


2006

The Degree of Congruency between the Normative and Desired Instructional Leadership Duties of the Secondary Assistant Principal

Heather A. Wetzel
Seton Hall University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), and the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wetzel, Heather A., "The Degree of Congruency between the Normative and Desired Instructional Leadership Duties of the Secondary Assistant Principal" (2006). *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)*. 1521.
<https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/1521>

THE DEGREE OF CONGRUENCY BETWEEN THE NORMATIVE AND DESIRED
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP DUTIES OF THE SECONDARY ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL

By

Heather A. Wetzel

Dissertation Committee

Elaine Walker, Ph.D., Mentor

Barbara Strobert, Ed.D.

James V. McLaughlin, Ed.D.

Richard W. Fair, Ed.D.

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
Requirement for the Degree
Doctor of Education
Seton Hall University

2006

© Copyright by Heather A. Wetzel, 2006
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to determine the degree of congruency between the normative and desired instructional leadership duties of the secondary assistant principal as judged by New Jersey high school principals and assistant principals.

The role of the assistant principal has changed over the last twenty years and has come to the forefront as an important role in educational leadership (Weller & Weller, 2002). Six leadership domains were examined in the study: communication, evaluation, facilitation, management, motivation, and supervision from the perspective of high school principals and assistant principals.

This study was quantitative in nature. This instrument utilized was the Assistant Principal Instructional Leadership Questionnaire (Martin, 1997). Surveys were sent to public high school principals and assistant principals in Morris and Union Counties of New Jersey. Additional demographic data were gathered that may have influenced the perceptions of principals and assistant principals.

Survey data and demographics were quantified. Statistical procedures were used to determine the differences between the assigned and desired instructional duties of assistant principals in high schools.

The test results revealed statistically significant differences in both principals' and assistant principals' assessments of the assistant principal's assigned and desired instructional leadership responsibilities in each of the six leadership domains. The instructional evaluation domain was the only category that the assigned mean scores were

higher than the desired mean score as judged by assistant principals. The most significant mean difference of the assistant principals' assigned and desired instructional duties were found in the facilitation leadership domain.

ANOVAs imply a high level of congruency between high school principals and high school assistant principals judgments on desired instructional leadership duties. Only one statistical significance difference resulted in the management leadership domain. Other ANOVA results indicate that female assistant principals attest to performing more duties in instructional evaluation and management leadership domains and they are more willing than males to assume additional responsibility in instructional evaluation and facilitation. ANOVA test results indicated that school context is a factor in the high school assistant principal's role as instructional leader.

Acknowledgements

First, I wish to thank God for my existence and the ability He has given me the strength to complete this dissertation. Next, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my dissertation committee members, Dr. Elaine Walker, Dr. Barbara Strobert, Dr. James McLaughlin, and Dr. Richard Fair for the time you invested in me. Their commitment to leading people in the field of education is truly commendable. I would especially like to thank my advisor, Dr. Walker for her expertise, advice, and support as I ventured and stumbled through this endeavor. I also want to thank Carol Gernat, editor, for her expertise in proofreading my study.

To my parents, John and Maureen Wetzal and my grandfather, Martin Lazistan who provided immeasurable amounts of support, encouragement, and continual patience throughout this entire study. Thank you for your support and assistance and also for instilling in me the values of dedication, discipline, and determination. If it were not for your influence, this dissertation would have never been completed.

I would like to acknowledge my friends, especially Tiffany Sofranko for their love, kindness, and encouragement through my journey. I'm truly blessed and grateful for my family and friends. These individuals believed in me even when I did not believe in myself.

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated in loving memory of my grandparents, Helen Lazistan, Arthur & Edna Wetzel and George Reilly whose wisdom always remains with me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
DEDICATION.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	
Introduction.....	1
Problem Statement.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	5
Significance of the Study.....	5
Research Questions.....	9
Delimitations and Limitations.....	10
Basic Assumptions.....	10
Definition of Terms.....	11
Organization & Overview of the Study.....	13
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF RELATED LITEATURE	
Introduction	14
Traditional Role of the Assistant Principal.....	17
Gender and the Assistant Principalship	22
Instructional Leadership.....	22
Instructional Leadership & Student Achievement.....	24
Standards-Based Context for Instructional Leadership	25

The Reformed Role of the Assistant Principal.....	26
School Reform.....	29
Distributive Leadership Theory.....	30
Assistant Principal as a Partner in the Administrative Team.....	35
Organizational Development.....	35
Role Theory.....	36
Restructuring and Leadership Roles.....	38
Research on Assistant Principals.....	39
Assigned vs. Desired Duties of the Assistant Principal.....	43
Changes in the Position of the Assistant Principal.....	50
The Relationship between the Assistant Principal and the Total School Organization.....	53
Overview of the Assigned vs. Desired Instructional Leadership Duties of the Assistant Principal.....	53
The Complexity of Measuring the Effect of the Assistant Principal's Instructional Leadership Duties.....	54
New Directions in the Assistant Principalship	56
Summary.....	57
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	
Research Design.....	60
Sample Selection.....	61
Instrumentation	62
Data Collection.....	66

CHAPTER IV: REPORT ON DATA ANALYSIS

Description of Demographic Characteristics	70
Findings for Research Questions	
Research Question 1	74
Research Question 2.....	76
Research Question 3.....	78
Research Question 4.....	81
Research Question 5.....	96
Research Question 6.....	101
Summary of Findings.....	106

CHAPTER V: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMENDATIONS

Introduction.....	109
Discussion of Demographic Findings.....	110
Implications on Policy and Practice.....	110
Conclusions.....	115
Limitations.....	118
Recommendations for Future Research.....	119
REFERENCES.....	122
APPENDIX;.....	143

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Actual Duties of Assistant Principals: Rankings and Percentages.....	45
Table 2	Assistant Principals' Rankings of Their Duties for Degree of Importance.....	47
Table 3	Demographic Background Data on Assistant Principals.....	72
Table 4	Comparison of Principals' Assessments of Assigned and Desired Duties of High School Assistant Principals.....	75
Table 5	Comparison of Assistant Principals' Assessments of Assigned and Desired Duties of Assistant Principals.....	77
Table 6	ANOVA Principals' and Assistant Principals' Assessments of Assigned Duties Instructional Leadership Duties.....	79
Table 7	ANOVA Principals' and Assistant Principals' Assessments of Desired Instructional Leadership Duties.....	80
Table 8	Paired t-Tests for the Congruency of Principals' Assessments of the Assistant Principal Desired & Assigned Leadership Duties.....	87
Table 9	One-Way ANOVA of Assistant Principals' Assessments of Assigned & Desired Instructional Duties.....	99
Table 10	One-Way ANOVA of Assistant Principals' Assessments on Assigned Instructional Duties.....	100
Table 11	Comparison of Principals and Assistant Principals' Mean Differences of Assigned Duties Instructional Leadership Duties.....	102
Table 12	Comparison of Mean Differences of Assigned and Desired Duties of the Assistant Principal as Judged by Principals.....	104
Table 13	Comparison of Mean Differences of Assigned and Desired Duties of the Assistant Principal as Judged by Assistant Principals.....	105

Chapter I

Introduction

The role and the responsibilities of the assistant principal have been debated and refined in many public elementary, middle, and high schools across the nation. The actual role definitions vary greatly from district to district and school to school. Specific job descriptions are dependent upon many factors including school demographics, individual needs of the community and characteristics of faculty as well the administrative team.

The popular portrayal of the assistant principal is the administrative disciplinarian who patrols the hallways and bathrooms, monitors student attendance and truancy, and attends all athletic events, dances, and student activities. The assistant principal is probably the least understood administrative positions (Johnson, 2000). The title assistant principal has taken on a variety of meanings depending upon the school and its location (Weller & Weller, 2002).

Marshall (1992) stated,

Assistant principals do many of the same tasks as principals. A majority of their time is spent dealing with issues of school management, student activities and services, community relations, personnel, and curriculum and instruction. However, they lack the position, power, and status of the principal and remain dependent on the principal, who usually delineates their specific tasks and responsibilities. (pp. 3-4)

In most cases, these duties promote the stability of the school organization, rather than effect change.

Problem Statement

The increasing complications of the high school principal's job due to changing demographics, shrinking state budgets, legislated reform initiatives, school restructuring and the

expectations to improve standardized test scores is fundamentally affecting leadership roles in schools (Fullan, 2002; King, 2000; Murphy & Hallinger, 1993; Quinn, & Schiff, 2002). One study on the changes in the principalship validated other studies findings on the increased complexity of the principal's role (Goodwin, 2002). In the study, practitioners identified 45 descriptors of the principal's role. The analysis revealed four major themes:

1. Role conflict: conflict between the roles of strategic leader, instructional leader, organizational leader, and political and community leader.
2. Accountability conflict: conflict between being inclusive and being accountable, between meeting the diverse needs of students and meeting high standards.
3. Autonomy conflict: conflict between being responsive to mandates and being autonomous.
4. Responsibility conflict: conflict between increased responsibility and the need for both professional and clerical assistance.

Current research indicates that most high school principals are not perceived as fulfilling their instructional leadership responsibilities (Fink & Resnick, 2003). While considerable focus has been placed in recent years on the principalship, little has been written about the assistant principalship. What literature that does exist on the assistant principalship shows an ambiguous conceptualization of its role in the school organization with limited opportunities for the assistant principal to develop as an effective instructional leader (Wells, Rinehart, & Scollay, 1999).

Recent research on one district's role in the implementation of reform in mathematics instruction points out the pivotal role that administrative leaders play in shaping the purpose of

changes in instruction, in setting expectations about what will happen in classrooms, in modeling active construction of new knowledge and about learning of new conceptions of content and pedagogy that must occur across levels of administration in order for the new ideas to reach into the instructional core (Spillane, 2004).

Critical to this concept is how leadership duties can be distributed over multiple leaders. Spillane & Sherer (2004) focus their attention on “coordinated distribution,” which occurs when sequential tasks are led by different individuals (p. 37). Therefore the action of one leader becomes the basis for the actions of another leader, “collaborative distribution” (p. 38). There is evidence in some research on the assistant principalship that revealed assistant principals desire to expand their responsibilities beyond simple managerial and organizational duties in order to contribute to effective instructional and educational leadership (Harvey, 1995). More recent research found that the responsibilities of an assistant principal include much more than discipline of students and supervision of the school environment. Simpson (2000) expanded the role to include problem solving, decision-making regarding policy and procedures, assisting staff in the creation and implementation of curriculum as well as a variety of activities that vary day to day (Simpson, 2000).

Other dominant duties of assistant principals include teacher appraisals, school safety, student attendance and working with school policies (Roberson, 2003). In a study of secondary school assistant principals in Texas, school safety was found to be a responsibility of great importance and high priority, especially in the wake of the Columbine High School and 9/11 terrorist attacks (Roberson, 2003). Additionally, assistant principals were responsible for special education, development of improvement plans, instructional methods, curriculum development,

teacher selection, staff development and new teacher orientations, as well as custodial duties (Roberson, 2003).

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2001) legislation has stimulated demand for new knowledge of curriculum, pedagogy, and organizational improvement at the school and system levels (Goodwin, 2002). Reform initiatives have required school leaders to take on greater and more varied responsibilities. Yet, little guidance is given as to the way they are distributed among the administrative team. The responses to school reform have included acts of school restructuring, school deregulations, shared decision-making, increased accountability, and a change in the role of school leadership.

Assistant principals traditionally have not been charged with instructional responsibilities and have not had many opportunities to develop their experience in instructional leadership, teacher evaluation, and curriculum development (Celikten, 2001). As changes continue in public education, the responsibilities of assistant principals will undoubtedly see further additions or deletions. Recent research illustrates the increasing need for assistant principals to exert leadership in school (Marshall & Hooley, 2006). Typically, the principal has the ability to assign responsibilities to the assistant principal's role. These prescribed duties tend to be those that principals find undesirable or often do not wish to perform because they do not afford the opportunity to maintain maximum visibility and leadership (Marshall, 1992; Roberson, 2003). Consequently, the job description for assistant principals tends to be ambiguous, inconsistent, and difficult to define (Roberson, 2003).

Spillane's (2004) work points to the importance of common normative frame in shaping instructional change on a large scale. However, there are disagreements about the assistant

principal's role, and the role of assistant principal is still seen as someone who ensures the school operates properly and generally keeps things running on a day-to-day basis, despite willingness to engage in leadership activities (Smith, 2002).

Considering the implications of NCLB on school administrators, the assistant principal role must evolve to include greater instructional leadership responsibilities. For the principal's leadership to be effective, assistant principals must actively participate with the principal. This warrants a close examination of what the actual and normative secondary assistant principal's instructional leadership duties and responsibilities are as perceived by principals and assistant principals.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to determine the degree of congruency between the normative and desired instructional leadership duties of the secondary assistant principal as judged by New Jersey high school principals and assistant principals.

Significance of the Study

The impact of NCLB has put more pressure on the public education system to increase student achievement for all students. The newly reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) both reflects and reinforces a major shift in thinking about the roles and responsibilities of school board members, district superintendents, and principals (Anthes, 2003). As a result, administrators are expected to adjust their leadership focus from a traditional management-orientation to a performance -orientation that guarantees high achievement for all

students. Curricular and instructional issues are areas ranked by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1998) as those most critical for improving student achievement in schools.

Two aspects of change in the world of education, which seems to be significant, are the changes in expanding roles of principals (Goldring; 1990, Vandenberghe, 1995) and the growing need for shared leadership. Distributive leadership challenges not only the principal, but also the structure of school leadership, in which structure has historically been bureaucratic and hierarchical. Consequently, for distributive leadership to be practiced successfully, it would require the principals to relinquish some power and share leadership responsibilities with vice principals.

Today's successful educational leaders understand that in a complex and open system they cannot make change alone or by edict (Wagner, 2001). Shared leadership has long been evidenced in the effective schools literature. Murphy (1990) believes that decentralizing leadership duties for instructional improvement to school-based personnel will have a profound impact on the roles of the central office personnel and of the school administrative team.

It is widely accepted that one of the hallmarks of effective, successful school is a strong administrative team (Brent, Haller, & McNamara, 1997). "Members share a 'culture of commitment' regarding the school"(Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005 p. 104). Critical to this concept is how leadership duties can be distributed over multiple leaders. Spillane & Sherer (2004) focus their attention on "coordinated distribution," which occurs when sequential tasks are led by different individuals (p. 37). Therefore the action of one leader becomes the basis for the actions of another leader, "collaborative distribution" (p. 38).

One of the least researched topics in professional journals and books focusing on educational leadership is the role of the assistant principal (Weller & Weller, 2002). There is no specific job description in existence that can be consistently compared from school to school with any similarities. The definition of the role is open to the interpretation of all personnel and often becomes an individual who performs all of the duties and responsibilities assigned by a superior, which in most cases is the building principal (Weller & Weller, 2002).

There has been an expansion in the assistant principal's role in some schools beyond the traditional duties of student discipline, attendance, and supervision to include instructional programming issues, monitoring of student achievement, monitoring and hiring of new teachers, and staff development (Kaplan & Owings, 1999; Armstrong, 2004). Many assistant principals are highly competent and capable in sharing in instructional leadership responsibilities (Marshall 1992; Kaplan & Owings, 1999).

The leadership potential of assistant principals in many schools is not being fully released or exploited and their leadership capabilities are not being developed in the role (Rutherford, 2002). Today's aspiring school leaders are acquiring leadership, management, and policy knowledge and skills in preparation for running effective schools. The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) has produced a prominent set of standards for school leaders. This set of standards is used by the Educational Testing Service (ETS), which is used to test future school leaders as to their knowledge and skill to meet the standards established through ISLLC. Thus, the duties and responsibilities of the secondary assistant principal require revisions to meet the educational reform changes in secondary schools.

This research will help delineate the assigned versus the desired instructional leadership duties and responsibilities of the high school assistant principal. It will also describe the impact of education reform on the role of secondary assistant principal. Additionally, this study will gather valuable information from school administrators in New Jersey high schools regarding their role expectations of the secondary assistant principal about leadership, as well as their notion of team development and shared leadership.

This research will provide school leaders with additional information as they continue to examine the role of the secondary assistant principal. Such information should prove helpful in capitalizing on human resources, and maximizing the secondary assistant principal's role, as well as providing a more professional job description for the secondary assistant principal.

Overall, data from this study can be used to develop job descriptions, assist in personnel decisions, and develop in-service programs and criteria for evaluation performance. Also, school districts, superintendents, and school boards will find this information is valuable when improving the administrative effectiveness of their schools' leadership team, improving school decision making, and implementing school improvement activities that address system-wide changes. Moreover, recommendations and conclusions of this study may assist in developing a new direction for the role of the high school principal and be presented at professional conferences.

Research Questions

The overarching research question of this study is what instructional leadership duties do principals and assistant principals value in the high school assistant principalship

The intent of this study was to determine the degree of congruency between the assigned and normative instructional leadership duties of the secondary assistant principals in selected Morris and Union county high schools in New Jersey. The research data elicited from a random sample of principals and assistant principals in Morris and Union Counties in New Jersey will seek to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the degree of congruency that exists with respect to the normative and desired instructional leadership duties of the high school assistant principal as stated by high school principals?
2. What is the degree of congruency that exists with respect to the normative and desired instructional leadership duties of the high school assistant principal as perceived by high school assistant principals?
3. In what general instructional leadership domains are the viewpoints of high school principals and assistant principals parallel with respect to their opinions of the assistant principals' normative and desired instructional leadership duties?
4. What specific instructional duties do high school principals believe assistant principals should perform as an instructional leader?
5. What are the unique aspects of instructional leadership that exist within the leadership domains (communication, evaluation, facilitation, management, motivation, supervision)?
6. Who perceives the greatest discrepancy overall on the assigned and desired instructional leadership duties as reported on the Assistant Principal Instructional Leadership Questionnaire? (Martin, 1997)

Delimitations and Limitations

The delimitations included the fact that the study was limited to only those principals and assistant principals in Morris and Union county high schools in the state of New Jersey. The study was confined to school districts in which superintendents granted permission to conduct the study. The limitation was the ability to ascertain a high rate of return in comparison to the number of principals and assistant principals in the Morris and Union Counties.

Another limitation is that the survey used in this study relied on self-reports of the principals, assistant principals, and superintendents, and assumed they would respond honestly. Thus, the validity of the responses cannot be completely insured. Moreover, the questionnaire used in this study was adapted from the Instructional Leadership Questionnaire (ILQ) (Scott, 1983). Although Hoes (1991) conducted two preliminary studies to establish validity and reliability for this instrument, Martin (1997) added a sixth domain, instructional communication, based on instructional leadership behaviors. The instrument was modified based on current literature to obtain high school principals' and assistant principals' responses to the assistant principals' instructional leadership.

For these reasons, the results of this study are limited in its generalizability to those responding to the survey.

Basic Assumptions

Basic assumptions of the research study include:

- I. Participants are honest;

2. Participants are employed as secondary principals and assistants principals;
3. Participants have an interest when completing the survey; and
4. Participants are able to interpret and answer the survey instrument accurately with respect to their positions as principals and assistant principals.

Definition of terms

Assistant principal- an individual who works under the general direction of the principal with staff, students, and community to ensure a high quality educational program and to formulate and accomplish the school mission. To assist the principal in providing for an environment of high expectations for staff and students (Pack, 1986).

Principal- the single administrative officer who is responsible for the operation of the school and provides leadership in the high school community by building and maintaining a vision, direction, and focus for student learning (Lunenburg & Orenstein, 1996; NASSP, 2004).

Leadership- the identification, acquisition, allocation, coordination, and use of the social, material, and cultural resources necessary to establish the conditions for the possibility of teaching and learning (Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001).

Instructional Leadership-Creating a learning environment that supports higher achievement for all students (Kaplin & Owings, 1999).

Distributive Leadership- a form of collective agency incorporating the activities of many individuals in a school who work at mobilizing and guiding other teachers in the process of instructional change (Harris & Chapman, 2002; Spillane, 2000.).

Role-functions of the administrator to include duties of the position assigned by his/her superior and the expectations of his superiors, his subordinates, the faculty, and members of the community (Pack, 1987).

Assigned duties of the assistant principal-tasks actually performed by the school assistant principal in order for him or her to act effectively (Norton & Kriekard, 1987).

Desired Duties of the Assistant Principal-activities that should be performed by the school assistant principal in order for him or her to act effectively (Norton & Kriekard, 1987).

High school- a public educational institution that typically includes grades 9-12 (Alexander & George, 1993).

Instructional Leadership Behavior

Instructional communication-is the behavior exercised by the secondary assistant principal to discuss curriculum and instruction (Martin, 1997).

Instructional Evaluation-is the behavior exercised by the secondary assistant principal to assess student achievement, teacher performance, and a school's education program (Martin, 1997).

Instructional facilitation-is the behavior exercised by the secondary assistant principal to acquire and provide the human and material resources required to implement the instructional program of the school (Martin, 1997).

Instructional management-is the behavior exercised by the secondary assistant principal to directly influences the overall daily school management and organizational structure related to instruction in the classroom (Martin, 1997).

Instructional motivation-is the behavior exercised by the secondary assistant principal to identify and reinforce teacher behaviors that contribute to the success of the instructional program of the school (Martin, 1997).

Instructional supervision-is the behavior exercised by the secondary assistant principal that delineates steps in a process which promote effectiveness in teacher instruction and the teaching-learning situation (Martin, 1997).

Organization and Overview

This study is presented in five chapters. Attached at the end of the study are appendices of various documents used throughout the study. The first chapter is an introduction to the study. Chapter 2 contains the literature review, chapter 3 describes the methodology and procedures, chapter 4 reports the findings of the data analyses and chapter 5 states the researcher's conclusions and recommendations

Chapter 2

Review of related literature

The purpose of this study is to determine the degree of congruency between the normative and desired instructional leadership duties of the secondary assistant principal as judged by New Jersey high school principals and assistant principals. This chapter reviews related literature relative to the research questions raised in chapter 1.

The review will address the factors, which are influential to instructional leadership duties of the assistant principal. It will begin with an introduction and the historical evolution of the assistant principal's position and of instructional leadership. Following will be a discussion on the theoretical framework of the study, role theory, and distributive leadership theory. Next, an overview of the assistant principal's duties, changes in the duties, and desired duties of the assistant principal. The final section will be on the relationship of the assistant principal's duties to the total school organization and emerging instructional leadership duties.

Introduction

Further development of accountability in school reform points out that the assistant principals now face the possibility of being held accountable for results of education in the school. Despite the growing demands being placed on building administrators, very little research has focused on the potential importance of the role of the assistant principal. In fact, the role of the assistant principal has yet to be fully defined (Scoggins & Bishop, 1993). Glanz

(1994^a) maintained that even with renewed interest in the assistant principalship, there is much more to be learned about the role and function of that position.

Each administrator's duties on the team should be made clear and the goals should be clearly defined (Williams, 1995). However, Johnson's (2000) work contradicts Williams' claim when he described the assistant principal, as the least understood administrative position in education. Similarly, other researchers concurred that the assistant principal position does not have a consistent, well-defined job description, delineation of duties, or way of measuring outcomes from the accomplishment of tasks carried out by assistant principals (Black, 2000; Marshall, 1992; Porter, 1996).

The role of the assistant principal has changed over time. However, assistant principals continue to be viewed by many as general operations managers (Weller & Weller, 2002); a recent study of 100 assistant principals stated that 77% of the respondents found student discipline and student attendance to be their primary responsibility.

Although no precise list of duties exists, Scroggins and Bishop (1993) related 20 duties common to assistant principals. The 20 duties include discipline, attendance, student activities, athletics, community agencies, master schedules, principal substitute, building operations, budget, reports, transportation, curriculum, communications, cafeteria, school calendar, and locks and lockers.

In more recent studies researchers indicated that the job of the assistant principal reaches far beyond the school office and into the lives of the community members (Richard, 2000). The role of the assistant principal is much broader than just discipline (Simpson, 2000). Others recognized the importance of a large number of tasks performed by the assistant

principal and their importance to school leadership (Pellicer & Stevens, 1991). Educational leadership perspectives have focused on the skills and competencies (behaviors) required for effective instructional leadership. As an instructional leader, the principal actively supports instructional activities and programs by modeling desired behaviors, communicating clear goals for the school, articulating those goals to faculty and staff and engaging in frequent classroom observations (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 1995). In the reflection-growth (RG) model, Blasé and Blasé (1999) identify the following behaviors: encouraging and facilitating the study of teaching and learning, facilitating collaborative efforts among teachers and establishing coaching relationships among teachers.

To understand the assistant principal's position, a paradigm of role theory and distributed leadership is needed. This theoretical lens will allow for the important variables of context and organizational level. Gorton (1987) said "no other entity has greater impact on the fortunes of an assistant principal in a specific school than the principal of that school" (p. 3). Manatt (1989) acknowledged that much of what the assistant principal does is not formally stated in job descriptions, but rather determined by the principal. Assuming this, the principal/assistant principal relationship is characterized by a flow of influence from superior to subordinate (Hosking, 1988). Consequently, the different level of hierarchy, how the leadership duties are distributed, and different perceptions of principals and assistant principals play a major role in setting the tone of the school (Hartzell, 1995).

Organizational development is identified as crucial to improving schools, which entails a redistribution of power and a realignment of authority within the organization. Traditionally, high schools have been organized using the bureaucratic model (Abrams, 1997; Conly, 1996;

Tewel, 1995). Researchers have recently begun to recognize that the organizational context in which administrative responsibilities are accomplished differs significantly for the two positions. Hartzell (1993) suggests three reasons for these differences in the leadership experience at upper and lower levels of the organizational hierarchy: (a) the individual's position in the administrative hierarchy; (b) the different responsibilities at each level of the hierarchy, and (c) the perception of the individual by subordinates. He claims that these differences make the leadership experiences unique at each level and further that it would be beneficial to the understanding of educational leadership if researchers explore the effects of these differences on administrative performance (Hartzell, 1993).

In this hierarchy of relationships, the principal has the authority and power to allocate roles and their status. In this relationship, the assistant principal works within the limits established by the principal. Hence, the principal establishes the assistant principal's role within an individual school. It is also understood that the assistant principals will strive to successfully achieve the principal's expectations (Manatt, 1989).

Many in the role reported being overwhelmed and exhausted with the continued emphasis upon discipline and other managerial tasks, which are considered the least satisfying responsibilities in public education (Jorgenson, 2000). Clearly, the position of assistant principal has developed slowly since its inception.

Traditional Role of the Assistant Principal

As urbanization intensified and schooling expanded in the United States during the 1920s and the early 1930s principals, were forced to spend the majority of their time on the

managerial tasks of operating a school (Glanz, 1994). Consequently, other supervisory positions were created to meet the demands of the growing and complex education system. These general supervisors were primarily employed to assist with the supervision of teachers and to assist the principal with some of the managerial tasks (Glanz, 1994^b). The general supervisor, which was later called the assistant principal, performed such tasks as attendance reports, data collection for evaluations, school programs coordinator and other administrative duties. All were male and perhaps perceived differently as a result (Glanz, 1994^b). According to Spaulding (1995) supervisors “were quite generally looked upon, not as helpers, but as critics bent on the discovery and revelation of teachers’ weaknesses and failures...they were dubbed Snoopervisors” (p.130). Although this was how the assistant principal was perceived, most of the early literature demonstrated that most assistant principals were responsible for clerical tasks, extracurricular activities, and supervision of students (Glanz, 1994^a).

According to Spady (1985) the role of the assistant principal is one of keeper of the social order. Panyako and Rorie (1987) found that the assistant principal’s traditional role was to relieve the principal of some of the details and trivial tasks of everyday management essential to the proper functioning of the school. They stated that the assistant principal is a supervisor of (a) buses, (b) building and grounds, and (c) sporting events.

While limited in number, there have been studies focusing on the role of the assistant principal and the changes that have transpired over the years. The first nationwide research study of the assistant principal was conducted by the National Association of Elementary School principals (2003) in 1923. Data were collected regarding the characteristics of assistant principals along with other information such as experience, training, financial status, and other

demographic variables. In a 1946 study, researchers discovered slight increases in the amount of responsibility assistant principals were given. The duties included attendance, scheduling of school activities, discipline, public relations, and supervision of teachers (Brottman, 1981). In a 1957 investigation, research revealed additional changes to the role of the assistant principal. The results indicated opportunities for the assistant principal to assume the principal position in his or her absence, supervising extra-curricular activities, scheduling, discipline, and maintaining teacher and student relationships (Brottman, 1981).

In 1965, Congress passed the (ESEA), designed to provide basic grants to local districts for the education of children from low-income families. As a result, these programs required the principal to refocus direction in order to determine eligibility and create programs to meet the mandates of these laws. Major amendments to ESEA took place in 1974 and 1978, which added a considerable number of categorical programs. Again the principal had the responsibility to integrate these into his/her school (Blome & James, 1985).

In 1973, the assistant principal's duties included discipline, teacher evaluations, attendance, curriculum, and community relations (Brottman, 1981). Matthews and Crow (2003) articulated, "The assistant principal position was not even looked upon as a significant position in educational administration until the early 1970s" (p. 19). Subsequently, in 1980 the National Association of Secondary Principals created a job description for assistant principals.

The responsibilities were divided into five major areas: administration, teaching personnel, student personnel, curriculum, and external relations. Administrative tasks included activities such as serving for the principal in his/her absence, following school district policies, assisting in preparing the budget, preparing the school calendar and performing other

management duties. As for teacher personnel, assistant principals conducted evaluations of teachers and developed teacher handbooks. In terms of student personnel, assistant principals were responsible for discipline, guidance, supervision, and visibility. With respect to curriculum, emphasis was placed on administration of testing and schedules. In the area of external relations, assistant principals work with community agencies and parents regarding educational issues (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1991).

Also in 1980, The Assistant Principal Commission developed five major areas of responsibility: students, administrative, staff, curriculum, and community (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1991). Later, the NASSP (1991) conducted another survey in which participants were asked to identify the top 10 duties assigned to them by their building principals (Frazier, 2002). The following lists the results:

1. Student discipline
2. Teacher evaluation
3. Student attendance
4. School policies
5. Special arrangements for opening and closing school
6. Master schedule
7. Emergency arrangements
8. Instructional methods
9. School-related building use
10. New student orientation programs

Researchers have also established basic parameters surrounding the roles and responsibilities of assistant principals. Marshall (1992) stated,

Assistant principals do many of the same tasks as principals. A majority of their time is spent dealing with issues of school management, student activities and services, community relations, personnel, and curriculum and instruction. However, they lack the position, power, and status of the principal and remain dependent on the principal, who usually delineates their specific tasks and responsibilities .(pp. 3-4)

Pressley & Block (2002) claimed the role of the assistant principal can be categorized into five basic areas: discipline, curriculum, teacher evaluations, supervision of extra-curricular activities, and management of daily administrative activities such as attendance, textbooks, and student activities.

Outside the United States, within the Australian educational context, Harvey (1995) argued that the position and role of deputy principal, that is the assistant principal, has been a wasted educational resource in education systems. He displays a rather gloomy picture of the traditional role, seeing it centering:

on a mosaic of administrative routines which contribute to the maintenance of organizational stability in the school. The work of the deputy principals is largely defined by the needs of other school participants. This includes supporting the principals and the teachers, as well as providing for the welfare and maintaining the standard of behavior of students. Deputy principals have not been given responsibility for the curriculum and for leadership in the teaching-learning process. Traditionally they have had little autonomy in the responsibilities they perform and have not been the initiators of school level change. They lack opportunities for self-expression and their contribution to maintaining the administrative routines of the school has become taken for granted. (p.7)

Likewise, Hartzell (1993) pointed out the preoccupation of assistant principals with the maintenance and effectiveness of present operations in that they have fewer opportunities to practice educational leadership. And according to Gowanda (1991, p. 273) the underlying skills which "if not utilized, are most likely to be lost."

Gender and the Assistant Principalship

Women do not attain assistant principalships as readily as White males. Hooley's work (1997) reflected the failure to promote minority females among secondary assistant principals who worked in North Carolina between 1982 and 1992. Males, White and non-White, and White female assistants were all promoted at 61% or better, but non-White females during the same period were promoted only at a 38% rate. This implies that equity has not been accomplished, and the assistant principalship remains a crucial position for effecting equity.

Reviews of the literature on women in school administration have found consistent patterns in favor of women (Bell & Chase, 1989; Marshall, 1989; Mitchell, 1987; Ortiz & Marshall, 1988; Shakeshaft, 1987;): women exert more positive efforts on instructional supervision.

1. Women produce more positive interactions with community and staff.
2. Women's administrative styles tend to be more democratic, inclusive, and conflict-reducing.
3. Female secondary principals engage in more cooperative planning.
4. Female elementary principals observe teachers more frequently.
5. Female superintendents tour the school more.
6. Female principals and superintendents spend more time in the classroom and in discussions with teachers about instruction and academic content

Instructional Leadership

Historically, instructional leadership resulted from the determination that individuals in any organization need a vision to follow (Lezotte, 1994). The traditional

perspective of instructional leadership values principal knowledge and focuses instructional relationships in the school on a hierarchical principal teacher dyad. Originally, administrators qualified as instructional leaders by setting clear goals, allocating resources to instruction, managing the curriculum, monitoring lesson plans and evaluating teachers (Lashway, 2002).

Today instructional leadership remains a dominant theme, but how it is defined is far richer and expansive than in the past. Research has indicated that individuals tend to work best when they can share in and believe in the vision of the organization for which they work (Lezotte, 1994; Zenz, Schacht, Clift, & Thurston, 1993). In New York City's District Two the school has adopted a comprehensive approach that weaves learning into the fabric of the organization. Central office engages principals in dialogue and reflective analysis of intensive, learning and teaching through monthly conferences, support groups, peer observation and periodic "walk through" (Fink & Resnick, 1999).

Deborah King (2002) claims the definition of Instructional leadership has manifested into the "core technology" of teaching and learning, which involves deeper involvement in professional development and the use of data to make decisions. The paradigm has shifted from teaching to learning, and some prefer the term "learning leader" over "instructional leader" (DuFour, 2003).

The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSSP, 2001) conceptualizes instructional leadership as "leading learning communities." NASESP believes instructional leaders have six roles:

1. Making student and adult learning a priority,
2. Setting high expectations for performance,
3. Gearing content and instruction to standards,

4. Creating a culture of continuous learning for adults,
5. Using multiple sources of data to assess learning,
6. Activating the community's support for school success.

The widely accepted view of excellence in educational leadership calls for administrators to serve as instructional leaders rather than as building managers (Griffiths, Stout, & Forsyth, 1987). Current research upholds that instructional leadership is not limited to the principal or to the department chairperson; the assistant principal can assume instructional leadership duties. Polite & Davis (2004) found that rigorous academic focus was missing in midwestern high schools. Polite believes school administration needs to shift toward a focus on instruction instead of on building management (2004).

Instructional Leadership and Student Achievement

Three different kinds of research explain the effects of school leadership on student learning. One type of research about the leadership's effects is a large-scale quantitative studies. Hallinger and Heck's (1995) analysis concluded that leadership explains three to five percent of the variation in student learning across schools. Although this is small, it is significant in that it is about one quarter of the total variation explained by all school level variables. Hill's (1998) research clarified the magnitude of the effect of leadership by finding that classroom factors explain only a slightly larger proportion of the variation of student achievement.

Cotton (2003) identified 25 categories of principal behavior that positively affect the dependent variables of student achievement, student attitudes, student behavior, teacher

attitudes, teacher behaviors, and dropout rates. The findings of her narrative review that principal leadership does have an effect on student outcomes. Cotton explains:

In general, these researchers find that, while a small portion of the effect maybe direct-that is, principals' direct interactions with students in or out of the classroom may be motivating, inspiring, instructive, or otherwise influential-most of it is indirect, that is mediated through teachers and others. (p. 58)

Marzano, et al. (2005) expanded this type of research through a quantitative meta-analysis. Their study distinguishes 21 leadership "responsibilities" and calculates an average correlation between each responsibility and whatever measures of student achievement were used in the original studies. The researchers' data analysis revealed a 10 % increase in student test scores of an average principal who improved his/her "demonstrated abilities in all of 21 responsibilities by one standard deviation" (p.3).

Standards-based Context for Instructional Leadership

When principals and assistant principals were asked to rank information and attributes that they believed to be important for the assistant principal job, many of them shared common beliefs and opinions of what the roles and responsibilities should be, and most of those included many different facets of instructional leadership (Thompson & Jones, 1997). Those surveyed by Thompson and Jones (1997) all agreed that the job of assistant principal was an important one, but yet there are basically no standards for instructional leadership that have been set out specifically for this job category. While there have been standards for teachers, only several years ago did ISSLC developed standards for school leadership. Also, The National Council for

Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) aligned its accreditation standards for leadership training programs with ISLLC (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2002).

A study of assistant principals and what they do was not conducted nationally until 1970, even though the job had been around much longer than that (Glanz, 1994^a). The role of the assistant principal, however, has only been recently recognized as being expanded enough to include instructional leadership (Glanz, 1994^b).

Concerns still abound as to whether assistant principals are being used to their full potential (Glanz, 1994). Therefore, assistant principals should not be bound by a large number of administrative duties. The responsibilities of an assistant principal include more than discipline of students and supervision of the school environment. The position includes problem -solving situations as well as a variety of activities that vary from day to day. The career offers great challenges and rewarding opportunities to those that choose to enter the profession (Simpson, 2000). Thus, expanding the leadership duties would go a long way toward school reform and toward making the assistant principal a truly effective instructional leader.

The Reformed Role of the Assistant Principal

Assistant principals are not typically seen as building level instructional leader. The pressure for increased school accountability could cause the principal and assistant principal to develop new relationships, requiring greater sharing of instructional leadership activities (Elmore, 2005). Stein and D'Amico (2000) address the extent to which the principal is directly involved in curriculum, instruction and assessment. These researchers note that knowledge of subject matter and pedagogy should be as important to administrators as it is to teachers. Spady (1985)

emphasizes the potential for the influence of assistant principals as agents of change. He asserts that assistant principals could play key roles in the implementation of serious restructuring initiatives.

Spady (1985) proposes that assistant principals must make the shift toward proactive instructional planning and implement the paradigm shift from time-based to out-come based model of instructional delivery. Despite the circumstance of limited opportunity, Harvey (1995) has found evidence to suggest that assistant principals themselves are demanding a greater involvement in instructional leadership and management of school level change (p.16). Research, although 20 years old now, reported that assistant principals desired a “greater sense of shared responsibility with the principal in regard to all administrative functions” (Gorton & Kattman, 1985, p. 39).

Others regarded the assistant principal role in terms of the relationship between the assistant principal and the principal (Golanda, 1991; Michael, et al., 1993; Ogilvie, 1977, Panyako and Rories, 1987). Golanda (1991) argued that essentially supportive and complementary role of the assistant principal to the principal in conjunction with the already traditionally assigned and delegated responsibilities determined by the principal insufficiently prepared and equipped the assistant principal for the role of principalship. Notably, when the ideal does not meet the actual, higher levels of “alienation” result (Hartzell, 1993, p.717).

Still when one considers dated views of the role of the assistant principal, there are strong indications that the role should be both broad and complex, embracing

“all aspects of school management, ranging from financial accounting, school law, and educational and psychological measurement, to staff supervision and evaluation, and effective communication with students, parents and general public...must also deal with

matters relating to curriculum design and implementation, vocational guidance, and assessment of the unique educational needs of students” (Panyako & Rorie, 1987 p.).

Toth (1996) stated that restructuring the assistant principal’s role should focus on instructional leadership, supervision of employees, assisting the principal and teachers, encouraging collegiality, leading on-the-job training, fostering excellence in education, public relations, promoting positive student interactions, supporting learning, promoting a quality curriculum, modeling high expectations, and creating a positive learning environment.

The assistant principal plays an important role in the lives of the students, faculty, and staff. The assistant principalship offers great challenges and rewarding opportunities for new administrators (Simpson, 2000).

An assistant principal is responsible for the following (Simpson, 2000):

1. Creating a positive and safe teaching/learning environment in a school through the use of well-thought-out- policies and procedures that, when effectively implemented, can assist students, teachers, and parents to achieve success.
2. Assisting all staff and support staff members to deal with the many personal, political, and educational challenges and changes thrust upon them. Work closely with them and keep them well informed. Encourage them to share in developing solutions to problems and participate in your decision-making processes.
3. Dealing with the multitude of problems that involve students, their families, and teachers, class-by-class, hour-by-hour, minute by minute, in the course of a normal school day and reacting quickly and responsibly in emergency situations.
4. Assisting staff in the creation and implementation of an effective curriculum.
5. Designing a well-balanced master schedule of school timetable that can be critical to the delivery of the curriculum. This involves using the individual strengths of each staff member in a manner that best serves your students. (pp.3-4)

School Reform

Dissatisfaction with schooling in America is not a new phenomenon. Literature of the 1950s suggested American schools were “soft” and a “tougher” American education was needed (Selznick, 1957). Consequently, reform followed and the next ten years became known as the ‘Schooling Decade’ (Goodlad, 1976). After the “Schooling Decade” reports emerged that suggested that schools did not make much of a difference: the critical factor in student achievement was the home environment. By the 1980s, studies on school effectiveness and success gained ground and the demand for student achievement in the nation’s public schools increased (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Edmonds, 1979; Goodlad, 1983; Lipham, 1981).

Accountability is of great consequence in school reform. In *A Nation at Risk, The Imperative for Education Reform* (1983), the National Commission highlighted the large imbalance of American trade in international markets. The Commission attributed the economic loss, the sales of American products in the world economy, to the deficiencies in American education. Consequently, further development of the concept of accountability emerged. In 1992, *America 2000*, a school reform initiative, called for both national goals and national tests, which set goals and standards for all students (NASSP, 2001). Demand for increased student achievement has emanated from all sides, public and private sectors as well as federal and state levels of government.

Since the 1990’s the federal government’s role in reform is more clearly defined. The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 has shifted focus from the distribution of inputs to outputs, generally as measured by standardized student test scores (NAESP, 2003).

The differences in school reform, however, all depend on one specific thing – the

capacities and abilities of the school leadership to improve student achievement. There have been various studies done regarding the improvement of school districts and school reform (Cawelti & Protheroe, 2001; LaRocque & Coleman, 1990; Murphy & Hallinger, 1988; Togneri & Anderson, 2003). These studies provide much insight into the actions and policies for school reform that have taken place on the district level, but they do not address this issue from a leadership theory perspective.

In the American high school reform movement, leadership must include the entire staff, student body and community (NASSP, 2004). Developing this leadership strategy requires a sound philosophy, one in which the school is a community of learners and the key to leading the continuous improvement. Once this is in place, structural systems can be designed to allow leadership to emerge from organizational sources (Elmore, 2004). Researchers provide some discussion of what should be done where school reform on the district level is concerned; however, this area still is being researched.

Distributive Leadership Theory

The nature and impact of distributive leadership has become the object of recent research, although the concept dates back to the 1930s (Gronn, 2002). A distinguishing factor of distributed leadership is that the interdependence between two or more organizational members may be based on role overlap or complimentary of skills and knowledge (Gronn, 2002). Resnick and Glennan (2002) highlight the importance of mutual or two-way accountability between leaders in different roles and levels of an organization.

Distributed leadership is distinctive in that that leadership influence is exercised through

actions and tasks to accomplish functions for the organization (Spillane et al. 2000). Thus, distributed leadership increases the opportunities for the organization to benefit from the capacities of more of its members. Elmore (2000) describes this as comparative advantage, where individuals in different positions within and organization contribute to leadership functions in areas of organizational activity over which they have the greatest influence.

While distributed leadership has roots in earlier concepts such as “shared decision making,” current definitions go beyond simply reshuffling duties. The new concept calls for a fundamental shift in organizational thinking that redefines leadership as the responsibility of every one in the school. However, the terms distributed and shared leadership tends to be used interchangeably.

Yukl (2002) outlines the basic notion of distributed leadership as:

An alternative perspective [to the heroic single leader], that is slowly gaining more adherents, is to define leadership as a shared process of enhancing the individual and collective capacity of people to accomplish their work effectively...Instead of a heroic leader who can perform all essential leadership functions, the functions are distributed among different members of the team or organization (p. 432).

There are distinctive elements about the concept of distributed leadership, however within the approaches significant differences can be identified. Bennett, Wise, Woods and Harvey (2003) put forward three distinctive elements of the concept of distributed leadership. First, distributed leadership emphasizes leadership as an “emergent property of a group or network of interacting individuals” (Bennett, et al., 2003, p. 7). Gonn’s (2002) research provides meaning to this notion of distributed leadership, namely “concertive action” (p. 3). Concertive action is about the dynamic, which results when people work together in such a way that when they pool their expertise, the outcome is a product which is greater than the sum of their individual actions.

Second, distributed leadership proposes “openness of the boundaries of leadership” (Bennett, et al., 2003, p. 7). This suggests empowering more individuals to take on leadership roles with the school. Third, distributed leadership necessitates the view that “varieties of expertise are distributed across the many, not the few” (Bennett, Wise, Woods and Harvey, 2003, p. 7). This idea is that germane perspectives and capabilities can be discovered in individuals spread though the organization.

Distributed leadership can be viewed as an analytical orientation to leadership. Thus, it calls for many schools to make new choices and priorities in relation to its operation. For this reason, it is important to distinguish the variable features of distributed leadership. A major variable is control and autonomy. Certain goals or values may be set by higher levels in the hierarchy and may be seen as non-negotiable (Gratz, 2000). This contrasts with the degree of autonomy for those who contribute to leadership and their ability to alter values and goals (Keyes et al. 1999).

Also, some approaches to distributed leadership concentrate on organizational structuring of leadership. Considerable attention and analysis in this area is from James Spillane and colleagues. These researchers describe distributive leadership as a form of collective agency incorporating the activities of many individuals in a school who work at mobilizing and guiding other teachers in the process of instructional change (Harris & Chapman, 2002; Spillane, 2000). This perspective on leadership allows for the examination of how social interaction and situation simultaneously constitute leadership practice. The notion of team development among members of administration in secondary schools will be investigated to determine if this is directly related to the responsibilities of the assistant principal. Understanding how leaders in a school work

together, as well as separately, execute leadership functions and tasks is an important aspect of the social distribution of leadership practice.

Social and cultural context has a significant effect on how far distributed leadership can be achieved in a directive, hierarchical organization (Bryant, 2003; Kets de Vries, 1999; Knight & Trowler, 2001). For example, a culture that values commitment to truth and inquiry (Ayas & Zenuik, 2001) and trust (Absug & Phelps, 1998) are important components in creating and sustaining the conditions for distributed leadership.

Two national organizations, The National Association of Headteachers in England and the National College for School Leadership funded research to identify and examine successful leadership practice in schools. In 2000, Day, et al, conducted research on successful leadership practice in schools in England. The findings revealed that although principals were at different stages in their careers, of different ages, had different experiences and were working in very different situations, their approaches to leadership were remarkably similar. The evidence from this study pointed towards a form of leadership that was distributed through collaborative and joint working.

The second study of successful school leadership also investigated leadership practice within a group of 10 schools facing challenging circumstances. In all 10 schools, the research found that distributed approaches to leadership prevailed and directly influenced approaches to problem solving and decision-making. Their approach to leadership was not one of “delegated headship” where unwanted tasks are handed down to others (Harris & Chapman, 2002). Rather, they distributed leadership activity through redistribution of power within the organization by giving others responsibility for major and important development tasks.

A powerful argument for considering distributed leadership concerns the fact that existing theories and models of leadership, which have been primarily concerned with the skills, abilities and capabilities of one person, has been shown to be limited in generating and sustaining school and classroom level change, (Fullan, 2001). Elmore (2000) advocates for distributed leadership in generating reform and instructional improvement. Elmore argues that creating unity and not micromanaging instruction is the principal's core responsibility.

While there is considerable theory about distributed leadership, the research base for distributed leadership is embryonic. There is a clear need for more exploration of practice and consequence within schools. There is very little empirical knowledge about how, or to what extent, principals actually use it. Empirical research is important because while distributed leadership tends to be seen as normatively a good thing, it has also been contested (Gronn, 2000; Gunther, 2002; Lakomski, 2002; Robinson, 2001; Wallace, 2001), most notably because of the complexities of who does the distribution, who is in receipt of distribution, and what does it look like within the realities of site-based performance management (Gunter & Ribbins, 2003, p. 132).

Consequently, one of the biggest barriers to distributed leadership is with multiple leaders and role ambiguity. The literature also points towards top-down management structures in schools as the main impediment to the development of distributed leadership. This takes a paradigm shift to look at school and district leadership. Wasley (1991) asserts that staff needs to be involved in the process of deciding on what roles they wish to take on and must then feel supported in doing so.

Assistant Principal as a Partner in the Administrative Team

Leadership as a function of teamwork is one of the prevailing organizing themes in *Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution* (NASSP, 1996). Comprehensive reform requires secondary principals to pursue a more collaborative and shared leadership style. One of the four recommendations states:

The leadership of students, parents, and others in the school community will enhance the work of the principal, who should recognize this potential for leadership by nurturing and supporting it. (p.)

Again the concept of teamwork is reinforced in *Breaking Ranks II* (NASSP, 2004), "Reform driven solely by the principal is not only less likely to succeed, but also less likely to provide long-term results". (p. 21)

Today's high school principal must have the skill and knowledge to develop leadership skills in others (Alvoid, 1999). Developing the skills necessary to facilitate school improvement requires an understanding of the leadership team's own strengths and weaknesses, including the challenges associated with various leadership styles.

Organizational Development

Leadership styles and behaviors, however, are most often shaped and framed through the existence of organizational culture and the influence that it has on behavior (Ammeter, Douglas, Gardner, Hochwarter, & Ferris, 2002).

Understanding the impact of human organizations on leadership styles and behaviors is exceedingly complex. Social psychologists have provided models for understanding, describing and explaining organizations.

Open systems theory allows one to see and order the complexity of variables and interrelationships. Simply stated, the assumptions linking the levels of analysis are the following: (a) Individuals are linked to organizations by the roles they play. Their participation is maintained through the satisfaction of individual needs through participating. (b) The roles performed are specifically task designed and task accomplishing for the organization. (c) Organizational roles are primarily determined by the task the organization performs for society. (d) Organizations are linked to society by the performance of these tasks and by the dependence upon society for the necessary facilities (Katz & Khan, 1966).

Hartzell (1993) suggests three reasons for these differences in the leadership experience within the levels of the organizational hierarchy: (a) the individual's position in the administrative hierarchy; (b) the different responsibilities at each level of the hierarchy, and (c) the perception of the individual by subordinates. He claims that these differences make the leadership experiences unique at each level. Furthermore, it would be beneficial to the understanding of educational leadership if researchers explore the effects of these differences on administrative performance (Hartzell, 1993).

Role Theory

Role theory is particularly appropriate to use as a theoretical lens, as it offers a mechanism to model the impacts of the differences on outcomes in relationships. Moreover, this approach implies that each individual influences the other to conform to its view of the role. Often, there is disagreement with respect to what the focal person should do, and the role is usually shaped by a matrix of organizational influences (Katz & Khan, 1966).

Role conflict in work situations is widespread. Role conflict has been characterized into two types: intersender and intrasender (Katz & Kahn, 1966). Intesender role conflict can occur when workers perceive that two different sources are generating incompatible demands or expectation. Intrasender role conflict can arise when workers perceive conflicting demands from the same source. Overload is frequently created by excessive time pressures, where stress increases as a deadline approaches and then rapidly subsides. Underload is the result of an insufficient quantity, or an inadequate variety of work. Both overload and underload can result in low self-esteem and stress-related symptoms; however, underload has also been associated with passivity and general feelings of apathy (Katz & Kahn, 1966).

Various researchers have located different examples of leaders that work within the same objective context but demonstrate many different levels of both transactional and transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Bass, Avolio, & Goodheim, 1987; Hater & Bass, 1988; Howell & Higgins, 1990; Popper & Zakkai, 1994). From this, it is quite clear that the objective organizational context has a strong influence on the behavior of a leader. However, some researchers have also argued that many of the interpretations of the context in which leaders work shape their behavior (Ferris, et al., 1996). In that case, role theory set out by Merton (1957) can be extremely helpful in looking at how various managers and other leaders perceive the context of their leadership in creating their expectations for the role. Also, role theory can help to further the understanding and use of either transactional or transformational leadership behaviors.

There are a number of concepts related to roles that are often examined including role expectations, role sets, sent role, role forces, role pressures, and role behavior (Kahn, Wolfe,

Quinn, & Snoek, 1964). Even though the work done by Kahn et al. (1964) looks primarily at individuals within an organization, role senders, the work done by Stewart (1967, 1976, 1982) creates a model between demands, constraints, and choices. Stewart indicates the characteristics involved within the organization are influential as role senders as well. As described by Yukl (1989), the constraints and demands are limiting in the short-term context. However, the choice that a leader makes in the long run gives him/her many opportunities to eliminate some of the constraints that they have and modify the demands of his/her role.

Yukl (2002) also indicated that the constraints and the demands will be different between different people, even within the same type of job, since the perceptions of the person holding the job will be different and this has a stronger effect on an individual than the objective characteristics of that particular job. In referencing role expectations as being sent, researchers have referred to various members within a role set as being potential role senders and to the expectations that they communicate to others as the sent role (Rommetveit, 1954).

Restructuring and Leadership Roles

Restructuring occurs when the public is disenchanted with schools. Barnett and Witraker (1996) articulated, "Reform periods in education are typically times when concerns about the state of the society or the economy spill over into demands that schools set things straight" (p. 174). While schools are usually the front line when it comes to societal concerns, effective school leaders know that effective restructuring comes from within and not from external forces. Barnett and Whitaker (1996) also point out that there are features of restructuring that have more depth and the following premise:

Restructuring, ideally, alters the patterns of rules, roles, relationships, and results in and around schools so that they will be consistent with what people believe should happen with students. Although beliefs about the components of student success certainly vary, a theme common to many reform proposals includes a vision of all students becoming active, responsible, life-long learners. (p.3)

In some instances, restructuring involves becoming an instructional leader.

Administrators are expected to be instructional leaders of a school. Most of the public assumes that this is occurring on a daily basis. Albeit, administrators know that the majority of the day is spent on competing other duties. "Instructional leaders model and maintain a focus on improving teaching and learning by helping teachers improve their instructional practices and by making student achievement the highest priority" (King, 2002, p. 63)

Research on Assistant Principals

An investigation of current literature indicates that the role of assistant principals is undergoing change. A secondary education study by Smith (1987) surveyed district principals, directors of secondary education and district superintendents in Washington State. A two-part questionnaire was used for data collection. Part I consisted of demographic information and Part II was a Likert-type instrument with 37 questions indicating the degree to which assistant principals were involved in various duties and responsibilities, and to what degree the assistant principal should be involved in the duties and responsibilities. The profile of secondary assistant principal in this study revealed that 90% had master's degrees, 80% or more were White, more than 70% were males, more than 50% between the ages of 35 and 42, and more than 50% used the title of assistant principal. Most assistant principals viewed the principalship as a career goal. Superiors of assistant principals felt that assistant principals should have a greater involvement in

the area of instructional leadership. The second area of need for increased involvement was professional development.

Another education study conducted by Worner and Stokes on the East Coast (1987) surveyed more than 200 high school principals. The purpose of the study was to determine if the function of instructional leadership was being carried out in secondary schools in West Virginia, and if instructional was being performed, and by whom. The survey contained a list of 38 instructional leadership activities. The results indicated that 80% of the schools assistant principals carried out instructional activities. Coordinating and supervising student assemblies were one area in which the assistant principal was assigned the greatest responsibility. The second highest area was observing instructional techniques in the classroom. The assistant principals in larger schools were assigned a greater proportion of responsibilities than assistant principals in smaller high schools. Lastly, the principals were asked to rank the five most important activities. The three that most frequently occurred were formulating schools goals, participating in the recruitment and the selection of all instructional personnel, and visiting classrooms to observe instructional techniques. The researchers clearly stated that instructional leadership was a shared responsibility between principals and assistant principals.

Brown's study on the roles of Georgia high school assistant principals aimed to determine if ambiguity existed between the perceptions of the role as viewed by the assistant principals and principals (Celikten, 2001). The majority of assistant principals listed their major area as discipline. Only 21 assistant principals listed curriculum as their major area and 31 listed instruction as their major responsibility. Over half of the assistant principals listed principalship as

their career goal and the average level of job satisfaction was low for assistant principals (Celikten, 2001).

In 1991 NASSP reported on the role of the assistant principal and described roles that were assigned through job descriptions, contracts, organizational structure, directions from superiors, mentors, and personnel evaluations, expected through tradition, training programs, media, interactions with constituents (faculty, staff, colleagues, parents, and students) and assumed which the assistant principal chooses to complement and expand upon the assigned and expected role and ones that provides opportunity for more active leadership roles (p. 1).

It can be debated that the former two categories can be ill defined, restrictive and perpetuate a dissonance between the role of the principal and assistant principal. This situation may also result in a lack of alignment among the assigned, expected, and assumed roles that might be developed and based on a strategic and collaborative view of leadership.

Martin (1997) surveyed principals and assistant principals in the Baltimore County Public Schools in Maryland, using the Assistant Principals as Instructional Leader Questionnaire. Survey results coupled with selected interviews revealed principals and assistant principals held similar beliefs:

1. Assistant principals should spend more time on instructional duties.
2. Lack of time appeared to be the major impediment to why assistant principals were not able to be more involved in instruction.
3. Raising student achievement requires more direct involvement by school's leadership, specifically the assistant principal.

4. Assessing other personnel for non-instructional responsibilities would provide needed opportunities for assistant principals to function as instructional leaders (p.10)

Consequently, because of the limited opportunities for assistant principals to develop as instructional leaders, others have questioned the adequacy of the position as an effective preparation for the principalship and higher administrative positions (Austin & Brown, 1970; Kelly, 1987; Marshall, 1985).

David and Sylvia Weller surveyed 100 assistant principals from rural, urban and suburban school districts to basically find out what they do. The findings remained consistent with other sources discussed in that the primary responsibilities were discipline and attendance. In fact, 77% responded that these were the two primary job assignments (Weller & Weller, 2002). In the study assistant principals were asked to list other duties that were not in their job description or possibly assigned by the principal. The following data were collected:

1. Supervision of students-98%
2. Complete routine reports, enforce policy, and write grant proposals-92%
3. Participate in the selection of teachers, department heads, and assistant principals-87%
4. Evaluate teacher and staff personnel performance and provide remedial assistance-78%
5. Coordinate and/or conduct staff development programs and mentoring or peer tutoring programs-62%
6. Develop the school's master schedule-57%
7. Coordinate and place student teachers and paraprofessionals-52%
8. Prepare the school's budget-7%
9. Act as the school's liaison to community and civic organizations-5% (Weller & Weller, 2002, p. 12).

Assigned vs. Desired Duties of the Assistant Principal

According to Marshall (1992) some assistant principals are raising new questions about how they spend their time and what the job itself entails and produces. Each assistant principal likely has a different perspective of the duties that he or she has to work with each day (Lashway, 2003; Merrill, 2001). It is difficult, therefore, to indicate specifically what kind of perspective an assistant principal has when it comes to these duties. Yet, it can be generally assumed that those that work in this capacity are pleased with the changes that have been made to their positions, which will be discussed in the following section.

Those that work as assistant principals are often seen to be out of the spotlight (Merrill, 2001). They have traditionally been behind the scenes doing the work that others did not or would not do. Their original perspective of the job involved the idea that they played a very secondary role – not just to the principal of the school, but to others in administrative roles as well. They seemed to be likened to the vice president, a person with a very important job, though no one really understands what that job is and that jobholder is not heard from or seen very much.

Assistant principals want a definition of the role (Richard, 2000). Subsequently, this growing concern has resulted in more national and state organizations offering workshops and seminars focusing specifically on the tasks of assistant principals (Richard, 2000).

The traditional perspective of the assistant principalship, however, is changing due to the fact that the job itself is changing in many ways (Merrill, 2001). This is very important for education reform, since the work that the assistant principal does is more important and significant than many individuals realize. It has only been recently that this significance has come

to light, and the perspective of the assistant principal has changed with it. This is due to the fact that individuals that work in this capacity are realizing more freedom and more inclusion than they have seen in the past in many schools throughout the country (Merrill, 2001).

Perspectives of assistant principals will likely continue to change as their jobs also change and the evolution of the position will continue (Merrill, 2001). Instructional leadership will help to move this evolution along and make it somewhat faster for those that work as assistant principals throughout the country.

Others who are considering this line of work might also be more likely to take a job in this field if they are aware of the changes that are taking place and the idea that they will be able to do more with their jobs in the future (Merrill, 2001). The tables below indicate what the assistant principals in the study conducted by Glanz (1994) spend most of their time doing and how important they feel that all of these things are.

Table 1

Actual Duties of Assistant Principals: Rankings and Percentages

Duties	Rank	%
Student discipline	1	94
Lunch duty	2	95
School scheduling (coverages) ^a	3	91
Ordering textbooks	4	93
Parental conferences	5	91
Assemblies	6	91
Administrative duties	7	91
Articulation ^b	8	90
Evaluation of teachers	9	83
Student attendance	10	71
Emergency arrangements	11	63
Instructional media services	12	54
Counseling pupils	13	46
School clubs, etc.	14	41
Assisting PTA	15	35
Formulating goals	16	32
Staff development (in service)	17	27
Faculty meetings	18	24
Teacher training	19	24

Table I (continued)

Duties	Rank	%
Instructional leadership	20	23
Public relations	21	9
Curriculum development	22	7
Innovations and research	23	5
School budgeting	24	3
Teacher selection	25	1

Note. ^aCoverages refers to scheduling substitute teachers.

^b Articulation refers to the administrative and logistical duties required to prepare students for graduation (e.g., preparing and sending cumulative records of graduating fifth graders to middle school).

Source: Glanz, 1994^b.

Table 2

Assistant Principals' Rankings of Their Duties for Degree of Importance

Duties	Rank	%
Teacher training	1	93
Staff development (in-service)	2	92
Curriculum development	3	91
Evaluation of teachers	4	90
Instructional leadership	5	90
Formulating goals	6	86
Innovations and research	7	83
Parental conferences	8	82
Articulation ^a	9	82
School scheduling (coverages ^b)	10	81
Emergency arrangements	11	80
Assemblies	12	80
Administrative duties (paperwork)	13	76
Instructional media services	14	68
Counseling pupils	15	61
Faculty meetings	16	55
Ordering textbooks	17	51
School clubs, etc.	18	45

Table 2 (continued)

Duties	Rank	%
Assisting PTA	19	39
Student attendance	20	34
Student discipline	21	31
Lunch duty	22	25
Public relations	23	21
School budgeting	24	11
Teacher selection	25	9

Note. ^aArticulation refers to the administrative and logistical duties required to prepare

students for graduation (e.g., preparing and sending cumulative records of graduating fifth graders to middle school).

^bCoverages refers to scheduling substitute teachers.

Source: Glanz, 1994^b.

As can be seen from the tables above, assistant principals have many different duties, and while they see the training of staff and the development of teachers as being their most important duties, they actually spend the majority of their time on issues such as lunchroom duty and the maintaining of student discipline. This suggests that school reform might want to include some changes to the position of principal and assistant principal to include responsibilities into the nature of school leadership instead of focusing too much of his or her attention on some of the tasks that could be shared. Elmore (2000) recommends that principals should “rely more heavily on face-to-face relationships than on bureaucratic routines” (p.32).

According to Sergiovanni (2001) when school administrators are asked to report how they would like to spend time at work, they often respond differently than when reporting their assigned tasks and the time spent on these tasks. Moreover, the assigned tasks are often at variance with what experts describe as the desired task and time. Clearly, a gap exists between the assigned and desired images of the assistant principalship (Sergiovanni, 2001).

Norton & Kriekard's (1987) study of 263 secondary assistant principals across six states validated the ideal competencies versus actual competencies performed by assistant principals. Six major areas were selected. These include school management, personnel, community relations, student activities, curriculum and instruction, and pupil issues. The results indicated that assistant secondary school principals viewed "every competency as below the level that ideally would make the position more effective" (p.29). The researchers saw implications of this lack of congruence for training and in-service development (Kriekard & Norton, 1987).

In short, the lack of training, the misconception of the position and the real and perceived lack of authority contributes to the assistant principal's sense of powerlessness and alienation. Harvey's (1995) research on primary assistant principals revealed a lack of positive identity contributed to by unrealistic expectations of being a member of a the team, the effect of which is compounded by a lack of control over work duties, insufficient recognition, limited resources and opportunities, and unfulfilled expectations.

Changes in the Position of the Assistant Principal

The position of assistant principal has gone through many changes throughout the years. The most striking change has been in the way that the assistant principal is viewed by others in

the administration. Originally, the assistant principal had little power and could do very little when it came to decisions that were made at the school (Fink, 2003).

That is not to say that the assistant principal had no power at all, but only that he or she was relegated to a role that was not in the spotlight and did not allow for much ability to make changes or be included in the decisions that were made (Fink, 2003). This was not that uncommon during the early days of the position; however, because most of the administrative positions in schools were subservient to the principal and the school district.

When the growing complexity of schools as organizations as well as the growing workload of public secondary school principals “requires the establishment of an administrative team for the effective management of all aspects of school operations” (Harvey, 1995, p. 16) with an emphasis on new professional relationships and responsibilities and a greater sense of shared decision making and instructional leadership. Harvey (1995, p. 21) attempted to reconceptualize the emergent role of the assistant principal in response to the changes occurring in schools. Harvey’s reconceptualization of the assistant principal embraces both leadership and management roles. He saw it involving:

1. Prioritizing competing demands and a coherence of purpose;
2. Redefining the role to encourage professional growth;
3. Sharing responsibilities for significant aspects of school operations;
4. Involvement in educational and curriculum leadership and management;
5. Accepting responsibility for change;
6. Adopting a critical perspective to scrutinizing new guidelines and policies;
7. Being involved in organizational and instructional effectiveness, and,

8. Selecting the concept and paradigm of leadership to base practice

Harvey's emerging role as delineated above has the potential to reframe the relationship between the assistant principal and principal.

In light of the aforementioned changes, the leadership paradigm would also need to shift, otherwise in an existing bureaucratic structure dissonance between the role of the principal and assistant principal may occur. According to Hartzell(1993) the "environments are different because principals and assistant principals exist at different levels of the hierarchy, the duties are different, and subordinates perceive principals and assistant principals differently" (p.16).

As a partner on the administrative team, there is much that the assistant principal must do. He or she must be able to work with others, and good communication skills are essential for that (Resnick, 2001). Good communication is not something that many people think of when they talk about what skills are needed. Instead, they seem to focus more on the specific aspects of a certain job, such as computer skills, etc. However, having the communication skills to talk to others properly and work with others to get one's point across appropriately is a much-overlooked and much-needed skill, especially in the education field.

Communication is not the only skill that is needed. The assistant principal must also be a team player (Resnick, 2001). An individual that does not work well with others, both adults and children, will have a hard time in a position such as that of assistant principal, since much of what is needed is to work with others comes from an actual desire to do so. Not everyone has that desire, and those that do not would do better in other occupations. For those that are team players, and for those that love to help others and work with children, however, assistant

principalship is an occupation that offers many important instructional leadership opportunities (Resnick, 2001).

Being a team player is so important to those that work in the capacity of assistant principal, and much of the reason for this is that these individuals are becoming more involved with instructional leadership or distributive leadership, which allows them much more freedom and sees that they are included in the group and the decisions that are made throughout the school regarding many different issues (Resnick, 2001). This has not always been the case, as has been seen by information provided in other sections. However, many schools are becoming interested in instructional leadership today and therefore assistant principals that were not used to this idea must be flexible enough to adapt to the changes that it brings (Resnick, 2001).

One of these changes involves the duties that these assistant principals will engage in. It is very hard to be specific about these duties, since many of them are different based on the school. There are many behind-the-scenes duties that assistant principals used to carry out, which need to be restructured, in order for these individuals to become more visible and accomplish more with the students and the other administrative personnel.

This is a welcome change for many assistant principals that felt their jobs were unrecognized and unappreciated by many individuals, both at the school and in the community of students and parents as well. However, there also may be some assistant principals that were used to doing things the "old way" and therefore will not be completely comfortable when it comes to changing things and working more closely with administration as part of a team. These individuals can likely adapt to the changes that are taking place with distributive leadership, but for those that cannot, retirement or another career will likely be the best option (Resnick, 2001).

Many people resist change, and the distributive or instructional leadership model that some schools are now starting to follow is definitely different from what assistant principals were used to in the past when they were allowed to avoid the spotlight. As has been mentioned, not all of them liked this lack of recognition, but for those that did, the change over to distributive leadership may be more than they are actually prepared to deal with.

*The Relationship Between the Duties of the Assistant Principal
and the Total School Organization*

As has been mentioned, the assistant principal has many duties that he or she did not previously have in total programming of the school. In Armstrong's (2004) dissertation study, she examined duties of 123 secondary assistant principals in the state of Texas and their level of job satisfaction. The findings indicated involvement in every aspect of the school (albeit in some areas the involvement was limited in number), that is from discipline (123, 100 %) to management of assessment data (45, 37.1%), at-risk programming (61, 50.1%), campus decision-making team (22, 17.8%), attendance (31, 25.2%), curriculum development (10, 08.1%), master schedule (12, 09.8%) to keys (5, 04.0%) and student parking (2, 04.0%)

Maintaining a safe and orderly environment continues to be the hallmark of the secondary assistant principal; however, the role has expanded for some to include curriculum and instructional issues, monitoring of student achievement, monitoring and hiring of new teachers and staff development. Armstrong (2004) also analyzed new arrangements of secondary assistant principals time and areas of responsibility. The results revealed that 48(38.4 %) of the assistant principals marked yes to new responsibilities and 75(61.6%) did not indicate any changes in the

role. Of the 48 secondary principals that stated they have rotated duties, 46 rotated duties annually, and 2 rotated duties every 2-3 years. This is possibly indicative of a new trend in defining the time of secondary assistant principal. Marshall's (1992) research discusses role negotiation and job rotation, which are methods for dividing assistant principal's time and areas of responsibility.

This was not the case in the past; duty rotation has changed the way the assistant principal is viewed in the total school organization, from the principal to the teachers, to those that work in maintenance and other departments. (Schacht, 1993). This change is significant, and the duties that the assistant principal has relate very strongly to the school organization as a whole, since the work that the assistant principal does affects not only him or her, but the rest of the school and the school district as well in some cases.

Overview of the Assigned Versus Desired Instructional Leadership Duties of the Assistant Principal

Many of the assigned instructional leadership duties of the assistant principal still do not allow this individual enough freedom to really get to know those that he or she works with and the students that are served at the school (Wise, 2004). This is very significant as it is more strongly desired that the assistant principal be a more open and outgoing individual that the students feel they have access to.

As was seen in a previous section through the use of tables, the assistant principal often must deal with duties that he or she does not see as being that important and therefore does not have as much time for the important issues that really should be dealt with. Since this is the case,

assistant principals' job satisfaction would be assumed to be often not as high as it should be to keep them at their jobs for many years. However, in a study done by Chen, Blendinger, and McGrath (2000), it was found that the job satisfaction of the assistant principals surveyed was actually very high based on intrinsic, extrinsic, and general values.

While there were no statistically significant issues based on the student population and the amount of time worked, it did appear that there was – to some small degree – a higher rate of job satisfaction for those assistant principals that put in the most years on the job (Chen, et al., 2000). In other words, those that worked the longest enjoyed their jobs the most. Whether this was due to the fact that they had settled in and gotten comfortable with what they could and could not do, or whether this was due to changes that they had been able to make during their time working as assistant principals was not known. General enjoyment for assistant principals was found when working with parents, students, and teachers and an interest in avoiding student discipline. Many assistant principals indicated student discipline as their least enjoyable part of their job (Chen et al., 2000).

The Complexity of Measuring the Effect of the Assistant Principals Instructional Leadership Duties

Measuring the effect of instructional leadership is very difficult, due to the instructional leadership functions that are delegated to assistant principals, which may not be significantly correlated with student achievement. For example Champeau's (1998) dissertation study on the delegated instructional leadership functions of the high school principal in Wisconsin high schools found that the functions that were delegated the most frequently were using standardized test results to assess progress. Out of the 25 instructional leadership functions that are least

delegated were establishing school-wide goals, creating a healthy instructional climate that encourages innovation, making programmatic efforts to reward student progress, and providing direction for teachers to eliminate poor instructional practices (Champeau, 1993).

New Directions in the Assistant Principalship

Several authors have argued that the role of assistant principal needs to be restructured to include more instructional leadership and to move away from more standard roles of disciplinarian and attendance officer (Celikten, 2001; Kaplan & Owings, 1999,). Kaplan and Owings (1999) contend that assistant principals seek a more pronounced role in instructional leadership. They stated

Many assistant principals.....seek a shared instructional leadership role. They have become involved with improving curriculum and instruction, creating new projects to increase student achievement. They have, and are willing to learn, the professional knowledge and skills to act as capable instructional leaders. They need principals who want leadership partnerships, who will mentor and support the AP's professional growth, and who are willing to restructure the school administration to make shared instructional leadership happen to benefit student achievement. (p.82)

Celikten (2001) also believed in the need for increased instructional duties for assistant principals. He conducted a study to assess the role of secondary assistant principals and their leadership tasks. The study discovered that the most pronounced influences on assistant principals' instructional leadership activities were the principal and attending professional development activities. The most significant factors that inhibited assistant principals' instructional leadership activities were the lack of a role description for the position, lack of professional development opportunities, and the performance of a wide range of duties.

Lastly, in light of the future direction of the role of assistant principal's, Dyer (NASSP, 1991), observed;

Recently there has been a noticeable trend toward recognizing the assistant principal's important role in a school...[and] although it is never easy to predict the future, it is anticipated that the trend will continue. It is not unrealistic to expect the AP's of the future will get more attention in the professional literature and will be less restricted to the role disciplinarian and attendance checker. Instead more AP's will be trained to be instructional leaders and trusted to do the job....In this era of "empowerment", "restructuring", and school-based management," the AP emerges as a vital participant in the enhancement of education for young men and women. (p. vii).

Summary

The assistant principalship was created at the turn of the 20th century to help principals meet the increased duties and responsibilities that had been placed on them with increased public school enrollment. Over the last several decades, the literature maintained a prominent focus on responsibilities that are managerial and administrative in nature. While duties have added to the list of assistant principal tasks, student discipline, monitoring of extracurricular and athletic events, student attendance, teacher evaluation, buses, textbooks, and building supervision and maintenance have remained constant.

Accountability measures have brought some instructional leadership roles to the assistant principalship. Interestingly, however principals are finding it difficult to fulfill many of the instructional leadership duties since NCLB. As principals' duties increase, the principals are forced to delegate many duties to be able to meet the increasing demands (Matthews & Crow, 2003). Thus, the role of the assistant principal must evolve to include greater instructional leadership responsibilities. As a team member, the assistant principal can greatly influence school leadership (Matthews & Crow, 2003).

Assistant principals continue to struggle with their lack of a clear conceptualization of the relationship and place in the overall school organization and many responsibilities that they must perform. Educational researchers have put forth a call for research that not only focuses on how assistant principals view their work, but also on how the principal and assistant principal interact and restructure their relationship to create a co-principalship model (Marzano, et al., 2005). Such a model would allow assistant principals and principals to share responsibilities, allow assistant principals to experience more duties that will help the assistant principals become better prepared for the challenges in the principalship. The benefits of such a renewed vision of shared leadership between principals and assistant principals in the school organization are more collaboration between administrative team members, an increase in student achievement, and an increase in the overall effectiveness of the administrative team (Celikten, 2001).

Chapter III

Methodology

The purpose of this study is to determine the degree of congruency between the normative and desired instructional leadership duties of the secondary assistant principal as judged by New Jersey high school principals and assistant principals. The study examined the opinions of secondary principals and assistant principals in Morris and Union Counties in New Jersey. The instructional leadership duties were categorized into six instructional leadership behavior domains: communication, evaluation, facilitation, management, motivation, and supervision.

Every organization has a core set of workers that are essential to the maintenance and growth of the organization (Black, 2000). Literature on leadership and strategies for leading high school reform emphasizes that the principal and leadership team are the key components in implementing the changes needed to help all students succeed in the 21st century (NASSP, 2004). Organizational effectiveness is best served when leadership is distributed to the whole team (Elmore, 2004).

In today's educational era, the principalship is considered a job of vast dimensions (Quinn, 2002; Schiff, 2002). Site-based management and increased autonomy have often led principals to act more as managers or proprietors of businesses than instructional leaders. Addressing and implementing the necessary NCLB reforms is clearly the ultimate challenge for school leaders. Historically, one of the reasons for adding assistant principals to larger schools was to provide additional assistance to the principal in meeting the increasing demands of the

job. Although adding assistant principals relieved the principal of some of the managerial and discipline duties for other matters, it has not provided more time for instructional leadership (Daresh, 2004; Mertz, 2000; Shockley & Smith, 1981).

General duties of the assistant principal are described generically in the job descriptions. The assigned duties differ for assistant principals depending on assignment by the principal. Some educators argue that to improve administrative team effectiveness, assistant principals need a clear job description containing specific instructional leadership responsibilities (Weller & Weller, 2002).

Data on the normative and desired instructional leadership duties was collected and analyzed, and the results were used for role analysis and clarification. This chapter presents the research design, population, sampling method, instrumentation, data collection, and statement of hypotheses.

Research Design

One way to study the relationships between principal and assistant principals in the school (as he/she performs the instructional leadership functions) is to examine their perceptions (Hoes, 1991). The design chosen for this study was a quasi-experimental design called a static group design (Campbell & Stanley, 1966). This design allowed a comparison between assigned and desired instructional leadership duties of the secondary assistant principal as judged by the high school principals and assistant principals.

This study required the collection of data, which was quantitative in nature, from high school principals and assistant principals in Morris and Union counties of New Jersey. The data

were collected through the survey method and relied on the instrument called the Assistant Principalship Instructional Leadership Questionnaire (APILQ, Martin, 1997). This instrument was judged by the researcher as the most appropriate way to obtain high school principals' assistant principals' viewpoints of the instructional leadership role and leadership behaviors for assistant principals.

The data were analyzed with the aid of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences Research (SPSS, version 11). The summarized data was used to facilitate drawing inferences and interpretations with respect to principals' and assistant principals' perceptions of the secondary assistant principal's actual and desired instructional leadership role and behaviors.

Sample Selection

The population for this study is public high schools in Morris and Union Counties of New Jersey. The superintendent in each school district was contacted to request permission to conduct the study. There are a total of 38 public high schools in these two counties. Surveys were only sent to those districts that the superintendent granted permission to conduct this study. Permission was not obtained from 5 school districts, which reduced the sample population to 33 public high schools. Each of the 33 principals and 69 assistant principals received an APILQ(Martin, 1997) to complete.

The pool of data this size provided enough variation of honest responses to offset any respondent who possibly is so extremely prejudiced in his/her perception as to skew the data (either negatively or positively). With respect to the validity of the responses, the assumption

was made that the principals and assistant principals would complete the instrument to the best of their ability, as well as honestly and fairly.

Instrumentation

After reviewing the literature and investigating various instruments to gather the information needed to conduct this study, the researcher determined that the Assistant Principal Instructional Leadership Questionnaire (APILQ) (Martin, 1997) instrument was appropriate. This instrument is an adapted version of the Principal as Instructional Leader (PAIL) (Glatthorn, 1984). Modifications were made by other researchers in order to focus on concrete leadership instructional leadership duties of the secondary assistant principal that were categorized into six leadership behaviors (communication, evaluation, facilitation, management, motivation and supervision).

Glatthorn's (1984) work provided considerable guidance on instructional leadership and how it may affect the school setting. He contends that the two most important aspects of the educational context are the degree of coupling existing within the organization and the maturity of the instructional staff.

Glatthorn (1984) used the term coupling to describe organizational behavior. Coupling has two branches: loose and tight. Loose coupling refers to a method of organization which is loosely knit or connected and where activities of one unit or person (e.g., the school principal) have little direct influence on another unit or group (e.g., a school's assistant principal) (Lewis, 1984). Conversely, tight coupling refers to a method of organization which is tightly knit or

connected and where activities of one unit have a great amount of influence on another unit or person (Lewis, 1984).

In conjunction with coupling, Glatthorn(1984) uses the concept of maturity and/or developmental level to explain the instructional leadership styles of school principals. Maturity refers to such qualities as competence, experience, and self-directedness. For optimal effectiveness, Glatthorn alleged that an appropriate leadership style would be needed for a principal and based on that he developed the

The PAIL instrument was validated has been used successfully to identify principals' instructional leadership styles in elementary and secondary schools. The reliability of this Likert-type instrument revealed an r of .644 to .90, which are typical for attitude-type scales (Glatthorn, 1984).

Scott (1988) adapted the PAIL questionnaire to study instructional leadership behavior of principals in Fairfax County, Virginia. She categorized the instructional leadership duties into five instructional leadership categories: evaluation, facilitation, management, motivation, and supervision.

Hoes (1991) conducted two preliminary studies to establish validity and reliability for the PAIL instrument. First, face validity and content validity was established by a select panel of 10 experts in the fields of public education and education research. A method of content validation employed systematically determined the relevancy of each item statement to the leadership behaviors of school administrators.

Secondly, a pilot test to determine reliability of PAIL was conducted in a test and retest format using 40 principals in selected schools in the state of Maryland. The Pearson product

moment correlation coefficient statistical procedure was employed to compute a correlation coefficient value of the test and retest for principals. Hoes (1991) renamed the instrument to Principal Instructional Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (PILBQ).

The revised instrument was given to 40 selected principals and assistant principals as a pilot study to determine reliability. The Pearson product moment correlation coefficient statistical procedure was employed to compute a correlation coefficient value of the test and retest reliability for principals. These correlation coefficient scores were used to determine statistically the reliability of the principals' perceptions of the PILBQ. The Pearson product moment correlation for the survey test and retest yielded a coefficient of 0.87 for administrators with subscale scores between 0.80 and 0.68.

The PIBBQ instrument was later revised and used in a doctoral dissertation that focused on the actual and desired instructional leadership so secondary assistant principals as judged by high school principals and assistant principals (Martin, 1997). Minor revisions were made as a result of Martin's literature review. The questions are inclusive of a team approach to instructional leadership and a sixth leadership domain, instructional communication, was added (1997). Martin renamed the instrument to the Assistant Principal Instructional Leadership Questionnaire (APILQ; Martin, 1997).

A pilot test was administered to 10 high school principals and 27 assistant principals in the state of Maryland. The Pearson product moment correlation for the total test scores of test 1 and test 2 yielded a coefficient value of .62 for principals and .65 for assistant principals (Martin, 1997). The perceptions of the principals and assistant principals' instructional leadership behaviors from the first to second test administered seem to have remained

consistent on test 1 and test 2. The perceptions were deemed reliable due to a very small deviation in the means scores of the test-retest surveys.

The instrument placed a numerical value on principals' perceptions and assistant principals' perceptions of the assistant principal's behavior for the purpose of this analysis. Each of the 100 items had a value assigned to it by the principals and assistant principals based on their responses. A 4-point Likert-type scale was used with the following assigned values:

<u>Value</u>	<u>Response</u>
4	<i>Strongly Disagree (SD)</i>
3	<i>Disagree (D)</i>
2	<i>Agree (A)</i>
1	<i>Strongly Agree (SA)</i>

It is important to note that means were computed based on the total group of principals, and the total group of assistant principals. Also, the APILQ uses the term "assigned" duties and in this study "assigned" and "normative" will be used interchangeably.

Each subscale produced a total score by adding the values of the response items related to the subscale and by dividing by the number of items for the subscale. By dividing the score by the number of items, each assistant principal received a score on assigned duties and desired duties for each instructional leadership behavior.

The instrument covers the following categories with the identified item statements' numbers: (see Appendix;)

Instructional communication:	Items 01-07
Instructional evaluation	Items 08-14

Instructional facilitator	Items 15-24
Instructional management	Items 25-36
Instructional motivation	Items 37-38
Instructional supervision	Items 39-50

Data Collection

The sources of data for this study were the responses made by the participants on the Assistant Principal Instructional Leadership Questionnaire (APILQ; Martin, 1997). Participants were public high school, school principals, and assistant principals in selected high schools in Morris and Union counties of New Jersey. A cover letter and the survey, APILQ, were mailed to 33 principals, and 69 assistant principals. The questionnaire was coded with an identification number. Each self-addressed, stamped return envelope was also coded with the same number to account for returned answer sheets. The participants were asked to return responses within two weeks. The coding was done so that a second questionnaire could be mailed to all subjects not responding within a 2 week period following the initial mailing. A week later, a telephone call was made and a third set of materials mailed to subjects if no response had been received.

Each survey packet included a preaddressed envelope, a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study, a demographic question sheet, and the survey. The name and position of each participant used in this study was obtained from the NJ schools website.

In computing the APILQ scores, a numerical value was assigned to each response as selected by principals and assistant principals. The rating "1" is considered a high score, and the

“5” rating is considered a low score; as a result, for the subscales (domain) and the items of instructional leadership behaviors (actual and desired duties), the lower the mean scores the more often the instructional leadership behaviors were used by the assistant principal.

Each assigned and desired duty produced a mean scores. The end result produced a total score for each of six instructional leadership domains (communication, evaluation, facilitation, management, motivation and supervision) by adding the values of the response items related to the domain and dividing by the number for the subscale.

Finally, the sample size yielded data from the selected principals and assistant principals sufficient to do the analyses called for in this study. Data from the survey instrument were compiled and analyzed through the use of independent and dependent t-tests, and analysis of variance (ANOVA). Results are displayed in a table format in chapter 4 of this dissertation, which is vital to understanding of the role of the assistant principal as instructional leader.

Chapter IV

Report on Data Analysis

As stated earlier, the purpose of this study is to determine the degree of congruency between the normative and desired instructional leadership duties of the secondary assistant principal as judged by public high school principals and assistant principals in selected Morris and Union counties of New Jersey.

This study examined the perceptions of high school principals and assistant principals on the normative and desired instructional leadership duties, which are, categorized into the following six the instructional leadership behaviors (Martin, 1997; Scott, 1988,).

Instructional communication is the behavior exercised by the secondary assistant principal to discuss curriculum and instruction.

Instructional evaluation is the behavior exercised by the secondary assistant principal to assess student achievement, teacher performance, and a school's education program.

Instructional facilitation is the behavior exercised by the secondary assistant principal to acquire and provide the human and material resources required to implement the instructional program of the school.

Instructional management is the behavior exercised by the secondary assistant principal to directly influences the overall daily school management and organizational structure related to instruction in the classroom.

Instructional motivation is the behavior exercised by the secondary assistant principal to identify and reinforce teacher behaviors that contribute to the success of the instructional program of the school.

Instructional supervision is the behavior exercised by the secondary assistant principal that delineates steps in a process which promote effectiveness in teacher Instruction and the teaching-learning situation.

To answer the overarching research question of this study, what instructional leadership duties do principals and assistant principals value in the high school assistant principalship, the following research questions were asked and answered:

1. What is the degree of congruency that exists with respect to the normative and desired instructional leadership duties of the high school assistant principal as stated by high school principals?
2. What is the degree of congruency that exists with respect to the normative and desired instructional leadership duties of the high school assistant principal as perceived by high school assistant principals?
3. In what general instructional leadership domains are the viewpoints of high school principals and assistant principals parallel with respect to their opinions of the assistant principals' normative and desired instructional leadership duties?
4. What specific instructional duties do high school principals believe assistant principals should perform as an instructional leader?
5. What are the unique aspects of instructional leadership that exist within the leadership domains (communication, evaluation, facilitation, management, motivation, supervision)?

6. Who perceives the greatest discrepancy overall on the assigned and desired instructional leadership duties as reported on the Assistant Principal Instructional Leadership Questionnaire?

Demographic Characteristics

There was a total of 81 respondents who completed the Assistant Principal Instructional Leadership Questionnaire (APILQ; Martin, 1997). The responses were reviewed and sorted into two groups: principals and assistant principals. Thirty three principals and 48 assistant principals responded to the survey. Surveys were only sent to those districts that the superintendent granted permission to conduct this study, consequently, five districts were eliminated from the study. As was documented in Chapter 3, there are 33 high school principals and 69 assistant principals in the sample population. Within the allotted time for return, 33 principals returned their surveys, a response rate of 100%. During the same period, 48 of the 69 assistant principals returned their surveys, a response rate of 69%.

Accompanying the survey was a sheet requesting demographic information. Table 3 presents the demographic data on assistant principals. Principals were only asked demographic data on their gender and school description. All respondents were self-identified as either a secondary assistant principal or principal and currently employed in Union and Morris county public high schools.

Table 3 displays self-reported responses of assistant principals regarding their gender; more male assistant principals (62.5%) participated in the survey than female assistant principals (37.5%). The data on ethnicity show that the majority of assistant principals identified

themselves as White (95.7%). Fewer identified themselves as African American (4.9%) and Hispanics (2.5%). The information on age shows that the largest segments of respondents between are between 46-55+ years of age (79%). The fewest number of respondents (13.6%) identified themselves as being in the 25-35 age range.

The data on years served as an assistant principal show the largest segment (79.2%) of respondents have been in the assistant principalship between 1 and 10 years, of which 60% have been an assistant principal 5 years or less. Seven assistant principals reported being in their current position for 11-15 years, and one assistant principal reported serving in the position 22+ years.

Information on the assistant principal's level of education revealed (81%) have their master's, eight in administration; (17%) hold a doctoral degree, and (2%) earned an educational specialist degree. The data illustrate that the majority of assistant principals use the assistant principalship as training for advancement. Thirty (62.5%) are not satisfied with the position and will use the experience to prepare for advancement (i.e., principal, superintendent). Seventeen (35.4 %) assistant principals indicated that they are satisfied with their position and do not want to advance professionally in public education any further.

Notice at the bottom of Table 3 it displays the data collected from both principals and assistant principals on the number of administrators in their school building and their school context (urban, suburban, rural). The largest number of respondents indicated three to five administrators in their building (89.6%). Sixty-four participants identified their school as suburban and 17 described their district as urban. No respondents selected rural as their school context.

Table 3

Demographic Background Data on Assistant Principals

Background Data	Number	%
<u>Gender</u>		
Male	30	62.5
Female	<u>18</u>	<u>37.5</u>
Total asst. principals	48	100
<u>Ethnicity</u>		
African American	4	.08
Asian	0	0
Hispanic	2	.04
White	42	87.5
Other	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total asst. principals	48	100
<u>Age</u>		
25-35	11	23.4
36-45	11	23.4
46-55	16	34.1
56+	<u>9</u>	<u>19.1</u>
Total asst. principals	48	100
<u>Length of service as assistant principals</u>		
1-5	29	60.0
6-10	9	18.8
11-15	7	14.6
16-20	2	4.2
21+	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>
Total asst. principals	48	100

Table 3 (Continued)

Background Data	Number	%
<u>Education level</u>		
Master's	39	81.0
Ed.S.	1	2.1
Doctorate	<u>8</u>	<u>17.0</u>
Total asst. principals	48	100
<u>Career aspirations</u>		
Permanent position	17	35.4
Training for advancement	<u>31</u>	<u>62.5</u>
Total asst. principals	48	100
<u>Number of administrators</u>		
2	4	8.3
3	9	18.8
4	11	22.9
5	23	47.9
6	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>
Total asst. Principals	48	100
<u>School context</u>		
Urban-total	17	20
Principals	5	
Asst. principals	12	
Suburban-total	63	80
Principals	28	
Asst. principals	36	
Rural	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total asst. principals & principals	81	100

Findings for Research Questions

Research Question 1

What is the degree of congruency that exists with respect to the normative and desired instructional leadership duties of the high school assistant principal as stated by high school principals?

The data show statistically significant differences (see Table 4) in all leadership domains; instructional communication $t = -2.71$, $df 1, 32$, $p < .001$), evaluation $t = -2.83$, $df 1, 32$, $p < .001$), facilitation $t = -3.36$, $df 1, 32$, $p < .001$), management $t = -3.54$, $df 1, 32$, $p < .001$), motivation $t = -2.60$, $df 1, 32$, $p < .000$) and supervision $t = -2.91$, $df 1, 32$, $p < .001$).

This finding indicates a low degree of congruency between principals' perceptions of the assistant principal's actual and desired instructional leadership duties. All desired mean scores were higher than the assigned mean scores, which suggests that principals would like assistant principals to have more responsibility in instructional leadership.

The lowest degree of congruency between the actual and desired instructional leadership duties of high school assistant principals as judged by principals was found in the instructional facilitation domain (mean difference = -1.84). This result implies that high school principals believe that assistant principals can assist in promoting a successful learning environment by coordinating more opportunities for teams/departments to improve student learning.

Table 4

Comparison of Principals' Assessments of Assigned and Desired Duties of High School Assistant Principals

	M Difference	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
Communication						
Assigned	22.69		4.30			
Desired	23.78	-1.09	4.10	-2.71	32	.001***
Evaluation						
Assigned	22.48		4.00			
Desired	22.63	-.15	3.87	-2.83	32	.001***
Facilitation						
Assigned	29.27		6.78			
Desired	31.12	-1.85	6.66	-3.34	32	.001***
Management						
Assigned	34.27		6.29			
Desired	35.93	-1.66	6.33	-3.54	32	.001***
Motivation						
Assigned	5.72		1.62			
Desired	6.06	-.33	1.67	-2.60	32	.001***
Supervision						
Assigned	40.51		4.85			
Desired	41.93	-1.42	5.06	-2.91	32	.001***

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Research Question 2

What is the degree of congruency that exists with respect to the normative and desired instructional leadership duties of the high school assistant principal as perceived by high school assistant principals?

Table 5 displays the comparison data of assistant principals' assessments on their assigned and desired instructional leadership duties. The data show statistically significant differences in the following leadership domains: communication $t = -5.25$, df 1, 47, $p < .001$; evaluation $t = -4.14$, df 1, 47, $p < .001$; facilitation $t = -6.22$ df 1, 47, $p < .001$; management $t = -5.98$, df 1, 47, $p < .001$; and supervision $t = -4.22$ df 1, 47, $p < .001$.

These results indicate a low level of congruency exists between high school assistant principals of their assigned and the desired instructional leadership duties. Assistant principals responses imply that they are dissatisfied with their current performance level as an instructional leader. Also, based on the results, assistant principals' would prefer more participation in the aforementioned instructional leadership domains.

Notice, the data also revealed that assistant principals opinions of their normative and desired instructional leadership duties were most consistent in the evaluation domain (mean difference=1.04). The evaluation domain was also the only category in which the assistant principals' assigned mean score was higher than the desired mean score. This points out that assistant principals spend most of their time performing instructional evaluation responsibilities.

Table 5

Comparison of Assistant Principals' Assessments of Assigned and Desired Duties of Assistant Principals

	M	Mean Difference	SD	t	df	Sig.
Communication						
Assigned	21.27		3.90			
Desired	23.47	-2.20	3.03	-5.25	47	.001***
Evaluation						
Assigned	21.85		3.00			
Desired	20.81	1.04	2.55	-4.14	47	.001***
Facilitation						
Assigned	28.07		5.41			
Desired	31.91	-3.84	4.53	-6.62	47	.001***
Management						
Assigned	31.60		5.42			
Desired	37.02	-5.42	6.13	-5.98	47	.001***
Motivation						
Assigned	4.91		1.48			
Desired	6.04	-1.13	4.81	-4.62	47	.001***
Supervision						
Assigned	38.93		4.80			
Desired	41.35	-2.42	3.59	-4.22	47	.001***

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Research Question 3

In what general instructional leadership domains are the viewpoints of high school principals and assistant principals parallel with respect to their opinions of the assistant principals' normative and desired instructional leadership duties?

Assigned instructional leadership duties. Table 4 displays the comparison data for principals' and assistant principals' judgments on assigned instructional leadership duties for each of six leadership domains. Statistically significant differences were found in two leadership domains; management $F = 4.15$, $df, 1, 79$, $p < .04$. and motivation, $F = 5.39$, $df, 1, 79$, $p < .02$. The principals assigned mean scores were higher than the assistant principals mean scores.

Discrepancies indicate that principals' and assistant principals' are not clear of the assistant principals level of involvement in managing and instruction motivating teachers.

In four of the six instructional leadership domains, no statistically significant differences were found (see Table 6). This finding implies a general understanding among principals and assistant principals of the assistant principal's actual responsibilities as an instructional leader.

Desired instructional leadership duties. The comparison data of principals' and assistant principals' assessments for desired instructional leadership duties for each leadership domains is shown in Table 7. Only one statistically significant difference was found in the management leadership domain $F = 4.15$, $df, 1, 79$, $p < .04$. Assistant principals' mean score was greater than the principals' mean score, which suggests that principals' and assistant principals have different opinions of assistant principal's level of involvement in managing curriculum. Assistant principals would prefer to spend more of their time managing instruction and curriculum.

Table 6

ANOVA Principals' and Assistant Principals' Assessments of Assigned Duties Instructional Leadership Duties

	M	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Difference					
Communication						
Principal	22.69		4.30			
Assistant Principal	21.27	1.42	3.90	2.40	1,79	.12
Evaluation						
Principal	22.48		4.00			
Assistant Principal	21.85	.63	3.00	.65	1,79	.42
Facilitation						
Principal	29.27		6.78			
Assistant Principal	28.04	1.23	5.41	.82	1,79	.36
Management						
Principal	34.27		6.29			
Assistant Principal	31.60	2.67	5.42	4.15	1,79	.04*
Motivation						
Principal	5.72		1.62			
Assistant Principal	4.91	.81	1.48	5.39	1,79	.02*
Supervision						
Principal	40.51		4.85			
Assistant Principal	38.93	1.58	4.80	2.08	1,79	.15

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table 7

ANOVA Principals and Assistant Principals' Assessments of Desired Instructional Leadership Duties

	M	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Difference					
Communication						
Principal	23.78		4.30			
Assistant Principal	23.47	-.31	3.90	2.40	1,79	.12
Evaluation						
Principal	23.63		3.87			
Assistant Principal	23.81	.18	2.55	-.65	1,79	.42
Facilitation						
Principal	31.12		6.66			
Assistant Principal	31.91	-.79	4.53	-.82	1,79	.36
Management						
Principal	35.93		6.33			
Assistant Principal	37.02	-1.09	6.13	-4.15	1,79	.04*
Motivation						
Principal	6.06		1.67			
Assistant Principal	6.04	-.02	1.48	.00	1,79	.95
Supervision						
Principal	41.81		5.08			
Assistant Principal	41.35	-.46	3.59	.233	1,79	.63

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Research Question 4

What specific instructional duties do high school principals believe assistant principals should perform as an instructional leader?

The comparison data revealed statistically significant differences in the principals mean scores on specific assigned and desired instructional duties within the six leadership domains. Table 8 shows the duty within each leadership domain that was found to be statistically significant. In all cases, the significant differences resulted in the principals' desired mean score being higher than the assigned score.

The following identifies each duty within the leadership domains that principals assess as an important function for high school assistant to perform.

Communication

There are seven duties within this domain, and three duties produced significant mean differences at the $p < .01$ level. Principals desired mean ($M=3.48$, $SD= .56$) for the duty, confers with teachers to discuss their beliefs about curriculum and instruction was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 3.24$, $SD= .66$). The mean difference was $-.24$ points between the two four-point Likert ratings for assigned and desired instructional leadership duties ($t = -2.77$, $df 1, 32$, $p < .01$).

The desired mean ($M=3.42$, $SD= .830$) for the duty, clarifies the districts instructional goals was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 3.12$, $SD= .92$). The mean difference was $-.30$ with a t of -2.73 , $df 1, 32$, and $p < .01$.

The desired mean ($M=8.72$, $SD= 23.30$) for the duty, stresses with teachers the value of a closely articulated K-12 curriculum in each subject area was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 8.42$, $SD= 23.38$). The mean difference was $-.30$, $t = -2.73$, df 1, 32, and $p < .01$.

Evaluation

In this domain 4 of the 7 instructional leadership duties produced statistically significant results. The desired mean ($M=3.42$, $SD= .70$) for the duty, regularly evaluates the school's instructional program as a member of the school improvement team was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 3.24$, $SD= .79$). The mean difference was $-.18$ points between the two four-point Likert ratings for assigned and desired instructional leadership duties ($t = -2.66$, df 1, 32, $p < .01$).

The desired mean ($M=2.93$, $SD= .88$) for the duty, analyzes school-wide test data to identify instructional goals for strengths and weaknesses was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 2.66$, $SD= .95$). The mean difference was $-.27$, $t = -2.72$, df 1, 32, and $p < .01$.

The desired mean ($M=3.03$, $SD= .88$) for the duty, regularly evaluates the school's instructional program was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 2.84$, $SD= .90$). The mean difference = $-.18$, $t = -1.97$, df 1, 32, and $p < .05$.

The desired mean ($M=3.63$, $SD= .54$) for the duty, sets high standards for academic performance of students was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 3.42$, $SD= .70$). The mean difference = $-.21$, $t = -2.03$, df 1, 32, and $p < .05$.

Facilitation

Within this domain 7 of the 8 duties produced statistically significant mean differences. It also should be noted that all desired mean scores for each duty were higher than assigned mean score.

The desired mean ($M=2.63$, $SD= .96$) for the duty, conducts inservice meetings dealing with instructional matters was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 2.78$, $SD= .85$). The mean difference was $-.15$ points between the two four-point Likert ratings for assigned and desired instructional leadership duties ($t = -1.97$, $df 1, 32$, $p < .05$).

The desired mean ($M=2.93$, $SD= .89$) for the duty, uses faculty meetings to discuss instructional and curricular issues was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 2.72$, $SD= .83$). The mean difference = $-.21$, $t = -2.93$, $df 1, 32$, and $p < .001$.

The desired mean ($M=3.21$, $SD= .78$) for the duty, encourages teams and/or departments to develop their own inservice plans was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 3.03$, $SD= .76$). The mean difference was $-.18$, $t = -2.24$, $df 1, 32$, $p < .03$.

The desired mean ($M=3.15$, $SD= .87$) for the duty, encourages teams and/or departments to develop their own inservice plans was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 2.84$, $SD= .87$). The mean difference = $-.31$, $t = -3.28$, $df 1, 32$, and $p < .01$).

The desired mean ($M=3.54$, $SD= .71$) for the duty, encourages teachers to try new instructional methods was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 3.33$, $SD= .81$). The mean difference was $-.21$, $t = -2.51$ $df 1, 32$, and $p < .01$.

The desired mean ($M=2.96$, $SD= .84$) for the duty, encourages teams and/or departments to develop their own curricula was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 2.78$, $SD= .81$).

The mean difference = $-.18$, $t = -2.66$, df 1, 32, and $p < .01$.

The desired mean ($M=3.18$, $SD= .72$) for the duty, encourages teachers to develop their own instructional materials was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 3.03$, $SD= .76$). The mean difference was $-.15$, $t = -2.39$, df 1, 32, and $p < .02$.

The desired mean ($M=3.15$, $SD= .87$) for the duty, encourages teams and/or departments to develop their own inservice plans was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 2.84$, $SD= .870$). The mean difference = $-.31$, $t = -3.28$, df 1, 32, and $p < .01$.

Management

The data results indicated four of the twelve instructional duties had statistically significant mean differences. The desired mean ($M=2.84$, $SD= .75$) for the duty, lets individual teachers determine their own inservice needs was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 2.66$, $SD= .77$). The mean difference was $-.18$ points between the two 4-point Likert ratings for assigned and desired instructional leadership duties ($t = -2.24$, df 1, 32, and $p < .03$).

The desired mean ($M=3.63$, $SD= .48$) for the duty, shows an awareness of current research about instructional effectiveness was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 3.27$, $SD= .67$). The mean difference was $-.36$, $t = -3.20$, df 1, 32, and $p < .01$.

The desired mean ($M=2.78$, $SD= .92$) for the duty, attempts to coordinate instructional program between teachers on different grade was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 2.60$, $SD= .93$). The mean difference was $-.18$, $t = -1.97$, df 1, 32, and $p < .05$.

The desired mean ($M=3.21$, $SD= .81$) for the duty, encourages teachers to observe each other classes was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 3.06$, $SD= .86$). The mean difference = $-.15$, $t = -2.39$, $df 1, 32$, and $p < .02$.

Motivation

One of the two identified duties within this domain yielded a statistically significant difference. The desired mean ($M=2.93$, $SD= .86$) for the duty, rewards teachers who cooperate in implementing district policies was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 2.75$, $SD= .83$). The mean difference was $-.18$ points between the two four-point Likert ratings for assigned and desired instructional leadership duties ($t = -2.66$, $df 1, 32$, and $p < .02$).

Supervision

Principals' responses on 6 out of the instructional duties produced statistically significant differences. The desired mean score ($M=3.36$, $SD= .85$) for the duty, checks to see if teachers are following district curriculum goals with the desired mean of was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 3.15$, $SD= .83$). The mean difference was $-.21$ points between the two 4 point Likert ratings for assigned and desired instructional leadership duties ($t - -2..93$, $df 1, 32$, and $p < .01$).

The desired mean ($M=3.36$, $SD= .85$) for the duty, checks to see if teachers are working toward district's instructional goals with a mean of was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 3.51$, $SD= .83$). The mean difference = $-.18$, $t = -2.67$, $df 1, 32$, and $p < .01$.

The desired mean for the duty ($M=3.36$, $SD= .859$), expects individual teachers at different grade levels to coordinate their own instructional program, was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 2.96$, $SD= .809$). The mean difference = $-.40$, $t = -2.67$, $df 1, 32$, and $p < .01$.

The desired mean for the duty ($M=3.12$ $SD= .892$), provides instructional leadership improving student discipline, was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 2.96$, $SD= .883$). The mean difference was $-.16$, $t = -2.67$, $df 1, 32$, and $p < .01$.

The desired mean for the duty ($M=3.54$, $SD= .415$), speaks with teachers individually about instructional matters, was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 3.39$, $SD= .788$). The mean difference = $-.15$, $t = -2.39$, $df 1, 32$, and $p < .02$.

The desired mean for the duty ($M=3.42$, $SD= .867$), meets frequently with team leaders and/or department heads on curricular and instructional matters, was greater than the assigned mean score ($M= 3.27$, $SD= .875$). The mean difference = $-.15$, $t = -2.30$, $df 1, 32$, and $p < .02$.

Table 8

Paired t-Tests for the Congruency of Principals' Assessments of the Assistant Principal Desired & Assigned Leadership Duties

	M	Mean Diff	SD	t	df	Sig.
<i>Communication</i>						
Confers with teachers to discuss their beliefs about curriculum and instruction						
Assigned	3.24		.662			
		-.24		-2.77	32	.001**
Desired	3.48		.565			
Clarifies the district's Instructional goals						
Assigned	3.12		.927			
		-.30		-2.73	32	.01**
Desired	3.42		.830			

Table 8 (Continued)

	<i>M</i>	Mean Diff	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Stresses with teachers						
the value of a closely articulated K-12 curriculum in each subject area						
Assigned	8.42		23.38			
		-.30		-2.73	32	.01**
Desired	8.72		23.30			
Evaluation						
Regularly evaluates the school's instructional program as a member of the school improvement team						
Assigned	3.24		.791			
		-.18		-2.66	32	.01**
Desired	3.42		.708			

Table 8 (Continued)

	<i>M</i>	Mean Diff	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig.
Analyzes school-wide test data to identify instructional goals for strengths and weaknesses	Assigned 2.66		.957			
		-.27		-2.66	32	.01**
	Desired 2.93		.899			
Regularly evaluates the school's instructional program	Assigned 2.84		.905			
		-.19		-1.97	32	.05*
	Desired 3.03		.883			
Sets high standards for academic performance of students	Assigned 3.42		.708			
		-.21		-2.03	32	.05*
	Desired 3.63		.548			

Table 8 (Continued)

	<i>M</i>	Mean Diff	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
<i>Facilitation</i>						
Conducts in-service meetings dealing with instructional matters						
Assigned	2.63		.859			
		-.15		-1.97	32	.05*
Desired	2.78		.960			
Uses faculty meetings to discuss instructional and curriculum issues						
Assigned	2.72		.899			
		-.21		-2.93	32	.00***
Desired	2.93		.769			
Encourages teams and or dept.'s to develop innovative programs						
Assigned	3.03		.769			
		-.18		-2.24	32	.03*
Desired	3.21		.780			

Table 8 (Continued)

	M	Mean Diff	SD	t	df	Sig.
Encourages teachers to try new instructional methods						
Assigned	3.33		.816			
Desired	3.54	-.21	.711	-2.51	32	.01**
Encourages teams and or dept.'s to develop their own in-service plans						
Assigned	2.84		.870			
Desired	3.15	-.31	.870	-3.28	32	.00***
Encourages teams and or dept.'s to develop their own instructional materials						
Assigned	2.78		.819			
Desired	2.96	-.18	.847	-2.66	32	.01**

Table 8 (Continued)

	M	Mean Diff	SD	t	df	Sig.
Encourages teachers to develop their own instructional methods						
Assigned	3.24		.867			
		-.21		-2.93	32	.02*
Desired	3.45		.794			
<i>Management</i>						
Lets individual teachers determine their own in-service needs						
Assigned	2.66		.777			
		-.18		-2.24	32	.03*
Desired	2.84		.755			
Shows an awareness of current research instructional effectiveness						
Assigned	3.27		.674			
		-.36		-3.20	32	.00***
Desired	3.63		.488			

Table 8 (Continued)

	<i>M</i>	Mean Diff	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig.
Attempts to coordinate instructional program between teachers on different grade levels						
Assigned	2.60		.933			
		-.18		-1.97	32	.05*
Desired	2.78		.927			
Encourages teachers to observe each other classes						
Assigned	3.24		.867			
		-.21		-2.39	32	.02*
Desired	3.45		.794			
<i>Motivation</i>						
Rewards teachers who are successful in achieving instructional goals						
Assigned	2.96		.883			
		-.16		-2.67	32	.01**
Desired	3.12		.892			

Table 8 (Continued)

	<i>M</i>	Mean Diff	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig.
<i>Supervision</i>						
Provides instructional leadership in improving Student discipline						
Assigned	3.63		.488			
Desired	3.78	-.15	.415	-2.39	32	.02*
Expects individual teachers at different grade levels to coordinate their own instruc program						
Assigned	2.96		.801			
Desired	3.15	-.19	.833	-2.66	32	.01**
Speaks with teachers Individually about Instructional matters						
Assigned	3.39		.788			
Desired	3.54	-.15	.794	-2.39	32	.02*

Table 8 (Continued)

	<i>M</i>	Mean Diff	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Checks to see if teachers are following district curriculum goals						
Assigned	3.15		.833			
Desired	3.36	-.21	.859	-2.93	32	.00***
Checks to see if teachers are following district instructional goals						
Assigned	3.18		.808			
Desired	3.36	-.18	.822	-2.67	32	.01**
Meets frequently with team leaders and/or dept. heads on curricular and instructional matters						
Assigned	3.27		.875			
Desired	3.42	-.15	.867	-2.39	32	.02*

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Research Question 5

What are the unique aspects of instructional leadership that exist within the leadership domains (communication, evaluation, facilitation, management, motivation, supervision)?

First, analysis of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to determine the effects, if any, of the independent variables (ethnicity, gender, age, and school context) on the dependent variables, assistant principal judgments on assigned and desired instructional duties within the six leadership domains. The ANOVA indicated no statistically difference in the assigned and desired means when ethnicity was considered as the independent variable. The result suggests that White and African American assistant principals have similar opinions of assistant principal's assigned and desired instructional leadership duties. Notice, this finding is based on self-identified responses from 42 White and 4 African American assistant principals.

Second, gender was examined. Results of the ANOVA (see Table 9) produced significant effects between gender and assistant principals' opinions on assigned and desired instructional leadership duties in the areas:

Assigned

Evaluation ($F = 4.50$, df , 1, 47, $p < .04$)

Management ($F = 3.96$, df , 1, 47, $p < .01$)

Desired

Evaluation ($F = 3.86$, df , 1, 47, $p < .05$)

Facilitation ($F = 6.82$, df , 1, 47, $p < .01$).

The data show female mean scores are greater than male mean scores. This outcome implies that female assistant principals spend more time on instructional evaluation and

management leadership tasks than do male assistant principals. The result also confirms that female assistant principals value their participation in evaluation instructional leadership tasks and want to expand their instructional leadership role by working with teachers and teams to improve student learning.

ANOVAs indicated that the independent variable, school context, had an effect on school administrators' perceptions of the desired instructional leadership duties for high school principals. The suburban administrators' mean scores for assigned instructional leadership duties, in each leadership domain, were higher than urban principals and assistant principals. The statistically significant findings are:

Note: suburban administrators $N=64$, urban administrators $N=17$

Evaluation ($F = 8.88$, df , 1, 79, $p < .001$). The strength of relationship as assessed by r^2 (Eta Squared) is strong, with school context accounting for 19% of the variance of the dependent variable.

Communication ($F = 15.2$, df , 1, 79, $p < .001$). The strength of relationship as assessed by r^2 (Eta Squared) is very strong, with the school context accounting for 23% of the variance of the dependent variable.

Facilitation ($F = 17.17$, df , 1, 79, $p < .001$). The strength of relationship as assessed by r^2 (Eta Squared) is very strong, with the school context accounting for 21% of the variance of the dependent variable.

Management ($F = 11.58$, df , 1, 79, $p < .001$). The strength of relationship as assessed by r^2 (Eta Squared) is moderate, with the school context accounting for 14% of the variance of the dependent variable.

Motivation ($F= 4.23$, df , 1, 79, $p < .001$). The strength of relationship as assessed by r^2 (Eta Squared) is weak, with the school context accounting for 8% of the variance of the dependent variable.

Supervision, ($F =7.06$, df , 1, 79, $p < .001$). The strength of relationship as assessed by r^2 (Eta Squared) is moderate, with the school context accounting for 13% of the variance of the dependent variable.

Finally, the findings show statistically significant effects when considering the independent variable, school context, on the dependent variable, assistant principal's assessments of desired instructional leadership duties. The suburban assistant principals' mean scores for desired instructional leadership duties, were higher than urban assistant principals and assistant principals. The statistically significant results are:

Note: suburban assistant principals $N=36$, urban assistant principals $N=12$

Evaluation ($F =6.85$, df , 1, 47, $p <.01$)

Communication ($F = 5.05$, df , 1, 47, $p <.03$)

Facilitation ($F =11.34$, df , 1, 47, $p <.001$)

Supervision ($F = 3.77$, df , 1, 47, $p <.05$)

In the instructional Management and Motivation leadership domains no statistically significant differences were found. This finding revealed that urban and suburban assistant principals have similar views on their level of involvement in instructional management and motivation.

Since only five urban principals and only 12 urban assistant principals participated in this study, no further analyses were conducted.

Table 9

One-Way ANOVA of Assistant Principals' Assessments of Assigned & Desired Instructional Duties

	N	M	SD	F	df	Sig.
Assigned						
Evaluation						
Female	18	23.00	2.00	4.50	1,46	.04*
Male	30	21.16	3.31			
Management						
Female	18	33.55	5.34	3.96	1,46	.05*
Male	30	30.43	5.21			
Desired						
Evaluation						
Female	18	23.65	2.13	3.86	1,46	.05*
Male	30	22.27	2.66			
Facilitation						
Female	18	32.34	3.32	6.82	1,46	.01**
Male	30	28.89	4.75			

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table 10

One-Way ANOVA of Assistant Principals' Assessments on Assigned Instructional Duties

	N	M	Mean Difference	SD	F	df	Sig.
<u>Instr. Communication</u>							
Urban	12	19.16		4.494			
Suburban	36	21.97	-2.81	3.288	5.05	1,46	.01**
<u>Instr. Evaluation</u>							
Urban	12	20.00		3.433			
Suburban	36	22.47	-2.47	2.691	6.85	1,46	.02**
<u>Instr. Facilitation</u>							
Urban	12	23.91		5.298			
Suburban	36	29.41	-5.50	4.437	11.34	1,46	.00**
<u>Instr. Supervision</u>							
Urban	12	36.66		3.544			
Suburban	36	39.69	-3.03	4.955	3.77	1,46	.05*

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Research Question 6

Who perceives the greatest discrepancy overall on the assigned and desired instructional leadership duties as reported on the Assistant Principal Instructional Leadership Questionnaire?

Overall, assistant principals had the greatest discrepancy in their judgments on their assigned instructional leadership tasks and their views on ideal instructional leadership tasks for the assistant principalship. Table 11 displays the mean differences from the principals and assistant principal responses of the assistant principals of assigned and desired instructional responsibilities in each of the six leadership domains. The findings suggest that assistant principals want to assume more responsibility for instructional leadership duties in the areas of communication (mean difference=-2.20), facilitation (mean difference=-3.84), management (mean difference=5.42) and supervision (mean difference=-2.42).

Notice, assistant principals' mean difference =1.04 is positive in instructional evaluation, whereas principals' mean difference= -1.09. This result implies that principals believe assistant principals should assume more leadership responsibility in instructional evaluation, while assistant principals place more value on utilizing their leadership skills in managing instruction and curriculum. Specifically, assistant principals are interested in performing such duties, as coordinating instructional program between teachers on different grade levels, gives teams released time to observe other classes, develops school master schedules on the basis of team input, and expects teams to handle their own discipline problems.

Table 11

Comparison of Principals and Assistant Principals' Mean Differences of Assigned Duties Instructional Leadership Duties

	N	Mean Difference
Communication		
Principal	33	-1.09
Assistant principal	48	-2.20
Evaluation		
Principal	33	-1.09
Assistant principal	48	1.04
Facilitation		
Principal	33	-1.84
Assistant principal	48	-3.84
Management		
Principal	33	-1.44
Assistant principal	48	-5.42
Motivation		
Principal	33	-33
Assistant principal	48	-1.13
Supervision		
Principal	33	-1.42
Assistant principal	48	-2.42

Table 12 and Table 13 compare this study's mean differences of assistant principal's assigned and desired instructional leadership duties as judged by principals' and assistant principals' to Martin's (1997) study of the assigned versus the desired instructional leadership duties and responsibilities of high school assistant principals as reported by high school principals and assistant principals. These data are significant and comparable, since Martin also administered the APILQ in her study. Clearly, the data exemplifies an increase in high school principals' dissatisfaction with assistant principals' level of involvement in instructional leadership.

Table 12

Comparison of Mean Differences of Assigned and Desired Duties of the Assistant Principal as Judged by Principals

Leadership Domains	2006		1997	
	Mean Difference	Sig.	Mean Difference	Sig.
Communication	-1.09	.001***	-.50	.001***
Evaluation	-.15	.001***	-.42	.001***
Facilitation	-1.85	.001***	-.38	.01**
Management	-1.66	.001***	-.29	.001***
Motivation	-.33	.001***	.47	.01**
Supervision	-1.42	.001***	-.37	.001***

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table 13

Comparison of Mean Differences of Assigned and Desired Duties of the Assistant Principal as Judged by Assistant Principals

Leadership Domains	2006		1997	
	Mean Difference	Sig.	Mean Difference	Sig.
Communication	-2.20	.001***	-.50	.001***
Evaluation	1.04	.001***	-.39	.001***
Facilitation	-3.84	.001**	-.30	.01**
Management	-5.42	.001***	-.66	.001***
Motivation	-.1.13	.001***	-.79	.01**
Supervision	-2.42	.001***	-.55	.001***

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Summary of Findings

In summary, chapter 4 first examined the relevant demographic information on the assistant principals and principals. Next, the questions for this study were stated and the results were reported. Pairwise *t* tests and ANOVAs were utilized for data analysis.

The test results revealed statistically significant differences in both principals' and assistant principals' assessments of the assistant principal's normative and desired instructional leadership responsibilities in each of the six leadership domains (evaluation, communication, facilitation, management, motivation and supervision). This study's findings indicates that a low level of congruency exists between the high school assistant principal's assigned and desired instructional leadership responsibilities. Principals' and assistant principals' mean scores for desired instructional duties were higher than their mean scores on assigned instructional duties. These data reveal dissatisfaction in how the assistant principals' instructional leadership responsibilities are currently distributed.

The instructional evaluation domain was the only category that the assigned mean scores were higher than the desired mean score as judged by assistant principals. This points out that assistant principals are spending most of their time performing evaluation tasks. However, the data suggest they would prefer to utilize their instructional leadership skills in other instructional areas.

The most significant mean difference of the assistant principals' assigned and desired instructional duties was found in the facilitation leadership domain. This suggests that principals would like to see assistant principals utilize their facilitation leadership skills.

ANOVAs revealed statistically significant mean differences between administrators status and their opinions of the assistant principals assigned and desired instructional leadership responsibilities. Significant differences were found in assigned instructional leadership responsibilities in leadership domains (management, and motivation). The principals assigned mean scores were higher than the assistant principals mean scores. In this study, principals' and assistant principals' are not clear on the assistant principal's performance level in managing instruction and in motivating teachers to improve student learning.

ANOVAs imply a high level of congruency between high school principals and high school assistant principals judgments on desired instructional leadership duties. Only one statistical significance difference resulted in the management leadership domain. Principals place high value on instructional management of curriculum and would like assistant principals to assume more leadership responsibility in this area.

Other ANOVA results indicate that female assistant principals attest to performing more duties in instructional evaluation and management leadership domains. The data also show that females are more willing than males to assume more leadership responsibility in the instructional evaluation and facilitation.

ANOVA tests conducted on the independent variable, school context on the dependent variables, assigned and desired duties leadership categories revealed some statistically significant differences. This finding indicates that school context is a factor in the high school assistant principal's role as instructional leader.

Results of this study imply dissatisfaction in the high school assistant principalship relating to the distribution of instructional leadership responsibilities. Overall, both principals and

assistant principals would like high school assistant to assume more responsibility in instructional leadership; however, their values and needs on specific instructional leadership domains differ.

Chapter V

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Introduction

The National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1998) argues that assistant principals are a valued resource in enabling schools to maintain a strong sense of accountability for student achievement (NASSP, 2003). Since the enactment of No Child Left Behind, principals' duties have increased to meet the expected performance outcomes (Matthews & Crow, 2003). Consequently, interest has spurred interest among educators regarding the instructional duties and responsibilities of the assistant principal, particularly at the high school level .

This study was conducted to determine the perceptions of principals and assistant principals regarding the assistant principals assigned and desired instructional leadership responsibilities. The study embraced seven areas in the literature: (a) the evolution of the assistant principal (b) the roles and responsibilities of the assistant principal (c) the existing knowledge base relevant to effective schools and instructional leadership, (Lashway, 2003; Lezotte, 2002; Marzano et al., 2005,) (d) the theoretical framework of distributive leadership theory and role theory (Spillane et al, 2001) (e) the impact of school reform and formation of administrative teams (Elmore, 2004, Wallace, 2001) (f) the organizational development of school structure, (Goodwin, 2002) and (g) the reformed role of assistant principal to increase school improvement (Matthews, & Crow 2003; DuFour, 2002; Weller & Weller, 2002).

Discussion of Demographics Findings

Demographic data, in addition to survey data, were gathered from 48 high school assistant principals and 33 principals. Eighty percent of the participants in this study reported working in a suburban high school. Twenty percent reported working in an urban school setting, and no respondents were employed in a rural high school. The majority of principals and assistant principals self-identified themselves as being “White” (92.6%).

Background information on assistant principals indicated that more males (71.6%) are employed as high school assistant principals than females. Sixty percent of assistant principals stated being in the assistant principalship 5 years or less, and 62.5% aspire to advance to higher administrative positions in public education.

Implications on Policy and Practice

Glatthorn (2000) defines instructional leadership as “the exercise of those functions that enable school systems and their schools to achieve their goal of ensuring quality in what students learn.” (p.) Findings in this research revealed that both principals and assistant principals believe the assistant principal should spend more time completing instructional leadership tasks. Thus, this is an excellent opportunity for principals to distribute more instructional leadership responsibilities to assistant principals.

Early research conducted by Mullican and Ainsworth (1979) on the real and ideal roles of principals revealed that principals desire more involvement in instructional leadership. Mullican and Ainsworth concluded that the principals’ roles were not being fulfilled to principals’ satisfaction. The authors theorized that the principals’ perceptions on whether the principal as

instructional leader depends on many factors: (a) personal views, (b) which research is given greater credibility, (c) choice of definitions of instructional leadership and (d) whether the construct is of an ideal or real world.

Six years later, Norton and Kriekard (1985) attempted to define the role of the secondary assistant principalship through real and ideal competencies for the position. This finding had important implications for professional practice: First, assistant secondary school principals viewed every competency as below the level that ideally would make the position more effective. Second, the assistant principalship is the most common entry position for school administrators. This raised the issue of how assistant principals perceive their role expectations.

As found in the literature review, this research proves that high school assistant principals continue to have a significant amount of responsibility in completing instructional evaluations. As stated, most of assistant principals are new to administration now their duties require them to create a new superordinate-subordinate relationship. Since their former interactions and relationships with teachers have changed, based some assistant principals' may be experiencing role conflict. This may explain why they state spending a great deal of time in the area of instructional evaluation. For example, an assistant principal might be required to help teachers develop coordinated curricula, which is a "teacher support" function. However, this function conflicts with the monitoring, supervising, and evaluating functions. Moreover, when they must monitor teachers' compliance, assistant principals may have difficulty maintaining equal collegial and professional relationships with the teachers.

The new accountability facing schools in the 21st century are leading principals and assistant principals to engage in collegial leadership (Hoerr, 2005). Researchers have indicated that the most rewarding parts of the assistant principal's job is working with new teachers and helping teachers create lessons (Bartholomew & Fusarelli, 2003).

This study also showed that high school principals and assistant principals desire high school assistant principals to participate in collegial leadership by utilizing their leadership skills in instructional leadership domains. Particularly, the findings imply that assistant principals would prefer to spend more time communicating with faculty on current instructional effectiveness, analyzing school-wide test data, and facilitating teams to develop their own instructional goals about curriculum reform.

The results found that high school principals want assistant principals to exercise more instructional duties and assistant principals' willingness to increase their instructional leadership responsibilities. Therefore, this study strengthens Martin's (1997) findings on comparison of the assigned versus the desired instructional leadership duties and responsibilities of high school assistant principals as reported by high school principals and assistant principals.

Martin (1997) found no statistical differences between the principals' and assistant principals' opinions of the assigned duties of the assistant principal. Conversely, this study revealed significant differences between the perceptions of principals and assistant principals. Principals' mean scores were higher than assistant principals' mean scores. This indicates that principals do not have a clear understanding of the assistant principal's level of performance in the instructional management and instructional motivation leadership domains.

As for desired instructional leadership duties, this study supports Martin's (1997) research results that assistant principals would be more professionally satisfied if they were more involved in instructional responsibilities as opposed to the duties presently assigned to assistant principals' These results are important because it shows the need to improve communication in instructional leadership responsibilities to improve student achievement, teacher performance, and school climate. These findings are significant in distributive leadership decision-making.

Principals can distribute such duties as managing instructional data, facilitating team brainstorming sessions on new research, and implementing plans to increase student performance. Engaging assistant principals in those kinds of leadership behaviors supports King's (2002) claim that instructional leadership has manifested into the "core technology" of teaching and learning. Stated simply, this involves a deeper involvement for assistant principals to utilize their leadership skills in the use of data to make decisions.

Statistically significant differences were found between male and female assistant principals' perceptions of what instructional leadership duties they desire to perform. Female assistant principals would prefer to invest more of their time in evaluation and facilitation leadership responsibilities. The small percentage of female high school administrator's may be due to the fact that the majority of female administrators are found at the elementary level (Marshall, Hooley, 2006).

In reviewing the literature there was little information on the female assistant principal. Social psychologists and sociolinguists suggest that women's decision-making is more oriented toward caring for everyone and that women's ways of speaking, while less assertive and

authoritarian, include more listening and have the effect of eliciting input and participation in groups (Gilligan, 1982; Marshall, 1988). Such differences would, presumably, favor women's ascendance in an era of school leadership that emphasizes instructional leadership, administrative teams, and teacher empowerment.

School context, structure, and how principals utilize the administrative team may explain the statistical differences of suburban and urban administrators judgments of the assistant principal's assigned and desired instructional leadership duties. This finding supports prior research in that leadership styles and behaviors are most often shaped and framed through the existence of organizational culture and the influence that it has on behavior (Ammeter et al., 2002). Presumably, urban school districts are faced with multiple challenges in attendance, student records, and discipline, which greatly impact how assistant principals are spending their time (Armstrong, 2004).

Armstrong (2004) found that 37% of those assistant principals rotated their duties annually, and although 67% were satisfied with their jobs, their levels of satisfaction were lower in schools with higher student mobility. More recently Mertz' (2005) study on school leadership showed that principals assigned tasks in an ad hoc manner, so the assistants speculated they were assigned according to "who did he see first after learning about the task" (p. 18). Overall, the review of the literature suggested that the assigned duties of assistant principals are diverse, vary from school to school, and are essentially determined by the principal.

Educational researchers have put forth a call for research that not only focuses on how assistant principals view their work, but also on how the principal and assistant principal interact and restructure their relationship to create a co-principalship model (Marzano, et al.,

2005). This study exemplifies the need for strategies that allow assistant principals and principals to share responsibilities, allowing assistant principals to experience more duties that will help the assistant principals become better prepared for the challenges in the principalship.

Learning about instructional leadership occurs through expert knowledge and practical experiences. The more contexts from which assistant principals can select learning experiences, the deeper and more extensive their skill repertoires become (McCarthy, 1996). Another way to bring personal meaning to emerging instructional leaders is to reflect on how the desired role will fit with the present role. For instance, new assistant principals can begin to ponder how their new responsibilities affect their old and new relationships with teachers and students. Mentorship also provides opportunities for assistant principals to discuss how to conduct certain leadership activities. Once assistant principals' have learned the content and skills needed for instructional leadership, they need occasions to use these leadership skills in meaningful ways. According to Armstrong (2004), when assistant principals make good use of their skills, they generally have higher job satisfaction.

Conclusions

The shift to "high stakes" testing, increased emphasis on performance outcomes, teacher improvement, and safety plans may have in some instances, impelled a paradigm shift in how principals utilize the entire administrative team (DuFour, 2002). The paradigm has shifted from teaching to learning, and in order for systematic school improvement this researcher believe that high schools administrative teams need to proactive in redefining the high school leadership responsibilities. Some researchers support administrative reorganization within the

school by referring to the assistant principal as “learning leader” (DuFour, 2002) and Marzano et al.’s model (2005) on creating a co-principalship.

Although principals believe that assistant principals should perform as instructional facilitators and communicators, assistant principals’ greatest responsibility remains in instructional evaluation. This raises questions as to whether this finding was indicative of the assistant principalship being viewed as an entry-level position. Given the pressing policy issue of good training, and training and selection guidelines (Marshall & Holley, 2006), it is suggested that principals utilize the National Association of Secondary School Principals 21st Century School Administrator Skills Assessment for Instructional Leaders (NASSP, 2004 p.190). This instrument is valuable in determining skill levels and establishing or maintaining faculty collegiality which are important factors in determining the success of a school.

In effective school leadership, teams must hold collegial interactions to foster reflection and key conversations. The ongoing dialogue becomes the norm, which becomes a “culture people willingly learn with, learn from, and teach their colleagues” (Hoerr, 2005 p.21). Hoers’ (2005) collegiality contains five components specific to schools. One of the components is specific to promoting collegial relationships between administrators and teachers. School leaders who want to encourage collegiality in their schools should consider Hoers’(2005) approach:

Talking about educational philosophy and school vision

Reviewing common perspectives and goals

Tackling issues and problems in a collegial manner

Discussing how individuals see issues differently due their professional roles

Working together on faculty committees and ad hoc groups to reflect on the past and plan for the future (p.22).

In order for the assistant principal's role to be redefined to include spending more time on instructional facilitation leadership, it requires relieving them some of their other obligations, for instance, their operational duties, buses, lunches, and routine discipline. These duties pull administrators away from (Hoers, 2005) "capacity-building responsibilities like supporting effective instruction and fostering a school climate that nurtures and motivates students" (p. 24). Personnel could be recruited to perform some of those duties, which would then enable principals to distribute instructional leadership responsibilities, such as managing data, facilitating team brainstorming sessions, and implementing plans to increase student performance.

Accepting a shared instructional leadership role increases assistant principal's responsibility for increasing student achievement and thereby would exchange daily crisis management for long-term planning and school improvement. Finding ways to free time for assistant principal's to function as instructional leaders in schools has been and continues to be a challenge. One consideration for school districts is better utilization of their administrative workforce. For instance, the district could differentiate roles so that assistant principals can lead curricular and instructional improvement, while routine supervisory tasks can be assigned to support positions. (Steele & Curtis, 2005).

Today, many schools are implementing a school resource officer program to help in identifying, prioritizing problems and in developing solutions (Atkinson, 2000). The school resource officer program stems from the practice of community policing. The school community may involve the following: superintendents, administrators, principals and assistant principals,

teachers and assistants, counselors, school nurses, school social workers and psychologists, bus drivers, custodians and cafeteria personnel, students and parents. The team's focus is on creating a setting that is safe and secure, with a focus on prevention and early intervention activities.

The roles and responsibilities of the school resource officer(SRO) often varies from school to school and their responsibilities can be incorporated into their job description (Atkinson, 2000). Some functions served by the SRO are: public safety specialist, community problem solver, and law related educator and positive role model. Implementing an effective school resource officer program will be helpful in areas of discipline, crisis and emergency management planning, crime prevention or intervention, and other safe- school planning

The areas emerging from this study require a more in-depth research to understand both the dynamics of the high school principalship and its potential to contribute to the leadership of schools in these challenging times. While assistant principals are very busy people who work long hours and are under considerable pressure in roles that have changed and are changing, there are indications that they may well be an under-utilized resource, particularly from an instructional leadership perspective. (Cranston, 2002).

Limitations

The number of principals and assistant principals that completed survey instruments limited this study. There were 33 principal respondents (male = 28, female =5) and 48 assistant principal (male = 30, female = 18) respondents. The sample consisted of 33 high schools within Morris and Union County (urban = 5, suburban = 28, rural = 0). Ethnicity

representation is limited this study, as majority of assistant principals identified themselves as White (95.7%), African American (4.9%), or Hispanic (2.5%).

Recommendations for Future Research

The roles and responsibilities have changed throughout the evolution of the position of assistant principal (Johnson, 2000; Rutherford, 2002; Weller & Weller, 2001).

Today's assistant principals may still be dealing with student discipline, parental complaints and teacher/student problems; however, the shift to high stakes testing for job accountability may have added more instructional leadership duties. The need for qualified administrators is rapidly increasing, therefore a very critical area that needs to be addressed is how do school districts replace assistant principals as they retire or are promoted to the principalship or other administrative position. However, no evaluation instruments have been devised specifically measuring the ability of the assistant principal skills.

Research indicates that high school assistant principals play a major role in instructional leadership. Nevertheless, discrepancies exist in the principals' and assistant principals' assessments on normative and desirable instructional leadership duties.

A follow-up study is needed to determine if there is a need to standardize the instructional leadership role of the high school assistant principalship.

Based upon the findings of this study, the following future studies are recommended.

1. Two vital areas for follow-up research are: The first is to investigate the notion of teams and team development among the secondary administrative teams. Utilizing Breaking Ranks II 21st Century School Administrator Skills () to evaluate assistant principals' skill

level as perceived by assistant principals, principals, and teachers is suggested. The data collection from this assessment will be more relevant to the current structure and practices of high school Administration. (Breaking Ranks II: Strategies for Leading High School Reform, 2005). It is suggested that the aforementioned data collection can be utilized in the development of a new assessment instrument. Other inputs to consider:

Literature review

Ideas and concepts from similar studies into the roles and workloads of secondary principals, including several sub-sections, not only instructional leadership.

It is suggested to include open-ended items providing the opportunity for explanation of specific closed item responses. One open-ended item specific to team work is an important factor in the operations of schools, as well as on the overall satisfaction of high school principals. Another question may pertain to level of job satisfaction in relation to the alignment between real and ideal responsibilities.

Feedback and comment from executive members New Jersey Principal and Superintendents Association.

Pilot study for trialing presentation, sense, and formatting.

2. Future studies should examine the roles and responsibilities of high school assistant principals and effects on student achievement through a quantitative meta-analysis.

Marzano, et al., 2005) conducted this type of study on the effects of school leadership and student achievement distinguished 21 leadership responsibilities and calculated an average

correlation between each responsibility and whatever measures of student achievement were used in the original studies. The researchers' data analysis revealed a 10% increase in student test scores of an

3. average principal who improved his/her "demonstrated abilities in all of 21 responsibilities by one standard deviation" (p.3).
4. Future studies should focus on recruiting and retaining female high school assistant principals.
5. Important differences emerged among the roles of the assistant principal and school context, which reveals need for further investigation. Future studies should look at and compare the roles and responsibilities of secondary assistant principals by school description. Consideration was also given to finding or developing an instrument which could be scored in an objective and rapid manner.
6. Future studies should look at the difference in roles and responsibilities of the principals will undoubtedly play a key role in helping their assistant principals.
7. Future studies should explore collaborative leadership and distributed leadership among administrative teams.

References

- Abrams and Gibbs (2000). Planning for school change: School-community Collaboration in a full-service elementary. *Urban Education*, 35: 79-103.
- Absug, R. & Phelps, S. (1998) Everything old is new again: Barnard's legacy-lessons for participative leaders. *Journal of Management Development*, 17, 3, 207-218.
- Aieta, R., Barth, R. & O'Brien, S. (1988). The principal in the year 2000: A teacher's wish. *Clearing House* 62(1), 18-19.
- Alexander, W. & George, P. (1993). Grouping students in the middle school. In the exemplary middle school (2nd ed., pp. 299-330). Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Alpin, N. (1983). *Values guiding the leadership of a suburban school superintendent*. Un published doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati.
- Alvoid, K. L. (1999). Leadership: A function of teamwork. *High School Magazine*, 7(3), 16-21
- Ammeter, A. P., Douglas, C., Gardner, W. L., Hochwarter, W. A., & Ferris, G. R. (2002). Toward a political theory of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13(6), 751-796.
- Anderson, C. R. (1977). Locus of control, coping behaviors, and performance in a stress setting: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62(4), 446-451.
- Andrews, R.L., & Soder, R. (1987). Principal leadership and student achievement. *Educational Leadership*, 44(6),9-11.
- Anthes, K. (2003, March). StateNotes: Leadership. State Policy Scan on Distributed Leadership Structures in Education. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Armstrong, L. (2004). The secondary assistant principal in the state of Texas: Duties and job satisfaction, University of Houston. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65(02), 353. [Electronic version]. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from <http://wwwlib.umi.com/dissertations/fullcit/3122339>
- Atkinson, A.J. (2000) The successful school resource officer program: Building effective School and law enforcement partnerships, Richmond, VA: Greystone Publishers. Retrieved July 3, 2006, from [www. Colorado.edu](http://www.Colorado.edu).

- Austin, D.B., & Brown, H. L., Jr. (1970). Report of the assistant principalship of the study of the secondary school principalship. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. (1999). Reexamining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 7, 441-462.
- Awender, M.A. (1978). The Principal's Leadership Role: Perceptions of teachers, principals and Superintendents. *Journal of Education* 99(2), p. 172-179
Retrieved November 3, 2005, from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/Home.portalEric>, EJ196703.
- Ayas, K. and Zenuik, N. (2001). Project-based learning: building communities of reflective practitioners, *Management Learning*, 32, (1), 61-76
- Barnett, B. G., Basom, M. R., Yerkes, D. M., & Norris, C. J. (2000). Cohorts in educational leadership programs: Benefits, difficulties, and the potential for developing school leaders. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(2), 255-282.
- Barnett, B., & Whitaker, K. (1996). *Restructuring for student learning*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Company.
- Barth, R. (1991). *Improving schools from within*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bartholomew, S. K., & Fusarelli, L. D. (2003). Reconnecting preparation and practice through the work lives of assistant principals. In F. C. Lunenburg & C. S. Carr (Eds.), *Shaping the future* (pp.291-300). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Education.
- Bates, R.C., & Shank, J.G. (1983). The associate principalship: A better, more effective way to manage schools. *NASSP Bulletin*, 67 (462)111-116.
- Bearden, D. B., K. & Babu, S. (1995). Effective schools: Is there a winning combination of administrators, teachers and students Association. San Francisco: American Education Research
- Bell, C. S., & Chase, S. E. (1989, March). *Women as leaders in a male-dominated context*. Paper present at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Bennett, N., Harvey, J. A., Wise, C., & Woods, P. A. (2003) Distributed Leadership a Desk Study. <http://www.ncsl.org/literaturereviews>
- Black, S. (2000). Finding time to lead. *American School Board Journal*, 187 (1), 46-48.

- Blase', J., & Blasé, J. (1999). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: Teachers' perspectives. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 35(3), 349-380.
- Bolman, L.G. and Deal, T. E. (1997), *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership*. San Francisco, CA, Jossey Bass.
- Bottoms, G. O., K. (2001). Preparing a new breed of school principals: It's time for action.
- Boyan, N.J. (1988). Describing and explaining administrative behaviors. In N.J. Boyins, (Ed.), *The handbook on research on educational administration* (pp.77-97). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Brent, B., Haller, & E., McNamara, J. (1997). Does graduate training in educational administration improve America's schools?. *Phi Delta Kappa*, 79, 222-227.
- Brieve, F. (1972). Secondary principals as instructional leaders. *NASSP Bulletin* 56(368): 11-15.
- Brook over, W., & Lezotte, L (1977). *Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement: Executive summary*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, College of Urban Development.
- Brottman, M.A. (1970). Theory into practice. Teacher education for urban schools. *Education and Urban Society* 2(3), 315-334.
- Bryant, M. (2003). Cross-cultural perspectives on school leadership: Lessons form Native American Interviews. In Bennett, N., Crawford, M and Cartwright, M. (Eds.), *Effective Educational Leadership*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing. (pp. 216-228).
- Calabrese, R. L. (1991). Effective assistant principals: What do they do? *Principals Bulletin*, 75, 51-57.
- Calabrese, R. L. (1991). The Principal and assistant principal: A mentoring relationship. *Principals Bulletin*, 75, 67-74.
- Campbell, D.T. and Stanley, J.C. (1966). *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research*. Rand McNally, Chicago, Illinois.
- Catelli, G. & Protheroe, N. (2001). High student achievement: How six school districts changed into high-performance systems. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Celikten, M. (2001). The instructional leadership task of high school assistant principal. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(1), 67.
- Champeau, D. (1998). Great ideas in teaching health. Boston, MA: Ally and Bacon.

- Champ, J. (1995). *Reengineering management*. New York: Harper.
- Chuckle, K. (2000). The contemporary principal. *Education Update*, 42, 3-8.
- Chen, K. Blending, J. & McGrath, V. (2000). Job satisfaction among high School assistant principals. Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association. Bowling Green, Ky.
- Church, A. H., & Waclawski, J. (1998). The relationship between individual personality orientation and executive leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 71(2), 99-125.
- Coffey, E. & Lashway, (2002). *Trends & issues: School Reform*. Clearinghouse on educational Policy and Management. University of Oregon. Retrieved from, http://eric.uoregon.edu/trends_issues/reform/
- Cohen, G. S. (1999). Strategies for school system leaders on district level change. In *System Thinking: Untangling the Knots of Systemic Change* (Eds.), S. T. Shophie Sa, Kenneth Tewel, George Perry and Kathaleen Larson Florio, Panasonic Foundation and American Association of School Administrators.
- Coleman, J.S., Campbell, E.Q., Hobson, C.J., McPartland, J., Mood, A.M., Weinfeld, F.D., et al. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Conley, D. T. & B., Francis. (2002). *University expectations for student success: Implications for system alignment and state standard and assessment policies*. University of Oregon.
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to Great*. New York. HarperCollins.
- Cotton, K. (2003). *Principals and student achievement: What the research says*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Covey, S. 1989. *The seven habits of highly effective people*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Cranston, N. (2002). School-based management, leaders and leadership: Change and challenges for principals. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 30(1), 2-12.
- Cranston, N., Tromans, C. & Reugebrink, M. (2004). Forgotten leaders: what do we know about the deputy principalship in secondary school? *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory & Practice*, 7(2), 225-242.

- Crockett, M. (1996). Reculturing American education: The emerging task of leadership. *Clearing House* 69(3), 183-187.
- Crow, G. H., C. & Scribner, J. (2002). *Reshaping the role of school principal*. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.
- Daggett, W.R. (2002) Moving from standards to instructional practice. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84(620), 66-72.
- Danielson (2002). *Enhancing student achievement*. Alexandria VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Daresh, J. C. (2004). *Beginning the assistant principalship*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Day, C. Harris, A. Hadfield, M. Trolley, H. & Beresford, J. (2000). *Leading schools in times of change*. Buckingham, NY: Open University Press.
- Dolan, W. P. (1994). *Restructuring our schools*. Kansas City, MO: Systems and Organization.
- Drucker, P. (2002). *The effective executive*. New York: Harper Collins.
- DuFour, R. (2003). Professional Learning Community. *School Administrator*, 60(5), 13-18.
- Dunne, D. W., & Delisio, E. R. (2001). Common elements of effective schools. Retrieved January 22, 2006, from http://www.educationworld.com/a_issues/issues168.shtml
- Elmore, R., Abelman, C., & Fuhrman, S. (1996). The new accountability in state education policy. In H. Ladd (Ed.), *Performance-based strategies for improving schools* (pp. 65-98). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Washington, DC: Albert Shanker Institute.
- Elmore, R. F. (2004). *School reform from the inside out*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Ferris, G. R., Frink, D. D., Galang, M. C., Zhou, J., Kacmar, K. M., & Howard, J. L. (1996). Perceptions of organizational politics: Prediction, stress-related implications and outcomes. *Human Relations*, 49(2), 233-266.
- Fink, D. (2003). Sustaining leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(8), 598-606.

- Fink, E. & Resnick, L. (2003). *Developing principals as instructional leaders*. University of Pittsburgh, Learning Research and Development Center.
- Fletcher, J. K., & Kaufer, K. (2003). Shared leadership: Paradox and possibility. In C.L. Pearce & J.A. Conger (Eds.), *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*. (pp.21-47). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Frazier, C. R. (2002). Roles and responsibilities of public middle school, junior high school, and high school assistant principals in the state of Mississippi. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63, 04A, 1201.
- Fullan, M. (2002). The change leader. *Educational Leadership* 59(8): 16-21.
- Fultan, O.K. (1987). Basic competencies of the assistant principal. *NASSP Bulletin* 71(501), 52-54.
- Getsels, J. W., Lipham, J.M. & Campbell, R.F. (1968). *Educational administration as a social process: Theory, research, practice*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Glanz, J. (1994)^a. Dilemmas of assistant principals in their supervisory role: Reflections of an assistant principal. *Journal of School Leadership* 4: 577-590.
- Glanz, J. (1994)^b. Redefining the roles and responsibilities of assistant principals. *Clearing House*, 67(5): 283-287.
- Glatthorn, A.A. (2000). *The principal as curriculum leader: Shaping what is taught and tested*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- Glickman, C.D., Gordon, S.P., & Ross-Gordon, J.M. (1995). *Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach* (3rd ed.), Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Golanda, E. L. (1991). Preparing tomorrow's educational leaders: an inquiry regarding the wisdom of utilizing the position of assistant principal as an internship or apprenticeship to prepare future principals. *Journal of School Leadership* 1(3): 266-283.
- Goldring, E. B. (1990). Elementary school principals as boundary spanners: Their engagement with parents. *Journal of Educational Administration* 28(1): 53-62.
- Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Goodson, C. P. (2000). Assisting the assistant principal. *NASSP Bulletin* 79(4): 56-57.

- Goodwin, R. H. (2002). On the edge of chaos: A Delphi study of the changing role of the secondary principal, West Virginia University.
- Gordon, R. (1987). Improving the assistant principalship. *NASSP Bulletin* 71(501): 1-4.
- Gorton, D., & Kattman, B. (1985). The assistant principal: An underused asset. *Principal* 65(21), 36-40.
- Graetz, F. (2000). Strategic change leadership. *Management Decision*, 38 (8): 550-562.
- Greenfield, W. D. (1995). Developing an instructional role for the assistant principal. *Education and Urban Society*, 18, 85-91.
- Griffiths, D.E. (1988). Educational administration: Reform PDQ or RIP. University Council for Education Administration, Occasional Paper No. 8312, Arizona State University, Tempe.
- Griffiths, D.E., Stout, R. T., & Forsyth, P.B. (1987). Leaders for America's schools: The report and papers of the NCEE. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Gronn, P. (2002). *The new work of educational leaders: Changing leadership practice in an age of school Reform*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Gunter, H. (2002). Teacher appraisal 1988-1998: a case study. *School Leadership and Management* 22 (1). pp: 61-72.
- Gunter, H. & Ribbins, P. (2003). Challenging orthodoxy in school leadership studies: knowers, knowing and knowledge? *School Leadership & Management*, 23(2),125-128.
- Guzman, N. (1995). The Leadership covenant: Essential factors for developing cocreative relationships within a learning community. *Journal of Leadership Studies* 24, (4),151-160.
- Hallinger, G. N. (1987). Principal instructional management rating scale. *Educational Leadership* 44, 55-61.
- Hallinger, P. & Heck, R.H. (1995). *Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995*. Nashville, TN: Author, Vanderbilt University.
- Harris, A. & Chapman, C. (2002). *Democratic leadership for school improvement in challenging contexts*. Paper presented to the International Congress on School Effectiveness and Improvement, Copenhagen.
- Hart, A. W. (1993). *Principal succession*. Albany, NY: SUNY.

- Hartzell, G. N. (1993). The assistant principal: Neglected actor in practitioner leadership literature. *Journal of School Leadership* 3(6), 707-723.
- Hartzell, G. N. (1995). Helping administrators learn to avoid seven common employee performance appraisal errors. *Journal of Staff Development*, 16(2).
- Harvey, M. S. (1995). Measuring the perception of the primary school deputy principal's responsibilities. *Journal of Education Administration*, 33(4), 69-91.
- Hater, J. J., & Bass, B. M. (1988). Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(4), 695-702.
- Heck, R. H. M., G.A. (1993). Principal leadership behaviors and school leadership. *NASSP Bulletin* 77(553), 20-28.
- Hill, P. (1998). Shaking the foundations: Research driven school reform, School effectiveness and school improvement, 9(4), 419-436.
- Hoerr, T. R. (2005). *The art of school leadership*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria: Va.
- Hoes, D. G. (1991). An analysis of the principal's instructional leadership style and behavior as perceived by selected elementary school principals and teachers in the state of Maryland, Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland 1991.
- Hooley, R. M. (1997). *Site-based management, styles of goal accomplishments and diversity: Hiring and promotional practices among North Carolina assistant principals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Hopkins, D, Harris, A, Singleton, C & Watts, R, (2000), *Creating the conditions for teaching and learning*. London: David Fulton Publishers
- Hosking, D. (1988). Organizing, leadership and skillful process. *Journal of Management Studies*, 2, 147-178.
- House, R. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership on the cutting edge* (pp.) 189-207. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- House, R. (1991). The distribution and exercise of power in complex organizations: A meso theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, 2(1), 23-58.

- House, R. J., Spangler, W. D., Woycke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the U.S. presidency: A psychological theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 364-396.
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(6), 891-902.
- Howell, J. M., & Higgins, C. A. (1990). Champions of technological innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, 317-341.
- Hunt, J.G. (1999). Transformational/charismatic leadership's transformation of the field: An historical essay. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 129-144.
- Hurley, L. (1965). Vice principal-educational leader or hatchet man? *NASSP Bulletin* 49(297): 12-14.
- Imel, S. (2000). Change: Connections to adult learning and education. *Eric Digest*, 22. Retrieved on May 25, 2006 <http://www.calproonline.org/eric/docgen.asp?tbl=digests&ID=106>
- Institute for Educational Leadership (2000, October). *Leadership for student learning: Reinventing the principalship*. A Report of the task force on the principalship. Washington DC:
- Institute for Educational Leadership (2001). *Leadership for student learning: Recognizing the state's role in public education*. Washington, DC.
- Iwanicki, E. F. (1999). ISLLC standards and assessment in the context of school leadership reform. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 13, 3, pp. 283-294.
- Johnson, R. (2000). Other duties as assigned. Four rules for surviving the assistant principalship. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84(612), 85-87.
- Jorgenson, O. (2000). Dancing through the minefield. *Principal Leadership*, 2, 72-74.
- Josey, G. R. (1988). The role of the assistant principal for curriculum and instruction in the public schools of Georgia as perceived by principals and assistant principals, University of Georgia.
- Kahn, R. L, Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., & Snoek, J. D. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: Wiley.
- Kahn, R. L., & Quinn, R. P. (1970). Role stress: A framework for analysis. In A. McLean (Ed.). *Mental health and work organizations*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

- Kaplan, L. S. & Owings. (1999). Assistant principals: The case for shared instructional leadership. *NASSP Bulletin*, 83(605), p80-94.
- Katz, G. & Kahn, R.L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kelly, G. (1987). The assistant principalship as a training ground for principalship. *NASSP Bulletin* 71(501): 13-19.
- Kets de Vries, M. F.R. (1999). High-Performance Teams: Lessons from Pygmies. *Organizational Dynamic*, 27(3), 66-77.
- Keyes, M. W., Capper, C. A., Jamison, M., Martin, J., & Opsal, C. A. (1999). Tradition and alternative in educational practice: Three stories of Epistemological conflict. *Journal for Just and Caring Education*, 5. (4), 502-519.
- King, D. (2002). The Changing Face of Leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 59, 8.
- Knight, P.T. & Trowler, P. R. (2001) *Departmental leadership in higher education*. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University.
- Kohn, A. (2001). Fighting the test: A practical guide to rescuing our schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(5), 349-357.
- Kretovics, J. N., E. (1994). *Transforming urban education*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kruse, S.D., Louis, K.S., & Bryk, A.S. (1995). An emerging framework for analyzing school-based professional community, In *Professionalism and community: perspectives on reforming urban schools*, (Eds.) (pp. 24, 30). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Kuhnert, K. W., & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(4), 648-657.
- Kuhnert, K. W., & Russell, C. J. (1990). Using constructive developmental theory and data to bridge the gap between personnel selection and leadership. *Journal of Management*, 16, 595-607.
- Lakomski, G. (2002, September). Distributed leadership: an idea whose time has come? Keynote paper, National Conference of the British Educational leadership, Management and Administration Society, Aston University.

- LaRocque, L. & Coleman, P. (1990). Quality control: School accountability and district ethos. In M. Holmes, K. Leithwood, & D. Musella (Eds.), *Educational policy for effective schools*, (pp. 168-191). Toronto, ON: OISE Press.
- Lashway, L. (2000). Who's in charge? The accountability challenge. *Principal Leadership*, 1(3), 8-13.
- Lashway, L. (2002, Spring). Rethinking the principalship. *Research Roundup*, 18, 3. Available: http://eric.uoregon.edu/publications/roundup/Spring_2002.html
- Laughery, W. W. (1959). Expedience or vision in the assignment of assistant principal's duties? *NASSP Bulletin* 43, 112-113.
- Leedy, P. O., J.E. (2005). *Practical research planning and design*. Upper Saddle River, NJ, Pearson Education.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K.S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). Review of research: How leadership affects student learning. *Learning from Leadership Project*: 1-90.
- Levine, S. (1993). Reflections on school leadership. *Independent Schools* 53: 25-30.
- Lewin, K. (1936). *Principles of topological psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lewis, N. A. (1984). Instructional leadership styles of effective elementary school principals in Texas (Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1984). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 45, 709A
- Lezotte, L. (1994). The nexus of instructional leadership and effective schools. *School Administrator*.
- Lezotte, L. (2001). *Revolutionary and evolutionary: The effective schools movement*. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd
- Lipham, J. (1981). *Effective principal, effective school*. Reston, VA: NASSP.
- Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of Collegiality and Experimentation: Workplace Conditions of school success, *American Educational Research Journal* 19: 326-334.
- Little, J. W. (1985). Is there instructional leadership in high schools? *NASSP Bulletin* 18(3), 29-30.
- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership*, 7(3), 385-42.

- Lunenburg, F.E., & Ornstein, L.E. (2000). *Educational administration: concepts and practices*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Manatt, R. (1989). Principal evaluation is largely wrong headed and ineffective. *Executive Educator* 11(11), 22-23.
- Marazza, L. (2003). *The 5 essentials of organizational excellence*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Corwin Press.
- Marion, R., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2001). Leadership in complex organizations, *Leadership Quarterly*, 12(4), 389-418.
- Marshall, C. (1988). Analyzing the culture of school leadership. *Education and Urban Society*, 20(3), 262-275.
- Marshall, C. (1989). More than black face and skirts: New leadership to confront the major dilemmas in education. *Agenda*, 1(4), 4-11.
- Marshall, C. (1991). *The assistant principal: Leadership choices and challenges*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Publishing.
- Marshall, C. (1992). The dynamics in the enculturation and the work in the assistant principalship. *Urban Education* 22, 36-52.
- Marshall, C., & Holley, R. (2006). *The Assistant principal: Leadership choices and challenges* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, Ca: Corwin Press.
- Martin, P. M. (1997). *A comparison of the assigned versus the desired instructional leadership duties and responsibilities of high school assistant principals as reported by high school principals and assistant principals*. Baltimore, University of Maryland.
- Marzano, R.J., Waters, T. & McNulty, B. (2005). *School Leadership That Works*. Aurora, CO. Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Matthews, J., & Crow, G. (2003). *Being and becoming a principal. Role conceptions for contemporary principals and assistant principals*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- McCarthy, B. (1999). About learning. *Educational Leadership* 56, 76-86.
- McIntyre, K. (1988). How to increase the assistant principal's effectiveness. NASSP tips for principals. *Principal* 6(1).

- Melcher, A. J. (1977). Leadership models and research approaches. In J. G. Hunt & L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge*, (pp. 94-108). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Merrill, R. (2001). Lost luster. *School Administrator*, 58(10), 18-22.
- Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure*. New York: Free Press.
- Mertz, N. M., S. R. (1999). Through the looking glass: An up front and personal look at the world of the assistant principal.
- Mertz, N. (2005). How it works: Organizational socialization of assistant principals. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Miller, D., Kets De Vries, M. F. R., & Toulouse, J. (1982). Top executive locus of control and its relationship to strategy-making, structure, and environment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25(2), 237-253.
- Michael, G. J., Cason, F.W. Jennings, J.J., Palmer, R.L., T.R., & Pressley, S. (1993, October). *The assistant principal's accountability in school reform and restructuring*. Paper presented at the South Carolina State University Management Institute on the Assistant Principal, Hilton Head, SC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED358528).
- Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning. (2000). *Asking the right questions: The school leader's guide to systemic thinking about school improvement*. Aurora, CO: Author.
- Mitchell, B. A. (1987). Modes for managing the assistant principalship: Sex differences in socialization, role orientation and mobility of public secondary school assistant principals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Muffs, M. S. L. (1999). Job sharing for administrators: A consideration for public schools. *NASSP Bulletin* 83(605): 70-73.
- Mullican, F. & Ainsworth, L. (1979). The role of the principal. *Theory into Practice*: 18(1) 33-38.
- Murname, R.J. (1981). Interpreting the evidence on school effectiveness. *Teachers College Record*, pp. 19-38.
- Murphy, J. (2001, September). *Re-culturing the Profession of Educational Leadership: New Blueprints*. Paper commissioned for Ensuring Universities Capacity to Prepare Learning Focused Leadership Conference. Racine WI: Author.
- Murphy, J. & Hallinger, P. (1988). Characteristics of instructionally effective school districts. *Journal of Educational Research*, 81(3), 175-181.

- Naisbitt, J. A., P. (1985). *Reinventing the corporation*. New York: Warner Books.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. (1991). *Restructuring the role of the assistant principal*. Reston, VA: Council on the Assistant Principalship.
- National Association of Elementary School Principals. (2003). *K-12 Principals Guide To No Child Left Behind*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Association of Elementary School Principals. (2003). *Urban principals respond: Building and maintaining high achieving schools*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. (1996). *Breaking ranks I: Changing an American institution*. Reston, VA: Author.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. (2001, February). *Reconfiguring the traditional school*. *Principal Leadership: High School* (Ed.) Reston, VA: Author.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. (2004). *Breakthrough High Schools: Breaking ranks II*. Reston, VA: Author.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1998). *The school administrator supply*. Columbia, MO: Author.
- Nelson, M., & Quick, J. C. (1994). *Organizational behavior: Foundations, realities, and challenges*. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.
- Norton, M. S. & Kriekard, J.A. (1987). Real and ideal competencies for the assistant principal. *NASSP Bulletin* 71(501): 23-30.
- Ogilvie, D. (1977). Leadership and high school deputy principal. *Journal of Education Administration*, 15(1), 92-103.
- Ortiz, F. I., & Marshall, C. (1988). Women in educational administration. In N. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp.123-142). New York: Longman.
- Osborn, R. N., & Hunt, J. G. (1975). An adaptive-reactive theory of leadership: The role of macro variables in leadership research. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership frontiers*, (pp. 27-44.) Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.
- Overholt, H. K., L. (1994). Changing people, changing organizations information strategy. *The Executive's Journal* 11, 39-45.

- Owings, L. S. K. W. A. (1999). Assistant principals: The case for shared instructional leadership. *NASSP Bulletin* 83(610), 80-94.
- Quinn, T. K. (2002). Redefining leadership in the standards era. *Principal*, 82(1), 16-20.
- Pack, R. (1986). A profile of the high school assistant principal in Georgia, University of Georgia.
- Panyako, D. Rorrie., L. (1987). The changing role of the assistant principal. *NASSP Bulletin* 71(502): 1-8.
- Paskey, R. J. (1989). The principal as mentor, partner of assistant principals. *NASSP Bulletin* 73(516), 95-98.
- Pellicer, L. O. Stevens., K.R. (1991). The assistant principalship as a legitimate terminal career alternative. *NASSP Bulletin* 75(533), 59-65.
- Peterson, K.D., Marshall, C., & Grier, T. (1987). The assistant principals' academy: Technical training and socialization of future leaders. *NASSP Bulletin*, 32-38.
- Pillai, R. (1995). Context and charisma: *The role of organic structure, collectivism, and crisis in the emergence of charismatic leadership*. Academy of Management Best Paper Proceedings.
- Polite, V. C., & Davis, J. E. (2004). African American males in school and society: Practices and policies for effective education. New York; Teachers College Press: New York
- Poore, D.E. (1983). Instructional leadership styles of middle school principals (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1983). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 44, 978A.
- Popper, M., & Zakkai, E., (1994). Transactional, charismatic and transformational leadership: Conditions conducive to their predominance. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 15(6), 3-7.
- Porter, J. J. (1996). What is the role of the middle level assistant principal, and how should it change? *NASSP Bulletin* 57(8), 23-30.
- Portin, B. S. Shen, J.,S., & Williams, R. C. (1998). The changing principalship and its impact: Voices from principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 82(602), 1-8.
- Pressley, M., & Block, C. C. (2002). Summing up: What comprehension instruction could be. In C.C.Block & M.Pressley (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices* (pp. 383-392). New York: Guilford..

- Principals, National Association of Secondary School (2001). *Priorities and barriers in high school leadership: A survey of principals*. Reston, VA: M. F. Foundation. Reston.
- Radich, P. A. (1990). *Performance styles and the high school assistant principal: A field study*. Annual meeting of the Washington Educational Research Association. Tacoma WA.
- Reitzig, U. (1997). *Images of principal instructional leadership: From super-vision to collaborative inquiry*. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 12(4): 322-343.
- Resnick, L.B. (2001). *Developing principals as instructional leaders*. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 82, 598-606
- Resnick, L. & Glennan, T. (2002). *Leadership for learning: A theory of action for urban school districts*. In A. Hightower, M.S. Knapp, J. Marsh & M. McLaughlin (Eds). (2002). *School districts and instructional renewal*. (pp. 160-172). New Your, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Ribbons, P. (1997). *Heads on deputy headship: impossible roles for invisible role holders?* *Educational Management and Administration* 25(3): 295-308.
- Richard, A. (2000). *Lesson of a century. The toughest job in education: Education Week: [On-line]*. Retrieved May 21, 2006 from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2000/04/12/31principal.h19.html>
- Richard, M. (2004, September). *Bush test proposal for high schoolers joins wider trend*. *Education Week* 24(03): 32-33.
- Roberson, S.L. (2003). *A descriptive and comparative study of the duties and responsibilities of secondary assistant principals in Texas schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Baylor University.
- Robinson, V. (2001). *Embedding leadership in task performance*, In: Wong K. & Evers C. (Eds.), *Leadership for quality schooling*. London, Routledge.
- Rommetveit, R. (1954). *Social norms and roles*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Runyon, K. E. (1973). *Some interactions between personality variables and management styles*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57(3), 288-294.
- Rutherford, D. (2002). *Changing times and changing roles: The perspectives of primary headteachers on their senior management teams*. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 30, 447-459.

- Salant, R. D. (1994). *How to conduct your own survey*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Savery, L.K. & Dyson, J.D. (1992). Ideal decision making styles indicated by deputy principals. *Journal of Educational Administration* 30(2), 18-25.
- Schneider, B., & Gunnarson, S. (1991). Organizational climate and culture: The psychology of the workplace. In J. W. Jones, B. D. Steffy, & D. W. Bray (Eds.), *Applying psychology in business: The handbook for managers and human resource professionals* (pp.). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Schiff, T. (2002). Principals readiness for reform; A comprehensive approach. *Principal Leadership (High School ed.)*, 2(5), 21-26.
- Scoggins, A. J. & Bishop., H.L. (1993). *A review of literature regarding the roles and responsibilities of assistant principals*. Annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association. New Orleans, LA.
- Scott, G.H. (1983). Actual and ideal management instructional leadership, and community relation's functions of the elementary school principal in the Baltimore County Public Schools as perceived by the selected others (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1983). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 44, 2938-A.
- Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in administration*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York, Double Day.
- Sergiovanni, T J. (2001). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective* (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1987). *Women in educational administration*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Shartle, C. L. (1961). *Leadership and organizational behavior*. New York, Rinehart and Winston.
- Sherman, J. D., & Smith, H. L. (1984). The influence of organizational structure on intrinsic versus extrinsic motivation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27 (4), 877-885.
- Shockley, R.E. & Smith, D. (1981). The co-principal: Looking at realities. *Clearing-House*, 90-93.
- Simpson, P. R. (2000). *Assistant Principal's Survival Guide: Practical Guidelines & Materials for Managing all areas of your work*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Smith, J. A. (1987). Assistant principals: New demands, new realities and new perspectives. *NASSP Bulletin* 71(501), 9-12.
Kappan, 83(8), 584-594.

- Southern Regional Education Board. (2000). *Teacher salaries and state priorities for education quality*. Atlanta, GA: Author.
- Spady, W. G. (1985). The vice-principal as an agent of instructional reform. *Education and Urban Society* 18: 107-119.
- Spady, W. G. S., C. (2001). Leading when everyone goes back to zero. *Principal Leadership*.
- Spaulding, F. E. (1995). *School superintendent in action in five cities*. Ringe, NH: Richard R. Smith Publishers.
- Spillane, J., Halverson, R. Diamond, J.B. (2001). Investigating School Leadership Practice: A Distributed Perspective. *Educational Researcher* 30(3), 23-28.
- Spillane, J. P. & S Sherer, J. Z. (2004). A distributed perspective on school leadership: Leadership practices as stretched over people and place. The Distributed Leadership Study: Northwestern University.
- Steele, J.L & Curtis, R. (2005). *Preparing non-principal administrators to foster whole-school improvement in Boston*. Commissioned by the Massachusetts Department of Education's State Action for Educational Leadership Project. Retrieved on July 3, 2006, from www.bostonslig.org.
- Stein, M. K., & D'Amico, L. (2000). *Inquiry at the crossroads of policy and learning: A study of a district-wide literacy initiative*. New York, NY: Teacher College Press.
- Stewart, R. (1976). *Contrasts in management*. Maidenhead, Berkshire, England: McGraw-Hill UK.
- Stewart, R. (1982). *Choices for the manager: A guide to understanding managerial work*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Sutter, M. R. (1996). What do we know about the job and career satisfaction of secondary school assistant principals?, *NASSP Bulletin*, 80, 108-111.
- Sweeney, J. (1982). Research synthesis on effective school leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 39, 346-352.
- Sweetland, S. H., W. (2000). School characteristics and educational outcomes: Toward an organizational model of student achievement in middle schools. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 26, 703-729.

- Szabo, M. (1994). Rethinking restructuring: Building habits of effective inquiry. In M. W. McLaughlin and I. Oberman (Eds.), *Professional Development in the Reform Era*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Tanner, C. K., & Dennard, V. R. (1995). Leadership behavior of the high school principal and assistant principal for instruction. *The High School Journal* 172-181.
- Taylor, R., & Williams, R. D. (2001). Accountability: Threat or target? *School Administrator*, 56(6), 30-33.
- Tewel, K. J. (1995). *New schools for a new century: A leader's guide to high school Reform*. Delray Beach, FL: St. Lucie Press.
- The Education Alliance (2004). *Breaking Ranks II: Strategies for leading high school reform*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Thompson, R.L., & Jones, L. (1997). A study of roles and responsibilities of assistant secondary school principles. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South American Educational Research Association: Memphis, TN.
- Togneri, W., & Anderson, S.E. (2003). *Beyond islands of excellence: What districts can do to improve instruction and achievement in all schools*. Washington, DC: The Learning First Alliance and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Toth, C. (1996). Restructuring the assistant principalship: A practitioner's guide. *NASSP Bulletin*, 80(578), 87-98.
- Tirozzi, G. N. (2001). The artistry of leadership: The evolving role of the secondary principal. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(6), 434-439.
- Tucker, M.S. & Coddling, J.B. (2002). Preparing Principals in the Age of Accountability, in *The Principal Challenge*, eds.
- University of North Texas News Service (2003, October 17). Assistant principals focus on leadership in the age of accountability. Retrieved May 25, 2006
<http://web2.unt.edu/news/story.cfm?story=8682>
- Vandenberghe, R. (1995). Creative management of a school: A matter of vision and daily interventions. *Journal of Educational Administration* 33(2), 31-51.
- Wagner, T. (2001). Leadership for learning: An action theory of school change. *Phi Delta Kappa*, 82(5), 378-383.

- Wallace, M. (2001). Sharing leadership of schools through teamwork: A justifiable risk?, *Educational Management & Administration*, 20(2), 153-67.
- Wasley, P.A. (1991). *Teachers who lead: The rhetoric of reform and the realities of practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Waters, T., Marzano, R.J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced Leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Waters, T. & Grubb, S. (2004). *Leading schools: Distinguishing the essential from the important*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Wells, S., Rinehart, J.S. & Scollay, S.J. (1999). *Kentucky's Induction-Model Intern Assistant Principals: Players or Designated Hitters in High-Stakes Accountability?* (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED443139).
- Weller, L. D. & Weller, S.J. (2002). *Assistant principal's survival guide: Essentials for effective school leadership*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Whitaker, K. S. (1994). *The restructuring handbook: A guide to school revitalization*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Whitaker, T. (2003). *What great principals do differently: Fifteen things that matter most*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Wiggins, T. (1975). *The influence of role and organizational climate upon principal behavior. A systems analysis*. New York, Macmillan.
- Williams, F.B. (1994). *Restructuring the assistant principal's role*. NASSP Bulletin, pp. 75-80.
- Winter, P. A. & Partenheimer, P. R. (2002). *Applicant attraction to assistant principal jobs: An experimental assessment*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA), Pittsburgh, PA. 9 (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED471558).
- Wise, D. (2004). *Time to support instruction: when this district decided that student achievement had to become its sole focus, school- and district-level roles were reconstructed to free up time for administrators to be instructional leaders. Leadership, 34*. Retrieved from http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0HUL/is_1_34/ai_n6358521/pg_2
- Worner, W. S., R. (1987). *Instructional leadership: What are the activities and who perform them?* NASSP Bulletin, 71(502), 49-56.

- Wulff, K. L. (1996). The changing role of the principal in Washington State, University of Washington.
- Yammarino, F. J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Transformational leadership and multiple levels of analysis. *Human Relations*, 43(10), 975-995.
- Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (5th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Zenz, K., Schacht, M., Clift, R., & Thurston, P. (1993). *Cross case analysis*. Urbana, IL: National Center for School Leadership,

APPENDIX;

APILQ

ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL AS INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Please respond to each of the following statements twice. The **left column** asks for your decisions of your **assigned** instructional leadership duties. The **right column** asks for your decisions of your **desired** instructional leadership duties. Please check the appropriate response. Please be sure you are responding in regard to your decision of the instructional leadership duties and responsibilities.

- 1 (SD) = Strongly Disagree (never)
- 2 (D) = Disagree (seldom)
- 3 (A) = Agree (at times)
- 4 (SA) = Strongly Agree (typically)

ASSIGNED DUTIES					The assistant principal:	DESIRED DUTIES				
1 <u>SD</u>	2 <u>D</u>	3 <u>A</u>	4 <u>SA</u>			1 <u>SD</u>	2 <u>D</u>	3 <u>A</u>	4 <u>SA</u>	
1.	—	—	—	—	Instructional Communication Articulates clearly to the faculty her/his beliefs about curriculum and instruction	51.	—	—	—	—
2.	—	—	—	—	Encourages teachers to communicate with parents about instructional goals	52.	—	—	—	—
3.	—	—	—	—	Uses faculty meetings to clarify school policies	53.	—	—	—	—
4.	—	—	—	—	Confers with teachers to discuss their beliefs about curriculum and instruction	54.	—	—	—	—
5.	—	—	—	—	Encourages teams and/or departments to confer regularly with subject area specialists	55.	—	—	—	—
6.	—	—	—	—	Clarifies the district's instructional goals	56.	—	—	—	—
7.	—	—	—	—	Stresses with teachers the value of a closely articulated K-12 curriculum in each subject area	57.	—	—	—	—
8.	—	—	—	—	Instructional Evaluation Regularly evaluates the school's instructional program as a member of the school improvement team	58.	—	—	—	—
9.	—	—	—	—	Analyzes school-wide test data to identify instructional goals for strengths and weaknesses	59.	—	—	—	—

ASSIGNED DUTIES					DESIRED DUTIES			
<u>I</u> <u>SD</u>	<u>2</u> <u>D</u>	<u>3</u> <u>A</u>	<u>4</u> <u>SA</u>		<u>I</u> <u>SD</u>	<u>2</u> <u>D</u>	<u>3</u> <u>A</u>	<u>4</u> <u>SA</u>
				Instructional Evaluation (cont.)				
10.	—	—	—	Evaluates teachers primarily on the basis of their instructional effectiveness	60.	—	—	—
11.	—	—	—	Evaluates teachers on the extent to which they conform to district policies	61.	—	—	—
12.	—	—	—	Regularly evaluates the school's instructional program	62.	—	—	—
13.	—	—	—	Encourages teachers to evaluate their own teaching	63.	—	—	—
14.	—	—	—	Sets high standards for academic performance of students	64.	—	—	—
				Instructional Facilitator				
15.	—	—	—	Organizes service programs that deal with instructional issues	65.	—	—	—
16.	—	—	—	Conducts inservice meetings dealing with instructional matters	66.	—	—	—
17.	—	—	—	Uses faculty meetings to discuss instructional and curricular issues	67.	—	—	—
18.	—	—	—	Encourages teams and/or departments to develop innovative programs	68.	—	—	—
19.	—	—	—	Encourages teachers to try new instructional methods	69.	—	—	—
20.	—	—	—	Encourages teams and/or departments to develop their own inservice plans	70.	—	—	—
21.	—	—	—	Encourages teams and/or departments to develop their own curricula	71.	—	—	—
22.	—	—	—	Encourages teachers to develop their own instructional materials	72.	—	—	—
23.	—	—	—	Encourages teachers to try new instructional methods and approaches	73.	—	—	—
24.	—	—	—	Encourages teams and/or departments to develop their own instructional materials	74.	—	—	—

ASSIGNED DUTIES					DESIRED DUTIES			
1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4
<u>SD</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>SA</u>		<u>SD</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>SA</u>
				Instructional Management				
25.	—	—	—	Chooses department heads or team leaders who are strong instructional leaders	75.	—	—	—
26.	—	—	—	Sets school policies for grading and promotion	76.	—	—	—
27.	—	—	—	Lets individual teachers determine their own inservice needs	77.	—	—	—
28.	—	—	—	Shows an awareness of current research about instructional effectiveness	78.	—	—	—
29.	—	—	—	Gives team and/or department heads released time to observe classes	79.	—	—	—
30.	—	—	—	Involves individual teachers in determining their own teaching schedule	80.	—	—	—
31.	—	—	—	Attempts to coordinate instructional program between teachers on different grade levels	81.	—	—	—
32.	—	—	—	Expects individual teachers to handle their own discipline problems	82.	—	—	—
33.	—	—	—	Develops school master schedules on the basis of team or departmental/grade level input	83.	—	—	—
34.	—	—	—	Expects teams and/or departments to handle their own discipline problems	84.	—	—	—
35.	—	—	—	Encourages teachers to observe each other's classes	85.	—	—	—
36.	—	—	—	Expects team leaders and/or department heads to communicate regularly with teachers	86.	—	—	—
				Instructional Motivation				
37.	—	—	—	Rewards teachers who are successful in achieving instructional goals	87.	—	—	—
38.	—	—	—	Rewards teachers who cooperate in implementing district policies	88.	—	—	—

ASSIGNED DUTIES					DESIRED DUTIES				
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>		<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
	<u>SD</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>SA</u>		<u>SD</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>SA</u>
					Instructional Supervision				
39.	—	—	—	—	Provides instructional leadership in improving student discipline	89.	—	—	—
40.	—	—	—	—	Expects teachers to articulate their own instructional goals for students	90.	—	—	—
41.	—	—	—	—	Expects individual teachers at different grade levels to coordinate their instructional program	91.	—	—	—
42.	—	—	—	—	Expects team leaders and/or department leaders to evaluate their instructional program	92.	—	—	—
43.	—	—	—	—	Expects team leaders and/or department heads to articulate their instructional goals to teachers	93.	—	—	—
44.	—	—	—	—	Expects teachers to follow "chain of command" and to go through channels in communication with the assistant principal	94.	—	—	—
45.	—	—	—	—	Speaks with teachers individually about instructional matters	95.	—	—	—
46.	—	—	—	—	Observes teachers in their classrooms	96.	—	—	—
47.	—	—	—	—	Checks to see if individual teachers are following school policies on discipline	97.	—	—	—
48.	—	—	—	—	Checks to see if teachers are following district curriculum goals	98.	—	—	—
49.	—	—	—	—	Checks to see if teachers are working toward district's instructional goals	99.	—	—	—
50.	—	—	—	—	Meets frequently with team leaders and/or departmental heads on curricular and instructional matters	100.	—	—	—

PROFILE OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP PRACTICES QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SECONDARY ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

*Please complete the following information by CIRCLING the response
that is most relevant to your situation.
All responses will be held in strict confidence.*

1. AGE
 - A. 25-35
 - B. 36-45
 - C. 46-55
 - D. 56+

2. SEX
 - A. Male
 - B. Female

3. ETHNICITY
 - A. African American
 - B. Asian
 - C. White
 - D. Hispanic
 - E. Other (please specify) _____

4. HIGHEST DEGREE
 - A. Bachelor's
 - B. Educational Specialist
 - C. Masters
 - D. Doctorate

5. IN WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING AEAS DID YOU MAJOR AS AN UNDERGRADUATE?
 - A. Secondary Education
 - B. Elementary Education
 - C. Physical Education
 - D. Humanities
 - E. Physical or biological sciences
 - F. Social Sciences
 - G. Mathematics
 - H. Fine Arts
 - I. Business
 - J. Vocational-technical

6. YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN THE CLASSROOM
 - A. 1-5
 - B. 6-10
 - C. 11-15
 - D. 16-20
 - E. 21+

7. YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS AN ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL
 - A. 1-5
 - B. 6-10
 - C. 11-15
 - D. 16-20
 - E. 21+

8. WHAT WAS THE LAST POSITION YOU HELD PRIOR TO BECOMING AN ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL?
 - A. Teacher
 - B. Assistant Principal (elementary or middle)
 - C. Guidance Counselor
 - D. Other (specify education or non-education position)

9. RECENT TRAINING INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP
 - A. Leadership Institute
 - B. Professional Organization Conference
 - C. School District In-service Training
 - D. College/University Credit
 - E. Other _____

10. SCHOOL DESCRIPTION
 - A. Urban
 - B. Rural
 - C. Suburban

11. NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATORS IN YOUR BUILDING (including yourself)
 - A. 1
 - B. 2
 - C. 3
 - D. 4
 - E. 5

12. CAREER ASPIRATIONS AS AN ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL (see explanation below before circling)
 - A. Permanent Position
 - B. Training for advancement
 - A. You are satisfied in this position and do not want to advance professionally in public education any further.
 - B. You are not satisfied with this position and you will use it to prepare yourself for advancement, i.e. Principal, Superintendent.