International Profiles of the Principalship

Paul T. Begley
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Glenda Campbell-Evans
Edith Cowan University
Perth, Western Australia

Dr. Paul T. Begley is Associate Professor at the Midwestern Field Centre of
the Ontario
Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto,Ontario. His areas of
academic interest, within
the Department of Educational Administration, include administrative
values, school
improvement processes, and leadership development in cross-cultural
environments.

Dr. Glenda Campbell-Evans is Lecturer at the Department of Educational
Policy and
Administrative Studies, Edith Cowan University, Perth, Western Australia.
Her research
efforts are currently focused in the area of the professional development
of practising and
aspiring school administrators.

Abstract

This paper reports on three university sponsored projects carried out during the time
period 1990-92 in the Canadian Province of Ontario, the Canadian Northwest Territories,
and Western Australia. Each project involved the development of multi-level, situationally
sensitive, profiles of school leadership practices by writing teams composed of 12 to 15
academics and practicing school administrators. The outcome was three documents, each
depicting in a graphical manner, contemporary and regionally specific images of the
principalship. Each profile portrays multi-dimensional images of practice, described
behaviourally within developmental stages of growth leading to ideal practice as locally
defined.

In addition to the contrasting images of the principalship and the genuinely
transformational experience of producing such profiles, the writing teams report as outcomes
several uses for their profiles at the state, district, or school site levels. All three profiles are
currently being used as a basis for developing situationally sensitive pre-service preparation
courses for aspiring principals as well as in-service programs for incumbent school leaders.
They may also be used at the district level as supports to strategic planning processes.
Within individual schools, profiles of effective practice can be used as resources to support
self-directed professional development or collegial coaching processes.

International Profiles of the Principalship   A number of persistent
problems confound the efforts of those committed to the
development of expert leadership practices for schools of the present as
well as those of the
future. For example, there is a continuing lack of consensus among
academics and
practitioners alike on what constitutes ideal school leadership and how it
should be defined.
The "rear view mirror" perspective of most formal preparation programs and
the
questionable pedagogy and relevance of some university and field-based
professional
development efforts are other problems. A final important issue, in our
view, is the failure
of formal programs to accommodate divergent regional needs and learning
readiness levels
evident among the participants in such programs.
        Our efforts to respond to these challenges has led us to explore
the development and
use of situationally specific, multi-dimensional profiles of professional
practice as a basis for
fostering the development of expert school leadership practices. Within
the past two years
we have produced three separate regional profiles of effective principal
practice; two in
Canada and one in Australia.   Even as we complete the field validation of
these initial three
profiles, it is our intention to launch additional profiling projects in
other regions of Canada
and the United States. In time we hope to produce six or more profiles
representing
alternate images of effective school leadership practice in North America
and Australia.
        The three profiles described in this paper were developed by
writing teams made up
of academics and practitioners working collaboratively within given
regions. We begin the
paper with a review of some of the generic problems faced by staff
developers which
profiles may address and some discussion of the conceptual underpinnings
and procedures of
the profile development process.   The balance of the paper is devoted to a
description of thethree profiles which have been developed and a discussion
of several issues and liabilities
which have emerged from our work.   Edited versions of the three profiles
have been
included as appendices.

Objectives:
Objectives for this ongoing project include:
1. To develop regionally specific profiles of contemporary school
leadership practices,
grounded in locally defined images of effectiveness as well as the
findings of relevant
research,   to be employed as a basis for designing pre-service and in-
service professional
development programs.
2. To develop, as an alternative to formal training programs,
professional development
resources which could be used by individuals or small groups as a support
to self-directed
and / or formative professional development.
3. To compare and contrast the images and dimensions of effective school
leadership
practices developed by several regionally representative writing teams
employing the same
profile generation procedures.
4. To investigate the transformational learning potential of the profiling
technique as a mode
of professional development.

Practical & Conceptual Issues Relating to School Leadership Development:
        The design and implementation of formal training programs which
meet the current
and future needs of school leaders involves considerably more than just
mirroring the typical
practices of the past. Effective programs will be those which address the
knowledge, skills
and attitudes required by the leaders of future schools (Leithwood, Begley
& Cousins, 1992).
Furthermore, such learning and skill acquisition must be achieved through
the use of a
process or learning context that is responsive to a number of factors. An
ideal learning
environment will be sensitive to the varying levels of readiness manifested
by school
leadership candidates upon entry into a formal preparation program. It
will also recognize
the particular needs of adult learners. Finally, the delivery of even an
exemplary program
will inevitably be complicated by the precedents and expectations
established by previous
leadership programs and even the potentially divergent orientations of

instructional personnel
and program sponsors.

In our experience as program developers since 1985, we have noted that people enroll
in principal preparation programs and professional development courses for a variety of
reasons and with a broad range of expectations (see Begley & Campbell-Evans, 1993).
Readiness levels can vary so greatly within a given cohort of candidates that program
implementors are sometimes presented with instructional challenges which parallel, or even
exceed, those faced by a teacher in a completely de-streamed elementary panel classroom.
To be specific, depending on whether a serious needs assessment process precedes course
development, and what criteria are employed for candidate selection, participants enrolled in
programs may bring to the experience a relatively broad spectrum of prior experiences,training needs and personal expectations. These "base rate" characteristics (Feldman, 1989)
constitute candidate readiness for participation in a particular program.

Given the array of educational experiences and skills required for the development of
a comprehensive image of leadership effectiveness, it also seems important to take a
longitudinal and developmental view of administrators' socialization experiences. We find
van Gennep's (1960) three stage model of professional socialization (Separation, Transition,
and Incorporation) helpful in conceptualizing the developmental process whereby individuals
are influenced by a number of socializing factors (see Ronkowski and Iannaccone, 1989).
van Gennep suggests a process of general professional maturation progressing from being
defined by others to being self-defined. According to van Gennep, at the Separation stage,
people are concerned with comparing themselves with others and how others judge their
adequacy. At the Transition stage the pattern of "self location" is against the standards
imposed by the functions of the job and task performance. At the Incorporation stage
individuals make comparisons between their former and present self (e.g. perceptions of
progress made from a previous self toward becoming an instructional leader).
Developmental principal profiles, such as the three we describe herein, at least potentially

could play an important role in supporting this theorized process of professional maturation;
particularly at the Transition and Incorporation stages of development.
         A substantial body of applied research has accumulated in recent years purporting to
describe the nature of administrative expertise (see Greenfield, 1987; Burdin,1989;
Leithwood, Begley and Cousins,1992).   Principal preparation programs can now be
grounded in more than just the context-bound practices, or theories-in-use (Argyris, 1982),

manifested by local practitioners serving as instructors. This availability of research-derived
knowledge on effective administrative practices has permitted the design and development of
much better validated leadership programs for principals (see Daresh & Playko,1992).
However, despite the increased rigour which is evident in research-driven program designs,
several issues remain. These relate to candidate perceived relevance. Semantic problems
can occur with the use of particular educational or academic jargon which is more or less
acceptable from region to region. In our experience, a particular emphasis on some
dimension of practice in one region can easily alienate the audience from another region.
For example, discussing "socialization" research with a group of practitioners in Australia
may suggest mind control, a negative connotation, whereas, with a Canadian audience, nary
a ripple would be noted. Similarly, in many regions of Canada the term "child-centred
education" has recently become politically charged and is to be avoided at all costs. On the
other hand, American practitioners seem much inclined to speak of "test scores" and
improving a school's "grade point average", terms which are not "user-friendly" in the
Australian and Canadian "interface." The development and use of research-driven, but
situationally sensitive profiles may prove helpful in addressing this issue. Thus a profile for
an Australian audience might safely address the "pastoral" responsibilities of the principal
without fear of confusing Canadian principals who likely would associate this term with crop
management or animal husbandry.

Paper Presented at the Joint AARE/
NZARE Conference, Geelong, 1992
Australian Association
for Research in Education

In Ontario, the Northwest Territories, and Western Australia virtually all principal
pre-service preparation programs now manifest varying degrees of commitment to the view
of the principal's role usually described as instructional leadership1. It is possible to argueconvincingly in support of more recently developed conceptions of the role, such as
transformational leadership (see Educational Leadership, 1992). However, given the
mandated nature of the syllabus for most principal certification programs, and the natural
time lag encountered when new knowledge impacts on established procedures, we initially
concluded that instructional leadership remains the dominant image of school leadership.
However, that proved not necessarily to be the case for at least two of the profiles. With the
Northwest Territories Profile, the writing team proved to be quite keen to incorporate within
their document what they viewed as the highly attractive, minority group empowering
vocabulary of Transformational Leadership2.   A similar response was observed with the
Ontario profile writing team, although they wished to avoid the term "transformational" as
much as possible because of its perceived trendiness.
        As suggested earlier, traditional university-based courses tied to graduate degree
programs often lag behind the most recent findings of research on educational leadership.
This is something of an irony. Unfortunately, they frequently also add insult to injury by not
necessarily being sensitive to the canons of good pedagogy or even candidate satisfaction
levels.   As Gaines-Robinson and Robinson (1989) point out, course activities are more likely
to reflect a stereotyped requirement of a course, which has developed a life of its own
through repetition, rather than any identified need expressed by candidates or perceived by a
program sponsor. Furthermore, course candidates, who may or may not have need for a
particular skill activity, must typically participate in all activities because of expectations for
a uniform pre-service course experience. A generalization perhaps, but, nevertheless, not a
flattering image for those of us who are teaching university faculty.

        A recent study on the socializing influences experienced by

aspiring principals (see
Begley & Campbell-Evans, 1993) lends further support to the notion that developmental
profiles may be useful to school leadership development.   According to the findings of this
study involving 87 aspiring principals in the Northwest Territories, more than half of the
aspirants apparently pursued principal training as a way of moving towards an existing image
of the principal's role. In this study, more than 50% of candidates also cited skill
development as motivating them to pursue training. Nearly a third (26 cases) sought training
to broaden their professional perspective and 19 candidates saw the training as relevant to
their present position. The implication for those interested in promoting principal
recruitment, or encouraging individuals to pursue training, is that their best strategy may be
to emphasize the organizational "career ladder" and "skill development" aspects of principal
training, and the general value and applicability of the training to presently held positions.
This is consistent with Van Maanen's (1984) notion of "chains of socialization", cited by
Feldman (1989), which suggests that the process of organizational socialization consists of
aspirants making only minor modifications in their behaviour and attitudes from job setting to
job setting.
        A final word to acknowledge the perspective of radical theorists, subjectivists and the
like. Our orientation to profile development has been, without apology, functionalist. To
produce our profiles we employ a set of procedures derived from and founded upon
traditional curriculum gap analysis techniques (Leithwood and Montgomery, 1987), planned
educational change theory (Fullan, 1991), and the procedures of school improvement
(Huberman & Miles, 1984: Leithwood, Fullan & Heald-Taylor, 1986) . On the other hand,we do acknowledge the contingent and dynamic nature of the school leadership role, as well
as the multiple images of situationally and subjectively defined practice. Hence our interest
in multiple, regularly validated images of the role. Furthermore, the members of the writing
team were predominantly practicing principals, and therefore the primary stakeholders in the
process of profiling their own practices. However, these are people who do

not question
their right or responsibility to exercise leadership in their schools. Finally, although these
profiles reflect the findings and vocabulary of school improvement and principal effectiveness
research, they are primarily grounded in the actual practices of keen and competent school
leaders who are much valued as professionals within their own jurisdictions.

What's A Profile?
          A profile is a two dimensional matrix which describes developmental stages of growth
in professional practice within selected dimensions of professional action (see appendices A,
B, & C for illustration).   The creation of a profile begins with the establishment of a goal
statement followed by a series of decisions about which categories of professional action are
most relevant to the achievement of the desired state described in the profile goal statement.
In a profile these categories are called Dimensions. Each of these Dimensions is also usually
broken down into a set of Sub-dimensions. To accomplish this, various facilitative and
consensus building strategies are employed to blend research findings from the literature with
local craft knowledge. For example, in the case of the NWT Principal Profile, the writing
team ultimately settled on four key dimensions of principal practice: The Principal as
Advocate, School Culture Management, The Principal as Instructional Leader, and

Organizational Management (see Appendix A).
        The next step in creating a profile is behaviourally describing, within each Dimension
or Sub-dimension, the range of professional behaviour which might be observed in the work
setting. These alternate levels of professional practice are sequenced within dimensions of
the profile according to their relative impact on attaining the desired outcomes identified in
the profile goal statement. They can be thought of as the stages of growth ranging from
typical competent practice to highly exemplary or ideal practice. Profiles generally are not
employed to describe incompetent practices.
        Profiles are usually produced by a writing team of representative

practitioners and
academics who generate a series of draft documents. These profile drafts
then typically
undergo an extensive field validation process before a final version of the
document is
released for use. Developing each of the profiles described in this paper
typically required
30 to 40 hours of intensive collaborative group work by the actual writing
team, plus many
additional days of work by a subset of the team in editing and validating
the various drafts.
Full validation of the final drafts typically takes at least one academic
year. In our view, the
profiles should probably be reviewed and revalidated within five years.
        The original and probably best known "principal profile" was
produced in 1983-84 by
Leithwood and Montgomery (1986). This was a rigorous application of the
innovation
profiling technique, essentially a curriculum analysis procedure, to a role
description task
(see Leithwood and Montgomery, 1987) . This profile was based on an
exhaustive review
of existing research on effective schools and instructional leadership
practices3. Following
usual academic protocol, field validation with a large sample of
practitioners occurred afterthe literature review. We reversed this
procedure in developing our three profiles to the
extent that we employed personal inventory surveys and consensus building
activities with the
writing teams prior to introducing and reviewing research findings.   This
reflects our
somewhat more subjective philosophical orientations as well as our desire
to ensure a high
degree of local relevance in terms of vocabulary and image definition.
        Two attributes were common to all three of the profiling projects
reported in this
paper; the time frame and the methodology employed. All three profiles
were produced
during 1990-92 with the Canadian author acting as group facilitator for all
three writing
teams. Secondly, except for as noted above, the procedure used to produce
these
developmental images of the principalship was based on an innovation
profile development
process proposed by Leithwood and Montgomery (1987). Applied as a role
analysis
procedure, this process produces multi-dimensional images of practice
described
behaviourally within developmental stages of growth leading from typical
competent practice

to an image of ideal practice.
Using Principal Profiles:
        Role profiles can be used for a variety of purposes. In addition
to their utility as a
research-driven, field-validated conceptual framework from which to design
and develop pre-
service and in-service programs, they can be used for a number of less
formal professional
development purposes.   School principals, working alone or with one or
more partners, can
use Principal Profiles as a resource to monitor and support their continued
professional
growth as school leaders in their jurisdictions. This may occur in a
number of quite specific

ways:
1. A profile may help to focus the principal's goals on the needs of
students.
2. A profile may identify relevant criteria and standards of practice for
self-evaluation,
mentoring or coaching purposes.
3. A profile integrates the findings of recent research on principal
effectiveness and local
craft knowledge within detailed and situationally relevant descriptions of
principal action.
4. A profile may help individuals analyze the amount of change required
in their
professional practices into incremental steps leading towards some ideal
image of the role.
5. A profile may help principals to identify, emphasize and justify
particular managerial
and leadership practices identified by research and their colleagues as
desirable.
6. A profile may provide a framework for predicting the obstacles which
may be
encountered by principals as they implement changes in their practices.
7. A profile may provide a basis for identifying school and regional
differences which
justify variations in an individual principal's practices.
        Information on how the three existing principal profiles are
actually being used as
supports to school leadership development in their respective
jurisdictions is provided in the
immediately following sections of this paper.

The Three Profiles:
        This section of the paper provides a brief overview of the three
profiles of the
principalship produced by the writing teams in Western Australia, the

Northwest Territories,
and Ontario. We also discuss some of the outcomes and issues which emerged
from ourwork. Edited versions of the actual profiles have been included
with this paper as three
separate appendices.
The NWT Principal Profile: Instructional Leadership & Community
Facilitation
        The majority of schools in the Northwest Territories (a vast
region of the Canadian
Arctic located north of the 60th parallel) are situated in small isolated
communities. The
population of the Northwest Territories (NWT) is also predominantly
indigenous (Innuit,
Dene & Metis) except in Yellowknife, the capital. Despite these unique
features of context,
a needs assessment process conducted by the NWT Department of Education in
1987
identified instructional leadership, a popular conception of school
leadership in Canada and
the USA, as equally relevant to school administration in Arctic Canada.
This was perhaps
natural since all but a few of the incumbent school principals were non-
natives, much of the
formal school curriculum comes from the southern regions of Canada, and
most of the
teachers employed in the North acquire their professional training at
colleges in the south.
        Since that time, the academics and practitioners associated with
the NWT legislated
principal certification program have increasingly recognized the
shortcomings of instructional
leadership as an image of ideal practice upon which to base their program.
Instructional
leadership may be an appropriate image for large white-population dominated
communities
such as Yellowknife, but it fails to address important expectations for the
role in the more
predominant small and isolated communities. Other factors of concern which
have recently
be identified are the persistently high turnover rates for principals, and
the continuing low
levels of recruitment to the principalship from among aboriginal educators.
    The implementation in 1991 of a key Department of Education document
entitled, The

Framework, produced the final impetus necessary for developing an updated
profile of the
school leadership role in the NWT. This document identifies three
responsibilities for the

NWT principalship, at least one of which extends beyond the normal scope of instructional
leadership. The first two, responsibility for instructional programs and creating a supportive
learning environment are familiar enough. However, the third, provision of services that
facilitate students' physical and cognitive preparedness for learning, implies for the NWT a
broader, more community-wide, scope of concern.

        The profiling project was sponsored by the NWT Department of Education and the
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.   A writing team was organized; composed of four
practicing school principals, three district administrators, three Department personnel, one
OISE faculty, and an OISE research officer. They met for four consecutive days to produce
the first draft of their profile in May 1992. Two of the team members were aboriginal
practitioners and four were female educators.   They established the following goal for the
NWT Principal Profile: To identify key dimensions through principals meet the needs of
individual students, improve the quality of teaching and learning, and support the aspirations
of the community. Without abandoning core dimensions of instructional leadership (eg.
collaborative goal-setting, direct participation, monitoring, and a concern for student
outcomes) the team produced a more situationally sensitive image of the role which reflects
the cultural base of the Northwest Territories.

        The Department of Education Framework document contributed several new
dimensions or sub-dimensions for the principal's role including; "consensual team building",
"inter-agency community partnerships" and "community facilitation."
However, the four keydimensions of principal action selected for the profile were Advocate, School Culture
Management, Instructional Leader, and Organizational Management. The new profile (see
Appendix A) provided the conceptual framework for developing the 1992 principal
preparation program, replacing Leithwood and Montgomery's (1986) profile of the
principalship. Final validation of the interim profile is being carried out during the 1992-93
academic year.
The SW Ontario Principal Profile: Developmental Images of Effective Practice

A number of factors combined to produce a school leadership profiling initiative in
Ontario. The first source of motivation was the Ministry of Education. During 1990, the
Principals' Course Advisory Committee of the Ontario Ministry of Education articulated a
need to review and update the core objectives for its certification program. The existing core
objectives had been developed in 1984 and focussed primarily on the curriculum
management role of the principal. In more recent years it had become increasingly apparent
that other important expectations for the role were being neglected.   A need had emerged
for an updated image of the principal's role which would encompass such new notions as
transformational leadership, collaborative school cultures, and community empowerment.

During the same time frame, the senior administrators of a school district located in
Southwestern Ontario expressed to OISE faculty an interest in examining the links between
the principal's role in district level strategic planning and school-based improvement projects.
They had committed a considerable amount of district energy towards a top-down strategic
planning initiative which produced detailed objectives for school improvement.
Unfortunately, the links between the district plans and what individual principals were to

expected to do in schools to support these plans was less than clear. It was hypothesized that
a regional principal profile might help bridge this gap in the planning process.

A final source of energy for the Ontario Profile initiative came from a third school
district, in this case a publicly funded Roman Catholic school system. Much like the
Western Australian principals discussed in the next section of this paper, these Ontario
principals expressed a desire to use the innovation profile procedure as a needs assessment
process prior to developing in-service programs which would link district priorities and
initiatives to professional development plans. It was felt that all three of these Ontario
agendas could be attended to by the development of a profile of effective principal practices.

A writing team of 15 individuals was established with representation from the two
school districts. A faculty member from OISE, aided by a research officer, acted as
coordinator and facilitator for the process. Seven members of the team were female. This
writing team met for a total of six days spread across several months in early 1992. The
team produced as their profiling goal, the identification of the key dimensions of
professional practice for principals committed to improving the quality of education. As a
result, five key dimensions for the principalship in Southwestern Ontario were selected (see
Appendix B). These included; The Principal as Visionary, The Principal as Problem Solver,
The Principal as Instructional Leaders / Program Facilitator, The Principal as School
Community Facilitator, and the Principal as Manager.
A Principal's Profile (Western Australia, 1990)
        Recent changes in the Western Australian education system, resulting from the release
and implementation of Better Schools in Western Australia: A Programme for
Improvement(1987), have induced significant changes in the nature of the Western Australian primary
principalship. Principals are now required to play a much expanded leadership role within
their school communities compared to the past. Partially in response to these pressures, a
project was launched to produce a profile of the primary principalship in Western Australia.
This profile was also the first of the series of three profiles to be developed. The document
which resulted is primarily intended to be used by incumbent principals as a resource to
promote their own self development and empowerment. This is in contrast to the strong
Northwest Territories and Ontario agenda to produce a profile to support the development
of formal professional development programs. The W.A. Principal Profile has certainly
influenced the design and development of professional development experiences at Edith
Cowan University, but perhaps in less formal or officially sanctioned ways than the other
two profiles.
        The W.A. Principals' Profile was constructed by principals from the Ministry of
Education and Catholic education and based on their collective experiences as well as a

literature review of key Ministry documents. The stated objective of the profile was, "to
demonstrate collaborative leadership which will optimize the education of each member of
the school community." As is the case for the other profiles, it is not a deficit model which
describes the shortcomings of a failing principal. The user of the profile is assumed to be
performing at a level which is considered at least satisfactory. The strength and validity of
this profile lie in its multi dimensional description of the characteristics of the highest levels
of achievement. The writing team members feel confident that a principal using this profile
can easily see what qualities are required to be a top level performer in W.A. schools.

        The W.A. Principal's Profile (see Appendix C) has three sections or key dimensions:
Self - which describes the personal qualities of successful principals; Processes - which
describe gradations of successful use of processes; Outcomes - which describe the goals of
the successful principal's actions.

Discussion:
The Profile Dimensions: When the three profiles are compared it becomes evident that all
the profiles share a common core of three key dimensions . With semantic differences,all
three profiles have in common descriptors of effective practice relating to School Culture
Management, Instructional Leadership, and Organizational Managment (see appendices A, B,
& C). In some ways this is a remarkable outcome given the far-flung distances involved. It
suggests that there are important similarities in the Australian and Canadian principalships.
In both countries principals apparently see their contemporary roles as extending much
beyond traditional building management to include instructional and cultural leadership
responsibilities. On the other hand, given that all three profile teams reviewed the same
school improvement research findings as part of the profiling process, it is not surprising that
the profiles share some of the same vocabulary and concepts.
        A comparison of the NWT and Ontario profiles reveals a heavier emphasis in the

NWT profile on transformational (collaborative, teacher and community empowering)
strategies. The ideal NWT principal is portrayed as engaging in school culture or
organizational "management" as opposed to being "the manager"; an emphasis on facilitation
and consensus building rather than control.   In contrast, the Ontario
profile projects a moreindividual or charismatic leadership-oriented image of the role. The Ontario Profile also
presents a more ambitious or sophisticated image of the principalship. This is illustrated by
the inclusion of "Visionary" and "Problem Solver" as additional key dimensions of practice.
However, in both profiles, the writing teams have clearly expanded their image of the
principal's role beyond the limitations of traditional instructional leadership.
       The W.A. Principal Profile also has some unique qualities. The Australian writing
team chose to place the three dimensions common to all three profiles (culture, instruction,
& administrative management) within a single composite dimension they called Processes.
They then created a separate dimension, titled Self, as a way of describing the personal
orientations which drive the activities or Processes of the principalship. This effort to
isolate the beliefs and intents which underly the actions of the principalship is unique to the
three profiles.
       A second unique feature of the W.A. Profile is a third composite dimension identified
as Outcomes. This key dimension collates the highest levels of effective practice identified
under Processes into a summary of goal oriented practices.   Like the Ontario and NWT
profiles, the three sections of the W.A. profile are clearly inter-related, but, unlike the other
two profiles, may be used separately or as a total picture. Thus, the W.A. Profile user may
look at their success on the Outcome dimension of the profile and then validate this against
the Processes and Self profiles. Alternately the principal can commence at Processes and
work either way to the other dimensions.
The Profile Growth Strands: The preceding section focussed on a discussion of the
dimensions of practice selected by the writing teams for their regional profiles. In this section

we look at the developmental growth described in the profiles, moving left to right on the
pages from the lower levels of competent practices to the ideals described at the highest level
of the profiles.   A comparison and analysis of these descriptive statements reveals the
implicit "growth strands" which the writing teams have incorporated within their profiles.
Some fascinating images of professional growth emerge. What follows is a sampling of the
growth strands common to all three profiles:
From a tendency towards reactive responses to proactive responses: The "management" sub-
dimensions in both the NWT and Ontario profiles (e.g. finances, time management) illustrate
this growth strand.
From reliance on self, to mimicry of others, to attention on outcomes, to sensitivity to
multiple environmental influences: This growth strand is evident particularly in the school
and community culture management dimensions of all three profiles.
From rigid adherence to fixed procedures, to procedural flexibility, to philosophical or
conceptual fidelity: The instructional leadership dimensions in all three profiles illustrate this
growth strand within such sub-dimensions as evaluation.
From in-school focus, to inter-school focus, to school within the greater community focus:
All three profiles incorporate this growth strand, particularly within the school and
community culture management sub-dimensions.
From a limited repertoire to a broad repertoire of strategies: The highest levels of practice
across several dimensions of the three profiles, but especially the sub-dimensions of
instructional leadership, manifest this notion.

Conclusion: Some Liabilities Relating to Profile Use
        We can identify a number of potential liabilities resulting from the use of profiles.
However, despite these caveats, we believe the potential benefits far outweigh the liabilities.
Certainly, the practitioners involved in the validation of these profiles have responded with
enthusiastic support for the documents. We have been encouraged enough by the outcomes
of our first three profiles that tentative plans have been made to produce at least two
additional profiles in the coming year; one in a state of the United States

Paper Presented at the Joint AARE/
NZARE Conference, Geelong, 1992
Australian Association
for Research in Education

and a third
Canadian profile. Ultimately, we believe that responsibility for appropriate and ethical use
of such resources will lie with the user. However, this does not eliminate our responsibility
to consider potential liabilities. We conclude by identifying six limitations to profile use:
1. Profiles are expensive to produce in terms of the time and resources needed. Not all
jurisdictions can afford to produce such labour intensive resource documents. This may
raise an equity issue. In an era of fiscal restraint, some groups may devote less energy to
field-validation then would be considered ideal, or employ something less than a
representative group as a writing team.
2. Once a profile has been produced, it needs to be properly implemented. Project sponsors
should avoid expectations for a quick fix in terms of increased principal effectiveness. The
writing team members must also have credibility with the potential users of the profile
otherwise implementation efforts will fail. Finally, a profile should be attractively laid out in
order to invite use by busy school administrators who already must process a lot of paper.
3. Most profiles are quite linear and sequential in their portrayal of a role. They are also,
more often than not, complex documents. This may offend individuals who are more

intuitive or "right-brained" in their orientations. Moreover, a profile is in many respects a
caricature of professional practice, emphasizing some dimensions and not others. Some
individuals, whose professional practices are not reflected within the dimensions and
developmental stages may become alienated. Nobody likes to be perceived as incompetent or
out of step professionally.
4. Some educators are strongly inclined to be innovation focussed. They may mistakenly
view the profile as an "end" in itself rather than a" means" to an end. Dogmatic adherence
to a fixed role image is not a desirable outcome of profile development. The nature of the
principalship is in continual flux and this dynamism in response to social and environmental
influence will likely continue.

5. There is a very real potential for the mis-use of principal profiles as a tool of summative
evaluation. Most principals involved in the validation of our profiles have been quick to
point this out. In our view, this is not an appropriate use for profiles. Informal and
formal or growth-oriented performance appraisal applications may be acceptable.
However, there are simply too many personal and contextual variables which cannot be
accounted for to allow the use of profiles for summative evaluation purposes. We
acknowledge that there are those who do not agree with us.
6. Profiles must be reviewed and updated from time to time. Changing role requirements,
new research findings, a continually evolving image of what it is to be an educated person,
these are all factors which conspire to give profiles a relatively short shelf life; probably five
years or less. They ought to be reviewed and renewed on a cyclical basis just like school
curriculum.

Notes

1.   Instructional leadership is usually characterized by the presence of a clearly
articulated educational philosophy, extensive knowledge about effective educational practices,
and a clear understanding of the policy environment framing the school's purposes and
practices. This image of the role emphasizes leadership as well as management functions and
extends considerably beyond the performance of routine work tasks, the usual domain of
training research. Within the research community, justification for an instructional
leadership approach to school administration has been based largely on the premise that
certain characteristic actions of principals, intended to encourage and support classroom
practices linked by research to improved student outcomes, have a positive impact on student
achievement. However, research by Heck, Larsen and Marcoulides (1990) has also begun to
validate the instructional leadership role of principals as a causal link to improved student
outcomes.

2.   Miller and Seller (1985) identify the Transformational orientation

as one aimed at
achieving personal integration and, particularly, social awareness. The
strategies of the
Transformation orientation are those of creative thinking, invitational
teaching, cooperative
learning, guided imagery techniques, and whole language learning.

3.   For a more recent review of research on the principalship, see
Leithwood, K.A.,
Begley, P.T., Cousins, J.B. (1990). Nature, causes and consequences of
principals'
practices: An agenda for future research. Journal of Educational
Administration, 28,4,5-31.

REFERENCES

Argyris, C. (1982). Reasoning, learning, and action: individual and
organizational. San
        Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Begley, P.T., & Campbell-Evans, G.H (March 1993) Socializing experiences
of aspiring
        principals. Alberta Journal of Educational Research.

Begley, P.T., & Leithwood, K.A. (1990). The influence of values on school
administrator
        practices. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education. 3,
337-352.

Burdin, J.L. (ed.) (1989). School leadership. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Daresh, J.C., & Playko, M.A. (1992). The professional development of school
        administrators. Toronto: Allyn and Bacon.

Feldman, D.C. (1989). Socialization, resocialization, and training: reframing the research
        agenda. In I.L. Goldstein & Associates, Training and development in organizations
        (p. 376-416). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M.G. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. Toronto: OISE Press.

Gennep, A. van (1960). The rites of passage,. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Greenfield, W.D. (1985, April). Being and becoming a principal: responses to work contexts
        and socialization processes. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American
        Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Greenfield, W.D. (1987). Instructional leadership. Boston: Allyn & Bacon Ltd.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1987). Instructional leadership in the school context. In W.
        Greenfield (Ed.), Instructional leadership: concerns, issues, and controversies.
        Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Heck, R.H., Larsen, T.J., & Marcoulides, O.A. (1990). Instructional leadership and
        school achievement: validation of a causal model. Educational Administration
        Quarterly, 26(2), 94-125.

Huberman, M.A. & Miles, M.B. (1984) Innovation up close: How school improvement
        works. New York: Plenum Press.

Leithwood, K.A., Begley, P.T., Cousins, J.B. (1992). Developing expert leadership for
        future schools. London: Falmer Press.

Leithwood, K.A., Begley, P.T., Cousins, J.B. (1990). Nature, causes and consequences of
        principals' practices: An agenda for future research. Journal of Educational
        Administration, 28,4,5-31.

Leithwood, K.A., Fullan, M.F. Heald-Taylor, G. (1987) School level CRDI procedures
        to guide the school improvement process. OISE mimeo.

Leithwood, K.A., & Montgomery, D.G. (1986). Improving principal effectiveness: the
        principal profile. Toronto: OISE Press.

Leithwood, K.A. Montgomery, D.G. (1987) Improving classroom practices - using
        innovation profiles. OISE Press, Toronto.

Ministry of Education in Western Australia. (1987) Better schools in Western Australia: A
        programme for improvement. Perth: Government Printer.

Northwest Territories Department of Education. (1991) The framework. Yellowknife:
        Queen's Printer.

Ronkowski, S., & Iannaccone, L. (1989). Socialization research in administration, graduate
        schools and other professions: the heuristic power of van Gennep and Becker models.
        Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational
        Research Association, San Francisco.

Van Maanen, J. (1976). Breaking in: socialization to work. In R. Dubin (Ed.), Handbook of
        work, organization, and society, (p.67-130). Skokie, Illinois: Rand-McNally.

Appendix A: The Northwest Territories Principal Profile
(1992)

Appendix B: The Southwestern Ontario Principal Profile
(1992)

Southwestern Ontario Principal Profile

Writing Team:

John Bailey, Wellington Bd. of Ed.
Paul Begley, OISE Midwestern Centre
Marianne Bissegger, OISE Midwestern Centre
Ralph Borelli, Dufferin-Peel R.C. Bd.of Ed.
Ray Contois, Huron-Perth R.C. Bd.of Ed.
Peter Durksen, Wellington Bd. of Ed.
Madelaine Hughes, Waterloo R.C. Bd.of Ed.
Paul Kelly, Dufferin-Peel R.C. Bd.of Ed.
Laurie Kraftcheck, Huron-Perth R.C. Bd.of Ed.
Faye Lund, Wellington Bd.of Ed.
Bruce Macpherson, Wellington Bd.of Ed.

Linda Ness, Waterloo Bd.of Ed.
Lois O'Grady, Dufferin-Peel R.C. Bd.of Ed.
Carol Slater, Dufferin-Peel R.C. Bd.of Ed.
Gail Vick, Dufferin-Peel R.C. Bd.of Ed.

The Principal as Manager   Utilizes available resources to ensure the effective and efficient operation of the school

Student Conducthas a discipline policy in place
strictly adheres to and enforces the
school discipline policy

uses school discipline policy to
develop students' responsibility and
problem solving strategies
has collaboratively developed policies,
procedures and an inserviced school
community to ensure that all students
are respected and learn to accept
responsibility
Budgetmeets the basic operating needs of
the school within budget guidelines
seeks input from staff in setting
budget priorities
involves the staff in setting budget
priorities
implements a collaborative philosophy
of school budgeting which reflects
accountability, long term planning,
efficiency, and the current political and

economic climate
Supervisionimplements the basic summative
evaluation procedure
incorporates aspects of formative
supervision
uses a variety of supervisory
approaches to assist and support staff
development in a sensitive way
integrates the supervisory practices
with personal and professional growth
plans in an effort to achieve school
goals
Legalitiesrelies on input and guidance of
superordinates and colleagues to
carry out the daily operations of the
school
demonstrates an awareness of the
Ministry and Board procedures and
acts when these impact on the daily
operations of the school

has a knowledge of the Education
Act/Regulations and Statutes which
are reflected in the school-based
planning and goal setting process
integrates the requirements/priorities of
the Education Act/Regulations and
Statutes into the daily operation of the
school in a manner consistent with the
school vision, goals and priorities
Time Managementspends administrative time reacting
to daily demands and occurrences
is aware of the need to analyze and
develop time management strategies
develops a time management plan
along with staff to facilitate the
effective operation of school
uses a time management plan to
maximize the use of resources in order
to achieve both the short and long term
school goals

The Principal as Instructional Leader/Program Facilitator   Initiates
and directs a growth oriented change process which maximizes learning
outcomes

               for students, staff and community

Learning
Environmentrecognizes obvious features of the
culture and accepts the existing
school culture

reacts to expressed needs within the
culture

examines the school culture by
gathering input from informal
monitoring procedures and initiates
some changes unilaterally

makes changes in school culture
based on data gathered through
formal, ongoing monitoring
procedures

begins to encourage participation in a
school level decision-making process

creates a climate which fosters
sharing and professional growth

establishes a culture which fosters

cooperation, encourages risk taking and
empowers (creating a community of
leaders)

establishes a culture which is based on
a philosophy of life long learning

establishes aa culture which fosters
high levels of participation in a school
level decision-making process

creates a proactive culture which
anticipates needs, initiates responses
and monitors progress

Goalsis aware of Board and Ministry goals

develops school goals as mandated
by the supervisory officer

develops school goals in consultation
with staff with reference to Board
and Ministry goals

initiates school goals in collaboration
with staff with reference to Board
and Ministry goals

encourages teachers to use goals for
long term planning

transforms goals into short term
objectives

selects goals according to Board,

Ministry, school-based initiatives and
community needs

sets high expectations for all students
and staff

transforms goals into short term
objectives and identifies indicators of
success

uses goals as reference points for all
activities

Appendix C: A Principal's Profile (Western Australia)
(1990)