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ABSTRACT

This thesis reports a study of recent UK provision for the training of primary school headteachers, carried out as a basis for informing recent initiatives in the training of school principals in Turkey, with which the author is involved.

The thesis starts by describing this context and reviewing recent UK developments in school headship role under the influence of increasing concern with school effectiveness and improvement. A conceptual framework for professional development provision is proposed and this is used this to examine the HEADLAMP and NPQH national programmes recently introduced by the DfEE/TTA for headship training.

Given a lack of published evaluations of these programmes, a knowledge-building, developmental (Chelimsky, 1997) investigation was designed and conducted into HEADLAMP and NPQH participants' views of the processes and impact of these programmes. The main methodology used was anonymous postal questionnaires, selectively followed up by telephone interviews in a small number of cases. An attempt was made to gain access to the entire cohort of headteachers and deputy headteachers involved in the 1997 programmes by way of their local education authorities, and this gave a final sample of 101 responses (53 headteachers, 48 deputy heads), a return rate of 67 percent, as the basis for data analysis.

General trends included the findings that participants were positive concerning the nature of the training provision, but (a) deputy heads in particular expressed serious concern about the need for realistic support to engage in headship training whilst continuing to fulfil their existing posts; (b) participants emphasised the importance of also including training provision situated within real school contexts; (c) they emphasised the importance of quality of local implementation.

In the context of other recent papers on these programmes, recent alterations to them by the TTA and a critical reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of the present investigation, possible implications for the UK and Turkish situations were discussed.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

This study is concerned with the nature and impact of training provision for exis-
tive primary headteachers in England, particularly those undertaking the He-
Leadership and Management Programme (HEADLAMP) and National Pro-
Qualification for Headteachers (NPQH) training programmes. In this open-
contextual factors and a rationale for the study are discussed.

The Study

The research was felt to be needed for two reasons. Firstly, during the research-
studentship at the University of Leeds School of Education, the Turkish Ministry
Education (MONE) proposed to launch training for school principals in Tur-
initiative was of central interest to both my Faculty of Education at Ankara Unive-
the National Education Development Project that was funding the studen-
troduction of NPQH training and the further development of HEADLAMP wer-
opportunity to inform the new Turkish principal training programme. It was the
understanding of aspects of training as developed for English headteache-
informative with respect to training strategies for school principals in Turkey;
school principals there did not receive any form of training support. Therefor-
good opportunity for the researcher to learn more about the British experience i
for his involvement in the new Turkish initiative.

Secondly, although in England and Wales there are approximately 20,950 hea-
16,180 deputy headteachers with a management function in primary schools (1)
and even though the literature seems to focus upon primary school ma-
leadership, no study has been conducted into training for primary headteachers
England, in contrast to the secondary headship area. Whilst this literature me-
for training, it made little mention of the nature of the training required. How-
introduced national headship training in the form of the HEADLAMP (19
opportunity for a study of such training
gramme and had a diagnostic and formative function rather than any summative regarding outcomes of the programme. To date no such evaluation has been ing.

1. Of the Study

lish context

h primary schools, the key person with school management responsibility is the er although deputy headteachers and to a lesser extent classroom teachers will also management role. Equally, all will have teaching responsibility, and for head teachers ties this will depend on the size of the school or the attitude of the head to classroom is makes their roles multi-dimensional and complex.

lishment of comprehensive schooling, the raising of the school-leaving age, the size and complexity of schools in the 1970s, all pointed to a growing need for ers, in particular, to become more competent and effective managers of schools. forms in the 1980s, particularly the 1988 Education Reform Act and, within it, Local ent of Schools (LMS) and the implementation of the National Curriculum have he responsibilities of managers. As a result of these rapid changes, the demands for ndards and calls from the government to improve the quality of teaching and learning ;, professional development and in-service training have attracted increased attention years.

staff-development programmes for teachers and management training for ers and senior promoted staff in primary and secondary schools have been available years, it was not until 1995 that the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) national were launched.

lish Context

in Turkey is undergoing great change in many areas. In comparison with the locuation system, the Turkish education system is much more highly centralised. One jor changes in recent years was the “Eight Years Compulsory Education Reform”.
Until recently, in Turkey the need for management training for school principals was not seen as urgent as the job was seen to be essentially educational, especially since many of the specifically managerial functions, such as personnel and financial management, the national curriculum, selecting and recruiting teaching and non-teaching staff were performed by the Ministry of National Education (MONE). The general view about management training was that it was not necessarily important and there was no constitutional liability for teachers or school principals to gain a management qualification or training/education. The Turks have a common saying "meslekte esas olan ődretmenilik" that is "being a class teacher is sufficient for professionalism". Thus, it was assumed that school principals were able to run their schools with little training or no training (Taymaz, 1989; Bursalioglu, 1994). However, this has changed with the implementation of the eight-year compulsory education system. Consequently, it is likely the number of primary students and staff in a given school will increase, thereby creating more problems to deal with.

In the past, in the Turkish education system, school principals were generally appointed by a selection process from successful teachers or deputy heads. According to MONE (1997) depending on the type of schools [A: Large; B: Medium, C: Small size school], candidates must have at least 3 to 8 years teaching experience with some managerial roles and appropriate qualifications such as PhD, MEd degrees or must attend in-service training programmes to gain management capability etc. However, in fact it was hard to find many school principals with an MEd, PhD or other qualifications, since the above requirements are just "on paper" and it was difficult to find people to fill these posts.

According to Taymaz (1989), the values and the roles of teachers and educational managers including principals were not properly defined. In most cases school principals are put into the same category as educational managers, therefore there is a problem in the system, because in Turkey school management has not been accepted as a profession. The mixture of these roles and values has resulted in a type of "teacher-manager", thus a person who trained as a teacher has to play two different roles and hold different values. As a result of the above issues and because of other political reasons, Turkey has a problem with a lack of skilled/competent educational managers in the MONE and among the provinces and principals in schools.

As Balci claims (1988), until recently when talking about the training for school principals and educational managers, there was actually no compulsion to be trained or have a degree in the field of educational management or school management. To be appointed for a managerial
position, all that was required is to be a serving teacher. There were many criticisms concerning the appointment process, for instance, accusations that political connections tended to be involved in appointments and dismissals at school principal level.

In addition, National Education Basic Law No.1739, para.43 of 1973 defined teaching as a profession and stated that “teachers are responsible for fulfilling their teaching and training roles for the government as well as their managerial roles”. In short, until recently it has still been the practice in Turkey not to have training centres or institutions to train school principals. On the one hand, the same Bill [No.1739] states that teachers are able to perform educational and managerial roles in schools, and teachers would be prepared for their teaching role through general knowledge, subject knowledge and pedagogical formation. On the other hand, it is clear that Basic Law No.1739 does not give very much consideration to any preparation for educational or school management roles (Bursalı oglu, 1994; Balço, 1988).

**Turkish Professional Development Programme for School Principals**

In the past, only a small number of school principals in Turkey were able to attend short term in-service training courses. On 23rd September 1998 MONE introduced an article, No.23742 under which, for the first time, there was set up official training provision in educational management. Aspiring school principals who have a five-year teaching experience could take a course selection test at national level. This test covers Turkish Language and Composition, Principals of Atatürk, History of the Turkish Republic, and Public Management and Related Issues. It does not deal with school management as such. The successful candidates would receive a three-week (total 120 hours) training course at any of 24 Training and Development Centres generally run by higher education institutions. Alternatively, according to Article No.23742, teachers who have a masters degree in the field of educational management and administration can be appointed as a principal without taking this exam, but they must attend this in-service training course.

The MONE introduced this three-week (15-working day) development course in February 1999. The programme aims to improve the professional knowledge and understanding of school principals and those educational administrators working in the MONE and in the provinces. The candidates were selected from among aspiring school principals and teachers: 35,000 people applied for the course. All the candidates completed the selection test and from them 1612 candidates were found to be suitable.
MONE is in charge of deciding the content of the course and which HEIs will be providing this course, though it leaves decision concerning the timing, training materials, training activities and trainers to the HEIs.

The MONE determined the programme content without any consultation with universities and other educational institutions. The programme is to contain the following modules:

1. Management and its Functions
2. Functioning of Public Administration
3. Change and Innovation
4. School Management and the Principal
5. Monitoring and Evaluation
6. Personnel Development
7. Team Work
8. Theories and Methods of Teaching and Learning
9. Regulations
10. Contemporary Approaches to Management
11. Total Quality Management
12. Skills of Communication and Social Interactions
13. Democracy and Human Rights
14. Relationship between school its, Environment and Community
15. Decision-making and Implementation
16. Resource Management

After completion of these sixteen modules, candidates are given another academic test: they are only appointed to a headship if they reach a cut-off score in this test and the size of school they will lead depends on the marks they attain above this cut-off. Appointment to larger schools requires higher scores.

The programme is new and still at the development stage, so it is difficult to make informed comment on the programme contents or the success of implementation. Nevertheless, for a 15-day course there is a lot to cover, and it appears anecdotally that there is not enough time
for practical training and application. Although this national training is a module-based course, there is no general training material such as seminar books written or developed by MONE, other than those developed by Ankara University/The Faculty of Educational Sciences. In other centres the candidates are suggested to read and buy many textbooks during the three-week training. According to Balci (1988) there is a tendency for the specific content of these programmes to be weak and not research based; most of it copied from the university programmes of other developed countries and based on general management theories.

Faculties of education have been asked to provide this training for school principals and all the trainers have in fact been lecturers from the universities. Some universities could not cover some of the modules with their own staff, so they employed lecturers from different universities. In addition, most of the lecturers involved have no experience as a school principal. Therefore, on the basis of prescribed content and the kinds of personnel involved in providing the courses, we might doubt that this new provision will be adequate from a practical point of view.

Another set of issues with this course concerns the needs assessment and evaluation processes. As mentioned earlier, before attending the course candidates take an exam, but they do not undergo any other assessment before the training starts. Just before the course is due to finish, MONE distributes questionnaires to candidates to evaluate their training in terms of the training materials, effectiveness of the trainers, and content, organisational arrangements including timing, funding, and accommodation. MONE also asks candidates whether the Training and Development Centres identified their training needs. Since it is a three-week course (15 working days) and the content is already determined by MONE, it is difficult to see how there is time to adequately assess the training needs of the candidates and to cover the prescribed content, and still less to adapt the course to the candidates’ needs.

As also indicated, the final examination following the course is based on education system theory and lacks practical aspects. There is also no interview before people are appointed to headship posts. There is no other form of assessment process in the Turkish context.

Given all this, it is difficult to see that these programmes will be regarded as functional and systematic among educational managers, or even by the MONE. The above-mentioned issues seem to indicate that Turkey is still in need of a lot of work to design systematic opportunities for the effective training of school principals.
These doubts are partially confirmed by a recent study by Karip and Köksal (1999), who investigated the perceptions of trainees about the selection process (which was a standard test consisting of 100 questions), how the course is planned and executed, timing of the course (which is a three-week being away from the school) and who will be in charge of the final assessment (the Training and Development Centres or MONE). The main concerns of the trainees can be summarised as follows:

- 76% of the candidates thought that there should not be an assessment test shortly after the training. If there is an assessment then there should be adequate time for preparation.

- A small majority of the trainees (52%) thought that the course should be spread over a long term period.

- 79% of the trainees thought that school principals should be selected from among teachers who have teaching experience and have a masters degree in the field of educational administration and management.

In summary, Article No 23742 can be seen as a starting point in the systematic training of school principals in Turkey. The 15-day training course is theory-based and so is the end-of-course assessment, and the needs assessment aspect seems weak. So far more than 5000 trainees have attended this course, but there has been no formal evaluation of the success of these courses.

**Aims of the Research and Thesis Outline**

In this situation, it might have been desirable to make an evaluation study of the new Turkish course provision for headship preparation in educational management, but this was not possible from a practical point of view. However, at the point I began my doctoral studentship national initiatives in the area of training for school headship had just been introduced in the UK. Although it would be necessary to keep in mind possibly important cultural differences between the Turkish and British contexts, I and my sponsors nevertheless thought that it could be useful to study the nature and impact of the new British provisions for headship training to in order to provide the MONE with formative information as a basis for the planning of school principal training programmes in Turkey. The study, therefore, has three aims:

- To examine the historical context and recent development of thinking and provision in England with respect to training for school headship
• To gather empirical evidence concerning the impact of the new TTA programmes for headship training (HEADLAMP and NPQH)

• To consider possible implications of the above information and evidence for the training of school principals in Turkey

The remainder of the thesis tries to achieve these aims through the following chapters:

Chapter two discusses the role of headteachers in English primary schools and examines influences on its development.

Chapter three discusses the historical background and current status of provision regarding primary headship training in England.

Chapter four focuses on aspects of the nature of professional development and provides a framework to assist discussion of development processes and the planning and evaluating of professional development provision.

Chapter five describes the aims, research design and methodology of a questionnaire and interview study of the impact of HEADLAMP and NPQH on a sample of recent participants.

Chapter six reports the data analysis and findings of this empirical study.

In the final chapter seven, the empirical study and its findings are critically discussed for their possible implications in relation to headship training in England and Turkey.
CHAPTER TWO
THE ROLE OF THE PRIMARY HEAD IN ENGLAND

The role of the primary headteacher and influences on the role's development are discussed in this chapter. Influences are many-fold; some direct and immediate, some more complex and long term. New legislation has the most obvious and forceful impact on the role of headteachers and deputies, whether that impact is due to the volume of changes or to their nature, it can result in shifts in emphasis and priority in workload and role. Combined with legislative changes other developments also exert influence: a strong focus in the education system on management and leadership has developed in the last 20 years or so; the policymakers having turned their gaze to school effectiveness and school improvement. Never before has the headteacher been seen to be so crucial to the success of educational provision and to the economic and social well-being of the nation. This expansion of the job, and roles within it, is of central importance to this study, as the above changes have also brought developments relating both to a perceived need for systematic training for prospective and existing headteachers and to the form of that training. With this in mind we now look at these changes in more detail.

System and Legislative Changes

If schools are to ensure their future success then they must continually adapt to the demands of change. Change is most often imposed from outside an organisation, and in the case of schools changes usually come from the government albeit often via the LEA. However, the concerns of other stakeholders have also brought about some degree of change. For example, changing parental expectations, although driven partly by centrally introduced ideas (e.g. open enrolment and parental choice), have also played their part.

Since the 1970s there have been many changes in the English education system, most of which have affected the role of the headteacher as they have led to an inevitable increase in managerial responsibilities and as a result an enormous change in daily life. For example, during the period from the 1970s onwards a profound change took place in central government's role in educational policy-making. It began in late 1976 with the Labour Government and has continued uninterrupted with Conservative administrations since 1979 and Labour since 1997.
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System and Legislative Changes

If schools are to ensure their future success then they must continually adapt to the demands of change. Change is most often imposed from outside an organisation, and in the case of schools changes usually come from the government albeit often via the LEA. However, the concerns of other stakeholders have also brought about some degree of change. For example, changing parental expectations, although driven partly by centrally introduced ideas (e.g. open enrolment and parental choice), have also played their part.

Since the 1970s there have been many changes in the English education system, most of which have affected the role of the headteacher as they have led to an inevitable increase in managerial responsibilities and as a result an enormous change in daily life. For example, during the period from the 1970s onwards a profound change took place in central government's role in educational policy-making. It began in late 1976 with the Labour Government and has continued uninterrupted with Conservative administrations since 1979 and Labour since 1997.
There was increasing public criticism of schools in the 1970s, especially from certain industrialists and politicians. England had invested generously in education in the 1960s and yet the rewards were not immediately apparent. The criticism coincided with a sudden oil crisis in the mid 1970s, and reached its climax in the period of massive de-industrialisation accompanied by mass unemployment. Industrialists seemed to avoid blame by claiming schools were failing to produce young people with the skills required by industry. So a widespread attack and critique was mounted against schools, including the teachers, headteachers and local authorities responsible for the education of children. (Simon, 1988; Trowler, 1996)

In October 1976 the Labour Prime Minister James Callaghan made a famous speech (Great Debate) at Ruskin College Oxford attacking schools and colleges for being out of touch with the changing industrial world. One of the main concerns voiced in the “Great Debate” was Britain’s declining industrial competitiveness compared to Germany, the USA and Japan. This speech is considered as marking the start of a serious campaign to make the education system more responsive to industry and economic needs, and above all to make schools more “accountable” to parents, to the public and to government. “The intention was to shake the system into line” (Trowler, 1996). The speech also brought school curriculum and performance onto the political stage of central government. An assertion of a link between the quality of leadership and school success emerged as an early main topic of debate, even though Callaghan did not directly refer to this. However, at the time he spoke, the received view was that the running of schools was safely entrusted to what was called “the headmaster tradition”.

Over the last twenty years, various Acts of Parliament and government directives have moved the focus of educational management away from the LEAs to individual schools. With the introduction of the 1986 Education Act No: 2 and the Education Reform Act 1988 (ERA) and within it, Local Management of Schools (LMS), additional responsibilities were given to governing bodies and inevitably to headteachers.

1986 Education Act No:2

A main characteristic of the 1986 Education Act and more recent legislation was the extension of school governors' power. It had elements of transferring power from Local Education Authority (LEA) to governors in appointing staff, including the headteacher. The Act distributed places on the governing body almost equally among parents, the LEA, teaching
staff, and the local community. It also included details on the school curriculum, which was to be agreed between the LEA, the governing body and the headteacher by a set procedure that included a duty to keep parents fully informed. Finally, the conflict since the mid 1970s over the distribution of powers between LEA, governors and headteachers seems to have been settled (Gilbert, 1990; Tomlinson, 1993).

The Education Reform Act 1988

The 1988 Education Reform Act (ERA) is arguably the most wide-ranging piece of educational legislation since the 1944 Education Act. It has played a very important role in the changing role of the headteacher in England. Dunford and Sharp (1990) described its main characteristics as follows:

The 1988 Education Reform Act changed the basic power structure within the education service. It increased central government’s control of the system by spelling out the powers of the Secretary of State...At the same time it also took powers away from the LEAs and gave those powers to the schools and colleges, mainly through increasing the authority of governing bodies. [Dunford & Sharp, 1990: 39]

Later as a result of her research Webb (1994) was able to describe how the ERA had an effect on schools.

The ERA has forced major changes to be rapidly implemented, placing many additional demands on schools. Alongside implementing the National Curriculum and its associated assessment arrangements, schools have had to come to terms with local financial management, additional governor powers, providing school-based INSET, teacher appraisal, competing in the market place for pupils as a result of open enrolment and, most recently, preparation for OFSTED inspections. [Webb, 1994:5]

Any decisions made by the Secretary of State or the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) have direct and indirect repercussions on the headteacher who, as the leader of the school, plays the most significant role, tends to be the first to be informed about any changes and holds responsibility for implementation.

The National Curriculum

The curriculum in the form of the National Curriculum became, for the first time, centrally controlled. This is significant because in so doing the balance of power over the curriculum shifted to the government. Heaton and Lawson (1996) see the introduction of the National Curriculum as an attempt to control the content of education nationally, the impact of which is felt by headteachers who have the management of teaching and learning and the
implementation of the curriculum as part of their curriculum leader role. Indeed, research on
the role of primary school headteachers shortly after the implementation of the ERA reveals
fears that increasing pressure from management and administration would have the effect of
diluting the headteachers' curriculum leadership role (Webb and Vulliamy, 1996a: 117).

Another fundamental change was the introduction of "national assessment". This involves
standardised assessment tests (SATs) in each of the core and foundation subject at the ages of
7,11,14 and public examination at 16, details being found in section 2 of the National
Curriculum and Assessment (Dunford and Sharp, 1990). SATs are used as a way to monitor
school standards and to keep parents informed of their child's progress. Again, the
headteacher has a leading role in improving the results of these tests by working in
collaboration with the teaching and non-teaching staff and parents.

By the mid 1990s "league tables" of schools were introduced in England. This also had the
impact of increasing the responsibilities of both headteachers and teachers. The results of
tests and public examinations at the ages of 7,11,14, and 16 are compiled into "league tables"
of schools, giving parents information about how a school is performing. The results are
considered by politicians as indication of a school's effectiveness. Through the league-tabling
of examination results, parents are purportedly able to identify "successful" schools. In
addition, the introduction of "league-tables" and testing arrangements has forced headteachers
to place emphasis on higher results and in many cases encouraged teachers to "teach to the
test". (Elliot and MacLennan: 1994, in Heaton and Lawson:1996). As a consequence,
headteachers may have to place emphasis on this aspect of schooling in a effort to ensure their
school achieves better results in the league tables. Such work not only entails all the
administrative tasks associated with the national testing programme, but also includes
managing the added pressures of dealing with high profile accountability mechanisms, the
impact of which has the potential to affect the daily lives and morale of teachers and pupils.

It is not an simple task for a head to manage and to take control over the curriculum and other
innovations. To achieve this difficult task, headteachers have adopted several strategies
(Wallace, 1992). They have adapted or developed the management structure of their schools,
delegated responsibilities to deputy heads and curriculum co-ordinators, encouraged whole
school planning and accountability among all staff. As summarised in an OFSTED discussion
paper:

The curriculum management role alone involves "a formidable list of
responsibilities", including a great deal of focused discussion about the curriculum
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with colleagues; leading, and contributing to staff and team meeting; developing and reviewing policies; analysing assessment data and children’s work; observing teachers and children at work; consulting members of the governing body and others with a concern for the work of the school; keeping up-to-date with local and national curriculum documentation; and, very importantly, finding time to reflect upon progress and the direction of the work. [OFSTED, 1994: 9]

Similarly, the research by Webb (1994: 2) revealed the tremendous pressure of work felt by headteachers as a result of the introduction of National Curriculum and procedures for assessment, recording and reporting pupil progress. Consequently, providing support and encouragement and protecting teachers from possible criticism from parents and governors, has become another important part of headship.

Local Management of Schools (LMS)

As a result of the 1988 ERA and of the devolution of administrative control in education, financial matters have become increasingly important for the educational administrators at the local level. School governors and headteachers have started dealing with financial issues as part of their educational administrative roles. They are now responsible for the local management of schools, including the budget and hiring and firing of staff; and the opportunity for schools to opt out of LEA control. At the time of writing, they are also given direct control of at least 80 percent of their school budget (Heaton and Lawson, 1996). The budget is determined by the size of the school roll and therefore one of the effects of LMS is to encourage competition between schools for pupils, thus again broadening the headteacher role to include public relations and marketing of the school.

According to Bush & West-Burnham. (1994) “the aim of the LMS policy is to locate the main decision-making powers with those groups and individuals best placed to assess the impact of decisions on their pupils and students”. DfEE also stated the purpose of LMS as:

The purpose of local management of school is to enhance the quality of education by enabling more informed and effective use to be made of the resource available for teaching and learning. As such, LMS is a key element in the Government’s overall education policies. [DfEE 1993, para.7]

McAlister and Connally (1990) explained the principles of LMS as:

The principle underlying LMS is that responsibility for the management of resources should, as far as possible, be delegated to those who use them, in this case to schools. Delegated system of management, including finance, are based on the claim that, if decisions about resource allocation are taken as close as possible to the operational part of the process, better quality decisions will emerge. [McAlister and Connally, 1990:34]
Pre LMS funding mechanisms were based on LEA decisions about the level of finance and about a whole range of real resources allocated separately. The Council and its education and finance committees would determine the pupil/teacher ratio, the level of support staffing, equipment budgets and the level of capitation allocated to schools for books and materials. These methods were supplemented by discretionary funding allocated by LEA officers and advisers in response to request from heads and governing bodies (Bush & West-Burnham 1994: 19). The introduction of LMS greatly increased the scope for governors and managers to determine the educational objectives of the school and to deploy resources in support of those objectives. Gilbert (1990) emphasises the financial and managerial aspects of LMS:

LMS delegates the school's financial budgets to governors. This is a major financial responsibility. At the same time, LMS delegates related managerial authority and responsibility for staff. Such financial and staffing delegation is intended to enable governing bodies and headteachers to deploy their resources in accordance with their own needs and priorities and to make schools more responsive to parents, pupils, the local community and employers. [Gilbert, 1990:16]

The research carried out by Levacic and Marren (1992) in 11 primary, middle and secondary schools in one LEA provided some early evidence on how LMS was affecting school management. They found both senior management and governors welcomed the increased autonomy. However, the senior management team generally undertook resource management with the involvement of only a few active governors. They found governors typically relied heavily on the judgement of the headteacher and senior management team rather than playing an influential role in planning themselves (Levacic and Marren, 1992:23). In addition to these issues there are two important aspects of LMS that need to be discussed: the areas of “open enrolment” and “Grant Maintained Schools”.

Open Enrolment

The ERA 1988 also had the effect of creating competition between schools. It introduced “market forces” into educational planning by introducing open enrolment. This placed an obligation on schools to enrol to their full capacity and it provided parents with a wider choice in the type of state school that they could send their children to. Evetts (1994: 16-18) saw the open enrolment as a significant movement stating that “the Education Reform Act promoted institutional competitiveness between schools in their recruitment of pupils by giving parents more opportunity to choose schools for their children”. Schools receive money through formula-funded budgets and they are largely determined by numbers of pupils on roll. Elliot and MacLennan (1994) pointed-out that, open enrolment “exposes schools to internal market
forces as they seek to compete for pupils”. In addition, schools have been encouraged to seek sponsorship from commerce and industry for particular projects in order to increase the amounts they receive in addition to their formula-funded budget. The headteacher being the focal person in school is also forced to play a larger role outside the school, due to role-related relationships with outsiders, for example members of other groups - trade unions officials, suppliers, consumers.

**Grant Maintained Schools (GM)**

Headteachers and governors became able to “opt out” of local authority control, hence giving them increased freedom, providing that the majority of parents, whose children attend the school, vote for it. Unlike LEA schools, GM schools receive their budgets from central government through the Funding Agency for Schools and so they have full control over their budgets and a complete say in how their schools are run and organised. Similar to “open enrolment”, Grant-Maintained status has increased the business-management aspects of headship.

**School Inspection: OfSTED**

The many changes brought in by ERA 1988 were also to be monitored and evaluated by the government inspection agency, OfSTED. This was another mechanism for change as schools which were not complying with requirements were publicly criticised and in extreme cases deemed to be failing and put under *special measures*. Headteachers found themselves not only dealing with the bureaucracy and extensive paperwork associated with an inspection, they also found themselves taking on the role of counsellor as they guided staff through what was often found to be an extremely stressful and debilitating experience.

**Ideas about Management and Leadership**

Changes in the role of primary headteachers have also occurred in other ways. The management movement and school effectiveness research has influenced ideas about management and leadership of schools. Theories and practices from business and industry have also been introduced and adapted to increase efficiency and effectiveness. In addition, they have also contributed to a gradual reconceptualisation of schools as organisations and as businesses.
The Management Movement

Poster and Preston (1973) described three stages of management development in England, which they refer to as the “three managerial revolutions”. The first stage is change in hierarchical organisation of management, which started with the establishment of comprehensive schools in England in the 1970s. This movement saw the emergence of a variety of management roles such as academic and pastoral care.

The second stage was change in professionalisation. This again was the due to the development of comprehensive schooling, which, similar to the first stage, saw increased emphasis on the professional skills of managers, especially in the pastoral care and guidance sector. The establishment of comprehensive schools in England was a therefore a revolution in itself.

The third stage was participation - other people’s and groups’ involvement in the process of school management. Although Preston and Post called these three stages the “three managerial revolutions”, it would be more useful in this context to refer to them as the three major changes in the role of the headteacher. The three stages were primarily the result of an increase in the size of schools with the setting up of comprehensive schooling but their impact was to be felt in all areas of education.

In recent years, as never before, there has been considerable pressure on headteachers to manage their schools more efficiently and managing a school has always been a complex and demanding task “Being a good headteacher is more than undertaking a series of tasks, however skillfully you work, and you are never dealing with one thing at a time, never working to achieve one goal” Dean (1989:19). The general understanding of the role of the headteacher and expectations of the role have been changing as the task has changed. Joan Irwin-Hunt (1993) refers to this changing role in the following way:

Congratulations headteachers! You are about to undertake a demanding and exciting job as a high profile manager, diplomat, accountant, marketing agent, personnel officer and educationalists! You are responsible for almost everything from the spiritual and moral welfare of your pupils to the state of the drains. However, the real challenge and No.1 priority is the opportunity you have to influence and enhance the aspirations and achievements of every young person in your care. [Irwin-Hunt, J. 1993:2]

It is however possible to see the various ideas and research findings about the head’s management role as presented in the literature under three headings, each reflecting a different emphasis.
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A first emphasis to be found in the literature is as follows: Hellawell (1991), Jones and Hayes (1991) identified a perception of the headteacher as administrator and manager. Research carried out by Hellawell found that the majority of heads identified themselves as performing this role. As Hellawell (1991:321) stated “Nearly all the heads said that they had to reduce their class teaching commitments over the years”. In a article titled “The Gerbil on the Wheel”, based on conversations with primary headteachers about the implication the 1988 ERA, Boydell writes:

A general theme running through many of the comments is that headteachers will become more like managers (for instance administering, delegating, co-ordinating, liaising, monitoring staff, budgeting) and less like teachers (despite the need to release for assessment to save money by acting as a supply teacher, support staff, and as a classroom resource. [Boydell, 1990:20-24]

The second is to be found in the work of a number of writers (Clerkin, 1985; Coulson, 1986; Williams, 1988; Southworth, 1988) who place emphasis on the head as chief executive and leading professional of school. These two roles of headteachers are illustrated in Figure 2.1 and described by Southworth (1988:43), drawing on Coulson’s (1986) categories in the role of the primary headship, as the four sectors of headship.

![Four Sectors of Headship Diagram]

**Figure 2.1** Four Sectors of Headship

Clerkin and Coulson report that heads spent much of their time in Sector D, taking unplanned, executive action. Southworth (1988) finds sector B, the planned leading professional area “is often most vulnerable” possibly because heads working in different schools might have different jobs depending on the school. Also, some heads were found to devote a lot of time to organisational matters and others to classroom teaching. Sector A would include many of the things that Coulson listed under chief executive roles (e.g. liaison, spokesperson, and resources). Sector C can be illustrated as the head teaching classes when teacher colleagues are suddenly absent.
Southworth (1988) provides two reasons for the importance of a two-fold role of headship. The first is that headteachers must be able to balance the unexpected with the planned aspects of the job. The second, that a headteacher deals with the urgent and unexpected at the expense of planned activities. He also pointed out that primary heads may spend so much time making decisions as the chief executive that time for their leading professional role is reduced.

A third emphasis is a focus on the curriculum leader aspect of headship (see Alexander et al. 1992; Webb, 1994; Richards, 1995; Webb and Villuamy, 1996b). Webb (1994) emphasised the importance of “curriculum leader” believing that despite the existence of many other roles, the headteacher’s role cannot exclude curriculum leadership and ensuring the quality of curricular provision. In her research, Webb (1994) highlighted the importance of this role, stating:

> The curriculum leadership role of the headteacher involves discussion about the curriculum with colleagues, leading and contributing to the staff and team meetings. Others are developing and reviewing policies, analysis of assessment data and children’s work, and observing teachers and children at work.  

[Webb, 1994:12]

Similar views can be found in the discussion paper on primary education written by Alexander et al. (1992) for DES. They warn of the danger of allowing the role of the headteacher to become an administrative rather than an educational one. They argue that headteachers cannot ensure the quality of curricular provision without involving themselves directly and centrally in planning, transaction and evaluation of the curriculum and the two must link together for the quality of education. Alexander et al. (1992) emphasise this by stating:

> There is a view at present in England that...the primary headteacher must become an administrative or chief executive. We reject this view absolutely. The task of implementing the National Curriculum and its assessment arrangements requires headteachers, more than ever, to retain and develop the role of educational leader.  

[Alexander et al., 1992: 46]

Research by Webb & Villuamy (1996a) on the changing role of the primary headteacher found that all headteachers could be said to be curriculum leaders because they have direct practical involvement. Richards (1995) agrees and feels curriculum leadership and management are central and important for a primary headteacher, as do Bell and Rhodes (1996) who also feel this is a vital role regardless of whatever development occurs in the future. They also identified curriculum management as consisting of three components: co-ordination, monitoring and evaluation. In order to provide quality education in their schools headteachers must have knowledge of curriculum matters and be able to fulfil their curriculum leadership role effectively.
In summary, the headteacher is the key person in the running of the school and as such needs to balance the two areas of chief executive and leading professional with those of administrator and curriculum leader. They should be recognised as the leader of the school and as such they have a responsibility to be a good role model and example to teachers and pupils alike.

**Leadership and Management in the Effective School**

*The Characteristics of Effective Schools*

In recent years there has been a growing number of attempts to analyse and describe effective schools. As highlighted by Craft (1996), the school effectiveness movement has been concerned with identifying the salient characteristics of effective schools. Before this focus upon the school itself, it was believed that the primary determinant of achievement outcomes was family background as measured by Socio-economic-status (SES) and ethnicity. High SES students did well in school while disadvantaged students, especially minorities, did poorly (Walker, Farquhar and Hughes, 1991).

In England, and particularly the USA, studies have been carried out regarding school effectiveness. Over the last decade the view about SES has changed, and currently schools effectiveness researchers devote much attention to issues of measurement of student outcome and the importance of the school influencing this. The effectiveness of a school is measured in terms of student outcomes and other characteristics using a variety of research methods and including differing approaches. Stoll and Mortimore (1996) describe several approaches to identifying school effectiveness, namely: “value added analysis” - a technique designed to make fair comparison between schools by taking into account variation in the prior achievements of pupils; “stability and continuity in school effectiveness” - this technique considers that there is general agreement that it is important to take account of the student’s performance over a period of time when judging a school’s effectiveness. Another approach to school effectiveness is “Schools’ effectiveness for different pupils and those taking different subjects” - this approach suggest that within certain schools some students of different ethnic or social backgrounds or prior attainment levels tend to do better than others. And a last consideration is applicable to the process of using school effectiveness research to inform school development work - known as “context specificity of school effectiveness” here, i.e. “what works” in one context may lack relevance in others.
Although SES as a determinant of achievement is still seen as of some importance, many other factors are now seen as affecting the outcomes of schooling and these have been held up as important for effective schooling (see Rutter et al. 1979; Edmond, 1979; Mortimore et al. 1988; Sammons et al. 1995; Stoll and Mortimore 1996). In particular, the work of Peter Mortimore is worth describing. Mortimore et al. (1988) studied fifty schools in London and carried out a detailed examination of 2000 children over five years. They found twelve key factors, which contributed to school effectiveness: (i) purposeful leadership of the staff by the headteacher; (ii) involvement of deputy head; (iii) involvement of teachers; (iv) consistency amongst teachers; (v) structured sessions; (vi) intellectually challenging teaching; (vii) the work-centred environment; (viii) limited focus within session; (ix) maximum communication between teachers and pupils; (x) record keeping; (xi) parental involvement; and (xii) positive climate.

A later report by Sammons, Hillman and Mortimore (1995:8) which was written for OFSTED, provided a list of key characteristics of effective schools from a broader review of school effectiveness research. They identified 11 key characteristics of an effective school: (i) professional leadership; (ii) shared vision and goals; (iii) a learning environment; (iv) concentration on teaching and learning; (v) purposeful teaching; (vi) high expectations; (vii) positive reinforcement; (viii) monitoring progress; (ix) pupils rights and responsibilities; (x) home-school partnership; and (xi) a learning organisation.

However, other researchers focused on different aspects of effectiveness. For example, in earlier research carried out by Rutter et al. (1979), their analysis suggested that staff attitudes, behaviour and academic focus produce an overall ethos that is affects achievement. Other results highlighted classroom management that kept students actively engaged in learning, firm discipline, use of rewards and praise, a physical environment that is conducive to learning and effective monitoring practices. Another study carried by Edmond (1979) gave rise to five characteristics of school effectiveness: (i) strong instructional leadership; (ii) high expectations for all students; (iii) an orderly, work-oriented climate; (iv) priority focus on instruction; and (v) frequent monitoring. It is easy to see the role of a headteacher in promoting these five characteristics that seem to lead to school effectiveness.

Determinants of school effectiveness may change as society and its expectations of schools change. Therefore, it is unwise to think that any specific factor is a permanent and totally important determinant in school effectiveness. For example, as mentioned earlier, until recently the socio-economic background of students was viewed as the most important factor.
Today, however, the emphasis is also turning to the quality of the teaching and in secondary schools the effectiveness of the subject department. A report by Judith O'Reilly, Education Correspondent (The Sunday Times, 6 September, 1998) went as far as putting this by stating "...pupils fail because of their teachers, not because of their social background". Referring to a recent OFSTED report, Chris Woodhead, the Chief inspector of schools, said:

The report confirms the message that has emerged from inspections that poor performance in some schools cannot be explained away in terms of social circumstances. What matters is the quality of teaching and leadership.

This emphasis on the quality of teaching and learning of pupils has now moved the effectiveness focus to the quality of teachers and of management by their headteachers and deputies.

Having briefly considered the characteristics of an effective school, aspects relating to management will now be explored further. As seen above, three important issues need to be highlighted: (i) purposeful leadership of the staff by the headteacher; (ii) the involvement of the deputy head; and (iii) the involvement of teachers in the running of the school (Reid et al. 1987 and 1988; Southworth, 1995).

**Headteacher Leadership and Management**

As stated earlier, effective school research stresses that the quality of leadership provided by the headteacher is a key factor in making particular schools effective. Important aspects of the headteacher's leadership were seen to centre around active involvement in the work of the school, such as, discussing curriculum policy, school budget, guidelines with the teachers, implementing changes, and guiding teaching and non-teaching staff on to suitable professional development courses. Southworth (1995) described these aspects of headteacher effectiveness as:

Understanding the needs of the school and being actively involved in the school’s work. These heads take part in curriculum discussion and influence the content of guidelines draw up in the school, but do not take complete control. They also influence the teaching strategies of teachers, where they judge it necessary, monitor pupil’s progress, ensure that teachers keep records of pupils' work and encourage staff to attend in-service courses. These heads can be seen as knowledgeable about classroom activities and pupils' progress. [Southworth, 1995].

The importance of headteachers in the effective school has been considered and it is now useful to examine the perceived distinction between leadership and management, also found relevant in the effectiveness research. Louis and Miles (1993) make the distinction between
leadership and management and emphasise that both are essential in the effective school. According to them, leadership relates to mission, direction, inspiration, articulating a vision, getting shared ownership and evolutionary planning. Management involves designing and carrying out plans, getting things done by others, negotiating demands and resources with the ability to cope with the environment and persistent problems and working effectively with people.

Sergiovanni (1984) suggested five leadership impetuses which were illustrative of collaborative school management and involve the headteachers and others as leaders: These are:

*Technical:* This is concerned with sound management techniques and known as the process of management and includes the capacity for: planning, organising, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting. Within collaborative school management it is assumed that the headteacher has a specific responsibility to ensure that the technical aspects of leadership are in place.

*Human:* This area involves the effective and efficient use of available human resources such as building and maintenance, moral encouragement, a participative approach to decision-making.

*Cultural:* Cultural leadership involves the building of a unique school culture. Headteachers, teachers and students play very important roles in terms of creating a good school atmosphere and this in turn creates a strong school culture.

*Educational:* This involves the use of expert knowledge about education and schooling. Headteachers work in co-ordination with colleagues in the school, so that they have the ability to identify the needs of the school as an organisation, ability to develop the curriculum, provide supervision and monitor, review and assess all the work carried out by the staff, as well as the pupils’ progress.

*Symbolic:* Symbolic leadership involves focusing the attention of others on matters of importance to the school. The headteacher as a leading professional looks after the school, including inspecting the school surroundings, visiting classrooms, being with teachers in the common room etc.

In addition, style of leadership is also considered important. The DES publication “Ten Good Schools” concluded that: “Without exception, the most important single factor in the success
of these schools is the quality of leadership of the head" [DES, 1977:36]. An important component in the quality of leadership was headteachers' participative management style. Weindling and Earley (1986) pointed out in their research that “all the heads spoke about the importance of staff participation and consultation but also stressed that they reserved the right to make the final decision”.

According to Whitaker (1983:53-54) primary school headteachers may follow any of six approaches in making decisions, ranging from the autocratic to the democratic, and a combination of such approaches may be seen to describe different styles. In the above order, the approaches are:

(i.) the headteacher alone controls the decision-making process by making the decision and then expounding them to the staff who are expected to follow;

(ii.) the headteacher still controls the process but having made a decision attempts to give reasons for it;

(iii.) the headteachers undertakes the early stages of the process then recommends to staff the preferred solution;

(iv.) the headteacher invites colleagues to share in the first three stages but then makes the final decision;

(v.) the headteacher involves the staff at all stages but defines the criteria determining the choice of solution; and

(vi.) the headteacher becomes an equal member of a corporate decision-making body.

An interesting set of issues arise as to how the above possibilities might relate to the combination of involvement, consultation and leadership which the earlier cited school effectiveness research appeared to favour.

The Role of the Deputy Headteacher

Traditionally headteachers are recruited from amongst deputy headteachers. The present study will investigate the training of deputies for headship and it is therefore necessary to contextualize the perceptions of respondents within a realistic conception of their expectations and working lives. To this end a brief examination of the role of the deputy head is now made.
The deputy headteachers' role in primary schools is a key one, but it has sometimes been described as problematic, in that it may lead to role conflict. For example, is his/her role that of class teacher or administrator and how can the two roles be reconciled? (Reid et al. 1988). The effective school headteacher delegates to the deputy headteacher and involves him/her in sharing responsibilities. Furthermore, in effective schools teachers were found to be involved in curriculum decision-making, suggesting that a consultative head was more effective.

During the 1970s and 1980s, heads tended to be remote and independent figures in English primary schools, and deputies often saw themselves as the “go-between”, providing a link between the head and the staff. A study carried out by Mortimore et al. (1988) provided a picture of the role of deputy heads in 50 London schools prior to the 1988 ERA. They found that for most deputies, almost three-quarters of whom were also class teachers, “the most important part of their role was connected in some way with the interpersonal relationships between the headteachers, teachers, parents and pupils”. In their study they also suggested that the involvement of the deputy was an advantage to the effectiveness of the school. Another significant factor, which came out of Mortimore’s (1988) research, is that the attitude of the headteacher plays an important part in the deputy’s position within the school. When heads delegate and share responsibilities, then Mortimore (1988) argued the school as a whole benefited. He also suggested that the involvement of the deputy made a difference to pupil progress.

As indicated earlier, ERA increased the roles and responsibilities of headteachers and consequently it has become difficult for a head to fulfil all these responsibilities, so that delegation of responsibilities to deputy heads and to senior management teams has become more accepted as the norm.

However, Reay and Dennison (1990) carried out a questionnaire study of 30 deputies in one authority. They summarised their findings as follows:

The deputy is a teacher whose main aim-function is to deputise for the head during any absence. The main duties are as a “go-between” (keeping the head and staff informed of what the other sides thinking), as a counsellor of staff, and as organiser doing those jobs no one else thinks are part of their responsibilities. Only a minority seem accountable for major areas of school activity, and while a majority claim a working partnership with the head, it is on a basis of the deputy as a subordinate member. [Reay & Dennison, 1990:44]

From the above definition and as other studies highlight, the deputy’s role is greatly dependent on what the head will allow him/her to do (Reay & Dennison, 1990:44). A study carried out
by Webb (1994) supported this point and echoed earlier studies. It concluded "the post of the deputy head can be difficult to occupy as the holder stands to some extent between the staff and the head and between being a class teacher and being a head".

Deputy heads in primary schools are usually employed as class teachers. Most studies of the role of the deputy indicate that, apart from class teaching, curriculum leadership was the second most frequent responsibility. The study undertaken in the initial stages of the introduction of ERA 1988 by Alexander (1992: 109-110) showed that deputy headteachers undertook very diverse responsibilities, but that among them four activities emerged as particularly prominent: (i) class teaching; (ii) curriculum leadership; (ii) general managerial responsibilities, delegated by the head; and (iv) staff development and staff pastoral support.

Later studies carried out by Purvis and Dennison (1993) and Webb (1993) portrayed a very similar picture. These studies look at whether the role of the deputy has changed since 1988. In their study, Purvis & Dennison (1993:27) found that many deputies had full class teaching commitments in addition to making major contribution to the school curriculum usually by coordinating a National Curriculum area. Webb’s study (1993) supports the findings of Purvis & Dennison. In her study she identified that most of the deputies were class teachers who were having difficulty in keeping up with the demands of the job, due to the constraints of the National Curriculum and increased workloads since its implementation. Purvis & Dennison had concluded their study by saying:

In the main the deputies who responded to this study were accepting increased responsibility willingly, as a result of the Reform Act changes, in the hope that it would supply a clear rationale for their present position and provide a good preparation for eventual headship. When asked, though, they found it difficult to articulate that rationale. They were being busy, the demands on them were high. Overall, however, there appeared to be a lack of definition about what was required of them. [Purvis & Dennison, 1993: 21]

These studies highlight the problem of the increased workload of deputy and the competing responsibilities of class teacher and school manager.

Summary

In summary, recent educational/legal changes have brought about a substantial re-definition of the role of the headteacher and deputy headteacher in English primary schools. During the course of this chapter influences on the changing role of the primary headteacher have been discussed. It has been seen that the role of the headteacher has expanded considerably over
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These studies highlight the problem of the increased workload of deputy and the competing responsibilities of class teacher and school manager.

**Summary**

In summary, recent educational/legal changes have brought about a substantial re-definition of the role of the headteacher and deputy headteacher in English primary schools. During the course of this chapter influences on the changing role of the primary headteacher have been discussed. It has been seen that the role of the headteacher has expanded considerably over
the last twenty years and is now extremely complex, as well as continually developing. To provide a clear idea of what existing, newly appointed and, more importantly, prospective headteachers may need by way of capability and professional skill, we may turn to the useful summary of the head’s role found in the *School Teachers’ Pay and Conditions Document* (DfEE, 1998) which sets out the conditions of employment of headteachers but also provides a clear articulation of a headteacher’s role. These conditions are presented in three sections: overriding requirements; general functions; and professional duties. The largest and most important of these sections is the professional duties which encompasses:

...defining school aims; appointment of staff; management of staff; liaison with staff unions and associations; curriculum; review; standards of teaching and learning; appraisal, training and development of staff; management information; pupil progress; pastoral care; discipline; relations with parents, other bodies, the governing body, the authority and other educational establishments resources; premises; absence; and teaching.

We have also seen on the one hand that school effectiveness is associated with a management approach that includes clear leadership but also delegation, but on the other hand that not all the deputy heads aspiring to headships will have enjoyed these delegated forms of headship experience.

All of the above has suggested that it can no longer be assumed that classroom teachers and deputies, when promoted to a headship position, can perform their duties satisfactorily without some form of management induction and professional development. An examination of the forms of training considered and recently introduced for this is presented in Chapter 3.
CHAPTER THREE
DEVELOPMENTS IN HEADSHIP TRAINING

Characteristics of effective schools and effective leaders provide an agenda of issues to be addressed through professional development with a school focus. They suggest aspirations for school management teams such as professional leadership, collaborative work, good communication, good relationships, shared vision and goals, fairly delegated responsibilities among the school staff and procedure for implementing change.

The characteristics shown by effective schools do not exist without effective, professional, strong leadership, plus co-operation within the school. Since most researchers in the area have viewed the headteacher as the professional leader of the school, he/she must fulfil all the roles and responsibilities of leadership. Many skills are needed for this, some of which can only be gained through a formal development course, and some through learning through experience or combination of both.

As the role of headteacher has developed over time so has the provision of training. Like the curriculum its form was local and often informal. National consistency in the extent and form of professional development training, in the standards or competences towards which training was aimed, and the availability of provision has not been a major feature. In short, whilst training and professional development opportunities existed for headteachers, these were unsystematic, inconsistent, and piecemeal (Hughes, 1981; Buckley, 1985; Glickman and Dale, 1990; Bolam, 1997; Bush, 1998).

For instance, in the area of short award-bearing courses, Hughes reported that provision is “patchy and uneven”. Buckley (1985) stressed that “the best is very good but in many areas provision is fortuitous and unplanned.” Hughes described these courses as being mostly “of two to five days’ duration and many are spread over several weeks or even months. Local Education Authorities provided some two thirds of all short courses.” He also pointed out that there were very wide differences in the financial support provided by Local Education Authorities for participants attending courses.

Although government commitment to teacher development in the 1970s and 1980s was reflected in a gradual movement towards school-focused in-service education and training
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Although government commitment to teacher development in the 1970s and 1980s was reflected in a gradual movement towards school-focused in-service education and training
(Bolam, 1982), significant change really only began with the publication of Circular 6/86 (DES, 1986) which established the Local Education Authority Training Grant Scheme (LEATGS).

**Professional Development for Educational Leaders in England: A brief historical review**

Many training initiatives established in the mid 1970s and during the 1980s also encouraged re-framing of professional development. It was not until 1970s that substantial number of teachers and headteachers undertook any course of study beyond their initial training (Gaunt, 1997). The publication of the James Report in 1972, *Teacher Education and Training* (DES, 1972) the TVEI Related Training Grant Scheme (TRIST) introduced in 1983-1984, and in 1986 the Local Education Authority Training Grant Scheme (LEATGS) brought about an enormous expansion of INSET provision in England. At that time, in-service education and training was considered to be 'the quickest, most effective and most economical way of improving the quality of education in the school and colleges and raising standards, morale and status of the teaching profession' (DES, 1972, 1983, 1986, cited in Tomlinson, 1997). After that time and into the late 1980s, more teachers and headteachers than ever were benefiting from continuing professional development opportunities.

Although both TRIST and LEATGS were broadly meeting their declared objectives and were responding to the imperatives of the Education Reform Act 1988, it was reported that ERA initiatives including LMS, GMS had disappointed some teachers and heads by not fulfilling the promise of promoting their professional development. Other criticisms were that the expertise of higher education institutions was not being used to best effect and that the administration of LEATGS was excessively bureaucratic (Glickman and Dale, 1990).

In order to take a broader view of activities and to promote efficiency and economy of operation (Glickman and Dale, 1990) TRIST and LEATGS were combined within a unitary grant called 'Grants for Education Support and Training' (GEST) in 1991. Similar to the LEATGS, a large proportion of the funding was devolved to schools, but LEAs retained control of funds for designated courses. At first, these designated courses were all of 20 days duration, but many have since been reduced to 10 or 5 days. GEST, however, remained the principal sources of funding for CPD and in 1997 it was replaced by the Standards Fund (DfEE, Circular 13/1997).
As ERA 1988 became implemented and within it LMS, the need for management training for headteachers, particularly for staff development and financial management was recognised. This need led to the establishment of the School Management Task Force (SMTF) in January 1989. In the publication, 'The Way Forward' (DES, 1990) there is an emphasis in the need to shift from off-site courses, provided by LEAs and universities, to on or near-site programmes designed to link individual development to school needs. Their recommendations, including the school-based approach to management development drew attention to the responsibility of the headteachers and the governors for management development, whilst recognising the need for external support, particularly from LEAs (Bush, 1995).

Also, the SMTF refers to the importance of the head's leadership role and the need for increased management development opportunities:

The headteacher plays a highly significant role in school management, being both focus and a pivot at the centre of decision-making. Preparing, inducting and developing headteachers is a major responsibility of the education service. Given heads' high and increasing level of responsibility, it is perhaps surprising that candidates for headship are required to have no specific training, no minimum length service, and no other qualification than to teach. [DES, 1990:3, in Bush 1998:325).

Following a recommendation from the SMTF, mentoring for headteachers was introduced in 12 regions of England and Wales, with mentor training funded by the Government. Mentoring was available for the first year of headship, but was often offered without any related management development'. Bush (1998) described this as:

Many senior professionals take up their first principalship without any structured management training...[Mentoring] is an in-service model of professional development. It might be regarded as a substitute for training rather than forming part of it. [Bush, 1998:325 - emphases in original]

In 1982 a national DES initiative of three elements was announced with the aim: 'to develop the expertise needed to organise schools and their curriculum and to handle resources' (Buckley, 1985). When the initiative was announced, the Education Secretary Sir Keith Joseph, stated:

The standards of our schools - academic, moral and cultural - are set by the heads and the senior staff within them. It is essential that they should be fully equipped for the difficult tasks that faced them, including those tasks created by falling schools rolls. At the moment there is insufficient management training for headteachers and we, together with the LEAs, want to increase it. [Buckley, 1985:88]

As described by Buckley, the three elements of the initiative were:

1. The creation of a National Development Centre which would provide a national focus for management training for school. The Centre would evaluate existing courses, develop new materials, set up a resource bank and disseminate such
materials, foster the establishment of new regional schemes for providing basic and other courses and develop links with regional committees for in-service training.

2. The release of experienced heads and senior staff for one term secondments. These would provide opportunities for visits to schools and other institutions, seminars, private study, encounters with managers from other fields of education, commerce and industry. It was expected that those who had completed one term training opportunities would in turn contribute to the staffing and organising of basic courses.

3. The development of basic short courses in school management which would be 'a regional response to regional needs'. These courses were called for because according to the Education Secretary 'many local education authorities and institutions offer management courses which, though admirable in themselves, do not match the requirements of the new scheme'. Approval of such courses would need to be sought from Her Majesty's Inspectors responsible for regions. [Buckley, 1985:89].

The DES charged the National Development Centre (NDC) with the task of promoting effective management training courses for headteachers and senior staff in schools. It was located in the School Education of the University of Bristol and 27 institutions were identified as able to offer one-term training opportunities. The purpose of the NDC was that of monitoring, co-ordinating, supporting and promoting the effectiveness of these courses. The centre was also given the task of investigating good management-training practice in industry and commerce and promoting ideas which could be transferred to school management training (Wallace, 1991). In addition, the government made available to LEAs specific funds for regional courses run by providers from higher education institutions. A majority of the courses were either twenty-days away from school, with the idea of improving the participants' performance as managers, or one-term secondment, directed towards training participants as trainers of their colleagues in other schools. In 1983 the DES introduced a number of government sponsored national strategies to support the senior management training programmes. From this DES introduced a policy of specific grants for 'One-Term-Training-Opportunities' (OTTO) as well as a basic 'Twenty-Day' courses. An evaluation of the OTTO was carried out by Hellawell (1988:229) and concluded that 'such an opportunity gave heads the chance to reflect on the particular nature of the job of headteacher and the individual's particular ways of carrying out that job'. Indeed, the 1980s were the years of recognition of the need for headteacher professional development and training in England. The importance of the quality of leadership and the need for management training in relation to improvement and effectiveness in schools was now widely recognised, and was highlighted in research carried out and disseminated in official publications in the late 1980s and early 1990s.
One piece of research, a survey of headteachers training needs, (Jones, 1987) involved 400 headteachers responding to a questionnaire and in doing so they identified leadership as the first choice of focus for training. Jones also identified the specific tasks of that training, these being: staff evaluation, staff development for curriculum initiatives and improving staff morale.

A national survey of school management development and training provision was undertaken in 1988 at the time of the Education Reform Act by Wallace and Hall (1989). In their study they highlighted that there had been a growing realisation that good management of school does not happen without training. This study also indicated that systematic support for the longer term development of headteachers and senior staff, which the majority of LEAs had built up, had in many cases been swamped by the immediate and urgent need to give staff adequate preparation for the effective implementation of the reforms. The courses offered under this heading were therefore for the preparation of staff in managing finance, curriculum management and staff development. The courses were generally school-focused INSET programmes, of 2-3 days, usually residential. As Wallace (1991) pointed out, these years were especially marked by the decline in support for long award-bearing courses, which had previously been offered almost exclusively by higher education institutions.

According to Busher and Paxton (1996), the late 1980s and early 1990s were the turning point of research and development with regard to headteacher training. The TTA's definition of headteachers' tasks and abilities (TTA, 1995), in addition to the HEADLAMP initiative were important elements in this development.

In their 1996 article, Busher and Paxton indicate that, under the auspices of the DES, the School Management Task Force produced a report (1990) making recommendations on how existing training provisions for headteachers could be improved. It suggested that this could be achieved by: (i) helping people to analyse their needs; (ii) more accurately targeting training and development requirements; (iii) examining the most appropriate delivery mechanisms; (v) monitoring and evaluating effectiveness in the work place.

The same report also urged LEAs to promote partnership with schools and external bodies, including higher education institutions (HEI), to develop high quality management courses. It suggested that HEI should work both in conjunction with LEAs and together in regional consortia to: (i) meet the requirements for management development; (ii) develop appropriate modules and programmes; (iii) give accreditation to prior learning.
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In 1994 the DFEE and OFSTED, the Confederation of British Industry (CBI), through its public relations agency Understanding British Industry (UBI), commissioned and supported a research project into the training and development needs of headteachers, their deputies and those of chairpersons of governors in secondary schools. It identified several training priorities (DFEE, 1995):

1. Strategic management
2. Monitoring, evaluation and review
3. School development and business planning
4. The policy development and implementation process
5. The development of middle managers
6. The delegation and accountability of management roles
7. Leadership

It is possible to say that as the national policy and priorities change their reflection can be found in the headteacher training and development programme.

Finally, many writers (see Jones, 1987; Morgan et al, 1989; Bolam, 1997) found a lack of systematic training to be a serious obstacle for headteachers. There seemed to be an unstated assumption that headteachers already have the knowledge and skill to carry out the role and accomplish desired improvements. Although they recognised that Headteachers might gain this knowledge and skill through experience, they thought that this is often not the case, particularly for newly appointed headteachers, who are thereby not fully prepared to serve effectively as manager, leading professional, chief executive, and curriculum leader in their schools.

The TTA Training Initiatives: Their Origins and Development

As discussed earlier, the nature of headship has undergone a radical transformation. Expectations of headteachers by the community and government have increased. By the 1990s the role of headteachers involved greater responsibility and now requires a greater range of skills, knowledge and understanding compared to the early 1980s.
In 1994 the TTA was established. At first it concerned itself largely with initial teacher training, but in March 1995 the Secretary of State discussed with the TTA its involvement in the development of more targeted and effective continuing professional development. Three main areas of formed the thrust of its preliminary investigation:

- To survey the nature and cost of existing provision;
- To determine national training priorities; and
- To consider strategic approaches to managing and focusing CPD.

A MORI Survey was commissioned to examine current CPD. Three lengthy questionnaires were developed and circulated to teachers, headteachers, INSET co-ordinators and INSET providers. There appeared to be substantial differences in the perceptions of respondents on the extent and usefulness of provision but overall the researcher concluded that: 'CPD currently taking place in most schools appears to operate on an ad hoc basis with no real linkage across school development planning, personal development planning and teacher appraisals' (MORI, 1995). In addition to the MORI Survey, the TTA undertook an extensive consultation with schools, professional and subject associations, higher education institutions, OFSTED and other interested parties including teacher and headteacher association on identifying priorities and strategies for targeting funds and formulating longer term strategic approaches to CPD. From this work a model of CPD as a continuum of different stages aimed at newly qualified teachers, expert teachers, expert in subject leadership and management, and expert in school leadership and management and based on the provision of nationally approved assessment was launched by the TTA (TTA, 1995a; Bolam, 1997).

The TTA gave priority to the development of the fourth stage. The TTA believed that systematic provision for professional development was crucial and should be planned as a continuous process throughout the professional life of the teacher. Therefore, the TTA started to work on the defining of standards, tasks and abilities for headship (TTA, 1995; 1996) and this work resulted in a framework for headship training and nationally agreed standards being introduced in England.

*Headteacher's Leadership and Management Programme (HEADLAMP)*

In 1995, the TTA introduced the Headteachers' Leadership and Management Programme (HEADLAMP). This programme was established to provide training for the newly appointed
headteachers. Headteachers were offered a maximum of £2,500 HEADLAMP money to be spent through LEAs on TTA approved courses. When introducing its HEADLAMP programme, TTA emphasised the main role of the headteacher as “‘the key characteristic of an effective school’”. To support the programme, it identified ‘Tasks and abilities’ regarded as central to effective leadership.

HEADLAMP programmes took different forms in terms of structure, context, nature and delivery methods. According to the TTA, any organisation could apply to register as provider of HEADLAMP training. Providers ranged from LEAS, HEI, professional associations, management consultants and various private sector organisations such as HTI (TTA, 1995). By 1996 more than 200 HEADLAMP providers had been selectively licensed by the TTA. In order to obtain funding, the providers had to comply with the 'Tasks and Ability' requirements identified by the TTA when designing their individual programmes. The providers also had to take into account the busy schedule of headteachers, by making the programmes accessible and manageable with a degree of flexibility that catered to the needs of individual headteachers and their schools (TTA, 1995; Busher and Paxton, 1996).

Under HEADLAMP arrangements, headteachers could choose what they studied, how they studied and with whom they studied. Their training could be customised to meet their self-identified needs. The majority of HEADLAMP providers were universities. However, some of the trainers of HEADLAMP were employed from outside the university system. For example, the University of Leicester Education Consortium (ULEMC) was formed in 1995 in order to meet the requirements of the HEADLAMP programme. They employed sixty consultants, who had experience in school leadership as well as the ability to support colleagues. The consultants consisted of LEA advisors/inspectors/officers, experienced headteachers and university tutors (ULEMC; 1997). It seems that the TTA was selective with the providers but left the selection of trainers to the providers themselves.

The main practical problem arising with HEADLAMP has been highlighted in an article by Gunraj and Rutherford (1998). In this article they mentioned the difficulties the providers of HEADLAMP had in recruiting viable numbers course members to their modules. Uncertainty about recruitment forced some of the universities, such as the University of Leeds and the University of Birmingham to abandon their HEADLAMP programmes. This uncertainty about the future of HEADLAMP, had become a major issue for the TTA. Although the HEADLAMP programme continued, on 11th October 1995 Education and Employment
Secretary Gillian Shephard announced plans to establish a new National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH), a programmes for deputy headteachers who are aiming for headship.

**National Professional Qualification for Headteachers (NPQH)**

The NPQH is a formal system of training for aspiring headteachers, introduced in 1996 by the TTA and based on national standards. It set out to form the basis of a mandatory qualification for aspiring headteachers (Gyte, 1998). It was designed to equip future headteachers with the skills, abilities, and knowledge they require to lead schools successfully. The TTA aimed to ensure that NPQH training and development would have an impact on practice, therefore, central control of the outcomes and processes was seen to be crucial. By the time of writing NPQH has been revised in some quite substantial respects, but the following account describes the nature of the new programme as put forward in 1996 and as studied in the empirical investigation reported later in this thesis.

Compared with the HEADLAMP scheme, which is extremely flexible and open, NPQH was a highly structured model of training which could be taken over a period of up to three years. The programme is based on a number of key principles.

According to the TTA, The NPQH:

1. is rooted in school improvement and draws on the best leadership and management practice inside and outside education;

2. is based on national standards for headteachers;

3. signals readiness for headship, but does not replace the selection process;

4. is rigorous enough to ensure that those ready for headship gain the qualification, while being sufficiently flexible to take account of candidates' previous achievements and proven skills on the range of context in which they have been applied;

5. provides a base line from which newly appointed headteachers can subsequently, in the context of their schools, continue to develop their leadership and management abilities.

[TTA, 1997a]
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One of the important and contentious characteristics of the NPQH is that it separates training from assessment by erecting what the TTA describes as a 'Chinese wall' between these functions (Bush, 1998:326). The process begins with a needs assessment at a Regional Assessment Centre (in total 11).

Regional Assessment Centres are responsible for:

(i.) the selection of candidates from all type of schools,
(ii.) initial self-assessment for all candidates,
(iii.) the assessment of any key areas not assessed through training; and
(iv.) final assessment for all candidates.

This need assessment process includes the use of:

1. A Psychometric test
2. A presentation and Observed group discussion
3. Self-evaluation
4. A personal interview involving action planning
5. Target setting.

Through this process a candidate will be identified to be ‘ready’ in certain respects while in need of training in other aspect of headship. There is however, compulsory module on Strategic Leadership and Accountability (SLAM) which must be taken by all applicants and can only be offered by the regional training centres (in total 12) or by the supported open learning (SOL) provider (the Open University/NAHT). The Training and Development Centres and the SOL provider are responsible for the compulsory module and its assessment. According to the TTA (1997), on the recommendation of OFSTED inspectors, all NPQH candidates should undergo training in Strategic Leadership and Accountability (SLA). This module involves sixty hours contact time and a minimum of 120 hours school-based projects (school days), individual study and preparation for assessment (Bollington, 1998; HTI, 1998). The TTA stated that:

The compulsory module will be taken by all candidates of National professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH). It draws on the best leadership and management practices from inside and outside education. It is intended to develop aspiring
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headteachers' professional knowledge, understanding, skill, attributes and capabilities in strategic leadership and accountability". [TTA, 1997b: f].

The SLA Module covers the following themes under four units (TTA, 1998: 5):

Unit 1 Developing a strategic educational vision committed to raising achievement;
Unit 2 Translating a vision into practice in order to secure high-quality teaching and learning;
Unit 3 Monitoring, evaluating and reviewing the effectiveness of the school;
Unit 4 Being accountable for the efficiency and effectiveness of the school to governors, staff, parents and pupils.

The TTA also specifies three further optional modules and their assessment: Depending on the result of the candidate's initial needs assessment and on their previous experiences they are able to choose one or more or three further optional modules, these being teaching and learning, leading and managing staff, and efficient and effective deployment of staff and resources. The contact time for each this module is thirty hours with a minimum of 90 hours of related work (Bollington, 1998; HTI, 1998).

When the training process is completed, the candidate returns to the regional assessment centre for final assessment and, if successful, receives the award of NPQH. As Bollington (1998) mentioned, candidates are able to choose where to go for their training and assessment. The espoused aim is to ensure that all candidates have access to high-quality training and assessment wherever they live in England and Wales.

**Regional NPQH Training and Development and Assessment centres**

In order to implement this programme the TTA established 11 NPQH Assessment Centres and 12 NPQH Training and Development Centres (TDC). In addition to this there is a Supported Open Learning (SOL) function provided across England and Wales by The Open University. Training and Development Centres providing the NPOH training were chosen through open competition by the TTA. The responsibilities of Assessment and Training and Development Centres and the structure and organisation of the NPQH intended to provide flexibility for candidates. All candidates were given a choice of undertaking their needs assessment and training with either the SOL or a TDC. The aim was to ensure that all candidates had access to high quality training and assessment wherever they live in England and Wales, though in practice this intention was evidently difficult to achieve (Bollington, 1998).
At least one writer (Gyte, 1998) has contended that the establishing of the TDCs provided a sound basis from which to secure better leadership and management training and that effective input from both inside and outside the education establishment assured the importance of the qualification. He went on to assert that this resulted in the NPQH being acknowledged nationally for its qualification thus leading to an improvement in training (TTA, 1997a and Bollington, 1998). Whether or not these assertions can be substantiated is discussed later and is to some extent a focus of this study.

**NPQH trainers**

Trainers and assessors were accredited by the TTA to carry out the training and assessment. Trainers were mainly chosen from amongst experienced and successful headteachers with some LEA advisors/inspectors, lecturers from HEI and people from outside education also involved. Before anyone can be officially accredited as a TTA NPQH trainer/assessor, a regional induction day, a-three day training and assessment programme has to be successfully completed. When the NPQH was introduced, the TTA was in the process of training some 500 trainers and assessors.

The TTA (1997a) and Bollington, (1998) claim that the flexibility in the NPQH and the mixture of training and assessment recognise individual differences between candidates. The model is also designed to ensure that the analysis of the individual candidate’s needs is matched by appropriate training. These two points are critical. As Bollington points out, 'A perennial problem with professional development has been the failure to link training to individual needs. The NPQH seeks to address this problem and secure an appropriate match'.

The TTA's expectation of the RAC's and TDCs' is clear. However, it may be difficult to secure and sustain the consistency between the RAC and TDC because there are differences between assessors and trainers themselves, and also there are differences in terms of the needs of trainees and their schools. For example, depending on the trainees' previous experience and circumstances, they might be able to work through the qualification at different speeds. In addition, the success of the programme, in the case of needs assessment or training and development, depends on whom the trainees had as assessors or trainers.
NPQH and the National Standards for Headteachers

The NPQH is designed to meet the National Standards for Headteachers. These were devised by the TTA in consultation with teachers, headteachers, professional and subject associations, LEAs, HEI and others both inside and outside education (TTA, 1997), and relate to the defining capabilities involved in headship:

These national standards set out the knowledge, understanding, skills and attributes which relate to the key areas of headship. They define expertise in headship and are designed to serve as the basis for planning the professional development of both aspiring and serving headteachers. [TTA, 1997:1]

In other words, as Bush (1998) pointed out, this is an ambitious attempt to set out the main requirements for headship and the standards are being applied to training for serving headteachers, in particular within NPQH and to lesser extent to HEADLAMP:

The TTA (1997: 1) sets out these standards in five parts:

1. Core purpose of headship
2. Key outcomes of headship
3. Professional knowledge and understanding
4. Skills and attributes
5. Key areas of headship

Having described the historical background and the main features and emphases of the TTA’s recent headship training initiatives in this chapter, the following chapter will offer a general framework for considering professional development. This will allow the writer to deal briefly with some issues concerning professional training and development in general. It will also be useful for considering issues relating specifically to HEADLAMP and NPQH.
CHAPTER FOUR

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:

A FRAMEWORK

This chapter examines different aspects of professional development. It proposes a framework intended to inform discussion at two levels: (1) general consideration of aspects of development processes, including the planning and evaluation of professional development provision; (2) specific consideration of these aspects in relation to the TTA approach to headship training.

Professional Development and Training: Concepts and Approaches

As described in the previous chapters, the UK government has recently introduced formal course provision for headship training, in particular HEADLAMP and NPQH. This followed from rapid changes in headship role and recognition of the importance of school heads in promoting quality of teaching and learning.

These initiatives are the strategy the UK government has chosen to bring about the desired improvements, but although these developments were based on experience and consultation, there is no guarantee that a national innovation such as this will work. In the area of professional development and in education in general there can be uncertainties and differences of viewpoint about many things. For instance, individuals may develop professionally in many ways, so we could ask how effective the two TTA initiatives are likely to be for different people and contexts. This is really a question about how good is our theoretical understanding of professional learning.

There could also be more basic issues concerning the definitions and understanding of the central concepts and intentions here. For example, it is difficult to arrive at agreed definitions of the terms professional education, training and development, and in-service education of teachers (INSET). This difficulty arises because of the different ways these terms are used generally and in the literature. This comes partly from the complexity of professional development itself. It is also due to different stakeholders being affected differently and having different values and starting points concerning what is involved.
As Craft (1996) and Dale (1998) described them, continuing professional development (CPD) and in-service education of teachers (INSET) are terms which tend to be used fairly loosely and interchangeably. Both terms tend to be used to cover a broad range of activities designed to contribute to the learning of teachers who have completed their initial training. Professional development (PD) seems to be a broader concept relating more to ongoing, positive changes in people’s professional capabilities and careers. The PD terminology will be used here to refer to a process of developing self-awareness, competence in and better understanding of professional roles and tasks. This definition of professional development also means that it may occur without taking formal courses.

But in this area there are also some traditional arguments concerning terminology and underlying concepts, such as: is it correct to consider the TTA initiative as headship training or as education for headship? Linked to this many authors have made clear that the TTA emphasis on national standards is a competence-based approach. This raises again the long-lasting controversies concerning the meaning and implications of competence, including arguments about whether these approaches are appropriate. Also, as these last two points show, the issues arising in this area are also difficult because they difficult to separate from each other.

Because of this, the writer believes that it is useful to have a general conceptual framework for thinking about professional development and for designing and implementing ways of assisting PD. In the next part of this chapter a framework for PD will be outlined, with its main elements indicating issues that arise generally in provision for professional learning and development. In the final part of the chapter these aspects will be examined in relation to the TTA headship training initiatives.

A Framework for Promoting Professional Development

Although the present author takes responsibility for the framework proposed below, it should be recognised that a range of aspects of PD have been addressed in the literature by various writers and that these show some similarities. For instance, O’Neil (1994) looked at professional development in terms of target (individuals or groups with like needs); needs analysis (intrinsic or extrinsic); purpose (career-oriented personal needs); and focus (short or long-term). Craft (1996) categorised aspects such as purpose; location; length; methods and level of impact. Eraut et al. (1998) made similar points in their research into development of
knowledge and skills in employment.

The framework offered below is meant to indicate the sorts of issues that would need to be considered by anyone thinking about PD provision, although it might be seen as most useful to course providers and designers. As shown in table 4.1, the framework has five main aspects or phases. It should not be seen rigidly. For example, theoretically it is possible to start at any point, although in human activities purposes do tend to have the most importance, so purpose is put first.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Identification of Purpose (professional development goals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Analysis of learner needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Development programme or process of professional learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Methods and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>Content of the programme or process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>Length and timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3g</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assessment of professional capability/development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation of professional development programme/process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1  Framework for considering the processes and issues of professional development

1  **Identifying Professional Development Goals**

The first aspect to think about in any intended professional development is its purpose: what is being developed, what are the goals of the professional learning activity? Above it was defined that professional development means positive change in professional capabilities. It is recognised that people can come to professional development activity from many starting points and for many reasons. But the writer is arguing that, when people do think of professional development as it is defined above, they are thinking about a purpose to acquire
or develop professional capabilities. This is the usual starting point for managers in education systems who recognise a need to provide preparation or training for a particular role, such as headship. But people thinking of taking such training will also ask themselves what they may gain in capability and awareness.

The goals chosen for PD are therefore likely to be related to a need for development of some kind that has been identified. They may arise at national or local level such as the instance of an initiative or legislative change, or realisation of a need to increase the effectiveness of existing arrangements through improved fulfilment of particular professional roles within a system. Or for example, they may arise from an individual’s awareness of a personal development need or professional problem to be solved. For a professional development process to be effective in the broader context, it is necessary not only to think in terms of the benefits to the individuals taking it, but also how these benefits fit into their organisation’s overall objectives. As Beardwell and Holden (1997) comment, “many organisations invest considerable resources in training and development but never really examine how training and development can most effectively promote organisational objectives, or how developmental activities should be altered in the light of a business plan”.

**Professional Development Goals and Competence Specification**

The present writer therefore believes that the intended outcomes of any professional development provision should be made clear. Making clear the professional capabilities, qualities and development offered provides at least a basis for informed choice by potential candidates and it promotes accountability by the providers.

This view is likely to be seen as arguing in favour of a “competence” approach to professional development. Because of the controversy recently expressed about competence-based approaches (e.g. Hustler and McIntyre, 1996a, 1996b), it is important to be clear which aspects of a competence approach the writer agrees with and which aspects he rejects.

The position put forward here is based closely on the viewpoint of Tomlinson (Tomlinson, 1995a, 1995b; Tomlinson and Saunders, 1995). Tomlinson points out that the traditional everyday meaning of competence is *capability*; that is, capacity to bring about intended purpose. In this sense it seems obvious to try to specify the capacities aimed at by a course of education or training. This is what the competence-based movement originally intended. However, Behaviourist psychological influences soon led to an unfortunate concern with
observable actions, so that the terminology ‘competence-based’ actually started to be used to refer to observable performances. Tomlinson points out that this is ironic since it is almost the “opposite” of the traditional capacity meaning of competence. But observable performance has nevertheless become associated by educationalists with the word “competence” and particularly with “competency”. For this reason it has been attacked by many writers. For example, according to Tomlinson, specifying behavioural performances like this is almost always inappropriate, because what matters in skilful capability is what a person can reliably achieve, not the way they do it. He points out (Tomlinson, 1995a) that in the “open-complex” capabilities involved in dealing with people, as in teaching and management, and even in many physical skills, it is usually important to change strategic actions to fit changing circumstances and that this is done on the basis of relevant understanding. Therefore, specifying and training particular behaviours would actually have limited value for teaching such capabilities and it could easily be counter-productive.

Tomlinson does consider it useful to try to specify the relevant sub-skill capabilities which correspond to the functions and sub-functions of an overall role capability. But he warns that these are still capabilities which may involve different strategies and may take many forms and kinds of organisation. Therefore he argues for “pluralism” which recognises this. Like many other critics, he also points to the danger of a “checkbox” approach to competence specification and training. He argues that an overall capability is not usually reducible to a collection of separate elements, in which someone would possess a skill when they have mastered all the different fragments. Instead, skilful action typically has a holistic quality, it requires the integration of many specific action, which are embedded within each other. These actions also have to be based on reading the situation.

The writer of this thesis generally accepts Tomlinson’s position as being applicable to provision for professional development. An important part of this view is that specifying goals of a teaching/learning activity is not the same as deciding the learning/teaching processes that may bring about these intended capabilities: usually there are many ways to achieve the learning goals. To choose relevant learning activity we do need to know first what are the intended capacities. But we also need relevant pedagogy, that is, understanding of the ways learning can work and how to assist this by teaching. Also, at some point, the individual needs and aptitudes of professional learners must be taken into account.
2 Analysis of Learner Needs

The previous section dealt with specifying professional development goals at a more or less general level, and it was said that this follows from some general analysis of need at a system level or even at an individual level. But at some point there has to be an analysis of specific learner needs and this is usually linked with particular forms of training provision. Two kinds of needs seem to be important, these are (a) outcome needs and (b) process needs or aptitudes.

(a) Outcome Needs

This refers to what the learner actually needs amongst the professional goals already specified. For example, an education minister could decide that headteachers need capability in legal knowledge, financial administration and people-management, and a course might be designed to develop these competences. But a particular headteacher who is thinking of taking this course may already have enough legal knowledge and he or she would therefore only require to learn about the other two parts. Therefore it is necessary to have some form of needs analysis process as part of any training course provision, to not waste resources or to de-motivate the learners.

(b) Process Needs

Many writers claim that people have different learning styles and aptitudes (e.g. Kolb, 1984), and that learning is more effective when the teaching process matches learning styles. We can extend this idea of learners' resources to include their contexts, because these contexts may provide different kinds of opportunities for professional learning. For example, a deputy headteacher may be in a school where the headteacher has good expertise in financial management and useful computer packages for this, so the deputy could use this to learn much in his or her own school context.

(c) Methods of Needs Assessment

Learner needs assessment is usually seen as part of training provision and it often takes place just before the start of formal courses, so that the results can be easily fed into course provision. It can be done by different methods, but it seems that they all have their own advantages and disadvantages. For example, it can be considered that the candidates for professional development know themselves best, therefore needs assessment should include self-evaluation. But novices are usually not familiar with all that is involved in expertise
including important aspects and they may therefore be less good at judging their strengths and weaknesses (Eraut, 1994, chapter 7). In some cases they may also be motivated to claim more capability than they have, but in other situations they may claim a greater need for training than they really have.

Another problem here is that professional development is concerned with improving practical capability in real contexts, such as teaching or managing in a school. But although this means it is important to have evidence from the real context itself, more convenient forms of assessment may be used, for example written tests. But these could only assess theoretical or ‘declarative’ knowledge, not actual practical capability. It is now recognised that practical capability includes “procedural” knowledge, which is often difficult to express (Atkinson and Claxton, 2000; Tomlinson, 1999). The present writer therefore believes that a range of different approaches usually need to be used in needs assessment.

Successful identification of specific professional development needs leads to the selection of relevant parts of a professional development programme or process. It may be the basis for customised design and planning of provision where possible, but more typically the level of match to individual needs will not be perfect, because it will be affected by limits on understanding, expertise and practical resources. Although needs assessment is sometimes seen as something that happens only at the beginning of the course, in fact it should be continuing through the course as formative assessment. In this way pre-course needs assessment can be seen as the first step in professional development formative assessment.

3 A Development Programme or Process

3a Content of the Programme: Education, Training and Development

Content means what is included in the programme, which is not exactly the same thing as the particular activities included in the programme. The content of the programme should depend on the intended development goals and it was claimed above that in PD these are essentially concerned with practical abilities. However, similar to competence, there have been controversies about practical capability and this also relates to what should be involved in provision for developing practical capability.

Eraut (1994) has claimed that “discussions about professional knowledge and learning tend to be based on a dichotomy between theoretical knowledge, which is codified in books and taught and examined on courses, and practical knowledge that is acquired on the job”. Similar to this,
Tomlinson (1998, 1999) has pointed out that traditionally this dichotomy has often been expressed as a contrast between knowledge and skill. Knowledge and understanding have been seen as conscious representations, but skill was seen as purely action. He argues that this viewpoint is related to traditional Western philosophy known as dualism which sees the human person as a combination of the mind and the body. The mind is not seen as physical, but as involving awareness, it contains knowledge and carries out thinking. In contrast, the body is seen as just a machine that carries out behaviour.

This dualism is connected also with the traditional contrast between education and training and with ideas about what processes should occur in each of these. Education has been seen as "the development of states of a person that involve knowledge and understanding in depth and breadth" (Hirst and Peters, 1970, p.25), but training was associated with skill and "narrow inculcation" of procedures, which were not seen to require understanding".

Tomlinson (1998, 1999) emphasised that this is actually an inadequate behaviourist view of skill and he argues that it could only apply to simple, "closed" activities where simple routines can guarantee success. In complex, "open" social activities such as teaching and management, it is impossible to find specific procedures that "always work". Modern studies of expertise confirm this by showing that human skills involve much knowledge. This knowledge must often be used to "think on your feet" in the middle of activity (Eraut, 1994, chapter 7; Bransford, Brown & Cocking, 1999; Schön, 1983).

The traditional contrast between education and training therefore appears to be breaking down and so in order to avoid these traditional assumptions the above framework refers to professional development, not to training or education. It was claimed earlier that PD is about learning how to do things better, but it is now recognised that this includes development of knowledge and understanding, and actually some forms of PD will deal only with knowledge and understanding. It is important to add that the above arguments mean that PD provision may include being told procedures and practising them, but it should also helping people to improve at solving everyday problems and to use practical strategies intelligently. The choice of professional development and not training as the best term in this context also indicates that it is not assumed that the success of PD can be guaranteed, as in the traditional model of training, which assumes there are correct procedures and that they can simply be drilled in.
Once the development needs have been identified the programme providers - or the learners themselves if they are managing their own development - can begin the task of planning development priorities including which methods can fit needs effectively. There are a number of factors which will affect this selection. One important aspect that needs to be taken into account is the cost-benefit of the possible alternatives, including their planning as well as implementation, as Beardwell and Holden (1997) pointed out. However, in any type of professional development the approaches and methods or types of activities selected must play a very important role in the success of the initiative, so it can be argued that choosing appropriate methods is the most basic decision. This includes aspects such as kind of activity, location/context, duration and participants, which will be considered in the following sections.

Detailed examination of professional learning theories is not within the scope of this thesis, however there are some important ideas relating to learning processes that are supported by a number of theorists and writers today and which are important here.

One emphasis comes from Constructivist ideas which are now very influential in educational thinking (Bransford et al, 1999; De Corte, 1996). This underlines that learners make sense of new information by using their existing ideas as a ‘filter’ (see also Holden, 1995). People participating in professional development courses tend to interpret new information in terms of their own ideas and assumptions, even though they may not realise this and even though their own ideas may not be correct. Constructivists therefore recommend that learners should be helped to actively compare their own assumptions with new inputs, although there is some controversy about the meaning of “active”.

Another set of ideas relating to development process comes from the study of expertise and coaching (Bransford et al, 1999, chapters 2 & 3), and they have frequently been referred to by well-known writers in the area of professional development such as Eraut (1994) and Joyce and Showers (1988). These emphasise the importance of linking ideas and principles to practice and feedback. For example, Joyce and Showers (1988) studied the impact of including different levels of components in training methods on teachers professional classroom development. Their results suggest that different components combine to impact at different levels, which they named as: awareness, knowledge, skills and application. According to Joyce and Showers:

- Presentation has an impact on awareness.
Methods and Processes

Once the development needs have been identified the programme providers - or the learners themselves if they are managing their own development - can begin the task of planning development priorities including which methods can fit needs effectively. There are a number of factors which will affect this selection. One important aspect that needs to be taken into account is the cost-benefit of the possible alternatives, including their planning as well as implementation, as Beardwell and Holden (1997) pointed out. However, in any type of professional development the approaches and methods or types of activities selected must play a very important role in the success of the initiative, so it can be argued that choosing appropriate methods is the most basic decision. This includes aspects such as kind of activity, location/context, duration and participants, which will be considered in the following sections.

Detailed examination of professional learning theories is not within the scope of this thesis, however there are some important ideas relating to learning processes that are supported by a number of theorists and writers today and which are important here.

One emphasis comes from Constructivist ideas which are now very influential in educational thinking (Bransford et al, 1999; De Corte, 1996). This underlines that learners make sense of new information by using their existing ideas as a ‘filter’ (see also Holden, 1995). People participating in professional development courses tend to interpret new information in terms of their own ideas and assumptions, even though they may not realise this and even though their own ideas may not be correct. Constructivists therefore recommend that learners should be helped to actively compare their own assumptions with new inputs, although there is some controversy about the meaning of “active”.

Another set of ideas relating to development process comes from the study of expertise and coaching (Bransford et al, 1999, chapters 2 & 3), and they have frequently been referred to by well-known writers in the area of professional development such as Eraut (1994) and Joyce and Showerers (1988). These emphasise the importance of linking ideas and principles to practice and feedback. For example, Joyce and Showerers (1988) studied the impact of including different levels of components in training methods on teachers professional classroom development. Their results suggest that different components combine to impact at different levels, which they named as: awareness, knowledge, skills and application. According to Joyce and Showerers:

- Presentation has an impact on awareness.
Demonstration has an impact on awareness, and knowledge.

Practice in simulated settings has an impact on awareness, and knowledge.

Feedback has an impact on awareness, knowledge, skills, and application.

Assistance in the classroom has an impact on awareness, knowledge, skills, and application.

If these views are accepted, then professional development could take many forms and could impact on different levels, as Eraut (1998) has emphasised. It seems that the wider and deeper its effects are intended to be, the more features it should include. But these effects would also depend on the quality of implementation.

In practice, a range of methods have been used in professional development, as summarised in table 4.2 based on Holden (1995), Craft (1996) and Glover & Law (1996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holden, 1995</th>
<th>• Workshops</th>
<th>• Simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Case studies</td>
<td>• Interactive computer-learning packages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Role play</td>
<td>• Problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft, A. 1996</td>
<td>• Action-research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-directed study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher placement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Personal reflection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Experimental assignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collaborative learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Using distance learning materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Receiving on-the-job coaching, mentoring or tutoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• School-based and off-site courses of various lengths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Job shadowing and rotation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Membership of a working party or task group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glover &amp; Law, 1996</td>
<td>• Conferences</td>
<td>• Group activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Observation</td>
<td>• Critical friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Short courses</td>
<td>• Professional development days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Long courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2. Common professional development activities/methods

3c Location

When organising professional development courses one of the important aspects is the location and relationship to 'normal work'. This can range from completely on-site, school-based through to off-site arrangements in other settings such as professional development centres.
We can expect that different kinds of arrangement may have advantages and disadvantages.

According to Thompson (1982), Hopkins (1986) and Craft (1996), the main advantages of on-site development are that it normally targets a group of staff, it matches the needs, resources and culture of a particular group of professionals more easily and it may have a direct impact on practice. Furthermore, on-site courses have the advantage of bringing together those who are going to work together on a particular real-life problem. This approach can also be good for those who have a heavy workload and do not have time to travel to and stay at long-term courses. Beardwell and Holden (1997) maintain that on-the-job training is probably the most common approach to training, and can itself range from relatively unsophisticated to more subtle and ambitious versions.

Also, as Craft (1996) explained, the on-the-job approach can advocate and include much greater use of distance-learning materials and other similar information packs, and can also include working on workplace-focused projects or on personal skills with other members of the team, rather than depending on residential sessions involving heavy dependence on external speakers.

These writers' views seem to arise from their experience rather than analysis, but theorists in the sociocultural school of psychology (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Brown, Collins & Duguid, 1989) support this view. They emphasise the power of natural forms of collaboration in everyday life and increasing participation in new activities with help from people who are already more expert. Other writers about professional development similarly accept that learning can and does occur informally in everyday situations. As Eraut (1998) pointed out,

learning occurs in employment throughout a person's working life, and people learn at work without necessarily being recipients of training...[...]

achieving the goals often requires learning, which is normally accomplished by a combination of thinking, trying things out and talking to other people.

Nevertheless, writers referred to above like Thompson, Hopkins and Craft seem to be running together a number of elements. For example, residential sessions do not always involve external speakers as they say - it can be useful for groups of colleagues to experience a residential working together on a school focused problem. Equally, when it comes to on-site work being better for the hard-worked practitioner, the opposite of what is suggested above could be true - those who have heavy workload may need the demand of leaving the workplace to be able to engage in development work at all.

But perhaps the biggest danger of on-site work and especially a danger of informal learning in
the normal situation is that it can prevent critical reflection and innovation. People may tend to simply take in existing practices and ways of thinking, because they are familiar in the context, immediately observable and approved of by those in power.

Off-site work has the opposite advantage that it may help people think more freely about the issues, especially where it is led by independent participants. Typically, it allows staff from a number of different schools to come together for varying lengths of time, so that they may learn from a wider range of perspectives and from people seen as equally practical and relevant to themselves. Off-site professional development can also take a number of different forms, such as going on a placement in another school or a local workplace or industry, job-shadowing, working on a small-scale project for a company or organisation, collecting materials and exchanging ideas for curriculum, accounting, appraisal, and management in the school, and so on.

Craft (1996) pointed out that one of the weaknesses of the off-site approach to professional development is that there can be a perceived gap between theory and practice, and lack of supporting culture in valuing individuals’ off-site experiences for the team or school as a whole. On the other hand, off-site training gets people away from the work environment to a place where the frustrations and burden of work are eliminated. This gives learners time to concentrate on what they are doing and explore new and innovative ideas without being disturbed. Also, they need time to reflect on what has been learned. In general she claims learners have found such courses stimulating both in terms of acquiring new ideas, meeting colleagues from similar schools and in exchanging experiences with those from other schools. However, skill development demands not only the contextual work situation but also extensive practice. The off-site context cannot provide the situational aspect as fully, nor, for financial and other considerations, the time needed for practice to change (Joyce and Showers 1988).

A reasonable conclusion for this section is therefore suggested that generally, professional development provision should try to combine the benefits of on-site and off-site arrangements by providing opportunities for both of these.

3d Length

Existing professional development courses may range from a single, one-day event to a continuous programme, and they may be part-time or full-time. Craft (1996) classified INSET and professional development opportunities into three types by reference to their duration, as
shown in table 4.3 next.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of opportunity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-term opportunities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following through a school development plan; MA, MBA, Med. Advanced Diploma, etc.</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job rotation; school-based, local or National Curriculum development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following through a school development plan; MA, MBA, Med. Advanced Diploma, etc.</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job rotation; school-based, local or National Curriculum development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short-term opportunities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working groups; 20-day courses, award-bearing courses delivered at a number of</td>
<td>2-20 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sessions spread over time; short university course such as certificate modules,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summer residential; teacher placements, secondments etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incidental opportunities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study days, one-day courses; job-shadowing; attending relevant conferences,</td>
<td>1 day or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 The range of INSET and professional development opportunities (adapted from Craft, 1996)

Since the purpose of PD is to improve the knowledge and skills of the individual (and hence the organisation and other stakeholders within it, e.g. pupils), at the end of this event changes are expected. But these changes take time to develop. Craft (1996) made the point that “change takes place over time, those involved in change are also likely to need support and development over time”. It appears that very often funders expect change and evidence of change too soon, when they should see many courses as providing resources that will then be used for learning in the real context over a longer period - only a beginning.

Once again, regarding duration there seems to be a need for a range of provision. Professional development opportunities of varying lengths would allow systematic, integrated courses, perhaps involving different kinds of activities and location, to be taken by those with the time and resources, but shorter elements for those who need them. Until a systematic overall approach is established at any level in an education system, it would be necessary to keep the separate elements open to those who do not need all the other parts or do not have time or resources to take them.

3e **Participants**

Participants include all those involved in the development work. They fill many roles including course designers, tutors and trainers involved in off-site and on-site formal courses;
consultants and mentors for less formal, on-site provision and of course the learners themselves, including colleagues in informal learning through everyday pursuit of normal roles.

Although different kinds of provision can have the theoretical advantages and disadvantages mentioned earlier, the *capabilities* of the participants and the actual quality of their contributions are always important. But there is probably no single set of abilities needed by all trainers, although most of them will probably require several skills from the following list: course design, study skill promotion, communication, for example in, oral presentations, writing reports, team building, observation, counselling and tutoring.

Another important feature concerns the *credibility* of personnel involved in professional development provision: practitioners often think that professional assistance and teaching can only be given by those who have recent successful experience in the same kind of activity. Considering this together with the theory-practice separation referred to earlier, many professional learners might be less enthusiastic about more theoretical and off-site provision.

4  *Summative Assessment of Learner Achievement*

There are several reasons why final (summative) assessment may be important at the end of professional development provision. The strongest argument is that the purpose of the provision starts from awareness of needed professional capabilities (see section 1 earlier) and so these capabilities cannot simply be assumed to be possessed by anyone. Also, it has been seen that professional development provision can no longer be seen in the old way as training which can guarantee transmission of unfailing knowledge and procedures. In any case, even if professional skills were so powerful, we could not assume that anybody taking a such a course would automatically learn them, because training is not automatically successful.

These points show the need to assess the professional capabilities learners actually possess at the end of their PD experience. For any programme that results in a formal award the idea of end of course assessment is traditionally taken for granted.

In practical terms the problems discussed earlier about needs assessment also arise here still more seriously. For example, validity of self-assessment may increase as a result of taking the course, because they are now more aware of what is involved. But motivation to claim positive capabilities may also be greater, especially if course assessment is being used as a basis for professional selection. As also mentioned, it is a danger that it might be convenient
to use written tests of theoretical knowledge because they are easily administered and give precise scores, instead of trying to assess actual practical competence in real situations. This is much more difficult.

Therefore we should probably use a range of methods to access outcome learning achievement. But professional selection should not depend just on these assessments, it should also be based on evidence of effectiveness in real contexts following such courses.

5 Evaluation and monitoring of professional development programme or process

The final element in the proposed framework involves monitoring and evaluation, because all individuals and institutions involved with professional development provision wish to make it as useful as possible, especially those providing the funds wish to make it cost-effective. As Robson (1993) claimed, accountability is now widely recognised as important in public services such as education. He defines evaluation as “an attempt to assess the worth or value of some innovation or intervention, some service or approach”.

Purposes and Methods of Evaluation

Authors such as Robson (1993), Chelimsky (1997) and Cook (1997) have pointed out that the meaning of evaluation has developed historically, especially during the late part of the 20th century. Earlier the focus was on effects and outcomes, but now many aspects and purposes are recognised as important in evaluation and these are connected to the wide range of approaches and methods now used. For example, Craft (1996) identified seven possible purposes of evaluation as: (i) evaluation to provide accountability; (ii) evaluation for improvement of professional development; (iii) evaluation to promote better public relations and good practice; (iv) evaluation to provide information for policy, planning and decision-making; (v) evaluation as a means of ‘needs diagnosis’; (vi) evaluation for exploration - to further understanding; (vii) evaluation as a learning process. House (1978) listed 11 available models of evaluation which have different conceptualisations as to what evaluation is about and how it should be done.

Evaluation specialists have therefore become aware of many aspects and possibilities within evaluation including political issues. Political issues arise because when judging the value of particular activities, especially publicly funded programmes, this takes place in a social context where different people and institutions have different ideas and values. They may try to influence findings, deliberately or without realising it. This can be expressed by saying that
writers about evaluation now recognise that ideology is always involved to some extent in evaluations. It has led to differences of opinion about what evaluators should do or can do about these political and ideological influences.

Finally, recognition of more different aspects and purposes in evaluation has taken place while research methods have been developing and this has brought controversies amongst different approaches (e.g. Cook, 1997; Nixon, 1990). Therefore it is now difficult to understand the field of evaluation and to choose the right methods and aspects to focus on. This is also more difficult because of terminology problems. Robson (1993) pointed out that the labels used for evaluation models are sometimes not very helpful. For example, "needs based evaluation" is sometimes referred to as 'goal-free evaluation'.

However, Chelimsky (1997) proposed a useful classification of evaluation purposes and perspectives, which can also help to show how other aspects such as methodology could be considered. She thinks that evaluation purposes fall naturally into three general perspectives:

1. Accountability: e.g. the measurement of results or efficiency
2. Development: e.g. the provision of evaluative help to strengthen institutions
3. Knowledge: e.g. the acquisition of a more profound understanding in some specific area or field

(Chelimsky, 1997: 10)

For example, some of the evaluation purposes suggested above by Craft (1996) might be placed into Chelimsky's groups as follows: accountability i; development ii, iii, v; knowledge gain iv, vi, vii. But these purposes also seem to be connected. For instance, if possible, development should obviously be based on knowledge and understanding of how the processes work. But this also requires outcome information on how far the process has in fact worked.

Another important distinction here is between formative and summative evaluation (Scriven, 1997; Wadsworth, 1997). This seems similar to Chelimsky's development versus accountability perspectives: formative evaluation involves judging progress during a programme, so as to alter the following parts if necessary; formative evaluation is developmental. Summative evaluation involves assessing the overall effectiveness of the provision, usually at the end but sometimes earlier (Scriven, 1997, p.499). However, effectiveness tends to involve a number of strands over a period of time. For instance, Dale (1998) proposes that focuses for a good quality evaluation process would include:
Post activity assessment - was the activity fit for its purpose, did the intended activity achieve its intended result?

Assessment of the application of learning - was the learning worth acquiring in terms of time, effort and money; has it led to any improvement in the individual's knowledge, skills and abilities; is it possible to act upon the learning?

Was the learning required? - was the need accurately identified in the first place?

Has any unintended learning resulted - was it worth acquiring, can it be applied?

Can the learning be shared with others - does it enhance the performance of the collective work of other individuals and teams?

Does the learning help individuals (and teams) to achieve the business objectives?

Does the learning help to add value to the organisation?

Similarly, Hegarty (1983) points out the elusive nature of the term in terms of what it may involve. Not only may there be many aspects of possible outcome to examine, but in attempting to examine or analyse the “effect” on an individual or an institution which may have been brought about by a programme of training, one is faced with the intractable problem of distinguishing those changes which may have been brought about by the training from those which may be attributed to other sources or influences. Some changes may have been brought about by a complex mixture of influences and again other may be short-lived and be followed by reversion to former practices. Glatter (1983) therefore considers that:

- Testing the claims for effectiveness of group development clearly raises acute methodological problems. In particular, examining whether intended changes actually occur is major research task. (Glatter, 1983).

Some writers go even further. For example, O'Shea (1983) implies that summative evaluation may be virtually impossible at least in some forms:

Individually have different capacities for perception and growth as well as different potentialities for change and development. Professional development cannot be measured quantitatively in terms of input-output model. Moreover, participants bring to each conference different levels of professional experiences, different needs, different philosophies as to how schools should be managed, different personal skills and intellectual abilities'. (O'Shea, 1983: 13)

Likewise, Reid and Barrington (1996) argue that evaluation is not appropriate for anything to do with learning processes because (a) the summative and historic nature of evaluation makes it inappropriate for long term findings, (b) evaluation as a process is not consistent with the learning process.

Although the difficulties of achieving valid effectiveness evaluation are often massive, it is clear that eminent evaluators such as Chelmsky (1997); Pawson & Tilley (1997) and Scriven (1997) would reject not be as pessimistic as O'Shea and Reid and Barrington.
According to Chelimsky, her three different evaluation purposes have been connected with different research methods, although some methods have been used for more than one kind of purpose and there are controversies in this area. Accountability purposes traditionally used experimental approaches with quantitative data analysis of outcome measures, and case studies only occasionally. Developmental purposes also include monitoring programme processes and implementation, for example through observing activities and consulting participants, for example by interviewing them. A development approach may include case studies, and for some developmental evaluators it will include providing consultancy and assistance to self-evaluate and sometimes also help to improve their performance (e.g. Patton, 1982). A knowledge perspective may use all of these methods, separately or in conjunction with each other.

In recent years, controversies and tensions have arisen in the evaluation field between specialists in these different evaluation perspectives, who have emphasised different kinds of investigation methods. Evaluators focusing on the development aspect have tended (a) to emphasise empowerment and consultation of possible stakeholders, (b) to work from constructivist paradigms which emphasise the importance of individual experience, judgment and impact and (b) to prefer qualitative methods such as participant observation and unstructured interviewing as ways of getting access to the depth and meaning of participants' experience (e.g. Guba & Lincoln, 1989). Others such as Scriven (1997) and Pawson & Tilley (1997) have questioned aspects of this position.

General Implications

The picture in evaluation has become much more complicated and controversial, but it is now generally accepted that many things must be taken into account across all aspects targeted (Robson, 1993). To ensure the effectiveness of professional development effort, the National Staff Development Council (1995:7) recommends that “evaluation must be seen as an ongoing process that is initiated in the earlier stages of programme planning and continued beyond program completion.” However, this would often pose great problems and require massive resources. Often, evaluators will have to choose priorities and their methods will need to depend on these priorities. Nevertheless, general research principles such as triangulation will always be useful to apply.
Applying the Framework to the TTA Approach to Headship

The general PD framework presented previously will now be briefly applied to Headship development and in particular to the TTA's approach to headship training by considering each of the sections and sub-sections.

1 Identification of Purpose (Professional Development Goals)

Bush and Paxton (1996), Bolam (1997), Tomlinson (1997), Bush (1998) all point out that the tasks and abilities set out for the HEADLAMP and NPQH National Standards are based on a competence model, although as Bush (1998) pointed out the term "competence" has been avoided. Despite this "semantic nervousness" (Lumby, 1995), the chief executive of the TTA, Anthea Millett claimed that the requirements for the headship can be specified and measured:

We should make explicit all of the key characteristics of those most likely to succeed in establishing and maintaining excellence as the headteachers of a school... The NPQH will provide the preparation for leadership that our headteachers and our children deserve. (Millett, 1997)

Whereas Bush (1998) questions this claim and states:

It remains to be seen whether the apparently straightforward process of setting out the 'key characteristics' of leadership will lead to 'excellence' in schools. The identification of 13 areas of knowledge and understanding, 40 separate skills and 28 areas of headship point to a flawed atomisation of the complex role of headteacher'.

(Bush, 1998: 328)

He also compared the identification of national standards to that of School Management South's similar attempt in the 1980's, to set out the functions of school management and led to recognition of no fewer than 250 performance criteria. He concluded: "unsurprisingly, this approach had little impact on the preparation of heads". He also argues that the national standards put more emphasis on competence than on support through mentoring systems and that they make a false and distorted distinction between leadership and management.

Bush's (1998) criticisms correspond to the criticism of atomism mentioned earlier in presenting the general framework, but it could be pointed out that that the National Standards (1997) document does clearly refer to abilities and knowledge, so that it does not involve a behaviour specification approach. Also it refers to core purposes in the first general section, then knowledge and understanding, skills and attributes and finally key areas of headship, in separate sections. It therefore seems that different levels of generality are involved in this structure, corresponding to the embedded nature of skilful competence pointed out by
Tomlinson (1995a). But this is not explicitly recognised and in fact more general capabilities (e.g. "4v) build and support a high-performing team") are found in same list as more specific ones (e.g. "4xi) deal sensitively with people and resolve conflicts"). This suggests that there is little awareness of the embeddedness and that the writers have just included everything they thought to be relevant in headship, as Tomlinson (1995b) argued about teaching competences. Yet it is difficult to find any of the included standards/competences that are irrelevant in headship.

2 Analysis of Learner Needs

The HEADLAMP arrangements seem to involve a very little by way of needs assessment and matching of provision: essentially, headteachers informally assess their own needs and on this basis they choose amongst available courses. It was pointed out earlier in this chapter that self-evaluation has risks where those involved do not really know what is required in the form of expertise in question. However, the headteachers involved with HEADLAMP do already have experience of the role.

NPQH needs assessment involves a number of components, as this writer recommended earlier: Bollington (1998) claims that the flexibility in the NPQH and the mixture of training and assessment recognise individual differences between candidates. It could be argued that there is a balance between self-evaluation and independent evaluation by other ways. Also, it is a positive feature that the self-evaluation takes place in the context of a personal interview with a trained assessor, rather than based on the candidate's ideas. However, the independent evaluation parts are de-contextualised, they do not happen in an authentic, real context, although the presentation and group discussion parts of the assessment are perhaps realistic social activities.

The use of psychometric tests is difficult to comment on, because we do not know what these are supposed to assess and it appears strange that different tests may be used in different assessment centres (Collarbone, 1998). It would surely not be useful to use them to select people with particular personality characteristics, because different leadership and management styles may be effective. Collarbone's claim that such tests are "objective" seems simplistic, because there must be pressures to appear to have the desired qualities.

Finally, the "Chinese wall" separation of needs assessment from trainers and training processes is likely to limit how well the development provision can be matched to the participants,
because the results of the process at the assessment centre must be recordable in a formal way, i.e. in writing etc. Collarbone (1998) suggests that the training regime has not yet been developed to target diverse needs emerging from the action plan.

3 Development Programme or Process of Professional Learning

Once again, the actual development process in HEADLAMP was left very open, but the NPQH has specified things much more closely. The comments below are therefore aimed at NPQH.

Content, Methods and processes

Eraut (1994) has suggested that headteachers need the following categories of knowledge:

1  Knowledge of people: This is concerned with people about whom headteachers make decisions and judgements. Linked with this is:

2  Situational knowledge: This is concerned with how headteachers "read" the situations in which they find themselves.

3  Knowledge of educational practice: This lies at the heart of the "leading professional" role of a head and covers the whole repertoire of possible policies and practices.

4  Conceptual knowledge: This is defined as that set of concepts, theories and ideas that a person has consciously stored in memory, used in analysing issues or problems, or in debating policies or practices.

5  Process Knowledge: This is essentially knowledge of how to do things and how to get things done, including managerial processes such as planning, organising, staffing, coordinating, reporting, budgeting, monitoring, team building, directing.

6  Control knowledge: This relates to controlling one's own behaviour rather than control of others. It covers self-awareness and sensitivity; self-knowledge about one's strengths and weaknesses; self-management about use of time, prioritisation and delegation; knowing how to learn and control one's own learning; the ability to reflect and self-evaluate.

It could be claimed that the national standards cover a great deal of these aspects, although Eraut's classifications are more systematic. But the important question is how far the training provision actually deals with these aspects.

Regarding the actual processes of training and development, Lodge (1998) claims that there is
lack of clarity in the TTA approach, but that it is clearly a transmission model that is "part of a wider policy to adopt industrial and commercial management techniques within education" (p.353). However, Bush (1998) suggests that drawing NPQH content from "best practice from outside of education" is problematic as the core business of schools is teaching and learning, and there is a question of who decides what is best practice (see also Glatter, 1997). Lodge (1998, p.353-4) also claims that the TTA approach ignores growing understanding about situational leadership, including that it does not recognise the complex and problematic aspects of school effectiveness and improvement. Bush (1998) also criticised the TTA for not recognising the potential of linking NPQH and specialist degrees in educational leadership and management.

In fact, in NPQH the actual processes of development are left to the training providers. Although the TTA has said that their approach should be "professional rather academic", it seems clear that the courses are generally off-site and likely to involve a large amount of knowledge acquisition and discussion, rather than the practice, guidance and feedback which Joyce and Showers (1988) emphasised.

Location

The points just made also apply to the issue of location. The situational nature of learning was referred to earlier and by Lodge above. As Biott (1992) also emphasised "...being a head of school, headteachers should spend most of their time in the school, thus working with teachers and others is their central task". He points out that this actually means "working and learning together". Recognising this would surely have led to a stronger emphasis on linking off-site training provision with on-site activity, local support and mentoring. This was not a feature of the original NPQH approach.

Length of provision

There has been a growing recognition that short-term-training programmes for heads have a limited value beyond providing an awareness of the problems involved. Buckley (1985) emphasised that "...courses, which last for one or two days or a week, are not effective in bringing about changes in school."

This does seem to be accepted by the TTA, as NPQH was planned to take between one and three years, depending on the needs of candidates. However, this positive recognition makes it seems even more unfortunate that the opportunity for long-term involvement of on-site
programme components was not also recognised.

Participants

HEADLAMP left headteachers relatively free to engage in development work in different forms, e.g. alone or with others in a similar situation. They can choose different models of learning and take particular courses of training or education involving different kinds of personnel and methods.

NPQH candidates do not have the same freedom of choice, although they may choose the assessment and provision centres they attend. Because the TTA does have accreditation requirements and training provision for its official trainers, it does seem likely that candidates will meet a range of other participants, including other aspiring headteachers and training staff. These staff may be practising or retired experienced headteachers, LEA advisors/inspectors, lecturers from HEI and people from outside education. However, regarding this last category of “participant”, Bush (1998) is concerned that participating heads are required to have a business mentor and cannot opt for professional mentoring, despite the evidence that this is invaluable for new heads (Williams and Bolam, 1993, Southworth, 1995). Business mentors cannot help heads with the core issues of learning and teaching, yet school improvement research (Stoll & Mortimore, 1996) emphasises the need for leaders to focus most strongly on these specifically educational topics, rather than the generic tasks of managing staff, finance and marketing (Bush, 1998).

4 Assessment of Professional Capability/Development

Systematic outcome assessment seems to have been missing from the HEADLAMP arrangements, but it is a central feature of NPQH. Candidates are assessed on the module aspects by the training providers, but they have to be assessed at assessment centres separately from their training. This final assessment is supposed to involve candidates in a "rigorous battery of exercises focusing on the core purpose of headship" (Collarbone, 1998). As recommended earlier in this chapter, this does include a range of assessment techniques, including a portfolio of evidence of their direct involvement in a number of aspects of school improvement. For practical reasons, it might be difficult to improve this assessment by examining more real life achievements in the school context, but this would be desirable if possible.
Earlier in this chapter a brief review of concepts of evaluation led to acceptance of Chelimsky's (1997) classification of three main evaluation purposes/perspectives: (a) accountability, focusing mainly on achievement of outcomes; (b) knowledge, focusing on understanding the ways programme processes work; (c) development, focusing on improvement. It was pointed out that although these are different perspectives, in reality they tend to overlap and depend on each other. For example, a full understanding of the ways programme processes work would include understanding the range of processes and how knowing how far these processes had actually succeeded in particular cases. Assisting implementation of processes should be more successful if it was based on valid understanding, but there is always the question of transfer and generalisability.

In the case of Headship and school management PD, it is particularly relevant to remember the reservations about the possibility of valid accountability evaluation cited earlier from writers such as Glatter, Hegarty and O'Shea. As Hegarty (1983) wrote specifically on this issue:

the distance between school leadership training and institutional outcomes is so great and so indirect that the problems of practical measurement assume a new order of difficulty and on occasion seem virtually insoluble.

Reid and Barrington (1996) add that questions about results and efficiency are anyway difficult to evaluate in HEADLAMP and NPQH, because there are no indicators or standards to measure against. Despite the fact that each trainee has a cost to the TTA, it is also difficult to judge the programme in terms of efficiency.

In the case of HEADLAMP and NPQH, therefore, even in theory, evaluation from the perspective of accountability would therefore be extremely difficult to undertake. In practice, anything approaching it would take massive resources beyond what is possessed by a single researcher. Conducting evaluation from all three of Chelimsky's perspectives, accountability, knowledge and development, would be even more difficult.

This reinforces conclusion earlier in this chapter that evaluators must usually select priorities. As indicated in the early part of this thesis, in Chelimsky's terms, this researcher's main basic concern was to assist development of headship training in Turkey by learning possible lessons (knowledge/understanding) from the situation in England, in particular from the recent introduction of headship training provision.

It therefore seemed useful, as well conducting a review of UK developments (see chapter 3), to
attempt some form of empirical evaluation study of UK provision from these two perspectives. The specific aims and methods of this study are presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE
AIMS, DESIGN AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Aims and Design of the Study

Aims

On the basis of the research rationale outlined in the introductory chapter and the viewpoints presented in the previous chapter, the researcher decided to conduct an evaluation study of aspects of TTA headship professional development provision. Decisions concerning the particular focus of this study were influenced by a range of factors, the most important of these were:

- Limited resources: the research had to be conducted by one person (the researcher), with limited financial resources and within the 1998 calendar year.

- Historical context: although HEADLAMP provision was in its third year by this time, the first proper implementation of NPQH provision took place in the autumn of 1997 following an initial trial in 1996, and the programme was intended to last as long as a maximum of three years. This study could therefore only investigate the early parts of the NPQH programme, but this was seeming to become the main form of headship PD.

- Main goals: the researcher's eventual purpose was to contribute to the development of Turkish school principal training by MONE, based on an understanding of UK headship provision and its impact. It was realised that findings from this study would be firstly relevant to the UK situation and that their use to illuminate the Turkish situation would raise a number of further issues. Intended audience considerations like these are now acknowledged as an important aspect of a developmental evaluation perspectives (Chelimsky, 1997; Reid & Barrington, 1996)

It was therefore decided that the general focus of the study should be on what Chelimsky called the knowledge-building and development aspects of evaluation, although as it was argued above, these aspects do partly include impact and effectiveness. Specifically, it was felt that this should be done by way of consulting those taking the programme, because such an approach offers various advantages. These include:
traditionally in evaluation research, participant/stakeholder consultation has been used as a major form of getting at process and outcomes of provision,

consulting participants is particularly important from the knowledge building and development evaluation perspectives

constructivist insights (see chapter 4) mean that the perspectives of learners concerning learning processes and provision are of crucial importance in the success of PD provision. Therefore it is important to find out the ideas and reactions of headship trainees. This kind of focus could also assist in the long term by helping to judge the relevance of present findings to the Turkish situation, since the English participants’ ideas could be compared with Turkish trainees’ expectations and learning approaches.

As Wadsworth (1997: 10) expressed this:

...Doing an evaluation is actually doing a piece of research regarding people evaluating things. There is value in knowing what people think of things, but even more value in knowing why, and thus what they would prefer. Users must have channels for "voicing" their experience and needs, and providers must have - and show they have - "ears" and "eyes" to hear and see.

Therefore, the nature of the headteachers' interests, values, situations, ideas and perceptions need to be considered in relation to different aspects of the training programme.

When the present study was starting, no published evaluations of the NPQH were yet available. It was known that Wolf had conducted an internal evaluation of the first trial of the NPQH central SLAM module. Also, formal and informal participant feedback was built into NPQH provision in the form of written questionnaires and discussion. Such instant feedback can be of use locally, as it enables course providers to make adjustments and modifications to course arrangements, and provides trainers, lecturers, and course directors with perspectives on their own performances. However, this information was not published and such questionnaires and discussions also have limitations. According to Hopes (1982) they are often completed under the influence of “post-course euphoria” and may simply tell the course directors what they want to hear, especially where they are done within the course and cannot be conducted anonymously. As Hegarty (1983) says, they are more “measures of satisfaction”.

Given all these circumstances, the researcher decided to consult participants who had undertaken (parts of) TTA headship training for their anonymous views concerning:

(a) the perceived effectiveness so far of their courses in meeting the headship training
provision's aims, as expressed in the TTA's national standards for headship;

(b) strengths and weaknesses of the processes involved in this provision, in the context of these goals and the participants' own perceived needs.

That is, in terms of Reid and Barrington's (1997) "levels of evaluation"; the present study would be directed towards levels 1 and 2, that is:

Level 1: Reaction of trainees to content and methods of training to the trainer and to any other factors perceived as relevant.

Level 2: Learning obtained during the training period. Did the trainees learn what was intended?

Although major interest was in the NPQH provision, it was also decided to apply this approach in the case of HEADLAMP, because this was the other main form of official UK provision at the time and it provided a contrast in the form of provision (much less prescribed) and in those taking it (existing headteachers).

**Design**

The validity of evaluation also depends on the particular methods used for it. Choice of methods will be largely determined by the purpose and scope indicated in the brief for setting up the evaluation, and must take into account the practical restrictions on the study (Craft, 1996; Beardwell and Holden, 1997). Method triangulation is always advisable.

It had been decided that this study should focus on consulting participants in TTA headship development programmes and it was therefore considered important for these participants to feel as free as possible to express their viewpoints honestly. If there had been less practical constraints, a variety of research strategies could have been used by the researcher to collect perspectives in a wider range of ways and achieve a more solid triangulation of data. In particular, interviewing would have been a desirable main strategy because of its flexibility and other features (Borg, 1987; Robson, 1993; Powney & Watts, 1987). However, there were practical limitations as mentioned earlier and the researcher therefore decided to combine two methods of data collection: anonymous postal questionnaires and telephone interviews. After development and piloting of the instruments, the study would use postal questionnaires as its main method, with some follow up interviewing of participants which would be based on preliminary analysis of the questionnaire data. The researcher intended that the questionnaires should contain different types of question to provide quantitative and qualitative kinds of data.
Methodology

The remainder of this chapter describes the design and construction of the data gathering instrument used in the study, the ways in which the samples of respondents were chosen, and the general procedures of the study.

Data Gathering Instruments

Questionnaire Design: Structure and Content

The questionnaire was designed to get access to the professional learners’ perceptions of the processes and the effectiveness of training provision for existing and prospective primary headteachers in England. Therefore the questions chosen were mainly based on the national standards for headship and the content of Headlamp and NPQH training programmes. Since these two programmes were relatively new there was no research on them available on which to base the construction of research instruments. Consequently, the questions in the questionnaire were partly derived from an instrument devised by Jones (1987), an instrument used by Wallace (1991) and the HEADLAMP evaluation form developed by the TTA (1995).

In her study Jones composed a questionnaire for the professional development of secondary headteachers. She attempted to assess headteachers’ training needs and identify indicators for the future. By using Morgan et al (1986) managers' tasks in five key areas of management, Jones tried to identify the training needs of secondary headship. She also asked questions about the skills for headteachers and their opinions about a future headteacher-training programme.

Wallace (1991) used an instrument to collect evidence in the evaluation of the secondary school management programme. This questionnaire was found relevant to this study and several questions were adapted. The particular interest in this questionnaire were the questions designed to evaluate programme content, organisational arrangements and training activities of the programme.

The researcher decided to ask the same questions to both groups (heads and deputy heads). This course of action was taken because, although the two programmes may have been different in form, in essence they were aiming to achieve the same results. The NPQH terms were therefore used, as these are commonly understood descriptions of the headship role (see Coulson, 1986, Morgan et al, 1989; TTA, 1995, 1997). In addition, it was felt that respondents
would be familiar with the terms and be able to link them with their experiences and roles.

Great care was taken in designing the research questionnaire and its advantages and disadvantages as a tool for gaining access to the participants' perceptions were taken into account. The layout was designed to be neat and easy to read. Vocabulary was kept as simple, direct, unambiguous and familiar as possible. The questionnaire was in four parts, each of them containing a number of more specific items/questions.

The first part was designed for the purpose of obtaining the headteachers' and deputies' biographical and career details, but not their actual names.

The second part of the questionnaire was designed to collect information about the needs assessment process which is an important part of the framework proposed earlier in chapter 4. It is an aspect of both training programmes.

The third and the largest part of the questionnaire was designed to consult the respondents about the HEADLAMP and NPQH training programmes. This included: organisational arrangements, training activities, programme trainers and the content of programmes.

The fourth and final part related to related to respondents' perceptions of benefits of their training and their views about appropriate forms of training for headteachers.

Both closed and open-ended questions were used. Generally, main questions in closed form came first, followed by open-ended questions asking for further comments to be written in the provided boxes. The fourth section consisted only of open-ended questions.

The closed items used various response forms. Some questions offered alternative content categories and others involved modified Likert scales, most often a four-point version ('very effective', 'effective', 'quite effective', 'not effective') to register the strength of opinions.

_Piloting the Questionnaire_

To ensure maximum appropriateness of the questionnaire design and to maximise the returns and minimise the error rates in the answers, it was important to pilot the questionnaire with a small group similar to the sample to be surveyed. As Frankel and Wallen (1996) and Gall _et. al._ (1996) pointed out, a pre-test of the questionnaire can reveal ambiguities, poor questions and questions that are not understood.
A pilot questionnaire was constructed and sent out to 20 respondents for comment. These respondents were not used in the main study. They included 10 existing headteachers who had taken HEADLAMP and 10 prospective headteachers who were taking the NPQH.

The feedback from this exercise enabled several important alterations to be made to the instrument. Although it is often suggested that survey researchers should avoid open-ended questions, in the pilot questionnaire ten open-ended questions were asked. The idea behind asking this type of question was to obtain useful information which then helped to put them into a closed form. In addition, some of the questions were found to be too long and some were not applicable in particular situations. Some of the training activities mentioned were seen not to be applicable. Therefore, five of them were omitted from the final version of the questionnaire. Also, respondents to the pilot questionnaire suggested that the space provided for some of the open-ended questions was insufficient. In the final questions more space was provided for the answers.

To keep the questionnaire as short as possible and easy to complete, the items related to content of the training programme in the HEADLAMP and NPQH were rephrased and shortened. When doing this great care was taken to try to make the shortened version in essence the same as the full one.

No space for the respondent's name was indicated on the questionnaire and no mention was made of identification in the accompanying request letter. The final version of the questionnaire is presented in Appendix 1.

The Design of the Interview Schedule

The reasons for using both the questionnaire and the interview as research tools was that both techniques have their strengths and weaknesses. Questionnaires can be particularly effective for large-scale surveys: they can give indication of the similarities and variations in representative samples. They can also allow respondents to respond anonymously. As mentioned earlier, this can be important where there are social pressures and this is perhaps likely here because the participants in NPQH had not completed their courses and they might well think that making criticisms could affect their chances of success.

But there are also criticisms of the questionnaire. One is that it can be shallow, that is, it does not allow the researcher to gain an accurate picture of the respondents' particular meanings, opinions and feelings. The interview gives a researcher the chance to obtain first-hand
information in a flexible way which allows exploration of meanings. For this reason it is a popular strategy to use smaller number of interviews as a way of triangulating the questionnaire method.

It was therefore decided to use semi-structured, tape-recorded telephone interviews as well as the questionnaire approach. A telephone interview was used because the sample was geographically dispersed. This technique also has other advantages, such as, lower cost in terms of time, effort and money. According to Robson (1993: 241), telephone interviews share many of the advantages of face-to-face interviewing, including "a high response rate; correction of obvious misunderstandings, possible use of probes etc."

The researcher particularly wished to concentrate particularly on items found to be significant from the questionnaire. The questionnaire therefore formed the basis for the interviews and the interview schedule was designed after examination of the questionnaire responses. In fact, however, the content of the interview schedule was more or less similar to the questionnaires. It gave the interviewer the research opportunity to pursue contextual and clarificatory issues, for example, by asking trainees questions like "Why is that?", "Can you tell me more about that?", "Why did you choose that?", "Why did you say that?", "Can you say more about that?", and so on.

The interview schedule was piloted on the first interviewee and as a result it was slightly altered. The version used in all the remaining interviews is shown in Appendix 2.

Samples

The relevant population in this survey were primary headteachers who had attended versions of HEADLAMP and the prospective primary headteachers who were participating in NPQH.

A written request was made to the TTA to provide access to the population of HEADLAMP and NPQH participants, but this was not granted.

To reach a sample of trainees, the researcher therefore sought help from a variety of people and organisations by writing in November 1997 to all LEA Chief Education Officers (around 132) and headship training and development centres in England. Eighty three of the LEAs were willing to consult headteachers and deputy heads to see if they were willing to have their names passed on to the researcher.

This procedure clearly did not involve random sampling directly from the whole population of
headship training participants. It can be argued that the resulting sample was reasonably representative, in that two thirds of English and Welsh LEAs contacted all their headship trainees. The researcher recognises that in theory it may be possible that the non-co-operating LEAs might have related characteristics which affect their heads and deputy heads and their perceptions of the training. But it is difficult to imagine particular ways in which this might work in practice, therefore the researcher believes that the sample actually contacted was largely representative.

Sample 1 - Questionnaire: Headteachers and deputy heads:

As a result of writing to the LEAs, the researcher was supplied with lists of the names and addresses of 90 primary headteachers who had attended HEADLAMP and 80 deputy heads who had taken the NPQH (including those who had undergone a trial of the NPQH), who had agreed to have their names passed on to the researcher through their Chief Education Officers. Twenty of these (10 heads and 10 deputy heads) participated in the pilot trialling of the questionnaire and took no further part in the study. One hundred and fifty copies of the final version of the questionnaire were therefore sent out to 80 primary heads and 70 primary deputy heads (see Procedure section below).

Sample 2 - Interviews: Headteachers and deputy heads

Once the questionnaire data had been analysed, the telephone interviews were carried out with a sample of typical and atypical respondents on the survey data. Four headteachers and four deputy heads who had attended one or other training programme were selected, with two typical heads and two typical deputy headteachers whose views were very much like the majority, and two atypical heads and two atypical deputy heads who showed exceptional patterns of responding. Access to interviewees was achieved through direct contact with the headteachers and deputy headteachers themselves on the telephone.

Characteristics of Final Sample

Postal Questionnaire dispatch followed by follow-up mailing to non-respondents succeeded in obtaining a total of 101 (53 headteachers, 48 deputy heads) returns representing a 67 percent overall response-rate. From these 101 respondents only 88 were found usable for further statistical analysis. Among the 13 nonusable questionnaires, eight respondents had started filling in the questionnaires, but they answered only a few questions; three said they quit the
course half way through, and two returned empty questionnaires.

A breakdown of this final sample by various kinds of personal, institutional and geographical variation is presented in table 5.1 below and of the centres carrying out the needs assessment in the case of the NPQH deputy heads in table 5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item descriptor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headteacher</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy headteacher</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary controlled</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant maintained</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 Breakdown of responding sample by gender, job and school type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorley</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midland</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwist*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds (CCDU)*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London University</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Wales</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Humberside</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 Numbers of respondent needs assessments carried out by centres (NPQH)

* The Gloucestershire and Wiltshire Initiative for Staff Training (GWIST)
* Careers Counselling & Development Unit (University of Leeds)
Procedures

This final section of the chapter describes the general procedures of the study following the design and piloting of the questionnaire instrument.

*Administering questionnaires and following up with the respondents*

The main questionnaire was sent out to the 150 persons as indicated above. Each of the heads and deputies was mailed the questionnaire instrument used in the study and a covering letter describing the study and requesting their participation. Each respondent was to return the completed instrument in an enclosed pre-paid envelope. After three weeks, follow-up questionnaires were sent out. This attained a 67 percent overall response rate (details are given in the following chapter).

*Telephone Interviews*

As indicated above, telephone interviewees were selected after preliminary analysis of the questionnaire data had been carried out. A total of eight headteachers/HEADLAMP participants and deputy headteachers/NPQH participants were selected for their typicality and atypicality.

When contacted, interviewees were told about the likely length of the interview, the background and the purpose of the research were given and strong efforts were made to make sure they were aware that confidentiality would be respected. They were encouraged to talk freely and were given minimum interruption. Initially interviewees did not seem willing to spend much time on the interviews, but in fact they all agreed to do so and they appeared to forget the time as the interview progressed. The shortest interview lasted for 30 minutes while the longest was 40 minutes. The first interview was used as a pilot, but after this the same interview schedule was used for each interviewee. All interviews were tape-recorded with the permission of the interviewee and then transcribed verbatim.

*Data Analysis*

*Questionnaire Closed Item Data*

The raw data from the closed question questionnaire responses was entered into an SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) data file for quantitative analyses using this computer

*Chapter 5*
package. Simple descriptive statistical analyses were carrying out, with non-parametric
techniques being used to analyse relevant trends and differences, as this was appropriate to the
measurement level of the items. For frequency analysis, the usual Chi-square test was used,
with the exact significance option being generally used because of the relatively small numbers
involved. For group differences, such as those between HEADLAMP (headteachers) and
NPQH (deputy headteachers), on ordinal measures such as effectiveness ratings, Mann-
Whitney-U tests for independent samples were used, with p≤0.05 as the cut-off significance
level.

Data Obtained by Open-ended Questions and Interviews

To analyse the data collected by open-ended questions in the fourth part of the questionnaire
qualitative analysis (content analysis) was used. When analysing the open-ended questions the
recommendations of Miles and Hubermann (1994) were followed. An independent judge
checked on the reliability of the researcher's application of categories.

All interview tapes were fully transcribed by the researcher with the assistance of a native
speaker of English. Each transcript was then read and research-related points were
highlighted. Relevant information, including examples of illustrative quotes, were recorded
and used in combination with the research findings of the questionnaires. The sample of
interviews was too small to carry out any statistical analysis.

The results of these data analyses are presented next in chapter 6.
CHAPTER SIX
FINDINGS

This chapter comprises a presentation of analysed data and includes limited comments on this. More substantial discussion is to be found in Chapter 7. To a considerable extent, quantitative aspects form the major part of the information presented, reflecting the nature of the questionnaire. However, this is elaborated on and further discussed through the use of interview data and analyses of open-ended questions, where available. The findings are presented under the following headings:

1. Needs assessment
2. Organisational arrangements
3. Effectiveness of the training activities
4. Programme trainers quality and effectiveness
5. Content of programmes
6. Impact and benefits of HEADLAMP and NPQH.
7. Ideas concerning future headship training

1 Needs Assessment

As discussed in chapters three and four, identifying training needs is of particular relevance to the success of any professional development process and hence the learning of trainees. Needs assessment aspects were therefore asked about in the first part of the questionnaire.

The HEADLAMP programme, as conceived, did not necessarily require formal assessment of headteachers' (HTs') training needs. The questionnaire responses of almost half (48%) of the headteachers indicated that they did not undergo a formal needs assessment process. In practice they only did so if they partook of a training programme where the provider built in a formal needs assessment phase, and as HEADLAMP training takes a range of forms, from single events with a range of providers to extended programmes with a single provider, it appears that this was not even mostly the case.

Table 6.1 shows the combinations of the NPQH needs assessment elements ticked as “most helpful element of the needs assessment process” for the headteachers (HTs) who did
undertake formal needs assessment in HEADLAMP and the NPQH deputy headteachers (DHTs), who all did so (it should be noted that here, in other tables and in the text, percentages have been rounded up to the nearest whole number and therefore may not sum exactly to 100).

It seems fair to conclude that Heads in the HEADLAMP scheme found the personal interview by far the most helpful amongst the few formal methods used. Personal interview was indicated on its own by 28 per cent of these HTs and for 64 per cent this group it occurred alone or in combination with other methods, i.e. with self-evaluation, action planning or both.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Headteacher (HEADLAMP) % of those who had needs assessment</th>
<th>Deputy Head (NPQH) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interview only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed group discussion only</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation only</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action planning only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interview &amp; observed group discussion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interview and self-evaluation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interview and action planning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interview &amp; psychometric test</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed group discussion &amp; self-evaluation &amp; other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interview &amp; obsrvd grp discn &amp; self eval</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interview &amp; self evaluation &amp; action planning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interview &amp; self eval &amp; actn plng &amp; psych tst</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self evaluation &amp; action planning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self evaluation &amp; other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychometric test &amp; self evaluation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed group discussion &amp; self eval &amp; action planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other combinations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1. The most helpful elements of the needs assessment process

When interviewed HTs pointed out that need assessment can take place at different times during training and in many different ways, such as in an informal way with their consultants or tutors or through self-assessment. However, this was not necessarily seen as a positive feature; for example, one HEADLAMP participant stated:
...I wish I had done my needs analysis at the beginning of the HEADLAMP training...It was too late and I should have done it at the beginning - right at the beginning of my appointment to headship... [HT-2]

Headteachers on HEADLAMP, who had undertaken formal needs assessment at the beginning of the professional development process, also found the criteria of the process challenging. When asked about whether the needs assessment they undertook identified their training needs, the majority of these HTs (53%) said that it did, 39% said partly, and 8% said no. The positive categories of 'partly' and 'yes', when combined, may be seen to indicate a widespread (92%) positive attitude to a formal needs assessment process in those who undertook it.

In NPQH programmes, DHTs were obliged to undergo the official Needs Assessment Process. As a result all the DHTs had undertaken this in one of the 12 Regional Assessment Centres before they started on the course. Here the most helpful element is once again personal interview, which was indicated either alone (25 per cent) or in combination with other elements by nearly 80 per cent of the respondents. The modal response amongst all elements and their combinations was personal interview and self-evaluation, which was chosen by some 33 per cent. Self-evaluation itself was chosen alone as most helpful by 10 per cent of the respondents.

When the sub-sample of DHTs were interviewed about aspects of the self-assessment some useful information was obtained. For example, one of the DHTs stated:

> It was extremely helpful, the self-evaluation made you think very deeply about where you are going and what you needed...It made you focus on your own professional developments so far and what you needed to do in the future. [DHT-4]

Another spoke about the personal interview and action plan:

> The personal interview was really useful, because that was a chance to really look at yourself with a mentor and then the action plan as well was helpful. That gave you a sort of direction [DHT-3]

It is clear from the data presented in table 6.1 that psychometric tests, observed group discussion and action planning were generally not mentioned as being particularly helpful. According to the TTA (1997), the test (a personality test) was designed to identify candidates' strengths and areas for development in a working context. The information obtained from the test was meant to be used during the personal interview in order to provide additional data when considering candidates' training and development needs.

The researcher himself attended two NPQH assessment sessions and completed a questionnaire during one of these. It did not appear to be a very straightforward test to complete. For
example, each question had four phrases and some of the phrases were repeated in other questions which was felt to be confusing and seemed to confuse individuals in the room. However, different assessment centres used different tests, (Collarbone 1998) and so it is impossible to generalise from the experience of the researcher, however it may point in the direction of an explanation for this perception by deputy heads.

The observed group session, personal interview and action planning were confidential, so the researcher was unable to attend these sessions and was obliged to obtain information outside the room. However, when DHTs were interviewed by telephone about them, some interesting points of view were provided. One DHT spoke about the 'psychometric test' and reported: "[It was] awful, it didn't actually give a true reflection. It said I hated conflict which is not true..." [DHT-2]. Another said, " when you went through it you knew that you were probably disagreeing with something you've done before..." [DHT-4]. Before they started completing the test, the person who was in charge of this process described her previous experience, and mentioned that most of the candidates made similar points to DHT-2. From these interviews one could suggest that this test was felt not to be fair, objective or user friendly.

Although the questionnaire data suggests that DHTs were positive about the formal needs assessment, when interviewed some DHTs reacted negatively about the relationship of the process to the training. For example one DHT pointed out:

People that deal with the needs assessment are kept separate from the people that do the training...The left hand didn't know what the right hand was doing...No one had told you what you had to do in it, and lots of people didn't really follow the criteria and people were going off at a tangents. [DH-1].

Another [DHT-4] talked about their observed group discussion. They said "It was not very well thought out, in the sense that we had to do a timed activity and there was no clock in the room." One DHT spoke about the self evaluation and found it difficult to fill in because of the way that it was conducted. She explained:

There was the main tutor and a second, who I was with. There were six of us and we'd all had personal interviews with him and he didn't really give us any guidance because I don't think he knew what he was doing. [DHT-1]

And on the same note, this DHT was unhappy with her personal interview. She said

In the personal interview the tutor [assessor] ended up just having a chat about nothing in particular. He didn't know what he was doing, that's my honest point. [DHT-1]
It is relevant to mention here that during the informal assessment session observation referred to above, it was noticed that, when DHTs were provided as a training tool with self-evaluation forms covering four key areas of headship which had already completed by previous candidates, they started taking notes and copying the examples, presumably because they felt that there were right answers to be entered and they didn’t see the process as personally useful but as a test to enter the course. The underlying reason may be indicated by the comment one headteacher spontaneously wrote on the questionnaire: "...it was not very satisfactory as I didn’t know what I didn’t know!" (HT-29).

The DHT questionnaire results also indicated that they found the criteria of the needs assessment process complex and challenging. When interviewed about the process one DHT explained:

...it was quite a complicated process, because there was the profiling but there was a lot of preparation and doing a presentation and working in a group dynamic. That was particularly alien to a lot of us...  [DH-3]

However, when asked later in the questionnaire about whether the needs assessment identified their training needs, a majority of DHTs (61%) were positive. Since the telephone interview sample was very small indeed, it would be wrong to generalise these negative feelings for the whole process. However, the points they made need to be taken into account because a needs assessment process can have many functions and these are sometimes in competition.

2 Organisational Arrangements

It would seem self-evident that well planned and organised professional development events will increase the effectiveness of programmes. How a course is organised and timed may be crucial to its success, as are the resources, financial support and evaluation arrangements. In themselves they may seem relatively unimportant, but given the limited time and money available to primary headteachers, they may well take on some significance in the teachers perceptions of the overall effectiveness of HEADLAMP and NPQH provision.

When the term effective is applied to such features of the provision, it is therefore not intended to refer directly to eventual PD outcomes, but to the effectiveness of these intermediate factors of implementation and development. The rating scale categories very effective to not effective were intended to indicate a continuum from positive to negative in stance or perception of effectiveness, but as writers (Robson, 1993) have often pointed out, questionnaires can be subject to ambiguity which may sometimes only be picked up through direct interaction with
respondents in interviews. For example, here it would be most obvious to take the three categories “very effective”, “effective” and “quite effective” as positive degrees of effectiveness. However, in the context of the “effective” category, the phrase “quite effective” might have a degree of negativity, where respondents might use it to indicate that something is not effective enough to be rated as definitely effective. In other words, the respondents might be saying that it was not quite as good as it should be. The writer admits that this distinction is rather fine, but he suggests that it should be borne in mind when results involving this rating scale are being considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very effective %</th>
<th>Effective %</th>
<th>Quite effective %</th>
<th>Not effective %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HT</td>
<td>DHT</td>
<td>HT</td>
<td>DHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to resources</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation arrangements</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2 The effectiveness of organisational arrangements

The types of organisational arrangement and frequency of their effectiveness rating categories are summarised in Table 6.2 above. Generally speaking, HTs thought location and financial support were relatively effective, whereas timing, access to resources and evaluation arrangements were slightly less so. For DHTs financial support was considered to be relatively effective, whereas nearly one third of the group felt that access to resources and evaluation arrangements were not. This study also shows statistically highly significant differences in the views of the HTs and DHTs as to the effectiveness of the programme organisational arrangements for three items - timing, resources and evaluation arrangements.

The questionnaire data points to HT general satisfaction with the organisational arrangements of HEADLAMP programmes and this is supported in the interview data, which revealed some particular viewpoints with regard to timing, finances and resources.

Timing

A HEADLAMP interviewee commenting on timing -

The headship is the hardest job in a school and when you're asked to go on a course at one o'clock on a Friday afternoon until seven-thirty and then all day Saturday, it's not
exactly giving you quality time... Again I would rather it was in school time and not
in my own time, because I've got enough things to do as a headteacher. [HT-2].

A second one said "I don't want to give up my weekends! I work hard enough during the week,
and also I have a family to look after" [HT-4]. Timing of courses is important, not only
because of the competing demands of responsibilities, but also because erosion of holidays may
well be seen as unreasonable. Headteachers thought that the best timing for training was week
only (67%) and the rest (33%) preferred a combination of the school week and vacation time.
The majority of the DHTs (51%) said a combination of during the school week and the
vacation and 45% said during the school week only, whereas only 2% preferred vacation time
and 2% said weekends. When interviewed the DHTs made a similar point as the HTs. For
example one DHT said:

I think heads and deputy heads work long hours in a stressful job and take work home
in the evenings... and they have to do things at the weekends... I think it's not fair, you
only get two days on your weekends and in one of them you have to go on a course all
day... it doesn't go down to well with your partner or your kids. [DH-4]

Combining study and work is difficult and the more so when the study consists of contact time
for school-based activities as in NPQH. Therefore, location and timetables should be carefully
planned and between them offer flexibility for the trainees in order to suit school and other
commitments, and in addition provide some necessary time for reflection. As a group, the HTs
found the "timing" more effective than the DHTs (p=. 003). When interviewed about timing,
both groups emphasised heavy workload and family commitments as being considerations.
Therefore, they were in favour of training programmes taking place during the school week but
also in a combination of week and vacation. As Wolf (1997) pointed out, "full weekend
training was singled out by the majority of candidates as being difficult to manage alongside
personal and school demands. The most preferred pattern of training was Friday and Saturday".
What is interesting both from this study and the Wolf evaluation is that despite emphasising the
importance of using contractual time for courses, a substantial number of both groups were
willing to also give some of their own time, perhaps in recognition of the disadvantages of
being absent from school for extended or regular periods, or alternatively because of a resigned
pragmatism on their part. This seemed to be more so for DHTs.

Finances

HT-2 described the financial support as 'fairly cumbersome', he was not happy with applying
and claiming back. However, all the headteachers interviewed were glad to be funded by the
government. One headteacher said "I wouldn't be able to undertake HEADLAMP training without funding from the government." [HT-4]

Without government funding, it is also arguable that many HTs would not have considered their own training needs. As an alternative, they may use some money from the school budget, but this was not seen as practicable. As HT-4 stressed, "If I use money from the school budget for my own professional development, this is not good for other staff". The widespread provision of funding seems to be crucial and in itself probably a key contributor to the perceived success of the programmes.

Resources

Inevitably, the TTA paid close attention to the training during the planning and organising stages of the NPQH programme so as to increase its effectiveness, however following this through into the provision of resources became problematic. The data collected by interview also supported the questionnaire findings. For instance, two deputy heads spoke about the training support materials. The first one blamed her LEA and revealed "...Our Local Authority said they would order the books, but we only got some of them and we didn't get them all" [DH-1]. A second said "...the trainers were not getting the materials until very shortly before" [DH-4]. This deputy head also believed that "...they [trainers] were not given clear directions from the TTA".

Again HTs found the access to resources more effective than the DHTs (p<.001). The NPQH group was therefore in a disadvantageous position in terms of having access to resources compared to the HEADLAMP group. One possible reason is that, most of the HEADLAMP providers were from HEI with established resources such as libraries, computer facilities, than the NPQH providers who taught at newly-established training and development centres. Moreover, the TTA was still in the process of preparing training materials for NPQH training, such as CD-ROMs, and a Web-Site on the Internet.

Course evaluation and feedback

As with timing, both groups found evaluation arrangements to be relatively less effective, but with the DHTs significantly less happy (p<.0001). As discussed in chapter three, evaluation and feedback to providers allows quality control over the design and delivery of training activities.
Equally important is feedback for learning. As well as trainees providing feedback to the trainers, trainers may also give feedback to the trainees and the organisers of the programme. Lack of feedback was an area of concern amongst the trainees interviewed. The DHTs interviewed shared the view that the evaluation arrangements for NPQH were not effective and reported receiving inadequate feedback on their own performance during and at the end of the course. As one deputy head said.

We didn't really get any feedback at the end of it [NPQH] on how we had completed our module, we were in a quite different situation in that our tutor was moving to pastures new and was sort of lost half way through" [DH-3].

Another deputy head made the same point, and she explained the reason why they did not get enough feedback "They [trainers] said they weren't allowed to tell you and they gave you a sheet with points on it" [DH-1]. Understandably, without feedback from their trainers, they were anxious about their performance. As Patton (1990) suggests feedback and discussion about trainees' performance have a significant impact on their dedication to the purpose of the training programme.

In summary, whilst the HTs seem to be happy with the organisational arrangements of the HEADLAMP programmes, with the exception of the evaluation arrangements, the DHTs reported less positively especially with regard to timing, access to the resources and feedback and evaluation arrangements on the NPQH.

3 Training Activities
The effectiveness of a course depends on the learning activities and methods used by the trainers and this is the focus of this section. In discussing training methods, attention must inevitably be paid to the quality and content of the provision and not just the in principle usefulness of the method. However, in this section the main focus is the type of method and, although reference is made to content and the trainers actions and quality, these are dealt with in more specifically sections 5 and 4.

The HTs and DHTs reported on the effectiveness of a range of seven training methods found to be used in the HEADLAMP and NPQH from literature and during the piloting of the questionnaire. Table 6.3 summarises the responses. Findings indicate that the HTs and DHTs had experienced a wide range of training activities, although to very differing extents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Quite effective</th>
<th>Not effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HT  DHT</td>
<td>HT  DHT</td>
<td>HT  DHT</td>
<td>HT  DHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending a course</td>
<td>29  27</td>
<td>52  32</td>
<td>19  32</td>
<td>-  9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending lectures</td>
<td>13  7</td>
<td>63  35</td>
<td>19  36</td>
<td>6  22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending a workshop</td>
<td>42  11</td>
<td>42  48</td>
<td>15  22</td>
<td>-  19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going on placement</td>
<td>15  20</td>
<td>54  10</td>
<td>23  20</td>
<td>8  50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation and role play</td>
<td>-  11</td>
<td>38  26</td>
<td>33  34</td>
<td>29  29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation by trainers</td>
<td>22  20</td>
<td>58  46</td>
<td>19  22</td>
<td>-  12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group discussion</td>
<td>55  34</td>
<td>33  42</td>
<td>9  22</td>
<td>3  2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3. The effectiveness of the different types of training activities.

Headteachers reported on the effectiveness of the range of training methods used in HEADLAMP and indicated that not all activities had been experienced by all of them. So it should be pointed out that some three quarters of both groups had not experienced placements. Of the activities engaged in, headteachers particularly seemed to value workshops and small group discussion. However, from those who had experienced simulation and role-play, these had a clearly less positive profile of ratings than other types of training.

HTs were generally positive about their experience of training activities, in the sense of using "effective" or better. Some useful insights were gained through interview. For example, one head said "Generally I found them to be pretty useful, especially when they [trainers] brought in an outside speaker who had expertise in different areas" [HT-1]. Another head spoke of his experience about the workshops, saying that his group had done a lot of workshop activities related to financial planning and took back some information to their own school. This head gave an example:

We were having two modules on financial planning, you would be looking at the theory perhaps in the first part you came back for the second part, you actually worked with figures from your own school and from your own school development plan. [HT-2].

Although simulation and role play received relatively less positive ratings than other methods, one of the headteachers who had most experience of simulations and role-play and of small group discussion compared them positively to other methods:

I found simulations and role-play better than the lectures. [She gave an example], the outside speakers, one or two of them in the early stages came and spoke for a very long time to tired people and it was theoretical knowledge and were not experienced enough to make best use of it. [HT-3]
Another head sampled a range of activities and believed that they were all effective and emphasised the need for there to be a range:

There was some discussion groups, there was workshops, lectures...I think they were all very effective...you need to use a complete range of activities otherwise it's less effective as I think you begin to fidget may be! But with a range of things it works well. [HT-5]

The DHTs were quite similar to the HTs generally in their pattern of responses on training activities, although the HTs were generally more positive than the DHTs about the effectiveness of the training activities they had experienced, including three significant differences (at or beyond the .05 level) between the HTs and DHTs in experienced effectiveness of different types of training activities. These were for “attending a workshop”, “attending lectures” and “group discussion”, with the HTs showing a more positive profile of ratings than the DHTs in each case. The trainees, particularly the ones who reported negatively, mentioned the trainers, trainees themselves and the nature of the methods used by the trainers. Some of the trainees said the trainers were not well prepared and they thought the training situation to be artificial.

Two particular findings within the DHTs’ ratings stand out somewhat. First, they particularly liked small group discussion, though not quite as much as HTs: perhaps this was because the members of HT groups themselves all had experience of the headteacher role: they may have been and appeared to be more useful in their inputs. Second, although it was thought by the TTA that going on placement in industry would be effective, it is clear that DHTs had not yet experienced it very much and those few who had did not value it as far as this set of responses can be taken as an indicator of this.

The deputy headteachers interviewed were both positive and negative about their experience of training activities and this data provides some useful insights. For example, two DHTs mentioned that they did not feel comfortable when they were asked to take part in role-play and simulations. One said "I didn't like role-play, I just thought it was false...I found it a bit cringey, a bit uncomfortable" [DHT-1]. A second explained how she felt about her experience:

...we had to do a lot of our presentation assuming we were talking to the governing body. I just didn't feel comfortable with the fact that it was artificial. [DHT-4]

This DHT was positive about the training activities and made some further points:

I think the best work was achieved when it was like an interactive discussion between colleagues and trainers...One of the best things about the course I went on [NPQH] was the interaction with your colleagues and getting another point of view [DHT-4]
The DHTs also emphasised the need for a range of activities, and that the effectiveness of the training activities depended on their content and the ways that trainers managed and carried out the activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Descriptor</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HT (HEADLAMP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award-bearing course</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award-b.c. + Mentoring</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award-b.c. + Mentoring +Schl Based</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awrd-b.c. + Mentoring +Schl Bsd + Sch Indt</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awrd-b.c. + School based</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training by Mentoring</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring + School-based</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring + Schl-Indstry</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School based training</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schl-based + Schl-Indstry</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Industry based training</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4. Preferences for different types of management training

However, choosing the right type of method and appropriate training activities is difficult where trainees are headteachers (adult learners) and from different contexts with different concerns. As discussed in chapter 4, many educationalists agree that the most effective form of learning is where the learner is actively involved in the learning process, especially when skills are the intended outcome. (Joyce and Showers, 1988, Holden, 1995; Eraut, 1998). In addition, trainers need to know about the trainees' needs when designing the best approach for their situation. As one of the DHTs pointed out earlier, "the left hand didn't know what the right hand was doing", the trainers should be involved during the needs assessment process. This seemed to be crucial error in the structure of the programme as trainers did not seem to be equipped to tailor the course to student needs in a direct way.
Whilst the type of activities discussed above are the most common forms to be found on HEADLAMP and NPQH training courses, there are other forms of professional development that may be equally or more effective for headteachers and it was of interest to explore the general perception of these. The HTs’ and DHTs’ preferences for different types of training activities are shown in Table 6.4

Headteachers’ preferences included a range from school-based to school-industry-based training. Clearly, school-based training and training by mentoring were strongly popular with the HTs, with the majority preferring one or more of these forms of training. It was notable that not one of the HTs chose school-industry as a basis for training. Those interviewed varied widely in their ranges of opinions. For example, one HT expressed his preferences for award-bearing course:

…I wanted something which was award-bearing for my own personal development to feel that I had achieved something. I felt I needed an outside perspective on the situation. You can always get advice and information from colleagues in your locality…and I felt the outside perspective on the situation was very valuable to get a national picture and not just the local picture. And to be able to share the value of other people’s experiences. [HT-1]

Two other HTs preferred mentoring which they had experienced as an effective process. Currently a process of mentoring is being used for newly-appointed headteachers as mentioned by HTs, thus, "the mentor guides them through the first steps of their post"[HT-3]. Another HT preferred a combination of training by mentoring and school-based training, and found them pertinent to his own school. He gave an example, "the person [mentor] I had was very helpful, as he had a similar kind of school in a similar area" [HT-5].

The other said, "A combination of the two [school-based and award-bearing] gives the opportunity to look at organisation from outside the school context"[HT-2]. This head also believed that a balance of types of training provide the opportunity to look at the school from a wider perspective and to use the particular insights in the development of the school itself.

DHTs’ preferences also ranged widely in terms of elements and combinations. Although various factors prevent a statistical analysis of the differences between the groups seen in table 6.4, that school-industry training was chosen by nearly a fifth of the DHTs responding, in contrast to none by the HTs. It may be noted that this appears to contrast with the low frequency of positive ratings for industrial placements by DHTs seen earlier in table 6.3 The DHTs also tended to indicate that headship training should lead to awards and laid less emphasis on mentoring and school-based training than the HTs.
Again, when interviewed, the DHTs made different emphases. One stated a preference for an award-bearing course: "if you go for a job [headship] you can say you've got the qualification" [DHT-1]. The other spoke about school-based training and stated:

We face the actual issues that we have as deputy head as managers of our school. So if we are to manage certain curriculum areas, it is more relevant to us, because it is our school. And school-based training gives us the chance to carry out the task that what we do. [DHT-2]

The few DHTs who experienced a particular form of placement as part of a school-industry-partnership reported positively. In England, this experience is part of the Heads, Teachers & Industry (HTI) initiative and is intended to train HTs and DHTs in different areas of leadership and management. It is also thought to have a two fold purpose: providing training in the area of leadership, management and marketing and establishing effective relationships with industry.

In concluding the discussion of training activities, the relationship between these and effective learning of the course objectives (programme content) should be remembered. Hopes (1982) makes the point that, for example, human relations training can be better achieved by a series of event or experiences over a longer period of time. In addition, course situations inevitably differ from school situations and, if that difference becomes too great, the validity of the exercise becomes unacceptably low. This is a particular danger with role-playing exercises. However, the difficulty can be eased if the activity has purpose within the course itself (Eraut: 1998: 93-94).

4 Programme Trainers

There is a wide range of HEADLAMP providers and within them, trainers with varying expertise and background. It is possible to say that the majority of the trainers for this course were HEI lecturers. However, in the example of Leicester University, and this may well be the case for other providers, people from outside the university including; education consultants, mentors, successful and experienced headteachers, and also people from outside education were employed.

In general, trainers were found by the majority of HTs to be well prepared (87%), and to set clear objectives (79%), whereas only 6% of HTs felt the trainers were not well prepared and 2% that they did not set clear objectives. On combining the positive answers (yes/partly) we find that HTs were overwhelmingly positive about the trainers (94%).
When asked about trainers' quality and effectiveness in preparing for different aspects of headship, HTs showed a generally strong level of satisfaction ratings for their HEADLAMP trainers (Table 6.5 below) if we consider the three levels of “effective” as positive ratings. However, way discussed earlier, we might regard the “quite effective” category in a more negative way, as meaning “less effective than they might have been”. If we use this interpretation, then it is noticeable that both HTs and DHTs, but particularly the deputy heads, seem rather unhappy in a number of respects, most noticeably “preparing you in effective deployment of resources”, “preparing you to be accountable to the governors and others”, “preparing you in effective deployment of people and staff”. The DHTs were if anything more negative in these aspects. For example, 38% of the DHTs stated that the trainers were not effective in preparing them in effective deployment of people and staff and 30% that they were not effective in preparing them in effective deployment of resources. Also, the HTs found the trainers more effective than the DHTs did in preparing them in the effective deployment of people and staff (p = .035) and in preparing them to develop a strategic direction and development for the school (p = .007).

These findings could of course have a number of interpretations. One is that these aspects are precisely those which depend most on contextual learning in the real situation. Another is of course that the trainers themselves may not have been experienced or good at teaching in those areas. Equally we could speculate that despite being in receipt of training of whatever quality, many headteachers and deputy headteachers would feel ill prepared in certain areas because of the relative newness of that aspect. Linked with this, it may be that the more negative deputy head teachers were expecting too much of the SLAM module they had taken. Nevertheless, it can be noted that the reservations with respect to these items are consistent with the emphasis in the last section in the HTs and DHTs preferences for mentoring and school-based training methods of management training.

The small number of interviews with HTs showed a variety of perspectives. For example, two HEADLAMP trainees made similar points when describing experienced headteachers, and university lecturers as programme trainers. HT-2 and HT-3 described the university lecturers as giving them a theoretical overview of the various management procedures that they might like to try and explore. Whereas serving headteachers were found to be more up-to-date and had practical knowledge of what it was like to try and manage, for example, the National Curriculum or pupils designated as having special educational needs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item descriptor</th>
<th>Very effective %</th>
<th>Effective %</th>
<th>Quite effective %</th>
<th>Not effective %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HT</td>
<td>DHT</td>
<td>HT</td>
<td>DHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving your knowledge and understanding</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing you to develop strategic direction and Development of school</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing you to secure and sustain effective Teaching and learning</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing you in leading and managing staff</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing you in effective deployment of people and staff</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing you in effective deployment of resources</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing you to be accountable to the governor and others</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging analysis of your role and leadership skills</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing your self-confidence in using these leadership skills</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing you to meet national standards for headteachers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5 The effectiveness of trainers in preparing HTs and DHTs for each aspect of headship

The NPQH trainers who worked through the 11 Training and Development the Centres had varying expertise and backgrounds. Again, in a similar way to the HEADLAMP trainers, it is possible to say that the majority of the trainers were lecturers from HEI or successful and experienced headteachers. There were also education consultants and people from outside education. They were thought by the majority of DHTs to be well prepared (51%), and to set clear objectives (63%). Only 16% of DHTs felt the trainers were not well prepared and 19% that they did not set clear objectives. If the categories “very well prepared” and “quite well prepared” are regarded as positive, then combining them suggests an overwhelmingly positive picture with 84% and 81% of respondents judging trainers positively in respect of preparation (84%) and setting clear objectives (81%). For example, one DHT said:

The trainers were excellent. Most of the trainers have gone away, looked at the material and added to it, fleshed it out, so that people can use it as a learning
experience and then some of the trainers used outside speakers to come in and make the experience more real. [DH-3]

Whilst the DHTs were generally satisfied with the trainers, when interviewed about them, some interesting opinions emerged. For example, they found the experienced headteachers better than the lecturers and other trainers from outside education. For example one DHT spoke about the experienced headteachers as trainers in these terms:

Our trainers were experienced headteachers. I think it's more relevant that they were a bit nearer to the reality than the academics in the university. Because when we had our needs assessment they were academics, I think they have been out of teaching for so long that sometimes they forget the realities of life in a school. I think it's more relevant to have people who are still headteachers or recently retired. [DH-1]

Another deputy head also spoke about the headteacher trainers and the nature of headship. Moreover, she also discussed some real issues in school which the trainers would not have experienced:

Experienced headteachers can bring practical..., so much of headship is of a practical nature. It isn't all to do with the higher levels of the quality of teaching or learning, a lot of it is like, how to deal with the caretaker in the boiler house... it's those practical aspects that people who are heads can give advice on. It's how you manage crisis without flapping... by the time you get to deputy head or head level you have a good understanding of what constitutes an effective school and the quality of teaching and quality of learning. It is the management of stress of dealing with the people... when you've got parents effing and blinding at your door, it's those practical aspects they bring, that sort of dimension to it. [DH-4]

In summary, although as reflected in the questionnaire data the opinions of HTs and DHTs about the programme trainers showed similar profiles and were generally positive, the HTs were generally more positive about their effectiveness and there were some clear exceptions to this positive picture with respect to some aspects of headship capability. Both groups found the experienced headteachers more relevant compared to lecturers and other trainers from outside education. Their comments suggest that the trainers were effective when they had up-to-date knowledge, recent experience, and when information used was relevant to particular training needs and their school context.

5 TTA Key Area Content of HEADLAMP and NPQH Programmes

The term content is used here to mean the broad categories of knowledge and skills which are mediated by trainers through the use of particular materials and examples of practice. The TTA in describing and structuring the standards, the NPQH programme and its support materials,
conceived of headteacher development in a particular way. The broad categories of content reflect this.

Participants were therefore asked in Part 3 of the questionnaire (see Appendix 1) to report on the content of their training programme under the categories of the key areas and skills of headship, which the TTA takes to be: (A) strategic direction and development of the school (6 categories/questions); (B) managing teaching and learning (4 categories/questions); (C) leading and managing staff (4 categories/questions); (D) efficient and effective deployment of staff and resources (4 categories/questions); (E) accountability (4 categories/questions); and (F) skills of headship (4 categories/questions). For each question respondents indicated in a first column whether they had received training in that aspect and then in a second column whether they felt that they needed more training in it. Taking this pair of questions together generates possibilities concerning experience and need of training: no training/no need; had training/no need; no training/need training; had training/need training.

Although it is desirable to present the raw data in these terms and to use this for comparisons such as those between the HEADLAMP HTs and the NPQH DHTs, the entire data on these 26 items has not been presented in this way mainly because this would not easily allow a single overview of the pattern of responses across the two groups of professional learners.

The four separate categories have therefore been reduced to two: "Not Needed" includes the patterns no training/no need and had training/no need, "Need Training" includes no training/need training and had training/need training. Since these two inclusive categories must sum to 100 percent of the frequency for each question, this data can be summarised in a single table by presenting just the percentages of respondents in the "need training" general category for each question and each group, as shown in table 6.6 below.

Chi square procedures have however been applied for each question to the comparison of frequencies of the four basic combination categories mentioned above across the HT and DHT groups and the exact significance level is indicated at the right of each row in table 6.6 below, with values beyond the 0.05 level shown in bold font.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMME CONTENT</th>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Need Training %</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HT</td>
<td>DHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Defining aims and objectives of the school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing effective leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing finance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising and administering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring, evaluating, reviewing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Providing a good learning environment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the curriculum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing teaching and learning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing partnership with parents and others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Managing staff development and performance</td>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating and enabling staff</td>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving staff in decision-making process</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing, planning, allocating the work of staff</td>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Working with governors and colleagues</td>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting appropriate priorities for expenditure</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and managing resource provision</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing and organising accommodation</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Providing support to the governing body</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting an account of the school's performance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that parents and pupils are well informed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a climate of accountability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Leadership skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making skills</td>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-management skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6 Patterns and Percentages of respondents indicating Need training* in relation to aspects of headship programme content (*see text)

To clarify the results in table 6.6, it will also be useful to make selective use of histograms to show the original response pattern trends in the original two aspects involved in the 26 items. There appear to be four basic patterns here and the pattern found for each of the content aspects is shown in the third column of table 6.6 above.
(1) Same main trend: "Had training/Need no training"

This pattern is illustrated in its most extreme form by the responses to the item on monitoring, evaluating reviewing, whose histogram is shown in figure 6.1 below. Here both HTs and DHTs have a pattern dominated by (a) indication that this aspect has featured in the respondent’s training, combined with (b) the claim that the respondent does not need any training i.e. green bars). This may be a claim that "I have had training in this aspect, so I now do not need any more training on this", though other interpretations are possible.

![Histogram showing response pattern](image)

Figure 6.1 HT & DHT response pattern (1) - Providing effective leadership

Approximately this pattern was found in the following items: Defining Aims and Objectives; Providing Effective Leadership; Strategic Planning; Organising and Administering; Monitoring Evaluating and Reviewing; Ensuring that Parents and Pupils are Well Informed; Providing Support to the Governing Body; Leadership Skills; Communicating Skills; Self-Management Skills.

This pattern is defined by relative similarity in the HTs and DHTs, so it is not surprising that only one out of the above ten items showing the pattern has a significant chi square showing a difference between the HTs and the DHTs. This is Leadership Skills, with a highly significant difference. Its histogram patterns for the two groups are presented below in figure 6.2.
The shapes of these patterns are somewhat similar, inasmuch as the "had training, no need for more training" combination dominates both. But the HTs are almost twice as likely to think in this way than the DHTs. The DHTs are more spread into the two next category combinations either side: "no training, but no need for training" (red bar) and "had training, (still) need training" (blue bar). It is perhaps notable that around a quarter of the DHTs appear to consider that leadership is something for which they do not need training as aspiring headteachers.

![Figure 6.2 HT & DHT response pattern (1): Leadership Skills](image)

(2) Contrast: "Had training, no need" (HTs) vs "No training, but need training" (DHTs)

The main feature of this pattern is that the HTs claim that they have had training in this aspect and (so) they do not need any training in it (green bar), whilst the DHTs say that they have had no training, but do need training in this aspect (blue bar). These two combinations were obvious in the following three aspects: Managing Finance; Setting Appropriate Priorities for Expenditure; Planning and Managing Resource Provision. The most simple example of this pattern occurred in the case of Managing Finance, as shown in figure 6.3 below.

The two other aspects just mentioned showed a modified version of the pattern in which other combinations featured quite strongly. These may be seen as mixed patterns and so they will be dealt with below after the other two main patterns have been introduced.
(3) **Contrast:** "Had training, no need" (HTs) vs "No training, no need" (DHTs)

Here the major feature is again that the HTs mainly claim to have had training in this aspect and do not need any (more) (green bar), while the DHTs mainly say that they have had no training, but do not need any (red bar). One of the clearest cases of this pattern is provided by *Managing the Curriculum*, whose patterns are shown in figure 6.4. It is notable that this pattern is to be found in all aspects making up the Teaching and Learning Key Area 2, namely *Providing a Good Learning Environment; Managing the Curriculum; Managing Teaching and Learning; and Developing Partnership with Parents and Others*. It also occurs in half of the items relating to Key Area 3 Leading and Managing Staff, namely *Motivating and Enabling Staff* and *Involving Staff in Decision-Making Process*. It appears that roughly half the deputy heads think that their previous experience presumably as teacher and deputy head have equipped them to deal with the areas of teaching and learning. The fact that the headteachers claim to have had training in these aspects might suggest that once they were heads, they realised they did in fact need such training and took it as part of HEADLAMP. However, we cannot be sure from the questionnaires that the training the HTs are referring to was part of what they chose for their HEADLAMP training. This teaching and learning area also involves some of the mixed versions of this pattern, which will be dealt with below.
Figure 6.4  HT & DHT response pattern (3) - Managing the curriculum

4) Contrast: "No training, need training" vs "Had training, no need"

It can be seen from figure 6.5 below that this pattern is the reverse of (2) above, in that here it is the HTs who are saying mostly that they have had no training in this aspect, but need training (blue bar), but the DHTs mainly say that they have had training and do not need training in this aspect (red bar). This pattern occurred in only two out of the 26 aspects, namely Presenting an Account of the School's Performance and Creating a Climate of Accountability. The last of these two is illustrated in figure 6.5. The occurrence of this pattern in these particular aspects is perhaps not surprising because the TTA and DfEE recently increased the emphasis on accountability and school performance. These seem to have been left to chance in HEADLAMP, but have become established even in the early parts of NPQH. This TTA/DfEE approach might be seen as justified by the fact that the HTs who had taken HEADLAMP are saying they did not have training in these aspects, but also that they’ll be need and in them.
Figure 6.5  HT & DHT response pattern (3) - Creating a Climate of Accountability

(5)  Mixed Patterns

As indicated above, various mixed patterns also occurred. The first of these was 2/3, in which the main categories for HTs and DHTs were as in pattern (2) above, but in addition to the main “no training, but need training” combination (blue bar) amongst DHTs, there was also quite a strong frequency of "No training, and no need for training" (red bar). This pattern is well illustrated in the case of Setting Appropriate Priorities for Expenditure, as shown in figure 6.6 below, but it also occurred in Planning and managing resource provision and Managing and organising accommodation.

This could appear as a negative finding in relation to the TTA intentions. In figure 6.6, for instance, a minority of DHTs are claiming to have been given training on this aspect in the programme and to not need any further training, but over three-quarters of them are claiming not to have had such training in the SLAM module, which seems surprising. It is also interesting that although most of these respondents do say they feel they need training in this respect, more than a quarter of them say they do not. This pattern and contrast are seen even more strongly in Managing and Organising Accommodation (see figure 6.7), which thereby seems to be a rather specific item that has been missing for NPQH training so far.
Figure 6.6  HT & DHT response pattern (2/3) - Setting Appropriate Priorities for Expenditure

Figure 6.7  HT & DHT response pattern (2/3): Managing and Organising Accommodation
The other mixed pattern was 3/2, which had the same main features as pattern (3) ("Had training, no need" - HTs vs "No training, no need" - DHTs), but with a relatively large proportion of DHTs saying that they had no training in the aspect, but did think they needed such training (blue bar). This is illustrated well by responses to *Working with Governors and Colleagues* shown in figure 6.8 below.

![Figure 6.8 HT & DHT response pattern (3/2) - Working with Governors and Colleagues](image)

Figure 6.8   HT & DHT response pattern (3/2) - *Working with Governors and Colleagues*

We can note that pattern (3/2) occurred in three out of the four aspects in TTA key area IV Leading and Managing Staff, the remaining aspect showing a (3) pattern. The (3/2) to was also found in the *Decision-making Skills* aspect of the final key area, *Effective Deployment of People and Resources*. Possibly the most important feature to comment on in this set of results is the variation in DHT responses regarding these important aspects of headship. If there had been time in this study, it would have been very useful to discover why the different deputy heads took these different positions.

*Interview Data*

Whilst the DHTs were generally pleased with the content of the NPQH, the interview data provided useful further details about the quality and effectiveness of the content. For example,
and practical, 9% just said it was theoretical and 21% included combinations of these descriptions. If we include all those who identified professional and practical the total is 70%.

When interviewed about the overall programme they spoke about the delivery, materials, and up-to-date information, school-related issues and recent management techniques. They mentioned that they were able to use some of the materials and information in their roles. For example, one DHT said:

It was delivered by professional people. Every thing was explained, we had lots of handouts to do extra reading, different models were explained to us...there were opportunities to ask questions and to take part in group work. [DHT-1]

The DHTs emphasised the need for the programme to be professional and practical, to be delivered by professional people in a more organised and planned way and to have up-to-date information about school life and the challenges of the moment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item describer</th>
<th>Very effective %</th>
<th>Effective %</th>
<th>Quite effective %</th>
<th>Not effective %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HT</td>
<td>DHT</td>
<td>HT</td>
<td>DHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving your knowledge and understanding</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing you to develop strategic direction and development of school</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing you to secure and sustain effective teaching and learning</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing you in leading and managing staff</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing you in effective deployment of people and staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing you in effective deployment of resources</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing you to be accountable to the governors and others</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging analysis of your role and leadership skills</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing your self-confidence in using these leadership skills</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing you to meet national standards for headteachers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.7  Rated Effectiveness of training programmes to meet different aspects of headship

Chapter 6
They were also asked in question 20 to judge the effectiveness of the programmes in developing their capabilities in ten broad categories, which were simplified version of the TTA key aspects of headship. The percentage frequencies for the two groups are presented in Table 6.7 below.

It is clear from table 6.7 that the respondents generally expressed positive judgments. Across both groups the modal frequency for half of all the items was only "quite effective", although in the remaining items the mode was in the "effective" category. The clearest positive trends were for *Improving Your Knowledge and Understanding* and *Encouraging Analysis of Your Role and Leadership Skills* and this applied particularly to the HTs. The only item showing a significant difference between the ratings by HTs and DHTs was *Preparing You in Effective Deployment of People and Staff*. Here the ratings were on the whole negative and significantly more negative by the DHTs. It is perhaps interesting that in the final item, the general judgment concerning the effectiveness of the training to prepare for meeting national standards for headteachers looks clearly more positive for the DHTs than for the HTs, although this difference was not statistically significant.

The data collected by interview tended to confirm the positive nature of the above questionnaire data. Of the HTs interviewed all mentioned that training had a very positive impact in their school and on them. For example, heads reported positively when they were asked whether they had used anything from the programme in their role. They stressed that they had benefited quite a lot and used the programme content in their role, particularly managing finance, monitoring the curriculum, monitoring the teaching and learning, leading and managing staff, school development planning, staff development and appraisal. HTs also made the following statements:

I think preparing me for leading and managing staff was probably the most helpful element of the process in terms of core development planning, the link between that staff development and appraisal and effective and realistic job description.  [HT-1]

This head also mentioned that he had benefited quite a lot "...concerning the management of finance...it provided me with sufficient background knowledge" [HT-1]. Another said:

...a lot of the work that we did was very current; for instance for monitoring teaching and learning, for monitoring the outcome in teaching and learning and then of putting the system in place and to bring about an improvement in teaching and learning. [HT-2]

It is perhaps significant that some HTs not only felt that they benefited from the training, but also used some of the ideas and materials with their colleagues so as to involve them in any
new initiatives that arose from the training. For example, HT-2 and HT-4 gave evidence of
direct application to their situations:

When I have been doing target setting and work with the governors, I have used some
of materials that I was given. The school development plan has been revised and now
we have much more structured and systematic school development plan. [HT-2]

'The work we did on leadership and management...I used that just so very recently
actually with my senior management team the work that we did on leadership and
management. [HT-4]

Another commented on the course "...we did quite a lot of work on target setting and
management of finance, which are obviously very relevant at the moment and that was very
useful "[HT-5].

Similarly, when interviewed, the small number of DHTs also gave evidence of more tangible
benefits. One DHT said, "I benefited quite a lot from the training. I think it has sharpened my
practice in a fairly broad sense. It has improved my knowledge, skills and confidence"[DHT-
4]. Again making similar points to these made by the HTs; the DHTs also talked about the
effectiveness of the programme trainers and the relevance of the content to individual situations
as well as their schools' circumstances. Some of the issues relate to the content and some to the
trainers of the programme, which was discussed in an earlier section.

Closed Items on Types and Timing of Training

Towards the end of part three of the questionnaire, respondents were asked about their
preferences amongst four different forms of management training and the best timing for
headship training programmes. The results are briefly presented below in Figure 6.9 (in this
the leftmost pair of bars refer to missing-data returns) and they will be commented on later in
relation to the open-ended question findings concerning respondents' views on future forms of
headship training. For the moment we can notice that mentoring and school-based training are
the strongly favoured forms, particularly by the headteachers. The DHTs are the only ones to
mention school-industry based training and they tend to rate award bearing courses rather
higher than the HTs.

Respondents were next asked what they thought to be the best timing for HEADLAMP/NPQH
training amongst three alternatives or their combination. The results for this item were very
clear cut in that 70 percent of HTs indicated that training should be during the school and
weekend, with 20 percent of them indicating a combination, and DHTs showed a 40 percent
response to each of these. However, there was little indication of what these respondents would include in the combinations.

![Graph showing preferred types of management training](image)

**Figure 6.9** Preferred types of management training

*Open-ended Questions: Benefits and Forms of Future Training*

The final three questions in Part Four, the last part of the questionnaire, were open-ended. It was recognised that exposure to all the previous items in the questionnaire could possibly influence the respondents' ways of thinking and the space available for their written responses was relatively small. But the researcher considered it important to provide respondents with at least some opportunity to express their thoughts on these issues in their own words.

The following general strategy was adopted for analysis of responses to these question. In order to maximise validity of interpretation, all responses were first examined independently by the researcher and a colleague with the purpose of summarising the main ideas into a series of categories. These two judges then discussed their categories in the light of examples and came to agreement on a common set. The entire set of responses to the question (HEADLAMP and NPQH) were then independently rated by each judge for the presence of these categories, with multiple category allocations being permitted where appropriate. As an inter-judge reliability check, a subset of 20 independently judged responses would be compared. If these were found to yield at least a 70 percent agreement rate in terms of category application, remaining disagreements were settled by discussion. This occurred for
the first and last questions, on *Personal Benefits* and *Preferred Forms of Future Training*, but in the case of *Benefits to the School*, it was not possible to follow such a systematic procedure completely, as it will be reported below.

1  **Benefits to Participant**

The following categories were produced as the basis for recording responses to question one (How did you benefit...?). In each case, the examples quoted are just the parts of responses relating to the category in question. Some complete responses are given further below (p.101).

(1)  *Meeting and sharing experiences with people in a similar position:* Here the main idea is that coming together with other heads or deputy heads enables them to gain in a variety of ways, with the nature of those gains often being left implicit. Examples include:

An opportunity to discuss things in-depth, in quality time, with colleagues who are having similar experience. The benefit of advice from colleagues who have been doing the job for longer than you. (HT)

I enjoyed and benefited from meeting with other heads to discuss issues -- in fact our tutor group still meets regularly. (HT)

Discussion with colleagues, similar experiences, challenges in different LEAs (DHT)

Meeting local heads in the same situation in close proximity to school - good for liaison. (HT)

The opportunity to take issues directly related to managing school and discuss them with others. (HT)

Developing a network of colleagues with similar views and aspirations (DHT)

There seem to be two emphases here: firstly, the benefits of being able to discuss relevant issues in detail with others who had experience of such matters, sometimes considerably more experience. Secondly, the idea of building relationships and networks of support with colleagues for the present and stretching into the future.

(2)  *Acquisition of knowledge/awareness of strategies, practices and other factors that will improve performance of one's headship role:* Comments emphasising the importance of time and distance for reflection and analysis were included under this category.

Developing skills and acquiring knowledge useful for headship - also productive for my present role. (DHT)

Increased knowledge/up-to-date research (DHT)

Learning about finance and how to access services from LEA. (HT)

Opportunities the course allows for reflection and analysis of how schools work and one's place in it. (DHT)
The time to consider ways of moving from a reactive position toward proactive -- where theoretical frameworks can underpin practicalities and manage change. (HT)

(3)  Experience/acquisition of knowledge on which to base self-evaluation and estimation of necessary commitment: This category is similar to the previous one, but also slightly different. In category No 2 the emphasis is on the utility of the knowledge gained for the performance of the role, whilst in this category the emphasis is on self-awareness and appraisal regarding one's potential for the job. Example include:

It has enabled me to take stock - self-evaluation has been valuable. (DHT)
Professional development -- Able to have an insight into headship before becoming a head. (DHT)
Confidence to apply for headships - realistic expectations of problems/rewards involved in a headship (DHT)

(4)  Instrumental: Essentially to do with achieving gains and avoiding being disadvantaged in career terms. For example:

Gaining professional qualification which will be essential. (DHT)
Easier to gain headship in future (DHT)
To achieve the qualification (DHT)

(5)  Increase in confidence and self-esteem:

Increased confidence in an ability to manage team/school. (HT)
Greater confidence in my skills and abilities at managing all aspects of a small school. (HT)
The training given will give me the confidence through the preparation of the course tasks, workshops etc (DHT)

(6)  Other: A small number of a small number HTs mentioned as a personal benefit the importance of money and courses that were dedicated specifically to headship training. Not only did this permit headship training to happen by preventing this funding from getting soaked up by other school needs, but it also raised the status of headship and made the training more attractive. A small minority of clearly negative responses were present.

Quite often these categories occurred in combination. Table 6.8 presents the "multiple response frequencies" for them, that is, the percentage of responses containing each category, whether alone or in combination with other categories. These percentages therefore typically add up to more than 100% because more than one category could and often did occur in combination in particular responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived benefit</th>
<th>HEADLAMP</th>
<th>NPQH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting and sharing experience</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of knowledge/awareness to improve performance</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience/acquisition of knowledge to base self-evaluation and commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental benefits</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in confidence and self-esteem</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.8  Personal benefits from Headship training received:**

*Multiple frequency Percentages per group*

Reproduction of some complete responses should help give a more concrete idea of the range of variation in participants outlooks on this question regarding personal benefits from undertaking the relevant programme:

I was looking forward to, what I thought would be, a good professional development course - (at last). But I have been very disappointed. In fact I feel "de-skilled " rather than the reverse. (DHT)

Many, self-esteem, needs assessment. Access to professional support. A clearer route to your first headship post. Working closely with colleagues from different schools, phases, etc having a reflective friend - an excellent idea. (DHT)

- Confidence to apply for headships
- realistic expectations of problems/rewards involved in headship
- has given me as stronger role in as a manager as I am better equipped to support the head (DHT)

Working and sharing ideas with other heads. (HT)

Meeting other heads and realising we are all in the same boat. (HT)

An opportunity for reflection on my preferred/emerging style of leadership and that required by my school. The time to consider ways of moving from a reactive practice toward proactive -- where chosen theoretical frameworks can underpin practicalities and manage change. (HT)

2  **Benefits to School**

When the responses to this question (concerning ways in which the school would benefit from the respondent undertaking HEADLAMP or NPQH training) were examined, it was found that they tended to continue and reflect the responses to the previous question on personal benefits,
And showed not enough variation and detail to justify setting up another descriptive category system. For example, roughly 80 percent of both headteachers and deputies talked about of themselves and what they would take into the school, rather than about the concrete school benefits which would result from this.

The personal gains they referred to included the sorts of items found in the previous question on personal benefits, typically including references to insights, up-to-date knowledge, broader perspectives, better understanding, becoming more analytical, getting more confident, having raised self-esteem. In each case roughly half of respondents referred to qualities they now possessed and the other half mentioned qualities and benefits they would bring in the future.

Amongst the school-related benefits they did describe where the following: the school gained insights into current changes, the headteacher's networking has enabled staff to visit other schools; self-esteem of pupils and staff was raised, the school had become more efficient, clearer strategic plan.

7 Ideas concerning Future Headship Training

Given that the writer's basic purpose in undertaking this study was to provide insights which could illuminate the development of headship training in Turkey, this third and final open-ended question can be considered as having particular importance, even though it does need to be considered in relation to other information gained from the questionnaire responses as a whole. In this item respondents were requested to give their ideas on the ways in which headteachers should be trained in the future. Although a total of 23 cent of the overall sample failed to respond to this particular item, it was noticeable that those who did respond tended to give their longest open-ended replies to this question.

These responses were also relatively rich and varied. For example, it was possible to apply the category derivation system described at the beginning of this section of the chapter and to discover eight categories, which are described below. But it should also be emphasised that responses generally contained a combination of a number of these categories and that they only cover the major ideas that were found across the responses. In order to convey this richness, the categories will each be described and then some complete responses will be presented, rather than just the parts which correspond to these categories.

1 Combination: This means that the respondent is saying that a combination of more than one type of training provision or methods should be used. This was sometimes stated
explicitly, but more usually it just reflected the fact that the respondents did mention more than one approach in their response.

2 Practical Situating: This category involves the idea that headship training should ideally take place in the school situation, but the category was also applied where there were references to training needing to be real, practical, "hands-on", or to involve "collegiality", shadowing, consulting and discussion with school colleagues, especially with experienced head teachers.

3 Mentoring: This could possibly have been included under the previous category, but it occurred relatively often and sometimes within responses that also included points matching the previous situating category, and this suggested that it was seen at least by some respondents as meaning something different. Mentoring was therefore given a category of its own. By mentoring it is here meant a situation where a headship trainee has a person chosen to help them become familiar with and learn about the various aspects of headship. The category was used for responses in which this meaning was more or less clear, or in which the term mentoring was actually used.

4 Realistic financial support for adequate professional learning: Here the emphasis was on the need to provide support (mainly financial) to ensure that headship trainees can actually engage effectively in the training provided. This was frequently seen in terms of financial support to obtain teaching cover whilst deputy heads and teaching heads took such courses during the school week. Therefore this category tended to have connections with category 8 below (Time and Timing), although it was decided that it was useful to keep it as a separate classification.

5 Content specification: This refers to the specification of particular topics and areas which respondents felt should be covered within headship training. These topics showed some variation, but finance and budget issues very frequent, while interpersonal aspects of management and leadership hardly seemed be mentioned much at all.

6 Flexibility/matching of provision to learner individual needs: This was where the respondent called for headship training provision to be differentiated and matched with individuals’ professional learning needs.

7 Approval of current provision: This refers simply to respondents expressing satisfaction with the current HEADLAMP/NPQH forms of provision.
Time and timing: This category contained various forms of reference to time, mainly including two aspects. Firstly, sufficient time in relation to training objectives, which could include claims that more time is needed to achieve goals NPQH has set itself, as well as suggestions that the course should be cut down so that it is manageable in the time available. Secondly, this category included issues about the appropriate times for headship training to occur: for example some respondents thought that it needs to be before taking up any headship post, others thought it would be most useful after a headteacher has got used to the job and some referred to need for ongoing arrangements of various kinds.

Other: This category included a number of other varied kinds of items, including references to quality of provision, dissatisfaction with the nature of headship standards specification, the need for distance from one's own school and work situation, including the useful role of regular residential conferences.

Following below are presented a number of complete quotations of responses to question three, in order to illustrate the relative richness of responses, and to provide concrete examples of the categories above.

Support in school, using real issues to deal with, time is too important to go away and think about hypothetical cases. Mentors near to school would be useful - mine was too far away and not really from the same type of environment. Residential courses are good - keep you in touch with colleagues. Mentoring by heads 3-4 years into first headship would be more useful. (HT 8 - Categories 1,2,3,8)

I was fortunate to have held a senior management post for many years before deciding to move into headship. Thus my training always underpinned senior management responsibilities. Whilst the NPQH may replicate this in part for less fortunate professionals than I, I do believe that nothing fully prepares the individual for the full weight of total responsibility for a school. Thus I would consider headlamp training absolutely vital as a support in the early years of headship. (HT 4 - categories 1,7,8)

Academic training prior to headship:

once in headship mentoring - conference training to provide space - to think and learn

training with group of other heads near enough to practically continue contact as professional friends. (HT 37 - categories 1,3,8,9)

Prospective heads could be given a secondment to work for a term in two other schools, shadowing the existing experienced heads, the schools should be of different characters to allow comparison to be made of the skills required. (HT40 - category 2)

Greater theoretical framework to course:

mentoring with closer association to accreditation

working alongside experienced practitioners (DHT 41 - categories 2,3,9)

NPQH module undertaken so far has been very beneficial; other idea would be to have time planned with "mentor head" or colleague with appropriate (REAL)
experience (not just theory or consultant) in setting budget, writing annual reports, running parents AGM, etc (DHT 37 - categories 1,2,3,7)

I think that the framework for NPQH is correct but I'd like to see more mentoring included. (DHT36 - categories 1,2,7)

Still far too many tasks to be completed prior to final assessment. For most candidates this has to be done in the holidays which slows down all processes. In primary sector virtually all candidates have full-time classroom commitments plus managerial work to do after school. (DHT35 - categories 4,8)

Mentoring? (DHT 33 - category 3)

To properly fund the NPQH training. Not to expect deputies to undertake training in the evenings and at weekends, on top of an already heavy workload. Primary deputies with full time class teaching commitments are unfairly disadvantaged. (DHT 32 - categories 4, 8)

On the job and by courses like NPQH - but so far I've been very disappointed with the content and delivery of the NPQH. (DHT26 - categories 1,5, 9)

More use of case study situations with time to determine own course of action and study those actually undertaken - real-life situations, real decision-making. (DHT 30 - categories 2,5)

The course has placed an unrealistic burden - the number of weekends and holidays used up along with time needed for assignments and inter-sessional activities is great - the job is already varied enough and I feel I have not been doing my deputy's job quite as thoroughly as I should. (DHT 24 - categories 4,8)

A "hands-on" approach is the best way to learn. A headteacher's workload is varied and a candidate needs the opportunity to practice through working closely with a headteacher. A candidate needs the opportunity to contribute and to monitor the way as school is run. This is in addition to the type of experiences offered by NPQH training - which I have found beneficial. (DHT 23 - categories 1,2)

Since the number of applicants has risen sharply as each cohort finds out more information about the precise details of the course. I feel strongly that the tasks for assessment are far too detailed and time-consuming. Training in future should avoid too much of this written assessment and more on evaluating the candidates performance in school on task. (DHT 20 - categories 5,8,9)

Should cut down on the competency statements. Should be given paid leave/secondment for at least one term to update NPQH, which is in fact be useful qualification and going in the right action. It really needs to be slimmed down and rationalised. Too much like GNVQ ! (DHT 16 - categories 4,7, 9)

Teachers should have good basic programme of professional development - properly funded. This would then "add up" to build up a skills/leadership profile that could go towards needs offer with a shadowing element as a final element once experience at deputy level was reached. (DHT 14 - categories 2,4)

Give them space (time) to be trained. More relevance and differentiation based on the next ability group of trainees. Make criteria bullet pointed for early portfolio building.

Sorry about the scribble. It is very late on Sunday night and I start an OFSTED inspection week in the morning. (DHT 12 - categories 4, 6,8,9)
To these written responses may be added some of the comments made by respondents in the follow-up telephone interviews, for example, one deputy head thought that certain aspects of managerial training might be needed even by newly qualified teachers:

As you go into your teaching as a newly qualified teacher, especially if you're going into a primary, quite often you're going to be asked to run the curriculum area and manage budgets. [DH-3].

The remarks of another DHT were close to some of those quoted above from the written responses:

Attending compulsory training is a good thing, but it's how it's delivered and what it's expecting of people to achieve that qualification. People don't have time.

I think there should be management training...but some of the tasks that are on the NPOH that you were expected to carry out, there wasn't enough clarity on what they were expected to do and also they were too demanding, they were too lengthy for people with such responsibilities...there is a lot of responsibility and a lot of deputies have full-time class commitment as well... [DH-4].

These examples and those given above from the final open-ended question are only a selection of responses, but they do illustrate that an aspect category system may be useful, but it has limitations. The limitations include the fact that even when particular categories apply more or less clearly, there is still often much further detail within what respondents say, and these details may be important. It may be still more important to remember that the categories typically deal only with separate aspects of what respondents say and that their statements often have an integrated structure which involves different kinds of connections between these aspects (see Miles and Huberman, 1994). This means that there is no substitute for examining the actual ways respondents made their replies and this is why the above examples have been offered.

Nevertheless, analysis of quantitative trends in respondents' references to these category aspects may be useful to help communicate a picture of the thinking across the whole sample. This was done in two forms. First, a multiple response frequency analysis was carried out with the use of the SPSS package. This analysis presents the percentages of respondents mentioning each category and its results are presented in table 6.9 (percentages for the set of categories add up to more than 100 because respondents were able to mention multiple categories as seen above). Second, a bar chart is presented in figure 6.10 of the percentages of respondents showing the full range of combinations of aspect categories found in these samples (the leftmost bars refer to missing data.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Method</th>
<th>HTs</th>
<th>DHTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Combination of methods</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
<td>10 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Real situation/practical</td>
<td>14 (47%)</td>
<td>14 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Mentoring</td>
<td>5 (17%)</td>
<td>11 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Realistic financial support</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>13 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Content specification</td>
<td>5 (17%)</td>
<td>8 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Match individual needs</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Approve current training</td>
<td>8 (27%)</td>
<td>8 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Time &amp; timing</td>
<td>16 (53%)</td>
<td>6 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Other</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>4 (11%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.10

Figure 6.10  Future training preferences: Multiple Response bar chart  
(for category number key see table 6.9 above)
It can be noticed that quite a large number of respondents failed to reply to this question, particularly the HTs. Apart from this, looking at table 6.9 and figure 6.10, various features can be seen in the responses of those who did complete the question.

Firstly, the range of aspect combinations is spread quite widely: many respondents showed many of these common features in their mixed responses, but very few used exactly the same combination. This may be seen as important, since, even when these busy professional learners were given only a very small amount of space at the end of a rather long questionnaire, they typically felt it was important to refer to a number of features in talking about future headship training; and this was confirmed more directly by the examples given previously. In terms of actual training, however, it is true that only just over a quarter of HTs and DHTs actually specified a combination of training methods (category 1).

Secondly, after taking into account the spread of emphasis amongst the categories, the table and the figure both indicate that certain of the categories have a stronger representation. There was relatively frequent reference by both groups to real situations/practical tasks and settings (category 2) and a slight tendency towards combinations including categories 2 (real situation) and 3 (mentoring). This is suggested by the bar chart and it was a definite impression when the researcher read through all the responses to this question.

Thirdly, a statistical comparison is not possible because of the multiple responses, but an examination of table 6.9 indicates slight contrast between the HTs and DHTs. The deputy heads refer more frequently to the need for realistic financial support (category 4), which may be because NPQH is a centrally administered common form of provision, which respondents must fit in with in terms of study, assignment completion, travel etc. The DHTs may feel that when such demands are made on them, the necessary resources should be provided so that they do not have to use even more of their own time to engage in headship training. By contrast, the head teachers refer more to time and timing (category 8) than the DHTs. Examination of the actual responses indicates that it is actually the timing aspect that the headteachers are mainly referring to. There were some quite strong contrasts in their recommendations on this: a number of respondents suggested that NPQH-type training should be available before practically situated activities such as shadowing and mentoring, but at least one other thought that such training should only occurred after a couple of years in the job getting used to headship.
It seems fair to conclude that the overall picture in relation to these respondents’ ideas about headship training in the future is a relatively positive one, but heavily qualified, as far as the provision they had received under the TTA’s schemes is concerned. That is, generally, these schemes were approved of, though with three main kinds of reservation. First, particularly the DHTs complained about the lack of realistic support to give them the time to engage properly in NPQH training whilst continuing their existing jobs. Second, they pointed out that in practice the quality of implementation is important (and that it had not always been good enough in their experience). Third, that practically situated elements are very important and are lacking in the present provision. For many respondents it would be best to add these practical elements to the kinds of provision already offered in HEADLAMP and NPQH, though there were some, particularly deputy headteachers, who seemed to be suggesting that such situated learning could replace the formal modules provided at separate training centres in NPQH. These various points should of course be considered together with related findings from other parts of the questionnaires and interviews, and this will be done in the next chapter.
CHAPTER SEVEN
DISCUSSION

In this final chapter the researcher will return to the basic purpose of the study as a whole, which was to gain insights which might be relevant to school principal training in Turkey. The historical and conceptual reviews in chapters two and three form one part of the study. The other part, as indicated in chapter 5, was an empirical study of UK headship PD provision with a general focus on the evaluative purposes Chelimsky (1997) calls knowledge-building and development, which in this case were eventually for possible use in relation to the Turkish situation.

In order to consider these possible insights, it is necessary first to reflect on the empirical investigation in order to summarise and assess its findings. This will need to be based on a critical examination of its design and implementation.

Following this, the second section of this chapter will consider possible implications of the empirical findings, in the context of the previous review of the recent development and establishment of headship training in the UK, and in the light of the PD framework proposed in chapter 4. First this will be done for the UK context, including brief comments on the present findings in relation to studies that appeared whilst the present one was being conducted and the most recent changes to the TTA headship training provision. Finally, possible lessons for the Turkish context will be considered, including reference to some issues and uncertainties concerning possible cross-cultural differences which may well be relevant.

1 The Empirical Study and its Findings

In order to assess the validity or trustworthiness of the findings of a study, this must be done in relation to the questions the study is intended to answer (Robson, 1993). In the present case, these goals were knowledge-building and development, but it has been argued in chapter 4 that in the case of goal-oriented programmes, these purposes must include the issue of effectiveness. Because of practical circumstances and the importance of participants' perspectives, as stressed by recent Constructivist insights, the researcher therefore argued that it was important to focus on participants' views, concerning both process and impact.
Reflections on the Design and Implementation of the Study

This section will consider the strengths and weaknesses in principle and in practice of the chosen methodology and sampling approach, in the light of experiencing the implementation and the data yielded by the study.

This research was designed as a consultation with participants in headship training. Given the underlying developmental purpose of the work, there still seems no reason to take an alternative approach. In fact, in general terms it might have been more useful to extend the methods for achieving this consultation of the central stakeholders, as emphasised in the recent history of evaluation research. (Chelimsky, 1997 and see chapter 4).

Methodology

Turning to the specific methods used, the main one was postal questionnaires, with a small amount of triangulation through the use of telephone interviews. It could be claimed that within the questionnaire a more restricted form of triangulation was achieved through the use of a number of open-ended questions in addition to the closed items, but the researcher recognises that this is not a strong claim.

The questionnaire did include a large number of specific, closed-question items, based partly on the researcher's interest in the impact effectiveness aspects of headship training and on sampling considerations (see below also). The content of questions and sections did overlap to some extent. In terms of traditional survey instrument design (Oppenheim, 1966), this could be seen as a basis for establishing reliability, although this would require data analyses that were beyond the scope of the present thesis.

It was also realised at the analysis stage that some questions could not safely be assumed to provide the indications which were intended. For example, in the items in Part Three on experienced/need training in various aspects of programme content, the pattern of responses cannot be taken as a simple indicator even of the respondents' views of the effectiveness of the programme, and it can be still less considered to get at any "real" effects beyond their perceptions. More specifically, for example, a respondent who says that he or she has "had training" but also that he or she "needs training" may mean any of a number of things. Another example is the Likert-type effectiveness scale, where the possibility of ambiguity was raised previously in chapter six. In contrast, other questions like the open-ended items concerning future training recommendations were seen to be richer in information and more
directly related to the eventual illuminative purpose of the study. It must be added that an unfortunate number of respondents failed to complete one or more of these open-ended items.

In retrospect, therefore, in so far as the same sampling approach would be taken and questionnaires used, the researcher feels that it would probably have been equally effective to design a shorter instrument, with more open-ended items. Also, in contrast to most of the items in the questionnaire, the flexibility and richness gained by the use of telephone interviews were considerable, and this would encourage the researcher to make much more use of semi-structured interview methods in researching this kind of area in the future. This would also give a stronger form of triangulation, although it would also raise issues of sampling.

**Sampling Approach**

Perhaps because of his initial concern with outcome effectiveness, this researcher chose the traditional form of probabilistic sampling and attempted to achieve a strong version of this by gaining access via LEAs to the entire population of those who had taken headship training within the previous year. The researcher accepts that for a knowledge building/developmental evaluation purpose it is particularly important to get the fullest range of viewpoints possible. Therefore it might in some ways be better to use a theoretical sampling approach (Pidgeon, 1996), in which the focus is on systematically discovering variations and contrasts in respondent viewpoints. But a major difficulty of this approach lies in gaining access to contrasting views and it would have been a risky strategy here because of the researcher's practical circumstances.

The return rate of 67 percent is fairly successful for postal surveys (Robson, 1993), but it has long been known that in some circumstances non-respondents tend to have different views from respondents (Oppenheim, 1966) and this suggests that findings from the present study may need to be treated with caution. However, it is perhaps likely that this would apply more strongly to views about impact and effectiveness, but less to views on process and future training possibilities, which are the main concern here. It can also be argued more positively that it is the more thoughtful and committed participants who are likely to provide responses.

**Trustworthiness**

In any research based on consulting people's views, issues of the validity or trustworthiness arise (Robson, 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1994). These issues centrally include questions about
how far respondents have understood questions in the ways intended by the researcher and how fully they have been able to express their views in the time and space available. A further issue may be even more important, namely, in so far as they have these opportunities, how far have they then expressed what they really thought, in spite of any motivation to do otherwise?

In this research, although some limitations on written questionnaires have been recognised above, this researcher argues that the large number of questions involved and the similarities amongst them can help indicate trustworthiness, at least in the form of consistency, by similarity in responses to questions raising comparable issues. Testing this at the level of individual responses would require further data analyses which are beyond the scope of this thesis, but relationships between responses trends in the two groups (HTs and DHTs) and the whole sample have been taken into account in chapter six and further below in this chapter.

It was recognised that although headteachers may have "had little to lose" by saying anything negative about headship training, deputy head teachers were being asked to evaluate aspects of a course where they thought their judged performance would strongly influence their career chances. For this reason, it was felt important to assure respondents that what they said would not be disclosed to anyone involved in NPQH. Questionnaire returns were therefore made anonymously and sent directly to the researcher at a university address. It turned out that this may not have been as necessary as the researcher had thought, as one respondent commented in an open-ended question response that the separation between course providers and central NPQH assessors was so strong, that candidates were prevented from having feedback on their assignments! It can also be pointed out that there was certainly a wide range of negative and positive comments in the questionnaire returns and there was generally similarity between written comments and those made in the private telephone interviews direct to the researcher.

**Findings of the study**

A relatively detailed account of the analyses of the various sections of the questionnaire and interview data has been provided in the previous chapter. The present section will focus on what the researcher sees as the main findings supported by these analyses. It is recognised that this must involve selectivity and interpretation, and that enabling readers to critically appraise the researcher's claims means that the basis for any selection and interpretation should be made clear.

In the case of selection, it has been frequently clarified that the researcher's interest lies in informing Turkish school principal training on the basis of the perspectives of UK course
participant stakeholders in headship training. At the outset of the study his own personal views as to the effectiveness of different forms of training was relatively open. That is, he believed that a number of different methods could probably make different contributions, but that such effects would probably depend on various further factors such as resources and personnel. However, it should also be disclosed that the researcher was also a member of a Turkish university education faculty. He was likely in the future to be involved in university provision of aspects of school principal training and his interest in improving such provision was still a central background here.

Two further factors have shaped the presentation made below. One is the general PD framework proposed by the writer in chapter four. The other is his “grounded experience” (Pidgeon, 1996) of the participants and their views in the study. Readers can critically examine the selectivity of this presentation against the fuller range of data and analysis in chapter six - although it is recognised that chapter six itself cannot be claimed to be the total picture of all available information in the study. In the case of interpretation, reasons for particular interpretations will be presented as specific issues are encountered.

**Needs Assessment**

According to the PD framework proposed in chapter four, the first important aspect for course participants is needs assessment. In retrospect, it would have been useful to directly ask respondents how far they did actually find needs assessment important or helpful. Nevertheless, there were indications that they did find it useful. Amongst other things, a strong majority of headteachers and a slight majority of deputy heads felt that the needs assessment process identified their training needs at least partly. But there was a strong preference for certain methods of needs assessment, especially for personal interviews, whether alone or in combination, especially with self-evaluation. By contrast, two methods in particular were very unpopular, namely psychometric testing and the observed presentation and group discussion. Respondents also recognised that quality of implementation of such processes is important, for example in personal interviewing.

Although we did not learn much at all about the focus and content of these personal interviews, the popularity of this approach may be taken as indicating that these respondents were taking an authentic, socially constructive learning stance. That is, they wished their views to be heard, but they were willing to accept the assistance of more expert others, such as retired headteachers, for the needs assessment aspect of PD provision. This was consistent
with the fact that respondents taking the more structured NPQH programme commented very negatively on its strong separation of needs assessment and course provision, which seems to have prevented needs assessment from being used effectively.

Realistic Support for Involvement in Headship PD

The next element in our proposed PD framework is the development programme or process of professional learning. Various further aspects of this were specified, but a very central emphasis in the responses in this study was on the underlying issue of having realistic support for engagement in training provision, whatever kind of processes would be offered. This aspect will therefore be dealt with first, before we turn to other aspects of process, such as methods and personnel.

The closed item responses indicated that headteachers and deputy heads both tended to see most of the organisational arrangements they had experienced as more or less effective, including provision of financial support. However, the interviews and the later open-ended responses indicated some strong concerns that the arrangements were disrupting personal free time and teaching. It was felt that supply teaching cover was needed to free participants for proper study during work time, but even then, some were not happy about the disruption this could cause to their classes.

There may be some dilemmas here, at least as far as formal course provision away from schools is concerned. But in relation to participants’ motivation and stress prevention the message seems clear that adequate financial support and realistic organisational arrangements are essential.

Training methods

This aspect seems particularly relevant to the knowledge-building, developmental purpose of the study. Although it was indicated earlier that "training" has sometimes been seen as a narrow, mechanistic kind of activity, we can see indications that these respondents did not generally see headship training in such a restricted way, although there were possible exceptions to this. Particularly in their open-ended responses to the question about “the ways headteachers should be trained in the future”, they tended to talk about meaningful approaches such as workshops, seminars and lectures, and to think that a combination of methods was useful. They also thought that considerable time tends to be needed in order to let these different kinds of approach work.
However, they did also particularly recommend using real situations and authentic practice. This included considering real cases, especially their own, in seminars and discussion, but there was a particular emphasis on active involvement in real situations, such as shadowing headteachers or working with their own heads, and a considerable number of the deputy heads also mentioned mentoring. This emphasis on real situations may have been partly a reaction to the training centre-based provision of NPQH, although in general they approved of existing provision and in this emphasis they were apparently only suggesting something extra that they saw as missing. Again, there were exceptions to this in that whilst some were clear that there should be a combination of training forms and even suggested particular orders of implementation, a very small minority appeared to want to replace formal courses with informal school-based learning.

Two other points can be noted here. First, in taking this situated approach, these respondents were in fact echoing current theoretical emphases such as those of sociocultural psychology (Lave & Wenger, 1993) and cognitive skill theory (Eraut, 1994; Tomlinson, 1995a). Second, this supports the relevance of the constructivist view that people typically bring their own ideas and expectations to educational experiences, including metacognitive ideas about the nature of learning and training itself (Bransford et al, 1999).

In the above context, it is interesting theoretically and practically to note that simulation/role-play was not generally thought effective in the questionnaire responses and that it received some particularly negative comments in the telephone interviews. One of the major claimed advantages of this method (Taylor and Walford, 1965) is to enable the actual practice of strategies in a more or less "real" but safe context. However, many participants seem to feel very uncomfortable with the "inauthentic" nature of such situations, which they rejected in favour of immersion in real contexts. The issue we turn to next, quality of implementation, may be important here.

Quality of implementation

This heading includes a number of aspects at the concrete level of actually carrying out PD processes, centrally involving quality of activity, personnel and resources.

Respondents clearly attributed considerable importance to the quality of implementation of course activities, which they often linked with quality of trainers and resources. This was evidenced in various places, including closed item questionnaire responses concerning trainers, their preparation, presentations and effectiveness, in the telephone interviews, and in
responses to the open-ended items at the end of the questionnaire. There were also a few comments about the need for adequate preparation and availability of good quality resources, usually in the context of complaints about the rushed nature of course implementation at some training centres.

Equally important was further evidence, consistent with constructivist claims referred to earlier, that these respondents already possessed their own theories about various aspects of professional capability, learning and in particular, training. Specifically, there were indications of a strongly shared view that the best personnel to involve in headship training are themselves experienced head teachers. These indications were particularly clear in the open-ended responses, but they were strongly corroborated by the other emphasis on authentic school-based activity and mentoring. It is not possible to tell whether respondents were just assuming that experienced heads would automatically make good trainers, as they were not probed on this issue. But the available information does strongly suggest that the involvement of experienced headship practitioners is a key credibility issue for headship trainees in the UK context.

Content orientations

There was also some evidence that these respondents tended to share certain ideas about what does and does not need to be included by way of content of headship training. There was considerable indication for example of a strong concern with financial and budgeting capability, both by existing heads and aspiring deputies. More than half of the deputy heads indicated that they had not had training in these areas, but that they felt they needed it.

By contrast, there was a more mixed and slightly negative picture with respect to interpersonal aspects and managing teaching and learning aspects of headship. In the interpersonal aspects, which included motivating and enabling staff, involving staff in decision-making, managing staff development, developing relationships with parents, and in the teaching and curriculum areas, substantial minorities claimed that they had had no training in these aspects and did not need it. However, there were considerable individual differences here and the interpretation of the above kinds of response patterns must be left open, given that extensive interview follow-up is not available to gain access to the reasoning behind them.
2 Broader issues

Having tried to draw together the most significant aspects of the responses of participants involved in the empirical study, the writer's task is now to further examine their possible meanings and implications, first of all in the UK context and for possible lessons for the Turkish situation. This will be done in the context of a small number of recent papers on NPQH that became available during or after the empirical study reported here, which will be briefly reviewed next.

Recent UK Studies and Developments

Recent studies

A range of perspectives have been adopted in recent papers concerning NPQH. They range from relatively limited, concrete focuses in empirical studies, through to broader and more radical examinations offered in more analytical forms of critique. There seems to have been relatively little empirical study of NPQH, which is perhaps not surprising because of its length and because of the expectation that it might be changed soon in the light of experience.

A brief report is available of the evaluation of the trials of NPQH carried out by Wolf for the TTA (TTA, 1997b). According to this internal evaluation, NPQH was already making a positive impact on schools in terms of the development of new structures, improved monitoring and evaluation procedures, improved staff development, more strategic approaches to development planning and a greater knowledge base.

Collarbone (1998), the director of the NPQH London Assessment Centre, published a brief study based on questionnaire feedback collected from candidates undergoing the needs assessment procedure at her centre. Collarbone leaves an important detail ambiguous when she says that "confidentiality was ensured on all questionnaires", since this does not tell us whether the candidates responded anonymously, although her statement about confidentiality suggests that their responses were in fact identifiable. Given what was said earlier in this thesis about social pressures on respondents to surveys, perhaps it is therefore not surprising that both cohorts' evaluations of both parts of the needs assessment process were extremely positive, although there was apparently less enthusiasm concerning the action planning session. It can also be noted that Collarbone praises the psychometric test by saying that "it provides an objective assessment of candidates' behaviour in the workplace" and that this may suggest she holds a rather naive view. However, the sorts of comments and reasons reported
by Collarbone for the candidates' positive views of personal interviews did resemble some of the findings of the present study, but would seem that Collarbone's study does not add much in terms of knowledge building to the present study.

In a slightly more recent study, Garrett and McGeachie (1999) conducted surveys of Sheffield LEA deputy head teachers "in the shape of interviews, questionnaires and discussions". Their findings indicated that although there were considerable variations, many deputies had insufficient time and funding to engage in managerial responsibilities and that they were very dependent for this on their particular headteacher. These authors conclude that primary deputy head teachers may be disadvantaged within the NPQH training programme in comparison with secondary deputies, both by way of time available for training and gaining experience and in knowledge useful for the training in the first place. This seemed particularly true in the case of smaller primary schools. These authors also claim that their own experience as NPQH trainers in the region suggests these effects are more widespread.

Other available studies have mainly targeted analyses of underlying assumptions and likely impact of NPQH at a number of levels.

Lodge (1998) draws attention to the distinctive features of the design of the NPQH and she points out that the TTA was concerned that training should not neglect professional application, but that it was also keen to avoid checklists. She cites Bleach's (1998) critique of the national standards as atomistic as a basis for thinking that the TTA is not likely to appear to outsiders to have succeeded in these intentions. As we saw earlier, Bush (1998) also accused the TTA's national standards formulation of falling into a fragmented view. Generally, Lodge appears to take a relatively positive view of NPQH, but she suggests there may be a tension between its centrist approach and our growing understanding about situational leadership, and she echoes other writers' reservations (such as those of Bolam, 1997) concerning possible TTA failure to promote independent critical judgment. She also thought that differentiation and individualisation would be a considerable challenge in practice to NPQH.

Brundrett (1999) points to the emergence of two parallel sets of qualifications in educational management: NPQH and a wide range of HEI-based qualifications of an academic kind. He sees inherent tensions between these emerging traditions and their related cultural paradigms, and suggests that "this clash may result in the development of reciprocal arrangements for accreditation or may form an increasingly heated 'battle'over the issue of 'ownership' of
knowledge and of professional structures" (Brundrett, 1998, p.507). Accorded to Brundrett, NPQH has already influenced the content of masters degrees in education.

Gunter (1999), Southworth (1999) and to some extent Bush (1998) offer more basic criticisms of the NPQH approach. In addition to attacking the TTA's adoption of a competency approach, Bush (1998) also attacks its simplistic assumptions concerning causal relations between what headteachers do and the achieving of desired outcomes, and he criticises the "quick-fix" assumption that training is relatively straightforward once one has defined the skills needed for headship. Similarly, Gunter (1999) points out that the TTA SLAM module talks as if the understanding and skills involved in headship are neutral processes, which there is no point problematising once candidates have acquired "the vision", rather than recognising that values and issues relating to power are inevitably involved. Southworth (1999) also sees the TTA approach as reducing leadership to management and management as technique, ignoring current transformational theories of leadership. He considers these last theories to constitute the main "new paradigm in leadership" and points out that they emphasise values, analysis, enlightenment, emancipation, education, justice and reciprocity, rather than influence and control. On the basis of three studies with headteachers, Southworth suggests that in practice the traditional model of the head as "all-dominating [...] individual leader" still persists, that it is not at all transformational and that the way headship is now being designed and driven by the policymakers through TTA makes it even more unlikely that it will become transformational.

Finally, Gunter (1999) offers a broader social perspective on what is going on here. Her view is that there has been a shift from voluntary and pluralistic provision of PD in the educational tradition, to a more mechanistic idea of centrally determined and accredited training. Economically, the shift has been from public provision towards commercial contracting as a way of saving money and of pushing the education system to achieve the ruling politicians' intentions. These various viewpoints will be kept in mind when we consider implications of this study further below.

Changes to NPQH

In February 2000 a new model for the NPQH was announced by the TTA, HEADLAMP was continued as a form of headship PD for new heads and a new continuing professional development scheme was introduced, the Leadership Programme for Serving Head Teachers
(LPSH). It was again stated that in due course the NPQH will be mandatory for all those seeking their first headship post.

According to DfEE (2000) the new 3-stage NPQH model builds on the strengths of the existing model but introduces a number of new features including:

- A shorter one year programme rather than the existing up to three years;
- An emphasis on school-based assessment rather than assessment tasks;
- Greater use of ICT;
- Visits to highly successful schools;
- A two day residential hosted by the National College for School leadership;
- Access modules (mainly self-study) to prepare candidates for the NPQH.

An outline of the new model is presented further below in figure 7.1

Precisely which factors influenced these changes is not known, but anecdotally, it has been suggested to the researcher by a number of people working in English education that the relatively small numbers of people applying to take NPQH was a key reason. This is also seen as the reason why although the DfEE has continually said it will make NPQH mandatory, it did not take this opportunity to do so. All this and the possible effects of candidates' feedback in course evaluations would be consistent in some respects with the views of respondents indicated in the present empirical study. For example, in this study there were strong calls for realistic support because of the competing demands of training and the fulfilment of their current posts. The TTA change to a considerably shorter programme with mainly self-study in stage one is at least consistent with the possibility that these calls were also made in feedback by NPQH participants and, more powerfully, seen as reasons for low numbers of applications in the first place.

The strong preference in our data for use of authentic situations is also consistent with the TTA's move to school-based needs assessment by a visiting tutor, involvement of the DHT's own head teacher, undertaking a school improvement project by candidates and the introduction of a day of school-based assessment at the end of the second, development stage. Likewise, assessment centres and psychometric testing seem to have disappeared and needs assessment includes a local aspect, although the relation of the needs assessment to provision is still not really clear. Even the preference of deputy heads in this study for their headship courses to be award-bearing might be seen to be echoed in the presentation of the NPQH award on successful completion. The heavy reduction in size and duration of the course have been due not only to the unwillingness of potential candidates, but possibly also due to
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economic considerations. Generally speaking centralised arrangements tend to be less expensive than varied, field oriented arrangements, which are represented more in the new model.

**Application and selection known as**

**Access stage**
Mainly delivered by self study
For candidates with relatively limited experience in senior management roles

**Development stage**
Candidates will be allocated a tutor, undertake a school improvement project, attend some taught seminars and visit high-quality schools. This stage ends with school-based assessment which you must complete successfully before proceeding to the Final Stage

**Final stage**
Candidates will attend a two-day residential hosted by the National College for School Leadership focusing on strategic leadership and vision.
They will then undertake final assessment

**Award**
Candidates demonstrate at final assessment that they meet all the required standards for headship attend an award day to receive their certificate.

Figure 7.1 Overview of new NPQH model (TTA, 2000)
Although these are extremely indirect and tentative indications, if anything, they may be seen as partly confirming the trustworthiness and representativeness of the present findings, or at least as not being inconsistent with them.

Possible implications for the English context

It could be argued that from the TTA perspective the implications of the empirical findings in this study are that it should make the sorts of changes which it has actually made, as just described above. The writer admits that this is virtually the same argument as he made earlier, but in reverse direction. The assumption here about the TTA’s perspective is that it wishes aspiring headteachers to become aware of certain ideas and practices, and to engage in activities, including assessment, which would make it likely that when they become head teachers they will do things the way the TTA wants to see them done. Therefore TTA would appear to be taking notice of feedback from these deputy head teachers, but not really genuinely consulting them as basic stakeholders who would be jointly deciding the nature of headship preparation. This would be more like a company trying to make an existing product more attractive on the basis of reactions to advertisements for it.

But, a different argument is also possible. This could be that the TTA's perspective is actually not obvious and that the large degree of modification of the NPQH programme described above offers evidence that the TTA's outlook is in fact very open and flexible.

These issues cannot be known for sure, however. The main issue for the writer’s knowledge-building, developmental purpose regarding headship training is to decide what implications, if there are any, that the findings from the present consultation of headship trainees might have, in the context of the historical developments reviewed earlier and the commentaries on NPQH seen from recent studies.

This is not an easy task, as the recent paper by Gunter (1999) suggests. In this paper, this author spends a lot of time pointing to what she sees as negative and restrictive developments involved in the trends that have led to NPQH. But she is in fact an NPQH trainer and we find that on the last page of her article she is considering not only possible ways of improving the original programme, but also “technical improvements to the NPQH” which she describes as “essential”. So it is clear that this author does not wish to get rid of all headship training; she wishes more to see certain features of the NPQH approach removed. In fact, in a positive way, she is recommending "the reality and importance of varied and pluralistic experiences in preparation for educational leadership" (p262).
Another problem is indicated in the article by Southworth (1999) referred to above. Southworth says that there is evidence from his own and from other analysts that traditional, individual power-oriented patterns of belief and action "...do prevail for many heads." Southworth is clear that these patterns are not transformational in the way he describes it. In fact, he suggests that "many heads unwittingly or otherwise, collude with them [the patterns]." (page 63). Here it may be relevant to mention also that situating the preparation of professionals within existing practical contexts may also be more likely to encourage persistence of these traditional assumptions and practices.

Therefore, although we always ought to consult stakeholders for various reasons, including ethical considerations of justice and respect, this consultation alone cannot be the only basis for deciding how to try to develop provision. We must also try to access well grounded understanding of the issues at stake.

In the case of headship training, this researcher believes that writers such as Eraut (1994, 1998) and Joyce and Showers (1988) have made a good analytical and empirical case for the pluralist strategies they offer for professional preparation and development. We can also apply the sorts of insight they and authors such as Tomlinson (1995c) draw from studies of skill and expertise. These ideas suggest that with certain sorts of capabilities, such as budgeting and finance, it may be relatively easier to decide on effective ways of teaching and to standardise training in these aspects. However, there are other more difficult and subtle issues that arise with regard to other areas of headship, such as interpersonal and power related issues, and these can vary very greatly according to local context.

Developing capability and responsibility regarding such aspects is likely to require more open and flexible kinds of approach, which should be modelled and encouraged in the various forms of provision provided. The new model of the NPQH can probably involve these sorts of features better than the old model, and the addition of a continuing professional development provision, the Leadership Programme for Serving Headteachers (LPSH), could allow long term experiential learning for real professional development. However, as the respondents in the present study pointed out, the effectiveness of whatever gets offered will also depend on the particular content involved and eventually on the quality of implementation of the process activities.
Possible Implications for the Turkish Context

We have just seen some reasons for being tentative in drawing implications for headship training in the UK from the earlier review and empirical study presented here. It is clearly necessary to be even more careful if we try to do this for a different country such as Turkey. Although the readiness to provide systematic training is a measure of Turkey's resources and willingness to invest in the future of its young people, as Hughes (1985) has pointed out, there are rather distinct differences in the historical, governmental and social contexts of education in Turkey compared to the UK and USA.

At the administrative level, for example, recognition as a profession is an important factor in Turkey and headship does not yet have this status. It can also be claimed that there is no nationally agreed model of headship in Turkey: principals carry out managerial roles as well as the teaching role. There is no long history of largely informal, higher education-based PD provision as in the UK, although very recently the Turkish government has started an attempt to deal systematically with the issue of preparation for school principals with the introduction of the MONE 15 day course (see chapter 1). We can probably also expect that Turkey will experience the increasing world-wide pressures towards educational success and accountability which have led to the ongoing UK headship developments described in this thesis.

On the other hand, although it is important to recognise differences at every level from national to specific contexts, there are surely common features and similarities which must also be recognised. That is, for example, we are dealing here with common human situations involving the education of young people, in education systems that share features such as school units, classrooms, compulsory attendance, and so on. The kinds of insights into professional learning offered by writers such as Eraut and Joyce and Showers may be regarded as very general, partly because they do make it clear that their general principles always need to be adapted to local circumstances and individual learners.

A National Centre in Turkey

In this context, a first general implication is therefore that Turkish educationalists should not only examine ideas and practices concerning headship preparation and development from all around the world, but they also need to study their own context carefully and systematically. At present there is a lack of appropriate institutions specialising in either research or training in the area of school principalship in Turkey. The writer therefore believes that there should
be set up a Turkish National Research, Training and Development Centre for school principalship, comparable to the National College for School Leadership recently set up in the UK. This centre should be responsible for the design, development and probably some aspects of the implementation of PD Provision for School Principals and Management, based on the expertise and ongoing research of its staff.

**Definition of Roles and Headship Training Goals**

One of the first tasks for such a national centre would be to arrive at clear role definitions for those who have management functions in schools, including school principals and their legal responsibilities. This would of course need to be based on a knowledge of the existing roles and responsibilities of primary and secondary headteachers, and this should be formally researched for this purpose. It might possibly be found useful for the government to use such evidence to actively regulate such roles in the education system.

The results of this sort of work would be a direct basis for deciding on the capabilities required by school principals. These would therefore directly inform the goals and process design of PD provision for school principals. In doing this, lessons from the UK and USA debates about competence specification and its relationship to instructional design should be kept in mind (see chapter 4 of this thesis). Although the writer recognises that certain issues remain concerning the UK nationals standards for headship, he feels that they do generally manage to avoid over-specification of detail and could therefore offer a useful comparison and starting point in the Turkish situation.

**Design and Range of Professional Development Provision**

As it has been claimed above, the PD literature contains a range of well grounded ideas and principles which are well illustrated by the contributions of writers like Eraut (1994, 1998).

These ideas imply the need for pluralism in different forms of PD provision (Tomlinson, 1995b). Especially, they emphasise the dangers of trying to find educational "quick fixes" and the importance of active participation and practice in authentic contexts. They make it clear that some kinds of knowledge and capability are more straightforward and possible to educate than others, and it is clear that headship involves many of these more difficult areas. Finally, these insights and those from recent constructivist work indicate that the existing ideas brought by learners to educational processes are a major factor influencing the success of their
learning. These personal resources include not only existing skills and knowledge relating to what is to be taught, but also metacognitive ideas about the way one should learn it.

The empirical study reported earlier gave confirmation of the above kinds of insights, especially regarding headship training candidates' ideas about ways of learning. Although the researcher has argued that designers of PD provision cannot base themselves simply on the ideas of their clients, it is clear that these must be taken into account.

On the basis of the above points, this writer would suggest that the current Turkish 15 day school principalship course needs re-examining using multi-method evaluation which targets processes, outcomes and stakeholders. It should check, for instance, whether the course does now try to cover too much content in the available time, and whether this may cause a transmission mode of teaching, that may not be very effective in achieving capability in practice.

The writer also suggests that Turkish headship training provision should eventually be expanded towards involving a wider range of forms. This should include more practice-based, situated learning, as well as support for communication and discussion amongst practitioners, both within their school situations and away from them. In this connection, the writer accepts not only pluralism of methods but also pluralism of providers. In particular, it is felt that it would be highly desirable for Turkey to promote the kind of complementary involvement of government training provision and access to HEI-based ideas, courses and research we saw that Southworth (1999) and Gunter (1999) have recommended.

An important point from the empirical study was to underline the importance of linking needs assessment with the actual provision on the course. It may well be a waste of resources to engage in formal procedures such as examinations for needs assessment when the programme will consist in didactic attempts to deliver too much content. On the other hand, needs assessment in relation to practical capability aspects of headship is difficult to carry out, and this should be the subject of an experimental and developmental programme by the national centre the writer has proposed for Turkey.

Finally, having made these general recommendations concerning forms of course provision, it is still extremely important to remember that professional learners' constructs and metacognitive assumptions can powerfully influence the success of any provision. There is little systematic information about these aspects with respect to Turkish professional learners. In taking forward the above suggestions in the Turkish situation, therefore, it would also be
important to research the ideas and reactions of Turkish school principal course candidates using methods that take account of the methodological lessons learned in the study presented in this thesis
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Notes

1. The same questions were used in the HEADLAMP and NPQH questionnaires.
2. The questionnaire sent to HEADLAMP participants is included here. Whilst the questions are the same as the ones in the questionnaire that was sent out, the layout is slightly different.
TRAINING OF PRIMARY HEADTEACHERS

This questionnaire is divided into four parts. PART 1 asks questions about you and your school; PART 2 asks questions about the needs assessment process; PART 3 asks about HEADLAMP training programme content and the evaluation of the training programme; PART 4 asks for your opinion on a range of issues about the HEADLAMP training programme. Please complete all four parts as fully as you can.

PART ONE - PERSONAL INFORMATION AND CURRENT POSITION

1 What is your gender? Female □ Male □

2 What is your job title? ......................................................

3 How many years have you been in your current job? □

4 What type of school are you working in? County □ Voluntary controlled □

5 How many pupils are there on the roll? □

PART TWO - NEEDS ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Please answer the following questions if you have undertaken a needs assessment process. If you did not take part in a needs assessment process go to Part III.

1 Who carried out the assessment (Please tick one or more boxes)
   Chairman of governors □ LEA Advisers □ Senior Management team □ Registered providers □

2 Do you have any managerial qualification? Yes □ No □

3 If yes, what managerial courses have you attended?

4 If not, how was your prior learning accredited?

5 Which was the most helpful element of the needs assessment process? (Please tick one or more boxes)
   The psychometric test □ Personal interview □ Observed group discussion □ Your self-evaluation □
   Action planning □ Others (please specify them) .................................................................

6 How did you find the assessment criteria? Easy □ Complex □ Challenging □
   (Please tick one or more boxes)
PART THREE: HEADLAMP TRAINING PROGRAMME

3a - Training programme content

Column 1: Please tick if you had training in this area. Tick as many as appropriate
Column 2: Please tick if you would like more training and development opportunities. Tick as many as appropriate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Strategic direction and development of the school</th>
<th>Had training</th>
<th>Need training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining aims and objectives of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing effective leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising and administering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring, evaluating, reviewing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Teaching and learning</th>
<th>Had training</th>
<th>Need training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing a good learning environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing teaching and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing partnership with parents and others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Leading and managing staff</th>
<th>Had training</th>
<th>Need training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing staff development and performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating and enabling staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving staff in the decision making process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing, planning, allocating, supporting and evaluating the work staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. Effective deployment of people and resources</th>
<th>Had training</th>
<th>Need training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working with governors and colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting appropriate priorities for expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and managing resource provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing and organising accommodation and resource effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. Accountability</th>
<th>Had training</th>
<th>Need training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing support to the governing body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting an account of the school’s performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that parents and pupils are well-informed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a climate of accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI. Effective deployment of people and resources</th>
<th>Had training</th>
<th>Need training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self management skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3b - Evaluation of the training content

1 Where have you undertaken your HEADLAMP training?
   Local Education Authority [ ] Higher Education Institution [ ] Management consultant [ ]
   Professional institution [ ] Others (please specify) ..............................................................

2 Which modules have you taken? Please list them.

3 How did you find the training as a whole? Please tick one or more box
   Academic [ ] Professional [ ] Practical [ ] Theoretical [ ]

4 Please tick only one box for each question.
   Did the training programme match your needs? [ ] Yes [ ] Partly [ ] No
   Were the trainers well prepared? [ ] Yes [ ] Partly [ ] No
   Did the trainers set clear objectives? [ ] Yes [ ] Partly [ ] No
   Was the needs assessment process well matched to your training needs? [ ] Yes [ ] Partly [ ] No

5 How did you find the organisation of the programme? Please tick one box for each aspect.
   Very effective [ ] Effective [ ] Quite effective [ ] Not effective [ ]
   Time [ ] Location [ ] Financial support [ ] Access to resources [ ]
   Evaluation arrangements [ ]

6 How did you find the training activities of the programme? Please tick one box for each activity.
   Very effective [ ] Effective [ ] Quite effective [ ] Not effective [ ]
   Attending a course [ ] Attending lectures [ ]
   Attending a workshop [ ] Going on placement [ ]
   Simulation and role play [ ] Presentation by trainers [ ]
   Small group discussion [ ]
7. Are there any other types of activities that you think would be useful? Please list them.

8. How effective did you find each aspect of the HEADLAMP training? (Please indicate by circling one appropriate number in each column)

   1=Very effective  2=Effective  3=Quite effective  4=Not effective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme content</th>
<th>Trainer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving your professional knowledge and understanding</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing you to develop strategic direction and development of school</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing you to secure and sustain effective teaching and learning</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing you in leading and managing staff</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing you in effective deployment of people and staff</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing you in effective deployment of resources</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing you to be accountable to the governor and others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging analysis of your role and leadership skills</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing your self-confidence in using these leadership skills</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing you to meet national standards for headteachers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Which types of management training would you prefer to do?
   - Award-bearing
   - Training by mentoring
   - School-based training
   - School-industry based

10. Name any particular courses that would be useful for you to attend as part of your management training.

11. Which do you think is the best timing of training for HEADLAMP?
   - During the school week
   - Weekends
   - Vacation time
   - A combination (please specify)
PART FOUR

1 What are the benefits for you in undertaking HEADLAMP training?

2 How do you think your school will benefit from you undertaking HEADLAMP training?

3 Please give your ideas on the ways in which headteachers should be trained in the future?

Thank you for your help in completing this questionnaire
Please return this questionnaire in the pre-paid envelope provided by Monday, 8 June 1998,

To: Sakir CINKIR School of Education, University of Leeds, LS2 9JT
April 6, 1998

Dear Sir / Madam,

The enclosed questionnaire is part of a project on the training of primary headteachers. The project is undertaking a survey of the views of headteachers regarding training provisions. The questionnaire will be used to address further research questions. The project is supervised by Dr. John Dunford and Ms Janet Hodgson at the University of Leeds, School of education.

I am writing to seek your cooperation with this survey. The questionnaire asks details about you, your school, and HEADLAMP/NPQH training programme. The survey is being conducted in the strictest confidence, and no individuals will be identifiable in the final report.

Please complete the questionnaire as fully as you are able to, return it directly to address given, in the enclosed pre-paid envelopes as soon as you can and, at the latest, Thursday, 30 April 1998. I realise that the demands on your time are many, but I hope that you will agree that this independent survey should help to improve and develop further training schemes for headteachers.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Yours Sincerely,

Şakir ÇİNKIR

PS: If you would like to be sent a copy of the final report please write your school name at the top this letter.
APPENDIX 3: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Introduction: I would like to learn more about your opinions on various aspects of the HEADLAMP/NPQH training programmes.

BASIC QUESTIONS

A. Needs assessment process
To start with, the majority of the HTs/DHTs tended to agree that it was complex and challenging?

1. Did you find it so? [ ] Yes [ ] No

2. If Yes, in what ways it was complex and challenging? 

3. What do you think about the methods in the needs assessment process (e.g. psychometric test, self-evaluation, personal interview, observed group discussion, and action planning)?
   a. Did they well match your training needs? [ ] Yes [ ] No
   b. If No, Can you give any reason for this?

Further questions according to the responses

B. Perception about training programme
Next question, the HTs'/DHTs' perceptions about the HEADLAMP/NPQH training programme as a whole. Most of the heads/deputies tended to agree that the training programme was professional and practical.

1. In what ways was it professional? 

2. In what ways was it practical? 

3. Have you used anything from the programme in your role? [ ] Yes [ ] No

4. If Yes, please give any example?

5. If No: Why not?

Further questions according to the responses

C. Organisation of the programme
If we consider the evaluation arrangements of the programme, most of the respondents to my research questionnaire did not find that they were not very effective.

1. Can you give any reasons for this?

2. Do your reasons relate to
   a. How it was carried out? OR
   b. Are there other reasons?

Further questions according to the responses
**D. Training activities**

Next question, if we move on to the training activities, again the majority of the group found that 'simulation and role' play were neither realistic nor effective.

1. Did you take part in the simulation?
   - a. If Yes, Do you feel it was ineffective?
   - b. If Yes, Why so?

2. What about the role-play. Did you take part in it?
   - a. If Yes, Do you feel it was ineffective?
   - b. If Yes, Why so?

**Further questions according to the response**

**E. Programme trainers**

If we think about the programme trainers, most of the respondents to my research questionnaire found that the trainers were not particularly effective.

1. Can you give any reasons for this? IF NO REPLY
2. Do your reasons relate to
   - a. The methods they used? OR
   - b. The programme content?

**Further questions according to the responses**

**F. Programme content**

Next question, if we move on to the programme content, again the majority of the group found that it was in effective in preparing them for their headship role.

1. In what ways it did not prepare you.
2. Can you give any reasons for this?
3. Do your reasons relate to
   - a. It did /not match your training needs?
   - b. The trainers of the programmes?

**Further questions according to the responses**

**ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS**

1. What do you think about the type of management training?
   - School-based training
   - Award-bearing course
   - School-industry-based training

2. What do you think about the best timing for training?
   - During the school week,
   - Vacation/weekends

3. What do you think about compulsory management training during your initial training, prior to headship, etc?