INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP ACTIVITIES IN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS IN VIRGINIA

by

Robert Lee Stokes

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Educational Administration

APPROVED:

Wayne M. Worner, Co-Chairman	William A. Bost, Co-Chairman
Glen I. Earthman, Committee Member	Thomas C. Hunt, Committee Member

Kenneth E. Underwood, Committee Member

June, 1984

Blacksburg, Virginia

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP ACTIVITIES IN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS IN VIRGINIA

by

Robert Lee Stokes

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was to examine the instructional leadership role of the senior high school principal, his administrative staff and the degree to which other individuals assume and perform instructional leadership responsibilities in the senior high schools in Virginia.

The descriptive survey method was used to accomplish the objectives of the study. The participants in the study included senior high school principals in Virginia. A thirty-eight item questionnaire was developed from a review of selected literature and administered to all senior high school principals in Virginia. Usable responses were received from 210 of the 256 senior high school principals for a return rate of 82 percent.

Responses to the thirty-eight item questionnaire from the principals were analyzed using the statistical analysis system (SAS). Data were reported by means, frequencies, standard deviations and percentages.

Major findings of the study were as follows:

1. All of the instructional activities were carried out in most of the schools. There was very little differentiation as a function of size, location, and staff.

2. The principal has the highest mean responsibility for most of the thirty-eight instructional activities identified; the assistant principal had the second highest mean responsibility. Exceptions are in follow-up of students, Instructional material development, Inservice programs, and staff development.

3. For the three variables examined (size, location, and staffing), size and staffing seemed to be the variables which influenced the distribution of responsibilities. Generally, mean scores and primary responsibility assigned to the principal decreased as school size and staffing increased. Conversely, responsibility of the assistant principal increased as school size increased.

4. Formulating school goals and observing instructional techniques were reported most frequently by principals as most important leadership activities carried out in secondary schools.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is indebted to members of the advisory committee who during the development of this study offered many helpful comments and suggestions. Chief among these persons were the co-chairmen of this study, Dr. Wayne M. Worner, Professor of Education at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and Dr. William A. Bost, Chairman of the Division of Curriculum and Instruction at Virginia Commonwealth University. Special thanks is also expressed to other members of the dissertation committee: Dr. Glen I. Earthman, Dr. Thomas C. Hunt and Dr. Kenneth E. Underwood. The direction and assistance of each of these gentlemen proved invaluable during the development of this study.

Appreciation is extended to the principals of the two hundred and ten participating senior high schools. Also, deepest appreciation is extended to Mrs. Betty H. Hackett for her assistance and to Mrs. Vickie Carroll for her time and commitment given to the typing and retyping of this study.

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my lovely and gracious wife, Emma Yvonne and to our sons, Robert Lee Jr., and Roderick Leonard. To them go my special thanks for their constant encouragement and inspiration throughout the preparation of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

DEDICATION v

LIST OF TABLES viii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY 1
Purpose of the Study 6
Need for the Study 7
Limitations of the Study 9
Definition of Terms 9
Organization of the Study 10

II. REVIEW OF SELECTED RELATED LITERATURE 11
The Origin of the Principalship 11
The Principal as Instructional Leader 15
The Principal as A Creator of A Climate for Instruction 29
Summary 36

III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY 38
Research Objectives 38
Research Method 39
Description of Population 40
Instrumentation 40
Data Collection 42
The Analysis Procedures 43

IV. RESULTS OF THE STUDY 45
Description of Subjects 45
Analysis of Responses 48
Summary of Results 76

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION 77
Purpose of the Study 77
Summary of Selected Related Literature 79
Summary of Methods and Procedures 80
Summary of Findings 82
Concluding Statement and Recommendations for Further Study 84

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Page

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 86

APPENDICES

A. List of Instructional Activities Included in Survey Questionnaire and Their Sources 91

B. Letter and Pilot Questionnaire 96

C. Letter and Principal Questionnaire 106

D. Follow-up Letter 117

VITA 119

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS TO INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP ACTIVITIES SURVEY	46
2.	PERCENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS INDICATING THAT SELECTED INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES ARE CARRIED OUT IN THEIR SCHOOLS	49
3.	MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES ACROSS CATEGORIES OF PERSONNEL IN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS	54
4.	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WHO INDICATED PRINCIPALS, ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS, CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS, CENTRAL OFFICE, AND OTHER(S), AS HAVING PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY FOR SELECTED ACTIVITY	59
5.	PERCENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS INDICATING THAT SELECTED INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES ARE CARRIED OUT IN THEIR SCHOOLS BY SIZE OF SCHOOL	62
6.	PERCENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS INDICATING THAT SELECTED INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES ARE CARRIED OUT IN THEIR SCHOOLS BY LOCATION OF SCHOOLS	63
7.	PERCENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS INDICATING THAT SELECTED INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES ARE CARRIED OUT IN THEIR SCHOOLS BY NUMBER OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS	64
8.	MEAN SCORE DISTRIBUTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES ACROSS SELECTED PERSONNEL BY SCHOOL SIZE	65
9.	MEAN SCORE DISTRIBUTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES ACROSS SELECTED PERSONNEL BY LOCATION	66
10.	MEAN SCORE DISTRIBUTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES ACROSS SELECTED PERSONNEL BY NUMBER OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS	67
11.	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY SIZE OF SCHOOL WHO INDICATED SELECTED PERSONNEL AS HAVING PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY FOR VARIOUS INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES	71

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

12. PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY LOCATION WHO IDENTIFIED SELECTED PERSONNEL AS HAVING PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY FOR VARIOUS INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES 72

13. PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WHO IDENTIFIED SELECTED PERSONNEL AS HAVING PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES FOR VARIOUS INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES BY NUMBER OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS 73

14. LEADERSHIP ACTIVITIES CONSIDERED MOST IMPORTANT IN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS 75

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

The principal is confronted with a variety of tasks. Managing a school is time consuming and demanding. Changing societal expectations have resulted in conditions that make the task even more difficult. In spite of these resulting conditions, the principal's most important task is the improvement of instruction. It is for this reason that the principal must develop a strategy which will enable him to accomplish that objective.[1]

The literature indicates that a principal's leadership and personal commitment can make the difference in whether a school achieves academic excellence. It also suggests that improved student learning is dependent upon improved teacher competence. The principal is viewed as the key, the person in the education hierarchy who is in the position to foster the improvement of teachers and thereby the instructional program.

James M. Lipham has suggested in his publication on effective principals and effective schools that the single most important factor in determining the success or failure of a school is the ability of the principal to lead the staff in planning; implementing changes; and evaluating the effectiveness of the school's curricular, co-curricular and extra-curricular program. The amount of time, effort and energy

---

[1]Paul B. Jacobson, James D. Logsdon and Robert R. Wiegman, The Principalship: New Perspectives (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973), p. 135.

devoted by the principal to the instructional process as opposed to managerial responsibilities is crucial. The management functions of the principal are important only as they facilitate and foster improvement in the school's instructional program.[2]

In making this statement, Lipham is not the first to voice the opinion that the principal's most important task is instruction. Also, Morrison, Culbertson and Henson in discussing performance objectives for school principals indicated that instruction is a central subsystem of the total educational system and that administering and improving the instructional program is an important domain of responsibility for school principals. There can be no doubt that superintendents and principals themselves are convinced that the principals should be instructional leaders.[3]

Time is an important factor for principals, and increased administrative demands have reduced the time available for instructional supervision. The open door concept has also made the principal accessible to a greater number of people and further reduced the time available for exercising instructional leadership.

Certain factors hinder principals in the successful completion of their jobs. According to the 1978 study of the high school

---

[2]James M. Lipham, Effective Principal, Effective Schools (Washington, D. C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1981), pp. 11-12.

[3]Morrison, Ruel, Jack S. Culbertson and Curtis Henson, Performance Objectives for School Principals (California: McCutchan Publishing Company, 1974), p. 152.

principalship by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), those most frequently mentioned are (1) time taken up by administrative detail; (2) lack of time; and (3) variations in the ability of teachers.[4]

These factors were further elaborated by Weddy in his 1979 article which appeared in the NASSA Bulletin. He maintains that most criticisms of a principal's instructional leadership are based on the following factors:

1. Principals are not trained to be instructional leaders;

2. Principals are too involved in other administrative roles;

3. Principals do not have time to be instructional leaders; and,

4. The art of instructional leadership is undeveloped and, therefore, not even available for principal's use.[5]

Furthermore, A. Lorri Manasse suggested in an article on effective principals, that although principals may prefer to see themselves as instructional leaders, the reality is that they spend much of their time on management functions. Schools are expected to do more than ever before, and modern principals have incredibly complex jobs. Principals administer various federal, state, and special needs

---

[4]David R. Byrne, Susan A. Hines and Lloyd E. McCleary, The Senior High School Principalship (Reston, Virginia: NASSP, 1978), Vol. 1, p. 25.

[5]Gilbert R. Weddy, "Principals Are Instructional Leaders. It's A Fact Not A Myth," NASSP Bulletin, LXIII (January, 1979), p. 72.

programs; they orchestrate parent and staff involvement in decision making and they supervise due process for staff and students.[6]

On the other hand, many writers focusing on the leadership role and responsibility of the principal strongly advocate that the principal is the instructional leader of the school. A proponent of this philosophy is Dr. Fred J. Brieve. Brieve stated that the principal is and must be an instructional leader. He is the single most important individual in influencing the instructional program in his school.[7]

Principals are indeed the instructional leaders of the school. Principals have no choice. In this period of declining student achievement, wavering public confidence in schools, and demands for financial accountability, principals must furnish instructional leadership whether they want to or not.[8]

Ursula Pinero postulated that principals need to return to the task of instructional leadership which gave birth to the profession but has been obscured by increases in school size and complexity.[9]

Effective school research supports the idea that effective schools share certain essential characteristics. Ron Edmonds listed five characteristics of an effective school: (1) the principal's leadership

---

[6]A. Lorri Manasse, "Effective Principals: Effective At What?" Principal, LXI (March, 1982), pp. 10-11.

[7]Fred J. Brieve, "Secondary Principals As Instructional Leaders," NASSP Bulletin, LVI (December, 1972), p. 11.

[8]Weddy, op. cit., p. 73.

[9]Ursula C. Pinero, "Wanted: Strong Instructional Leaders," Principal, LVI (March, 1982), p. 19.

and attention to the quality of instruction; (2) a pervasive and broadly understood instructional focus; (3) an orderly, safe climate conducive to teaching and learning; (4) teacher behaviors that convey the expectation that all students are expected to obtain at least minimum mastery; and (5) the use of measures of pupil achievement as the basis for program evaluation.[10]

Effective school research has also indicated that a principal can make the difference in an effective school. The four key themes which emerge from this research suggest that in order to have effective schools, principals must demonstrate the following: (1) well-defined instructional objectives and evaluation systems; (2) assertive, achievement-oriented leadership; (3) high expectations for staff and pupils; and (4) orderly, purposeful, and peaceful school climate.[11]

Effective principals tend to be involved actively in their school's instructional program in the following ways according to Pinero:

1. become knowledgeable about instruction;

2. set clear goals for the school's instructional program and announce these goals to students, faculty and community;

3. set high expectations for behavior and achievement of students;

---

[10]Ronald R. Edmonds, "Programs of School Improvement: An Overview," Educational Leadership, XXXX (December, 1982), p. 4.

[11]Jan Shoemaker and Hugh W. Frazier, "What Principals Can Do: Some Implications from Studies of Effective Schooling," Phi Delta Kappan, LXIII (November, 1981), p. 180.

4. participate with teachers in in-service activities;

5. insist on giving priority to instruction concerns; and,

6. make instruction and its improvement the central concern of the school.[12]

Principals in Virginia, like principals nation-wide, are confronted with the same time-consuming problems which prohibit them from spending adequate time with instruction; therefore, it is important to periodically examine their instructional role to determine if instructional activities are being performed, and if so, by whom.

This study was undertaken to provide information for examining the instructional role of the principal and the administrative staff in the senior high schools of Virginia.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine:

1. whether selected instructional activities are performed in the senior high schools of Virginia;

2. when instructional activities are performed by more than one person, the distribution of responsibility for carrying out the activity; and,

3. who is responsible for performing the instructional activities.

Specifically, the objectives of the study were to determine:

---

[12]Pinero, loc. cit.

1. To what extent selected instructional activities are carried out in Virginia senior high schools?

2. How instructional responsibilities are distributed across selected personnel in Virginia senior high schools?

3. Who has primary responsibility for each of thirty-eight selected instructional activities in Virginia senior high schools?

4. Are there differences in whether or not the instructional responsibilities are carried out based on school size, location (urban, rural, suburban), and staffing?

5. Are there differences in how instructional responsibilities are distributed by size, location and staffing?

6. Are there differences in who has primary responsibility for each of the 38 instructional activities by size, location and staffing?

Need for the Study

The literature supports the fact that the principal is the key individual in the success of an effective school. Several studies have been completed on the perceived instructional role of the principal in several areas of the country. One study in Virginia (Johnson, 1980) looked at the instructional role of the middle school principal in the Richmond Metropolitan area. However, no recent study has been carried out on the instructional leadership activities in the senior high schools in Virginia.

The Standards for Accrediting Schools in Virginia stipulate that the principal shall be responsible for the instructional leadership of the school and that forty percent of the combined time of the principal and assistant principal(s) shall be devoted to supervising instruction and curriculum development.[13]

Increased demands upon the principal's time for administering curricular and non-curricular activities have raised some concerns regarding time available for supervising instruction. The appointment of assistant principals in charge of instruction and in-school curriculum specialists has, in some instances, relieved the principal of some instructional supervision responsibilities.

The results of this study will provide an in-depth view of the instructional role of the principal, his administrative staff and the degree to which other individuals assume and perform instructional leadership responsibilities in the senior high schools. Additionally, the results of this study should prove valuable to the Department of Education and institutions of higher education involved with the preparation of in-service programs for secondary school administrators, as well as for those involved with the evaluation of principals and their supporting personnel.

---

[13]State Department of Education, "Standards for Accrediting Schools in Virginia," (Richmond, Virginia: July, 1983), p. 11.

Limitations of the Study

The study limitations include the following:

1. This study was based on the responses of Virginia senior high school principals;

2. Only those schools which were listed as senior high schools in the 1982-83 Virginia Educational Directory and satisfied the criteria for a senior high school as set forth in this study were considered.

3. A mail questionnaire survey technique was utilized in this study. A weakness in questionnaire surveys include the problem of misinterpretation by the respondents and the rate of returns by individuals.

Definition of Terms

Throughout the study, certain terms will be used. The terms are used in the context of the following definitions:

Senior High School Principal

The term "senior high school principal" refers to the administrative head of the senior high school. In this study it refers to the 210 respondents to the questionnaire who serve as high school principals in Virginia.

Instructional Leadership

In this study instructional leadership refers to a specific set of 38 activities identified as being appropriate to the instructional responsibilities of principals and included on a questionnaire distributed to the principals (see Appendix C).

Senior High School

The term "senior high school" refers to a secondary school containing a twelfth grade with no grade lower than eighth.

Organization of the Study

This study consists of five chapters. The introduction, purpose and objectives, justification and need, limitations, definition of terms, and organization constitute Chapter I. Chapter II presents a review of related literature which serves as general background for the study. Chapter III describes the methods and procedures used in the study. Specific topics include population, instrumentation, data collection and treatment of data. Chapter IV presents the results of the study. Chapter V includes the summary, conclusions, and recommendations based upon the findings of this study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a review of selected literature relevant to the study. The review is presented in four sections: (1) the origin of the principalship, (2) the principal as the instructional leader, (3) the principal as a creator of a climate for instruction, and (4) summary.

The Origin of the Principalship

The literature reviewed indicates that the principalship in American schools has existed for more than a century. Samuel Goldman points out in discussing the school principal that the principalship did not begin as a carefully planned, clearly defined position in education; rather, it emerged in response to a multitude of factors, including enrollment increases, numbers of teachers employed, and the proliferation of services provided by the school. Therefore, as these factors became more complex and more demanding of time, a distinctive role for the school principalship began to emerge.[1]

The high school headmaster or principal claims the honor of holding the oldest administrative position in American education. The

---

[1]Samuel Goldman, The School Principal (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966) p. 1.

position of secondary school principal antedates both the superintendency and the elementary school principalship.[2]

During the second half of the eighteenth century, increasing enrollments forced towns to organize multi-room secondary schools which required the services of several teachers. As these schools evolved, it became necessary to devise some way to coordinate the instructional services of the entire schools. Such things as determining the time of opening and closing school, scheduling classes and taking care of and managing the building began to demand so much time that the trustees found it necessary to appoint a "head teacher" to perform these duties. From this position of "head teacher," the secondary school principalship gradually emerged.[3]

Since the early administrator generally served as a teacher as well as a principal, a close relationship was maintained between the administrative and instructional programs of the school.[4]

The evolving role of the principal was described in 1965 as follows:

> As the principalship developed into a full time administrative job, and as principals became recognized as the officials responsible for the internal management of their schools, the attention they gave to the instructional program

---

[2]Richard W. Saxe, Educational Administration Today: An Introduction (Berkley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1980), p. 193.

[3]Anderson W. Lester and Lauren A. Vann Dyke, Secondary School Administration (Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972), p. 4.

[4]Ibid., p. 6.

> also tended to increase. They were expected to carry out the supervisory policies of the official responsible for the overall management of the educational system, the school superintendent, and to coordinate learning activities of their school.[5]

The freeing of the principal from the responsibility of classroom teaching was another important step in the development of the principalship. The introduction of courses of study and the grading of schools made it necessary for the principal to visit the classrooms to inspect the work of teachers. Principals were freed from all responsibilities for classroom teaching in several large cities prior to 1807.[6]

Originally, the principal was also the liaison person between the board of education and the teachers. A single administrator was adequate until communities grew so large that a number of schools were required. The position of superintendent was created in 1837 to coordinate the activities of the various schools and the task of general administration. The principal subsequently became responsible to the superintendent of schools and served as the liaison person between the central office and the teachers in his school.[7]

From 1895-1910, principals were especially slow to take advantage of the opportunities for professional leadership which were

---

[5]Neal Gross and Robert E. Herriott, Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Survey (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965), p. 3.

[6]Til Van Til, Secondary Education: School and Community (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978), p. 194.

[7]Anderson and Van Dyke, op. cit., p. 5.

available to them. Except in rare cases, they appeared content to rest on the point of view that the principalship had become established. Paul Pierce stated that principals were content to use "rule of thumb" procedures in dealing with the supervision of instruction. Principals' associations, for the most part, were more concerned with administrative phases of principals' work and with welfare features of the position.[8]

Many forces have impacted upon the principalship and influenced the responsibilities of the position since its beginning as "head teacher." Charles L. Wood and others point out that the role of the principalship has changed continually from closely resembling the role of a teacher to a role quite different from that of a teacher. There is no indicaton or reason to believe that this trend will be reversed any time soon. According to Wood, et. al. the major factors influencing this changing role of the principal are

1. continuing evolution of secondary education;
2. urbanization;
3. population;
4. school district reorganization;
5. technological advances;
6. student and teacher action to gain increased voice in decision-making;
7. changing societal values;
8. teacher collective bargaining; and,

---

[8]Paul R. Pierce, The Origin and Development of the Public School Principalship (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935), p. 21.

9. changing political environment.[9]

The principalship is different and much more difficult than it was a decade ago. There is little resemblance between the duties, responsibilities, and problems of the principal of a few years ago and those of today's administrator. Among the reasons for this difference are changes in the curriculum and more extensive teacher involvement in it, dissatisfaction of principals with the failure of training programs to keep current with the many aspects of his job, and the existence of societal injustices such as poverty in the midst of plenty.[10]

The Principal as Instructional Leader

The literature is overwhelming in its call for the principal to exercise instructional leadership. James Lipham and Marvin Fruth have defined instructional leadership as those behaviors of an individual which initiate new goals, structures, and relationships in the instructional program. Also, they have indicated that the principal's primary concern must be for the improvement of the instructional program of the school.[11]

---

[9]Charles L. Wood, Everett W. Nicholson, and Dale G. Findley, The Secondary School PrincipaL: Manager and Supervisor (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1979), p. 2.

[10]Paul B. Jacobson, James D. Logsdon, and Robert R. Wiegman, The Principalship: New Perspectives (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973), p. 1.

[11]James M. Lipham and Marvin J. Fruth, The Principal and Individually Guided Education (Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1976), p. 63.

Others supporting the position of principal as instructional leader include Wilbur Brookover, John M. Jenkins, and Harold J. Liphman. Brookover and others have indicated that although the principal may have many other functions in operating a school organization, the leadership role in establishing an effective instructional program in the school is foremost.[12] Jenkins has observed that hardly a journal article or a new book has been written which did not encourage the secondary school administrator to devote most of his time to the improvement of instruction.[13] Lipham, in his 1972 article which appeared in the NASSP Bulletin, suggested that the principal who makes it his first concern to improve the quality of teaching in his school must make himself a perceptive student of the social forces in which the school operates, as well as of the major disciplines and the relevant educational theory. He must be responsible for maintaining a climate conducive to change and innovation, a climate to encourage the view of education as a never static, growing process. He must keep the lines of communication open between himself and teachers who will increasingly expect and deserve to be respected as professional peers.[14]

---

[12]Wilbur Brookover and others, Creating Effective Schools (Florida: Learning Publishing Company, Inc., 1982), p. 82.

[13]John M. Jenkins, "The Principal: Still the Principal Teacher," NASSP Bulletin, LVI (February, 1972), pp. 69-70.

[14]Harold J. Lipman, "Instructional Leader or Administrative Robot," NASSP Bulletin, LVI (April, 1972), p. 21.

Ben M. Harris has suggested that the principal who desires to be efficient and effective as an instructional leader should adhere to the following conceptual framework:

> 1. Instructional leadership involves change that is uniquely instructional.
>
> 2. Leadership involves responsibility. Leaders assume responsibility above and beyond that of followers.
>
> 3. Leadership involves the pursuit of change. Without change as an essential focus or purpose, there is no need for leadership.[15]

The principal has numerous responsibilities to perform in discharging his role, and the literature is mixed on which school responsibility requires most of his time. However, the consensus among educators is that the primary function of the principal is to be an instructional leader.

Jo Ann Medwid has suggested that the principal can and must learn to be an instructional leader because public schools can no longer afford or tolerate the lack of instructional accountability. Both basic competencies and thinking skills must be part of every student's background. It is the principal's responsibility to ensure the essence of quality education: critical decision making based on sound information.[16]

Kimball Wiles and John T. Lovell have pointed out that the principal is the chief instructional leader of the school and that he is

---

[15]Ben M. Harris, "Altering the Thrust of Supervision Through Creative Leadership," Educational Leadership, XXXVI (May, 1977), p. 568.

[16]Jo Ann Medwid, "The Principal as Instructional Leader," NASSP Bulletin, LXIII (March, 1979), p. 41.

the one official leader at the local school level who is primarily concerned with the overall goals of the school.[17]

R. A. Pendergrass and Deane Wood pointed out that when principals think of themselves as instructional leaders instead of as school managers, they focus their attention on theories of learning, program supervision, and curriculum improvement.[18]

The premise that effective instructional leaders are actively involved in their school's instructional program is suggested by Pinero when he states that they are knowledgeable about instruction, set clear goals for the instructional program, make these goals known to students and teachers, and set high expectations for teachers. They consistently give priority to instructional concerns by concentrating their efforts on instructional matters and delegating noninstructional tasks. These leaders make instruction and its improvement the central concern of the school.[19]

The responsibility for the instructional program as seen by Miller, Madden and Kincheloe deserves a top priority rating among the administrative tasks. It is commonly treated as one of the areas of administrative concern because the primary reason for having schools is

---

[17]Kimball Wiles and John T. Lovell, Supervision for Better Schools (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1975), p. 202.

[18]R. A. Pendergrass and Deane Wood, "Instructional Leadership and the Principal," NASSP Bulletin, LXIII (March, 1979), p. 41.

[19]Ursula C. Pinero, "Wanted: Strong Instructional Leaders," Principal, LXI (March, 1982), p. 17.

to provide instruction. Responsibility for instruction is the basic and central concern in the administration of schools. All such other administrative task areas are undertaken for the sake of providing effective instruction.[20]

The improvement of instruction is a major responsibility of the principal. The 1970 study of the principalship by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) indicated that the principal is an educational administrator with all that the term implies. His primary responsibility should be, in cooperation with his staff, to direct, guide, and coordinate the total educational program within the school. The study pointed out that the principal's cardinal function is the improvement of instruction which will enhance the learning experiences of his students. The principal, then, is first and foremost an instructional leader; and all of his other activities must directly support this central function.[21]

The literature suggests overwhelmingly that the principal should be the school's key instructional leader and must continue to fulfill this responsibility. However, there are a number of persons who disagree with this idea. Medwid pointed out that the principal is frequently described as an "instructional leader." However, as school officials struggle to clarify this concept, there is little evidence

---

[20]Van Miller, George R. Madden and James B. Kincheloe, The Public Administration of American School Systems (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1972), p. 131.

[21]George E. Melton and John Stansavage, The Principalship (Reston: NASSP, 1970), p. 2.

that the principal is currently filling this role. In fact, the principal is not trained for this role and, more importantly, may not understand the need for it.[22]

That instructional leadership is an outdated role for the principal and that many principals are beginning to question the feasibility of directing employees toward instructional improvement is a contention of Hoch.[23] He also claims that another deterrent to principals' full commitment to instructional improvement has been the realization that, as a group, their efforts have not been particularly successful. Few principals have both the time and the inclination to operate from any theoretical model for instructional improvement.[24]

The role of the principal as an instructional leader according to Lipman must contrast sharply with the principal as a business manager. For the principal to be a leader of instruction, he must make a major commitment of time and be willing to cultivate new skills.[25]

If the principal is not devoting 70 or 80 percent of his time to the improvement of instruction, or related acts, Jenkins states that it is time he consider changing his image.[26]

---

[22]Medwid, op. cit., p. 105.

[23]James A. Hoeh, "Feeling Guilty for not Being an Instructional Leader: Don't," NASSP Bulletin, LXII (November, 1973), pp. 6-7.

[24]Ibid., p. 1.

[25]Lipman, "Instructional Leader or Administrative Robot," p. 21.

[26]Jenkins, "The Principal: Still the Principal Teacher," p. 23.

As a conclusion in his study, Carruthers reports that principals tend to perceive themselves as providing instructional leadership more than teachers perceived the principal as providing this leadership.[27]

Being critical of the role played by the principal in instructional leadership, Silberman states that compared with English heads, most principals no longer teach. Perhaps their failure to teach helps define teaching as less important than administration. The result of this distinction is that the American teacher is far less likely to receive the kind of support and help that is available to most teachers in England.[28]

Leonard O. Pellicer pointed out that the problem of principals being in a position to provide instructional leadership is surely more complex than can be explained by a lack of training or a lack of time. Principals who seek to be instructional leaders in school settings also lack support from their superiors and subordinates. Principals lack a suitable process to assist them in bringing about positive changes in instruction, and they also fall victims to a lack of agreement among so-called experts as to what constitutes effective instruction.[29]

---

[27]Snowden C. Carruthers, "A Study of the Instructional Leadership Role of Southern Secondary School Principals as Perceived By Selected Secondary School Principals and Teachers, (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1977), p. IV.

[28]Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom: the Remaking of American Education (New York: Random House, 1971), pp. 276-277.

[29]Leonard O. Pellicer, "Providing Instructional Leadership--A Principal Challenge," NASSP Bulletin, LXVI (October, 1982), p. 28.

It is indicated by Mullican and Ainsworth that whether the principal is, or can be, an instructional leader depends upon many factors; and the matter is much debated and not settled to the satisfaction of practitioners, theorists, or researchers. Principals, however, believe instructional leadership to be a desirable role, but that role is not being fulfilled to their satisfaction.[30]

Thomas R. McDaniel pointed out that the principal who is well-informed about contemporary guidelines relating to the selection, evaluation, and discharge of teachers and who is aware of the most recent findings on instructional effectiveness will be able to make wise decisions and take judicious actions. Improving instruction takes good management and good instructional leadership. The principal is the key.[31]

The principal can make a fundamental difference in the performance of a school contends Snyder by involving staff members in school improvement planning, as well as staff and program development. Schools can produce the levels and kinds of learning that society expects as principals become increasingly more skilled at organizing teachers in various permanent and temporary arrangements to work toward specific goals.[32]

---

[30]Frank Mullican and Len Ainsworth, "The Principal as Instructional Leader, Theory Into Practice, XVIII (February, 1983), p. 33.

[31]Thomas R. McDaniel, "What's Your P.Q.? Principalship Quotient?," Phi Delta Kappan, XII (February, 1982), p. 468.

[32]Karolyn J. Snyder, "Instructional Leadership for Productive Schools," Educational Leadership, XXXX (February; 1983), p. 37.

The person who knows the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty and has the best opportunity to help teachers according to De Roche and Kaiser is the principal. The principal is also in the best position to create a support team for the teachers; has the greatest opportunity to interpret the school's goals, objectives, and programs to parents and the community; and finally, is in the best position to organize, supervise, and evaluate the school's programs and personnel.[33]

Most writers in education would probably agree that at least half or more of the principal's time should be devoted to problems that relate to the improvement of instruction.[34]

Working with individuals and groups of teachers to improve classroom performance, Liphman reports, is a demanding job that requires the principal to have a broadly developed set of understandings, skills, and attitudes. There is a vast difference between knowing about the instructional program and being intimately involved in its development, implementation, evaluation, and refinement. Studies show that principals of effective schools:

1. are committed to instructional improvement;

---

[33]Edward F. DeRoche and Jeffrey S. Kaiser, Complete Guide to Administering School Services (New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1980), p. 18.

[34]Paul B. Jacobson, James D. Logsdon and Robert R. Wiegman, The Principalship: New Perspectives (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973), p. 139.

2. show strong knowledge of and participation in classroom instructional activities;

3. engage in effective instructional improvement processes; and,

4. have positive attitudes about their staff and students.[35]

The Connecticut School Effectiveness Project identified the following seven characteristics of an effective school:

1. Instructional Leadership: The principal acts as the instructional leader who effectively communicates the mission of the school to the staff, parents, and students, and who understands and applies the characteristics of instructional effectiveness in the management of the instructional program of the school;

2. Safe and Orderly Environment: There is an orderly, purposeful atmosphere which is free from the threat of physical harm;

3. Clear Mission Goal: There is a clearly articulated mission of the school through which the staff shows an understanding of and a commitment to instructional goals, assessment procedures, priorities and accountability;

4. High Expectations: The school displays a climate of expectation in which the staff believes and demonstrates that students can attain mastery of basic skills;

5. Opportunity to learn and student time on task: Teachers allocate a significant amount of classroom rime to instruction in basic skill areas;

---

[35]Lipman, op. cit., 13.

6. Frequent monitoring of student progress: Feedback on student academic progress is frequently obtained; and,

7. Home-School Relations: Parents understand and support the basic mission of the school and are made to feel that they have an important role in achieving this mission.[36]

As indicated by Wiles and Lovell the principal is the chief instructional leader of the school and is responsible for maintaining the delicate balance among all aspects.[37]

Ross Neagley and N. Dean Evans reported that writers in the field of educational leadership have been saying for years that the improvement of the instructional program and the curriculum is the principal's most important job.[38]

The literature on the principalship is filled with exhortations and clarion calls for "leadership in education" according to Goldman. Traditionally, this kind of leadership has been taken to mean that the school principal must hold as his primary and all-encompassing task the improvement of instruction in his building.[39]

---

[36]Connecticut Department of Education, "Connecticut School Effectiveness Project," (Hartford, Connecticut: November, 1983), p. 1.

[37]Kimball Wiles and John T. Lovell, Supervision for Better Schools (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1975), p. 202.

[38]Ross L. Neagley and N. Dean Evans, Handbook for Effective Supervision (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980), p. 124.

[39]Samuel Goldman, The School Principal, p. 107.

In their book, Chernow and Chernow reported that most principals indicated that they would like to spend more time in the area of instructional supervision. Two-thirds of all principals recently surveyed in the Northeast reported the following three activities as among those most used:

1. schedule and conduct classroom observation of teachers;

2. prepare and file written records of observation and/or conferences with teachers; and,

3. pre-visitation and follow-up conferences with teachers.[40]

If a principal is totally committed to becoming an instructional leader, John Jenkins suggests that the following steps should be observed:

1. Devote at least one faculty meeting per month to information about what is happening in the respective instructional areas;

2. Invite yourself to meetings of teaching teams and departments. Reflectively listen to what teachers are saying;

3. Build a daily schedule of events which outline how you will spend your day;

4. Keep a log of your daily activities with appropriate reflections;

5. Build into your daily schedule sufficient time for teachers to see you on a first come, first serve basis;

---

[40]Fred B. Chernow and Carol Chernow, School Administrator's Guide to Managing People (New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1976), p. 71.

6. Get out of your office and into the school proper where the action is; and,

7. Be responsible to people. You don't always have to condone behavior to understand it.[41]

The 1970 study of the principalship by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) indicated that as educational leader, the principal should:

1. keep instruction and learning foremost in his own planning, making certain that they are central to all school deliberations;

2. help to establish and clarify short and long-range goals for the school, and act as a catalyst for innovative thinking and action on the part of others in the school;

3. do not hesitate to suggest ideas for program, curriculum, and organization;

4. adapt the school's program and procedures to the requirement of the individual student;

5. encourage the staff to suggest new ideas and try new ways of doing things;

6. accept accountability for the overall effectiveness of the school; and,

7. foster sound interpersonal relationships among the students, the teachers, and the administration.[42]

Jo Ann Mazzarella indicated that principals can influence the instructional program in the following ways:

1. orienting faculty in new teaching techniques, both by planning and supervising in-service training programs and by holding demonstration lessons;

---

[41]Jenkins, op. cit., p. 32.

[42]George Melton and John Stansavage, The Principalship, pp. 2-3.

2. making classroom visits, evaluating, and giving feedback to teachers;

3. involving parents, teachers, counselors, and administrators in developing the grading system; and,

4. supervising the testing program and making sure that tests are providing the kinds of information needed.[43]

The principal who desires to be effective and efficient as an instructional leader should observe the following framework, according to Harris:

1. instructional leadership involves change that is uniquely instructional;

2. leadership involves responsibility; and,

3. leadership involves the pursuit of change. Without change as the initial purpose or focus, there is no need for leadership.[44]

In an attempt to help principals conceptualize accurately the institutional mission of the school that will have a direct impact on his ability to focus on the improvement of learning, Bagby made these suggestions:

1. Reexamine the training programs for leadership;

2. Redefine the administrative responsibilities;

3. Rededicate yourself to the imperative task of directing change;

4. Redistribute the sources of input into the decision making process;

---

[43]Jo Ann Mazzarella, "The Principal's Role as an Instructional Leader," School Management Digest, III (September, 1977).

[44]Ben M. Harris, "Altering the Thrust of Supervision Through Creative Leadership," Educational Leadership, XXXVI (May, 1977), p. 568.

5. Reinforce humane practices in the leadership function; and,

6. Reorganize the increasingly bureaucratic structure of the school system.[45]

The Principal As A Creator of A Climate for Instruction

Teachers and students need to be able to operate in a climate that is conducive to the person's self-enhancement in order to perform effectively. Students cannot be expected to learn efficiently if they are fearful of being victimized, subject to frequent disruptions in class, or easily tempted to break rules. Teachers cannot expect to teach effectively if they must spend valuable time dealing with student behavioral problems and if they fail to receive administrative backing. Establishing orderly classrooms depends to a great extent on the establishment of an orderly school environment.[46]

A positive school climate is both a means and an end. A good school climate makes it possible to work productively toward important goals, such as academic learning, social development, and curriculum improvement. It also makes school a good place to be, a satisfying and

---

[45]Geraldine Bagby, "Help Wanted: Instructional Leadership," NASSP Bulletin, LVI (November, 1972), pp. 41-45.

[46]Daniel L. Duke, "What Can Principal Do?," NASSP Bulletin, XXXVIII (October, 1982), p. 5.

meaningful situation in which both adults and youth care to spend a substantial portion of their time.[47]

The job of the administrator as a climate leader is to provide leadership and an accountability system consistent with the school's philosophy. He provides the basic leadership for:

1. assessing school climate improvement needs;

2. setting goals to describe needed improvements;

3. reducing goals to manageable projects with measurable objectives;

4. devising strategies for obtaining the objectives; and,

5. establishing progress.[48]

Schools with effective learning climates have high achievement regardless of the type of community served by the school. By the same token, ineffective school learning climates are associated with low levels of achievement.[49]

The essential for a good school climate as stated by Fox are respect, trust, high morale, opportunities for input, continuous academic and social growth, school renewal, cohesiveness, and caring. According to Fox, these factors were based on certain human needs in the school:

---

[47]Robert S. Fox and others, School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to the School Administrator (Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1974), p. 1.

[48]Ibid., p. 24.

[49]Brookover and others, Creating Effective Schools, p. 3.

1. physiological needs;

2. safety needs;

3. acceptance and friendship needs;

4. needs to maximize one's potential; and,

5. achievement and recognition needs.[50]

The open climate represents a high degree of trust and esprit and low disengagement. This combination suggests a climate in which both the principal and faculty are genuine in their behavior. The principal leads through example by providing the proper blend of structure and direction as well as support and consideration. Teachers work well together and are committed to the task at hand. Acts of leadership emerge easily and appropriately as they are needed. The open school is not preoccupied exclusively with either task achievement or social needs satisfaction, but both emerge freely. The behavior of both the principal and faculty is authentic.[51]

In a closed climate the principals and teachers simply appear to go through the motions, with the principal stressing routine trivia and unnecessary busywork. The principal's ineffective leadership is further seen in his close supervision, formal declarations, and impersonality. The behavior of both principal and teachers in the closed climate is

---

[50]Robert S. Fox, School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to the School Administrator, pp. 7-9.

[51]Wayne K. Hoy and Cecil G. Miskel, Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice (New York: Random House, Inc., 1978), p. 141.

least genuine when inauthenticity pervades the atmosphere of the school.[52]

Schools characterized by a humanistic, pupil-control orientation should foster opportunities for meaningful social relations, producing students with a positive commitment. A custodial, pupil-control orientation provides an atmosphere that limits identification with teachers and the school and may indeed produce a sense of alienation among students.[53]

It is a major responsibility of the principal to create a climate which is conducive to a high degree of teacher satisfaction.[54]

Paul Cunningham found that teacher morale was related positively to the openness of the school climate. He concluded that job satisfaction also was related positively to the openness of the school climate.[55]

The organizational climate.as defined by Halpin and Croft is the personality of a school, and they distinguish the following six organizational profiles:

> 1. The Open Climate describes an energetic, lively organization which is moving towards its goals, and which provides satisfaction for the group members' personal needs. Leadership acts emerge easily and appropriately from both the group and the leaders;

---

[52]Ibid., p. 142.

[53]Ibid., p. 157.

[54]Jacobson, The Principalship: New Perspectives, p. 384.

[55]Paul Cunningham, "A Survey of Selected Research on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire" (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1975), p. 182.

2. The Autonomous Climate is described as one in which leadership acts emerge primarily from the group. The leader exerts little control over the group members; high esprit results primarily from social needs satisfaction; satisfaction from task achievement is also present, but to a lesser extent;

3. The Controlled Climate is characterized best as impersonal and highly task-oriented. The group's behavior is directed primarily toward task accomplishment while relatively little attention is given to behavior oriented to social-needs satisfaction;

4. The Familiar Climate is highly personal, but undercontrolled. The members of this organization satisfy their social needs, but pay relatively little attention to social control in respect to task achievement;

5. The Paternal Climate is best characterized as one in which the principal constrains the emergence of leadership acts from the group and attempts to initiate most of these acts himself; and,

6. The Closed Climate is characterized by a high degree of apathy on the part of all members of the organization.[56]

According to English, a climate that includes fear might improve short-term performance, but over the long haul job performance would suffer under prolonged stress. He expressed the following opinions concerning a climate of fear:

1. Fear is a poor motivating force for job performance on a longtitudinal basis;

2. Fear inhibits change and personal growth; and,

3. Fear distorts communication and leads to greater anxiety.[57]

---

[56]Samuel Goldman, The School Principal, pp. 60-61.

[57]Fenwick W. English, School Organization and Management (Worthington, Ohio: Charles H. Jones, Publishing Company, 1975), p. 130.

On the other hand, English contrasted the climate that included fear with one of "humanistic value" and listed the following characteristics:

1. This system recognizes the legitimacy and worth of conflict in arriving at a more open work climate;

2. Role relationships are collegial;

3. The system is controlled by the internal goals of the people in an organization;

4. The response of the system toward change is open and adapting; and,

5. Competency is situationally defined and related to the ability of the staff to solve real problems.[58]

If one were to walk into a school building and try to gain a sense of its prevailing climate, Fox suggests that one would look for the following factors which comprise the school's climate and determine its quality:

1. Respect: Teachers and students should see themselves as persons of worth, believing that they have ideas, and that those ideas are listened to and make a difference;

2. Trust: Trust is reflected in one's confidence that others can be counted on to behave in a way that is honest;

3. High Morale: People with high morale feel good about what is happening;

4. Opportunities for Input: Every person cherishes the opportunity to contribute his or her ideas, and know they have been considered;

5. Continuous Academic and Social Growth: Each student needs to develop additional academic, social, and physical skills, knowledge, and attitudes;

---

[58]Ibid., p. 10-11.

6. Cohesiveness: The quality is measured by the person's feelings toward the school;

7. School Renewal: The school as an institution should develop improvement projects; and,

8. Caring: Every individual in the school should feel that some other persons are concerned about him as a human being.[59]

According to a 1979 study of high school principals by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), principals are interested in four major types of climate outcomes for students in school environments: (1) achievement; (2) development of self-concept; (3) changes in behavior; and, (4) changes in attitudes.[60]

Edgar A. Kelly indicates that in exercising leadership for climate improvement, the principal's major role is to provide the staff with the information, the expectations, the support, and the supervision so that the staff is able to serve as mediators and transmitters of the principal's expectations.[61]

He also indicated that regardless of the principal's leadership behavior, the principal is the individual in the school who is most responsible for the climate of the school and for the outcomes of productivity and satisfaction attained by students and staff.[62]

---

[59]Fox and others, School Climate Improvement, pp. 7-8.

[60]Edgar A. Kelley, Improving School Climate (Reston, Virginia: NASSP, 1980), p. 45.

[61]Ibid., pp. 51-52.

[62]Ibid., p. 41.

He further suggested that effective principals and effective leaders for climate development must see their roles as both vocation and avocation. The direct quality of the principal's leadership of staff leads to the mediated and indirect influence which the principal has on the climate experienced or perceived by students and teachers.[63]

Summary

This chapter has examined literature in the areas of (1) the origin of the principalship, (2) the principal as the instructional leader, and (3) the principal as a creator of a climate for instruction.

The first section focuses on the evolution of the principalship, from its initial position of someone in the school building for administration to the granting of release time to practice instructional leadership. The second section, which is the major focus of this chapter, deals with the principal as the instructional leader. It was apparent in the review of selected literature that the instructional role of the principal is perceived differently by various persons. However, it would be safe to suggest that there is strong support in the literature for the position that the principal should be the school's key instructional leader and must continue to fulfill this vital responsibility.

The third section of the literature reviewed indicated that a positive school climate contributes to a meaningful situation in which

---

[63]Ibid., p. 53.

both adults and youth care to spend a substantial portion of their time. Factors tending to characterize positive school climate included qualities such as respect, trust, high morale, opportunities for participation and input, continuous academic and social growth, cohesiveness, renewal, and caring.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the methods and procedures used in this study. The chapter is divided into six sections: (1) a statement of the research objectives; (2) the research method used in the study; (3) description of the population; (4) the instrumentation; and (5) description of procedures used in collecting data and (6) the analysis procedures.

Research Objectives

The purpose of the study was to provide information for examining the instructional role of the principal and his administrative staff and the degree to which principals and staff members assume and perform instructional leadership responsibilities in Virginia secondary schools. Specifically, the objectives of the study were to determine:

1. To what extent selected instructional activities are carried out in Virginia senior high schools;

2. How instructional responsibilities are distributed across selected personnel in Virginia senior high schools;

3. Who has primary responsibility for each of the thirty-eight selected instructional activities in Virginia senior high schools;

4. Any differences in whether or not the instructional responsibilities are carried out based on school size, location (urban, rural, suburban), and staffing;

5. Any differences in how responsibilities are distributed by size, location, and staffing; and

6. Any differences in who has primary responsibility for each of the instructional activities by size, location, and staffing.

Research Method

The descriptive survey method was used to accomplish the purpose of the study. Concerning the use of the descriptive survey method, Ary, Jacobs, and Razavich stated the following:

> Descriptive research studies are designed to obtain information concerning the current status of phenomena. They are directed towards determining the nature of the situation as it exists at the time of the study. . . .[1]

According to Cook and LaFleur, descriptive research entails the collection of data that essentially describe, accurately and objectively, the way things presently are.[2]

Furthermore, Kerlinger stated that the descriptive survey method was appropriate for analyzing sociological variables and psychological variables.[3]

---

[1]Donald Ary, Lucy C. Jacobs, and Asghar Razavich, Introduction to Research in Education (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1972), p. 286.

[2]David R. Cook and N. Kenneth LaFleur. A Guide to Educational Research (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975), p. 51.

[3]Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973), p. 411.

The use of the descriptive survey approach has resulted in the formation of collected data which has permitted an analysis of the objectives since the analysis is essential for obtaining relevant facts.

Description of Population

Principals of schools containing the 12th grade but with no grade lower than eight were included in the study. The Virginia Educational Directory--School Year 1982-83[4] was utilized to obtain the names of the principals. To update and check for any changes in administration after printing of the Directory, a comparison was made between those principals listed in the Directory and a print-out of secondary principals based on information provided by division superintendents in their School Identification Report for 1983-84 and submitted to the State Department of Education.

Instrumentation

A questionnaire was constructed to collect data needed to accomplish the purpose and objectives of the study. The initial questionnaire consisted of a list of forty instructional activities which describe instructional activities carried out in senior high schools. The list was developed following a review of the literature to determine what instructional activities are typically assigned to high school principals. In preparing the list, extensive use was made of the

---

[4]Virginia Educational Directory--School Year 1982-83 (Richmond: Department of Education, Virginia, 1982-83).

instructional activities listed for principals in: Performance Objectives for School Principals;[5] The Principalship: New Perspectives;[6] Standards for Accrediting Schools in Virginia;[7] The Secondary School Principal: Manager and Supervisor;[8] and the National Study of the Senior High School Principalship,[9] conducted by the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1978. Appendix A lists the instructional activities selected for the survey questionnaire and their major source(s).

Pilot questionnaires were administered to 26 administrators on July 11, 1983, at the Evaluation Workshop held at Radford, Virginia (See Appendix B). The principals and assistant principals who piloted the instrument were asked to complete the original 40 item questionnaire based on instructions given. They were asked specifically to indicate, after completing the instrument, any ambiguity in vocabulary, questions, or format and to indicate the approximate length of time required to

---

[5]Ruel Morrison, Jack A. Culbertson, and Curtis Henson, Performance Objectives for School Principals (California: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1974), pp. 159-166.

[6]Paul B. Jacobson, James D. Logsdon, and Robert R. Wiegman, The Principalship: New Perspectives (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973), pp. 60-386.

[7]Virginia Department of Education, "Standards for Accrediting Schools in Virginia." (State Department of Education, 1983), pp. 13-17.

[8]Charles L. Wood, Everett W. Nicholson, and Dale G. Findley, The Secondary School Principal: Manager and Supervisor (Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc. 1979), pp. 92-283.

[9]David R. Byrne, Susan A. Hines, and Lloyd E. McCleary, The Senior High School Principalship (Virginia: NASSP 1978), pp. 19-77.

complete the questionnaire. As a result of the piloting of the instrument and comments from the participants, two of the 40 items initially contained in the survey instrument were deleted, thereby reducing the instrument items to 38. To further establish the clarity of each item, the survey was piloted in selected middle schools in the Richmond metropolitan area. Those administrators indicated no problems were experienced and confirmed that an average of about twenty minutes were required to complete the survey instrument.

Data Collection

A questionnaire with a cover letter and a stamped, self-addressed envelope were mailed to the 256 principals of senior high schools in Virginia on October 14, 1983, (See Appendix C). For follow-up purposes, each survey participant was assigned a control number.

On the requested return date of October 28, 1983, one hundred and seventy-two principals (67 percent), had returned the questionnaire. A follow-up letter was mailed on November 4, 1983, to all survey participants who had not responded (See Appendix D). Responses were subsequently received from thirty-eight additional principals which increased the response rate to approximately 82 percent.

In order to test for nonresponse bias, telephone interviews were conducted during the week of December 5 - 9, 1983, with a ten percent random sample of nonrespondents. The purpose of this follow-up procedure was to determine whether any systematic differences existed between the group that responded to the questionnaire and the group that failed to respond.

Ten percent (five principals) of the nonrespondent group were randomly selected and interviewed by telephone. This sample of nonrespondents was interviewed during the regular school day at a predetermined time convenient to the administrator. The same questionnaire that had been completed and returned by the mail questionnaire respondents was used in the telephone interview. Following a comparative analysis of the data gathered in the telephone survey with the information received through the mail survey questionnaire, it was concluded that there was no systematic differences between the responses of the two groups.

Analysis Procedures

Responses to the thirty-eight survey items on the questionnaire from the principals were analyzed using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS). Descriptive statistics were used in analyzing the data. Data were reported by means, frequencies, standard deviations, and percentages.

Research question 1 was analyzed by computing percentages of affirmative responses to item 2 on the survey for each of the 38 listed instructional activities.

Research question 2 was analyzed by computing mean scores for each instructional activity across the five categories of personnel.

Research question 3 was analyzed by selecting the personnel category receiving the highest relative assignment of responsibility. The number of times a personnel category was listed as having the major

responsibility was converted to a percentage to illustrate the likelihood that a category would have primary responsibility.

Research question 4 was reviewed by distributing responses to item 2 across size, location and staffing using cross tabulation of those variables.

Research question 5 required cross tabulation of raw mean scores with school size, location, and staffing.

Research question 6 was analyzed by cross tabulation of the results from Research question 3 by school size, location and staff.

A final question on the instrument asked principals to select and rank the five most important instructional leadership activities. Responses to this item were ranked by frequency of selection and by weighting responses according to the ranks assigned by principals.

Tables were constructed to display the data collected and are presented in Chapter IV with comments and discussion.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

This chapter reports the results of a mail survey questionnaire which asked Virginia High School principals about the conduct of thirty-eight selected instructional activities in their schools. The chapter is divided into four sections: (1) Introduction; (2) Description of subjects; (3) Analysis of the responses to the questionnaire, and (4) Summary of results.

Introduction

A list of 38 instructional activities which principals of senior high schools perform with varying frequencies was included on the questionnaire distributed to all principals of senior high schools in Virginia. High schools were defined as schools containing the twelfth grade with no grade lower than the eighth. The subjects for the study were identified through the 1982-83 Virginia Educational Directory. The population consisted of 256 senior high school principals. Usable returns were received from 210 principals for a return rate of 82 percent.

Description of the Subjects

Table 1 provides demographic data regarding the subjects in this study. As shown in this table, 97 percent of the principals are males and 88 percent are Caucasian. Only eight percent are 35 years of age or younger; 46 percent are in the thirty-six to forty-four age bracket;

TABLE 1

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS TO INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP ACTIVITIES SURVEY

Variable		Frequency	Percent
Sex:	Male	203	96.7
	Female	7	3.3
Race:	Caucasian	185	88.1
	Black	25	11.9
Age:	24-35	17	8.1
	36-44	97	46.2
	45-54	80	38.1
	55 or older	16	7.6
Years As Principal:			
	1	5	2.4
	2-5	49	23.3
	6-10	63	30.0
	11-20	77	36.7
	Over 20	16	7.6
Years In Present School:			
	1	25	12.0
	2-5	80	38.1
	6-10	66	31.4
	11-20	36	17.1
	Over 20	3	1.4
Grades:			
	8-12	57	27.6
	9-12	123	58.1
	10-12	30	14.3
Locality:			
	Rural	110	52.4
	Suburban	64	30.5
	Urban	36	17.1
School Size:			
	0-700	57	27.0
	701-1000	53	25.0
	1001-1500	54	26.0
	1501 and Over	46	22.0

Table 1 (Continued)

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Number of Ass't. Principals:		
0-1	66	31.0
2	84	40.0
3 or more	60	29.0

and, 46 percent are 45 or older. In terms of experience, about 25 percent have been principals five years or fewer, 30 percent for six to ten years, and 36 percent for 11 to 20 years.

Thirty-eight percent of the principals, which represented the largest group, have been principals of their respective schools for two to five years, and only three principals, or one percent, have served in their schools for as long as twenty years.

Forty percent, of the schools, have two assistant principals, while 31 percent had zero to one, and 28 percent had three or more. Over 50 percent of the schools had a student enrollment of 701 to 1500 students and 22 percent had over 1500 students.

The typical senior high school principal in Virginia is male, Caucasian, and in his forties. The principal had seven to eight years of administrative experience and slightly less time in his current position.

Analysis of Responses

Research Question 1: Activities carried out

The purpose of Research Objective 1 was to determine the extent to which selected instructional activities were carried out in Virginia senior high schools.

The percentages of respondents who indicated that an instructional activity was carried out in their schools is shown in Table 2. Each instructional activity listed was carried out in a

TABLE 2

PERCENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS INDICATING THAT SELECTED INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES ARE CARRIED OUT IN THEIR SCHOOLS

Activity Number	Activity	Percent Carried Out
1.	Adding a new course or instructional program	99.0
2.	Evaluating the school's grading policies	95.7
3.	Formulating school goals	99.5
4.	Developing a budget for the school	95.2
5.	Collecting and analyzing data concerning the performance of students	98.5
6.	Collecting and analyzing data concerning the performance of teachers	99.5
7.	Participating in the recruitment and the selection of all instructional personnel	99.0
8.	Visiting classrooms to observe instructional techniques	100.0
9.	Leading in-service training activities for instructional personnel	99.0
10.	Conferring individually with instructional personnel about instructional matters	100.0
11.	Assessing the effectiveness of the school's in-service training program	96.6
12.	Defining the job responsibilities of each staff member in accordance with the instructional philosophy of the school	96.1
13.	Participating in instructional team meetings	90.4
14.	Conducting group conferences with instructional personnel experiencing similar problems in instruction	80.0
15.	Assigning students to the appropriate classes and time periods for instruction	98.0

Table 2 (Continued)

Activity Number	Activity	Percent Carried Out
16.	Determining the procedures and schedule for standardized testing within the school	97.6
17.	Recommending of personel for re-employment, promotion, or dismissal	99.5
18.	Assigning or reassigning of personel within the school to maximize conditions for learning	99.5
19.	Directing the development or the modification of instructional materials that are not available commercially	87.6
20.	Providing for the establishment of a collection of professional resource material within the school	96.6
21.	Coordinating and supervising student assemblies	99.5
22.	Allocating time and space to various instructional purposes	98.5
23.	Allocating materials, equipment, and facilities to accomplish instructional goals	100.0
24.	Providing an adequate system for reporting a student's performance to parents, prospective employers, higher education institutions and others	98.5
25.	Training other professional staff members to assume leadership roles in the in-service programs	81.4
26.	Collecting, organizing, analyzing, and interpreting data concerning former students	95.7
27.	Relating of student needs to school system goals and legal requirements	96.6
28.	Directing the identification and selection of needed materials, equipment, and facilities for instruction	99.0

Table 2 (Continued)

Activity Number	Activity	Percent Carried Out
29.	Coordinating the redesigning of instructional facilities to accomplish instructional goals	92.8
30.	Explaining the school's instructional policies and procedures to the school constituency	100.0
31.	Reporting achievements and instructional problems to the school constituency	99.0
32.	Developing school-community relations to accomplish instructional goals	100.0
33.	Establishing procedures for student's scholastic achievements to be recognized and rewarded	99.0
34.	Developing and implementing rules of acceptable conduct	100.0
35.	Involving volunteer services in the school	75.7
36.	Monitoring instructional decisions made by the staff	98.0
37.	Setting a climate for staff morale and professional growth	100.0
38.	Coordinating people and programs for the good of the instructional program	99.5

majority of the schools. In fact, with only four exceptions, each activity was carried out in 90 percent or more of the schools. Seven activities were reported to be carried out in all 210 responding senior high schools. Since the instructional activities were included in the survey because of their importance to instruction, it was not surprising that a high percentage of the principals reported that the activities were carried out in their schools. The lowest percentage (approximately 75 percent) was reported for activity 35, Involving volunteer services in the school.

Other instructional activities least likely to be carried out in the schools were: activity 14, Conducting group meeting with instructional personnel experiencing similar problems in instruction (80 percent); activity 25, Training other professional staff members to assume leadership roles in the in-service programs (81.4 percent); and, activity 19, Directing the development or the modification of instructional materials that are not available (87.6 percent).

Research Question 2: Distribution of responsibility

The purpose of Research Objective 2 was to determine the distribution of responsibility for instructional activities across selected personnel in the senior high school. If principals indicated the instructional activity was carried out in their schools, they were asked to distribute ten points across categories of personnel to indicate relative responsibility for carrying out the activity.

In general, principals have the largest percentage of responsibility for most of the instructional activities as indicated by

the means for the distribution of instructional responsibility as shown in Table 3. The activities for which the principal received the two highest means were activity 17, Recommending personnel for re-employment, promotion, or dismissal (6.84) and activity 18, Assigning or re-assigning of personnel within the school to maximize conditions for learning (6.78). The two lowest means assigned to the principals were activity 26, Gathering data concerning past students (1.47) and activity 19, Directing the development of instructional materials (2.13).

In only one case was the assistant principal assigned the greatest amount of responsibility for an instructional activity and that was reported for activity 21, Coordinating and supervising student assemblies (4.06). The second highest responsibility assigned the assistant principal was reported for activity 8, Observing instructional techniques in classrooms (3.57). Two other instructional activities, activity 6, Analyzing data of teacher performance (3.11), and activity 34, Developing rules of student conduct (3.10) received over 30 percent for assistant principals.

"Others" were assigned the highest percentage of responsibility for activity 26, Gathering data concerning past students (5.49) which was the lowest area of responsibility for principals. Others were also assigned majority responsibility for activity 20, Establishing professional resource material (3.87), activity 19, Directing the development of instructional materials (2.96) and activity 16, Handling schools standardized testing (3.45).

TABLE 3

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES ACROSS CATEGORIES OF PERSONNNEL IN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

Activity Number	Principals		Ass't. Prin.		Curr. Specialist		Central Office		Others	
	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD
1	4.35	1.8	1.33	1.3	.65	1.1	2.75	2.0	.89	1.2
2	4.47	1.9	1.57	1.4	.40	.8	2.55	2.4	1.01	1.3
3	5.11	1.5	1.84	1.3	.40	1.0	1.27	1.4	1.38	1.5
4	5.12	2.4	1.30	1.5	.23	.6	2.17	2.7	1.16	1.5
5	3.46	1.7	1.97	1.6	.66	1.4	1.44	1.9	2.45	2.3
6	5.12	1.7	3.11	1.7	.31	.8	1.06	1.2	.40	.8
7	4.67	1.8	1.03	1.2	.29	.7	3.69	2.1	.31	.7
8	4.86	1.9	3.57	1.8	.33	.8	.88	1.0	.35	.8
9	3.40	1.8	1.75	1.6	.62	1.2	3.40	2.5	.81	1.2
10	5.02	1.9	2.78	1.7	.55	1.0	1.12	1.2	.52	.9
11	4.00	2.0	1.95	1.5	.58	1.1	2.42	2.4	1.03	1.6
12	5.82	2.1	2.08	1.5	.24	.6	1.35	1.6	.51	.9
13	4.14	1.7	2.58	1.6	.70	1.3	.97	1.2	1.61	1.9
14	4.18	2.1	2.62	1.9	.70	1.3	1.43	1.6	1.01	1.5
15	4.20	2.7	2.56	2.4	.53	1.5	.11	.4	2.59	2.5
16	2.72	2.1	1.47	2.0	.71	1.8	1.62	2.3	3.45	2.9
17	6.84	2.1	1.61	1.5	.12	.4	1.20	1.6	.23	.6
18	6.78	2.3	1.70	1.7	.19	.7	.91	1.7	.42	.8
19	2.13	1.7	1.73	1.7	1.16	2.1	2.02	2.2	2.96	2.7
20	2.52	1.6	1.33	1.5	1.01	2.0	1.21	1.8	3.87	2.9
21	4.00	2.0	4.06	2.1	.21	.8	.04	.3	1.68	1.9
22	5.70	2.5	3.00	2.2	.26	1.0	.19	.6	.85	1.3
23	4.64	2.2	2.42	2.1	.42	1.0	1.15	1.8	1.36	1.6
24	3.37	2.0	1.44	1.6	.43	1.3	1.93	2.4	2.82	2.4
25	3.21	2.1	1.67	1.6	.56	1.2	3.44	2.9	1.04	1.6

Table 3 (Continued)

Activity Number	Principals		Ass't. Prin.		Curr. Specialist		Central Office		Others	
	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD
26	1.47	1.5	1.15	1.7	.68	1.9	1.17	1.7	5.49	3.4
27	4.55	2.0	1.70	1.4	.37	1.0	2.04	2.1	1.34	1.8
28	3.59	1.7	1.88	1.8	.64	1.3	1.59	1.7	2.27	2.0
29	3.93	1.9	1.40	1.5	.35	.8	3.12	2.8	1.19	1.5
30	5.55	1.9	1.76	1.4	.40	1.0	1.26	1.5	1.03	1.2
31	5.36	2.0	1.60	1.4	.36	.8	1.34	1.6	1.33	1.5
32	5.53	1.8	1.75	1.3	.29	.7	1.24	1.5	1.19	1.3
33	4.90	1.7	1.76	1.5	.32	.8	.77	1.1	2.22	1.8
34	4.58	1.5	3.10	1.7	.09	.3	1.21	1.5	1.02	1.2
35	3.94	2.4	2.30	1.9	.45	1.3	.89	1.6	2.33	2.4
36	5.30	1.9	2.59	1.6	.33	.9	.95	1.3	.79	1.1
37	6.22	1.9	2.02	1.4	.18	.5	.85	1.2	.73	1.0
38	5.63	1.9	2.40	1.5	.31	.7	.81	1.1	.83	1.1

Underlining indicates highest mean assigned for activity.

Curriculum specialists, according to principals, did not have a high percentage of responsibility in any area. The two areas in which curriculum specialists were reported as having the most responsibility were activity 19, Directing the development or the modification of instructional materials that are not available commercially (1.16) and activity 20, Providing for the establishment of a collection of professional resource material within the school (1.01). These were the only two activities indicated in which the curriculum specialists had a percentage of responsibility greater than ten.

The central office was reported as having the highest percentage of responsibility for activity 25, Training staff to lead in-service programs (3.44). The central office also showed equal responsibility with the principal for activity 9, Leading in-service training activities for instructional personnel (3.40). The most responsibility assigned to central office personnel was recorded for activity 7, Recruiting and selecting instructional personnel (3.69). The only other activity receiving more than 30 percent assignment of responsibility was activity 29, Coordinating redesign of instructional facility (3.12).

Research Question 3: Primary responsibility

The purpose of Research Objective 3 was to determine who has primary responsibility for each of the 38 instructional activities in senior high schools in Virginia.

Ten responsibility points were available for assignment across the five categories of personnel (principals, assistant principals, curriculum specialists, central office, and others) for each activity.

Assignment of more than five points to any personnel category placed primary responsibility with that category. When no personnel category received a majority of the responsibility points, primary responsibility was assigned to the category receiving the highest number of points. In cases of two or more categories tying for the highest responsibility, weights were assigned for responsibility distributed across the categories that were tied.

The principal was most often selected as having primary responsibility for activity 17, Recommending personnel for reemployment, promotion, or dismissal (88.04 percent), and activity 18, Assigning or reassigning staff in the school (87.72 percent). The activity for which the principal was least often identified as having primary responsibility was activity 26, Collecting, organizing, analyzing, and interpreting data concerning former students (7.55 percent).

The assistant principal was assigned primary responsibility for one of the seven instructional areas not assumed by the principal. Primary responsibility was indicated for assistant principals for activity 21, Coordinating and supervising student assemblies (43.46 percent). The assistant principal was ranked second to the principal in terms of primary responsibility for 13 instructional activities. The principal and the assistant principal cooperatively have primary responsibility for the overwhelming majority of the instructional activities.

Others were assigned responsibility for four of the seven activities which were not assumed by the principal. This represented

the highest number of activities to which primary responsibility was assigned by any group other than the principal. Others were assigned primary responsibility for activity 20, Providing for the establishment of a collection of professional resource material within the school (52.48 percent); activity 26, Gathering data concerning past students (42.06 percent); activity 16, Handling school's standardized testing (39.02 percent); and activity 19, Directing the development or the modification of instructional materials that are not available commercially (35.51 percent).

The two instructional activities of primary responsibility indicated for the central office were activity 9, Leading in-service training activities for instructional personnel (41.35 percent) and activity 25, Training other professional staff members to assume leadership roles in the in-service programs (42.60 percent). The central office was reported as being second to the principal in terms of primary responsibility for 16 instructional activities.

Curriculum specialists were not assigned primary responsibility by a majority of the respondents for any instructional activity. The only two activities for which 10 percent or more of the respondents accorded primary responsibility to this group were activity 19, Directing the development or the modification of instructional materials that are not available commercially (11.87 percent), and activity 20, Providing for the establishment of a collection of professional resource material within the school (11.92 percent). The percentage of respondents who assigned primary responsibility to each category for each item is shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WHO INDICATED PRINCIPALS, ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS, CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS, CENTRAL OFFICE AND OTHER(S), AS HAVING PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY FOR SELECTED ACTIVITY

Activity Number	Principals	Ass't. Prin.	Curr. Specialist	Central Office	Others
1	59.14	5.22	2.61	27.89	5.14
2	59.65	5.42	1.03	27.65	6.25
3	82.01	5.77	1.55	5.06	5.61
4	67.08	5.50	0.42	22.08	4.92
5	38.33	12.48	6.44	12.96	29.79
6	73.52	21.13	1.83	2.55	0.96
7	57.53	2.48	0.72	39.02	0.24
8	62.86	32.38	2.62	1.43	0.71
9	37.98	11.46	5.13	41.35	4.09
10	67.87	23.11	2.79	5.41	0.81
11	51.77	11.13	4.73	26.40	5.96
12	83.10	7.19	0.43	8.18	1.09
13	54.75	21.33	4.49	2.47	16.95
14	51.50	25.76	4.95	10.28	7.51
15	42.07	26.54	4.53	0.65	26.21
16	25.53	12.36	7.07	16.02	39.02
17	88.04	4.78	0.00	6.94	0.24
18	87.72	4.94	0.88	5.26	1.20
19	16.76	14.31	11.87	21.56	35.51
20	21.61	6.67	11.92	7.32	52.48
21	41.79	43.46	1.12	0.00	13.64
22	73.43	22.22	1.21	0.24	2.90
23	59.22	18.83	2.56	10.97	8.43
24	33.67	8.31	4.52	20.63	32.87
25	36.30	11.01	5.48	42.60	4.61

Table 4 (Continued)

Activity Number	Principals	Ass't. Prin.	Curr. Specialist	Central Office	Others
26	7.55	5.80	7.88	7.63	71.14
27	62.30	5.73	2.04	20.10	9.84
28	43.93	14.68	5.46	14.92	21.01
29	49.62	7.83	1.59	35.09	5.86
30	79.57	5.44	1.87	8.54	4.57
31	77.93	5.02	1.65	7.90	7.50
32	82.03	5.13	0.52	7.59	4.73
33	73.49	6.75	1.22	2.42	16.12
34	60.60	26.79	0.29	8.94	3.38
35	49.48	17.71	3.14	6.50	23.17
36	75.10	16.12	1.88	4.39	2.52
37	89.94	6.37	0.33	2.71	0.65
38	82.87	10.86	1.05	2.97	2.25

Underlining indicates primary responsibility for activity.

Research Question 4: Activities carried out by school size, staff and location

The purpose of Research Objective 4 was to determine whether there were differences in carrying out instructional responsibilities as a function of school size, location, and staffing. The percent of activities carried out by school size is illustrated in Table 5, by location in Table 6, and by number of assistant principals in Table 7.

While there were some variations based on size, location, and staffing, only in the case of instructional activity 35, Involving volunteer services in the school, did the percent of activities carried out seem to be affected by size, location, and staff to any real degree. Smaller schools, rural schools, and schools with fewer assistant principals were less likely to be engaged in this activity than were larger, better staffed, surburban and urban schools. To a lesser extent, the same tendency existed for activity 14, Group meeting with instructional personnel and activity 15, Assigning students to classes.

Research Question 5: Distribution of responsibility by school size, staff, and location

The purpose of Research Objective 5 was to determine if there are differences in how instructional responsibilities are distributed across personnel by size, location, and staffing. The distribution across selected personnel by school size is indicated in Table 8, by location in Table 9, and by number of assistant principals in Table 10.

TABLE 5

PERCENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS INDICATING THAT SELECTED INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES ARE CARRIED OUT IN THEIR SCHOOLS BY SIZE OF SCHOOL

Activity Number	Percent Indicating Activity Was Carried Out			
Size	0-700	701-1000	1001-1500	1501+
1.	100.0	100.0	98.1	97.8
2.	98.2	88.7	100.0	95.7
3.	100.0	98.1	100.0	100.0
4.	91.2	94.3	98.1	97.8
5.	96.5	98.1	100.0	100.0
6.	98.2	100.0	100.0	100.0
7.	100.0	100.0	98.1	97.8
8.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
9.	100.0	98.1	98.1	100.0
10.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
11.	96.5	96.2	96.3	97.8
12.	96.5	94.3	96.3	97.8
13.	86.0	88.7	90.7	97.8
14.	73.7	79.2	83.3	84.8
15.	98.2	100.0	98.1	95.7
16.	98.2	94.3	98.1	100.0
17.	100.0	100.0	98.1	100.0
18.	100.0	100.0	98.1	100.0
19.	82.5	88.7	83.3	97.8
20.	93.0	96.2	98.1	100.0
21.	98.2	100.0	100.0	100.0
22.	100.0	98.1	98.1	97.8
23.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
24.	98.2	98.1	98.1	100.0
25.	70.2	79.2	87.0	91.3
26.	91.2	100.0	94.4	97.8
27.	96.5	92.5	100.0	97.8
28.	98.2	100.0	98.1	100.0
29.	91.2	88.7	96.3	95.7
30.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
31.	100.0	100.0	98.1	97.8
32.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
33.	98.1	98.1	100.0	100.0
34.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
35.	61.4	71.7	77.8	95.7
36.	98.2	96.2	98.1	100.0
37.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
38.	100.0	100.0	100.0	97.8

TABLE 6

PERCENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS INDICATING THAT SELECTED INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES ARE CARRIED OUT IN THEIR SCHOOLS BY LOCATION OF SCHOOLS

Activity Number	Percent Indicating Activity Was Carried Out		
Location	Rural	Suburban	Urban
1.	100.0	98.4	97.2
2.	96.4	98.4	88.9
3.	100.0	98.4	100.0
4.	92.7	96.9	100.0
5.	97.3	100.0	100.0
6.	99.1	100.0	100.0
7.	99.1	98.4	100.0
8.	100.0	100.0	100.0
9.	99.1	98.4	100.0
10.	100.0	100.0	100.0
11.	96.4	95.3	100.0
12.	93.6	98.4	100.0
13.	86.4	93.8	97.2
14.	77.3	78.1	91.7
15.	98.2	96.9	100.0
16.	96.4	98.4	100.0
17.	99.1	100.0	100.0
18.	100.0	100.0	97.2
19.	82.7	93.8	91.7
20.	94.5	98.4	100.0
21.	99.1	100.0	100.0
22.	98.2	98.4	100.0
23.	100.0	100.0	100.0
24.	99.1	98.4	97.2
25.	76.4	85.9	88.9
26.	93.6	96.9	100.0
27.	96.4	96.9	97.2
28.	98.2	100.0	100.0
29.	91.8	92.2	97.2
30.	100.0	100.0	100.0
31.	100.0	98.4	97.2
32.	100.0	100.0	100.0
33.	98.2	100.0	100.0
34.	100.0	100.0	100.0
35.	62.7	87.5	94.4
36.	96.4	100.0	100.0
37.	100.0	100.0	100.0
38.	100.0	98.4	100.0

TABLE 7

PERCENT OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS INDICATING THAT SELECTED INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES ARE CARRIED OUT IN THEIR SCHOOLS BY NUMBER OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS

Activity Number	Percent Indicating Activity Was Carried Out		
Number of Assistant Principal	0-1	2	3 or More
1.	100.0	98.8	98.3
2.	97.0	94.0	96.7
3.	98.5	100.0	100.0
4.	92.4	95.2	98.3
5.	97.0	98.8	100.0
6.	98.5	100.0	100.0
7.	100.0	98.8	98.3
8.	100.0	100.0	100.0
9.	100.0	97.6	100.0
10.	100.0	100.0	100.0
11.	97.0	95.2	98.3
12.	97.0	95.2	96.7
13.	86.4	88.1	98.3
14.	77.3	76.2	88.3
15.	98.5	98.8	96.7
16.	98.5	95.2	100.0
17.	100.0	98.8	100.0
18.	100.0	98.8	100.0
19.	80.3	86.9	96.7
20.	92.4	97.6	100.0
21.	98.5	100.0	100.0
22.	100.0	97.6	98.3
23.	100.0	100.0	100.0
24.	98.5	98.8	98.3
25.	72.7	83.3	88.3
26.	93.9	96.4	94.7
27.	97.0	96.4	96.7
28.	98.5	100.0	98.3
29.	92.4	91.7	95.0
30.	100.0	100.0	100.0
31.	100.0	98.8	98.3
32.	100.0	100.0	100.0
33.	98.5	98.8	100.0
34.	100.0	100.0	100.0
35.	65.2	70.2	95.0
36.	95.5	98.8	100.0
37.	100.0	100.0	100.0
38.	100.0	100.0	98.3

TABLE 8

MEAN SCORE DISTRIBUTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES
ACROSS SELECTED PERSONNEL BY SCHOOL SIZE

Activity	Principals				Assistant Principals				Curriculum Specialities				Central Office				Others			
Number	0-700	701-1000	1001-1500	1501+	0-700	701-1000	1001-1500	1501+	0-700	701-1000	1001-1500	1501+	0-700	701-1000	1001-1500	1501+	0-700	701-1000	1001-1500	1501+
1.	5.32	4.25	4.23	3.38	0.72	1.25	1.60	1.89	0.40	0.58	0.70	0.98	2.86	2.83	2.42	2.91	0.67	1.04	1.06	0.80
2.	4.86	4.72	4.17	4.07	0.96	1.55	1.72	2.81	0.39	0.34	0.35	0.55	2.82	2.26	2.67	2.36	0.96	1.13	1.09	0.84
3.	5.39	5.25	4.76	5.02	1.44	1.94	1.93	2.11	0.44	0.23	0.48	0.46	1.14	1.02	1.33	1.63	1.60	1.56	1.50	0.78
4.	5.06	5.78	5.17	4.40	1.38	1.24	1.13	1.47	0.10	0.22	0.32	0.29	2.52	1.70	1.83	2.71	0.94	1.06	1.53	1.11
5.	3.51	3.58	3.33	3.43	1.27	2.00	2.24	2.46	0.65	0.62	0.76	0.61	1.13	1.15	1.61	1.93	3.42	2.63	2.06	1.54
6.	6.32	5.38	4.52	4.09	2.07	2.81	3.50	4.24	0.07	0.30	0.35	0.57	1.45	1.04	1.04	0.65	0.09	0.47	0.59	0.46
7.	4.82	4.66	4.87	4.27	0.58	0.89	1.17	1.60	0.18	0.36	0.25	0.42	4.39	3.64	3.64	3.27	0.04	0.45	0.36	0.44
8.	6.23	5.15	4.06	3.76	2.46	3.21	4.19	4.65	0.23	0.36	0.20	0.59	1.05	0.89	0.96	0.57	0.04	0.40	0.57	0.43
9.	3.65	3.98	2.92	3.00	1.02	1.75	1.89	2.52	0.42	0.65	0.58	0.85	4.30	2.81	3.62	2.70	0.56	0.81	0.98	0.93
10.	6.30	5.25	4.46	3.83	1.75	2.42	3.31	3.85	0.49	0.45	0.52	0.78	1.28	1.38	0.98	0.78	0.18	0.51	0.72	0.74
11.	4.25	4.08	3.96	3.62	1.25	1.80	2.27	2.60	0.49	0.51	0.52	0.84	3.38	2.51	1.90	1.76	0.58	1.06	1.35	1.18
12.	6.82	5.76	5.71	4.78	1.45	1.68	2.17	3.18	0.05	0.20	0.31	0.44	1.49	1.76	1.23	0.84	0.18	0.60	0.58	0.76
13.	5.00	4.09	3.71	3.73	1.82	2.47	2.84	3.24	0.51	0.62	0.88	0.80	1.04	1.32	0.98	0.53	1.63	1.51	1.59	1.69
14.	5.38	4.67	3.53	3.10	1.67	2.33	2.93	3.59	0.64	0.44	0.67	1.08	1.45	1.44	1.51	1.28	0.86	0.88	1.31	0.95
15.	5.50	4.23	3.74	3.09	0.96	2.55	3.06	4.02	0.73	0.15	0.72	0.50	0.04	0.17	0.06	0.20	2.75	2.91	2.43	2.18
16.	3.16	2.72	2.47	2.46	0.57	1.18	1.58	2.74	0.89	0.32	1.02	0.57	1.71	1.30	2.02	1.39	3.55	4.48	2.91	2.85
17.	7.61	7.13	6.70	5.72	0.88	1.42	1.92	2.37	0.05	0.11	0.11	0.24	1.46	1.00	0.94	1.39	0.00	0.34	0.32	0.28
18.	7.40	6.91	6.87	5.76	0.95	1.47	1.83	2.74	0.07	0.11	0.26	0.35	1.28	0.96	0.62	0.72	0.30	0.55	0.42	0.43
19.	2.81	2.36	1.82	1.47	1.53	1.60	1.96	1.87	0.96	0.79	1.20	1.73	1.62	1.91	2.31	2.24	3.09	3.34	2.71	2.69
20.	2.68	2.53	2.53	2.30	1.19	0.82	1.72	1.63	0.70	0.78	1.08	1.57	0.77	1.73	1.08	1.30	4.45	4.14	3.60	3.20
21.	4.63	4.08	3.57	3.63	3.93	3.83	4.17	4.37	0.32	0.17	0.15	0.17	0.04	0.09	0.02	0.02	1.09	1.79	2.09	1.80
22.	7.46	5.40	5.02	4.62	1.70	2.92	3.58	4.07	0.18	0.21	0.28	0.38	0.26	0.33	0.06	0.11	0.40	1.13	1.06	0.82
23.	5.95	4.57	4.07	3.78	1.51	2.21	2.76	3.39	0.32	0.36	0.39	0.65	1.49	1.02	1.30	0.70	0.74	1.85	1.48	1.41
24.	3.91	3.56	2.77	3.17	0.77	1.17	1.70	2.26	0.46	0.15	0.62	0.46	1.82	1.90	2.15	1.85	3.02	3.19	2.74	2.26
25.	3.77	3.51	2.94	2.67	1.27	1.47	1.83	2.07	0.65	0.26	0.47	0.90	3.40	3.35	3.60	3.40	0.90	1.16	1.15	0.93
26.	1.33	1.66	1.18	1.76	0.44	1.06	1.12	2.11	0.85	0.17	1.25	0.44	0.42	1.28	1.35	1.71	6.94	5.75	5.10	3.96
27.	5.11	4.51	4.15	4.40	1.18	1.88	1.63	2.22	0.20	0.18	0.69	0.40	2.09	1.92	2.26	1.84	1.42	1.51	1.28	1.13
28.	4.32	3.79	3.06	3.07	1.38	1.55	1.87	2.91	0.45	0.40	0.92	0.85	1.45	1.79	1.75	1.33	2.32	2.47	2.40	1.85
29.	4.79	3.79	3.65	3.41	0.73	1.38	1.69	1.86	0.33	0.30	0.37	0.43	3.04	3.21	2.96	3.30	1.12	1.32	1.33	1.00
30.	5.74	5.74	5.35	5.33	1.51	1.77	1.65	2.17	0.39	0.21	0.59	0.41	1.30	1.25	1.31	1.17	1.07	1.04	1.09	0.91
31.	5.16	5.43	5.55	5.31	1.16	1.60	1.72	2.02	0.39	0.32	0.28	0.44	1.67	1.15	1.32	1.16	1.63	1.45	1.13	1.02
32.	5.49	5.79	5.52	5.28	1.60	1.75	1.80	1.89	0.21	0.15	0.44	0.37	1.33	1.02	1.20	1.41	1.37	1.28	1.04	1.02
33.	5.09	4.69	5.13	4.63	1.38	1.98	1.56	2.24	0.32	0.12	0.33	0.54	0.84	0.71	0.80	0.74	2.30	2.50	2.19	1.85
34.	5.07	4.36	4.41	4.43	2.89	3.02	3.28	3.22	0.05	0.08	0.11	0.13	1.21	1.23	1.09	1.33	0.77	1.32	1.09	0.89
35.	5.11	3.42	3.55	3.84	1.51	2.63	2.33	2.61	0.17	0.26	0.76	0.55	0.77	0.89	0.79	1.09	2.17	2.76	2.55	1.86
36.	6.21	5.24	5.00	4.59	1.79	2.53	2.94	3.24	0.30	0.18	0.34	0.54	1.04	1.12	0.77	0.87	0.52	0.94	0.94	0.76
37.	6.56	6.09	6.37	5.76	1.74	2.00	2.06	2.35	0.23	0.11	0.15	0.24	1.04	0.94	0.72	0.65	0.44	0.85	0.70	1.00
38.	6.39	5.30	5.67	5.00	1.84	2.55	2.41	2.93	0.18	0.25	0.37	0.47	0.93	0.96	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.94	0.89	0.84

TABLE 9

MEAN SCORE DISTRIBUTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES
ACROSS SELECTED PERSONNEL BY LOCATION

Activity Number	Principals			Assistant Principals			Curriculum Specialists			Central Office			Others		
	Rural	Sub-urban	Urban	Rural	Sub-urban	Urban	Rural	Sub-urban	Urban	Rural	Sub-urban	Urban	Rural	Sub-urban	Urban
1.	4.65	3.90	4.20	1.06	1.78	1.37	0.45	0.78	1.06	2.88	2.56	2.69	0.91	0.98	0.66
2.	4.64	4.22	4.38	1.39	1.87	1.59	0.30	0.51	0.53	2.69	2.22	2.72	0.98	1.17	0.78
3.	5.20	5.03	4.97	1.67	2.29	1.56	0.32	0.49	0.50	1.17	1.03	1.97	1.64	1.16	1.00
4.	5.47	5.03	4.28	1.22	1.37	1.42	0.11	0.27	0.50	2.13	1.81	2.94	1.07	1.50	0.86
5.	3.53	3.41	3.36	1.59	2.58	2.03	0.58	0.56	1.08	1.34	1.41	1.81	2.94	2.05	1.69
6.	5.66	4.55	4.53	2.52	3.94	3.39	0.17	0.30	0.78	1.36	0.70	0.81	0.29	0.52	0.50
7.	4.65	4.59	4.89	0.82	1.40	1.03	0.19	0.29	0.61	4.09	3.35	3.06	0.25	0.37	0.42
8.	5.51	4.11	4.19	2.95	4.58	3.67	0.21	0.28	0.81	1.16	0.56	0.58	0.16	0.45	0.75
9.	3.59	3.43	2.81	1.34	2.16	2.31	0.44	0.52	1.31	3.83	3.08	2.64	0.77	0.81	0.94
10.	5.65	4.41	4.19	2.16	3.59	3.22	0.39	0.63	0.92	1.47	0.70	0.78	0.33	0.67	0.86
11.	4.07	4.15	3.53	1.54	2.46	2.31	0.40	0.69	0.94	3.08	1.57	1.92	0.89	1.13	1.28
12.	6.11	5.67	5.25	1.65	2.75	2.14	0.12	0.16	0.75	1.72	0.87	1.11	0.41	0.56	0.75
13.	4.53	3.87	3.57	2.12	3.08	2.97	0.54	0.68	1.17	1.26	0.68	0.69	1.56	1.68	1.60
14.	4.80	3.70	3.35	1.84	3.62	3.09	0.53	0.82	0.94	1.80	1.00	1.12	1.04	0.86	1.15
15.	4.93	3.47	3.31	1.65	3.42	3.83	0.53	0.44	0.69	0.11	0.15	0.06	2.78	2.53	2.11
16.	2.95	2.46	2.47	0.86	2.22	1.94	0.70	0.71	0.75	1.52	1.81	1.58	3.92	2.79	3.25
17.	7.30	6.48	6.08	1.21	2.27	1.64	0.04	0.14	0.36	1.30	0.78	1.61	0.15	0.33	0.31
18.	7.39	6.30	5.74	1.02	2.53	2.31	0.06	0.20	0.57	1.16	0.47	0.91	0.36	0.50	0.46
19.	2.55	1.68	1.76	1.62	1.73	2.06	0.66	1.57	1.82	1.98	2.12	1.94	3.20	2.90	2.42
20.	2.64	2.30	2.53	1.09	1.51	1.75	0.67	1.49	1.17	1.38	0.95	1.17	4.17	3.75	3.19
21.	4.42	3.75	3.14	3.73	4.33	4.58	0.26	0.05	0.33	0.03	0.02	0.14	1.55	1.84	1.81
22.	6.46	5.03	4.58	2.24	3.92	3.69	0.23	0.17	0.47	0.25	0.03	0.31	0.81	0.84	0.94
23.	5.08	4.34	3.83	1.92	2.92	3.06	0.22	0.56	0.78	1.38	0.83	1.00	1.38	1.33	1.33
24.	3.66	2.94	3.23	0.95	1.86	2.20	0.28	0.75	0.29	1.67	2.19	2.29	3.41	2.25	2.00
25.	3.39	3.22	2.72	1.48	1.96	1.66	0.40	0.67	0.81	3.38	3.35	3.78	1.22	0.76	1.03
26.	1.49	1.39	1.58	0.68	1.85	1.28	0.54	0.81	0.86	0.74	1.42	2.00	6.50	4.53	4.25
27.	4.64	4.50	4.37	1.39	2.21	1.74	0.18	0.55	0.63	2.28	1.65	2.00	1.51	1.10	1.26
28.	3.89	3.33	3.14	1.59	2.08	2.42	0.33	1.03	0.89	1.73	1.34	1.58	2.41	2.22	1.97
29.	4.12	3.59	3.97	1.10	1.73	1.71	0.25	0.44	0.51	3.39	2.86	2.77	1.15	1.37	1.03
30.	5.67	5.67	4.94	1.58	1.94	1.97	0.27	0.45	0.69	1.42	0.95	1.33	1.05	0.98	1.06
31.	5.32	5.67	4.94	1.38	1.87	1.80	0.22	0.40	0.71	1.55	1.03	1.20	1.53	0.97	1.34
32.	5.54	5.95	4.75	1.66	1.78	1.97	0.19	0.31	0.56	1.25	1.00	1.61	1.35	0.94	1.11
33.	5.05	5.02	4.25	1.56	1.77	2.39	0.22	0.39	0.50	0.79	0.73	0.81	2.35	2.09	2.06
34.	4.79	4.31	4.42	2.77	3.66	3.08	0.09	0.09	0.08	1.25	1.03	1.39	1.09	0.89	1.03
35.	4.38	3.82	3.26	2.01	2.36	2.79	0.14	0.66	0.74	1.01	0.75	0.88	2.33	2.38	2.24
36.	5.58	5.19	4.64	2.21	3.23	2.58	0.26	0.25	0.69	1.21	0.58	0.86	0.66	0.75	1.22
37.	6.19	6.55	5.72	1.88	2.20	2.11	0.16	0.14	0.31	1.15	0.45	0.64	0.62	0.66	1.22
38.	5.56	5.94	5.28	2.24	2.73	2.33	0.19	0.30	0.67	1.11	0.37	0.69	0.90	0.60	1.03

TABLE 10

MEAN SCORE DISTRIBUTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES ACROSS SELECTED PERSONNEL BY NUMBER OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS

Activity Number	No. of Ass't. Prin.	Principals			Assistant Principals			Curriculum Specialists			Central Office			Others		
		0-1	2	3+	0-1	2	3+	0-1	2	3+	0-1	2	3+	0-1	2	3+
1.		5.05	4.27	3.68	0.74	1.43	1.85	0.42	0.67	0.86	3.11	2.64	2.51	0.64	0.98	1.05
2.		4.73	4.39	4.28	0.95	1.75	2.02	0.28	0.47	0.45	3.14	2.41	2.09	0.89	0.99	1.17
3.		5.37	5.01	4.97	1.54	1.90	2.07	0.38	0.44	0.37	1.18	1.18	1.48	1.52	1.46	1.12
4.		5.25	5.66	4.25	1.34	1.13	1.49	0.07	0.38	0.20	2.34	1.81	2.49	1.00	1.01	1.54
5.		3.72	3.29	3.43	1.41	1.96	2.58	0.45	0.82	0.67	1.17	1.59	1.52	3.23	2.33	1.78
6.		6.20	4.86	4.33	2.14	3.29	3.90	0.06	0.37	0.50	1.37	1.04	0.77	0.23	0.45	0.50
7.		4.82	4.45	4.83	0.61	1.02	1.51	0.12	0.42	0.31	4.36	3.65	2.98	0.09	0.45	0.37
8.		6.26	4.32	4.07	2.36	3.98	4.33	0.21	0.33	0.47	1.06	0.92	0.63	0.11	0.44	0.50
9.		3.62	3.51	3.02	1.14	1.74	2.45	0.42	0.61	0.83	4.20	3.22	2.77	0.58	0.91	0.93
10.		6.15	4.92	3.92	1.74	2.83	3.85	0.47	0.52	0.68	1.41	1.14	0.77	0.23	0.58	0.77
11.		4.38	3.99	3.59	1.28	2.13	2.44	0.39	0.60	0.76	3.52	1.92	1.92	0.41	1.35	1.27
12.		6.52	5.66	5.26	1.42	2.11	2.76	0.08	0.25	0.41	1.81	1.34	0.84	0.17	0.64	0.72
13.		5.04	3.80	3.71	1.86	2.64	3.20	0.33	0.95	0.75	1.12	1.04	0.75	1.65	1.58	1.59
14.		5.49	3.92	3.26	1.82	2.50	3.50	0.53	0.78	0.76	1.61	1.34	1.35	0.55	1.45	0.91
15.		5.40	4.00	3.16	1.17	2.84	3.72	0.42	0.63	0.52	0.06	0.16	0.10	2.95	2.36	2.50
16.		3.22	2.34	2.68	0.74	1.51	2.20	0.55	0.92	0.60	1.63	1.85	1.30	3.77	3.38	3.22
17.		7.53	6.81	6.13	1.05	1.54	2.32	0.06	0.14	0.17	1.23	1.25	1.08	1.14	0.25	0.30
18.		7.36	6.80	6.12	0.98	1.71	2.47	0.03	0.23	0.32	1.36	0.71	0.68	0.26	0.55	0.42
19.		2.79	2.10	1.55	1.40	1.47	2.38	0.96	1.11	1.41	1.55	2.56	1.76	3.30	2.77	2.90
20.		2.61	2.60	2.32	1.07	1.09	1.95	0.56	1.18	1.25	1.25	1.37	0.97	4.34	3.77	3.52
21.		4.77	3.69	3.58	3.58	4.21	4.37	0.18	0.25	0.17	0.03	0.06	0.03	1.43	1.76	1.85
22.		7.18	5.22	4.71	1.83	3.17	4.08	0.15	0.34	0.25	0.27	0.20	0.10	0.56	1.07	0.85
23.		5.86	4.26	3.83	1.36	2.79	3.07	0.27	0.43	0.57	1.53	0.98	0.97	0.97	1.55	1.52
24.		4.11	3.00	3.07	0.95	1.20	2.31	0.31	0.53	0.41	1.68	2.17	1.88	2.94	3.07	2.34
25.		3.67	3.23	2.77	1.13	1.82	1.96	0.44	0.46	0.81	3.79	3.10	3.58	0.98	1.23	0.85
26.		1.53	1.37	1.55	0.69	1.25	1.50	0.47	0.95	0.53	0.63	1.10	1.86	6.66	5.28	4.53
27.		4.86	4.28	4.59	1.27	1.68	2.21	0.17	0.44	0.48	2.19	2.22	1.62	1.52	1.37	1.10
28.		4.32	3.40	3.03	1.31	1.62	2.90	0.29	0.86	0.73	1.60	1.74	1.36	2.40	2.38	1.98
29.		4.56	3.70	3.58	0.85	1.56	1.77	0.31	0.39	0.35	3.07	3.13	3.16	1.21	1.22	1.14
30.		5.65	5.64	5.30	1.53	1.74	2.03	0.32	0.46	0.40	1.52	1.15	1.13	0.98	1.00	1.13
31.		5.00	5.70	5.29	1.26	1.53	2.08	0.33	0.36	0.37	1.73	1.27	1.00	1.68	1.12	1.22
32.		5.47	5.73	5.32	1.56	1.79	1.92	0.17	0.33	0.37	1.47	1.06	1.23	1.33	1.10	1.15
33.		5.15	4.83	4.72	1.32	1.76	2.25	0.22	0.37	0.37	0.85	0.78	0.68	2.40	2.25	1.98
34.		4.85	4.49	4.42	2.86	3.20	3.20	0.05	0.13	0.08	1.32	1.00	1.38	0.92	1.17	0.92
35.		4.74	3.46	3.84	1.88	2.00	2.93	0.09	0.78	0.39	0.79	0.85	1.02	2.28	2.88	1.79
36.		6.11	5.10	4.72	1.75	2.84	3.13	0.24	0.30	0.48	1.25	0.82	0.82	0.52	0.94	0.85
37.		6.55	6.19	5.90	1.85	1.87	2.42	0.18	0.18	0.18	1.02	0.92	0.57	0.41	0.85	0.93
38.		6.26	5.40	5.24	1.91	2.52	2.78	0.18	0.37	0.36	1.00	0.77	0.66	0.65	0.93	0.90

Size

The data indicate that as school size increases, the proportion of the responsibility assigned to the principal decreases. Moving from smaller to larger schools, the principal's responsibility decreased for two-thirds of the thirty-eight instructional activities, with a substantial decrease for activity 22, Allocating time and space to various instructional purposes (7.46 to 4.62).

There were two activities, 26 and 31, Gathering data concerning past students (1.33 to 1.76) and Reporting to the school constituency, (5.16 to 5.31) in which school size increased and the principal's responsibility increased.

Consequently, responsibility of the assistant principal increased to make up for the loss in principal responsibility as the school size increased. In fact, the assistant principal(s) in the larger schools were assigned a greater portion of responsibility for all 38 activities than were assistant principals in the smallest high school. In two-thirds of the cases, the level of the principal's responsibility was twice that of the assistant principal's in the smallest schools. By comparison, very little change was noted in the assignment of responsibility to central office, curriculum specialist, and other personnel as a function of school size.

Location

The urban principal's mean scores were lower than rural principal's mean scores on 36 of 38 items. The differences were not as

striking as in the case of small to large school comparisons. It appears likely that a large proportion of urban schools are larger than rural schools, which suggests the possibility that mean score differences are a function of size and not location.

As might be expected, the mean responsibility assigned to assistant principals in urban schools was higher for each of the 38 activities than in rural schools. Again, if location is operating as a proxy for size, then those relationships simply mirror what was found in the earlier analysis of responsibility by school size. Responsibility assigned to principals and assistant principals in suburban schools varied considerably from rural and urban trends. It is assumed that greater variations in size confounded the ratings for this category.

The assignment of responsibility for curriculum specialist, central office, and other personnel was reasonably consistent across all items and reflected no discernible trends based upon school location.

Staff

The distribution of responsibilities based on staffing follows the same pattern as school size.

Research Question 6: Primary responsibility by school size, staff and location

The purpose of Research Objective 6 was to determine if there are differences in who has primary responsibility for each of the instructional activities by school size, location, and staffing. The distribution of primary responsibility by school size is indicated in

Table 11, location in Table 12, and number of assistant principals in Table 13.

Size

Principals in smaller high schools were more likely to be designated as having primary responsibility for various instructional activities than in larger high schools. Comparing the smallest size schools (0-700) in 20 of the 38 activities, small school principals were assigned primary responsibility 10 percent more of the time than in the largest (1500+) high schools. However, in large high schools, principals were assigned higher responsibility for nine activities than were principals in smaller schools (activities 5, 7, 24, 26, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 37).

In general, the assignment of primary responsibility for the assistant principal increased as a function of size similar to the trends noted in mean score shifts. Few variations were noted for the other three categories of personnel.

Location

While there were some shifts with respect to the assignment of primary responsibility by location, no discernible trends were identified which could be attributed to school location.

Staffing

Staffing reflects the same primary responsibility as found in school size analysis.

TABLE 11

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY SIZE OF SCHOOL WHO INDICATED SELECTED PERSONNEL AS HAVING PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY FOR VARIOUS INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

	Primary Responsibility Assigned to:																			
	Principals				Assistant Principals				Curriculum Specialists				Central Office				Others			
Activity Number	0-700	701-1000	1001-1500	1501+	0-700	701-1000	1001-1500	1501+	0-700	701-1000	1001-1500	1501+	0-700	701-1000	1001-1500	1501+	0-700	701-1000	1001-1500	1501+
1.	70.47	65.47	57.23	39.59	1.46	3.21	6.29	11.07	0.58	0.38	4.40	5.70	26.90	25.85	23.58	36.63	0.58	5.09	8.49	7.00
2.	63.45	70.21	57.41	46.29	2.74	3.19	6.48	9.92	0.95	0.00	0.93	2.35	28.93	19.15	28.40	34.17	3.93	7.45	6.79	7.27
3.	87.72	81.09	75.68	83.41	4.39	8.01	7.47	2.97	2.63	0.64	1.60	1.16	0.88	2.88	6.54	10.94	4.39	7.37	8.70	1.52
4.	64.42	79.00	66.67	57.41	3.85	3.00	4.72	11.11	0.00	0.00	0.94	0.74	28.85	14.00	19.50	26.30	2.88	4.00	8.18	4.44
5.	34.24	41.67	37.35	40.58	8.79	10.58	13.58	17.75	9.09	5.45	7.41	3.26	8.79	9.29	11.73	23.55	39.09	33.01	29.94	14.86
6.	89.29	83.96	62.96	54.71	8.93	9.43	30.56	38.41	0.00	1.89	2.78	2.90	1.79	2.83	1.85	3.99	0.00	1.89	1.85	0.00
7.	54.09	47.55	63.21	55.19	0.58	0.00	2.83	7.41	0.88	1.89	0.00	0.00	44.44	40.57	33.02	37.41	0.00	0.00	0.94	0.00
8.	84.21	76.42	46.91	39.49	14.04	20.75	45.99	52.54	1.75	2.83	2.47	3.62	0.00	0.00	1.85	4.35	0.00	0.00	2.78	0.00
9.	41.81	52.56	27.99	28.26	3.51	9.29	12.26	22.83	1.75	4.81	3.77	11.23	49.71	28.53	53.77	31.16	3.22	4.81	2.20	6.52
10.	81.29	79.56	61.42	45.36	8.48	12.58	30.86	44.28	2.63	1.57	3.40	3.70	7.60	5.66	2.78	5.51	0.00	0.63	1.54	1.16
11.	49.09	55.95	55.90	45.56	6.36	7.91	12.63	18.89	4.55	4.31	3.01	7.41	37.27	24.90	20.32	21.85	2.73	6.93	8.14	6.30
12.	88.79	85.00	81.41	76.00	4.24	1.00	5.77	19.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.93	6.06	14.00	9.94	2.30	0.91	0.00	2.88	0.44
13.	69.39	58.87	42.18	48.22	10.20	16.31	28.91	30.44	3.06	3.19	7.82	3.78	1.02	5.32	3.06	0.44	16.33	16.31	18.03	17.11
14.	69.84	67.13	40.00	27.78	10.32	14.81	32.59	46.58	5.56	0.47	4.44	9.83	8.33	8.99	10.37	13.68	5.95	8.60	12.59	2.14
15.	62.50	40.57	36.79	24.24	5.36	29.25	27.36	49.24	7.14	0.00	5.66	5.30	0.00	1.89	0.00	0.76	25.00	28.30	30.19	20.45
16.	33.04	26.00	21.70	20.29	3.57	13.00	7.55	27.90	10.71	1.00	8.49	7.61	17.86	6.00	26.42	12.68	34.82	54.00	35.85	31.52
17.	87.72	94.34	88.68	80.43	2.63	0.94	7.55	8.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.65	3.77	3.77	10.87	0.00	0.94	0.00	0.00
18.	88.60	89.62	90.57	81.16	2.63	2.83	4.72	10.51	0.00	0.00	1.89	1.81	7.89	5.66	2.83	4.35	0.88	1.89	0.00	2.17
19.	25.53	21.28	12.96	6.67	9.57	10.64	21.11	16.30	9.57	8.51	10.00	19.63	17.02	20.21	22.96	26.30	38.30	39.36	32.96	31.11
20.	23.65	19.28	24.21	18.84	4.78	3.92	8.81	9.42	7.61	9.80	13.21	17.75	3.21	12.42	6.29	7.61	60.75	54.58	47.48	46.38
21.	49.70	49.37	33.33	33.33	35.42	37.11	48.15	55.07	3.57	0.00	0.00	0.72	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.31	13.52	18.52	10.87
22.	90.35	74.04	67.92	57.78	7.89	20.19	26.42	37.78	1.75	0.96	1.89	0.00	0.00	0.96	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.85	3.77	4.44
23.	75.15	63.21	53.15	42.03	8.48	10.38	21.67	38.04	0.58	3.77	1.30	5.07	13.16	8.49	16.11	5.07	2.63	14.15	7.78	9.78
24.	33.04	39.10	27.42	35.51	3.57	4.49	9.50	17.03	5.95	0.00	7.92	3.99	19.35	19.87	23.65	19.57	38.10	36.54	31.51	23.91
25.	36.25	45.12	35.53	28.17	6.25	7.91	15.32	13.89	6.25	0.93	4.33	10.71	43.75	43.95	40.50	42.46	7.50	2.09	4.33	4.76
26.	3.85	10.38	5.23	11.11	0.00	5.66	3.27	15.56	10.58	0.00	16.34	4.44	0.00	9.43	6.54	15.56	85.58	74.53	68.63	53.33
27.	68.91	64.97	54.69	60.44	5.27	4.76	5.00	8.22	1.33	0.00	5.93	0.44	14.06	21.43	24.75	20.44	10.42	8.84	9.63	10.44
28.	59.88	47.55	34.40	31.30	6.61	6.98	16.48	31.20	2.74	2.89	12.08	4.13	8.99	19.56	17.42	13.91	21.79	23.02	19.62	19.35
29.	57.12	52.55	43.01	45.45	2.31	4.68	11.28	13.64	1.35	2.55	1.35	1.14	33.08	35.53	35.64	36.36	6.15	4.68	8.72	3.41
30.	74.04	82.39	75.43	88.04	6.49	2.52	6.30	6.52	2.11	0.63	4.44	0.00	9.12	10.38	8.77	5.43	8.25	4.09	5.06	0.00
31.	72.63	77.04	78.68	84.81	3.33	4.40	8.87	3.33	2.46	2.83	0.38	0.74	11.23	7.55	6.04	6.30	10.35	8.18	6.04	4.81
32.	78.42	88.05	80.93	80.87	5.61	3.14	5.93	5.87	1.23	0.00	0.37	0.43	6.49	5.35	9.63	9.13	8.25	3.46	3.15	3.70
33.	67.02	73.72	75.93	78.26	8.10	7.37	4.63	6.88	2.14	0.00	0.93	1.81	3.93	1.92	0.93	2.90	18.81	16.99	17.59	10.14
34.	63.51	57.86	63.70	56.52	23.16	30.50	25.74	28.26	0.35	0.00	0.74	0.00	9.12	6.92	6.30	14.13	3.86	4.72	3.52	1.09
35.	67.14	47.37	41.67	44.70	5.71	19.74	22.62	20.83	0.00	0.00	4.76	6.82	4.29	5.26	5.95	9.85	22.86	27.63	25.00	17.80
36.	80.06	81.37	73.27	64.20	10.42	12.75	17.61	25.07	2.38	0.00	1.89	3.33	5.36	3.59	1.89	6.96	1.79	2.29	5.35	0.43
37.	86.61	90.25	92.28	90.94	8.54	4.40	5.25	7.25	1.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.69	5.35	1.85	0.72	0.94	0.00	0.62	1.09
38.	87.72	86.48	79.38	76.67	6.14	9.12	10.86	18.89	0.00	1.89	1.30	1.11	3.51	1.89	4.07	2.22	2.63	0.63	4.38	1.11

TABLE 12

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY LOCATION WHO IDENTIFIED SELECTED PERSONNEL AS HAVING PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY FOR VARIOUS INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

Activity Number	Principals			Assistant Principals			Curriculum Specialists			Central Office			Others		
	Rural	Sub-urban	Urban	Rural	Sub-urban	Urban	Rural	Sub-urban	Urban	Rural	Sub-urban	Urban	Rural	Sub-urban	Urban
1.	62.83	51.96	60.48	2.98	8.31	6.67	0.94	4.34	4.76	27.98	29.21	25.24	5.26	6.19	2.86
2.	62.77	53.49	61.46	4.28	7.46	5.21	0.50	2.43	0.00	27.55	27.83	27.60	4.91	8.78	5.73
3.	82.42	82.12	80.56	5.61	6.72	4.63	1.36	2.75	0.00	3.03	4.60	12.04	7.58	3.81	2.78
4.	70.42	66.94	57.87	3.92	6.45	8.33	0.00	0.81	0.93	21.90	16.94	31.48	3.76	8.87	1.39
5.	37.38	38.02	41.67	7.17	20.05	14.81	7.32	4.17	7.87	10.12	14.58	18.52	38.01	23.18	17.13
6.	82.42	60.94	68.98	12.23	34.38	24.54	0.92	1.56	5.09	3.52	1.56	1.39	0.92	1.56	0.00
7.	54.43	54.50	72.22	1.22	6.08	0.00	0.46	0.00	2.78	43.43	29.42	25.00	0.46	0.00	0.00
8.	77.27	43.75	52.78	19.09	52.34	37.50	1.82	1.56	6.94	1.82	0.00	2.78	0.00	2.34	0.00
9.	43.12	37.57	23.15	6.27	15.34	20.37	2.60	3.70	15.28	44.19	39.68	35.65	3.82	3.70	5.56
10.	79.39	53.96	57.41	10.76	39.11	32.41	2.73	2.66	3.24	7.12	2.66	5.09	0.00	1.61	1.85
11.	50.66	56.89	46.39	6.79	16.72	14.44	2.08	6.34	9.81	35.57	11.53	24.63	4.91	8.52	4.72
12.	86.73	78.84	80.19	3.24	13.76	7.04	0.00	0.00	2.41	9.35	6.61	7.04	0.49	0.79	3.33
13.	61.40	47.50	49.14	13.51	27.50	32.00	4.74	4.44	3.90	2.98	2.22	1.52	17.37	18.33	13.43
14.	61.76	37.33	46.67	11.96	40.33	38.82	3.92	7.67	3.53	13.73	9.00	3.53	8.63	5.67	7.45
15.	56.48	27.15	24.54	12.50	34.41	55.09	4.63	4.84	3.70	0.93	0.54	0.00	25.46	33.06	16.67
16.	33.02	17.99	16.67	4.72	20.37	20.83	7.55	7.14	5.56	13.21	17.99	20.83	41.51	36.51	36.11
17.	88.99	87.50	86.11	2.75	8.59	4.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.80	3.91	9.72	0.46	0.00	0.00
18.	91.36	87.50	76.67	1.82	7.81	9.52	0.00	0.00	5.24	6.36	1.56	8.57	0.45	3.13	0.00
19.	24.18	9.72	9.09	12.09	13.33	22.22	6.04	18.33	16.16	19.23	22.22	26.77	38.46	36.39	25.76
20.	21.35	18.25	28.24	6.44	5.56	9.26	8.21	19.84	8.80	7.56	6.35	8.33	56.44	50.00	45.37
21.	51.99	32.03	28.24	34.56	48.44	61.57	1.83	0.00	0.93	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.62	19.53	9.26
22.	82.87	61.90	65.28	12.96	31.75	33.33	1.85	0.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.39	2.31	5.56	0.00
23.	64.85	54.69	50.09	13.03	25.00	25.56	0.30	4.69	5.65	13.64	7.03	9.81	8.18	8.59	8.89
24.	33.49	29.10	42.48	3.67	13.23	13.90	3.98	7.67	0.57	16.37	24.60	26.76	42.51	25.40	16.29
25.	38.51	39.08	25.63	9.69	12.73	11.56	3.40	6.36	8.44	41.25	38.18	53.75	6.75	3.64	0.63
26.	6.31	6.99	12.04	0.97	13.44	6.48	6.31	9.68	9.26	1.46	11.83	18.06	84.95	58.06	54.17
27.	61.54	59.68	69.24	4.47	8.33	4.95	1.16	3.49	2.10	22.39	18.01	16.86	10.44	10.48	6.86
28.	48.24	40.16	37.69	11.67	14.38	24.26	2.72	10.47	4.81	14.44	14.38	17.31	22.93	20.63	15.93
29.	51.68	45.25	51.05	5.15	10.51	11.05	1.19	1.19	3.43	36.83	33.39	32.95	5.15	9.66	1.52
30.	77.30	82.55	81.20	3.82	7.81	6.20	2.00	2.08	1.11	10.94	4.69	8.06	5.94	2.86	3.43
31.	75.36	83.33	76.29	3.09	7.94	5.81	1.27	1.59	2.95	10.82	3.97	5.81	9.45	3.17	9.14
32.	80.48	88.28	75.65	5.48	2.34	8.98	0.64	0.00	1.11	7.76	6.25	9.44	5.64	3.13	4.81
33.	73.33	77.86	66.20	6.20	2.34	16.20	1.11	1.30	1.39	2.50	2.86	1.39	16.85	15.63	14.81
34.	63.27	55.21	62.04	21.45	35.68	27.31	0.55	0.00	0.00	9.33	7.81	9.72	5.39	1.30	0.93
35.	60.87	38.69	44.12	10.87	22.62	23.53	0.00	5.36	5.88	6.52	7.74	4.41	21.74	25.60	22.06
36.	78.14	62.71	70.37	12.58	21.93	16.20	1.73	0.31	5.09	6.13	1.61	4.17	1.42	3.44	4.17
37.	87.00	91.93	95.37	7.45	5.99	3.70	0.64	0.00	0.00	3.97	2.08	0.00	0.94	0.00	0.93
38.	82.12	82.86	85.19	9.39	14.60	8.80	0.45	1.90	1.39	4.55	0.32	2.78	3.48	0.32	1.85

TABLE 13

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WHO IDENTIFIED SELECTED PERSONNEL AS HAVING PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES FOR VARIOUS INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES BY NUMBER OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS

Activity Number	No. of Ass't. Prin.	Principals			Assistant Principals			Curriculum Specialists			Central Office			Others		
		0-1	2	3+	0-1	2	3+	0-1	2	3+	0-1	2	3+	0-1	2	3+
1.		69.19	61.49	44.60	0.51	5.46	10.14	0.51	3.05	4.35	29.29	23.73	32.18	0.51	6.27	8.73
2.		60.47	63.50	53.51	1.88	5.27	9.54	0.31	1.48	1.21	33.13	25.32	24.77	4.22	4.43	10.98
3.		84.36	81.35	80.39	5.90	5.75	5.67	2.31	1.59	0.67	3.08	4.17	8.44	4.36	7.14	4.83
4.		69.67	74.79	53.95	3.28	3.13	11.02	0.00	0.63	0.56	24.59	17.29	25.99	2.46	4.17	8.47
5.		39.84	34.14	42.50	7.81	11.85	18.33	4.69	10.04	3.33	7.81	15.06	15.56	39.84	28.92	20.28
6.		89.23	72.02	58.61	7.69	23.21	32.78	0.00	2.38	3.06	1.54	2.38	3.89	1.54	0.00	1.67
7.		54.29	55.22	64.41	0.51	1.61	5.93	0.00	1.81	0.00	45.20	40.76	29.66	0.00	0.60	0.00
8.		86.36	58.13	43.61	12.12	36.11	49.44	1.52	3.37	2.78	0.00	1.19	3.33	0.00	1.19	0.83
9.		42.93	38.82	31.39	3.03	10.77	21.67	1.52	3.86	10.83	49.75	40.85	32.78	2.78	5.69	3.33
10.		81.57	71.03	48.39	8.08	21.63	41.72	3.03	2.18	3.39	7.32	4.17	5.06	0.00	0.99	1.44
11.		50.00	58.21	44.97	5.47	11.33	17.01	3.13	4.04	7.40	40.62	17.38	23.22	0.78	9.04	7.40
12.		85.94	81.87	81.67	3.13	5.83	13.56	0.00	0.00	1.49	10.94	10.62	1.78	0.00	1.67	1.49
13.		69.59	47.97	48.93	9.94	22.97	30.28	0.88	7.21	4.58	0.88	4.95	0.90	18.71	16.89	15.31
14.		73.53	50.00	32.47	9.80	21.88	45.43	4.58	4.69	5.62	9.15	8.59	13.33	2.94	14.84	3.15
15.		60.00	40.16	24.71	7.69	29.92	42.82	3.08	5.42	4.89	0.00	1.61	0.00	29.23	22.89	27.59
16.		31.54	22.50	23.06	6.15	14.38	16.39	6.15	8.13	6.67	15.38	19.38	12.22	40.77	35.63	41.67
17.		88.64	90.36	84.17	2.27	3.61	9.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.33	6.02	6.67	0.76	0.00	0.00
18.		87.12	92.17	82.22	2.27	3.01	10.56	0.00	0.00	3.06	9.85	2.41	4.17	0.76	2.41	0.00
19.		29.25	16.44	5.75	5.66	10.96	26.44	10.38	10.96	14.37	16.04	30.82	14.94	38.68	30.82	38.51
20.		23.55	25.00	15.00	4.15	4.07	12.78	6.61	14.02	14.44	7.43	9.55	4.17	58.25	47.36	53.61
21.		56.67	37.70	31.39	28.97	46.03	55.56	1.54	1.19	0.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.82	15.08	12.50
22.		90.91	68.29	61.02	6.06	24.39	37.29	1.52	1.83	0.00	0.00	0.61	0.00	1.52	4.88	1.69
23.		73.99	56.55	46.72	5.81	22.02	28.67	0.51	2.98	4.22	14.39	9.52	9.22	5.30	8.93	11.17
24.		38.97	32.33	29.72	3.59	5.82	17.01	3.59	6.02	3.45	16.41	23.90	20.68	37.44	31.93	29.15
25.		37.50	40.00	30.25	4.17	13.24	14.21	4.17	2.44	10.75	47.92	39.77	41.57	6.25	4.55	3.21
26.		8.06	6.58	8.33	1.61	7.20	8.33	5.65	10.29	6.90	1.61	7.41	14.37	83.06	68.52	62.07
27.		67.81	55.97	65.06	4.53	4.94	8.16	1.15	2.47	2.41	16.77	26.34	15.06	9.74	10.29	9.31
28.		57.23	43.97	29.21	4.92	10.83	30.90	1.59	9.44	4.07	14.15	14.40	16.50	22.10	21.35	19.32
29.		55.25	48.31	45.38	1.15	10.65	11.17	2.79	0.91	1.23	33.11	35.32	36.90	7.70	4.81	5.32
30.		70.76	83.73	83.44	6.36	3.57	7.06	1.82	2.78	0.67	12.42	7.74	5.39	8.64	2.18	3.44
31.		68.79	83.73	80.00	4.39	3.01	8.53	2.12	1.81	0.90	12.73	7.23	3.45	11.97	4.22	7.12
32.		78.84	85.12	81.22	4.60	6.55	3.72	1.06	0.00	0.67	7.63	6.55	9.00	7.88	1.79	5.39
33.		71.08	74.30	75.00	5.69	6.22	8.61	0.31	1.81	1.39	3.38	1.81	2.22	19.54	15.86	12.78
34.		60.40	60.79	60.56	25.56	29.25	24.72	0.30	0.48	0.00	9.90	6.23	11.67	3.84	3.25	3.06
35.		61.63	46.33	43.57	9.30	14.97	26.90	0.00	5.08	3.51	3.49	4.80	10.53	25.58	28.81	15.50
36.		80.69	75.14	69.17	10.05	17.91	20.00	2.12	0.84	3.06	5.56	3.05	5.00	1.59	3.05	2.78
37.		88.69	89.29	92.22	6.87	5.95	6.39	1.06	0.00	0.00	3.08	4.37	0.00	0.30	0.40	1.39
38.		90.15	80.99	77.40	5.30	11.94	15.54	0.00	2.02	0.85	3.03	2.02	4.24	1.52	3.02	1.98

Activities Considered Most Important

The respondents were asked to identify in rank order the five activities that they believed to be the most important instructional leadership activities in their schools.

Table 14 shows the instructional activities that principals considered most important in the school. Instructional activities 3, 7, and 8, Formulating school goals, Participating in the recruitment and the selection of all instructional personnel, and Visiting classrooms to observe instructional techniques, respectively, were reported the largest number of times and considered most important. Instructional activities 2 and 19 appeared the least number of times on the list of most important instructional activities. These activities were, respectively, Evaluating the school's grading policies and Directing the development or the modification of instructional materials that are not available commercially.

Thirty-four of the 38 instructional activities appeared at least one time on the most important list of activities conducted in the schools by the principal. The four instructional activities not reported were 14, 20, 21, and 35: Conducting group conferences with instructional personnel experiencing similar problems in instruction; Providing for the establishment of a collection of professional resource materials within the school; Coordinating and supervising student assemblies; and, Involving volunteer services in the school.

TABLE 14

LEADERSHIP ACTIVITIES CONSIDERED MOST IMPORTANT IN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

Activity Number	Frequency of Rank of Top 5 Activities	Activity Number	Weighted Frequency
8	114	3	414
3	96	8	357
7	83	7	260
38	68	37	232
37	67	38	203
10	61	34	175
34	60	10	175
12	49	12	159
15	48	15	149
18	44	6	141
6	43	18	122
32	42	32	95
17	39	17	92
5	31	5	88
27	25	4	66
4	24	27	60
22	20	23	43
23	19	22	39
30	17	36	36
9	15	30	36
28	13	9	35
36	12	28	34
33	12	29	27
29	12	33	26
13	9	13	25
24	7	24	12
31	4	31	7
25	3	11	7
11	3	1	7
1	3	25	6
26	2	26	5
16	2	16	5
19	1	2	4
2	1	19	3

Summary of Results

In summary, the findings are as follows:

1. All of the instructional activities were carried out in a vast majority of the schools. There was very little differentiation as a function of school size, location, and staff.

2. The principal had the highest mean responsibility for most of the 38 instructional activities identified; the assistant principal had the second highest mean responsibility. Exceptions are in Follow up of students, Instructional material development, Inservice programs, and Staff development where primary responsibility was assigned to central office and others.

3. For the three variables examined (size, location, and staffing), size and staffing seemed to be the variables which influenced the distribution of responsibilities. Generally, mean scores and primary responsibility assigned to the principal decreased as school size and staffing increased. Conversely, responsibility of the assistant principal increased as school size increased.

4. Curriculum specialists and central office personnel were assigned limited responsibility for nearly all 38 instructional activities. Little variation was noted regardless of size, location, and staffing.

5. Activity 3 Formulating school goals and activity 8 Observing instructional techniques were reported by principals as most important instructional leadership activities carried out in secondary schools.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The final chapter of this study is organized into four sections. A review of the purpose, objectives, and justification for the study is discussed in the first section. This section is followed by a summary of related literature; a review of methods and procedures; and a summary of findings, conclusion, and recommendations for further study.

Purpose of the Study

This study was designed to ascertain if selected instructional activities are performed in the senior high schools of Virginia, the distribution of responsibility for performing these activities, and the individuals having primary responsibility for the performance of the activities.

The instructional activities included in the study were selected from the Standards for Accrediting Schools in Virginia 1983, literature contained in the study regarding the leadership role of the principal, and State Board of Education policies and regulations which specifically delineate job responsibilities of the principalship. Specifically, the objectives were to determine:

1. To what extent are selected instructional activities carried out in Virginia senior high schools?

2. How are instructional responsibilities distributed across selected personnel in Virginia senior high schools?

3. Who has primary responsibility for each of the 38 selected instructional activities in Virginia senior high schools?

4. Are there differences in whether or not the instructional responsibilities are carried out based on school size, location (urban, rural, suburban), and staffing?

5. Are there differences in how responsibilities are distributed by size, location, and staffing?

6. Are there differences in who has primary responsibility for each of the instructional activities by size, location, and staffing?

In Virginia, there has been no effort made to study the instructional leadership role of the senior high school principal and his administrative staff. Likewise, no effort has been made to study the distribution of responsibility for carrying out instructional leadership responsibilities in senior high schools. Increased demands upon the principal's time for administering curricular and non-curricular activities have raised some concerns regarding the principal's availability and interest in supervising the instructional program. This study was designed to determine the leadership role of the principal and his administrative staff and the distribution of responsibility for leadership activities. The results of this study should prove valuable to the Department of Education and institutions of higher learning with regard to the preparation of in-service programs for administrators, as well as to those involved with the evaluation of these individuals. It is believed that this study will illuminate some of the issues of instructional leadership responsibilities in the senior high schools of Virginia.

Summary of Selected Related Literature

The literature revealed that the principalship in American schools did not begin as a carefully planned and clearly defined position but emerged as the result of a multitude of factors. Since the early administrator generally served as a teacher, as well as a principal, a close relationship was developed and maintained between the administrative and instructional programs of the school. Many factors have impacted upon the principalship and influenced the responsibilities of the position since its beginning as head teacher; there is no indication that this trend will be reversed in the near future.

Different perceptions of the instructional role of the principal constitute this phase of the literature review section of the study. It is apparent in this review that no consensus on the instructional role of the principal was available. However, it was generally agreed that at least half or more of the principal's time should be devoted to problems that are related to the improvement of instruction. Although there were some who maintained that instructional leadership is an outdated role of the principal, others indicated that the principal is the key instructional leader and must continue to fulfill this responsibility.

The literature indicated that schools with positive climate are places where the people care for, respect, and trust one another, and where the school as an institution cares for, respects, and trusts the people in it. The people in the school feel a high sense of pride and ownership which come from having an important role in making the school

a better place for all. The literature revealed that schools with positive climates are cohesive places with humanistic beliefs and value systems. Schools are people-centered institutions, and the people trust each other, respect each other, communicate with each other, and work together to improve the school for each other. The literature indicated that schools with positive climates are constantly changing as the needs change and as the people reshape the schools in accordance with these needs; in addition, the literature stated that improving the school and meeting the needs is everyone's business.

Summary of Methods and Procedures

The descriptive survey method was used to accomplish the purpose of this study. This method was used as a means of collecting the data necessary to analyze the objectives. The mail questionnaire technique was utilized to gather the data. The subjects of this study were the 256 senior high school principals in Virginia during the 1983-84 school year.

The Virginia Educational Directory--School Year 1982-83, was used to obtain the names of participants for the study. From the use of the mail survey questionnaire, data were collected from the participants.

Pilot questionnaires were administered to 26 administrators in the 1983 Summer Radford Evaluation Workshop. Based on given instructions, these individuals who piloted the instrument were asked to complete the questionnaire, to indicate, and after completing the

instrument, any ambiguous items in vocabulary, questions and format. Moreover, they were asked to state the approximate length of time required to complete the questionnaires. As a result of the pilot of the instrument and comments from the participants, two of the 40 items initially contained in the survey instrument were deleted, thereby reducing the instrument activities to 38. To further establish the clarity of each item, the survey was piloted in selected middle schools in the Richmond metropolitan area. These administrators indicated that no problems were experienced in the areas of review and confirmed the twenty minutes necessary for completing the survey instrument.

The questionnaire sent to 256 senior high school principals asked them to indicate whether or not each activity was carried out in their schools. If their response was "Yes," they were asked to distribute a total of ten points across the last five columns to indicate a relative responsibility for the activity. The response rate for principals involved in the study was 82 percent. A telephone nonresponse survey with ten percent of the nonrespondents was also conducted. Following a comparative analysis of the data gathered in the nonresponse survey with the information received through the mail survey questionnaire, it was concluded that there were no significant differences between the respondents and non-respondents.

Responses to the 38 survey items on the questionnaire from the principals were analyzed through the Statistical Analysis System (SAS). Descriptive statistics were used in analyzing the data. Data were reported by means, frequencies, standard deviations, and percentages.

Summary of Findings

The purpose of the study was to determine if selected instructional activities are performed in the senior high schools of Virginia, and the distribution of responsibility for carrying out the activities. To accomplish this purpose, six research objectives were delineated. The summary of findings was organized to coincide with the research objectives used in the study.

Research Objective 1 was to determine the extent to which selected instructional activities were carried out in Virginia senior high schools. Of the 38 instructional activities, with only four exceptions each activity was carried out in 90 percent or more of the schools. The data indicate that the instructional activities were carried out overwhelmingly in the senior high schools of Virginia, and these activities appear to be an important part of the total instructional program.

Research Objective 2 was intended to determine how instructional responsibilities are distributed across selected personnel in Virginia senior high schools. The distribution of responsibilities for the instructional activities is a shared responsibility in which some administrators were involved to a greater extent than others. The principal assumed responsibility for the majority of the instructional activities, the assistant principal had the second highest mean responsibility, and the curriculum specialist was assigned responsibility for the least number of instructional activities.

Research Objective 3 was designed to determine who has primary responsibility for each of thirty-eight instructional activities in Virginia senior high schools. The principal reported having primary responsibility for all but seven of the 38 instructional activities. The preceding idea suggests that the principal viewed the supervision of the instructional program as a major area of responsibility for the principal.

Research Objective 4 was to determine if there are differences in whether or not the instructional responsibilities are carried out based on school size, location (urban, rural, suburban), and staffing. For the variables examined (size, location, and staffing), there was some variation. Only in instructional activity 35, Involving volunteer services in the school, did the percent of activities carried out seem to be affected to any real degree.

Research Objective 5 was designed to determine if there are differences in how instructional responsibilities are distributed by size, location, and staffing. For the three variables examined (size, location, and staffing), size and staffing seemed to be the variables which influenced the distribution of responsibilities. Generally, the mean score responsibility for the principal decreased as school size and staffing increased. Conversely, responsibility of the assistant principal increased as school size increased.

These data would appear to indicate that as the school staff increase, the principal assigns a greater portion of the responsibility for instructional activities to other members of his staff.

The purpose of Research Objective 6 was to determine if there are differences in who has primary responsibility for each of the thirty-eight instructional activities by size, location, and staffing.

Principals in smaller high schools were more likely to be designated as having primary responsibility for various instructional activities than in larger high schools. Generally, the responsibility for the assistant principal increased as a function of size similar to the trends noted in the mean score shifts for distribution of responsibility. Essentially, other than primary responsibility for principal and assistant principals as the result of school size, there was no influence that could be attributed to location and staffing.

Concluding Statement and Recommendations For Further Study

The findings of the study indicated that all of the selected thirty-eight instructional activities were carried out in most of the senior high schools in Virginia. The distribution of responsibilities for the instructional activities is shared; however the principal has the primary responsibility for the majority of the instructional activities.

Several important uses may be made of this study. First, the results could be used by agencies involved with the training of individuals entering the principalship, as well as those concerned with the evaluation of these individuals. Secondly, the results could be used by the Virginia Department of Education in the Principals Institute and the Secondary Principals Conference to improve the instructional

leadership skills of principals. Finally, this study provides direction for examining the instructional leadership role of the principal and his administrative staff.

Recommendations for Further Study

Recommendations for further research include suggested studies which focus on the following:

1. Expansion of the population to include a survey of the perception of teachers, supervisory personnel, and others directly affected by the principal's instructional leadership;

2. A study to investigate the relationship between the teaching experience of teachers and their perception of the instructional leadership behavior of the senior high school principal; and,

3. A study of the same scope to be conducted using randomly selected senior high school principals on a nationwide scale.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Lester J., and Lauren A. Vann Dyke. Secondary School Administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Publishing Company, 1972.

Ary, Donald, Lucy Chester Jacobs, and Asghar Razavich. Introduction to Research in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

Bagby, Geraldine. "Help Wanted: Instructional Leadership." NASSP Bulletin, 56: 41-45, November, 1972.

Brieve, Fred J. "Secondary Principals as Instructional Leaders." NASSP Bulletin, 56: 11, December, 1972.

Brookover, Wilbur C., and others. Creating Effective Schools. Florida: Learning Publishing Company, Inc., 1982.

Byrne, David R., Susan A. Hines, and Lloyd E. McCleary. The Senior High School Principalship--Volume One: The National Survey. Reston: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1978.

Chernow, Fred B., and Carol Chernow. School Administrator's Guide to Managing People. New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1976.

Commonwealth of Virginia. Standards for Accrediting Schools in Virginia. Richmond: Virginia Department of Education, July, 1983.

_____. Virginia Educational Directory. Richmond: Virginia Department of Education, January, 1983.

Connecticut School Effectiveness Project. Hartford: Connecticut Department of Education, July, 1983.

Cook, David R., and N. Kenneth LaFleur. A Guide to Educational Research. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975.

Cross, Neal, and Robert E. Herriott. Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Survey. New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1980.

Cunningham, Paul. "A Survey of Selected Research on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire." Ed.D. dissertation, Temple University, 1975.

DeRoche, Edward F., and Jeffrey S. Kaiser. Complete Guide to Administering School Services. New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1980.

Duke, Daniel L. "What Can Principals Do?" NASSP Bulletin, 38: 5, October, 1982.

Edmonds, Ronald R. "Programs of School Improvement: An Overview." Educational Leadership, 40: 4, December, 1982.

English, Fenwick W. School Organization and Management. Ohio: Charles H. Jones Publishing Company, 1975.

Fox, Robert S., and others. School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to the School Administrator. Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1974.

Goldman, Samuel L. The School Principal. New York: The Center For Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966.

Harris, Ben M. "Altering the Thrust of Supervision Through Creative Leadership." Educational Leadership, 36: 568, May, 1977.

Hoeh, James A. "Feeling Guilty For Not Being An Instructional Leader? Don't." NASSP Bulletin, 57: 6-7, November, 1973.

Hoy, Wayne K., and Cecil G. Miskel. Educational Administration Theory, Research and Practice. New York: Random House, Inc., 1978.

Jacobson, Paul B., James D. Logsdon, and Robert R. Wiegman. The Principalship: New Perspective. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Jenkins, John M. "The Principal: Still the Principal Teacher." NASSP Bulletin, 56: 69-70, February, 1972.

Kelley, Edgar R. Improving School Climate. Reston: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1980.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Lipham, James M. Effective Principal, Effective Schools. Washington: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1981.

_____, and Marion J. Fruth. The Principal and Individually Guided Education. Boston: Addison-Wesley, 1976.

Lipman, Harold J. "Instructional Leader or Administrative Robot." NASSP Bulletin, 56: 21, April, 1972.

Manasse, Lorri A. "Effective Principals: Effective At What?" Principal, 61: 10-11, March, 1982.

Mazzarella, Jo Ann. "The Principal's Role as an Instructional Leader." School Management Digest, 3: 10, September, 1977.

McDaniel, Thomas R. "What's Your P.Q.? (Principalship Quotient)." Phi Delta Kappan, 12: 468, February, 1982.

Medwid, Jl Ann. "The Principal As Instructional Leader." NASSP Bulletin, 61: 106, January, 1982.

Melton, George E., and John Stansavage. The Principalship. Reston: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1970.

Miller, Vann, George R. Madden, and James B. Kincheloe. The Public Administration of American School System. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1972.

Morrison, Ruel, Jack Culbertson, and Curtis Henson. Performance Objectives For School Principals. California: McCutchan Publishing Company, 1974.

Mullican, Frank, and Len Ainsworth. "The Principal As Instructional Leader." Theory Into Practice, 18: 33, February, 1983.

Nealey, Ross L., and N. Dean Evans. Handbook For Effective Supervision. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.

Pellicer, Leonard O. "Providing Instructional Leadership--A Principal Challenge." NASSP Bulletin, 66: 28, October, 1982.

Pendergrass, R. A., and Deane Wood. "Instructional Leadership and the Principal." NASSP Bulletin, 63: 41, March, 1979.

Pierce, Paul R. The Origin and Development of the Public School Principalship. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935.

Pinero, Ursula C. "Wanted: Strong Instructional Leaders." Principal, 61: 19, March, 1982.

Saxe, Richard W. Educational Administration Today: An Introduction. California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1980.

Shoemaker, Jan, and Hugh W. Frazier. "What Principals Can Do: Some Implications From Studies of Effective Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, 63: 180, November, 1981.

Silberman, Charles E. Crises in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education. New York: Random House, 1971.

Snyder, Karolyn J. "Instructional Leadership For Productive Schools." Educational Leadership, 12: 37, February, 1983.

Til, Van Til. Secondary Education: School and Community. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1978.

Wood, Charles L, Everett W. Nicholson, and Dale G. Findley. The Secondary School Principal: Manager and Supervisor. (Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.), 1979.

APPENDIX A

List of Instructional Activities included in Survey Questionnaire and Their Sources

LIST OF INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES INCLUDED IN SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE AND THEIR SOURCE(S)

Activity Number	Activity	*Source(s)
1.	Adding a new course or instructional program	1,2
2.	Evaluating the school's grading policies	1
3.	Formulating school goals	1,2,3,4
4.	Developing a budget for the school	1,2
5.	Collecting and analyzing data concerning the performance of students	2,3,4
6.	Collecting and analyzing data concerning the performance of teachers	2,3,5
7.	Participating in the recruitment and the selection of all instructional personnel	1,2,3
8.	Visiting classrooms to observe instructional techniques	2,4,5
9.	Leading in-service training activities for instructional personnel	2,3,4,5
10.	Conferring individually with instructional personnel about instructional matters	2
11.	Assessing the effectiveness of the school's in-service training program	3,5
12.	Defining the job responsibilities of each staff member in accordance with the instructional philosophy of the school	3
13.	Participating in instructional team meetings	2
14.	Conducting group conferences with instructional personnel experiencing similar problems in instruction	2
15.	Assigning students to the appropriate classes and time periods for instruction	2,3

Activity Number	Activity	*Source(s)
16.	Determining the procedures and schedule for standardized testing within the school	2,5
17.	Recommending of personnel for re-employment, promotion, or dismissal	2,3
18.	Assigning or reassigning of personnel within the school to maximize conditions for learning	2,3
19.	Directing the development or the modification of instructional materials that are not available commercially	3
20.	Providing for the establishment of a collection of professional resource material within the school	2,5
21.	Coordinating and supervising student assemblies	2
22.	Allocating time and space to various instructional purposes	3
23.	Allocating materials, equipment, and facilities to accomplish instructional goals	3
24.	Providing an adequate system for reporting a student's performance to parents, prospective employers, higher education institutions and others	2,3
25.	Training other professional staff members to assume leadership roles in the in-service programs	3
26.	Collecting, organizing, analyzing, and interpreting data concerning former students	3

Activity Number	Activity	*Source(s)
27.	Relating of student needs to school system goals and legal requirements	3
28.	Directing the identification and selection of needed materials, equipment, and facilities for instruction	3
29.	Coordinating the redesigning of instructional facilities to accomplish instructional goals	3
30.	Explaining the school's instructional policies and procedures to the school constituency	3
31.	Reporting achievements and instructional problems to the school constituency	2,3
32.	Developing school-community relations to accomplish instructional goals	3
33.	Establishing procedures for student's scholastic achievements to be recognized and rewarded	4
34.	Developing and implementing rules of acceptable conduct	1,2,4,5
35.	Involving volunteer services in the school	4
36.	Monitoring instructional decisions made by the staff	6
37.	Setting a climate for staff morale and professional growth	2,4,6

Activity Number	Activity	*Source(s)
38.	Coordinating people and programs for the good of the instructional program	5,6

*Source(s):

1. Byrne, David R., Susan A. Hines, and Lloyd E. McCleary. The Senior High School Principalship Volume I: The National Survey. (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals), 1978.

2. Jacobson, Paul B., James D. Logsdon, and Robert R. Wiegman. The Principalship: New Perspectives. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.), 1973.

3. Morrison, Ruel, Jack A. Culbertson and Curtis Henson. Performance Objectives for School Principals. (California: McCutchan Publishing Co.), 1974.

4. Virginia Department of Education, "Standards for Accrediting Schools in Virginia." (State Department of Education), 1983.

5. Wood, Charles L., Everette W. Nicholson, and Dale G. Findley. The Secondary School Principal: Manager and Supervisor. (Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.), 1979.

6. Others--Those activities listed in the survey questionnaire as a result of the writer's experience as a State Supervisor of Secondary Administration.

APPENDIX B

Letter and Pilot Questionnaire

July 11, 1983

TO: Survey Field Participants

FROM: Robert L. Stokes

SUBJECT: Field Review Survey Instrument to ascertain Instructional Leadership Role of Senior High School Principals in Virginia

As a student in Educational Administration at the doctoral level at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, I am in the process of completing the dissertation phase of the degree requirements for the Doctor of Education. A final requirement for the degree is the conception, development, and writing of a dissertation. To fulfill this requirement, I am conducting a study to ascertain the Instructional Leadership Role of the Senior High School Principal in Virginia.

In order to collect data for this study, it is necessary to field test the instrument prior to administering it to senior high school principals throughout the state of Virginia. Therefore, I am requesting your cooperation and assistance in validating the instrument in the following areas: (1) Clarity of directions - Are the directions clear and free of ambiguous terminology? (2) Clarity of survey items - Are the 40 items provided in the survey instrument clear and reflective of the Instructional Leadership Role of the Senior High School Principal? (3) General Survey Format - Is the format simple and easy to understand and complete? and (4) Time - Approximately how long did it take to complete the survey instrument?

Your candid reactions to any one or all of the four items requested in the above paragraph will be greatly appreciated and will assist substantially in improving the quality of the survey instrument.

Please return the questionnaire with your comments to Robert L. Stokes prior to the conclusion of the conference.

Control Number _____

Please return to:
Robert L. Stokes
5719 Larrymore Rd.
Richmond, Virginia 23225

PART I
DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

Directions: Please check the one answer for each of the following questions that best describes your situation or fill in the blank with the appropriate response.

1. What is your sex?
   ____ 1. Male
   ____ 2. Female

2. What is your age?
   ____ 1. 23 or under
   ____ 2. 24 - 35
   ____ 3. 36 - 44
   ____ 4. 45 - 54
   ____ 5. 55 or older

3. What is your race?
   ____ 1. Caucasian
   ____ 2. Black
   ____ 3. Indian
   ____ 4. Oriental
   ____ 5. Other

4. How many years (including this one) have you served as principal?
   ____ 1. 0 - 1
   ____ 2. 2 - 5
   ____ 3. 6 - 10
   ____ 4. 11 - 20
   ____ 5. more than 20

5. How many years (including this one) have you been principal of this school?
   ____ 1. 0 - 1
   ____ 2. 2 - 5
   ____ 3. 6 - 10
   ____ 4. 11 - 20
   ____ 5. more than 20

6. How many years of teaching experience did you have prior to taking your present position? Do not include years as full-time administrator or supervisor.
   ____ 1. 0 - 1
   ____ 2. 2 - 5
   ____ 3. 6 - 10
   ____ 4. 11 - 20
   ____ 5. more than 20

7. On the average, how many hours a week do you work at your job as principal?
   ____ 1. 0 - 40
   ____ 2. 41 - 44
   ____ 3. 45 - 49
   ____ 4. 50 - 54
   ____ 5. 55 - 59
   ____ 6. 60 or more

8. What grades are included in your school?
   ____ 1. Kindergarten - 12
   ____ 2. 1 - 12
   ____ 3. 7 - 12
   ____ 4. 8 - 12
   ____ 5. 9 - 12
   ____ 6. 10 - 12
   ____ 7. 11 - 12
   ____ 8. Other, specify _____

9. How many high school students were enrolled in your school as of September 30, 1983?

____ 1. 0 - 250	____ 4. 750 - 999	____ 7. 2,000 - 2,999
____ 2. 251 - 499	____ 5. 1,000 - 1,499	____ 8. 3,000 - 3,999
____ 3. 500 - 749	____ 6. 1,500 - 1,999	____ 9. 4,000 or more

10. What was your major as an undergraduate? _____

11. What was your major field of graduate study? _____

12. What is the number of full time equivalent administrators assigned to your school? (Assistant principal, guidance directors, Activity Director, etc.)

_____ ____ _____ ____

_____ ____ _____ ____

PART II

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP ROLE OF THE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

Directions: Listed below are 40 instructional activities which are generally considered to be performed by Senior High School principals. Not all activities are performed by all principals, nor are they performed with the same frequency. Place a check below the title of the individual(s) having the primary responsibility for the activity in your school.

Instructional Items	Individual(s) Having Primary Responsibility				
	Prin.	Asst. Prin.	Curriculum Specialist	Central Office	*Other
1. Adding a new course or instructional program	____	____	____	____	____
2. Evaluating the school's grading policies	____	____	____	____	____
3. Formulating school goals	____	____	____	____	____
4. Developing a budget for the school	____	____	____	____	____
5. Collecting and analyzing data concerning the performance of students	____	____	____	____	____
7. Participating in the recruitment and the selection of all instructional personnel	____	____	____	____	____
8. Visiting classrooms to observe instructional techniques	____	____	____	____	____
9. Leading inservice training activities for instructional personnel	____	____	____	____	____
10. Conferring individually with instructional personnel about instructional matters	____	____	____	____	____

*Included in the category of "others" would be personnel such as department heads, committee chairperson, etc.

Instructional Items	Individual(s) Having Primary Responsibility				
	Prin.	Asst. Prin.	Curriculum Specialist	Central Office	*Other
11. Inventorying the changing need for time and space to accomplish various instructional objectives	____	____	____	____	____
12. Assessing the effectiveness of the school's inservice training program	____	____	____	____	____
13. Defining the job responsibilities of each staff member in accordance with the instructional philosophy of the school	____	____	____	____	____
14. Participating in instructional team meetings	____	____	____	____	____
15. Conducting group conferences with instructional personnel experiencing similar problems in instruction	____	____	____	____	____
16. Assigning students to the appropriate classes and time periods for instruction	____	____	____	____	____
17. Determining the procedures and schedule for standardized testing within the school	____	____	____	____	____
18. Recommending of instructional personnel for re-employment, promotion, or dismissal	____	____	____	____	____

*Included in the category of "others" would be personnel such as department heads, committee chairperson, etc.

Instructional Items	Individual(s) Having Primary Responsibility				
	Prin.	Asst. Prin.	Curriculum Specialist	Central Office	*Other
19. Assigning or reassigning of instructional personnel within the school to maximize conditions for learning	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
20. Providing for demonstration of effective instructional purposes	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
21. Directing the development or the modification of instructional materials that are not available commercially	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
22. Providing for the establishment of a collection of professional resource material within the school	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
23. Coordinating and supervising student assemblies	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
24. Allocating time and space to various instructional purposes	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
25. Allocating materials, equipment, and facilities to accomplish instructional goals	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
26. Coordinating and organizing the noninstructional services to accomplish instructional objectives	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

*Included in the category of "others" would be personnel such as department heads, committee chairperson, etc.

Instructional Items	Individual(s) Having Primary Responsibility				
	Prin.	Asst. Prin.	Curriculum Specialist	Central Office	*Other
27. Providing an adequate system for reporting students performances to parents, prospective employers, higher education institutions and others	____	____	____	____	____
28. Training other professional staff members to assume leadership roles in the inservice programs	____	____	____	____	____
29. Collecting, organizing, analyzing, and interpreting data concerning former students	____	____	____	____	____
30. Relating of student needs to school system goals and legal requirements	____	____	____	____	____
31. Directing the identification and selection of needed materials, equipment, and facilities for instruction	____	____	____	____	____
32. Coordinating the redesigning of instructional facilities to accomplish instructional goals	____	____	____	____	____
33. Explaining the school's instructional policies and procedures and reporting instructional problems and achievements to the school constituency	____	____	____	____	____

*Included in the category of "others" would be personnel such as department heads, committee chairperson, etc.

Instructional Items	Individual(s) Having Primary Responsibility				
	Prin.	Asst. Prin.	Curriculum Specialist	Central Office	*Other
34. Developing school-community relations to accomplish instructional goals	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
35. Establishing procedures for student's scholastic achievements to be recognized and rewarded	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
36. Developing and implementing rules of acceptable student conduct	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
37. Involving volunteer services in the school	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
38. Monitoring instructional decisions made by the staff	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
39. Setting a climate for staff morale and professional growth	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
40. Coordinating people and programs for the good of the instructional program	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

*Included in the category of "others" would be personnel such as department heads, committee chairperson, etc.

COMMENTS:

1. Approximately how long did it take to complete the survey instrument? _____ min.

2. Is the format simple and easy to understand? Yes____ No____
   If your answer is no, please list the difficulty you experienced.

   _____

   _____

3. Are the directions clear and free of ambiguous terminology? Yes____ No____

4. Are the 40 items listed on the survey instrument clear? Yes____ No____
If your answer is No, please list the item number that was unclear.

____ ____ ____ ____

5. Please list any other major instructional activity of the principal that is not included in the survey.

_____

_____

_____

6. If there are instructional activities listed on the survey instrument that in your opinion should be deleted, list the number of the item below:

____ ____ ____ ____

APPENDIX C

Letter and Principal Questionnaire

5719 Larrymore Road
Richmond, Virginia 23225
October 14, 1983

Dear Principal:

I am a doctoral student in Educational Administration at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. The topic of my dissertation is "Instructional Leadership Activities in Senior High Schools in Virginia."

The primary purpose of this study is to ascertain the instructional role of the senior high school principal through an analysis of selected activities typically associated with the principalship. A study of this nature represents, for the first time in Virginia, an opportunity for senior high school principals to provide input that may help to define their instructional role. Additionally, it will suggest the degree to which other individuals assume and perform instructional responsibilities in the school.

I would greatly appreciate your taking about fifteen minutes to complete the attached survey. Your responses will remain in strict confidence. Thanks in advance for your assistance with this endeavor. The control number will be used for follow-up purposes only.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed stamped self-addressed envelope on or before October 28, 1983.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Stokes, Supervisor
Secondary Administration

RLS

Enclosure

Control Number_____

Return to:
Robert L. Stokes
5719 Larrymore Road
Richmond, Virginia 23225

PART I

DIRECTORY INFORMATION

Directions: Please check one answer for each of the following questions.

1. What is your sex?
   ____1. Male
   ____2. Female

2. What is your age?
   ____1. 23 or under
   ____2. 24 - 35
   ____3. 36 - 44
   ____4. 45 - 54
   ____5. 55 or older

3. What is your race?
   ____1. Caucasian
   ____2. Black
   ____3. Indian
   ____4. Oriental
   ____5. Other

4. How many years (including 1983-84) have you served as principal?
   ____1. 1
   ____2. 2 - 5
   ____3. 6 - 10
   ____4. 11 - 20
   ____5. more than 20

5. How many years (including 1983-84) have you been principal of this school?
   ____1. 1
   ____2. 2 - 5
   ____3. 6 - 10
   ____4. 11 - 20
   ____5. more than 20

6. What grades are included in your school?
   ____1. Kindergarten - 12
   ____2. 1 - 12
   ____3. 7 - 12
   ____4. 8 - 12
   ____5. 9 - 12
   ____6. 10 - 12
   ____7. 11 - 12
   ____8. Other, Specify _____

7. How many high school students were enrolled in your school on September 30, 1983? _____

8. What is the number of administrators assigned to your school? Do not count yourself. (Assistant principal, guidance directors, activity directors, etc.).

   _____ _____ _____ _____
   _____ _____ _____ _____

9. Which of the population categories best describes the locality of the high school of which you are principal?

   ____1. Rural ____2. Suburban ____3. Urban

PART II

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP ROLE OF THE
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

DIRECTIONS: Listed below are 38 activities which are generally considered important to the instructional program of a school. Recognizing that the principal probably has final responsibility for all of the items in most schools, responsibility for the activity may be distributed across several individuals or groups. Please indicate whether or not this activity is carried out in your school by checking the second or third column. If you checked "Yes," then distribute a total of 10 points across the last five columns to indicate relative responsibility for the ability.

Instructional Activity	Yes	No	Prin.	Asst. Prin.	School Based Curriculum Specialist	Central Office	*Others
01. Supervise teachers	X		5	4	1	0	0
02. Adding a new course	X		2	2	1	5	0

In the above example, respondent has indicated that both activities are performed in his/her school, that the principal assumes half of the responsibility for supervising teachers, and that the central office assumes half the responsibility for adding a new course. Note that in each example 10 points are distributed to indicate relative responsibility.

Instructional Activity	Yes	No	Prin.	Asst. Prin.	School Based Curriculum Specialist	Central Office	*Others
1. Adding a New course or instructional program							

*Department heads, committee chairperson, other.

Instructional Activity	Yes	No	Prin.	Asst. Prin.	School Based Curriculum Specialist	Central Office	*Others
2. Evaluating the school's grading policies							
3. Formulating school goals							
4. Developing a budget for the school							
5. Collecting and analyzing data concerning the performance of students							
6. Collecting and analyzing data concerning the performance of teachers							
7. Participating in the recruitment and the selection of all instructional personnel							
8. Visiting classrooms to observe instructional techniques							
9. Leading in-service training activities for instructional personnel							

*Department heads, committee chairperson, other.

Instructional Activity	Yes	No	Prin.	Asst. Prin.	School Based Curriculum Specialist	Central Office	*Others
10. Conferring individually with instructional matters							
11. Assessing the effectiveness of the school's in-service training program							
12. Defining the job responsibilities of each staff member in accordance with the instructional philosophy							
13. Participating in instructional team meetings							
14. Conducting group conferences with instructional personnel experiencing similar problems in instruction							
15. Assigning students to the appropriate classes and time periods for instruction							

*Department heads, committee chairperson, other.

Instructional Activity	Yes	No	Prin.	Asst. Prin.	School Based Curriculum Specialist	Central Office	*Others
16. Determining the procedures and schedules for standardized testing within the school							
17. Recommending personnel for re-employment, promotion, or dismissal							
18. Assigning or re-assigning of personnel within the school to maximize conditions for learning							
19. Directing the development or the modification of instructional materials that are not available commercially							
20. Providing for the establishment of a collection of professional resource material within the school							

*Department heads, committee chairperson, other.

Instructional Activity	Yes	No	Prin.	Asst. Prin.	School Based Curriculum Specialist	Central Office	*Others
21. Coordinating and supervising student assemblies							
22. Allocating time and space to various instructional purposes							
23. Allocating materials, equipment, and facilities to accomplish instructional goals							
24. Providing an adequate system for reporting a student's performance to parents, prospective employers, higher education institutions and others							
25. Training other professional staff members to assume leadership roles in the in-service programs							
26. Collecting, organizing, and interpreting data concerning former students							

*Department heads, committee chairperson, other.

Instructional Activity	Yes	No	Prin.	Asst. Prin.	School Based Curriculum Specialist	Central Office	*Others
27. Relating of student needs to school system goals and legal requirements							
28. Directing the identification and selection of needed materials, equipment, and facilities for instruction							
29. Coordinating the redesigning of instructional facilities to accomplish instructional goals							
30. Explaining the school's instructional policies and procedures to the school constituency							
31. Reporting achievements and instructional problems to the school constituency							
32. Developing school-community relations to accomplish instructional goals							

*Department heads, committee chairperson, other.

Instructional Activity	Yes	No	Prin.	Asst. Prin.	School Based Curriculum Specialist	Central Office	*Others
33. Establishing procedures for students' scholastic achievements to be recognized to be recognized and rewarded							
34. Developing and implementing rules of acceptable student conduct							
35. Involving volunteer services in the school							
36. Monitoring instructional decisions made by the staff							
37. Setting a climate for staff morale and professional growth							
38. Coordinating people and programs for the good of the instructional program							

*Department heads, committee chairperson, other.

Please list any other major instructional activity that should be included in the survey.

Instructional Activity	Yes	No	Prin.	Asst. Prin.	School Based Curriculum Specialist	Central Office	*Others

*Department heads, committee chairperson, other.

Please identify in rank order the five activities that you believe are the most important instructional leadership activities in your school.

Most important item number ____

Second most important item number ____

Third most important item number ____

Fourth most important item number ____

Fifth most important item number ____

APPENDIX D

Follow-Up Letter

5719 Larrymore Road
Richmond, Virginia 23225
November 4, 1983

Dear Principal:

On October 14, 1983, a copy of a survey instrument titled Instructional Leadership Activities in Senior High Schools in Virginia was forwarded to you with a stamped self-addressed envelope. The letter accompanying the survey requested that you complete and return the questionnaire on or before October 28, 1983. In that a high return rate is necessary for the successful completion of the study, it is essential that I receive your completed questionnaire on or before November 11, 1983.

Enclosed please find another survey instrument and a stamped self-addressed envelope for returning the questionnaire. I would greatly appreciate your taking about fifteen minutes to complete and return the survey on or before November 11th.

I look forward to hearing from you on or before the above date.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Stokes, Supervisor
Secondary Administration

RLS

Enclosure

The two page vita has been removed from the scanned document. Page 1 of 2

The two page vita has been removed from the scanned document. Page 2 of 2