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My professional experiences as a teacher, assistant high school principal, elementary principal, chairman of elementary principals, state chairman of study groups for the Massachusetts Elementary School Principals Association and part time college instructor have more than once prompted me to ask myself 'why?'

Why am I engaging in this particular profession? Why have I spent these many years of study and teaching? Why am I going to continue to study and teach? All of these questions have the same basic answer. It is my purpose to share with others some ideas, thoughts, philosophy and concepts about what constitutes the real purpose of education ---- that is, helping people, including myself, in solving problems and developing skills so that they, as well as I, shall live the good life, the kind of life that doesn't merely prepare us to get and hold jobs, but rather shows us how to live.

If I am to continue to develop within myself and to share with others the philosophy, the concepts, ideas, and thoughts which will eventually aid me in the discovery of truth, I - like so many others who have this driving desire - must continue my formal education. What better way to increase my knowledge than by research and what better way to share that knowledge with others than by writing. I then had to ask in what area might I best serve my own education and that of my many colleagues. The answer seemed all too obvious - the area of continuing education.
I have concentrated in the area of in-service education needs of elementary principals in the state of Massachusetts in the interest of relatively consistent organization and maximum effects.

The major goal of this study is to focus on elementary principals' perceived needs and how they may best be met. It is hoped that this study will attract the attention of such agencies as the State Department of Education, the Massachusetts Elementary Principals Association and colleges and universities in order that they might act upon these needs in terms of in-service education. Thus, they can play an important role in increasing the effectiveness of principals and in this way affecting in a positive way the education of our staffs and students.
ABSTRACT

The Perceived In-Service Needs of Massachusetts Elementary Principals and the Identification of Perceived Techniques to Best Meet these Needs

(April 1976)


Directed by: Dr. Kenneth H. Blanchard

The major purpose of this study was to identify the perceived in-service needs of practicing elementary principals in Massachusetts and the perceived techniques to best meet these needs. In addition, this dissertation attempted to discover if elementary principals with varying years of experience as principals perceive their in-service needs differently, if the perceived needs of elementary principals in varying size systems are significantly different, and if the perceived needs of elementary principals in communities with varying per pupil expenditures are different.

A ten percent random sampling of elementary principals was used to obtain the data. From this data a profile of the respondents emerged which included a breakdown of principals by sex, mean age, educational achievement, years in education, years as a principal, size of the system, enrollment of school and per pupil expenditure.
An analysis was done to determine what percentage of principals felt there was a need for in-service training. It was found that ninety-five percent (95%) of the respondents felt there was such a need.

An analysis was done to determine the major priorities of perceived in-service needs. This finding revealed that the following areas were of major concern to principals in order of priority:

1. Staff evaluation
2. Curriculum development
   * (2) Curriculum evaluation
3. Leadership
4. Staff development
5. Massachusetts School Law

An analysis was made of possible techniques to meet these needs. This finding revealed that the following techniques were chosen most often. These are listed in order of priority by the most frequently chosen:

1. Study groups solving local problems
2. Bulletins of information helpful to principals
3. Local workshops conducted by professors or other consultants
4. Cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and management techniques
5. Procedures for inter-school visitations
   ** (5) State-wide conferences and workshops

*Note: These two areas had an equal rating.

**Note: These two techniques were given the same priority.
For the most part the perceived needs of elementary principals with varying per pupil expenditures were identical. They selected as priority needs staff evaluation, staff development, leadership, Massachusetts school law and curriculum development and curriculum evaluation, in that order. The only noticeable difference was that principals in the ($800 - $999) per pupil category selected innovation and change as a major priority.

Principals in varying size systems all selected staff evaluation and staff development as a top priority need. Public relations and planning and conducting workshops was selected as a major need in systems of under 1,000 students. In systems of over 15,000 pupils, principals selected the 766 law and the principal as a priority need.

Principals with varying years of experience all chose staff evaluation and staff development as a major need. Principals with (0 - 5) years experience selected leadership, current educational research and innovation as major priority needs.

This study recommends that all meaningful in-service education must start by assessing the needs of its recipients and that a cooperative approach to in-service education be adopted. In addition, the study recommends that, once the needs are ascertained, in-service agencies match people with given expertise to aid in solving and meeting those needs.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION
AND
DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

Background of the Problem

"Any improvement made in education in this country during the 20 years immediately ahead will be made largely through the leadership of people now employed in administrative positions."\(^1\)

The statement above is provocative and, in and of itself, is cause enough to view the leadership position of the principal with great trepidation and tremendous anxiety. Coupled with the many problems educational leaders are faced with today, the principal requires a tremendous amount of preparation and a great deal more in-service training than he has been getting.

The National Association of Elementary School Principals in the proposed NAESP bylaws, resolutions, and platform in 1973 stated that "the expanding role of elementary school principals demands a high level of professional preparation and continuing growth. NAESP strongly supports the efforts of those institutions that are experimenting with improved procedures for developing educational leaders . . . ."\(^2\)

---


The National Association of Elementary School Principals is not the only professional organization that has supported in-service education for elementary principals. In 1971, in a position paper written by the Massachusetts Department of Education entitled "The Results Approach to Education and Educational Imperatives", one of the major priorities listed was "... to encourage leadership competence of principals and superintendents." The Massachusetts Board of Education stated "there is strong evidence to conclude that the leadership ability of the principal is an extremely important variable in quality of education in a particular school."\(^3\)

The Massachusetts Elementary Principals Association felt so strongly about the need for relevant in-service education that in the fall of 1974 this forward looking organization started the funding of numerous in-service programs throughout the state. There can be little doubt that the Massachusetts Elementary Principals Association, the State Department of Education in the State of Massachusetts, as well as the National Association of Elementary School Principals Association have given top priority to in-service education.

The process of self-examination, of "self-renewal" (to cite a term from John Gardner) must be continuous. In-service education can provide the vehicle for the on-going growth of principals everywhere.

\(^3\)Massachusetts Department of Education, Bureau of Public Information, "Massachusetts Board of Education Priorities for 1971" (A position paper, Boston, 1971).

\(^4\)Ibid.
Justification for In-Service Training

Justification of the need for in-service training can readily be seen when one views the many forces at work in our rapidly changing society. Technological change, societal changes in all areas of life from economics to morality and ethics, and varied national and international forces demand that educational leaders be better prepared and constantly re-charged to meet today's challenges. It has never been truer that education is the hope of America and of the world. It is also a fact that educational leaders must meet the challenge with new skills in dealing with such areas as:

1. Curriculum and the many bodies of knowledge it includes.
2. Personnel and increasing their competencies and skills.
3. Evaluation and the many facets of evaluation i.e., staff, curriculum, programs, materials, media, teaching methods, etc.
4. Research and the many ramifications of research as applied to education today.
5. Accountability and responsibility to students, parents, teachers, taxpayers.
6. Financing education and the dilemma of finding adequate and equitable taxation for this purpose.
7. Budgeting and the establishing of priorities for wise expenditure of funds.
8. Public relations and the impending crisis in education if good public relations are lacking.
9. Unions and the erosion of the power of educational leaders.
10. Student rights and the need to see that students' rights are not abridged.
11. Censorship and the right to free speech.
12. Bi-lingual programs and the right of all children to receive a good education.
13. Deterioration of families and the rights and responsibilities of individuals.
15. Turnover of school administrators.
17. Declining student enrollment.
18. Urban education.
20. Integration of schools.

Educational leaders must modify and update their knowledge and skills and broaden their vision to remain effective leaders in their respective jobs. Several studies by Bechtold, Collins, Ebey, Mark and Skogsberg all conclude that the administrator, by virtue of the nature of his position and the legal setting in which he functions, is the most significant single factor in influencing modifications, adaptations and innovations in school programs. 5

Schools as a Microcosm of Society

Schools are a microcosm of the society in which we live, and no one can deny that society is in a constant state of flux. American society must deal with immediate problems such as rapidly changing technologies that produce unemployment and dislocation of people; unionism, strikes and a new political force; racial disorder that causes dissention and hate; dissolving marriages that leave broken homes, broken families, and broken human beings; unemployment which causes people to lose hope and pride; inflation which causes undue stress on family life; recession which causes business failures and people failure.  

These problems call for immediate action and resolution and for decisive leaders who must find workable solutions to them. This requires additional knowledge, improved skills, better values, and increased problem solving ability. While parents, politicians, preachers, and publishers are urged to greater efforts to find appropriate solutions, educational administrators and leaders are most often cited as the causative factors and the appropriate agents for the resolution of the problems.

Critics of American education are particularly vocal and influential today. Jonathan Kozol, John Holt, Edgar Friedenberg, Ivan Illich, Herbert Kohl and Charles E. Silberman are among the most influential and

6 Jack Culbertson and Stephen Hencley, Preparing Administrators' New Perspectives (Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1962).

vocal. They have charged education and particularly the leaders in education with being ill prepared to perform the responsibilities of sound education. Silberman in Crisis in the Classroom has charged "for the students many education programs lack relevancy." 8

Most of the critics state that educational leaders must be better prepared and continue to receive on-going in-service education so that they know and deal with the many problems and forces causing dis-equilibrium in all facets of society.

"... The problems appear to arise from relatively few sources. They arise from the major dislocations affecting American society; from the rapid social changes affecting American communities which impose changes upon the schools; from cultural changes which necessitate new roles definition for educational administrators; from individual characteristics of superintendents; and seemingly, from the persistence of traditional modes of organizational behavior and governmental structures and practices." 9

"There is considerable ferment among those concerned with the education of school administrators. School administrators - principals, superintendents . . . need additional education . . . for they have the responsibility of thinking about the means and ends of education for an entire school, or school system . . . ." 10

---


9 Goldhamer, op. cit.

10 Lavern Cunningham, "Simulation and the Preparation of Educational Administrators," paper presented at the International Conferences on Educational Administration, University of Michigan, October 1966. (Mimeographed.)
Programs of in-service education are not only desirable but essential and necessary. Not only is it necessary to provide continuous in-service training, but also to be aware of desirable and suitable programs of educational leadership development. We must examine the understandings, knowledge and skills that are essential to good programs of educational leadership development and then provide such on-going programs.

In addition to the statements made in several of the preceding paragraphs, it appears appropriate then to make the following statements:

1. All principals need in-service education. This statement may be easily verified by simply looking at the many new problems that principals are asked to face each day. In order for principals to cope adequately with these problems, in-service education is essential.

2. Improving instruction is concomitant with in-service education. Harold Spears expressed this concept when he states "... in-service work is a close relative of curriculum planning and supervision." 11

3. In-service education should emerge from the recognized needs of the participants. Harris, Bessent and McIntyre mentioned that it is a serious mistake to fail to relate in-service programs to the genuine needs of the staff. 12


4. In-service education is most effective when participants are involved in assessing and establishing their own priority of needs.

5. The Massachusetts Elementary Principals Association as an important force and organization should make clear to local, state and national officials, as well as to colleges and universities, principals' needs for in-service education and training.

In view of the assumptions made in the preceding paragraphs, it seems appropriate to assert the following:

1. The Massachusetts Elementary Principals Association should make clear to local, state and national officials as well as to colleges and universities principals' needs for in-service education and training.

2. All principals need in-service education.

3. Improving instruction is concomitant with in-service education.

4. In-service education should emerge from the recognized needs of participants.

5. In-service education is most effective when participants are involved in assessing and establishing their own priority of needs.

**Statement of the Problem**

Based on the foregoing data and assumptions, if improvement in education is to be made through the leadership of people now employed in administrative positions, it is essential that we then establish what
The perceived needs of practicing elementary principals are and make in-service training a major priority and an on-going process.

The purpose of this study is to discover the perceived in-service needs of practicing elementary principals in the State of Massachusetts and the perceived techniques to meet these needs.

If Massachusetts elementary principals are to receive relevant in-service education we must find out:

1. What are the areas of perceived needs of elementary principals in the State of Massachusetts?
2. What perceived techniques of in-service training may best serve these needs?
3. Do elementary principals with varying years of experience perceive their needs differently?
4. Do elementary principals in systems of various sizes perceive their needs differently?
5. Do elementary principals with varying per pupil expenditures perceive their needs differently?

This study starts with the basic assumption that viable programs of in-service education must develop from the needs of its recipients.

**Purposes of this Investigation**

1. To identify the perceived in-service needs of Massachusetts elementary principals.
2. To identify what perceived in-service techniques may best serve these needs.
3. To furnish data to the Massachusetts Elementary Principals Association, the Massachusetts Department of Education and
selected colleges and universities in planning to meet in-service needs of principals.

4. To help practicing elementary principals in recognizing and meeting their in-service needs.

5. To recommend in-service programs to meet the perceived identified needs of Massachusetts elementary principals.

The purposes of the study may be restated as questions as follows:

1. What are the perceived in-service needs of practicing elementary principals in the State of Massachusetts?

2. What are the perceived in-service techniques (as seen by practicing elementary principals in Massachusetts) that will best satisfy their perceived in-service needs?

3. Do elementary principals in Massachusetts with varying years of experience as principals perceive their needs differently?

4. Are the perceived needs of elementary principals in different size systems significantly different?

5. Are the perceived needs of elementary principals in communities with varying per pupil expenditures different?

**Definitions of Key Terms**


Per Pupil Expenditure - The total amount of money expended for administration, instruction, other school services, operation and maintenance of plant and fixed charges for regular day and special education programs, divided by the number of
pupils in net average membership K - 12 in the two programs.

CAGS - Certificate of Advance Graduate Studies.

Clinic - A meeting at which a given problem is explored.

Institute - A series of meetings during which scheduled speakers present their views on the same or different topics.

Workshops - Includes planning, work sessions, and sessions for summarizing and evaluating.¹³

In-Service Education - (Continuing education) Any planned educational experience received while on the job which helps principals grow educationally.

Study Groups - Principals that are studying common problems.

A.A.S.A. - American Association of School Administrators.

NAESP - National Association Elementary School Principals.


ASCD - Association for School Curriculum Development.

NEASCD - The New England Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

NEA - National Education Association.

UCEA - University Council for Educational Administration.

Educational Significance

This study will attempt to ascertain the perceived needs of elementary principals in the State of Massachusetts as well as how best these needs may be met.

This investigation should be helpful to Massachusetts elementary principals, to the Massachusetts Elementary Principals Association, to the Massachusetts Department of Education and to a number of selected colleges and universities. As a result of this study the above agencies should have a better understanding of the perceived needs of Massachusetts elementary principals and the techniques that these principals feel would best meet these needs.

This study, then, should act as a catalyst in aiding these organizations to focus in on the needs of principals and to aid principals in obtaining help from such agencies as the Massachusetts Elementary Principals Association, the Massachusetts Department of Education and colleges and universities in providing in-service programs.

Limitations of the Study

It should be evident that any research done on organizations is difficult as organizations are in a constant state of flux. Their complexities make it difficult to control the many variables which are bound to enter the investigation.

There are also cost factors, which restrict the size of the sample.

An additional limitation is the attitude of respondents at the time the survey was taken. (There is also the eventual question of respondents on "what is in it for me?") The question of communication
is always present and the reality that everyone may not lend the same interpretation to each question on a survey.

Perhaps the major limitation of this study is that, by the time it is concluded, some of the priorities of the principals may have changed. It is also true that, when one uses a sample population, one still has not, in fact, included the entire population.

Finally, it should be understood that reaction to research is, in fact, a reality.

Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter I, the introduction, is intended to offer the reader a background of the problem, a statement of the problem, a definition of key terms, the educational significance of the problem, the various limitations of the study, and the organization of the dissertation.

Chapter II provides an overview of the evolution of the principalship. It focuses on the major changes which have taken place in the role and duties of the principal, and which make on-going, in-service education necessary.

Chapter III discusses the evolution of in-service education and the current need for in-service education of principals. In-service education is defined. Principles of in-service education are explored. Objectives of in-service education are discussed and common failures of in-service are reviewed. It also cites the types of programs available for principals, as well as a number of sponsoring agencies. Some promising new programs in in-service education are described and finally the future of in-service education is assessed.
Chapter IV, Methodology, is designed to offer the reader a look at the design of the study, and an opportunity to appraise the description of the sample and sampling methods employed in the study. The procedures used in the study are offered. It also includes a description of survey instrument with some discussion of how the instrument was developed and consequently used. A discussion of the distribution and return of the questionnaire is included, and the method of the analysis of data from the questionnaire is presented.

Chapter V offers the results of the survey and a discussion of the data.

In the final chapter, Chapter VI, a summary of some conclusions and recommendations are offered.
CHAPTER II

AN OVERVIEW OF THE EVOLUTION OF THE
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP

Importance of the Principalship

Elementary school principals far outnumber other school administrators, and they hold crucial positions in any school system. The leadership each one brings to his position may deter or advance the growth of pupils and staff alike. He works with children in their most formative years. The elementary principal is responsible for achieving the best teaching-learning situation in his school. The importance of his position cannot be denied for he, in fact, is ultimately responsible for making sure that each child is given the basic skills that will allow him to grow.

In order to deserve the trust and responsibility implicit in his position, the elementary principal must be a good administrator and a good leader, and he must display human understanding. The principalship today is a truly professional position with a great deal of public trust and professional responsibility.

Early Beginnings

The elementary principal was not always considered so important a figure. In the early history of education in the United States, the one-room, one-teacher school was typical, especially in rural America until the close of the nineteenth century. In this type of school, little
administrative work was necessary; whatever administrative work was done was usually done by the teacher or the school board.

With the advent of larger communities, however, the elementary principalship slowly evolved. The early elementary school principal was often teacher, custodian, town clerk, grave digger; he dispensed punishment, monitored school facilities and equipment, maintained school records and occasionally assumed the role of educational leader of the school in which he was employed. Today he is the head of this school. He administers and supervises his school in accordance with school committee policy. Certainly a major transition has taken place since the 1830's in the elementary principalship.

**Head Teacher to Principal**

After 1830, cities began to develop; school enrollments rose rapidly. It became impossible for the superintendent of schools to administer each individual school himself. Consequently the superintendent turned for help to the head teacher of each school. At first the teacher in charge was given the title "headmaster" or "principal teacher." "Principal teacher" soon became shortened to "principal," and today this is the term used to designate the individual responsible for a public school.¹ In some school systems teachers were known as "school masters," rather than "head teachers," consequently, the term "headmaster" was used to signify the individual in charge of the school. The "headmaster" is still seen in many private schools today.

Principal-Teacher Duties Delineated

In 1839, records of the Cincinnati school system show the school committee delineating the responsibilities of both teachers and principal teachers. The principal teacher was (1) to function as the head of the school charged to his care; (2) to regulate the classes and course of instruction of all pupils whether they occupied his room or the rooms of other teachers; (3) to discover any defects in the school and apply remedies; (4) to make defects known to the visitor or trustee of the ward, or district, if he himself was unable to remedy conditions; (5) to give necessary instruction to his assistants; (6) to classify pupils; (7) to safeguard schoolhouses and furniture; (8) to keep the school clean; (9) to instruct assistants; (10) to refrain from impairing the standing of assistants; (11) to require the cooperation of his assistants.

It was further pointed out that principal teachers were chosen as a result of their knowledge of teaching methods, their understanding of children's characteristics and behavior, and their knowledge of the common problems of schools. It was also observed, however, that principal teachers rarely exercised those qualities for which they were originally hired, but rather occupied their time with mundane matters and typical clerical duties.

Released Time

By the middle of the nineteenth century, principals were released from teaching part of the time so that they might carry out their duties

2 Ibid. 3 Ibid. 4 Ibid., p. 15.
as principals efficiently. In 1857, in Boston, Massachusetts, principals were released from teaching for inspection and examination of primary classes. In 1862, in Chicago, most of the principal teachers were released for about half of their teaching time. In 1867, in New York City, no principal teacher had a grade or class "for whose progress and efficiency he was specially responsible." Released time from teaching brought with it a significant change in the role of the principalship. The principalship became a more professional position. (Webster defines profession as a calling requiring specialized knowledge.) Around the middle of the nineteenth century large cities cited the following roles for the principal; the principal has prescribed duties which are primarily limited to discipline, routine administrative acts, and grading of pupils in the various rooms. From the middle of the nineteenth century to 1900, a shift occurred in the administrative duties of principals. They were held responsible for organization and general management, control of pupils, buildings and grounds, enforcement of standards which would safeguard the health and morale of pupils, rating and supervising janitors, and requisition of education and maintenance supplies and equipment. By the year 1900, the principal in city systems was recognized as the administrative head of his school.

**Principalship Becomes More Complex**

The latter part of the nineteenth century brought some major changes in elementary schools, and in the principal's job as well.

---
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Eventually the word teacher was dropped altogether from his title and the word "principal" alone was used. With the advent of compulsory attendance laws, elementary school attendance naturally increased. Along with the sheer increase in enrollment came additional problems relating to the type of students who were now compelled to attend schools. Many children were reluctant and unmotivated and a great deal more just did not want to attend school. This placed an additional burden on the principal for seeing to it that students were in attendance and if they were in school he now had the job of disciplining these students, whenever it was necessary, in order to bring about good student behavior. As principals were faced with increased enrollment and its attendant problems, the need for a broader curriculum was realized to meet the needs of a more heterogenous body of students.

In addition to these added problems, graded schools were slowly evolving around the latter part of the nineteenth century and this brought additional problems for teachers and principals alike; problems such as student grouping, grade standards, gradation of instructional materials, and promotion policies. In addition, the growth of secondary schools in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century brought the problem of coordinating the curricula of both elementary and secondary schools. Although these significant forces were at work in the schools and principals had to cope with them, similar changes had not occurred in the public's concept of the role of the principal - nor, actually, in the principal's view of his own role. His primary responsibility, as it was then understood, was to make teachers and students alike "toe the mark." It is obvious that the ideas we conjure
up in our mind about the role of the principal today was practically unheard of at this point in educational history. The principal's role in regard to supervision or educational leadership as we understand it today was all but unheard of.

Beginning of Principalship Unimpressive

Principals generally were unimpressive figures in the early years of their existence. They were afraid to experiment and innovate; they were most interested in security and self-preservation; the early school principal did little to establish himself as an educational leader. It was not until the 1920's that a serious attempt was made to focus upon the principalship as an important position in education. ¹⁰

With the guidance and help of the Department of Education at the University of Chicago, the national organization for elementary school principals was founded in 1920. This event naturally aroused and fostered professional interest in the principalship. It became a topic of study in university departments of education and programs for the training of principals began to appear as offerings of these departments. ¹¹

Principals as Technicians and Managers

In 1930, Fred C. Ayers ¹² in a study on the "Duties of Public School Administrators" concluded that school administrators needed to acquire better understanding of administrative procedure. During this period

¹⁰ Ibid.


the school principal was becoming a technician. His major training was in the managerial task of the job -- budgeting, school construction, etc.

Actually the term management, rather than administration, carried well into the twentieth century and was an accurate description of the rather mechanistic position of the principal. Frederick Taylor, who was the pioneer of the scientific movement of management, was in vogue for some years and his school of thought prevailed. This school of thought stressed arbitrary standards, economy, orderliness, impersonalization, austerity, obedience, and conformity. It viewed administration largely as the management of an impersonal, mechanical system. Its primary emphasis was on efficiency; in fact, one author described his concept of administration as the "cult of efficiency." This system of management placed a great deal of emphasis on comparative cost, time and motion studies, achievement test results, age-grade tables, and normative measures of testing. This concept was useful for principals but failed to consider the human side of the principalship.

A New Concept Emerges for the Principal

During the 1930's new ideas and a new philosophy emerged. Around the time of the great depression with its dramatic impact on human lives, education, along with all areas of life, was affected. Among the major people who contributed to this new philosophy were Mary Parker Follett, who emphasized the psychological aspects of

---
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administration; Mayo, Roethlisberger and others, who considered the human side of the organization; and Barnard and Simon, who explored the theory of organization and made many contributions to the new body of knowledge in educational administration. These and other scholars drew attention to the individuals within organizations - their values, motives, needs and morale. Their work and the works of Lewin, Lippitt and a number of others gave rise to the group dynamics movement, which drew heavily on the behavioral sciences for an understanding of administration. It was largely their work which inspired a new "democratic" emphasis on school administration in the 1940's and 1950's.

The Principalship Gains Status

Around the middle of the twentieth century new organizations began to emerge which influenced the further development of educational administration and the principalship. In 1947, professors of educational administration began to meet annually in an organization which came to be known as the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. In 1950 and 1951, the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration got under way in eight institutions: Harvard, Columbia Teachers' College, the University of Chicago, the University of Texas, Peabody College for Teachers, Ohio State University, Stanford
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University and the University of Oregon. An experimental program of educational action-research and in-service training was funded through a grant of approximately 7 million dollars by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. This program facilitated knowledge about school administration and drew heavily from the social sciences for a better understanding of the role of the principal and educational administration in general.

**Strengthening the Principal Through In-Service Education**

In 1955 the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration was established under the sponsorship of the American Association of School Administrators and was funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. Its purposes were to strengthen school administration by disseminating research findings to administrators, to encourage states to raise certification standards for administrators, and to upgrade the standards of accreditation of the institutions preparing school administrators.

National, state, regional and local associations of elementary school principals have themselves added a significant force to further professionalize the principalship. They have set standards, engaged in research, disseminated information, and offered in-service education to those within their own ranks.

---
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New Roles Emerge for Principals

With the role of the principal taking on new dimensions now and the duties of the principal increasing we find that today the elementary school principal has a wide range of responsibilities which include the following: the development and improvement of the educational programs of their schools; the supervision of instruction; the evaluation of their entire staffs; leadership in curriculum development; maintaining cooperative relationships with parents and the community; maintaining and updating safety programs; assignment of teachers and other staff members; scheduling of classes; submitting a budget; maintaining accurate pupil records and registers; administration of attendance and discipline policies; employment and assignment of substitute teachers; supervision of custodial operation of the school; coordinating auxiliary services within their schools; mobilizing of staff to attain high levels of achievement; establishing in-service programs.

In-Service Training Needed for Principals

Also, today, there is more of a focus on the supervision of instruction, curriculum development and evaluation, staff evaluation, school organization and staff development. It is precisely for this reason that elementary principals need constant on-going in-service training. It is, also, precisely for this reason that in-service education for elementary principals must be relevant and it is for those principals now at the helm that such further training is immediately essential, is - in fact - long overdue.

The multitude of problems and the variety of responsibilities that face the principal today requires "sustained dialogue between those
in the world of discovery and those in the world of practice." This dialogue can help solve many of the problems which the principal now faces and which he will be required to face in the future.

With the evolution of the principalship came additional professionalism and growth. Professionalism and growth in this complex and demanding new role require the ability, the education, and the willingness to experiment and make change.

Katz suggests that to be an effective administrator a principal must employ technical, human, and conceptual skills. Technical skill refers to specialized knowledge in a given area. Human skill refers to the ability to work cooperatively with other individuals. Conceptual skill refers to the ability to see the complete organization and to see how one function of the organization depends on another.

It is obvious that, if the elementary principal is to maintain his professional status and to grow, he must be involved in on-going in-service education. Peter F. Drucker in *The Effective Executive* stated that "self-development of the effective executive is central to the development of the organization....As executives work toward becoming effective, they raise the performance level of the whole organization. They raise the sights of people - their own as well as others." If we believe that the principal is the single most important person in a school for developing or impeding its educational program, then we

---


must conclude that in the role he is asked to play today, he needs and must have in-service education. Without it, he risks ineffectiveness, inefficiency, stagnation, complacency with their attendant effects on the children and staff he leads.
CHAPTER III

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

Introduction

Leadership and in-service education of elementary principals is a concomitant of growth and change. If principals are to be effective in their jobs, they must continue to grow and likewise they must aid their staffs in continued growth.

Since growth implies change, principals need constant in-service training to aid them in dealing with today's tremendous changes and challenges. In planning for tomorrow in-service education for principals and staff currently working in our school systems has never been needed more. There is no universal solution to the many problems that face educators today; however, if answers are to be forthcoming, they may well be found in continuous in-service education.

The purpose of this writer in this chapter is to explore in-service education by reviewing selected literature in that area. The literature used was selected on the basis of in-service education literature which was obtained through the National Association of Elementary School Principals as well as my own review of in-service literature in the library.

While there was a great deal of literature in the general area of in-service education, there was a limited amount of books and research on specific in-service needs of elementary principals, particularly in the state of Massachusetts.
I shall explore in-service education from its infancy to the present. Specifically, I shall consider: (1) a definition of in-service education; (2) an overview of the history of in-service education; (3) reasons for in-service education; (4) principles of in-service education; (5) objectives of in-service education; (6) some common failures of in-service education; (7) promising designs for in-service education; (8) agencies for in-service education; (9) devices for in-service education; (10) the record of in-service education; (11) five characteristics of an ideal in-service program; (12) new programs for in-service education; (13) future in-service education.

In-Service Education Defined

In-service education may be distinguished from pre-service education by time and sequence. In-service education includes any and all activities which are provided for the improvement and growth of educators. This concept is somewhat vague and broad; consequently, for our purposes in this study, in-service education may be defined as planned activities for the improvement of principals through formal and informal experience particularly in the area of leadership and management. In-service education may be viewed as the vehicle for providing continuous professional growth for practicing educators.

Reasons for In-Service Education

There are perhaps more good reasons for in-service training than one could elaborate on in a paper of this kind. However, several of the more important reasons for in-service education are the following:

1. Pre-service education for principals is far from ideal.
2. Pre-service education for principals does not adequately prepare them for the principalship. (The real test is the on-the-job learning and training that take place.)

3. Societal change is so rapid today that educational leaders cannot keep current without in-service training. (Toffler's *Future Shock* presents a vivid picture of the kind and scope of the changes we see occurring all around us.)

4. Professional growth, which is essential, must be on-going.

5. Morale of all staff should improve as a result of well designed in-service programs.

6. Today there appears to be more teachers and principals than there are jobs and partly as a result of the present job market many of these people are holding on to their positions and are in need of upgrading their present skills through in-service education.

7. According to authorities in the field, the principal is the key person in an effective in-service education program in his building. The role he plays is determined by his concept of the nature of in-service education, by his understanding of the dynamics of change, and his attitude toward individuals working together in groups. Besides the principal's responsibilities for providing inspiration for in-service education and creating a climate for growth, he must spark the effective organization of an in-service program and facilitate
the work of the various groups of individuals involved in
the program.¹

An Overview of the History of
In-Service Education

A question immediately arises when one attempts to offer an
overview of the history of in-service education: How does one make
this quick review without leaving out important events? The writer has
attempted to highlight selected important events without going into
depth about any of them.

The need for in-service education was recognized quite early.
Horace Mann cited the need for in-service education in 1837.² According
to Richey, in-service education of teachers became a growing concern in
the early 1800's due to the increase in democratic participation, the
growing complexity of social, economic and political arrangements, and
the continuing growth of knowledge.³ During the 1850's, '60's, and
'70's institutes of two or three days' duration were used to furnish in-
service education.⁴ These institutes were established primarily for

¹Paul J. Misner, Frederick W. Schneider, and Lowell G. Keith,
Elementary School Administration (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill

²Horace Mann, Sixth Annual Report (Boston: Dulton and Wentworth,

³Herman G. Richey, "Growth of the Modern Conception of In-Service
Society for the Study of Education Yearbook, Chicago University Press,
1957), p. 35.

⁴Ralph W. Tyler, "In-Service Education of Teachers: A Look at the
Past and Future," in Improving In-Service Education: Proposals and
Procedures for Change, ed. Louis J. Rubin (Boston: Allyn and Bacon,
the purpose of bridging the gap between what teachers knew and what they were expected to know, consequently in-service education at that time was basically remedial. Mann described the institutes as follows:

> It is the design of the teachers' institute to bring together those who are actually engaged in teaching in common schools, or who propose to become so, in order that they may be formed into classes, under able instructors, may be exercised, questioned and drilled in the same manner that the classes of a good common school are exercised, questioned and drilled.

The institute became formalized, embedded in legislation and extremely difficult to change. Large cities were the first to modify it, and by the end of the 19th century some of the cities did away with it entirely. In the more rural areas the institute continued to be the major form of in-service education. The institute, however, did not achieve its original purpose of educating individual teachers.  

Eventually the institute evolved into what is commonly known as reading circles. Actually the reading circles served essentially the same purpose as the institute — to advance the knowledge and performance of teachers who had been deficient in academic and professional skills.

The reading circle and the institute had as their major goals the

---
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remediation of teachers, or as Philip W. Jackson\(^8\) calls it, the "defect" point of view. It began with the assumption that there was something wrong with the way teachers performed and that in-service education would repair their defects.\(^9\)

During the early 1920's colleges offered programs, summer schools, extension courses, afternoon classes, and correspondence classes -- all as a new approach to in-service education.

**Quantitative Standards**

After the first World War and until the depression of the 1930's, in-service education was affected by the establishment of quantitative standards for teaching certificates. It was thought that the quality of teaching could be improved by requiring all teachers to have a bachelor's degree.\(^10\) As a result, colleges tried to identify the old courses teachers had not taken. Teachers came to see in-service education as a way of getting certificates and filling in their background, rather than gaining new knowledge, better understanding and new competence.\(^11\)

**Supervisors Emerge**

During the 1930's with the broadening of school curricula, new subjects emerging and additional managerial responsibilities being placed on superintendents, superintendents of schools started delegating some of their supervisory duties to head teachers and supervisors. Supervisors appeared on the scene as a direct result of the new subjects being added.


\(^9\)Ibid. \(^10\)Tyler, op. cit., p. 10. \(^11\)Ibid.
to the curriculum, namely art, music, physical education, manual training, and home economics. The supervisor's major responsibilities were the instruction and supervision of teachers and the implementation of new curricular materials. The supervisors were supposed to have a greater command of the specific subject matter, and consequently they were responsible for improving classroom teaching through in-service education of teachers. The supervisor was expected to provide model lessons in classrooms, evaluate the work of teachers, give directions for future work, and hold training sessions for classroom teachers. 12

In-Service Ramifications of the Eight Year Study

In 1933 an eight year study began with thirty school systems participating along with colleges and universities in the development and implementation of new educational programs. Before long other studies emerged, and by 1939, colleges of teacher education became involved in pre-service and in-service education focused on the new educational programs of the schools. 13

Initial efforts to implement some of the proposals showed clearly that it was impossible to do new things in schools when teachers or principals did not understand the need for new things, or the bases of new proposals, or the ways in which new ideas can be effectively employed. 14 In the summer of 1936, Ralph Tyler was responsible for bringing a group of teachers to Ohio State University for six weeks


during the summer. The purpose of this workshop was to offer teachers an opportunity to put ideas into practice. Thus we see the emerging of a new concept in in-service education -- the workshop. However, the most significant contribution of the eight-year study was the education it provided in problem-solving and in developing attitudes and skills of educational inquiry.15

Reform of In-Service Education

Analysis of the reform thrust of the late 1940's and the 1950's lends itself easily to summary: (1) longer training, tougher standards, established accreditation procedures; (2) changes in content of training; (3) development of the concept of administration as a science.16

During the 1940's in-service education turned to an exploration of the aims of education and the development of training procedures for teachers. Around the middle of the 1950's, the workshop was looked upon as the panacea for in-service education. With the exception of college and university courses, it had become the most widespread technique used for in-service education. Workshops were designed around idea development, new ways to do old things, teaching skill development, new knowledge development, and inspirational incentives to do an even better job of teaching and administering the schools.17

15 Ibid., p. 13.


Action research was a product of the 1950's. It was defined by Corey as "research undertaken by practitioners in order that they improve their practices." Action research focuses in on problems as they arise out of practice. It is based on two premises: (1) teacher, or administrator creativeness could find an outlet in activities which they help design; (2) the transfer of results from research to practice would be efficient.

The internship experience as an in-service technique emerged in the late 1940's. Heather S. Doob reported while only two universities offered internship programs in 1947, by 1950 17 universities had such programs. By 1963, it is estimated that 117 universities offered them. A 1970 survey of 288 schools indicated that most of these schools offered them. While internships were rated favorably by 75% of the superintendents surveyed, a majority of the graduate students do not participate in the internship experience.

Although internship programs are alike in providing practical experiences, they differ significantly in other respects. For example, they may be under the sole direction of a university, or a school system, or under joint direction.

---
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Cooperative Program in Educational Administration

In 1950 the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (CPEA) was financed by the Kellogg Foundation. Regional centers were established in the following eight universities: Harvard, Teachers' College (Columbia University), George Peabody College for Teachers, Ohio State University, University of Chicago, University of Texas, Stanford University and the University of Oregon. The CPEA began a new era in educational administration; perhaps it could be viewed as a "revolution" in that it has been an impetus to major changes.  

Although each CPEA center operated independently, there was considerable exchange of information and ideas. The general purpose of all eight centers has been stated as follows: (1) the improvement of the educational programs for pre-service administrators and the in-service training of administrators already in the field; (2) development of greater sensitivity to large social problems through an interdisciplinary approach involving most of the social sciences; (3) dissemination of research findings to practicing administrators; (4) discovery of new knowledge about education and administration; (5) development of continuing patterns of cooperation and communication among various universities and colleges within a region and between these institutions and other organizations and agencies working in the field of educational administration.  


\[22\] Ibid.
The Ford Foundation funded the Consortium for Educational Leadership which was established in the state of Illinois in May, 1973. The member schools consisted of the following seven institutions of higher learning: Atlanta University, the University of Chicago, Claremont Graduate School, Columbia University (Teachers' College), the University of Pennsylvania, Ohio State University, and the University of Massachusetts. The goals of the consortium are listed as follows: (1) to train educational leaders; (2) to promote cooperation among member institutions; (3) to assist institutions which seek qualified persons; (4) to conduct research in the area of leadership training and practice.\textsuperscript{23} It was decided that the following work skills are needed for leaders: (1) problem recognition and solving; (2) organizational analysis and reorganization; (3) curriculum analysis, from system strategy to classroom; (4) political decision making; (5) budgetary analysis and financial control; (6) acquisition of and use of research.\textsuperscript{24} In actuality, the cooperative program in Educational Administration and the Consortium for Educational Leadership have essentially the same goals for in-service education of administrators.

If we look at how in-service education has changed and developed in the past 139 years, we can make a few generalizations. There is much less attention given now to remedying gross deficiencies in the pre-preparation of educators. In-service education is still viewed as a means for increasing communication. In-service education is still a major way of achieving social mobility in the education profession. In-

\textsuperscript{23}Consortium for Educational Leadership (Chicago, 1973).

\textsuperscript{24}Ibid.
service education is one avenue by which an individual educator's personal interest and needs may be served. Actually the only new major purpose of in-service education since 1930 is to aid the school in implementing new educational programs by helping individuals to acquire skills and attitudes essential to the roles they are to play in new programs. Perhaps a concomitant role of in-service education today is involvement in social changes and its effects on education.

**Principles of In-Service Education**

According to Harold Spears, in-service programs should help teachers and supervisors grow in their ability to improve the learning situation of children. Spears also points out certain principles of in-service programs:

1. Professional education does not cease when one leaves college.
2. Professional development cannot be adequately met by experience alone.
3. Although it is reasonable to expect an individual to guide his own future development, it is the obligation of the school system to stimulate advancement by providing opportunities for in-service growth.
4. The provision of leadership for this program is a legitimate school expenditure.
5. The test of in-service education is in its consequences in instruction and student development.

---


6. The program for in-service education can be separated from neither curriculum or supervision. The three represent overlapping functions of the program for instructional improvement.

Certainly no one would argue with the above principles. However, in order to obtain a more complete and comprehensive understanding of the principles of in-service education, the report of the teacher education workshop conducted at George Peabody College for Teachers offered fourteen additional principles. I shall cite those which I feel are particularly essential to establishing sound in-service programs.

1. Ultimately in-service education must contribute to the growth and development of children and to the quality of living in the community.

2. It is based on long term plans with broadly defined goals.

3. It is a democratic enterprise.

4. It is realistic and practical.

5. It maintains balance.

6. It coordinates the efforts of many individuals and agencies.

7. It is continuous and provides for continuous evaluation in the light of its purposes.

8. It emerges from the needs of the total school.\(^\text{27}\)

While each of the above is important criteria to use as a guideline for establishing sound in-service education, one of the most neglected is number eight. In-service education must start with the needs of

those who are going to receive it. All too often in-service education meets the wrong needs -- that is, the needs of those who are conducting it rather than those who are receiving it. While no act of principles can guarantee the success of in-service education, a program not grounded on the solid base of principles such as these may be doomed to confusion and failure.

Objectives of In-Service Education

In order to realize the objectives of in-service education, experience has shown that these five elements are important: (1) a knowledge of the general and applied psychology; (2) knowledge of one's own unique combination of qualities with their varying degrees of strength and weakness; (3) a working grasp of the attitudes needed to deal with people; (4) an ability to apply all of this knowledge and to mobilize the energy and enthusiasm needed for the special objectives of the organization; (5) deliberate efforts to broaden the total personality in a cultural direction. In order to achieve these objectives, one must be properly organized and obtain constant feedback in order to evaluate properly whether or not the in-service program is in fact on target.

Common Failures of In-Service Education

No single approach to in-service education will suffice because of the many needs that must be met in establishing sound in-service programs. However, most approaches planned to meet bona fide needs are likely to

be helpful. Those that become mere formalities or degenerate into routine are usually ineffective or even harmful.

In-service education should serve a dual purpose: it should provide new skills and techniques, and it should enhance the individual's self image. It is sad, but nonetheless true, that many in-service programs fail on both counts. Frazier\textsuperscript{29} (1959) points out some of the failures of in-service programs: they are often routine, superficial, poorly planned, and poorly timed. Serious errors often appear in the following areas:

1. Failure to plan in-service training with the recipients.
2. Failure to relate programs to the real needs of staff.
3. Failure to use proper techniques to implement in-service training.
4. Failure to implement in-service training with properly trained staff.
5. Failure to commit time resources in sufficient quantity.
6. Failure to commit financial resources in sufficient quantity.
7. Failure to obtain total commitment from the top down.

**Principals' Needs**

If good in-service training is to take place, principals must be the focal point in planning. All too many school systems still do not involve principals in the planning stages of in-service education. If principals are not allowed to plan in-service education to meet their perceived needs, it is obvious that their commitment will be less than sincere. Harris, Bessent and McIntyre stated "The shores of in-service

education programs down through the years are strewn with the wrecks of ships that sailed forth with only the officers on them, while the crew remained behind. One of the few certainties in the field of human endeavor is the relationship between involvement in an enterprise and commitment to its goals.30

Some common practices which violate sound thinking in this area are listed below:

1. School committees mandating a particular in-service program for principals.

2. Superintendents simply offering in-service training without any real input from principals.

3. Superficial surveys taken by superintendents and then interpreted by them.

4. Not considering the individual needs of principals and the uniqueness of each individual.

5. Failure to evaluate many present in-service programs.

Although these are not the only reasons why in-service programs often fail, they should evoke some reflection on current practices. They should remind those who plan in-service education effective in-service educational experiences must consider:

1. The recipients' needs.

2. The recipients' involvement in planning, implementing, and evaluating the program.

3. The total commitment of everyone involved.

No single recipe guarantees the success of in-service training; rather it requires good planning, participation at all levels with the recipients aiding the staff in recognizing their needs, stimulating interest in in-service education, and obtaining total commitment from the school committee on down to the staff.

**Promising Designs in In-Service Education**

Some promising designs for effective in-service education include the following ingredients:

1. Total commitment as seen by allocation of time, staff, and money.
2. A multitude of activities.
3. Establishment of and commitment to goals.
4. Support and encouragement.
5. Total staff involvement from the lowest staff member in the hierarchy to the superintendent and school committee.

**Principal's Involvement**

If real improvement is to occur in in-service education of principals, they themselves must be involved from the initial planning to the final evaluation and assessment of the program. While there are other important variables which go into making in-service programs successful, none is more important than involvement by the principal. Real involvement and participation brings with it total commitment, and consequently a greater chance for effectiveness.
Needs Assessment

The only meaningful way in which one can determine the current needs of principals is to do a needs assessment, the first and foremost step in planning in-service programs for principals. It can provide feedback to principals, to superintendents of schools, to boards of education as to what the perceived needs of principals are and can lead to programs which will effectively meet the needs of principals.

There is no standard method of doing a needs assessment. Needs assessment methods are still in a developmental stage. However, needs assessment is far better than other alternatives which involve little more than guessing and hit-or-miss efforts to meet needs perceived or invented by those not directly involved.

Agencies for In-Service Education

Oftentimes administrators are somewhat confused about what agencies should be used in carrying out in-service programs. Extensive studies have shown, however, that the following agencies should be used: (1) the local system; (2) the universities and colleges; (3) the state department of education; (4) state, regional, and national associations; (5) the community in which the schools are located; (6) industry and business agencies; (7) labor organizations. 31

Weber states, as do many other experts in the field of in-service education, that in-service education must be based on the challenging problems which have developed within the framework of the local school

As sensible as this statement appears, it is all too often neglected. In order to grow professionally, principals need objective information about real situations. Unfortunately, present practices too often utilize books and periodicals as the major source of both information and situation. Real learning should suggest solutions to real problems which principals can verify and test in application.\(^{33}\)

It should be clear that to rely upon outside agencies without utilizing the local system and its needs is an unfortunate error. The local school system should be the core of any intelligently designed program for educating principals in service.\(^{34}\)

**Devices for In-Service Education**

There are many resources to which principals in this area can turn for help in improving their own effectiveness. Membership in professional organizations such as the National Elementary Principals Association, the American Association of School Administrators, Massachusetts Teachers Association, New England Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Massachusetts Association for School Administrators, and the Massachusetts Elementary School Principals' Association. All of these organizations provide help through publications and local and national conventions. State departments of education make available specialists and consultants in many areas and also provide opportunities for principals to serve on various statewide committees. The state department also sponsors workshops and conferences. Many professional organizations form study groups at local, regional and state levels, which in many cases are most effective in providing motivation and

\(^{32}\text{Ibid.} \quad ^{33}\text{Ibid., pp. 73-74.} \quad ^{34}\text{Ibid., p. 74.}\)
professional growth. Other opportunities for in-service growth of school principals include action research on problems in their own schools, public speaking, consulting with teachers, supervisors, and other administrators -- participating in cultural activities, teaching in summer and evening programs in colleges and universities, enrolling in college courses, and pursuing independent reading.

According to a survey of Texas school administrators, five self-administered means of in-service education in order of frequency of use are: (1) reading in professional journals; (2) actively working in community service clubs; (3) participating in regional school men's clubs; (4) attending short conferences sponsored by state departments of education; and (5) reading accounts of successful ways of meeting problems. 35

These same administrators indicated that the most valuable means of in-service growth were: (1) attending summer workshops on college campuses; (2) visiting other school systems; (3) forming self-study committees; (4) attending short conferences sponsored by state departments of education; (5) applying evaluation instruments in their own systems; (6) conducting research in their own systems; (7) participating in regional schoolmen's clubs; (8) participating in clinics conducted by a school system around one particular problem. 36

From these two lists of in-service techniques, it can readily be seen


36 Ibid.
that the media considered most valuable by administrators are not the ones they themselves commonly use. This study indicated that the most valuable experiences are those that bring administrators into personal contact with each other. 37

It becomes increasingly clear that new methods are necessary to offer adequate intelligent and fruitful on-going in-service education to administrators today so that they may at least stay abreast of the times. In-service must change from a re-active process to one which involves foresight and training to perceive and meet the challenges of the day without having to resort to crisis leadership.

It is equally clear that model programs for in-service education should evolve through cooperative efforts of colleges, universities, state departments of education, state, regional and national associations, industry and business, labor organizations and those who are going to receive the training. It must be repeatedly emphasized that in-service education cannot be effective if it does not serve the needs of the administrators who are to be helped. If in-service programs instead serve the needs of the institutions offering them rather than focusing on the needs of those who are to receive the in-service education, the results will be negative feelings on the part of administrators and failure to seek out such services except under duress.

37 Ibid.
Looking at the Record of In-Service Education

Fred Edmonds et al. did a study of on-the-job in-service education for school administrators in Lexington, Kentucky. Their investigation involved a team of specialists in school administration, curriculum, supervision and in-service education, working with teams of school administrators in local school districts. One objective was to determine the extent of modified performance when participating administrators were helped (1) to conceptualize their administrative jobs; (2) to clarify their administrative organizations; (3) to identify their school problems; (4) to formulate solutions for their school problems and (5) to evaluate the consequences of their administrative performance.

In this study interdisciplinary consultants were used, representing the disciplines of anthropology, political science, sociology, and social psychology. Graduate research associates were also used. Problem solving was the learning vehicle. Seminars were devoted to problems identification. Specific methods such as questioning, reading, illustrating, conferences, telling, researching, clinics, etc. were used and modified as necessary.

As a result of this in-service experience, Edmonds reported that (1) the administrators did reformulate their job concepts; (2) the administrators did re-define their roles; (3) the administrators modified their concepts of their school's ultimate purposes. This

---
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study offers some evidence that a cooperative approach to in-service education using a combination of methods to effect change can be effective.

Terry A. Thomas in a study sponsored by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the National Center for Educational Research and Development reported that, as a result of a five-day laboratory experience, an experimental group of principals revealed more positive change than those in the control group. He also stated that the study demonstrated that laboratory group training in interpersonal relations affects positively the administrator's behavior with his staff and the socio-emotional climate of the school. Although there were some limitations and a random sample was not used, this study does suggest positive effects of a laboratory experiment.

Other findings about effectiveness of in-service training lead one to mixed conclusions. For example, Blake et al., and Miles et al. found that organizational productivity increased as a result of training; however, in these experiments no controls were used. A

40 Terry A. Thomas, "Changes in Elementary School Principals as a Result of Laboratory Training" (Oregon Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1970).


number of studies using control groups (Deitzer, Friedlander, Deep, Bass and Vaughn, Stinson and Underwood) found that groups with leaders who received sensitivity training were less productive than control groups. Weschler and Reisel found no change in productivity after one year of sensitivity training. Group learning and problem solving was found higher under sensitivity trained leaders in one but not another situation (Maloney). Three studies reported increases in group cohesiveness (Deep, Bass, and Vaughn, Stinson, and Maloney).

If we look at studies that utilized adequate controls, we must conclude that sensitivity training of leaders is associated with increased cohesiveness but decreased group productivity. Odiorne (1963) analyzed 51 books and 68 journal articles published between 1948 and


1961. He found not a single study that demonstrated that laboratory training changes behavior back on the job. He found weaknesses in both the theory and the method of laboratory training, which trains leaders for softness, rather than for coping with the tough realities of the world. 50

In retrospect, we find much evidence to support the fact that many in-service education programs are not meeting the needs of practicing administrators today. Perhaps no program will ever be devised to meet these needs. Administrators live in a world that is constantly changing. It is all but impossible to predict tomorrow with one hundred per cent accuracy. However, Beasley suggests five characteristics of a program that at least approaches the ideal. They are as follows: (1) an ideal program for in-service education is one in which motivation for participation comes from within the individual; (2) it is cooperatively planned; (3) it is adapted to the needs of the participants; (4) it provides for an interpretation to the public of both purposes and outcome; (5) and it provides a plan for continuous evaluation and improvement of the effectiveness of the program by all concerned. 51 In Figure I the criteria of an ideal program of in-service education is illustrated. 52


51 N. C. Beasley, "Evaluating In-Service Programs, the Teaching Profession Grows In-Service," report of the New Hampshire Conference under auspices of the National Committee on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, NEA Washington, 1949.

52 Ibid.
1. An ideal program of in-service education is one in which motivation comes from within the individual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPERIOR</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>INFERIOR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual has complete freedom to participate or not.</td>
<td>Individual participates when the majority express support for purposes and activities of the program.</td>
<td>Individual participates to gain salary increases, promotions, etc.</td>
<td>Individual participates when administrators or other authorities direct with no specific penalty involved.</td>
<td>Individual participates for fear of losing his position.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. An ideal program of in-service education is cooperatively planned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPERIOR</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>INFERIOR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By representatives of all groups concerned with the educational program (teachers, administrators, board of education, and public)</td>
<td>By representatives of all groups concerned with the educational program with administrators participating in an advisory capacity.</td>
<td>By group concerned, subject to subsequent approval of administrators.</td>
<td>By administrators for group concerned with no opportunity for participation or acceptance by group concerned.</td>
<td>By administrators for group concerned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIG. 1.** Criteria of an Ideal Program of In-Service Education
3. An ideal program of in-service education is adapted to the needs of the participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPERIOR</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>INFERIOR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets needs of group clearly identified by all groups concerned.</td>
<td>Meets needs of group concerned as determined by administrators in consultation with them.</td>
<td>Meets needs of group concerned as conceived by administrators only.</td>
<td>Program determined by purposes without regard to needs of group concerned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. An ideal program of in-service education provides for an interpretation to the public of both purposes and outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPERIOR</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>INFERIOR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program purposes and outcomes are adequately explained to the public.</td>
<td>Program purposes are partially explained to the public.</td>
<td>Public is completely uninformed about program purposes.</td>
<td>Public is misinformed through unofficial sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FJG. 1, cont'd. Criteria of an Ideal Program of In-Service Education
5. An ideal program of in-service education provides a plan for continuous evaluation and improvement of the effectiveness of the program by all concerned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPERIOR</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>INFERIOR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and improvement of all objectives by all, or evaluation of all objectives by some acting independently.</td>
<td>Evaluation of some objectives by some acting</td>
<td>Evaluation of a few objectives by individuals.</td>
<td>No attempt to evaluate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of some objectives by all, or evaluation of all objectives by some groups concerned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIG. 1, cont'd. Criteria of an Ideal Program of In-Service Education**


**Promising Programs**

In the following section of this paper I should like to cite a number of promising programs of pre- and in-service education so that the reader might become more aware of some of the types of programs that are available to administrators today.

Although this is not the central theme of the dissertation, it lends itself to additional understanding of the state of in-service education at this time.

In a research report from the Conference Board, Daniel Creamer and Barbara Feld reported a number of promising innovations now taking place in the training of educational leaders.
The Consortium for Educational Leadership

The Consortium for Educational Leadership is one supported by the Ford Foundation and involving the following seven universities: Atlanta, Chicago, Claremont, Columbia, Ohio State, Pennsylvania, and the University of Massachusetts — its goal to provide an opportunity for the member schools to work together as a group. Another important objective is to share their experiences in order to combine the theoretical aspects of course work with the practical aspects of internships. A significant aspect of the program is its emphasis on using the resources of the entire university, not merely those of the school of education. Two areas of the program for educational leadership which are particularly innovative and promising are rotating internships and what are called "situational analyses." Each student is able to select three to four internship experiences so that he may get a better idea of how policy is made and implemented. The internship also provides for experiences dealing with the many facets and functions of the organization. Situational analyses means research in educational problems. Students become involved in real situations and are engaged in analyzing and making decisions to solve real problems.

Programs by Educational Professional Development Act

The Educational Professional Development Act supports leadership training in the vocational field. There are currently 18 universities in this program:

University of California at Los Angeles
University of Connecticut
University of Georgia
University of Illinois
As with the Ford-supported program, the aim of the Vocational Educational Leadership Program is diversity of studies and a good internship experience.

**National Programs for Mid-Career Shifts into Education**

The National Program for Mid-Career Shifts into Education aims to recruit into the field of education persons who have been successful in other fields of endeavor, have demonstrated a sincere interest and want to work in education.

In 1970 five universities were involved in this project: Ohio State University, Claremont Graduate School, City University of New York; the University of Texas at Austin, and Northwestern University. In 1971; the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction joined in the project. The program is supported by a grant from the U.S. Office of Education.

**Institute for Educational Leadership**

In 1971 the Institute for Educational Leadership was established. Its major goal was "to meet the need for strengthening existing and
potential leadership in America at all levels of policy formulation and administration." This institute uses internships, and it brings together for one year 20 interns who are strongly committed to improving education in America. Their primary goal is to find out how educational policy is made in Washington.

Other Programs

Several other programs are worth mentioning. One is a doctor of education program in educational leadership at the Peter Sammartino College of Education at Fairleigh Dickinson University. It began in 1971. The major goal of the program is to produce leaders who are not only politically and economically literate but also have good cultural perspective.

This program is in the form of a university without walls. The focus of leadership education is on the learner. He selects his courses with the help of advisors, and he may do independent work or have an internship experience.

Harvard University has a relatively new area of study called Administration and Social Policy, which offers programs of advanced study. One is the administrative career program; another attempts to train educational planners for overseas positions; and the third is directed towards those who will analyze important social policy questions in education by using social science methods. The program offers course work as well as the internship.
Other Programs for In-Service Education

A number of the programs previously mentioned were primarily for the initial training of educational leaders; however pre-service education and in-service education cannot always be totally separated. Some programs are primarily designed to enhance the leadership abilities of educational administrators who are working in the field as practitioners.

A.A.S.A. Internships

The American Association of School Administrators has supported and designed an internship program for practicing administrators. Its objective is to offer the administrator some insight into how he can help society determine educational objectives and policy. This three-month program began in 1972. There are normally 20 or 21 internship options outside the field of education which an intern may choose. For example, he may opt for a two-week stint with a governor, mayor, or other elected official, two weeks with the AFL-CIO, two weeks at the budget bureau, etc. The intern usually comes to the program with a specific problem to solve, and will judge how effectively his internship experience has helped him.

Mid-Career Program for Practicing Administrators

Ohio State University in 1972 designed a program to assist practicing administrators with solving today's changing problems.
Other Agencies Aiding Administrators with In-Service Needs

The National Training Laboratory also offers in-service education to administrators; however, their efforts are largely based on T-group and sensitivity training. The record of the National Training Laboratory is somewhat mixed, depending upon who is doing the evaluation. Some critics claim that sensitivity training for leadership is in actuality not training in leadership, but rather training for the absence of leadership.

The Network, located in Merrimack, Massachusetts, offers administrators consultation and training in such areas as problem-solving, teacher evaluation, assessing school needs, managing change, curriculum development, effective leadership styles, etc. In the fall of 1975, Massachusetts school administrators from the Merrimack Valley and the North Shore participated in workshops in improving their managerial skills, utilizing management training courses developed by federally-supported education laboratories and centers. These workshops have been funded by a grant from the U. S. Office of Education.53

The Northeast Consortium for Staff Development and Continuing Education, located in Chelmsford, Massachusetts, offers in-service education for the spring of 1976 in curriculum design and development, educational media and learning systems, implementation of the diagnosed needs of adolescent pupils.

The Massachusetts State Department of Education has established regional centers throughout the state and offers in-service education

53 "Inside the Network," Merrimack, Massachusetts, Fall of 1975.
in most areas of administration; however, their in-service programs usually involve current issues in education, such as implementing Chapter 622, implementing Chapter 766, career education, Title I, Title III, etc.; while the areas of in-service education are important, the State Department has not yet attempted to ascertain what the specific needs of principals are.

The Massachusetts Elementary Principals Association in November of 1974 provided funding for workshops and conferences for various study groups throughout the state. One of the guidelines for use of study group funds is that the monies should be allocated on the basis of the established needs of the study group. Emphasis was placed on ascertaining the needs of those principals involved. This type of in-service education shows a great deal of insight and promise, since the workshops, conferences, etc. start with the needs of the group.

Last year projects were funded for seven study groups, and some five hundred principals were affected and participated in workshops in their local school systems, in regional centers of education, or in colleges and universities.

Several of the areas funded for in-service were the following: (1) the Elementary Principal and the Improvement of Instruction through Management by Objectives; (2) Effective Leadership Styles in Elementary Schools; (3) Conflict and Problem Solving; (4) Planning Programming, Budgeting Systems; (5) Role of the Principal; (6) Evaluation and Supervision; (7) Evaluation of Administrators; (8) Goals and Objectives of Instruction; (9) Self Evaluation; (10) Implementing Change.
It is important to keep in mind that all of these workshops started with the needs of the group, not with the needs of some college, university, or consortium. They started where all in-service education should start, but rarely does, that is, with the needs of the group receiving the in-service education.

Future In-Service Education

In Improving In-Service Education: Proposals and Procedures for Change, educators like Ralph W. Tyler, Ronald Lippitt, Robert Fox, Mario Fantini, Louis Fischer and Robert Bush offer some proposals for change in the area of in-service education.

For example, Tyler suggests that in-service training of the future will deal with real problems directly and by simulation and will also provide built-in, on-going feedback. Future in-service education will not be limited to college and university campuses or to school buildings but will be carried on in a variety of settings....

Ronald Lippitt and Robert Fox suggest that in-service education design must allow for and plan for individual differences in readiness, sophistication, focal concerns, and content needs. Also the design should include appropriate continuing support of efforts the trainees
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make to use the in-service training experience.  

Mario Fantini maintains that re-training must become more pragmatic and more vital. Louis Fischer suggests that the responsibility for professional growth should be shifted to the regular practitioners and should not rest with colleges, universities or other outside agencies offering courses, suggesting workshops and institutes. Fischer also suggests that outside assessment teams be responsible for providing an independent audit of the needs of the individuals involved in in-service training.

Finally, Robert N. Bush observes that "much of the current paraphernalia and practice in in-service education has grown up haphazardly and without a coherent rationale over a half century or more. It grew in response to a situation in which teachers were, to a large degree, not well prepared ... This condition has changed drastically over the past fifty years. In-service education has not. It now needs to be brought into harmony..."  

Summary

In-service education of principals has never been more needed than it is today. It provides opportunities for growth, for revitalizing

57 Ibid., p. 155.
one's energy in order not only to cope with the problems of education today, but also to chart the future. The need for in-service education was recognized as early as 1837 by Horace Mann.

The development of in-service education began with the institutes whose primary purpose was to bridge the gap between what teachers knew and what they were expected to know. The emphasis was remedial in nature. Today in-service education involved many media and devices and its purposes vary from remedial work to involvement in making change. Today a wide variety of agencies offer in-service education: colleges, universities, national, state and regional professional organizations, state departments of education, as well as private agencies. An even greater variety of techniques for acquiring in-service education exist: institutes, conferences, workshops, action research, and internships.

The Kellogg and Ford Foundations have aided the growth of in-service education. However, areas of in-service education still exist that simply have not kept pace with the needs of the times.

Many in-service education programs fail to consider the needs of the recipients, or do not implement training with properly trained staff, and many times the recipients are not committed to the in-service educational experience. Mixed reports as to the validity of some in-service programs exist. However, there are signs of growth in the area of in-service education; particularly in such new programs as the following: (1) The Consortium for Educational Leadership; (2) The Educational Professional Development Act; (3) The National Program for Mid-Career Shifts; (4) Institute for Educational Leadership.
There are also other programs which are worth watching such as the doctoral program at the Peter Sammartino College of Education at Fairleigh Dickinson University and a relatively new area of study at Harvard called administration and social policy.

The American Association for School Administrators offers internships for practicing administrators. Ohio State offers a mid-career program for practicing administrators. The National Training Laboratories offer on-going in-service training. The Network offers administrator consultation and training. The Northeast Consortium for staff development and continuing education offers help to administrators. The Department of Education offers help in its regional centers to administrators, and in the state of Massachusetts the Massachusetts Elementary Principals Association fund workshops and conferences for administrators based on their needs.

The future of in-service training looks promising. As Tyler suggests, more programs will focus in on the needs and problems of the people receiving in-service education. In-service programs will grow and expand from colleges and universities to on-site settings.

Lippitt and Fox state that future in-service will provide continuing support for in-service efforts made by trainees. Fantini suggests that in-service become more pragmatic and viable. Fischer suggests that the responsibility for in-service education should be shared by the practitioners who are in need of it. Robert N. Bush says that in-service training has not changed as rapidly as it should have and it still needs to be brought into harmony with the needs of the times.
However critical one may be of in-service education, there are encouraging signs of growth, of promise and most of all of viable, relevant programs if administrators choose to get involved.
CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

Sample Population

Elementary principals were randomly selected from the 1974-1975 Massachusetts School Directory, compiled by the Bureau of Educational Information Services and Division of Research Planning and Evaluation of the Massachusetts Department of Education. There were 1,887 elementary principals listed in the 1974-1975 Massachusetts School Directory. A random sample of one hundred and eighty-eight elementary principals was selected for this study.

In assessing the perceived in-service needs of Massachusetts elementary principals, and the perceived techniques for meeting these needs, it was decided after considerable consultation and reading that a ten percent (10%) random sample would provide valid and reliable data for this study. In Morris James Slonim's book Sampling, he explains "It may appear paradoxical to many of our readers and incredible to a few, but the fact is that as the universe increases in size, the sample size remains remarkably constant." Slonim offers a chart on page 74 of his book which explains why a ten percent (10%) random sample for a universe of 1,887 would be adequate for ninety-eight percent precision or better.

A ten percent (10%) random sample was decided upon and since the Massachusetts School Directory listed 1,887 elementary principals for 1974-1975 each eighteenth name was selected for the study. A total of one hundred and eighty-eight principals were thus randomly selected to take part in this research.

In addition to the initial questionnaire a ten percent (10%) random sample was taken of the original one hundred and eighty-one principals who responded to the survey. This was done to find out more specifically what principals had in mind when they filled out the questionnaire and listed their priorities of perceived needs. It was also done in order to find out how valuable the survey was to each principal selected.

Each of the eighteen principals who was randomly sampled was interviewed either by telephone or in person by the researcher and their responses were written down next to their original response on their original survey form.

**Procedures**

In order to ascertain the perceived in-service needs of practicing elementary principals in the state of Massachusetts, and the perceived techniques to meet these needs, it was decided to use the survey method.

The survey had to be designed in such a way that it would answer the following questions:

1. **What are the perceived in-service needs of Massachusetts elementary principals?**
2. **What are the perceived in-service techniques (as seen by practicing elementary principals) that will best satisfy their perceived in-service needs?**
3. Do elementary principals in Massachusetts with varying years of experience as principals perceive their needs differently?
4. Are the perceived needs of elementary principals in different size systems significantly different?
5. Are the perceived needs of elementary principals in communities with varying per pupil expenditures different?

A profile of the respondents is included in the research to allow the reader to view the number and percentage of males and females included in the study. The mean age of the selected principals is also included as well as the number and percentages of principals with Bachelor's degrees, Master's degrees, Certificate of Advanced Graduate Studies, and Doctorate degrees. Other factors such as the number and percentages of principals who have schools with enrollments in the following categories are included: (1-249), (250-499), (500-749), and (750 and over). The size of the system is also included in the profile with a breakdown by the number and percentage of principals in systems with enrollments of students (under 1,000), from (1,000 to 4,999), from (5,000 to 9,999), from (10,000 to 14,999), and (15,000 and over). Other categories include the years of experience as principal ranging from 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16 and over, and the total years of educational experience, ranging from 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16 and over.

Finally, the profile also reflects the number and percentages of principals who have varying per pupil expenditures ranging from ($600-$799), ($800-$999), ($1,000-$1,199) and ($1,200 and over).
This information not only offers a profile of the sample of principals taken but also offers additional information.

The design of the study allows the researcher to view a number of other variables. For example, it offers one an opportunity to view the priority of perceived in-service needs as well as the priority of the techniques which may best satisfy these needs. The design of the study also allows one to look at these needs and techniques in terms of other variables such as principals' educational background, and degrees held, per pupil expenditure, size of system, enrollment of school. Finally, the answer to the very basic question of whether or not there is a need for in-service training of elementary principals becomes apparent. Since this study was primarily designed to take a random sampling of the elementary principals in Massachusetts in relation to their perceived in-service education needs, the decision was made to use a questionnaire rather than an interviewing technique. This decision was made for these reasons: (1) The questionnaire provides more participation by respondents than could be effected by one individual interviewing; (2) Techniques of interviewing are perhaps more complicated than using a questionnaire; (3) There is less danger in the questionnaire method of allowing researcher's bias; (4) The possibility of a lower response level from a questionnaire did not seem a significant defect in this particular study.

Method Used to Develop Survey Instrument

As part of several spring workshops in 1975 funded by the Massachusetts Elementary School Principals Association, elementary
principals from two study groups were asked to develop and test a
survey form relating to the perceived in-service needs of elementary
principals, as well as to the techniques of in-service education
which might best service those needs.

The study groups worked both in small and large group sessions
to develop and refine the survey form. All groups reached consensus
in regard to the items, language and format of the form.

At a subsequent meeting the survey forms were administered to
fifteen elementary principals as a way of piloting and further refining
the instrument.

Following this pilot study, additional modifications were made to
the survey instrument.

An additional examination of the format, language, validity and
reliability of the survey form was made by the Massachusetts Elementary
Principals Association Executive Board.

At the Fall conference of the MESPA Organization, held in
Pittsfield, Massachusetts, in October of 1975, the executive board
received copies of the tentative survey form and gave their full
approval to and support of the survey, as well as further suggestions
regarding the survey instrument.

Composition of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire was designed to obtain data about the age, sex,
years of experience as principal, years of experience as principal,
years of experience in education and the highest degree held by the
respondent. Principals were also asked to provide data about the
enrollment of their school and the size of their system. Each principal was asked to circle and number according to priority five choices in the twenty-five areas of perceived in-service needs. And each was asked to circle and number according to priority the twenty techniques for meeting their in-service needs. The final questionnaire is displayed in Appendix I. A copy of the survey, accompanied by a cover letter, was sent to all principals in the sample population.

Distribution and Return of Questionnaires

The school addresses of the selected elementary principals were obtained from the Massachusetts School Directory. The survey instrument was mailed out to each of the one hundred and eighty-eight elementary principals on December 1, 1975. This initial mailing date was selected because it was felt that the arduous task of budgeting had been initially completed, and principals would have more time to complete the questionnaire, thus increasing the response rate. The cover letter which accompanied the questionnaire included the name of Robert McCarthy, President of the Massachusetts Elementary Principals Association, as he and the executive board of MESPA had endorsed the study. A return stamped, self-addressed envelope was enclosed in the initial mailing. A copy of the cover letter is displayed in Appendix II. Of the initial one hundred and eighty-eight letters mailed out to the elementary principals, one hundred eight (or 57%) were returned by the due date.

Five days after the scheduled return date, a follow-up letter and another survey form were sent to all principals who had not
returned their original forms. Eighty letters were mailed out as follow-up reminders. A copy of the follow-up letter may be seen in Appendix III.

In addition to the above two letters, a number of phone calls were made to obtain a greater response rate.

Also in December the Massachusetts Elementary Principals Newsletter, which is mailed to all elementary principals in Massachusetts, superintendents of schools, school committees, school of education libraries, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, and forty-nine state elementary school principals associations, contained a front page article explaining the rationale and purposes of the study, as well as a request for principals who received the survey to return it. A reproduction of the article is shown in Appendix IV.

The appearance of this article in the MESPA Newsletter of November, 1975, coincided with the initial mailing of the survey instrument.

Maintaining Up-Dated Record of Returns

A master list of those who responded to the survey instrument was kept in alphabetical order by town and by each principal's name; as survey forms were returned they were checked off in red.

Each principal who failed to return the survey five days after the initial due date were mailed a second letter and a second survey form. A blue dot was assigned to their names. This allowed the researcher to maintain a daily count of each return, as well as an
accurate count of how many and whose surveys had not been returned on a given date.

Analysis of Data from Questionnaires

Data from questionnaires are displayed in Chapter V. In order to ascertain the information each questionnaire was recorded in a journal by the following categories:

1. Per Pupil Expenditure which was further broken down into sub-categories of ($600–$799); ($800–$999); ($1,000–$1,199); ($1,200 and over).

2. Enrollment of School which was further broken down into sub-categories of (1–249); (250–499); (500–749); (750 and over).

3. Size of System which was broken down into sub-categories of (under 1,000); (1,000–4,999); (5,000–9,999); (10,000–14,999); (15,000 and over).

4. Years as Principal which was broken down into the following categories: (0–5); (6–10); (11–15); (16 and over).

5. Years in Education which was broken down exactly as was number four.

6. Degrees Held which was broken down into: Masters degree up to CAGS; CAGS up to doctorates degree; and doctorate degree and above.

Each of the above categories were established in the areas of perceived in-service needs and perceived techniques to meet these needs. Each respondent’s survey was recorded in priority from 1–5 (whenever it was possible). However, there were sixty-one principals (or 34%)
(including the nine principals who stated in-service education was not needed) who did not prioritize their selections. Because of the large number of principals who did not prioritize their choices it was decided not to attempt to prioritize each respondent's selections in the results and discussion chapter as there was no way to compensate for the large number of principals who did not prioritize their selections. The totals of all principals' selections are recorded. This, then, allows the top five choices to emerge to the highest position in terms of rank order.

Finally, each response was recorded by priority on master lists. If a principal from the sample population did not list his selections by priority, all his choices were recorded as having an equal rating.

After considerable consultation and guidance from my committee, as well as readings from William Wiersma's book Research Methods in Education\(^2\) and Lehmann and Mehrens' book Educational Research\(^3\), I determined that these methods and procedures would lend credibility to this study. It would, in fact, get at the major focus of this report with appropriate, reliable, valid, and most of all usable data. It was decided that the method used would provide the researcher with a vehicle for an accurate and useful compilation of data.


CHAPTER V

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent's Profile

This section of the dissertation addresses itself to the profile of the one hundred and eighty-one (181) or (96%) Massachusetts elementary principals who responded to the survey on perceived in-service needs and techniques that may best be used to satisfy those perceived needs. The profile includes information in the following categories: the sex of the principal, his (her) mean age, educational achievement, years in education, years as a principal, the size of the system, the enrollment of the school, and the per pupil expenditure.

Sex of Principals

Of the one hundred and eighty-one (181) elementary principals who responded to the survey, twenty-eight (28) were females or fifteen percent (15%). One hundred and fifty-three (153) or eighty-five percent (85%) were males. It would appear from the random sample that was taken that there are more men becoming elementary principals today and fewer women are entering the ranks of the elementary principalship.

Age

Out of the one hundred and eighty-one (181) principals who responded, fifteen (15) principals chose not to list their ages. The mean age of the remaining one hundred and sixty-six (166) was 44.6 years. The mean age of the sample indicates that the average principal
has been in education for several years. Perhaps this might further indicate the need for in-service education in order for principals to stay current in the field of education.

**Educational Achievement of Respondents**

The level of educational achievement of the respondents varied from the bachelor's degree to the doctorate. Three (3) principals (1.7%) had bachelor's degrees. One hundred and seventy-eight (178) principals had master's degrees and above (98.3%). The fact that (98.3%) had master's degrees and above indicates most principals have had advanced training; however, it may be true that a number of principals have not had recent in-service education in a formal program and may, indeed, need retraining.

A further analysis of the advanced degrees held by principals in this survey reveals the following: seven (7) held doctorate degrees (3.9%); another one hundred and eleven (111) principals held certificates of advanced study or its equivalent (61.3%); and finally sixty (60) held master's degrees and up to, but not including, certificates of advanced graduate study, (33.1%). An analysis of educational achievement may be viewed in Tables I and II.
TABLE I
OVERVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT
OR ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Degrees Held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
<td>Master's or above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals 181</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II
BREAKDOWN OF EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT
OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Degrees Held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>Master's to CAGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>CAGS to Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals 181</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years in Education

The total years the respondents spent in education were broken down into the following four categories: (0-5 years), (6-10) years, (11-15) years, and (16) years and over. One hundred and twenty-six principals (126 or 69.6%) had been involved in education for sixteen (16) years or more; forty-two (42) principals or (23.2%) between
eleven (11) and fifteen (15) years. Another twelve (12) principals or (6.6%) had been in the area of education between six (6) and ten (10) years. Finally one (1) principal or (.6%) had been in education between zero and five years (0-5). In viewing the percentage of principals who had over ten years of service, almost ninety-three percent (93%) fall into this category. We can see that there are very few principals, approximately (7%), who were in the area of education for less than ten years. Table III depicts this information.

TABLE III
YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>16 years or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>11 - 15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>0 - 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals 181</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experience as Principals

In terms of experience as principals, the following categories were used to calculate the respondents' replies: from (0-5) years as principal, (6-10) years, (11-15) years, and (16) years and over. Thirty-two (32) or (17.7%) had served as principals between (0-5) years; sixty-six (66) or (36.5%) between (6-10) years; thirty-one (31) or (17.1%) between (11-15) years; and fifty-two (52) or (28.7%) had been
principals for (16) years or more. The evidence offered in the
analysis of years of experience as principals indicates that some
eighty-two percent (82%) had been principals for over six years. This
factor may be cause for the need for additional in-service education
in order to become more aware of innovative developments and their
ramifications.

Table IV depicts the respondents' years of experience as
principals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Years of Experience as Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>11 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>16 years or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals 181</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enrollment of School**

School enrollments of the one hundred and eighty-one (181)
respondents were broken down into the following categories: (1-249),
(250-499), (500-749), (750 and over). Twenty-two (22) principals or
(12.2%) reported working in schools with enrollments from (1-249)
students. Eighty-six principals or (47.5%) reported working in schools
with enrollments from (250-499) students. Another sixty (60) principals or (33.1%) reported working in schools with enrollments from (500-749) students. Finally thirteen principals or (7.2%) reported enrollments of 750 students or more. Almost sixty (60%) of the principals had schools with less than 500 students. Table V summarizes this information.

TABLE V
ENROLLMENT OF SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>1 - 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>250 - 499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>500 - 749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>750 - or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals 181</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

System Size

The following five categories were used to view the respondents' system size: (under 1,000), (1,000 - 4,999), (5,000 - 9,999), (10,000 - 14,999) and (15,000 and over). The one hundred and eighty-one (181) respondents reported the following: thirteen (13) principals or (17.2%) worked in school systems with under 1,000 students enrolled; eighty-five (85) or (47.5%) worked in school systems with (1,000 - 4,999) students enrolled; another forty-eight (48) or (26.5%) worked in systems with (5,000 - 9,999) enrolled; sixteen (16) or (8.8%) worked
in school systems with (10,000 - 14,999) enrolled; and finally, nineteen (19) principals or (10.5%) worked in school systems with over 15,000 students enrolled. If one were to view the random sample in regard to system size and the percentage of principals from each of the five categories and compare this to the actual percentage of principals throughout the state of Massachusetts who work in similar size systems, it would indicate that the random sample is approximately the same.* These figures are depicted in Table VI.

TABLE VI
SYSTEM SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>System Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>1,000 - 4,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>5,000 - 9,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>10,000 - 14,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>15,000 and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals 181</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per Pupil Expenditure

Four categories of per pupil expenditure were established: ($600 - $799), ($800 - $999), ($1,000 - $1,199) and over ($1,200). Out of one hundred eighty-one (181) principals reporting, four or (2.2%) had per

*Note: This is verified by using the Massachusetts School Directory which is published by the Massachusetts Department of Education.
pupil expenditures of from ($600 - $799). Fifty-seven (57) principals or (31.5%) had per pupil expenditures of ($800 - $999). Seventy-three (73) or (40.3%) had per pupil expenditures of ($1,000 - $1,199). Another forty-seven (47) principals or (26%) had per pupil expenditures of ($1,200 or more). The average per pupil expenditure for the state of Massachusetts for the school year ending June 30, 1974, was $1,103. These per pupil expenditures would indicate, in terms of the random sample, that this sample was a relatively good cross section of principals. These per pupil expenditures may be seen in Table VII.

### Table VII

**Per Pupil Expenditure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>$600 - $799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>$800 - $999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>$1000 - $1199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>$1200 and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals 181</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

An additional analysis was used for the following purposes: (1) to determine how many principals, and what percentage of them, feel that there was a need for in-service training; (2) to determine what

---

were the top five perceived priorities of in-service needs; (3) to
discover what were the top five perceived techniques chosen to meet
those needs; (4) and to determine if the perceived needs of principals
from each of the sub-categories were different -- i.e., per pupil
expenditure, enrollment of school, size of system, years as principal,
years in education, degree held.

To make these analyses, a guide was used from Irvin J. Lehmann's
and William A. Mehren's book *Educational Research.*\(^2\) Four basic
questions were asked: (1) are statistical techniques needed to analyze
the data; (2) if statistical techniques are needed, what is the most
appropriate technique to use; (3) were any assumptions related to
using a particular statistic violated; (4) have the results been
adequately presented. In answer to question one and two, while statistics
were needed to analyze these data the most fruitful method was used.
This method involved tallying the respondent's survey by each category,
and then comparing one category to another. In some cases a table
was made and then divided by the total number of respondents to obtain
a percentage. It therefore follows that no assumptions were made which
violate a particular statistic, and that the results have been adequately
presented.

The findings of this analysis were compiled in a journal listing
each category, the five columns of perceived in-service needs, and
another five columns of techniques to meet these needs. The format of
the recording sheets may be viewed in Appendices V, VI, VII, VIII, IX and

\(^2\)Irvin J. Lehmann and William A. Mehrens, *Educational Research:*
X. These statistics are arranged under the major headings of (1) per pupil expenditure, which was further broken down into four categories: ($600 - $799), ($800 - $999), ($1000 - $1199) and ($1200 and over), each of which also had an equivalent recording sheet for the respondents who did not specify priorities; (2) enrollment of school was broken down in a similar way: (1 - 299), (250 - 499), (500 - 749), (750 and over) with each of these categories also having an equivalent recording sheet for unspecified priorities; (3) the size of the system, broken down into the following categories: (systems under 1,000), (1,000 - 4,999), (5,000 - 9,999), (10,000 - 14,999), (15,000 and over) with an equivalent recording sheet for the unspecified priorities; (4) years as principal, sub-divided into the following categories: (1), (0 - 5), (6 - 10), (11 - 15), (16 and over) with a similar record made of the unspecified priorities; (5) years in education, sub-divided in exactly the same way as years as principal; (6) degrees held, broken down into the following categories: master's degree up to Certificate of Advanced Graduate Studies (anything less than 30 hours beyond the master's degree was listed in this category), Certificate of Advanced Graduate Studies, or its equivalent (30 hours beyond the master's degree up to the doctorate degree). All those principals holding doctorate degrees were listed in another category. It was necessary to list separately a few principals who had only the bachelor's degree. A similar record was maintained of the respondents who did not list their choices by priority.

An additional record was kept of the number of principals who felt there was no need for in-service education. Finally, eighteen of the 181 respondents in the study were further surveyed (a 10% random sample)
to analyze additionally the specific needs of principals as well as to
obtain reaction to the survey's form and an estimate of its value.
This sample was done in two ways: either by a personal meeting between
principals and the researcher or by phone contacts. Data from the
survey are displayed in charts and/or tables where appropriate.

Response Rate

Of the one hundred and eighty-eight surveys mailed out, one
hundred and eighty-one (96%) were returned.

In-Service Education Needed

One hundred and seventy-two principals or (95%) indicated that
they felt in-service education was needed. Nine principals or five
percent (5%) felt in-service education was not necessary. The fact
that (5%) of the principals replied that in-service education was not
necessary is difficult, if not impossible, to comment on without
additional research.

Perceived In-Service Needs

in Priority Rating

The perceived in-service needs as revealed by the survey are listed
below in order of priority:

(1) Staff evaluation

* (2) Curriculum development

* (2) Curriculum Evaluation

(3) Leadership

(4) Staff development

(5) Massachusetts School Law
(6) Innovation and change
(7) 766 and the principal
* (8) Management by objectives
**(8) Current educational research
(9) Individualized instruction
(10) Negotiations
(11) Evaluating instructional materials
* (12) Public relations
* (12) Group dynamics
(13) Planning and conducting workshops
(14) School organization
(15) Humanistic education
(16) Budgeting
(17) Writing proposals
* (18) Organization and development technology
* (18) Time management
* (19) 622 and the principal
* (19) Differentiated staffing
(20) Transitional bi-lingual education

In studying the results of this survey, it certainly is obvious to the educated observer that the recent emphasis on accountability and evaluation has had a definite impact on principals today as they selected staff evaluation, curriculum development, and curriculum evaluation as perceived needs, in that order. They also selected leadership, staff development, and Massachusetts school law. It appears

*Note: In several cases two categories had the same priority.
evident that principals feel a definite need for retraining and a
definite need for expertise in many of the areas in schools which are
continuously challenged as being inadequate by the public.

It is also quite evident that these same principals feel that
differentiated staffing and bi-lingual education is a low priority with them.

**Summary**

In terms of the overall perceived needs of principals, bi-lingual education was chosen least often and staff evaluation was selected most often. The range of responses was from a minimum of 7 (or less than 4%) to a maximum of 85 (or 47%). Tabulation of the responses showed the following six areas were of most frequent concern: staff evaluation was selected most frequently; curriculum development and curriculum evaluation were the second most frequent areas chosen; leadership was mentioned next, followed by staff development and Massachusetts school law.

It would appear from looking at the expressed perceived in-service needs of Massachusetts elementary principals that staff evaluation, curriculum evaluation, curriculum development, and staff development are all very much in demand today. This could very well be a result of the tremendous impetus of pressure received today in regard to accountability and evaluation of schools. With the pressure of making schools more accountable, it would seem likely that principals as the heads of their schools would be quite concerned with staff evaluation and with curriculum evaluation.
It has never been more evident that the critics of the schools are having their day as accountability has come of age in educational settings all over the United States. What educator has not heard of or is not now living with management by objectives, performance objectives, or planning, programming, budgeting systems? Obviously, one starts with staff in response to accountability. Consequently, we see the perceived needs of principals as staff evaluation as their major perceived need.

Next, accountability and evaluation for what one is teaching is reflected in principals' perceived needs as curriculum evaluation and curriculum development, as these areas were cited as major perceived needs.

Finally, accountability finds principals seeking help in leadership skills as well as knowledge of Massachusetts school law. It is quite clear that principals are reacting in a very normal way in perceiving their needs as they do today.

The overall results of the survey of perceived in-service needs may be viewed in Appendix II.

Range of Responses of Perceived Needs

In estimating the range of responses, three categories emerged: 58 to 85 responses might be considered the top priority needs; 20 to 40 responses might be considered moderate priority needs; 7 to 19 responses might be considered of a lower priority need.

Major Perceived Priority Needs

The following areas fell into the "major perceived priority needs" category and ranged from 58 to 85 responses (or from a 32% to 47% response rate):
(1) Staff evaluation
(2) Curriculum development
(3) Curriculum evaluation
(4) Leadership
(5) Staff development
(6) Massachusetts school law

**Moderate Perceived Priority Needs**

The areas listed below fell in the "moderate perceived priority needs" category and ranged from 20 to 40 responses (or from 11% to 22% response rate):

(1) Innovation and change
(2) 766 and the principal
(3) Management by objectives
(4) Current educational research
(5) Individualized instruction
(6) Negotiations
(7) Evaluating instructional materials
(8) Public relations
(9) Group dynamics
(10) Planning and conducting workshops

**Lower Perceived Priority Needs**

The following areas fell into the "lower perceived priority needs" category and ranged from 7 to 13 responses (or from 4% to 7% response rate):
(1) School organization
(2) Humanistic education
(3) Budgeting
(4) Writing proposals
(5) Organization and development technology
(6) Time management
(7) 622 and the principal
(8) Differentiated staffing
(9) Transitional bi-lingual education

Techniques to Meet Needs in Priority Rating

The overall priority ratings of techniques that might best serve the needs of principals were as follows:

(1) Study groups solving local problems
(2) Bulletins of information helpful to principals
(3) Local workshops conducted by professors, or other consultants
(4) Cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and management techniques
*(5) Procedures for inter-school visitations
*(5) State-wide conferences and workshops
(6) Study groups solving regional problems
(7) Development of area management and consultant resource lists
(8) Local workshops conducted by principals

*Note: These two techniques had the same priority
(9) Local workshops conducted by principals
(10) Clinical services for the study of special problems.
(11) Study groups solving state-wide problems
(12) Having principals teach related college courses
(13) Use of graduate students to work with local principals
(14) Professional reading list for principals
(15) Involvement in applied research problems
(16) Graduate study done in local school districts
(17) Graduate work at local colleges and universities
(18) Field studies
(19) Study groups solving universal problems

Range of Responses of Perceived Techniques

A tabulation of the number of responses to each of the overall techniques may be viewed in Appendix XII. The range of responses in terms of techniques to meet principals' needs was from a low of 8 to a high of 84, with study groups solving universal problems chosen the least frequently and study groups solving local problems chosen the most frequently.

Techniques Selected Most Frequently

The following techniques were selected most frequently and are listed in order of priority:

(1) Study groups solving local problems
(2) Bulletins of information helpful to principals
(3) Local workshops conducted by professors or other consultants
(4) Cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and management techniques

* (5) Establishment of procedures for inter-school visitations and state-wide conferences and workshops

Three Categories

The range of interest in the techniques was estimated as follows: 61-84 indicated top perceived priority techniques; 17 - 49 indicated moderate perceived priority techniques; 8 - 9 indicated lower selected priority techniques.

Major Perceived Priority Techniques

Techniques of in-service education which fell into the "top perceived priority techniques" category ranged from 61 - 84 (or from 34% to 46%) and are listed below:

(1) Study groups solving local problems
(2) Bulletins of information helpful to principals
(3) Local workshops conducted by professors, or other consultants
(4) Cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and management techniques
(5) Establishment of procedures for inter-school visitations
(6) State-wide conferences and workshops

*Note: These techniques were chosen the same number of times by the respondents.
Moderate Perceived Priority Techniques

Techniques of in-service education which fell into the "modest interest" category ranged from 17 to 49 responses (or from 9% to 27%) and are listed as follows:

(1) Study groups solving regional problems
(2) Area management and consultant lists
(3) Local workshops conducted by principals
(4) Sabbaticals for research and study
(5) Clinical services for the study of special problems
(6) Study groups solving state-wide problems
(7) Use of principals to teach related college courses
(8) Use of graduate students to work with local principals
(9) Professional reading lists for principals
(10) Involvement in applied research problems
(11) Graduate study done in local school districts
(12) Graduate work at local colleges and universities

Lower Perceived Priority Techniques

Techniques of in-service education which fell into the "lower interest" category ranged from 8 to 9 responses (or from 4% to 5%) and are shown below:

(1) Field studies
(2) Study groups solving state-wide problems
Additional Analysis by Sub-Categories

In order to see if there were different needs and techniques for principals in different categories, an additional analysis was made in the following areas: per pupil expenditures, enrollment of system, and years as principal.

Per Pupil Expenditure

In the per pupil expenditure categories, the principals who were in systems which spent from $600 to $799 were so few (only 15) that no comparisons in this area were made.

$800 - $999 category. Principals in the ($800 - $999) per pupil category chose the following perceived needs in order of priority:

(1) Staff evaluation
(2) Massachusetts school law
(3) Leadership
(4) Staff development
(5) Curriculum development
(6) Innovation and change

$1,000 - $1,199 category. Principals in the ($1,000 - $1,199) per pupil category selected the following perceived needs in order of priority:

(1) Staff evaluation
(2) Curriculum evaluation
(3) Curriculum development
(4) Staff development
(5) Leadership
(6) Massachusetts school law
$1,200 and over category. Principals who were in the ($1,200 and over) category selected the following perceived needs in order of priority:

1. Staff evaluation
2. Staff development
3. Leadership
4. Massachusetts school law
5. Curriculum development
6. Curriculum evaluation

In each of the categories listed, staff evaluation emerged as a top priority. Staff development, leadership, Massachusetts school law, curriculum development, and curriculum evaluation followed in that order. The only noticeable difference was that innovation and change was listed as a major priority for principals in the ($800 - $999) per pupil expenditure category. Additional research would be necessary to respond to the fact that innovation and change was mentioned by principals in the ($800 - $999) per pupil expenditure category.

Size of System

Under 1,000. In the enrollment categories, principals who were in systems under 1,000 pupils selected their perceived needs as shown below by priority:

1. Curriculum development
2. Curriculum evaluation
3. Staff evaluation
4. Leadership
* (5) Staff development, public relations and planning and conducting workshops

1,000 - 4,999. Principals who worked in systems with 1,000 to 4,999 students selected their perceived needs as shown below by priority:

(1) Staff evaluation
(2) Curriculum evaluation
(3) Curriculum development
(4) Massachusetts school law
(5) Staff development

5,000 - 9,999. Principals who worked in systems with enrollments from 5,000 to 9,999 listed their perceived needs by priority in the following manner:

(1) Staff evaluation
(2) Staff development
(3) Curriculum development
(4) Massachusetts school law
(5) Leadership and time management

** (5) Leadership and time management

10,000 - 14,999. Principals who were employed in systems with 10,000 to 14,999 pupils selected their perceived needs by priority in the following manner:

(1) Staff evaluation
(2) Management by objectives

* Note: Each of these areas received the same number of responses.
** Note: Leadership and time management received the same number of responses.
(3) Massachusetts school law

*(4) Leadership, individualized instruction, staff
development and evaluating instructional materials

15,000 and over. Principals employed in systems with over 15,000
students responded by priority in the following way:

(1) Staff development
(2) Leadership

*(3) Innovation and change, staff evaluation, and 766 and the
principal

In view of the responses by each size system by sub-category, we
clearly see that staff evaluation and staff development is given a top
priority rating by each sub-category. Leadership is listed as a top
priority in all but the 1,000 to 4,999 students' group. Public relations
and planning and conducting workshops is seen as a top priority in
school systems with under 1,000 students, yet it is not listed as a top
priority in any of its other size systems. The 766 law is listed as a
top priority with systems of over 15,000 pupils. Finally, all systems
with over 10,000 students did not select curriculum evaluation or
curriculum development as priority needs.

It is probably correct to assume that the reason that public
relations and planning and conducting workshops is perceived as a
priority need in systems under 1,000 students is that these systems
by and large do not have the resources or the expertise to deal
adequately with these two areas. It is also equally correct to assume
that large cities have been more involved and felt greater pressures

*All of these areas received the same number of responses
regarding the 766 law than have many of the smaller communities due to vocal pressure groups and a major concern with establishing large, viable 766 programs in complying with the law, which required much money and many resources. By and large, the 766 law, which mandates children from age 3 to 21 with special needs receive special education to meet the needs as well as being integrated into regular school programs, has presented more problems to large cities with their more complex organizations than it has for the smaller communities.

Systems with over 10,000 students did not select curriculum development and curriculum evaluation as a top priority. This, I'm sure, is partly due to the fact that in larger systems there are specialists who take care of those areas for the systems.

Years as Principal

0 - 5. Principals who had from (1 to 5) years as principal selected their perceived needs as listed below in order of priority:

(1) Staff evaluation  
(2) Staff development  
(3) Leadership  
(4) Current educational research  
 *(5) Curriculum evaluation, innovation and change, time management

6 - 10. Principals who had served from (6 to 10) years listed their perceived needs in the following manner in order of priority:

(1) Staff evaluation  
(2) Curriculum evaluation

*Note: All of these areas received the same number of responses
(3) Curriculum development  
(4) Massachusetts school law  
(5) Staff development  

11 - 15. Principals employed from (11 to 15) years cited their perceived needs as shown below in order of priority:

* (1) Staff evaluation, leadership, Massachusetts school law  
(2) Staff development  
* (3) Curriculum development, staff development, 766 and the principal, time management  

16 and over. Principals who had served over 16 years selected their perceived needs as follows in order of priority:

(1) Staff evaluation  
(2) Staff development  
(3) Curriculum development  
* (4) Curriculum evaluation, Massachusetts school law, time management  

It is interesting to note that principals with varying years of experience all chose staff evaluation as a major priority and mentioned staff development as a major need. It is also worth noting that principals with 0 - 5 years experience felt they needed help in the areas of leadership, current educational research, and innovation and change. Perhaps it is due to some inexperience that principals in the (0 - 5) years category felt they needed additional leadership skills,  

* Note: All of these areas received the same number of responses
and also some up-dating regarding current educational research and
innovation and change.

It has been often said that "principals learn the skills needed
to do their job once they are in the position of a principal,"
consequently in the first few years on the job of principal one is
perhaps operating at the physiological and safety and security needs
as is depicted by Maslow. In other words, the new principal is too
busy trying to stay ahead of the everyday demands of his job, and
trying to learn and manage his time efficiently. Consequently, it is
perhaps true that new principals are more concerned with management
than with leadership; yet they perceive a need for leadership skills,
current educational research and innovation and change.

Techniques to Meet Perceived Needs

Techniques to meet the perceived needs of principals were further
analyzed in the following categories: per pupil expenditure, size of
system, and years as principal.

Per Pupil Expenditure

In the per pupil expenditure categories the principals who were
in systems which spent from $600 to $799 were so few (only 15) that
no comparison in this area was made.

$800 - $999 category. Principals in the ($800 - $999) per pupil
category chose the following techniques in order of priority:

(1) Study groups solving local problems

3 Abraham H. Maslow, Motivation and Personality (New York: Harper
(2) Local workshops conducted by professors and other consultants

(3) Bulletins of information helpful to principals

(4) Establish procedures for inter-school visitation

(5) Develop cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and management techniques

$1,000 - $1,199 category. Principals in the ($1,000 - $1,199) per pupil category chose the following techniques in order of priority:

(1) Local workshops conducted by professors or other consultants

* (2) State-wide conferences and workshops

* (2) Cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and management techniques

* (3) Study groups solving local problems

* (3) Bulletins of information helpful to principals

* (4) Establish procedures for inter-school visitation

* (4) Develop an area management and consultant list

(5) Study groups solving regional problems

$1,200 and over category.

(1) Study groups solving local problems

(1) Bulletins of information helpful to principals

(2) Local workshops conducted by professors or other consultants

(3) Sabbaticals for research and study

* (4) Develop cooperative evaluation teams to study

*Note: Each of these techniques received the same number of responses.
organization and management techniques

*(4) Establish procedures for inter-school visitations
*(5) Develop state-wide conferences and workshops
*(5) Local workshops conducted by principals

In each category local workshops conducted by professors and other consultants, study groups solving local problems, bulletins of information helpful to principals, establish procedures for inter-school visitations, develop cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and management techniques were mentioned as a preferred technique to meet principals' needs. Sabbaticals for research and study and local workshops conducted by principals were mentioned by the principals in the $1,200 per pupil category. In the $1,000 - $1,199 category develop an area management and consultant list and study groups solving regional problems were mentioned.

Size of System

Under 1,000. In the enrollment categories, principals who were in systems under 1,000 pupils selected the following techniques in order of priority:

(1) Bulletins of information helpful to principals
(2) Develop cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and management techniques
(3) Develop state-wide conferences and workshops
*(4) Study groups solving regional problems
*(4) Develop an area management and consultant list.
*(4) Having principals teach related college courses

*Note: Each of these received the same number of responses.
* (4) Sabbaticals for research and study

1,000 - 4,999.

(1) Study groups solving local problems
(2) Local workshops conducted by professors or other consultants
(3) Clinical services for the study of special problems
* (4) Develop cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and management techniques
* (4) Bulletins of information helpful to principals
(5) Establish procedures for inter-school visitations

5,000 - 9,999.

(1) Bulletins of information helpful to principals
(2) Study groups solving local problems
(3) Develop cooperative evaluating teams to study organization and management techniques
(4) Establish procedures for inter-school visitations
(5) Local workshops conducted by professors, or other consultants

10,000 - 14,999.

* (1) Study groups solving local problems
* (1) Local workshops conducted by professors or other consultants
(2) Establish procedures for inter-school visitations
* (3) Bulletins of information helpful to principals
* (3) Develop professional reading list for principals

* Note: Each of these techniques received the same number of responses.
(3) Develop state-wide conferences and workshops
(3) Local workshops conducted by principals

15,000 and over.

(1) Study groups solving local problems
(1) Bulletins of information helpful to principals
(2) Establish procedures for inter-school visitations
(2) Develop state-wide conferences and workshops
(3) Develop cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and management techniques
(3) Sabbaticals for research and study
(3) Using graduate students to work with local principals

In systems under 1,000 study groups solving local problems was not listed as a technique of high priority; however study groups solving regional problems was mentioned. Sabbaticals were rated highly by both school systems under 1,000 and over 15,000. Also systems with under 1,000 mentioned developing an area management and consultant list as a top priority, whereas this was not reflected in any of the other sub-categories.

Years as Principal

0 - 5. Principals who had from 0 to 5 years as principal selected the following techniques in order of priority:

(1) Develop cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and management techniques
(2) Local workshops conducted by professors and other consultants

*Note: Each of these techniques received the same number of responses.
* (3) Study groups solving local problems
* (3) Establish procedures for inter-school visitations
(4) Bulletins of information helpful to principals
* (5) Develop professional reading list for principals
* (5) Develop an area management and consultant list

6 - 10. Principals who had from 6 to 10 years as principal selected the following techniques in order of priority:

(1) Study groups solving local problems
(2) Bulletins of information helpful to principals
(3) Local workshops conducted by professors or other consultants
* (4) Develop cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and management techniques
* (4) Local workshops conducted by principals
* (5) Study groups solving regional problems
* (5) Establish procedures for inter-school visitations
* (5) Develop state-wide conferences and workshops

11 - 15. Principals who had from 11 to 15 years as principal selected the following techniques in order of priority:

(1) Study groups solving local problems
(2) Bulletins of information helpful to principals
(3) Develop cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and management techniques
(4) Establish procedures for inter-school visitations
(5) Local workshops conducted by professors or

* Note: These techniques received the same number of responses.
other consultants

16 and over. Principals who had from 16 years or over as principal selected the following techniques in order of priority:

*(1) Study groups solving local problems
*(1) Local workshops conducted by professors or other consultants
(2) Develop state-wide conferences and workshops
(3) Bulletins of information helpful to principals
(4) Establish procedures for inter-school visitations
(5) Develop cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and management techniques

Principals with from 0 - 5 years experience listed developing an area management and consultant list and developing a professional reading list as a priority whereas none of the other principals rated these highly. Local workshops conducted by principals was given a high rating by principals in the 6 - 10 year category. Local workshops conducted by professors or other consultants was selected by each sub-category, yet in no category did graduate work done at local colleges or universities appear.

Profile of Principals

Eighteen principals (or a 10%) random sampling was taken from the original one hundred and eighty-one respondents. The following profile of the follow-up sample is given as is depicted below. There were seventeen males and one female. Four principals had per pupil

*Note: These techniques received the same number of responses.
expenditures ranging from ($800 to $999). Nine had per pupil expenditures ranging from ($1,000 to $1,199). Five had per pupil expenditures of over ($1,200).

In terms of the enrollment of schools, one principal had from (1 = 249) pupils. Seven had from (250 - 499) pupils. Nine had from (500 = 749) pupils and one had (750) or more pupils.

The size of the system of each principal varied with fifteen principals from systems of (1,000 - 4,999) pupils, two principals with from (5,000 - 9,999) pupils and one principal with over (15,000) pupils.

The principals in the follow-up sample were made up largely of principals who had over eleven years in educational experience. Five had from (11 - 15) years in education, while thirteen had over sixteen years in education.

There were two principals who had from (0 - 5) years experience as a principal, seven who had (6 - 10) years as a principal, seven who had (11 - 15) years as a principal and two who had (16 years or more) as principal.

In terms of degrees held the principals in this follow-up sample held master's degrees on up to the doctorate. There were four principals who held masters degrees with credits beyond the masters but not including the CAGS. Fourteen principals held the CAGS plus credits -- up to forty hours beyond the CAGS.

Additional Analysis

The analysis of the ten percent (10%) follow-up on the original returned questionnaires reveals additional information in response to
the two questions that were posed. Question 1 -- What specifically did you as a principal have in mind when you selected your five choices of perceived needs and assigned your priorities? Question 2 -- What would be your general and/or specific comments about the usefulness of the survey instrument to you?

Analysis of the responses of the eighteen principals revealed that, in regard to question two, there were sixteen (16) responses of "excellent" and two (2) responses of "good." In all eighteen cases the survey instrument was considered to be of significant use for the purpose of the study. In regard to question one -- What specifically did you as a principal have in mind when you selected your five choices and assigned your priorities?, the responses were grouped by the area of perceived in-service needs.

Ten principals in this follow-up sample had leadership as an area of perceived in-service need. Their responses ranged from a general study of leadership theory to leadership styles. One principal felt that he wanted a general study of leadership. Five principals felt the need for a study of different leadership styles. Three principals felt "getting the most out of their staffs through leadership" was their need. And one felt he needs help in discerning "management from leadership" roles.

Several principals selected curriculum development as an area of need. Five principals felt they needed help in the procedures for developing curriculum. One principal wanted to know "how to utilize his staff better in curriculum development." One principal wanted "ideas on how to make the need for curriculum development felt."
Nine principals chose curriculum evaluation as a need. Six wanted help in the "process and instruments" available for curriculum evaluation. One principal wanted help in "how to make the need felt." One wanted very specific information in regard to evaluation instruments available in science and social studies. One principal reflected for a moment and said, "I would like a clarification of the role of the principal in the area of curriculum evaluation."

Individualized instruction was seen as a need by three principals. All three requested in-service education on "methods of implementing individualized instruction." In addition, one principal specifically wanted to know more about individualized guided education (I.C.E.).

Innovation and change was selected by two principals. One wished to know "how to go about gaining public acceptance." The other wanted to know "about some of the successful practices in innovations."

Thirteen principals considered staff evaluation a major area of need. All thirteen stated essentially the same idea -- that they wanted to become familiar with various evaluative ways and instruments so that they might choose the most effective, and, perhaps, the least threatening method of evaluation.

Staff development was seen as a need by four of the sample principals. Two wanted in-service training on "how to develop staff more effectively." And one wished to know how to "identify and head off staff problems." One principal wanted help in developing staff in the specific area of "teacher - pupil interaction."
Management by objectives was selected by two principals. Both wished to obtain objective evidence on the "effectiveness of management by objectives."

766 and the principal was chosen by three of the principals in this sample population. All three felt that the principal had in some strange way been left out of the Chapter 766 law. Consequently they wanted in-service education on "the role of the principal in relation to the implementing of the law."

Only one principal selected public relations as a need. He wanted help in "presenting the school in a favorable light to the public." Budgeting was not selected by any of this sample population. Current educational research was selected by only one principal. He wanted help in finding where to go for current, reliable educational research.

Massachusetts school law was chosen by eight principals as an in-service need. All eight cited the fact that they felt they had been inundated with laws, especially in the last several years, e.g., Chapter 622, 766, bussing, free lunch laws, etc., but had not been given clear direction on how to implement the laws. One principal also wanted more information on "the political ramifications of the new laws."

Group dynamics was selected by six principals. All six felt they could use help in trying to obtain a better understanding of the "mechanics" and "process" of group dynamics so that they might lead group discussions more effectively and also to help their staffs become more effective in this area.
Only one principal felt that humanistic education was a priority need. He wanted help in learning more about how to get his staff totally committed to humanistic education.

Transitional bi-lingual education was not selected as a need by any of these principals in this sample population. 622 and the principal was selected by one principal who wanted more "in-depth understanding of the law and the role of the principal in implementing the law."

Time management was chosen by four of the principals as a need. All four of the principals wanted information on how to manage time more efficiently. However, one of the principals said, "I do not want to exclude myself from dealing with people as a result of this time management."

Evaluating instructional materials was selected by two principals. Both wanted sound information on how best to evaluate materials -- according to current principles, procedures, and instruments.

Planning and conducting workshops was selected by two principals. Both wanted to know more about the mechanics of planning and conducting good workshops. One principal states, "Too many teachers are dissatisfied with in-service workshops as they are now, and rightly so." Only one principal saw a need for training in organization and development technology. He wanted help in better understanding the various types and philosophies of organization currently existing in our schools.

Writing proposals was selected by one principal who felt he needed a "better grounding in how one goes about writing effective proposals."
Six principals selected negotiations as a perceived need. All six wanted to obtain help in techniques and processes of negotiations which would be fair to them as middle managers without alienating superintendents and school committees. Two principals wanted specific proposals on negotiations from other principals.

Summing up the responses of this ten percent (10%) sampling, it can be seen, first, that a majority of these principals seem to have identical needs. Second, a number of principals naturally have very specific requests in terms of a given in-service area. This is certainly understandable if one keeps in mind such variables as geographic area, per pupil expenditure, enrollments of school, size of system, years of experience as principal, and differing educational experience as well as the demands of the community in which each serves as principal.

The overall usefulness of the survey to these principals as a group can perhaps be judged by the comments quoted below.

"One of the better documents I have been asked to fill out."

"This survey hits my priority areas of interest and is quite comprehensive."

"I have filed many surveys in the round file — but I enjoyed filling this one out as it served to start me thinking seriously about my needs."

"This form was to the point. In my busy schedule I don't always get an opportunity to fill these out. They often end up in the wastebasket because they are too long, cumbersome and not relevant. This form is relevant and on target."
"Best of luck in your response rate -- I'm sure due to the nature of the survey you'll hear from most."

"An excellent idea! I hope someone is listening."
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary - Need for In-Service Education

The principal is the crucial implementer of change. That is to say, any proposal for change that intends to alter the quality of life in the school depends primarily on the principal. Then, the case for continuing education for the principal is essential, especially in these times of rapid change in all facets of our society.

The major purpose of this study was to discover the perceived in-service needs of practicing elementary principals in the state of Massachusetts and the perceived techniques to best meet these needs. In addition, this dissertation attempted to discover if elementary principals with varying years of experience as principals perceive their in-service needs differently, if the perceived needs of elementary principals in varying size systems are significantly different, and if the perceived needs of elementary principals in communities with varying per pupil expenditures are different.

In-service education can have an import and impact on the potential growth of elementary principals. However, if in-service education is to be effective, it must start with the needs of those who are to receive it.

The need for in-service education by elementary principals in the state of Massachusetts is clearly demonstrated by the fact that ninety-five percent (95%) of the respondents felt in-service education is needed.

It might well be concluded that the ninety-six percent (96%) response rate, indicated an overwhelming recognition, need and desire for in-service education. At the very least, it shows a significant interest in the area of in-service education for elementary principals.

Other Factors

Other important factors that have come to light as a result of this study are the following:

1. Only fifteen percent (15%) of the principals surveyed were women. This might lead one to conclude that most elementary principals, eighty-five percent (95%), were men and that fewer women, for a variety of reasons, are becoming elementary principals.

2. A majority of elementary principals (98.3%) who hold master's degrees and above feel strongly that in-service education is essential. Perhaps one might conclude that pre-service training was not adequate to meet today's demands on the principship and that pre-service education and in-service education are actually on a continuum and cannot or should not be separated.

3. A majority of principals had over ten years of experience in education and also felt a need for in-service education.
4. Over forty percent (40%) of the respondents had been principals for over ten years, and they felt a need for in-service education.

**Major Areas**

The major areas of in-service education listed as perceived top priority needs were these:

1. Staff evaluation  
2. Curriculum evaluation  
3. Leadership  
4. Staff development  
4. Massachusetts school law

One may also observe that principals in each of the sub-categories of per pupil expenditure, enrollment of system, and years as principal selected the following areas of in-service needs: staff evaluation and staff development. However, not all principals in the sub-categories selected exactly the same needs. Consequently, it seems obvious that we must consider the individual principal's needs in in-service education.

**Major Techniques**

The major techniques listed to serve those needs were the following:

1. Study groups solving local problems  
2. Bulletins of information helpful to principals

*Note: These areas are of equal priority.*
3. Local workshops conducted by professors or other consultants.
4. Cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and management techniques.
*5. Establishment of procedures for inter-school visitations.
*5. State-wide conferences and workshops.

It is quite evident from the responses received that many principals with varying years of experience basically perceived their needs in much the same way. However, principals with from (0 - 5) years experience felt they needed additional leadership skills, as well as help in keeping current in the area of educational research and change.

Some differences were found among principals in varying size systems, in regard to their perceptions of their needs. For example, school systems with under 1,000 students listed public relations and planning and conducting workshops as major priority needs. In systems with over 15,000 pupils, the 766 law and the principal was felt to be an important need.

Finally, in answer to the question, "Are the perceived needs of elementary principals in communities with varying per pupil expenditures different?", we found that elementary principals from systems that spent ($800 - $999) per pupil mentioned innovation and change as a major priority, but other than that their needs were basically identical.

*Note: These areas are of equal priority.
An Unexpected Finding

An unexpected finding of the survey was that one of the least useful techniques for meeting in-service needs was graduate work at local colleges and universities. This technique did not emerge as a priority need in any of the sub-categories of principals. Of 181 principals who responded, only 17 (10.65%) chose this method. This could be due to the fact that many of the principals already hold advanced degrees and had already spent considerable time at colleges and universities. Perhaps they also felt that their time schedules were such that more efficient use of their time would be provided by other techniques of in-service training. Another possibility also exists, namely that colleges and universities are not necessarily meeting principals' perceived needs at this time.

David N. Campbell of the University of Pittsburg, in an article entitled "School of Education: Friend or Foe," touches upon this very point. He mentions the fact that many schools of education are not meeting the real needs of the practical world of practicing educators. He is quick to mention, however, that "There are exceptions." He goes on to say, "Every school of education, including my own, believes it is the exception."  

Local workshops conducted by professors or other consultants was a major technique mentioned. Seventy-four (74) or slightly more than

---
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forty percent (40%) of the principals felt that this was an important technique to use for in-service education.

Somewhat over forty-five percent (45%) of the respondents indicated that bulletins of information were helpful.

Slightly over forty-six percent (46%) selected study groups solving local problems as a means of in-service education.

Another thirty-eight plus percent (38%) selected cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and management techniques.

Finally, thirty-three percent (33%) selected the establishment of procedures for inter-school visitations and for developing state-wide conferences and workshops.

All other techniques fell between twenty-seven percent (27%) and approximately five hundredths of one percent (.05%).

It may be concluded, then, that while every technique was chosen at least eight times, some major techniques of in-service training were felt to be most useful, and other techniques, of little use.

Analysis of the ten percent (10%) follow-up of the original returned questionnaires indicated that principals felt that a study of this nature was important to them. This might be concluded in view of the fact that sixteen (16) principals thought the idea of the study was an excellent one, and two (2) principals thought it was a good idea.

Perhaps the response that best sums up the reaction to this study was offered by one of the principals in this sample population: "An excellent idea -- I hope someone is listening."
Implications of this Study

Since knowledge in today's fast changing world quickly becomes obsolescent, the need for continuing in-service education is evident. In-service education is apparently of major concern to principals in the state of Massachusetts; consequently the agencies providing it must look at the perceived needs of elementary principals and the techniques they themselves have selected as most likely to meet these needs. By doing so, these agencies may be able to do a better job than they are now doing. This is not an indictment of what is being done but rather an observation of possibilities for the future emanating from this study.

Not only should these agencies study this report for more accurate identification of perceived needs and of techniques to meet these needs, but they should follow up and replicate this study for other elementary principals, secondary principals, superintendents of schools, etc.

No research is worth much if its results are not acted upon but merely lie forgotten in some library. This study can and should act as a catalyst for such agencies as the State Department of Education, the Massachusetts Elementary Principals Association, colleges and universities, as well as for other organizations which are truly interested in the area of in-service education of administrators and teachers. The study certainly proves that the people in the field are concerned about in-service education, and this should indicate to these agencies that there are unfulfilled needs to be met. These agencies ought to take this opportunity to satisfy these perceived needs, thus justifying their own raison d'etre, as well as helping administrators everywhere. The eventual benefactors, of course, will be our students.
Recommendations

It is not my intention to recommend major changes in in-service education based on one study. That should be left to other experts. However, I should like to suggest that present in-service education must be closely analyzed and that additional studies must be done in this area, perhaps cooperatively with colleges and universities leading the way and involving all those who have a stake in in-service education. The state department of education, local school systems, consortiums, the Massachusetts Elementary Principals Association, colleges and universities all should play an important part in discovering the needs of principals and what techniques will best satisfy these needs. In terms of further studies, the questions should be raised as to why staff evaluation, curriculum evaluation and curriculum development were selected as major priority needs.

This study, then, should be a beginning and not merely a superficial exercise in research. It was meant to be and it can and should be a place to start. The elementary principals of Massachusetts have signified their interest in in-service education. I would recommend that these other agencies join them in an intelligent, purposeful effort to bring about some obviously needed improvements.

Major Recommendations Based on this Study

The perceived in-service needs of Massachusetts elementary principals and the major techniques which principals felt would meet those needs should be given major priority by colleges, universities, consortiums, the Massachusetts Elementary Principals Association and any other agencies involved in in-service education.
These agencies should replicate this study, and studies similar to this one. If the proper in-service agencies follow up this study with additional research, and the use of their resources and their expertise, valuable dialogue can take place between those who deal with theory and those who put it into practice. With this kind of cooperation and effort, we all stand to learn and grow together. In the final analysis it well might be that together we will have made education relevant for all our children -- and they (the children) will have benefited the most.

Additional Recommendations Based on Personal Opinions, Readings and Research Findings

The following additional recommendations are made as a result of the readings in related research as well as the findings of this study. These recommendations are not made in any specific order, nor are they in order of priority.

1. Keeping principals informed of new information, new research, new techniques is a responsibility of agencies which have a duty for in-service development of educational leaders. This statement was cited by Hollis A. Moore Jr. in Studies in School Administration.

2. In-service agencies need first to attract administrators to in-service offerings, and also to make those offerings realistic, germane and comprehensive. Moore also cited the above statement in Studies in School Administration.
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3. Local principals must create an effective voice to get forces moving which will alleviate the problem of financing in-service education.

4. Principals should partake in in-service education including serious study of research findings without such participation necessarily attached to college credits. Moore again cited evidence in support of the above statement.

5. Consultants need to continue to grow and learn in order to be more effective in working with school principals.

6. In-service education for principals should be tied in more closely with research and problem solving.

7. State, federal and other in-service institutions must continue to establish short-term and long-term goals in terms of resources which are realistic and show foresight.

8. Methods of learning should include case studies and simulated situations. They should also offer opportunities for utilizing social science concepts especially in the area of decision making. Jack Culbertson cited the above in his book Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives.

9. Traditional methods such as lectures and guided reading can be very helpful in providing a base for understanding administrative processes, purposes and technologies. Consequently, such methods should continue to have wide use

---

6 Ibid., p. 98.

in programs. However, their limitations must be kept in mind. They are limited to their capacity for providing students opportunities to generalize perceptively about concrete problems, to engage in decision making, and to take responsibility for making decisions.

10. "Innovations in instructional materials are needed to provide students experiences with policy problems." Culbertson cited this area as a major challenge to in-service agencies.

11. School districts should be used as learning laboratories and field experiences. Colleges and universities need to continue to grow and use the local school districts as a focal point for in-service education. Culbertson stated that "school districts offer outstanding opportunities for studying substantive issues related to policy."

12. Internships should be encouraged and used more frequently as a method of in-service education.

13. The need for in-service education is reinforced by the fact that knowledge is becoming rapidly obsolescent as is described by Alvin Toffler in Future Shock. Consequently, in-service has to become more a part of each school system's policy.

14. Principals must be responsible for obtaining in-service education as part of their professional growth.

15. Not all in-service education needs to be done in the formal setting of a university, nor should it be. This statement is

---

8Ibid. 9Ibid., p. 168.
supported by the fact that elementary principals in this study selected this technique as a low priority.

16. Planning, implementing and evaluating in-service education should include all of those people who are going to be involved; not just those who are conducting in-service education, but those who are receiving it as well. Most experts in the field of in-service education today support this statement completely. Such people as Hollis A. Moore, Jr., Ben M. Harris, Wailand Bessent, Kenneth E. McIntyre, Harold Spears, Jack Culbertson, Steven Hencley, Benjamin Willis and Philip Jackson have all asserted that people who are going to receive in-service should be involved in its planning, implementation and evaluation.

17. Without full participation in planning, implementing and evaluating in-service education, in-service education is not as effective as it should be. This would again be supported by the experts previously mentioned.

18. State-wide in-service education committees should be established and locally these committees should:
   a. assist in planning
   b. identify needs
   c. establish procedures and techniques
   d. arrange for on-going feedback
   e. arrange for evaluation procedures
   f. plan for the future
g. obtain commitment and participation of parents, students, staff, administrators, cooperating agencies, etc.

19. Budgetary considerations should be made in terms of both short-term and long-term goals for in-service education. (Perhaps $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 percent of the state education budget could be allocated for the purpose of in-service education.) Certainly all school systems should allocate monies for in-service education programs.

20. Principals should be encouraged to participate in in-service programs. This may be done by:

a. setting aside money for in-service education
b. setting up master calendars for in-service education
c. allowing principals to be away from their jobs for in-service programs.
d. rewarding principals for in-service educational experiences
e. obtaining commitment from school committees, superintendents, and the public in regard to in-service education
f. selling in-service via public relations in the community; explaining the need for and subsequent rewards of in-service education to all who are concerned.

21. Principals should be encouraged to conduct courses, workshops, etc., for others as a means of sound in-service education.
Nearly (24%) of the principals in this study mentioned this technique.

22. Whenever feasible, in-service programs should be consolidated and coordinated between local school systems, or on a regional and state basis. This can be done by encouraging open communication between school systems.

23. Principals should be encouraged to experiment in areas of in-service education. If principals are to grow, they should not have to fear punishment; but rather they should be encouraged to experiment and not fear failure.

24. A procedure should be established for principals to exchange positions both inside and outside the United States. This could be done on a volunteer basis from time periods of a week up to a year or possibly longer.

25. The use of sabbaticals for research and study with full pay for the purpose of in-service education should be encouraged (and perhaps subsidized through state funds). Slightly over (19%) of the principals in this study mentioned sabbaticals for research and study.

26. Principals should be encouraged to visit other principals on a regular basis as an in-service experience. Thirty-four percent of the principals in this study cited this technique.

27. Doctoral candidates from colleges and universities should be used to follow up in-service education experiences. Perhaps a program similar to the in-service innovator program at the
University of Massachusetts should be established in the area of in-service education for principals.

28. In-service education should start with problems in the field, rather than with theoretical problems.

29. Sound and realistic objectives for in-service programs should be established. (These objectives should be arrived at mutually by all participants.)

30. The responsibility for professional growth should be shifted to the principals themselves. They must assess their own strengths and weaknesses and determine the directions for their growth. (This might well be done through a process of self-evaluation.)

31. In-service education must be relevant. It must improve the performance of the principal, his staff, and ultimately his students. If this goal is not achieved then in-service programs are ineffective and wasteful.

32. In-service education must be approached realistically. Major changes do not take place overnight.

33. A good in-service education program should acquaint all staff and school committee members with related literature on the change process and the natural resistance to change.

34. In-service education should be an individualized experience whenever it is feasible. The results of this study indicated there were many individual needs of principals which need to be met.
35. Study groups should be encouraged and financed to study local and regional problems. Local study groups were cited by almost (45%) of the principals in this study as a major technique for meeting in-service needs.

36. More use should be made of local workshops conducted by professors and other consultants. Almost (41%) of the principals surveyed mentioned this technique.

37. Bulletins of information helpful to principals should continue to be developed and provided. Almost (41%) of the principals in this study survey mentioned this technique.

38. Cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and management should be utilized more frequently. Approximately (39%) of the principals in this study cited this technique.

39. Development of area management and consultant list should be continued. Nearly (26%) of the principals in this study selected this technique.

40. Local workshops conducted by principals should be encouraged. Almost (24%) of the principals in this study mentioned this technique.

41. The entire administration in a school system should be included (whenever feasible) in the same in-service program. Fleishman \(^{10}\) and others strongly recommend this.

42. Good in-service programs must start with an assessment of the needs of those for whom the program is designed. Needs

---

assessment is a logical problem solving tool by which we can locate problem areas and consequently focus in on needs areas.

43. The principles that have proven effective in existing in-service education programs should be used as a guide for future in-service education.

44. New models of in-service education must continue to be developed, keeping in mind the preceding guidelines.

45. The Continuous Growth Model of in-service education (which I have developed) might be one way to bring about more effective in-service education. This model starts with the needs of the recipients and provides for cooperative and continuous feedback at each stage. Figure 2 depicts the Continuous Growth Model of in-service education.
FIG. 2. Continuous Growth Model
Cyclical Feedback Model for Establishing
In-Service Program

1. Needs assessment—devise instrument to locate needs and establish priorities.
2. Cooperatively develop objectives, includes recipients of in-service program, parents, students, administrators, taxpayers.
3. Cooperatively develop budget.
4. Gain commitment to objectives by board of education and community.
5. Be sure people are ready for implementation.
6. Utilize resources and implement program.
7. Obtain feedback and evaluate program.
8. Modify program as needed.
9. Do another needs assessment.
A Final Note

As we view the meaning and function of in-service education we quickly come to realize that:

1. In-service education is a process for change.
2. In-service education is a process for planned change.
3. In-service education is but one of several organizational changes and takes place through personnel development. 11

However, all those involved in the area of in-service education must come to grips with the realities of the change process as well as the models of in-service programs that are available today.

We must recognize that as of this date no one model of in-service education has been designated as "the model" for training principals. Most in-service programs succeed in changing knowledge but fall far short in changing behaviors in an effective way.

![Diagram showing the relationship between Organizational Behavior, Individual Behavior, Attitudes, Knowledge, Time Involved, and Difficulty.](image)

FIG. 3. Time and Difficulty in Making Change

---

Blanchard and Hersey\textsuperscript{12} explain that there are four basic levels of change as depicted in Figure 3: (1) Knowledge Changes; (2) Attitude Changes; (3) Individual Behavior Changes; and (4) Group or Organizational Changes.

A major reason for the failure of existing programs of in-service education to make effective changes in behavior is the time element involved. Consequently, good in-service programs must take this extremely important factor of time into account and devise a means also for dealing with follow-up to in-service education. One excellent way to do this is to make better use of doctoral students to get them involved in in-service education, and to have them implement theories into action and evaluate the change efforts of principals.

Finally, this research goes beyond the actual work involved in reading related literature, establishing methods, collecting and analyzing data, and reaching conclusions about the study. It offers hope for the principals who participated in it and for other principals as well. It demonstrates the overwhelming interest of principals in the area of in-service education. It reaffirms again and again that any sound in-service program must start with the needs of those who are to receive it. The principals who participated in this study have indicated that they want to grow. They are now awaiting help from those agencies which have the expertise and resources to aid them in achieving the kind of in-service education which meets their needs today.
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APPENDIX I

SURVEY TO ASCERTAIN THE PERCEIVED IN-SERVICE NEEDS OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS IN THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS
SURVEY TO ASCERTAIN THE PERCEIVED IN-SERVICE NEEDS OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS IN THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Name: ______________________________________ Age: ______ Sex: M  F

Community: ____________________________ School:

Circle One Of The Following:

Enrollment of School:  (1-249)  (250-499)  (500-749)  (750 and over)

Size of System:  (Under 1,000)  (1,000-4,999)  (5,000-9,999)  
(10,000-14,999)  (15,000 and over)

Years of Experience as Principal:  (0-5)  (6-10)  (11-15)  (16 and over)

Total Years of Experience in Education:  (0-5)  (6-10)  (11-15)  
(16 and over)

Highest Degree Held or Number of Hours Beyond Masters Degree: __________

Items To Be Considered By Respondents:

Is there a need for in-service training of elementary principals?  
Circle One:  yes  no

If your answer is no, there is no need to complete the rest of this form.  
If your answer is yes, please circle only five choices in this next section and number according to priority.

Areas of perceived in-service needs as it relates to elementary principals:

1. Leadership
2. Curriculum Development
3. Curriculum Evaluation
4. Individualized Instruction
5. Innovation and Change
6. Differentiated Staffing
7. Staff Evaluation
8. School Organization
9. Staff Development
10. Management by Objectives
11. 766 and The Principal
12. Public Relations
13. Budgeting
15. Massachusetts School Law
16. Group Dynamics
17. Humanistic Education
18. Transitional - Bi-Lingual Education
19. 622 and The Principal
20. Time Management
21. Evaluating Instructional Materials
22. Planning and Conducting Workshops
23. Organization and Development Technology
24. Writing Proposals
25. Negotiations

Please circle only five choices from the following list and number according to priority.

Techniques of in-service needs of elementary principals may best be served by:

1. Study Groups solving local problems (Example: district problems)
2. Study Groups solving regional problems (Example: Eastern, Western part of State)
3. Study Groups solving state-wide problems
4. Study Groups solving universal problems (Example: relating to national or international)
5. Develop cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and management techniques
6. Develop bulletins of information helpful to principals
7. Involvement in applied research problems
8. Develop professional reading list for principals
9. Develop an area management and consultant resource list
10. Establishing procedures for inter-school visitations
11. Develop state-wide conferences and workshops
12. Graduate work at local colleges and universities
13. Local workshops conducted by principals
14. Local workshops conducted by professors or other consultants
15. Graduate study done at local school districts
16. Sabbaticals for research and study
17. Using graduate students to work with local principals
18. Having principals teach related college courses
19. Clinical services for the study of special problems
20. Doing field studies
APPENDIX II

INITIAL LETTER
5 Deborah Street
Palmer, Massachusetts 01069
December 1, 1975

Dear Principal:

As a fellow principal, I can appreciate your busy time schedule. As professionals, we are all asked to do many additional chores; however, the attached list will only take a few minutes of your time and will be invaluable to you as a fellow administrator.

I am trying to ascertain two things in this questionnaire:

1. What are your perceived in-service needs?

2. What techniques can best be utilized to service these needs?

The attached form was developed by a M.E.S.P.A. Study Group and reviewed by the M.E.S.P.A. Executive Board at the 1975 Pittsfield Conference.

The results of this report will be made known to you through your M.E.S.P.A. Newsletter. The results shall be distributed to M.E.S.P.A., MACE and the State Department of Education.

This information should aid these organizations in helping to solve your in-service needs.

We need a 100% response for this study to be effective in serving you and our M.E.S.P.A. Organization. Please return the survey today. It will take you but a few minutes to fill out but will be invaluable to you and our study. Please return by December 5, 1975.

Thanks in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ronald J. Laviolette
Chairman of the M.E.S.P.A.
Study Groups

Robert McCarthy
President of M.E.S.P.A.
APPENDIX III

FOLLOW-UP LETTER
December 11, 1975

Dear

A few days ago you received a letter and a survey form that you were asked to complete and return to me. Perhaps it slipped your mind or was misplaced; consequently, I am sending you another survey form.

Would you please fill out the form and return it promptly as we need your survey form to be sure that we are obtaining proper feedback which will aid all of us to obtain more effective in-service programs.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ronald J. Laviolette
Chairman of the M.E.S.P.A.

Robert McCarthy
President of M.E.S.P.A.

RJL:je

P.S. If I do not hear from you in a few days, I shall contact you by telephone in order to find out why you chose not to reply.

RJL
APPENDIX IV

MESPA NEWSLETTER ARTICLE
NOVEMBER 1975
State Study Group Chairman Ronald Laviolette will soon be taking a random sampling of principals to ascertain their perceived in-service needs and techniques to meet these needs.

This list was developed as an outgrowth of Study Groups 2 and 5 workshops which were funded by MESPA.

The rationale for this study is listed below:

1. MESPA should make clear to local, state and National officials as well as colleges and universities the need for in-service by principals

2. In-Service education should emerge from recognized needs of Elementary Principals

3. All principals need in-service education

4. Improving instruction is concomitant with in-service education

5. In-service education is most effective when participants are involved in establishing their needs

It is imperative that anyone who receives the survey return it so that we can best serve the needs of principals through the state.

This survey will take several minutes to complete but is extremely important to us all.

The results of the survey will be published in the MESPA Newsletter.
APPENDIX V

PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE
## Per Pupil Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCEIVED NEEDS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TOT.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TOT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TOT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX VI

ENROLLMENT OF SCHOOL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENROLLMENT OF SCHOOL</th>
<th>PERCEIVED NEEDS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TOT.</th>
<th>TECHNIQUES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TOT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TOT.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TOT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX VII

SIZE OF SYSTEM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCEIVED NEEDS</th>
<th>TOT.</th>
<th>TECHNIQUES</th>
<th>TOT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX VIII

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS PRINCIPAL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCEIVED NEEDS</th>
<th>TOT.</th>
<th>TECHNIQUES</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TOT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS PRINCIPAL
APPENDIX IX

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD
## Highest Degree Held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TOT.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TOT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX X

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATION
YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS OF EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>PERCEIVED NEEDS</th>
<th>TECHNIQUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX XI

TOTAL RESPONSES
I
TOTAL RESPONSES

Items To Be Considered By Respondents:

Is there a need for In-service Training of Elementary Principals?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>172</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>Areas of perceived in-service needs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1. Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>2. Curriculum Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>3. Curriculum Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4. Individualized Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>5. Innovation and Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6. Differentiated Staffing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>7. Staff Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8. School Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>9. Staff Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>10. Management by Objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>11. 766 and The Principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>12. Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13. Budgeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>15. Massachusetts School Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>16. Group Dynamics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17. Humanistic Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18. Transitional - Bi-Lingual Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19. 622 and The Principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>20. Time Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>21. Evaluating Instructional Materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>22. Planning and Conducting Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>23. Organization and Development Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>24. Writing Proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>25. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX XII

TOTAL RESPONSES
II
TOTAL RESPONSES

II

In-service needs of Elementary Principals may best be served by:

Responses

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>1. Study groups solving local problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2. Study groups solving regional problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3. Study groups solving state-wide problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4. Study groups solving universal problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>5. Develop cooperative evaluation teams to study organization and management techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>6. Develop bulletins of information helpful to principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7. Involvement in applied research problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>8. Develop professional reading list for principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>9. Develop an area management and consultant resource list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>10. Establishing procedures for inter-school visitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>11. Develop state-wide conferences and workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>12. Graduate work at local colleges and universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>13. Local workshops conducted by principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>14. Local workshops conducted by professors, or other consultants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15. Graduate study done at local school districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>16. Sabbaticals for research and study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>17. Using graduate students to work with local principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>19. Clinical services for the study of special problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>20. Doing field studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>