liked to attend but for some reason could not or did not attend?

- 1. no
- 2. yes - name of program or topic.....

P8. If your response for P7 above was YES, which of the following categories best describes your reason for not attending the program?.

- 1. I did not learn of the program until it was too late to make the necessary arrangements for attending.
- 2. I could not obtain release time.
- 3. The program occurred at a time when my job responsibilities required my continuous attention.
- 4. I could not secure the necessary funds for travel/fees.
- 5. Other (please specify).....

.....

For the remainder of the questions please keep in mind ALL THE INSERVICE PROGRAMS that you participated in LAST YEAR. CIRCLE all the descriptors that would describe these programs.

P9. TIME OF YEAR (Circle all months of participation)

- |              |             |            |
|--------------|-------------|------------|
| 1. September | 5. January  | 9. May     |
| 2. October   | 6. February | 10. June   |
| 3. November  | 7. March    | 11. July   |
| 4. December  | 8. April    | 12. August |

P10. WHEN IN THE YEAR (Circle all times in which you participated)

1. during the school year
2. on school year holidays
3. during the summer
4. other \_\_\_\_\_

P11. WHEN DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR (Circle all times in which you participated)

1. on weekends
2. after working hours
3. during the working day

P12. TYPE OF INSERVICE (Circle all types that apply)

1. intensive (only one gathering of participants)
2. continuing (series of gatherings)

P13. LOCATIONS OF PROGRAMS (Circle all locations that apply)

1. within easy commuting distance
2. In a distant city known for its tourist facilities

P14. LOCATIONS OF PROGRAMS (Circle all locations that apply)

1. division school
2. nearby university
3. nearby convention facility
4. nearby retreat facility
5. non-local school
6. non-local university
7. attractive city some distance from home

## P15. MODES OF INSTRUCTION (Circle all modes of instruction used)

1. Lecture
2. discussion group
3. simulation
4. gaming
5. computer-assisted instruction
6. programmed learning
7. independent study
8. television/lecture
9. films
10. case studies
11. site visitations
12. role playing
13. supervised readings
14. other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

## P17. DESIGNER OF PROGRAMS (Circle all agencies involved)

1. local school district
2. Department of Education
3. local groups of principals
4. university-related agencies
5. professional education agency
6. other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

## P18. FUNDING FOR PARTICIPATION (Circle all descriptors that apply)

1. only the school division
2. only the principal
3. mainly the school division, with minor support from the principal
4. mainly the principal, with minor support from the school division

APPENDIX D  
DEFINITIONS

DEFINITIONS

Case Study: an inquiry that investigates a topic or situation within its real life context.

Computer Assisted Instruction: activities organized to teach specific skills through the interaction of activities programmed into a computer.

Dual Track School: A school housing instructional programs in two languages, in this case, English and French.

Gaming: the playing of games as a training activity.

Independent Study: an activity where an individual relies upon his own direction in the study of a topic.

Inservice: Any activity that furthers the skills of an individual within a profession while the individual was employed in that profession. This word was used synonymously with professional development program and may include workshops, seminars, or conferences.

Intensive Inservice Program: only one gathering of the participants which may last for one or more days.

Continuing Inservice Program: a series of gatherings on a weekly or monthly basis.

Needs Assessment: a questioning to determine the importance of desirable or useful attributes to a program or individual.

Programmed Learning: instruction through information given in small steps with each requiring a correct response by the learner before going on to the next step.

Principal: The person who has controlling authority or is the chief executive officer of a school.

Role Playing: to play the part of an individual in an imaginary situation.

Simulation: an imitative representation of an educational situation.

Site Visitation: to become a guest and to observe activity in a school building other than one's own.