

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

**University
Microfilms
International**

300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

8520597

Jones, Paris

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHING EXPERIENCE AND EFFECTIVE
ADMINISTRATIVE BEHAVIOR

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Ed.D. 1985

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1985

by

Jones, Paris

All Rights Reserved



PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark .

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy _____
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages _____
8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received
16. Other _____

University
Microfilms
International

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHING
EXPERIENCE AND EFFECTIVE
ADMINISTRATIVE BEHAVIOR

by

PARIS JONES

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirement for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1985

Approved by


Dissertation Advisor

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Advisor Roberton O'Kane

Committee Members H. Sui Shogwa
John Humphrey
Robert H. Wilson

5 December 1984
Date of Acceptance by Committee

5 December 1984
Date of Final Oral Examination

© 1985 by Paris Jones

JONES, PARIS, Ed.D. The Relationship Between Teaching Experience and Effective Administrative Behavior. (1985) Directed by Dr. Robert O'Kane. 147pp.

The purpose of this study was to examine the possible relationship between two variables, years of teaching experience and administrative behavior. The common practice of boards of education requiring teaching experience as one of the criteria necessary for employment as principal provided the impetus needed to examine quantitatively this possible correlation. The implications of such a requirement prompted the development of a second phase of the study which qualitatively examined the world of the principalship as perceived by practicing administrators.

As a result of this two-phase study, it was determined that, mainly due to the bureaucratic structure of our public school system, very little leadership behavior is exhibited by the school principal. On the other hand, due to the school structure, the main type of behavior exhibited by principals is administrative.

The participating principals indicated that administrative behavior is advocated and promoted by the central administration and local boards of education. Furthermore, it was determined that instructional leadership is considered by the central administration a secondary role of the principal.

At the center of the entire dilemma confronting principals is the distinction between leadership and administration. This point of confusion along with other specific concerns of the principal causes a great amount of frustration. This complex, hierarchical position, the principalship, certainly offers many challenges for the principal who chooses to be a leader.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL PAGE	Page ii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
General Problem Area	7
Significance of the Study	10
Assumptions and Limitations	11
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	13
The Organization	14
The School: A Historical Perspective	20
The School: The Bureaucratic Organization	23
Psychological Leadership	27
Sociological Leadership	28
The Behavioral Leadership	29
Leadership Styles	30
The Principalship: A Functional View	34
Summary	39
III. METHODOLOGY	43
Qualitative -Interpretive Inquiry (Phase Two)	44
Process One: Problem Definition	48
Process Two: Gaining Access	49
Process Three: Data Collection	50
Process Four: Analysis of Data	50
Summary	51
IV. CASE STUDIES	52
Introduction	52
Case Study One: Adam	52
Case Study Two: Al	60
Case Study Three: Mitch	68
Case Study Four: John	77
Case Study Five: Beth	86
Case Study Six: Calvin	93
Case Study Seven: Sandra	100

V. INTERPRETIVE ANALYSIS OF CASE STUDIES	106
The World of the Principal: The Caretaker of the Enterprise	107
Conclusions	120
Recommendation for Future Study	122
BIBLIOGRAPHY	124
APPENDIX A Quantitative Research Design	131
APPENDIX B Raw Data	141

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the possible relationship between prior teaching experience and administrative behavior. As an extension of this specific purpose, the study attempted to examine subjectively the principal's perception of his or her role and function in terms of managing, administering, and leading.

This complex position, the principalship, was examined in terms of the following issues and questions:

a. Is the principalship a position which facilitates leadership behavior or does it facilitate administrative behavior among principals?

b. Is the prevailing organizational structure of American schools conducive to the purposes of education? What are the implications for the principal as a leader and as an administrator?

c. Is the principal, in terms of behavior, truly the instructional leader of the school or is this function or role one which receives much "lip service" and is seldom engaged in by principals?

d. Does the prevailing school system allow for the manifestation of instructional leadership?

e. Does the role and goal ambiguity centered around the principalship cause a high level of frustration and anxiety within the individual principal and if so, why?

This study is an attempt to address the serious concerns about the profession and thus provide for this writer and his fellow principals, an opportunity to view the principalship through one another. Through open and honest dialogue, where principals share ideas, beliefs, concerns and frustrations, the principalship can become something more than a mere hierarchical position.

Phase one of the study involves the investigation of a possible relationship between prior teaching experience and administrative behavior. It is this correlate that stimulated the investigation of the principalship. There is a popular belief among educators and lay persons that teaching experience is a significant qualification for an effective and successful principal.

Research done by Gross and Herriott (1965) provided empirical data which addressed this issue of teaching experience and success as a principal. At the time of their study, Gross and Herriott (1965) maintained that "nearly all states specify some teaching experience as a requirement for certification for the principalship" (p. 68). In their attempt to provide empirical data to support such a requirement, Gross and Herriott found that, "there was no support for the proposition that considerable previous teaching experience in elementary schools is a prerequisite of EPL (Executive Professional Leadership), nor is there support for the opposite view" (p. 69). In view of this lack of supporting data for the requirement of teaching experience, there continues to exist a general consensus of educators and non-educators that teaching experience is necessary in order for a principal to be effective. A recent poll conducted by the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP, 1978) revealed that "96.09 percent of principals agree that teaching experience is an essential part of the preparation as principal".

Data collected from 1,688 elementary principals across the United States in the NAESP study (1978, p. 21) revealed that "one-fourth of the principals had spent ten years teaching in an elementary school classroom before becoming principals. . . . The median for the total group was seven years of elementary classroom experience". Furthermore, the study (1978) revealed that "only eighteen (18) out of one hundred (100) in the total sample had no prior teaching experience in the elementary school classroom." Even though the study did not entertain the question of relevance, 84 percent of the principals indicated that they had taught before assuming the position of principal.

Until 1965, the State Department of Public Instruction of North Carolina required a minimum of three years' teaching experience in addition to a master's degree in administration for certification as a principal. This specific requirement of teaching experience has been removed since 1965; however, a perusal of various vacancy announcements in the 1983-84 school year from various school systems in the state reveals that teaching experience is very much a part of local boards of education requirements for filling their vacant principal positions.

Listed are two examples of actual vacancy announcements which are typical and which are mailed to various agencies for the purpose of advertising principal vacancies.

Example 1:

Chapel Hill-Carrboro City Schools

Position: Elementary Principal

Date of Vacancy: July 1, 1983

General Responsibilities: The principal has the responsibilities for providing leadership in the development of a flexible curriculum which will accommodate

diverse student interests and abilities in grades K-6. The principal is responsible for organizing and supervising the duties inherent in the operation of a school, including the broad areas of curriculum development and management, instructional leadership, staff development, human relationships, public relations, and business management.

Professional Qualifications: Applicants must be eligible to hold a valid North Carolina Principal's Certificate.

Experience: Classroom teaching and/or building level administrative experience required.

Example 2:

Mooresville Graded School District

P. O. Box 119

Morresville, North Carolina 28115

Date: April 25, 1983

Position: Principal, Park View Elementary School, Grades K-4

Salary: State Schedule Plus Local Supplement

General Duties: Responsibilities are outlined in job description adopted by the state and local school board.

Qualifications: The candidate must hold a Master's Degree and be certified in school administration. It is desired that the applicant shall have served in a teacher position a minimum of five years. Family residence within the school district is strongly recommended.

Thus, it is seen that the commonly held view--that teaching experience is necessary for effective administrative behavior--is very much a part of the hiring policies of local school systems, and that this view is

substantiated by principals themselves, according to the poll conducted by NAESP (1978) where 96.09 percent of principals agreed that teaching experience is essential for principals.

Two possible reasons are offered to explain why teaching experience continues to be used as part of the qualifications for the principalship. The first reason is historical. Literature reveals that the position was clerical and custodial in nature initially and that the head teacher or principal-teacher was mainly responsible for teaching.

According to Pierce (1935) and cited here by Blumberg and Greenfield (1980), there are four factors which contributed to the early development of the principalship:

- (a) the rapid growth of cities during the 1850-1900 period and the subsequent problems accompanying the schooling of an ever expanding school age population;
- (b) the grading of school and the introduction of new sets of management problems related to the coordination of pupils and curricula;
- (c) the reorganization of school and the consolidation of departments under a single administrative head; and
- (d) the establishment of the position of a head assistant to free the principal from teaching responsibilities. (p. 10)

Of the many duties prescribed for principals prior to 1850, Pierce (1935) stated that "58.8% were concerned with records and reports; 23.5% related to school organizational matters; 11.8% to maintaining building and equipment; 5.9% to care and concern of and about pupils", (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980, p. 10). During this period principals were teachers with managerial duties. They were considered "principal-teachers" or "headmasters" (Gross & Herriott, 1965).

By the late 1800's the principal-teacher's or headmaster's job had changed from maintenance of records and reports to general management and matters of school organization. Pierce (1934) stated that

the duties of principals between 1853-1900 showed that 40.5% related to organization and general management; 15.2% concerned equipment and supplies; 13.9% focused on records and reports; 12.7% dealt with the discipline and care of pupils; 7.6% concerned building and grounds; 10.1% related to miscellaneous duties. (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980, p.11)

This shift in emphasis on duties was due in part to the continued growth of cities. The schools grew in number and size, and as organizational problems increased in number and complexity, the superintendents freed the headmasters or principal-teachers from a portion of classroom duties to provide more time for administrative tasks (Gross & Herriott, 1965). Principals by the year 1900 had assumed much more responsibility for the daily operation and management of school and had by this time acquired specific powers which brought status and prestige to the position of principals (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980). Pierce (1934) maintained that during this period (1900) principals acquired

the right to graduate pupils on the basis of the principal's standards, the right to have orders or suggestions to teachers given only through the medium of principals, and the right to a voice in transfers and assignment of teachers connected with their schools. . . . the right to direct teachers, enforce safe guards to protect the health and morals of pupils, supervise, and rate janitors, require the cooperation of parents and requisition educational supplies. (p. 211)

With America rapidly growing and school becoming more complex, lay school board members, once responsible for supervision of teachers, relinquished this duty to principals, thus adding another dimension to the principalship.

Thus by the early 1900's three critical and enduring functions of the principalship had been established, the organizational and general management of the school; the supervision of instruction and staff development; and the interpretation of the work of the school to the immediate school community. (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980, p.12)

The principal-teacher with minor administrative duties underwent a metamorphosis caused by the increasing demands of a changing American society. The modern-day principalship continues to hold management, instruction

leadership, and community relations as its major functions or roles. Thus, tradition is one of the possible reasons local systems continue to place emphasis on teaching experience as a qualification for the principalship.

The other reason is one posited by Wiggins (1975):

The most commonly shared basis upon which school districts select candidates for principalship is evidence of experience as a 'good' teacher. Candidates for principalships. . . are almost always chosen from the ranks of the upward mobiles who already reside within the district. By the time the principal aspirant shows interest, the district has had ample time to identify the candidate as compatible with the image it holds for successful principal. One can surmise that promotions of this nature are ways. . . school districts reward compliance and make predictions regarding continued compliance in the principal role after promotion. (p. 365)

The investigator's personal experience corroborates the second reason that emphasis is placed on teaching experience as a qualification for the principalship--namely, that school districts prefer a candidate whose cooperation has already been ascertained.

General Problem Area

The general problem area is centered around the conflict of role expectations caused by the present hierarchical structure of the public school system. Because these role expectations are often perceived differently by the organization and by the principal, confusion results. According to Blumberg and Greenfield (1980):

School principals are for, the most part, managers; their work environment gives most of them little choice in this matter. While this situation does not prevent a few committed and talented individuals from achieving excellence as instructional leaders, most principals find themselves frustrated by their inability (be it skill, knowledge, or time allocation) to move beyond the management functions inherent in the role of principal as it has evolved during the past hundred years. To the extent that his work

environment remains unchanged, the effects of declining school enrollment coupled with increasing bureaucratization and formalization of work roles will exacerbate and not ameliorate those conditions. Principals will experience increasing difficulty in realizing the instructional leadership conception of the principalship. (p. 46)

The preceding statement refers to the principal as a manager. For the purpose of this study, the terms manager and administrator should be considered synonymous; however, leader and leadership are terms not to be confused or considered synonymous with administrator or administration.

Leadership behavior, as described by Lipham (1964) is that which involves "the initiation of a new structure or procedure for accomplishing an organization's goals and objectives or for changing an organization's goals; (he) or (she) is disruptive of the existing state of affairs"(p. 122). Applying this definition to the expected roles and functions of principals, the investigator asserts that leadership behavior among most principals is almost nonexistent.

The customary role of the principal is that of an administrator. Lipham (1964) described administrative behavior as that which involves

the utilization of existing structures or procedures to achieve an organizational goal or objective. . . .the administrator is concerned primarily with maintaining, rather than changing, established structures, procedures, or goals. Thus, the administrator may be viewed as stabilizing force" (p. 122).

This description can be applied to the majority of principals.

The American school system is structured in a bureaucratic, hierarchical fashion. The current public schools use conventional bureaucratic forms of organization with standard ideas of authority, administration, hierarchy, and control (March, 1978). These characteristics tend to foster administrative behavior and suppress leadership behavior according to the descriptions of leadership and administration cited above.

In the area of instruction, for example, where the principal is purported to be a leader, research has shown that leadership behavior is limited. Fallon (1979) maintained that the idea of the principal as instructional leader is a myth. He concluded that principals are not properly trained for such a function, and even if they were, the managerial task and other related administrative duties have the propensity for consuming much of the time needed to exercise instructional leadership behavior. Howell (1981) added that, as a result of the many different publics which make increasing demands on the principal, instructional leadership becomes a secondary function and is replaced by personal survival and crisis management.

The cumulative amount of time the principal devoted to selected activities was reported in a feasibility study (Howell, 1981) of 14 schools: Paperwork, 27 hours; Parent Conferences, 11 hours; Personnel Conferences, 11 hours; Discipline, 8 hours; Scheduling, 8 hours; Cafeteria 8 hours; Supervision, 6 hours; Instructional Leadership, 2 hours. This study and others support the assumption that principals spend most of their time on managerial and administrative tasks.

Roe and Drake (1974) maintained that

Even in those studies which show instructional activities being performed, the depth and effectiveness of these efforts are not assessed. . . . Do we really want the principal to be primarily an instructional leader or do we expect him to be primarily a manager of people and things? (p. 10)

In summary, the purpose of this study is dual in nature. Phase one examines the possible correlation between teaching experience and administrative behavior; phase two examines in a qualitative manner the principalship as a set of behaviors, perspectives, and role functions.

How is the principalship perceived, as a position of administration or a position of leadership? What is leadership and can it be engaged in effectively in the present work environment of the principal? Given the present bureaucratic work environment, is teaching experience necessary to do what principals do? These questions and other issues will be a part of the second phase of this study.

Significance of the Study

This study is significant in that it provided a personal encounter with fellow principals which serves to broaden the scope and perceptions of the principalship through honest and open dialogue.

The study investigated whether teaching experience has any positive bearing on administrative and leadership roles of principals, and whether any relationship exists between teaching experience and administrative behavior in terms of success and effectiveness.

After a description of leadership, and its criteria, requirements, and expectations, the question of leadership's role within the principalship was considered.

This study provides a clear distinction between administration and leadership and helps to correct the common practice of referring to the concepts as if they are synonymous. Awareness of the distinct difference between the two should reduce the number of role conflicts and the ambiguities which have become very much a part of the principalship.

Finally, this study can serve as a possible resource for school systems in developing or revising job descriptions for principals. It can provide the

information necessary for policy makers to reexamine and develop the roles and responsibilities of principals.

Assumptions and Limitations

One basic assumption is that the principals can react in relatively objective ways in relating teaching experience to success needed in administration. It is assumed that teaching experience is or is not significant to success as an administrator or a leader.

The first limitation was the personal bias of the investigator. The various scales, questionnaires, and checklist purported to measure leadership behavior can provide only objective data. Leadership behavior is more subjective and qualitative in nature.

The second is that the sampling was confined to a small area, one county, with only eighteen schools participating and is therefore restricted. This should be taken into account.

The quantitative instrument used was supposed to measure leadership behavior; however, this study is focused on administrative behavior. This limitation serves to point out that much of professional literature and the research add to the confusion and ambiguity of leadership due to their treatment of administration and leadership as synonymous terms or concepts.

Due to the major emphasis this study has placed on the qualitative aspect of the principalship, the section dealing with personal responses obviously is not precise and objective; it is admittedly subjective and personal. However, the intent was not to measure but to elicit perceptions, feelings, and accounts of personal experiences, and these cannot be objectified.

The fact that the personal interviews were electronically taped might have affected responses of some principals and prevented completely open and honest dialogue. An attempt to compensate by assuring anonymity and turning off the tape as much as possible was made. Even with the limitation of the tape recorder, the interview was of most value in this study as a data-collecting method.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature enabled the formulation of relevant questions. Principals who were interviewed for the study offered responses and viewpoints. In a sense, each theoretical and conceptual view gained through this review served as a lens, bringing into focus selected aspects and issues of the principalship which might not otherwise have been singled out as a concern at all.

Regardless of the principal's type of behavior, administrative or leadership, the common denominator between the two is the context of the organization. Therefore, the first section of this chapter will deal with the concept of organizations. The school system as an organization is the principal's work environment where administrative and leadership behaviors are or are not manifested. The structure and nature of the organization determine the type and amount of either behavior. Griffiths et al. (1964) maintained that

leadership and administration are not the same behaviors. It has been fashionable for some fifteen years to equate leadership and administration, but whenever attempts have been made to operationalize the two concepts the difference has become obvious. While this point. . . .When the dichotomy between leadership and administration is elucidated, the elucidation has great implications for the practice of administration not only in terms of behavior but also in terms of organizational structure.(p. 5)

The Organization

Before the attention is focused on the school, the literature which deals with the concept of organization and related theories is briefly reviewed.

Organizations provide a vehicle by which shared goals can be attained. This vehicle is composed of individuals who occupy various positions in a vertical and horizontal relationship to each other (Lonsdale, 1964). "The point is that organizations are, first, peopled; they are in existence because of the presence of human beings interacting" (O'Kane, 1982, p.2). Organizations are artifacts designed and formed by individuals who coalesce and engage in interactions for the attainment of an agreed upon or common purpose. Individuals come together either informally or formally. The formal organization is a deliberate arrangement or social structure, with specific criteria.

It must have a purpose, associational norms, and associational statuses or positions in order to respond to functions required. Legitimated power or authority, tests of membership, property, and a name and other types of symbols are other criteria necessary for the formal organization (Bierstedt, 1978).

It is useful to discuss briefly the antecedents of contemporary organizational theory. The scientific management approach and the human relations approach are two schools of thought at the center of all the theory, which reflect the concerns of the organization and the individual, respectively.

The scientific management and bureaucratic concepts (1910 to 1955) viewed the organization as if it existed void of people. Two dominant

theoreticians during this era were Frederick Taylor who was responsible for the development of the scientific management approach, and Max Weber who presented the bureaucratic approach. These approaches were complementary inasmuch as bureaucracy represented an apparatus of depersonalization and a system that would rationally dispense solutions without the function of subjective coloring and human error. Scientific management stressed the impersonal rationality of measurement (Bennis, 1975). The overriding factor in both was the concern for efficiency within the organization.

Followers of this classical line of thinking viewed man as a passive, inert instrument performing tasks like a machine. Any deviation from the smooth, predictable outcomes of the organization was due to the unstable and unpredictable nature of man. It was this reasoning that precipitated the creation of a scientific, rational instrument which was supposed to reduce the inefficiency in organizations caused by man. "The only road to efficiency and productivity was to surrender man's needs to the service of the bloodless machine" (Bennis, 1975, p. 520). When conflicts did arise between man and the organization, they were settled in favor of the organization.

Representing the other extreme and as a reaction to the scientific management-bureaucratic approach, a second group of theories (1938 to 1950) was developed called the human relations movement. This approach regarded people as the more important entity of the organization-man union, and considered their feelings, attitudes, beliefs, perceptions, ideas, and sentiments. "The major assumption of the human relations model was that man could be motivated to work more productively on the basis of fulfilling certain social and psychological needs" (Bennis, 1975, p. 321). This model settled conflicts between the organization and people in favor of people.

In situations where conflicts are settled in favor of either side, there is always a winner and a loser. The scientific-bureaucratic model and the human relations model failed to take into account that a win for either the organization or the people ultimately resulted in a loss for both in terms of overall purpose. There was no attempt by either model to use conflict as a means of feedback and thus channel this conflict into constructive rather than destructive outcomes.

Warren Bennis has observed that in a sense the scientific management period could be characterized as one in which there were organizations without people, whereas the human relations period could be characterized as one in which there were people without organizations. (Monahan, 1975, p. 36)

By way of summary, the preceding quote expresses the general flavor of each model and serves as the bedrock for the building of all other theory in terms of organizations.

The human relations era gave way to a new group of theories. Men such as McGregor and Argyris saw a definite need to develop theory which addressed the need for reconciliation, compromise, and integration of the scientific management-bureaucratic model and the human relations model.

Of particular significance here are the theories postulated by Argyris (1957) that the individual's needs and the formal organization's demands are opposed to each other. This incompatibility sets the stage for frustrations, anxiety, stress, and other pathological behavior on the part of the individual. Such behavior can only lead to the reduction or dilution of organizational goals and create an unhealthy emotional state in the individual (Bennis, 1975).

Argyris (1957) posited that there are basic principles of the formal organization which lead to the attenuation of the individual worker's mental health. These basic principles are as follows:

- (1) Task specialization: Organizational and administrative efficiency is increased by specialization of tasks assigned to the participants of the organization.
- (2) Chain of command: The principle of task specialization creates a plurality of parts, each performing a highly specialized task. However, a plurality of parts busily performing their particular objectives does not form an organization. A pattern of parts must be formed so that their interrelationship creates the organization. Thus, the assumption is made that administrative and organizational efficiency is increased by arranging the parts in a determinate hierarchy of authority where the part on top can direct and control the part on the bottom.
- (3) Unity of Direction: If the tasks of every person in a unit are specialized, and the objectives of every person in a unit are specialized, the objective or purpose of the unit must be specialized. The principle of unity of direction states that administrative and organizational efficiency increases if each unit has a single activity (or homogenous set of activities).
- (4) Span of Control: The principle of span of control states that administrative efficiency is increased by limiting the span of control of a leader to five or six subordinates whose work interlocks.

In all four principles there is the implication of someone in charge. Whether this person is a leader or an administrator depends greatly on his or her behavior. Based on the four principles of the formal organization it is

postulated that they create an environment which is more conducive to administrative behavior than for leadership behavior.

Under the first principle, task specialization, each individual is assigned a specific job. Someone has to do the assigning and is therefore usually in a position of some authority. This factor gives rise to the second principle, chain of command.

In an organization where there is a plurality of specialized tasks there is a need for someone to coordinate, control, and direct the efforts of the individuals toward the objectives of the organizations. The person hired to perform these duties is assigned formal, legitimate power or authority to hire, fire, reward, and penalize individuals in order that their behavior be molded toward the objectives of the organization. These conditions and environment are more descriptive of the roles and functions of managing or administering. Argyris (1957) indicated that such an environment creates dependency and passivity among individuals, unless they happen to be at the top of the chain of command.

The possible dysfunctions and unhealthy environment created by the planners of formal organizations are best captured by Argyris (1957):

if the principles of the formal organization are used ideally defined, employees will tend to work in an environment where (1) they are provided minimal control over their workaday world, (2) they are expected to be passive, dependent, and subordinate, (3) they are expected to have a short time perspective, (4) they are induced to perfect and value the frequent use of a few skin-surface shallow abilities and, (5) they are expected to produce under conditions leading to psychological failure. (p. 66)

These outcomes are based on ideal principles and most modern organizations do not adhere ideally to them; however, the potential for adherence exists. The closer an organization moves toward this ideal state,

the greater the incongruencies between the organizational goals and the individual needs become.

It is this movement from or toward these ideal principles that sets the organizational climate and tends to provide or not provide for growth of the individual in terms of healthy mature personality.

Argyris (1957) posited that the closer an organization moves toward the ideal principles of a formal organization, the more congruent it becomes with the needs of infants in our culture.

Maslow and other humanistic theorists agree that while baser consideration may divert a person's orientation from the ideals of growth and fulfillment, the nature of man is such that he will strive toward those ideals when he is given a realistic opportunity to do so. The problem in designing . . . organizations , then, from this point of view, is to create conditions under which this natural tendency of man can be supported and encouraged. (Porter et al., 1975 p. 35)

The organizational climate must be conducive to growth and should be viewed as developmental in nature. The key to climate is the structure of the organization which reflects the philosophy of its planners. If the philosophy of the management views man as "economic" then the behavior and the climate of the organization will reflect that view. The structure of such an organization will tend to be very rigid allowing for little growth and serving only the lower level needs of the individual.

On the other hand, if the philosophy of the management causes them to view man as a self-actualizing individual, the structure and climate of the organization will be less rigid and allow for the innovative, creative side of man to be manifested. This open as opposed to closed climate allows for risks to be taken. Tannenbaum and Davis (1971) maintained that

a widely discernible attribute of large numbers of individuals and groupings organizations today is the unwillingness to risk, to put one's self or the group on the line. Much of this reluctance stems from not being trusted,

with the resulting fear of the consequences expected to follow close upon the making of an error. It often seems that only a reasonable guarantee of success will free an individual or group to take a chance. Such a stance leads to conformity, to a repetition of the past, to excessive caution and defensiveness. . . . risk taking is an essential quality in adaptable, growthful organizations, taking a chance is necessary for creativity and change. (p. 73)

If the organization wants innovative behavior, then it must view man as self-actualizing. "Katz and Kahn say that eliciting self-control by appealing to higher level needs for achievement is especially necessary where innovative behavior as opposed to dependable behavior is required." (Dessler, 1980, p. 188)

Two major views of organizations have been presented. The one in which man is considered a self-actualizing individual and is constantly seeking higher levels of need concurs with Tannenbaum & Davis (1971):

Organizations at times question whether or not it is their responsibility to foster individual growth, we believe that for most organizations, especially those desiring long-term survival through adaptability, innovation, and change, it is an increasing necessity. Further, evidence suggests that to have people in process (rather than fixed) requires a growth-enhancing environment. (p. 65)

Schools are considered formal organizations, desiring long-term survival, and it is here where the principal works and behaves in either leadership or administrative capacities.

The School: A Historical Perspective

Silverman (1971) maintained that

organisations reflect the prevailing meaning-structure of their time in their internal pattern of social relations. Thus organisations originating within a bureaucratized society will tend to be created with a bureaucratic structure. . . . This is because the founders of organisations, whatever their aims, will usually take their ideas about efficient organisation from the stock of knowledge characteristic of the society at that time. (p. 148)

Silverman provided the impetus needed to examine our present school system from a historical perspective and helped answer how our schools became bureaucratically structured.

America began as a small agrarian nation composed of thirteen colonies. Free enterprise, individualism, uniqueness in trades or occupations were characteristics of America. Schools at that time were simple, teaching the basics of arithmetic, reading, and writing. Most were one-room, one-teacher schools, most were church-related, and all reflected the values of the societies they served.

As the colonies grew and America began to grow into diverse publics, schools emerged as a socializing agent of the American society. Urban growth in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in America occurred very rapidly as many immigrants came to America, "the melting pot". By the beginning of the twentieth century, America began to consider that public education should play an important role in promoting equality of conditions for the masses. Equality among men precipitated by free education constituted a democratic and classless society.

Horace Mann was one of the most eloquent spokesmen for education as the great equalizer. In a report to the legislature of Massachusetts in 1842, he asserted that 'individuals who, without the aid of knowledge, would have been condemned to perpetual inferiority of condition and subjected to all the evils of want and poverty, rise to competence and independence by the uplifting power of education'. (Adler, 1977, p. 137)

The purpose of education was one of socialization for the diverse groups of people with their different cultures. American education became a vehicle by which all groups of people could become Americanized. How to organize or to structure the schools to fulfill the dreams and wishes of a large and great democracy became a very important issue.

The magnitude of the task was staggering, and quite understandably, people turned to the one available model for dealing with large numbers--the factory. The notion was daring, and those who proposed it were the daring innovators, the radicals of their day. But it was a marked departure from the educational tradition of the whole Western civilization. (Bremer & VonMaschzisker, 1971, pp. 4-5)

Industry and the factory model had unquestionable impact on education and its structure. Kliebard (1971) maintained that

the picture that emerges from the apparently frenetic educational activity during the first few decades of this century seems to be one of growing acceptance of a powerful and restrictive bureaucratic model for education which looked toward the management techniques of industry as its ideal of excellence and source of inspiration. (p. 71)

Educational theory during this time took on an industrial flavor as can be dramatized by a passage from Cubberly's book Public School Administration. It reads as follows:

Every manufacturing establishment that turns out a standard product or a series of products of any kind maintains a force of efficiency experts to study methods of procedure and to measure and test the output of its workers. Such men ultimately bring the manufacturing establishment large returns, by introducing improvements in processes and procedure, and in training the workmen to produce larger and better output. Our schools are, in a sense, factories in which the raw products (children) are to be shaped and fashioned into products to meet the various demands of life. The specifications of manufacturing come from the demands of the Twentieth Century civilization, and it is the business of the school to build its pupils according to the specifications laid down. This demands good tools, specialized machinery, continuous measurement of production to see if it is according to specifications, the elimination of waste in manufacture and a large variety in the output. (Cubberly, 1916, p.338)

The preceding passage characterized children as both raw material and the product. This "factory philosophy" had a direct effect on the operation of schools. Thus, the principal became the manager. As manager, the principal adopted a set of management techniques purported by scientific management proponents such as Frederick Taylor and Franklin Bobbitt.

The central theme throughout Taylorism and scientific management was efficiency which is essential to a bureaucratic structure. Arnstine (1971, p. 23) concluded that "efficiency takes precedence over freedom of expression, of dissent, and the mutual formulation of common purposes".

Couched within the efficiency arena is the underlying factor of money. Blau and Meyer (1971) maintained that

one of the historical conditions that favors the development of bureaucracy is a money economy. Generally, . . . , a money economy permits the payment of regular salaries, which in turn create a combination of dependence and independence that is most conducive to the faithful performance of bureaucratic duties. Consequently, there were few bureaucracies prior to the development of a monetary system and the abolition of slavery. (p.26)

Because of the efficiency movement and the bureaucratically structured industries and society, schools too became bureaucratized. Their governance is hierarchically arranged, and specialists are assigned different responsibilities. These range from responsibilities of the custodian to the ones of the superintendent, the chief administrator.

The School: The Bureaucratic Organization

According to Presthus (1962) a bureaucracy has the following characteristics:

- (1) Fixed and jurisdictional areas, regularly ordered by rules, policies, regulations, by-laws.
- (2) Principles of hierarchy and levels of graded authority that ensue a firmly ordered system of super and subordination in which higher offices supervise lower ones.
- (3) Administration based upon written documents.
- (4) Administration by full-time, trained officials.
- (5) Administration by stable and comprehensive general policies. (p. 5)

One only needs to have attended our public schools to have first-hand knowledge of the existence of the preceding characteristics. However, there are

varying degrees of adherence to these principles. The closer the organization approaches the ideal principles or characteristics, the more bureaucratized it becomes.

According to theory, organizations are established to accomplish certain goals. The goal or purpose of public schools is generally acknowledged either directly or by inference, as "to educate our children". It is here that confusion exists, as many people are saying one thing and meaning something entirely different. O'Kane (1975) explained it in this fashion:

It is highly significant to note that schooling, as different from education, has to be highly organized and needs to give attention to clock calendar time and to chronological time and their concomitant stresses on efficiency and sameness. Schooling is associated with such virtues as promptness, preciseness, neatness deadline-meeting, orderliness, deference to authoritarianism, specializing, fragmenting, measuring, and assessing. One could almost venture the argument without fear of serious rebuttal that education stresses the opposite of such school-type virtues. Education is more tentative, is additive, and largely intrinsically motivated rather than extrinsically forced. (p. 317)

O'Kane's description of schooling coincides very well with the present bureaucratic structure of our schools. The virtues of preciseness, specialization, and measuring all point to efficiency which is essential to bureaucracy. On the other hand, education is less structured, more flexible, and comes from a desire within an individual. These virtues can not thrive and develop in a rigid structured environment. Education is more global and less precise, yet schools were founded for this very purpose. MacDonald (1971) maintained that

the American school system has been predicated upon the development of democratic ideal. Realization of this ideal entailed an education dedicated to rational processes of problem solving with the concomitant ethical principles. It also entails honoring attitudes and values which facilitate the fulfillment of justice, equality, and liberty for all. Central to this doctrine is the faith in the dignity and integrity of each human being and the resultant prizing of the necessary actions which facilitate the development of individual uniqueness and potential. (p. 235)

To accept the fact that schools exist for the purpose of education as outlined by MacDonald, O'Kane, and others means that one must reject the present bureaucratic structure of schools. The present structure does not allow enough freedom on the part of students and teachers to create a climate conducive to individual expression, uniqueness of character, innovative and creative ideas, spontaneity and change. These characteristics support intellectual development and are essential for "education".

The present structure of schooling creates a climate conducive to conformity, compliance, domination, competition, and stability. With its rules and regulations and hierarchical arrangement of personnel, the present structure appears to be antithetical to education. Schooling is supported and perpetuated by a bureaucratic and mechanistic climate.

In order for learning to proceed, the circumstances of teaching must provide optimum opportunity. When teachers are restrained and inhibited by an overly bureaucratic structure, and much of their academic and professional freedom is absent, their work becomes meaningless and they become apathetic (Arnstine, 1971). Apathy on the part of the teacher might be a reason that our public schools are in trouble. The need for change should be realized, according to Silberman (1970), who described our public schools in the following manner:

it is not possible to spend any prolonged period visiting public school classrooms without being appalled by the mutilation visible every where—mutilation of spontaneity, of joy in learning, of pleasure creating, of sense of self. Too many people fail to appreciate what grim, joyless places American schools are, how oppressive, and petty are the rules by which they are governed, how intellectually sterile and esthetically barren the atmosphere, what an appalling lack of civility. . . . there is lots of changes since 1970 however, all are on the part of teachers and principals, what contempt they unconsciously display for children as children. (p. 10)

This change will not come easily, according to Arnstine (1971) who posited that

the educational bureaucracy will never give freedom to teachers, parents, or pupils, for this would call for voluntary release of power. Historically, no group in power has ever just given it away. When power was lost, it was actively taken by someone else. But if freedom is to appear in education, it cannot result from efforts of any single group. Freedom is not a possession that can be given by one group to others; it is a condition that exists when all groups share in making decisions. This sharing of power will result in educational policies that are more tentative, and in practices that are more flexible and alterable. (p. 28)

Even though one single group within the organization might not bring about change resulting in freedom, the behavior of the principal can plant the seed. Thus, the difference between administration and leadership can be recalled by the analogy: administration is to maintenance as leadership is to change.

If principals are to assume the role of change agent--that is, one acting as a "procedural catalyst" (Rogers, 1975, p. 211), then they must assume a leadership position. Goldman (1971) indicated however, that

principals do not seem to understand that many of the urgent reforms of public education mean changing the bureaucratic structure to allow it to respond to societal pressures which it is currently unable or unwilling to meet. . . . It is difficult for principals to realize that their position which holds the old autocratic organization together and thus provides it stability. . . . By denying the necessity for changing themselves, they preserve the rigor mortis of the educational bureaucracy. (p. 127)

According to the descriptions of administration and leadership, and relating such to the present structure of schools, very little leadership behavior takes place; administrative behavior is paramount. The increase of bureaucratic principles within an organization results in the increase of administrative behavior and the decrease in leadership behavior.

The principal's work place, the school, and his or her work environment, the school system, have been discussed in terms of its bureaucratic

structure and theories which address organizations in general. Focus now turns to leadership, and the principal as the purported educational leader or instructional leader of the school.

Psychological Leadership

The first body of research on the concept of leadership gave rise to the "unitary trait theory" which said that the individual possesses traits which set him apart. The earliest trait theory suggested that a single or unitary trait set great men apart from ordinary men (Gibb, 1969).

This soon gave way to research which looked for a constellation of traits within recognized leaders. It focused on a pattern of traits which all leaders possessed, and which could distinguish a leader from a nonleader. The "great man theory" was based on this line of thinking. This body of research contained analyses of great men or recognized leaders such as Mohandas Gandhi, Charles de Gaulle, and others. In analyzing the lives of these and other leaders, the trait theorists purported that effective leaders have a finite number of identifiable traits that distinguish them from nonleaders (Dressler, 1980). According to Stogdill (1974), "Carlye's essay on heroes tended to reinforce the concept of the leader as a person endowed with unique qualities that capture the imagination of the masses" (p. 17).

The unitary trait theory and the constellation of traits theory focused on the personality of the leader. However, these theories were not supported and were considered inconclusive. Stogdill (1974) concluded that

a person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits, but the pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics,

activities, and goals of the followers. Thus, leadership must be conceived in terms of the interaction of variables which are in constant flux and change. (pp. 63-64)

Psychological factors alone proved insufficient to fully explain or account for this phenomenon called leadership. The emphasis shifted from the study of personality traits to the study of roles and relationships. This was considered the sociological approach.

Sociological Leadership

Group characteristics became the focal point as opposed to individual characteristics or traits. The major premise of the sociological approach is that leadership is determined less by the individual than by the social system or group requirements (Lipham & Hoeh, 1974). Leadership studied from this approach focused on the situation in which leadership was engaged. Gibb (1969) postulated that the interaction between the leader and the group in a specific situation determines the engagement of leadership.

This approach emphasized that leadership did not occur within a vacuum but at a particular time and place within a specific set of circumstances. The leader and the followers are influenced by staff specialists, superiors, and others outside the specific group (Davis, 1962).

The study of leadership solely according to the situation has likewise been discarded. This approach as well as the psychological approach failed to address the interaction between the leader and the situation. Porter et al. (1975) summarized the short-comings of the situation or sociological approach as follows:

Neither the trait nor the situational approach resulted in a major advance in understanding the leadership process; for example, even though a number of early studies did point up the importance of situational considerations in determining what kinds of leadership behaviors would be effective. The

ultimate situation is position--i.e., that, given adequate understanding of the situation, different individuals should be virtually interchangeable in leadership roles. (p. 422)

It was gradually realized that effective leadership represents an interaction between psychological (traits) and sociological (situation) factors. This line of thinking led to the third approach which focused on why and how the leader behaves (Dessler, 1980). The behavioral approach analyzed leadership behavior in terms of both psychological and sociological factors.

Behavioral Leadership

When examined together, the psychological and sociological factors provide a broader understanding of leadership in terms of behavior (Lipham & Hoeh, 1974). This approach takes the position that observed behavior is the center of the research, and that leadership behavior changes from situation to situation (Halpin, 1959).

One of the leading proponents of the behavioral approach was Fiedler (1967), who provided a concise description of leadership behavior which follows:

By leadership behavior we generally mean the particular acts in which a leader engages in the course of directing and coordinating the work of his group members. This may involve such acts as structuring the work relations, praising or criticizing group members, and showing consideration for their welfare and feelings. (p. 36)

Fiedler and other proponents of this approach were responsible for the development of elaborate instruments which were used to rate, evaluate, and classify behavior on the part of the leader. These instruments lent themselves to an empirical, scientific approach to the study of leadership. Researchers were able to develop instruments which placed leadership behavior in patterns which eventually became known as leadership styles. These styles of behavior were an attempt to codify a leader's behavior and bring about a better

understanding of the concept of leadership. The literature which follows depicts some of the classifications of leadership behavior.

Leadership Styles

Three of the most publicized and studied styles of leadership are laissez-faire, autocratic, and democratic. These styles were advanced and compared in several studies by Lewin and Lippitt (1938), Lippitt and White (1943), and White and Lippitt (1960).

Laissez-faire leadership is characterized by permissive behavior and little or no direction given by the leader. White and Lippitt (1960) found that permissive behavior resulted in low quantity and quality of work, and low satisfaction in addition to frustration on the part of the employees.

Authoritarian leadership is characterized by an autocratic leader who determines all policy for group members and dictates everything to be done. This style operates from the premise of complete obedience on the part of the followers. This style leads to low morale and a certain amount of hostility among the followers (Lippitt & White, 1943).

These two styles of behavior are not really oriented to leadership. That is, laissez-faire behavior is void of any leadership, and autocratic behavior is dictatorial with little or no regard for individual needs. These two styles of behavior are extremes, and the democratic style is a compromise between the two, under which a person in charge approaches some semblance of leadership and exhibits leadership behavior. The democratic style of leadership takes into account the individual's needs. It is more considerate and advocates a participatory atmosphere where decisions are shared.

Getzels and Guba (1957) designed another model describing styles of behavior similar to the autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire styles. They advanced the nomothetic, idiographic, and transactional styles of behavior, based on the medium through which the organizational goals were achieved.

The nomothetic style places emphasis on that behavior which facilitates goal attainment without consideration of individual needs; it considers the requirements of the institution, and its role and expectations (Lipham & Hoeh, 1974). Such behavior is best suited for a bureaucratic or mechanistic type of organization where emphasis is placed on efficiency. It is more closely related to administrative than to leadership behavior. The overriding factor is the organization. Individuals can be replaced or interchanged, and if the organization is structured properly, its goals can still be attained (Lipham & Hoeh, 1974).

At the other end of the continuum is the idiographic style of behavior which emphasizes individuals and their needs and dispositions. The most expeditious route to goal attainment is through the individual or people involved as opposed to organizational structure (Lipham & Hoeh, 1974).

The third style, transactional, moves from one style to the other depending on the circumstances. It is considered intermediate in that it attempts to take advantage of both the organization and the individual in attaining the goals of the organization, and the person who assumes this difficult style is making some attempt toward effective leadership. According to Lipham and Hoeh (1974, p. 198), "seeking a compromise between them. . . may very well compromise both the institutional role and the individual personality". The ability to approach the transactional style of behavior is what sets the effective leader apart from the led.

Burns (1978) posited that there are basically two types or styles of leadership behavior: transactional and transforming. These have similar elements of leadership described by others: Fiedler (1967), Getzels and Guba (1957), and Lippitt and White (1943), however, his approach includes the study of followership.

Followership is not looked at as a separate entity but as an integral part necessary to understand the true essence of leadership. Burns (1978, p. 3) maintained that

one of the most serious failures in the study of leadership has been the bifurcation between the literature on leadership and the literature on followership. . . . The leadership approach tends to often unconsciously to be elitist; it projects heroic figures against the shadowy background of drab, powerless masses.

Burns (1978) saw leadership as an engagement between people, a structure of action which was linked to collective purpose. Those people who are not engaged in the leadership process are considered inert, alienated, and powerless. The engagement between the leader and the led forms a relationship which is either transactional or transforming.

Transactional leadership is short lived and involves a simple exchange of valued things. "The relations of most leaders and followers are transactional. Leaders approach followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another: jobs for votes, or subsidies for campaign contributions" (Burns, 1978, p. 4). Many types of leadership can be called transactional: opinion leadership, group leadership, legislative leadership, and executive leadership (Burns, 1978).

However, this type of behavior is not so much leadership as it is administrative behavior. Leadership should be of a lasting nature; it should be for the purpose of elevating of one's needs and dispositions beyond the level of materialistic or valued things. As long as leadership behavior only provides for

lower-level needs of individuals, it will remain a concept clouded and misunderstood by those in leadership positions.

Burns (1978) described transforming leadership as leadership where both leader and followers engage in behavior which raises the level of motivation and morality of both parties. Transforming leadership binds leader and follower and causes a mutual and continuing pursuit of a higher purpose. "The result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation, an elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents" (p. 4).

To engage in this kind of behavior is to be a leader. Behavior by persons in leadership positions which is less than of a transforming nature is not leadership at all. Burns (1978) postulated that legitimate or true leadership behavior is moralistic; that is, it raises the level of ethical conduct and human aspiration of both leader and follower. The action or behavior of leaders ultimately serve to release human potential.

The review of the styles and types of leadership serves only to contribute to confusion in terms of understanding this complex concept called leadership. In short, any act of behavior by those in leadership positions which stops short of providing the climate, the stimulus, and the motivation needed by individuals to pursue and attain self-actualization is not leadership behavior.

Part of this study deals with looking at the principalship through the eyes of principals to see what leadership is and whether leadership does indeed exist in the bureaucratic organization, the public school.

Some basic findings pertaining to the organization and leadership have been presented. The final section of this chapter will review the literature

relevant to the principalship and analyze it in terms of it being a position of leadership or one of administration.

The Principalship: A Functional View

Because of its hierarchical placement within the chain of command of the formal, bureaucratic organization, the principalship is an administrative position designed with specific duties and responsibilities. It is the individual, the principal, who must breathe life into this position. The manner in which he or she behaves once in the position is the factor which determines whether it remains a position of administration or becomes a position of leadership. The acquisition of the position does not make a principal the leader of the school; the acquisition merely gives him or her sanctioned or legitimate power to carry out the policies of the system which are designed to achieve the specific goals of the organization.

Roe and Drake (1974) provided a summary of the major duties of the principal. These duties are divided into two major areas, administrative-managerial and leadership. The first area, administrative-managerial, included the following:

- a. Maintaining adequate school records of all types.
- b. Preparing reports for central office and other agencies.
- c. Budget development and budget controls.
- d. Personnel administration.
- e. Scheduling and maintaining a schedule.
- f. Building administration.
- g. Administering supplies and equipment.
- h. Pupil accounting.
- i. Monitoring programs and instructional processes prescribed by the central office. (p. 13)

It should be noted that these outlined duties are basically routine, housekeeping tasks, which coincide with the bureaucratic organization whose

main concern is efficiency. The principal who engages in this type behavior is often rewarded and promoted for "running an efficient school". The outcomes of these duties can be measured in terms of success or failure and can stand up under the scrutiny of accountability and bureaucracy.

On the other hand, the second area of responsibility of the principal is that of leadership, with special emphasis on instruction. The leadership duties are summarized as follows:

- a. Stimulate and motivate staff to maximum performance.
- b. Develop with the staff a realistic and objective system of accountability for learning (in contrast to merely monitoring programs and instructional processes in input terms as prescribed by the central office).
- c. Develop cooperatively operable assessment procedures for ongoing programs to identify and suggest alternatives for improving weak areas.
- d. Work with staff in developing and implementing the involvement of the community with the operation of the school.
- f. Encourage continuous study of curricula and instructional innovations.
- g. Help students to develop a meaningful but responsible student government.
- h. Establish a professional learning resource and expedite its use. (Roe & Drake, 1974, p. 13)

These duties come closer to a description of leadership. The majority of the duties call for involvement with other individuals, teachers, parents, and students. A principal who behaves in a manner which facilitates these duties is making an attempt to use the administrative position as a means of effecting change, facilitating personal and professional growth, and involving others in professional growth, and in the decision-making process. These are acts of leadership.

Because of the organizational structure, very few if any of these tasks are carried out with any regularity and consistency. Principals learn very early what gets rewards, and they have a tendency to work toward those ends and give less attention to leadership responsibilities.

One major area for which the principal is held accountable is that of instruction. The principal is historically the instructional leader and remains that in spite of all the other responsibilities. "It is virtually impossible to assume the principal can be a real instructional leader and at the same time be held strictly accountable for the general operational and management detail required by the central office" (Roe & Drake, 1974, p. 14). When asked, most principals will profess to be the "instructional leader". However, in actual behavior, this is not the case. As research shows, the principal is far from being the instructional leader. According to a recent survey conducted by Seifert and Beck (1981), "principals see themselves as instructional leaders, according to . . . 82 elementary school administrators in Texas public schools, but 246 teachers viewed their administrators less as instructional leaders than as managers".

In another study conducted by the National Education Association (1968), "59% of supervising principals think of themselves as educational leaders. . . .The attitude was backed by superintendents with over 60% agreeing that the elementary principals were recognized as leaders" (p. 39).

The results of the two preceding studies support an assumption that principals are the instructional leaders of the school. However, are the results based on actual engagement in leadership behavior by principal? In the same study conducted by Seifert and Beck (1981), which reported over 81% of principals saying that they were instructional leaders, 67% of the principals said they needed to devote more time to instructional activities; 61.9% blamed their failure to do so on lack of time. This raises questions as to the actual engagement in leadership behavior toward instruction and the preferred ideal engagement in leadership behavior.

Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) maintained that

school principals generally prefer to conceive of themselves as educational leaders, but frequently these men and women find the bulk of their time and energy consumed by the daily press of administrative detail and the problems of maintaining the school organization, its teachers and students, on an even keel. (p. 19)

Research which supports this statement was conducted by Howell (1981) who found that over a one-week period, in 14 schools, principals reported the following cumulated accounts of time spent on each activity: paperwork, 27 hours; parent conferences, 11 hours; personnel, 11 hours; discipline, 8 hours; scheduling, 8 hours; cafeteria, 8 hours; supervision, 6 hours; instructional leadership, 2 hours. The least amount of time was spent on instructional leadership with the most amount of time spent on paperwork which is more administrative in nature. Howell (1981, p. 336) summarized his study by stating "as a result of the increasing demands and roles of the principal by various publics, innovative instructional leadership is shelved and replaced by the realities of personal survival and crisis management".

Throughout the literature principals cite lack of time as the major reason for the lack of attention given to instructional leadership. Pellicer (1982) argued:

The problem of principals being in a position to provide instructional leadership is surely more complex than can be explained by lack of training or a lack of time. Principals who seek to be instructional leaders in school settings also lack support from their superiors and subordinates. Principals lack a suitable process to assist them in bringing about positive changes in instruction, and they also fall victim to a lack of agreement among so-called experts as to what constitutes effective instruction. (p. 28)

Fallon (1979) posited that the lack of training in necessary instructional leadership skills by certifying institutions contributes to the principal's lack of instructional leadership. A majority of experience and

background provided for principals are in administration and management.

According to Pellicer (1982),

Fallon (1979) proclaimed that the ideas of principals as instructional leaders is little more than a myth. His conclusion is based on the argument that principals are not trained to provide instructional leadership, and even if principals were properly trained, time constraints imposed by other job responsibilities would preclude their effectiveness in an instructional leadership role. (p. 28)

Lack of support was also mentioned as a reason for the lack of instructional leadership exercised by the principal. Pellicer (1982) argued that superintendents do little more than pay lip service to the importance of instructional leadership. Personnel evaluation and subsequent promotions and salary adjustments rely very heavily on the traditional managerial aspects of the principal's performance such as discipline, student activities, and housekeeping duties. "Surely, many more principals have been dismissed for mismanaged athletic programs than have been dismissed for mismanaged instructional programs" (Pellicer, 1982, p. 30).

On the lower end of the hierarchical chain, there are teachers who feel that principals are not instructional leaders but functionaries (Pellicer, 1982). This finding was supported in two studies (Seifert & Beck, 1981; Ray, 1980).

The study conducted by Byrne et al., (1978) revealed that of 18 "hindrance" alternatives, principals perceived that time taken up by administrative detail (90%) and lack of time were the two top hindrances in their job performances. In the same study, principals ranked program development below school management, personnel, student activities, and student behavior.

According to Blumberg and Greenfield (1980, p. 31), "Foskett (1967) determined there is a great deal of ambiguity associated with the position of elementary principal." The ambiguity of the principal's role was stated by Foskett (1967) as follows:

The evidence suggests that the position is not clearly defined. In part, the principal is identified as an administrator and in part as a member of the teaching staff. Similarly, the principals sometimes see themselves as administrators and sometimes as members of the teaching staff. However, there is a tendency for the principals to see themselves as administrators more frequently than do the several populations of others. This ambiguity is heightened by a low level of agreement among the principals themselves. . . . Whenever a position is interstitial and no well defined guidelines exist for the occupant and for others with whom he interacts, morale may suffer, performance may be less effective, and others may become critical. (p. 95)

According to Blumberg and Greenfield (1980),

school principals are, for the most part, managers; their work environment gives most of them little choice in this matter....most principals find themselves frustrated by their inability (be it skill, knowledge, or time allocation) to move beyond the management functions inherent in the role of principal as it has evolved during the past hundred years. (p. 46)

Summary

This chapter included a review of the literature which provided information about organizational theory, the school as a formal bureaucratic organization, leadership theory, and the principalship. These areas were considered significant to the study of the principal's behavior relative to administration and to leadership.

It was found that those principals who are thoroughly indoctrinated in the classical concepts of organization and administration will emphasize hierarchical structure, rigid rules, and regulations, and will rely heavily upon the superordinate-subordinate relationship in decision-making and the attainment of organizational goals. This climate is best facilitated by the classical, mechanistic type of organization.

Administrative behavior is exhibited within this type of structure. This behavior accomplished organizational goals through the utilization of established means. Schools are formal, bureaucratic organizations which call for administrative behavior rather than leadership behavior. Efficiency is of paramount importance in this type of organization, and administrative behavior facilitates efficiency and not necessarily effectiveness. The main problem with efficiency in such organizations is that often efficiency becomes the goal instead of the means by which the goal is attained. The principal concerned with efficiency for the sake of efficiency is not necessarily the most effective. Terms that have become associated with our present public school system include accountability, intelligence, conformity, standardization, cognition, stability, and measurability.

On the other hand, terms which could be associated with leadership are individuality, intellect, change, innovation, creativity, spontaneity, and subjectivity. In addition to terms, consider the type of organization which fosters leadership behavior.

The organic, open-type system views the organization as a living system with interacting relationships extrinsic and intrinsic to the organization. The individual is considered with less emphasis on centralized decision making and more emphasis on participatory decision making. Conflict is recognized as healthy and legitimate for the survival of the organization. Finally, this type of system fosters an open climate where coordination of effort becomes a mutual concern and less exclusively the domain of the superordinates (Owens & Steinhoff, 1976). Unfortunately, a public school system is not organized in an organic open fashion; thus, it is difficult for the principal to exhibit any leadership behavior.

The principal who exhibits leadership behavior is one who finds and initiates new means to reach established goals or to develop cooperatively new goals for the school. He is not so much concerned with maintenance, conformity, and stability but more with improvement through change. As the change agent, the principal sets the tone and creates a climate conducive to change and improvement. He or she is somewhat of a risk taker and a disruptor of the status quo, a founder as contrasted with a finder.

As the leader, the principal must be concerned with instructional improvement as opposed to instructional maintenance. The literature revealed that this is one area where there is doubt and ambiguity in terms of role expectations by various publics served by the school.

Not only are there reservations about the principal as the instructional leader, but also about leadership behavior of any type occurring in our public schools. Even with the odds against them, a few principals who manage to escape from the constraints imposed by their work environment emerge as reputed school leaders.

The following premises have been formulated as a result of what was found in the literature:

- a. Schools exist for the purpose of schooling as opposed to education.
- b. The principal is expected to be both the administrator and leader and these two roles are diametrically opposed to each other.
- c. The dilemma the principal faces because of contradicting roles causes much anxiety and frustration.
- d. The bureaucratic structure of public schools allows for little change, although the society and the environment are in a constant state of flux.

These premises make for an interesting study when used to explore the principalship through its practitioners, the principals. The next chapter will deal with the methodology used to study the principalship and its many issues and concerns.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study necessitated an examination of the two broad areas of research methodology, the quantitative and qualitative. After much deliberation, the researcher decided to attempt both types of methodology, causing the development of phases one and two included in the study. Both methods were initially decided upon in an attempt to provide a more binocular view of the principalship.

The intent of phase one was to address the possible correlation between teaching experience and effective administrative behavior of the principal. This would necessitate the measurement of human behavior which is not quantifiable; a more qualitative, subjective approach to examining the principalship was desired. However, so as not to dismiss the quantitative approach a research design which followed the traditional, scientific approach was developed. A general outline of this design at this point can be seen in Appendix A.

The subjects were selected through the use of a stratified random selection method. Two variables, dependent and independent, were established, and the instruments were chosen to collect the necessary data. Once the data were collected and analyzed, some conclusions were based on the results. However, this approach proved contradictory to the researcher's convictions

about human behavior. The descriptive and general analysis (see Appendix B) of the data did not elicit perceptions and feelings about the principalship; the quantitative approach employed was not appropriate for this. Thus, a qualitative approach was selected which would provide data meaningful in terms of the real world of the principal. At this point, Phase Two of the study was developed.

Qualitative-Interpretive Inquiry(Phase Two)

"Asking the question, 'What is going on here?' is at once disarmingly simple and incredibly complex" (Rist, 1982 p. 440). To answer it qualitatively is a much greater undertaking than it would appear to be on the surface. To address the office, and the individuals who breathe life into such a position requires an entirely different mode or way of knowing based on experience, empathy, and involvement. In this study, the human phenomena in terms of leadership, feelings, perceptions, and concerns of the principal are focal points of phase two of my study.

The rationale for this inquiry approach is that the qualitative side of a study lends itself to more of an artistic approach than does the scientific-quantitative approach.

The artistically oriented researcher recognizes that knowing is not simply a unidimensional phenomena, but takes a variety of forms. . . .Thus, when the content to be conveyed requires that the reader vicariously participates in a social situation context, the writer or film maker attempts to create a form that makes such participation possible. Methodological pluralism rather than methodological monism is the ideal to which artistic approaches to research subscribe. To know a rose by its Latin name and yet to miss its fragrances is to miss much of the rose's meaning. Artistic approaches to research are very much interested in helping people experience the fragrances. (Eisner, 1981 pp. 8-9)

This study purports to help those interested to experience the "fragrance" of the principalship through the experiences of selected principals. The best way to do this is through the real life accounts of principals. The

qualitative mode of inquiry is essential to the artistic approach to research.

Eisner (1981) maintained that

each approach to the study of educational situations has its own unique perspective to provide. Each sheds its own unique light on the situation that humans seek to understand. The field of education in particular needs to avoid methodological monism. Our problems need to be addressed in as many ways as will bear fruit.

The tendency to lean toward more qualitative types of inquiry was promulgated by the overemphasis on quantitative research, which attempts to reduce human behavior to numbers, and that which could not be quantified, tested or measured was considered insignificant and unimportant. (p. 9)

In choosing this mode of inquiry, consideration was given to several dimensions of the qualitative approach. This approach allows the use of figurative language and is somewhat idiosyncratic permitting the use of "I". There is a certain degree of artistic flavor to the presentation, where as most scientific-quantitative language is formal, codified, and sterile (Eisner, 1981).

In qualitative modes of inquiry the criteria for appraisal rest with the researcher and the ability to convince the reader of the findings. There is no test of statistical significance by which the qualitative conclusions can be stamped as valid or invalid. What one seeks in this mode of inquiry is not statistical significance but "illumination and penetration" (Eisner, 1981).

The qualitative mode, focuses on the unobservable. It focuses on experiences of individuals and what meaning these experiences have for others.

How does one make sense of what is not observable. Manifest behavior is treated primarily as a cue, a springboard to get someplace else. The other way is to 'indwell', to empathize; that is, to imaginatively participate in the experience of another. . . .The latter banks on the observer's ability to imaginatively project himself into the life of another in order to know what that person is experiencing. (Eisner, 1981, p. 6)

Qualitative research does not require the sample to be random or of a certain percentage in order to make generalizations. Quantitative researchers have a

tendency to consider findings based on single cases as arbitrary, biased, and unreliable. Qualitative researchers can and do generalize on single-case studies and findings. Eisner (1981, p. 7) maintained that "generalization is possible because of the belief that the general resides in the particular and because what one learns from a particular one applies to other situations subsequently encountered." Furthermore, in everyday life, one does not generalize on random samples or selection, but more so on individual, particular experiences.

Qualitative research is more concerned with the creation of meaning and meaningful images, so that one's views of the world can be changed, accepted or denied, or made more secure. The key difference is that qualitative modes of inquiry aim toward providing diversity whereas quantitative modes of inquiry are concerned with specifics and have a tendency to restrict ones perspective.

Further rationale for the use of a qualitative mode of inquiry is "based on two sets of hypotheses about human behavior: first, the naturalistic ecological hypothesis is based upon the belief

that human behavior is significantly influenced by the settings in which it occurs. Therefore, it is essential to study events in natural settings that generate regularities in behavior that often transcend differences among individuals. (Hamilton et al., 1977, p. 193)

Researchers acting from an ecological orientation

claim that if one hopes to generalize research findings to the everyday world where most human events occur, the research must be conducted in settings similar to those the researchers hope to generalize about. (p. 193)

Researchers applying the second hypothesis, called qualitative-phenomenological,

assert that the social scientist cannot understand human behavior without understanding the frameworks within which the subjects interpret their thoughts, feelings and actions. . . . The social scientist must come to

understand how all those who are involved interpret behavior in addition to the way the scientist interprets it from his 'objective outside'(distanced) perspective. Moreover, since the subjects cannot always articulate their perspectives, the researcher must find ways to cultivate awareness of the latent meanings without becoming over-socialized and unaware as most participants may be. He must develop a dynamic tension between his subjective role of participant and his role of observer so that he is neither one entirely. (Hamilton et al., 1977, p. 194)

Thus the researcher attempts to depict a particular phenomenon, especially the inside view, and also critically interpret the findings in light of normative social and theoretical framework.

In addition to the aforementioned hypotheses about human behavior, Rist (1982) contended that education is not a true science and does not lend itself to pure scientific, quantitative modes of inquiry. The scientific approach does not respect fluidity and change, nor does it address the processes of education. "The conceptual and epistemological vacuum created by the retreat of quantitative methods has been filled by a vigorous and growing interest in qualitative methods" (Rist, 1982, p. 439). The vacuum is created as the quantitative approach reduces certain phenomena to numbers, without much regard for the individual. Throughout this study, it is the individual--in this case, the principal--who is most important.

The qualitative approach leads the investigator in a different direction. Whereas the scientific-quantitative presumes that human environments and interactions can be held constant, manipulated, treated, scheduled, modified, or extinguished, qualitative methodology posits that the most potent way to understand humans is to watch and observe, to talk, to listen and to participate with them in their own natural settings. (Rist, 1982).

Various types of qualitative research aim toward generalization: ethnographic research; field studies, naturalistic studies; case study methodology; artistic approach. The key processes inherent in conducting any

qualitative study include sequentially, problem definition, entrance into the field, method of data collection and analysis, and presentation of findings. These stages are interdependent and integrated and cannot be approached as separate and contained procedures. Using these inherent processes, a format for Phase Two of the study was outlined.

Process One: Problem Definition

Phase Two focused mainly on the issues and concerns perceived as significant by principals. Examining the principalship through case studies of principals helped to elicit descriptive behavior and perceptions of different principals.

Moreover, a holistic understanding of the issues and concerns of the principals was sought. Patton (1980) has noted:

This holistic approach assumes that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts; it also assumes that a description and understanding of a program's context is essential for understanding the program. Thus, it is insufficient simply to study and measure the parts of a situation by gathering data about isolated variables, scales, or dimensions. In contrast to experimental designs which manipulate and measure the relationship among a few carefully selected and narrowly defined variables, the holistic approach to research design is open to gathering data on any number of aspects on the setting under study in order to put together a complete picture of the social dynamic of a particular situation or program. (p. 40)

A picture of the principalship was assembled, not necessarily one which has been explained in the prevailing literature, but one which materializes from real life accounts as described by principals who share the joys, the sorrows, the anxieties, and the frustrations which are very much a part of the principalship. To capture the true essence of the principalship, time was spent with the principals in their natural setting and case studies on each were developed.

Process Two: Gaining Access

While it is self-evident to suggest that field work is not possible if one is not in the field, the means by which a researcher can secure the opportunity must be carefully approached. Gaining entree, and the conditions under which it is granted, is one of the most critical phases of qualitative research. (Rist, 1982, p. 442)

The first level of entrance was the superintendent, who granted permission to use personnel in their school settings.

The second level of entrance presented few problems. The principals selected for the study were agreeable without much suspicion. They were reluctant to speak out about their concerns, fears, and frustrations until they were made to feel at ease, and that the study was genuine and not a means of gathering data which could be used against them.

This level of entrance was not so much concerned with the physical movement of entering the work environment of the principals but entrance into their world and how they perceived the principalship. Without question, this was more difficult and had to be approached with caution.

Process Three: Data Collection

The interview was employed as the major source of data collecting. The criteria used to select and document analysis were used to the degree necessary to complete the picture of the principalship based on real-life principals in the Cumberland County School System.

In the broadest sense, to conduct a good interview is to hold an interesting conversation. Like an engaging conversation, there is participation by all involved. Ideas and perceptions are exchanged, information is shared, and participants come to know more about each other in the process. The importance in stressing the conversational aspect of interviewing is to

reinforce the notion that qualitative work involves considerable human interaction-interactions that are likely to occur over time. (Rist, 1982, p. 443)

Areas of inquiry included the following:

1. Educational background
2. Job experience
3. Years of teaching experience
4. Years of administrative experience
5. Race, sex, and age
6. Size of school

After these were considered, and the fact that the principal should have "something to say", seven principals were selected.

Their openness and honesty about the principalship provided data related to concepts such as leadership, authority, power, administration, principal effectiveness, and success as a principal. These seven principals were observed at committee meetings, planning sessions, social gatherings, organizational meetings, and school visitations.

Process Four: Analysis of Data

As opposed to quantitative analysis where data is collected and then analyzed, the qualitative analysis is an ongoing process. There is no one way of analyzing qualitative data. Rist (1982, p. 445) posited that "analysis occurs concurrent with as well as subsequent to data collection." In other words, as the interviews took place a certain amount of analysis of dialogue took place as well. "The entire time the researcher is in the field, there is a constant dialectic between collection and analysis, i.e., a constant assessment of what is known versus what is to be learned".(Rist, 1982, p. 445)

The information provided by the interviews, documentations, and observations were used to formulate an interpretive account of the principalship as perceived by the principals in the study.

Summary

This chapter included a discussion of the research design and methodology used in Phase One of the study. A description of the subjects utilized was given, and the variables and instruments used were discussed as well. Phase One of the study was geared toward a quantitative mode of inquiry.

Phase Two was qualitative in nature. Through justification for the more qualitative approach, the principalship was explored subjectively. This approach provides the opportunity to take a journey through the world of the principal and take a real life look at this position called the principalship. The data collected in the form of case studies are presented in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV

CASE STUDIES

Introduction

Using a combination of observations, responses to specific questions and interpretation of what was said and not said, this chapter presents the world of the principalship as perceived by seven principals.

The questions asked in the interviews were open ended in order to provide some common grounds which all seven principals shared. The questions provided a framework for interpretive accounts of the conversations. They were not forced on the participants; on the contrary, once the conversations and dialogue had begun, some of the questions were answered without initiation. Enough responses pertaining to certain issues were sought that could be analyzed and presented in the form of a case study. The interpretive researcher attempted to evoke and provoke responses from the principals which would facilitate a better understanding of the world of the principal and the public school system.

Case Study One: Adam

Adam is in his mid forties, born and reared in Cumberland County. He attended the public schools which during his school years were segregated. After high school, he attended a local college and graduated with a teaching degree in elementary education. His family, wife and two children, are all products of the public school system.

Fresh out of college, he was fortunate to gain employment in a neighboring county as an elementary school teacher. His first teaching assignment was fifth grade. According to him, it was an experience he thoroughly enjoyed.

During the remaining six of the seven years of teaching, he taught at the primary and intermediate level. At the end of seven years of enjoyable teaching experiences, he embarked upon a new career, administration, a profession he was reluctant to enter. His reluctance was due in part to his love for students and the fear of becoming distant or "losing touch with children". "Before I accepted the position of assistant principal, I had to rationalize and see how as an assistant principal I could help children. To be honest, if it had not been for economics I probably would have been teaching today".

According to Adam, twelve monthly paychecks, as opposed to nine, was a big motivating factor for accepting an administrative position. This is an example of a man taking care of his lower-level (security) needs before attempting to attain a higher-level (self-actualization) which possibly for him could have been reached through teaching. That would have depended greatly upon the amount of latitude and freedom he would have been given by his superiors to reach his full potential or attempt to become self-actualized. While self-actualization is a need that is never reached, there are some who constantly strive toward this need. These individuals are not ordinary; these are the individuals who make leaders.

To visit Adam's school is to know that he is an extraordinary principal. Situated in a small town, his school is appealing extrinsically as well as intrinsically. There is a certain presence about the school which makes a profound statement; within this building made of brick and concrete are warm,

caring, loving individuals. The natural setting in which one finds Adam is one in which his love for children permeates the walls of the school.

It was observed on several occasions that personnel are on a first-name basis. Adam is very professional, yet his demeanor borders on flirtatious, to an outsider. He exudes warmth and a caring attitude toward faculty, staff, parents, and students. He is "tactile"; that is, when he speaks to individuals, he gives a hand shake, a hug, or a hand on the shoulder. The recipients of such tactile gestures receive them and him very well. When asked how he would feel if faculty and staff were to address him by first name instead of Mr. Jones, he simply replied that it would not bother him.

The fact that he is not only respected but admired by his faculty and staff is a testimony for his ability as head person of the school. As principal of this school with a staff of nearly 60 adults, he appears very calm and easy-going, but his behavior is not laissez-faire. An air of confidence about him is immediately noticeable. He attributes this to having taught on the elementary level, which gives him a certain amount of expertise when it comes to dealing with teachers and instruction. "I have been there, I can sit down with a teacher and discuss reading skills, or go into a classroom and observe a child and offer concrete suggestions to the teacher that might help her or him reach that child". This was his response to a question asked about prior teaching experience being necessary for principals to be effective and successful.

The principal's role, according to Adam, is that of a facilitator, one who is "able to pull in outside resources and be insightful enough to know where to get help if needed." His major role is that of a morale builder and maintainer. The positive attitude toward approaching a given task is essential in accomplishing that task. Therefore, the principal must project a certain positive

attitude and trust that will be carried over into the school. This positiveness combined with the competencies and skills a professional has are essential ingredients an effective principal must possess.

The following questions and responses represent another phase of the interview which occurred at a later date.

QUESTION: What motivated you to become a principal and what were some of the circumstances surrounding your decision to become a principal?

RESPONSE: I was satisfied with being a teacher and it was only when I could rationalize how my new position would benefit children that I felt comfortable in becoming a school principal. Economics and salary were extrinsic motivational factors; the intrinsic factor was my love and concern for students.

QUESTION: Has prior teaching experience contributed to your success as a principal?

RESPONSE: I have been there. When I, as principal, recommend certain teaching techniques and ideas, my teachers respect my suggestions and feel comfortable in trying them in the classroom setting. Teaching experience gives me a different perspective about teaching when viewed from administrative viewpoint. Teachers have a tendency to accept suggestions in terms of instruction more readily if coming from a principal who has taught on that level.

QUESTION: Do teachers perceive you as the instructional leader? If so, what are some leadership tasks you perform to be labeled as such?

RESPONSE: It's important for a certain kind of climate or atmosphere to be set in order for children to be able to effectively learn. One of the big things with me is, prior to students getting into any textbooks, teachers are reminded and encouraged to provide the classroom environment where children are turned on

and desire to come to school. I am a believer in a positive attitude approach in accomplishing a particular task.

One of my responsibilities as instructional leader is to hire personnel capable of effective instruction. I put little value in an applicant's press clippings and credentials. As the instructional leader, I work and look for a certain commitment and a certain amount of devotion to children in prospective teachers. I believe that commitment and devotion are intrinsic qualities which make for an excellent teacher. The extrinsic quality, certification, of course has to be met. In several cases I have seen that commitment and devotion within a prospective teacher and managed to cut through the red tape and get the individuals provisionally certified until they meet the State requirements for the new certificate.

This is my strong point as instructional leader, being able to surround myself with competent and effective teachers who are first and foremost devoted to teaching children; all the rest will come eventually if that commitment is present.

QUESTION: How do you perceive or describe leadership and administration? Is there a difference or are they the same? If viewed as different concepts, which do you engage in most frequently?

RESPONSE: Let me say that the principal has a dual role. By dual, I would say they are different aspects of the principal. I see the principal as one having to wear two hats, one of the school leader and the other as the administrator.

When asked to describe each concept, Adam was some what hesitant in responding; however, his reply appeared to come more from actual application than from textbook theory. Leadership is a phenomenon which is intangible; people do not see very vividly acts of leadership. Leadership is something that

is nonverbalized, something that is a slow process which doesn't occur overnight.

A leader is one who implements and initiates ideas, a leader is able to direct and influence his staff toward a desired goal. A leader must be able to anticipate, thereby, avoiding some situations which could compromise his or her leadership position. As the leader of the school, the principal should have a certain amount of vision.

A leader is both effective and efficient; however, efficiency is secondary and is not viewed as the ultimate goal. The principal who is able to get the most out of the staff he has is apt to be an effective one.

Administration, on the other hand, is something that principals have a tendency to overemphasize, due in part to the system, or the overall organizational structure. The public has caused administrative behavior to take place more than leadership behavior. The accountability factors force a principal into a position where his or her behavior can be measured and seen. The managerial duties, budget preparation, transportation, maintenance can be monitored by the public and the board of education. Principals have been forced to place a great deal of interest and time in these areas. An administrator who is efficient in maintaining these areas is considered effective, even though he or she may be ineffective when it comes to leadership.

QUESTION: Do you view man as economic or self actualizing?

Initially, Adam struggled with this question. He really had not verbalized his belief; however, his actions indicated that he viewed man as self-actualizing.

QUESTION: What type of climate do you feel exists within your school, open or closed?

RESPONSE: I admit that an open climate is where teachers and students feel like coming to work and are treated as part of the team.

As I interview people and hire people, I work for a commitment from them and trust that the commitment in terms of devotion and dedication toward children will be carried out. There are situations that are marginal where teachers must be reminded of their commitment to children. I insist that teachers and staff approach various tasks from a positive attitude.

QUESTION: Often principals give lack of time as the reason for not dealing with instructional leadership matters. If you had two hours of uninterrupted time, how would you spend it?

RESPONSE: Time is a factor; however, if the principal sets his priorities and utilizes his time wisely, a lot for instruction can be accomplished. I would take those two hours to visit with my staff and students. I would get into some classrooms and do some observations of teaching techniques and observe some of the problem students.

QUESTION: Do you agree schools exist for the purpose of education or something else? What is that something else if you disagree?

RESPONSE: In general terms, school exist for education, however, specific school systems may have other priorities. I feel that the Cumberland County School System exists for education, but there are times when that "something else" will emerge.

I believe that the superintendent has the responsibility of being the administrator and it is the principal's duty or role to take the administrative directives and filter out the particulars which can work best for his or her school.

The effective principal is one who takes the administrative ultimatums handed down by the superintendent and turns them into directions for his teachers which keep students out front. As an example, Adam cited blue sheets (Pupil accounting sheets). I am afraid that if constant emphasis was placed on blue sheets, the teacher eventually would develop the attitude that blue sheets were more important than students; thus students' interests and needs would become secondary.

This is a sad commentary for what efficiency and the bureaucratic system represent. The principals are at fault to a certain degree; however, being a part of the hierarchical chain, they have pressure placed on them from higher up, for these individual teacher reports have to be checked and verified for accuracy. The teacher has only one to worry about; however, it is conceivable that a principal has to check and verify anywhere from 12 to 80 blue sheets at the close of a school month.

QUESTION: Do you see this (Cumberland County) school system as one in favor of change and do you see your role as principal that of being a change agent?

RESPONSE: That's the key; the principal is the one who is in the best position to initiate change. Our school system has changed; however, I have seen certain "powers that be" a little resistant to change. Overall I would have to say we as a system are progressive and in keeping with the times. We had to change if we were to be competitive with other surrounding school systems.

QUESTION: Is there a single aspect of our present school system which causes you frustration or concern?

RESPONSE: It is not so much the local system as it is society and the restraints placed on the educators by society. Whenever there is an attempt by educators to make educational decisions, parents must be considered. It's the lack of trust

displayed by parents which cause me a great deal of anxiety. For example, retention of a child; I admit a great deal of thought should go into such a decision, and parents openly will agree that retention is necessary. It is necessary only if it is somebody else's child. Parents need to develop a greater trust in educators and believe the decisions that are made are in the best interest of the child.

Case Study Two: Al

Al is admired as an effective principal by colleagues, central office, and community. His ability to bring about stability where possible chaos exists and to demand respect from various publics through his professionalism are qualities that Al possesses. In retrospect, these same qualities may have been counterproductive in terms of promotion.

Al was not considered for several new positions last year because of those admirable qualities. They were needed when his small school was consolidated with a smaller school, and the superintendent felt that if a smooth consolidation was to occur, Al was the one to manage it. Initially, the consolidation had all the indications of being an explosive situation between the two communities; however, both communities respected Al and the superintendent knew this. Therefore, Al was chosen to remain as principal of the consolidated school, and the other principal moved on to a larger school. Needless to say, the superintendent made the most reasonable decision based on all reports and observations. In discussing the consolidation, Al will tell you that it took a lot of hard work to bring about a smooth transition.

When asked what had motivated him to become a principal, Al readily admits that at first he did not even want to teach. He went to college with the

intention of being a sociologist. However, because of economics, he decided to go into teaching. After graduation he taught the eighth grade at a small northeastern county school with a class of 44 students and coached two basketball teams. His experiences at the union school (1st - 12th grades) were enjoyable. However, when he had an opportunity to move back home and teach, he taught seventh grade at an all-black junior high school, and later he taught in the exceptional children's program.

At the end of twelve years of teaching, which he termed successful, he became an assistant principal at a junior high school. This was the beginning of his administrative career. Influenced and motivated by family and friends, Al finished his master's degree for the principal's certificate and at present has completed his sixth year degree (Ed. S.) which qualifies him for a superintendent's certificate, according to North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction.

Al is qualified, not only by certification but also by his nine years as a principal, to offer his thoughts regarding the principalship. After two major interviews, formal and informal observations, Al was analyzed as a dedicated professional who is torn between making a living and standing up for what he believes is right for education. He admits that "somedays I would prefer not being a principal".

His working environment is a consolidated school setting with approximately 550 students and a staff of over 50. Visiting the school, one would readily see organization; everything is in order. A man small in physical stature stands in the halls as the children hastily vacate the buses and move in an orderly fashion toward their respective classrooms. Outwardly, he gives the impression of "Mr. Official"; however, once he has had time to analyze and

determine one's purpose, he gauges his behavior on the visitor's behavior. His behavior having been analyzed in the school setting, in telephone conversations, and in general discussions, both informally and formally, Al was perceived as an effective principal who cares about his teachers and students.

QUESTION: Do you feel that teaching experience has helped you be a successful principal? Do you think it is necessary to be an effective principal?

RESPONSE: I feel my wide range of teaching experience has helped me to be more understanding of different teaching situations. One who has never taught can not know all the ends and outs of teaching, especially if he or she is the principal responsible for instructional leadership. I don't think I could have done as good a job as principal without my teaching experience. I would go as far as to say it should be required that every principal have at least three to five years of teaching experience before becoming a principal.

QUESTION: Is there a cutoff in terms of years of teaching when one should dismiss the idea of pursuing a principalship?

RESPONSE: Without any research to back me up, I would say fifteen years. If an individual does not become a principal before fifteen years in the classroom, then he or she should remain in the classroom. One reason is that beyond fifteen years in the class, age becomes a factor. Along with the age comes lower energy level, greater indoctrination or greater orientation toward the classroom. In order to be an effective principal, he or she must have a certain amount of drive, enthusiasm, and be willing to take certain risks. These qualities tend to decline with increasing age. An individual should definitely get into the principalship before he or she passes 35.

QUESTION: Do your teachers perceive you as their instructional leader?

RESPONSE: Not as much this year as they have in previous years. I have been confined more or less to the office this year due to consolidation, and I found myself having to perform more at a managerial level. This has not always been the case; in years past I have found time to devote to being an instructional leader. I never missed an opportunity, especially teachers' meetings, to introduce, to interject, ideas that I have picked up through reading educational journals. Teachers have even commented on how they miss those articles of educational interest.

An instructional leader must show interest in the educational process in terms of initiating new ideas, introducing innovations which will improve certain situations within the school. Change is a key factor when it comes to instructional leadership. Being able to work cooperatively with teachers and bringing about certain changes is an essential ingredient for a principal to be effective.

QUESTION: Lack of time is often given as the reason for instructional leadership not receiving the full attention of the principal. If you were guaranteed two hours of administrative duty free time how would you spend it?

RESPONSE: Reading. I don't have the time to read and stay abreast of the latest trends in education. As the instructional leader, one has to be knowledgeable of new trends, ideas, concepts, and research in terms of education. This knowledge will enable him or her to be better prepared to make changes in curriculum and instruction if necessary.

QUESTION: What words would best describe the concepts of leadership and administration?

RESPONSE: I see them as two different concepts as they relate to the principal. Leadership involves a degree of persuasion on the part of the person in charge. This persuasion is not through forceful means, but through cooperative efforts on both the leader and the followers. A leader is one who avoids using his or her legitimate power or authority as much as possible. Continuous use of authority and force diminishes the principal's effectiveness as a leader. He or she becomes more of an enforcer. There is a certain characteristic from birth a leader has: reasoning power, good old common sense. On the other hand, administration is more managerial. It is a process that you do or carry out. All good administrators are not good leaders.

QUESTION: Which do you feel the central office (system) favors or facilitates?

RESPONSE: Administration without question is what the central office (system) emphasizes, and I guess because I value my job, this is where I place emphasis as well. For instance, I know, I can come out here and not necessarily do much in instructional leadership and still maintain my job, whereas, those administrative duties--budget preparation, supply orders, pupil accounting, clean building--have to be done because I know these are things which can be monitored and possibly get you fired tomorrow if not done well. We can be held accountable more for these things than we can for leadership duties, which often can't be measured by a superior or the general public. Efficiency in terms of administration brings about much quicker rewards than effectiveness as a leader--rewards such as promotion and earning the title of "running a good school".

QUESTION: What is your belief in terms of how you view man? Is he economic or self-actualizing?

RESPONSE: I basically see man as having a need to reach higher levels. I honestly believe man to be self-actualizing although there are specific individuals who are satisfied just making a living and being secure. Based on my belief, I try to motivate my teachers through various means both tangible and intangible, for example, delegation of responsibility. I have some teachers who are constantly wanting to get involved, and, recognizing these needs, I attempt to provide challenging tasks which will facilitate growth and development within these individuals.

QUESTION: Can you describe the climate which exists in your school, open or closed?

RESPONSE: I would say somewhere in between. I don't believe an organization can survive in a totally open climate where "anything goes"; there have to be some guidelines and parameters set. These, however, should be broad and flexible enough for the teachers to experience a sense of freedom, a degree of latitude in making some decisions where they are concerned. Teachers feel free to question and I project an image that is not threatening. Our climate here at school leans toward a degree of openness. It's definitely not closed in a sense of rigidity: teachers bombarded with rules upon rules; teachers afraid to question for fear of reprisal from me. Teachers can't grow in such an environment and when their growth is stifled so is the growth of students in terms of learning.

I don't attempt to put a lot of restraints on teachers and their techniques. There are different teaching styles as well as learning styles and I would not be any kind of leader if I attempted to alter these styles if they are producing good results.

QUESTION: Do you perceive the central office as providing experiences for teachers which facilitate growth and maturity toward making decisions?

RESPONSE: At one time, this was not the case, but I feel now that teachers are allowed to participate more in decision making and worthwhile experiences through workshops, committees, seminars and, professional leave time, these all add up to the central office recognizing teachers more and more as professionals.

QUESTION: Do you feel school exists for education or for something else? Education is defined as that which fosters within children the development of critical thinking, creativity, intellectualism, and individuality.

RESPONSE: Yes and no is my answer. If I may qualify the answer, I would say that the majority of teachers at the elementary level attempt to educate according to the given definition. No, in a sense that the school has become a "catch-all", a place where we have become babysitters, a place where we feed students and provide medical and dental care; a place where everybody is an expert educator, deciding not only what to teach but how to teach.

Schools are blamed for everything that goes wrong in society, yet it is the same society which says we are not teaching. How can we, if we are to be all these other things to students? I guess because public schools are supported by taxes, every tax payer feels he or she has an invested interest in

what goes on in schools. I see nothing wrong with that with limitations. The main one, interference from non-parent taxpayers who don't care what happens to boys and girls but how wisely have we spent their tax money.

The thrust of accountability has influenced even curriculum in terms of what is taught and how it can be measured. Standardized testing is the vehicle used to show the taxpayers how well we are doing in terms of teaching. We all know that testing only serves to reduce learning and instruction into numbers which the average lay person understands. At least testing attempts to do this.

QUESTION: Does our public school system cater to intelligence or intellect?

RESPONSE: I contend that the system and the American public want schools to be able to measure or quantify learning. As I said earlier standardized tests are basically the tool used throughout America. Our system is no different. Testable knowledge, facts which can be memorized are the basic things which satisfy the American public. We as principals and teachers best accept this (testing) as a fact of life and get on with the program. If it's intellect you want you will have to find it elsewhere, because the public has demanded measured results and intellect is nonmeasurable.

QUESTION: What is it about our present American school system (including Cumberland County) that causes you as principal the most concern?

RESPONSE: I've expressed some concerns all along; however, I have some pretty good ideas that I would like to implement but am not allowed to by restraints and red tape. It gets to the point that you say what's the use? It will only mean more paper work if I try this or that.

Another concern is that education is the only profession where everybody is an authority. You don't go to a doctor and tell him or her how to treat your illness so why should educators be burdened with a lot of red tape and at the same time everybody telling them how to do their job. It becomes frustrating, and forces a lot of good educators out of the profession. Oh, not to mention the low salary!

Case Study Three: Mitch

Mitch is a distinguished looking gentleman in his early fifties, a family man who is civic-minded and considered a leader in the community. To engage in conversation with him is thought provoking. He credits his success as a principal in part to having certain philosophical beliefs which have guided him in much of his behavior as a principal and a person.

Coming to Fayetteville from a small city northeast of Cumberland County, Mitch attended a local university and majored in elementary education. After graduation, he was fortunate to acquire a teaching position in Cumberland County. According to him, he was a young "cocky" teacher who readily accepted challenges. He was a teacher who would tackle a problem and solve it. His persistence and perserverance were qualities which caused him to be recognized early as a prospective principal.

His principal recognized that he had leadership potential and provided experiences during his teaching career which helped bring out these qualities. While teaching, he was sort of the unofficial assistant principal. People began to speculate that he would be the next black principal in Cumberland County. During those years the only way a black became principal was if a black

principal died and had to be replaced. Black principals were very seldom fired as long as they didn't rock the boat at the central office. They were for the most part on their own to run the school as they saw fit.

Mitch's first principalship came about after twelve years in the classroom. Due to a personnel shift, the speculations became a reality. His somewhat awkward beginning as a principal eventually culminated with his attaining a superintendent's certificate, and he is presently principal at one of the largest elementary schools in the county. With a student population of over 700 and a faculty staff of over 60, he has had plenty of opportunity to exhibit both administrative and leadership behavior during his 19 years as a principal.

This researcher has known Mitch for at least ten years and has observed his behavior during regular administrative meetings and while serving with him on many committees. His opinions and suggestions are highly valued by the central office and fellow principals. He is a knowledgeable, articulate individual, who has given much thought to the many problems which confront principals. His remarks and comments about the principalship were well worth the hours spent in the interviews.

QUESTION: Why did you pursue an administrative career?

RESPONSE: I don't know. I was always aggressive and somewhat of a risk-taker as a teacher. I majored in elementary education with no intention of remaining in teaching or education.

QUESTION: Do you feel that having had prior teaching experience has contributed to your success as a principal?

RESPONSE: Teaching gave me a chance to be exposed to the general public. Teaching was the means whereby others saw certain qualities in me and their encouragement was what gave me the motivation to become a principal. I'd like to say that I was a damn good teacher before becoming a principal.

QUESTION: Do your teachers perceive you as their instructional leader? If so, what is it you do or have done to be perceived as such?

RESPONSE: Most of my teachers have been here their entire tenure as teachers. Teachers here consider or perceive me as their instructional leader, their "godfather"; some even in a paternalistic manner, as a "father figure". I would say the newer faculty members do perceive me as an instructional leader. I am a child advocate. Students and their well-being are of paramount importance to me. Teachers realize this and I feel are motivated to do their very best because of the child advocacy role I project. I attempt to learn all there is about the students in each classroom. Through informal discussions at lunch, walking the halls, or in the lounge, I talk about children and their progress to specific teachers. I can see sometimes from the expression on a teacher's face that he or she is shocked to find out I know about one or several of his or her students.

My informal discussions with teachers usually are productive in that a lot of discussion, and dialogue are exchanged, and I feel we all benefit. Teachers usually can determine whether a principal is really interested in instruction, and thus through conversation I attempt to convey my feelings about instruction, curriculum, teaching techniques, and the latest developments in education. All of these things are very much a part of my attempt to establish a climate conducive to instruction and learning.

Some principals make the mistake of attempting to get all teachers teaching the same way they taught while in the classroom. I see nothing wrong in helping a teacher with technique problems or making suggestions. An instructional leader is one who realizes that teaching methods and styles differ and what works for one may not work for another.

Most teachers know how to teach, some need help from time to time; however, I'm not so sure that the principal is the best one or in a position to give them this help. There are other people and other resources on which the principal can call, supervisors for example. The best resource I have found is other teachers who possess specific strengths in certain areas.

QUESTION: Do you perceive your role as principal the same as the central office does?

RESPONSE: Basing my answer on the behavior exhibited by those at the central office level, I would have to say no. The system perceives my role as more managerial. I am made to feel more like a manager of the facilities. They see me as the caretaker of the enterprise. I perceive my role as being more leadership oriented. The principal is the one person at the school level who should give some philosophical meaning to the school and to education. Because of the two perceptions of the role of the principal, the individual is more or less trapped or caught in the middle. Needless to say this brings about a great deal of frustration from time to time.

QUESTION: Do you view your position as essential?

RESPONSE: The principal's position is essential; however, the school could operate for a period of time without a principal. Eventually the principal would

be needed to help channel those diverse energies toward achieving specific goals. An effective or successful principal is one who can bring about a degree of balance among those diverse energies and at the same time continue to let those energies remain diverse and unique in their own way.

QUESTION: In your own words can you describe leadership and administration? Do you view them as the same or different?

RESPONSE: Leadership is on a higher plane or at a higher level than administration. Leadership has to involve some administrative functions, but a leader is able to dispense quickly with those duties and continue to work toward a specific goal. A leader takes a plan, a goal, and if necessary bends, directs, synthesizes, and possibly gives the goal new meaning. A leader has to have a degree of intelligence as well as a certain amount of vision. A leader is one who is constantly looking at himself and doing an ongoing self-evaluation of his behavior. He is able to predict and project ahead of his followers. He has to be able to synthesize and analyze ideas and be able to put these ideas into action. I personally would take a leader over an administrator every time. Leadership defies specific definition; just when you feel that you understand the concept something else emerges which makes you question your understanding. It is truly a phenomenon that all principals should strive to understand. However, most principals are so involved in the managerial, administrative things that not much thought is given to this concept. I think some principals actually don't know the difference and when in fact they are very good administrators, they really feel as if they are leading.

Administration is more specific in nature. The manner in which we are organized facilitates administration very well. Most people who are good

administrators advance rapidly within the system. The reason is simple. Good administrators work toward efficiency. They are always on time with reports; they can take a mandate or dictate from the central office and get it done in the minimum amount of time. Those duties which require administering are usually the ones which can be checked, monitored, and measured. The duties can be evaluated and thus those administrators who receive high evaluations are the ones who usually get promoted.

The greater the accountability factor becomes for principals, the greater the emphasis will be on efficiency. Principals are finding themselves under increased pressure to account for the multitude of things which take place in schools. I see the principal as an administrator who becomes the scapegoat for everything that goes wrong at the school level, when in fact, supervisors, directors, assistant superintendents, and the superintendents should all share the blame.

The principal is charged with the responsibility to be the leader of the school. However, given our present bureaucratic structure, he or she definitely is more of an administrator. Furthermore, schools really call for strict administration. Our goals are flexible and vague which call more for a leadership type of behavior; however, attempts are being made every day to develop educational goals in a measureable form which ties into more administrative behavior.

In trying to summarize or make some sense out of what I've said, I would have to say that the structure of our school system calls for an administrator yet the broad goals of education call for leadership. I really don't see the existing school structure fostering a climate conducive to the engagement in leadership behavior by the principal. I don't see administration

and leadership as opposites unless one is blindly engaged. Especially administration, for it can be so time consuming that it has actually a negative impact on leadership. The effective principal is one who realizes the pitfalls of what I have stated and actively seeks to reach a compromise which is a difficult task.

QUESTION: Do you view man as economic or self-actualizing?

RESPONSE: I perceive man as being economic with a potential or need to go beyond the level of economics and security. Society places a great deal of emphasis on economics; however, human beings want something out of life more than just security or material things. It is not just in our capitalistic society but all societies that man's basic needs have to be fulfilled first. Once this happens man will aspire to reach higher level needs. We do have those exceptions where a few individuals are content with just surviving and making a living.

QUESTION: How do you feel about delegation of authority and responsibilities within your school?

RESPONSE: With the many things principals are held responsible for, I can not imagine any principal not delegating some of these duties to others within the school. An effective principal has to know his staff in terms of capabilities and has to assess the different needs levels of individuals. This is necessary for if a teacher or other individual is not capable or is not at a needs level which enables him to achieve the task, no one benefits. The task is not done, the individual becomes frustrated and begins to question his own abilities. The principal who is a leader is able to tune in on the different wave lengths of his teachers and delegate responsibilities accordingly. People can't meet with too

many failures before they begin to think of themselves as failures. Therefore, the effective principal has to provide tasks and responsibilities with which his teachers and staff can experience success. Success breeds success, as the saying goes.

QUESTION: What causes you the most concern and or frustration as a principal?

RESPONSE: I have several concerns about the principalship. The principal's major role should be that of a protector of the principalship. The principal is in the best position to be a spokesman for education, but because of the restraints, rules, and policies, the principals are reaching a position where they are the holders of the keys, and even they have to be accounted for at the close of the year.

The respect that the principal once had is rapidly declining. I think it is due in part to the many trite and managerial duties we must perform. Respect as a result of the office or position held no longer exists. Teachers are better educated, parents are more involved, and these people no longer recognize you as an authority because of the number of keys hung on your belt. It goes back to what I said earlier. Unless we as principals exhibit some leadership behavior and cease to function as just the holder of the keys, the principalship will cease to be an essential position in the school as it was many years ago.

More and more principals are treated like hired hands, and not like professionals. Goals which come down from the central office I think are good; however, when you have to keep a log as to how you are achieving the goals, the desire to work toward or lead others toward those goals decreases.

Principals are asked to do certain things and yet there are so many guidelines attached that really the principal feels like a highly paid clerical worker. I think the central office has good intentions about providing experiences so that principals can feel that their position is unique, but somehow down the line before these experiences, tasks, and responsibilities reach the principal they have accumulated so many attachments, rules, and regulations that the actual intent of the experience is lost within the trappings.

Another concern of mine is that principals no longer have any loafing time. Loafing time meaning time to share ideas, visit a fellow principal, and "talk shop". There is no time for reflection on issues and concerns centered around our profession. We really need time to engage in dialogue, not formally but informally, about school. This is where I used to get ideas, or the conversations stimulated me to think about ways I could improve the school.

Lack of trust is another area. Trust in terms of giving me a task and giving me enough latitude to accomplish the task in my own way. I don't mind general parameters or boundaries; however, if I'm to be treated as a competent professional then give me an opportunity to show you my way of accomplishing the task. If I must accomplish it your way all the time, then I really prefer that you do it yourself.

QUESTION: Do you see schools existing for the purpose of education or something else?

RESPONSE: Schools exist for a lot of other things than just education. Schools provide all kinds of services for children. Given our present situation I would say that schools cater to teaching facts. Teachers' hands are tied because the

public demands that the knowledge learned be testable. Accountability and testability go hand in hand in schools. If it can't be tested then don't teach it.

Schools tend to stifle creativity and critical thinking among children. However, unless there is a total restructuring of schools and rethinking of the real purpose of schools and education by society, schools are going to continue to stifle intellectual growth among students.

Mitch had several predictions for the public school system. He predicted that ten years from now the public school system will cater only to the poor and indigent students. The emergence of a private school system will house other students and eventually create an elitist society. Unless educators intervene and begin looking at structure, techniques, and goals, the public school system will meet its demise. The public schools are definitely in trouble, and private schools are becoming more attractive to a vast majority of the people including all races.

Case Study Four: John

One gets the impression that John is a well organized individual and his school is operated in the same manner. His school is in a highly transient area with as many as 200 students, mostly military connected, entering and leaving his school within a year's time. With this much transiency, organization is a must. Job descriptions and responsibilities are spelled out in order to give direction to employees and everyone knows his or her duties and responsibilities.

John is of the opinion that by applying maximum efficiency in the daily operations of the school, he provides time to perform his instructional

duties in the classrooms. John perceives his major role as that of child advocate--that is, providing the best instructional program. During his entire preparation for an educational career, John has viewed children as the most important entity of the educational environment. His beginnings are interesting in that his original goal was to become a physician. However, after two years of preparation, he dropped out of school and during this period got married. Marrying a teacher possibly had some influence on his decision to continue his education and pursue an educational career as opposed to a medical career. He transferred into a small college and completed his degree in Biology.

His first teaching experience was at the secondary level, teaching ninth grade. Desiring to get closer to Fayetteville, he applied in Cumberland County and was fortunate to get a position as a sixth grade teacher at one of the elementary schools, where he taught in a blocking or departmentalized setting. He was assigned to teach science, math, health, physical education, art, and music.

By this time his wife had received her master's degree and John began to look into the possibility of going back to school. Through encouragement from his principal, he finally enrolled and finished his master's degree in administration. Part of the requirements for the degree was a year-long internship which necessitated his accepting a position in a neighboring county as a classroom teacher with administrative duties.

Upon completion of his master's, he was hired as principal of one of the small elementary schools in Cumberland County. According to John he is very glad to get the position. He felt that with five years of teaching experience and the additional preparation in the master's program, he was ready to accept a position as principal at any school.

During his 16 years as principal, John has been at four different schools. While experiences have been different at all four, the school where he is principal now presents the most challenging and rewarding ones.

A much larger school with over 700 students and a staff of 70 definitely provides a different environment. His previous school contained only 11 teachers and because of its small size, he had been able to be more of an instructional leader and at the same time finish up his Educational Specialist degree. He has been principal at this present school for approximately ten years. It is here where the researcher had the opportunity to observe him as principal and evaluate him as a leader.

QUESTION: Do you feel that having had prior teaching experience has contributed to your success as principal? Do you feel it necessary to have teaching experience before becoming a principal?

RESPONSE: I don't know an answer to your first question. However, in terms of how I feel about teaching experience and the principalship, I think that teaching experience provides another dimension to the background and preparation of the principal.

John was offered a job as building principal before he finished his graduate degree and with only three years of teaching experience. He declined the position because he felt he did not have enough background experience in education at that time. He admitted this possibly was a mistake in terms of an opportunity to get into the principalship earlier. Certainly, the position would have increased his salary which at that time was approximately \$3800.00 per year.

He believes that his teaching experience does provide him with another perspective on education. John agreed that some teaching experience certainly would not hurt but to say it is a must before becoming a principal is a little extreme. Depending upon the individual, the length of time spent in teaching before becoming a principal could be a liability in that extended time in teaching might decrease the ability of the individual to view problems and make decisions with the entire educational process in mind rather than from a narrow-minded perspective. Furthermore, as years of experience increase, so does age, and with increase in age comes less physical energy and the decline of mental and psychic abilities.

Overall it would depend upon each individual principal as to the relationship between his teaching experience and principalship. Utilizing that experience to enhance his or her instructional and humanistic leadership abilities is of most concern. John stated that his teaching experience did play a part in his getting his present position. However, he doubts very seriously if it helped with the positions at the other three schools.

QUESTION: Do you feel that your teachers perceive you as their instructional leader? If so, what are some of the things you do within the school to be perceived as such?

RESPONSE: Most of the teachers, I feel, see me as their instructional leader; at least I hope so. This area is of most importance to me as a principal. To be the instructional leader one doesn't have to be an expert in every discipline nor does one have to be recognized as that master teacher in all subject areas. I'm not an expert in all areas of curriculum, but as the instructional leader, I attempt to provide in-service, seminars, workshops for teachers wherein they

can improve and become more knowledgeable of certain areas. I attend every session of each workshop scheduled for my faculty. My opinion is that if it is important enough for my faculty then it is certainly important to me as well.

As for the central office's perception of my major role, I would have to say that I'm looked at as an administrator first and a leader second, if at all.

QUESTION: How would you describe leadership and administration?

RESPONSE: As an administrator, I am more concerned with carrying out the process. This is how the central office demands that I act. The Board of Education policies and goals are placed in our hands and we carry them out. These goals take top priority regardless of the individual school goals which we have developed. The faculty and I develop our goals based on the needs which are unique to our school. The central office has decided what our needs are and thus undermines the principal's leadership role.

Getting back to administration, I would have to say that it is more concerned with carrying out the process than developing the process. Leadership places more emphasis on developing the process than of course having the process implemented. Administration is more concerned with maintenance of the status quo than trying to develop new ideas which could improve certain aspects of the total school.

Leadership is the other side of the coin in that it deals with development, creating, innovation, and change. Going back to the central office, most of the time all the leadership in terms of what I mentioned has taken place before it gets to the principal and the school. There are attempts to involve teachers and principals in the developmental planning of certain aspects

of the education; however, most of the time the decisions have been made and we are included to give the appearance of involvement.

QUESTION: Do you consider the principalship an essential part of the school system's structure?

RESPONSE: It is essential in a sense of maintaining what has filtered down from the central office. If the principal's role was what it should be instead of what it has become, I would certainly say it is essential.

QUESTION: Are there other concerns about the principalship you would like to share?

RESPONSE: Most definitely! As I have stated, the central office, the system, not just Cumberland County, but the overall public school system and its structure concern me as a principal. The structure as it is places the principal between the teacher and the central office. It has never been easy being in the middle; sometimes principals suffer from an identity crisis. Are they management or labor?

The erosion of the little authority principals have bothers me. An example is that parents and teachers are able to bypass or circumvent the principal and go directly to the top. Before the principal has had a chance to deal with a particular problem, individual board members or central office personnel are calling with suggestions rather than directing these people back to the principal first. Then if the problem is not solved, these people have the right to appeal to the higher levels of authority.

Politics has become a very important factor in making decisions. No longer does a principal have to consider how the decisions are going to affect

the student, but he or she is constantly reminded of how the parents and image of the system will be affected. If decisions made are not in the best interest of children as opposed to furthering someone's chances for election or promotion, then those decisions are not for education.

Accountability, according to John, is another concern. The more school systems are held accountable by taxpayers, the more paper work and recordkeeping will increase. The central office also has more paper work; however, there are more secretaries, clerks, and directors to handle it. At the elementary school level, there is the principal and the secretary to handle this increase in paper work and reporting. If it is large enough the principal might have a teacher with administrative duties to help out during portion of the day or in the afternoon.

The one factor which will cause the pendulum to swing back toward an era where accountability is less important, is a teacher shortage. The next ten years good teachers are going to be hard to find, and the cry for teachers will go out. The shortage will bring about a change in the attitude of society. I hope it never gets to this point, but we'll be looking for warm bodies to stand up in front of a class and teach.

Society in general, due to the industrial influence, is demanding that education become an exact science where learning can be measured in terms of scores and numbers. We are not dealing with machines. There is no way we as educators can measure learning and teaching effectiveness in a sense that industry can. If you are in charge of placing four screws in a case, it is very easy for the supervisor to count the screws and thus evaluate your performance. Education and teaching do not work that way.

All of these concerns are directly or indirectly connected with many frustrations I think principals experience. The central office has a tendency to lower my position to something less than a leader. Often the actions of the central office undermine my professionalism and integrity as a principal.

Another great concern of mine is the inequitable treatment of elementary principals. In terms of support personnel, we as elementary principals apparently are viewed as not having much to do. At the central office level, the high school level and the junior high level all have 12-month secretaries. Our secretaries are given two extra weeks of employment; then we as elementary principals have to do it all or get youth employees for the summer. The high schools have an assistant principal who works all year round. I am not in favor of taking away what they have, but it should at least be considered that what we do is important and our time during the summer is just as valuable. The planning and organizing by the elementary school principal is no longer less laborious than that by the high school or junior high principal. I feel that a rethinking of the elementary principal's job description and the value placed on higher education including high school and junior high is in order. Allocations or resources in terms of finance, personnel, and equipment should be in the reverse. Elementary schools lay the ground work or build the foundation in terms of students. If a poor foundation is laid, regardless of the elaborate toppings, the end product will eventually fall.

QUESTION: Do you view man as economic or self-actualizing?

RESPONSE: Man, I am sorry to say, is basically an economic individual. Applying this to my faculty, I have approximately 50 percent who are more

interested in a paycheck than seeking fulfillment from a job well done.

These teachers will do their job; however, when it comes to going that extra step, they do not. Of course, these teachers do not last long because the demands eventually outweigh the salary, and they leave the profession.

The other 50 percent love teaching and will admit they are not in it for the money. These are the ones who usually are your leaders among teachers. The innovations, good ideas, and changes that are made usually come from this group of teachers.

These are the ones to whom I normally delegate responsibilities. These seek additional challenges from the standpoint of growth and fulfillment. An effective principal capitalizes on these people and at the same time attempts to raise the level of those economic-minded teachers. With some of these you are successful in changing attitudes and values; however, a few will never change.

QUESTION: Will you describe administration and leadership for me?

RESPONSE: Administration is the mechanics through which a leader orchestrates his concepts, duties, expectations, and demands. Administration is not going to be any better than the leader who implements. Is leadership a phenomenon that is inert or never actualized? Once leadership becomes actualized or put into motion, it is still leadership or does it become an act of administration?

One can not be separated from the other. An effective principal or leader has to be an efficient manager. In a meeting concerning instructional improvement, another principal made the erroneous statement that I run a good school but when it comes to visiting and evaluating teachers, "I ain't worth a

damn". This principal is a classic example of a paper-shuffling office manager or a high salared office clerk. He was more interested in efficiency of the school operation than he was in establishing an effective instructional program and being perceived as the instructional leader.

QUESTION: What type of climate exists within your school--open or closed?

RESPONSE: If I'm to provide for growth of that 50 percent who seek it and possibly bring about a change in the others, I must create an open climate. All my teachers know that I am in favor of creativity and innovation if it will benefit children. Teachers are free to experiment with and develop techniques. New ideas are welcomed. Not that I must approve every idea, but out of respect teachers usually share their ideas with me. I would say we have an open climate here at school and teachers realize why we are here--for the children. An effective principal has to provide this type of climate. Unfortunately, I enjoy being a principal.

Case Study Five: Beth

Beth is a middle-aged principal with a varied background in terms of job experiences. She worked as a business manager for several years before assuming a teaching position. Having taught for twelve years, Beth went back to school and received her graduate degree in supervision and administration.

The timing was perfect; she was hired as a supervisor for a federally funded math program as soon as she completed her master's degree requirements. After serving in that capacity for several years, she was hired as principal of a small, one-grade-level school. Circumstances the next year provided Beth with a opportunity to move to a larger school. She has been at

this school for two years and gives all indications that she is happy with her job.

The school itself was recently built and is spacious and contemporary. To walk into the office gives one the impression that the principal must be well-organized and meticulous. The office has a "woman's touch"; it is clean, well arranged, and neat, like the principal herself.

Every letter, memo, and book seemed to have a specific place indicating that Beth was definitely a strong advocate of organization and structure. If an item had to be moved, i.e., piece of paper, telephone, or pencil, Beth would return it to its proper place.

The interviews with Beth were less relaxed and informal than the others had been. However, knowing her demeanor through observations at various meetings, the researcher began formally, and then carefully and gradually cut through the formalities until eventually some open and honest dialogue took place.

QUESTION: Why did you become a principal? What were some of the circumstances surrounding your decision to pursue an administrative career.

RESPONSE: I came into the principalship with the idea of being the instructional leader; however, I found out very fast that there was more to it. My extensive background in teaching and curriculum was going to be put to the test, so I thought.

QUESTION: Do you feel that having had prior teaching experience has contributed to your success as a principal? If so, why?

RESPONSE: Prior teaching experience is definitely necessary. An individual should be required to teach at least five years before becoming a principal. On the other hand, success as a teacher does not necessarily guarantee one success as a principal. Principals and teachers are two different groups of professionals. A principal has to be more assertive and aggressive. He or she has to take certain chances if improvement and progress are to take place. All good teachers do not make good principals; there are too many variables for me to make that kind of prediction. Therefore, I would have to say that teaching experience can not hurt in terms of becoming a successful principal, but at the same time I can not say that it helps a lot given our present job description and or duties.

QUESTION: What do you consider your major role as principal? Do you think that you and the system share your perception of your role as principal?

RESPONSE: I am made to feel like a paper shuffler from time to time. However, I perceive my role as that of the person who coordinates the many activities which take place in the school. Ideally, I would like to be considered as the instructional leader, however, in reality principals cannot be considered an instructional leader when we are constantly bombarded with everything under the sun to do. Of course we all, principals, central office, and parents, must share some of the blame for the state of the principalship as it exists today.

There is so much centralization, brought on by parental demands, and lack of trust by the system brought on by the nonprofessionalism exhibited by many principals. The more centralized we become, the less respect and authority the principal has. All decisions are made at the central office level

and principals simply carry them out. Directives are forever coming down the line of authority.

I would have to say overall I perceive my role as more of a manager and I feel as though the central office or the system shares in my belief or perception. All this is based on reality and not necessarily what my role ideally should be.

QUESTION: Even though you've stated that you perceive your role as that of a manager, do you make any attempts as the instructional leader?

RESPONSE: Certainly, but when you have a secretary out sick half the year and you end up doing payroll, bookkeeping duties, and registering students, there is little time left for instructional leadership. All of those managerial things have to be done and if all attempts fail, then they fall on the principal. You'll get by as a principal not leading, but the one thing that will kill you is if your reports are not turned in on time and are not accurate. If you are not a good manager the central office will know it rather fast. Here again it is not the fault of the central office. Those people are held accountable for this and that report and most of the time their reports are dependent upon our reports.

Accountability is a concept which when put into practice can become a monster in terms of eating away the time. Society is demanding that a great deal of our time be spent dealing with reports and forms. The increase of accountability is directly related to the increase in paper work; thus we all end up being paper shufflers.

QUESTION: Do you view your position as essential and necessary in the school?

RESPONSE: Teachers do just enough to get by unless they have a little push. The principal is the one to provide that push. The principal is there to make sure things are done and on time. Having a business background, I would not think of having a business without a manager. School is a business and the principal is that manager.

QUESTION: What are your thoughts about leadership and administration? Are they the same or different?

RESPONSE: As far as leadership goes, we as principals are not true instructional leaders. Leadership in general terms is having the ability to motivate people in order to reach agreed-upon goals of the organization. Leaders are able to manipulate tangible and intangible rewards in a manner to motivate their subordinates. You have good leaders and you have bad leaders.

Administration is more than leadership. I see leadership as part of administration. If I associated administration with efficiency and leadership with effectiveness, I would certainly have to be efficient in order to be effective, however, I could be efficient without being effective. However, up to this point, I really had not given the two concepts much thought.

QUESTION: Does the central office facilitate or cater more toward administrative behavior or leadership behavior?

RESPONSE: The central office places more emphasis on managerial, administrative behavior, but it is not their fault. The many external pressures and demands placed on the central office causes those people to behave in more of an administrative manner; thus it filters down to the schools and the principals.

QUESTION: Do you view man as economic or self-actualizing?

RESPONSE: In terms of teachers, I have stated that they will do just enough to get by unless they have a little push. I must admit that there are a few who will do more. I think that you will find more teachers at the elementary level working toward self-satisfaction or self-actualization than at the secondary level. The main reason for this is possibly the structure and organization of the secondary schools. They are so fragmented and departmentalized; I have no research to back me up, but it just appears that way from observing secondary teachers.

QUESTION: How do you feel about delegation of responsibility to teachers?

RESPONSE: I give teachers certain responsibilities, and allow them into the decision-making process some of the time. Those decisions for which I'm held accountable, I don't delegate. I'm not really in favor of a great deal of delegating; teachers are hired to teach.

I am all for committees of various kinds; however, I want all decisions to come through me. I have to know what is going on and I attribute that to my business experience in private industry. The manager must have knowledge of everything going on around him.

QUESTION: Would you say you have more of an open or closed school climate?

RESPONSE: I have a more participatory climate where committees are set up to decide certain things. I have found that often when committees make decisions or want a change, there is another group wanting something to remain the same. For example, when I developed a plan for bus duty, a group got together and

worked out another plan. I presented this plan to the faculty for consideration and they voted it down and we went back to the old plan.

QUESTION: Do schools exist for the purpose of education or something else?

RESPONSE: Schools exist for a lot of things including education. As for creativity, curiosity, and inquiry I would say not. Our structure stifles creativity. All students should not have to enter school at the same chronological age. Some children are not ready.

Schools are forced to perform many duties and play too many roles. Our priorities are mixed up. The insistence upon accountability, and measuring learning are direct results of parental pressure. This is what parents want and this is what we as educators are attempting to give them.

Everything is trying to become so specific. What are the goals of education? We do not know because they are so vague, yet we are being forced to make them less vague and more specific for the purpose of accountability and measurement.

QUESTION: What are some of your concerns in terms of the principalship?

RESPONSE: Too much emphasis is placed on the physical plant and facilities. There are so many directives coming at us that very little time is left to do any thing but respond to directives.

Another concern is that too much is done for show, cosmetic dressing in the classrooms, for example. Teachers spend too much time on making games and pretty bulletin boards instead of actual teaching.

Also, politics and parents are allowed to influence sound educational decisions. Parents, because of who they are, are able to bypass the principal in the decision-making process. This bypassing weakens my authority as principal

and to allow parents to do this and not send them back through the proper channels disturbs me.

Case Study Six: Calvin

Calvin is interesting to talk with in terms of his philosophy of leadership and being an effective principal. In his early forties, he is considered an organizer, as is manifested within the daily operations of his school. The physical plant has all the characteristics of a well-organized school facility. Calvin plans well and pays close attention to details.

His undergraduate degree was in biology and mathematics. He began pursuing a masters degree in Zoology, but, realizing teaching did not pay well enough, he decided to pursue an administrative career.

After teaching for six years, at the secondary level, Calvin opened up a new school with approximately 900 students and a staff of approximately 40 teachers. Calvin admitted those were tough and stressful years at which time he had to be in fact more of a domineering, dictatorial type of principal. This style served its purpose and eventually gave way to his present administrative behavior, participatory in nature.

His opinions have created from time to time a great deal of anxiety and frustration for other committee members which included central office personnel. He may not have always persuaded others to see it his way but he was not afraid to express his convictions concerning certain issues.

QUESTION: Why did you become a principal? What were some of the surrounding circumstances in terms of your decision?

RESPONSE: Money was the basic reason. A principal's job paid more and was eleven month employment. I further realized that I did not want to remain in the classroom but to assume a leadership position which continued to keep me in touch with children. Economics has played a major role in the majority of good teachers leaving the classroom and aspiring to become a principal. There is the myth about the principalship being a position of power, authority, and prestige. These along with higher salaries act as inducements for teachers who aspire to become principals.

QUESTION: Do you feel that prior teaching experience has contributed to your success as a principal?

RESPONSE: Yes, teaching helped me to remember what it was like to be a classroom teacher. By having been a teacher I think I have more compassion for them when it comes to making certain decisions.

QUESTION: Do you feel that teachers perceive you as their instructional leader? If so, what are some of the things you do or have done to be perceived as such?

RESPONSE: By having taught school, I made a commitment early as an administrator that I would always work for the classroom teacher. My basic philosophy has been to create and set up an environment where all the classroom teacher has to do is teach. To accomplish this makes me their instructional leader.

I handle the majority of the paper work and busy work in the office and teachers never even see much of this type of work which could be pushed off on teachers to complete. When there is paper work which cannot be done without teacher input, I give them ample notice and time to complete it so as

not to sacrifice valuable classroom instructional time. When I present a task to my staff, every detail has been thought through. I set down and scrutinize every task which is required of my staff. I analyze the task in terms of questions that may come up and provide enough detailed instructions which will eliminate the need to waste time wondering about certain details of the task to be performed.

Every angle or viewpoint is anticipated and I try not to leave a stone unturned in presenting or initiating projects. It eliminates the need for teacher to worry about minute details.

As the instructional leader, I am concerned with children and their performance. The need to be visible and available for teacher, parents, and students is one of my major roles.

To get into the classrooms is a must for the principal. High visibility in the classrooms signifies to the teachers that a principal is concerned. The effective principal should strive to visit and observe each teacher every two weeks. This does several things: it will keep the principal abreast of what is going on in the classroom, provide information on how well students are doing, and provide an opportunity to point out to teachers areas of strength as well as areas of weakness.

If there is time provided just for instructional leadership duties, I prefer to lead by example. A leader should never ask a task to be performed unless the leader can do it.

QUESTION: What do you consider your major role as principal?

RESPONSE: My major role is to set up an environment conducive to teaching and learning where the teacher can teach and the student can learn with the least restrictions and interruptions.

A typical school day includes six hours set aside for instruction. Of these six hours, students only receive about three hours of pure instruction. My major role is to safeguard the instructional time the best way I see fit. I just cannot see wasting time on mickey mouse, routine jobs, to which teachers are subjected.

Another role of mine is to help teachers improve in weak areas and to point out areas of strength, thus giving them positive feedback. In doing so, I act as a facilitator, a procurer of resources to help implement instruction and curriculum.

I see my role also one of supporting my teachers in decisions that are made. Most of these decisions have been shared with me or jointly made; therefore, when parents challenge I can support the decision in favor of my teachers.

QUESTION: Do you view the position of principal as being essential in the school?

RESPONSE: Yes, someone has to orchestrate the many different activities which go on in the school. In order to create harmony among a diverse group of teachers with diverse ideas, the principal is the most appropriate to be that orchestrator. If teachers are not responsible to someone, then an extreme view is that the majority would behave like children. These teachers are not going to do any more than you assign to them or any more than necessary to get by. The principal is there to guide and motivate these teachers; he or she has to set the pace at which the group will move toward the school goals.

QUESTION: Then are you saying, that if left alone teachers are not capable of fulfilling a higher needs level?

RESPONSE: Most humans, let alone teachers, are that way. It is very difficult to find individuals who are self-actualizing. History has repeatedly shown man to be satisfied with maintaining a survival level. The failures of early settlements and organizations built upon the premise of total freedom to experience self-actualization are examples that it just does not work.

The percentage of teachers who seek self-actualization is small and those teachers are in the minority. The larger percentage are happy just to meet their survival level. Are we working the clock or are we working the job? The majority are working the clock.

QUESTION: What are your thoughts on the delegation of responsibility to subordinates?

RESPONSE: In connection with what I just stated, as principal, once a teacher is identified as being more economic than self-actualizing, I attempt to give him or her minor task and responsibilities. Once these are accomplished, I increase the size of the task and level of responsibility. By doing so, I am working on the ego and self-esteem of the teacher; hopefully, the successes will increase ego, self-esteem, and confidence. As the leader, I am concerned with raising the needs level of those identified teachers. The key is identifying the needs level and assigning tasks which will match and then work toward raising the level. All the staff are not at the same level at the same time.

I have found that usually those teachers who are at lower needs levels are often chronic complainers, dissatisfied with everything and everybody. As the leader, I try to find out the positive qualities of this type of teacher

and dwell on them. I have even had "heart to heart" conferences and found the main issue was that having someone just to hear their side or to listen to what they had to say was enough to turn them around and head them toward self-actualization. I feel like the majority of my staff is leaning toward self-actualization.

QUESTION: What are your thoughts concerning leadership and administration? Is there a difference?

RESPONSE: A leader should be a good listener and knowledgeable about anything he or she initiates. The leader should strive to bring out the same leadership qualities in the followers that he as the leader possesses. The leader has to be one who can think on his feet.

When initiating a task, the leader should have vision and project the possible obstacles. As I prepare to enter a project or task, I make certain all angles are covered before I bring it to my faculty. All the resources, questions, and scheduling have been checked, so when I walk into a staff meeting I have a finished product.

Some people, including principals, cannot think beyond today, where as I attempt to look at today, tomorrow and next week. A leader has to be proactionary as opposed to reactionary. Some principals sit behind their desk until it is time to react and find out that their minds have become so stale that it is impossible to make quick decisions which are reasonable. They end up making a reactional decision or cannot decide. This necessitates them calling the central office for a "bale out".

The bottom line is that a leader must be attuned to what is going on around him or her. The leader must anticipate and be courageous enough to

make a decision and stand by it. The worst thing for a person in a leadership position is to give the appearance or impression of indecisiveness.

QUESTION: What type of climate exists within your school?

RESPONSE: My teachers are free to make suggestions. I have a policy or have tried to gain their respect in that they will feel comfortable in presenting new ideas and suggestions. We work together in finalizing the plans before they are presented to staff for their consideration. I insist that if a plan is to be implemented it must be thoroughly analyzed and my teachers know this by now. I would have to say that the climate is definitely not closed; however, it is not totally open either.

QUESTION: What is it about the prevailing school system which causes you concern, anxiety, or frustration?

RESPONSE: The one thing is the reactionary philosophy by which the central office operates. Rules upon rules are established after the fact. No one can foresee everything that might happen; however, forecasting and projection are qualities of a leader.

The other thing is the tendency of central office personnel to reject ideas simply because it did not come from the top down. I have had several of my ideas introduced by central office personnel as their own. They take all the credit.

That of course is minor compared to the reactionary philosophy of the central office. Once an issue surfaces, one can look forward to a memo or an administrative dictate coming down from above.

Case Study Seven: Sandra

Sandra is one of five female principals in the school system, and has had more teaching experience than any principal in this study. Her love for children and teaching were factors which kept her in the classroom so long. According to Sandra, she had no aspirations to become a principal. She basically wanted to help teachers improve and help children become better students. Supervision was the route she decided to take to accomplish her goal.

Sandra's experience as a teacher is varied in that she has taught at both elementary and junior high levels. In addition to this, she obtained a master's degree in reading and was afforded the chance to teach reading as a reading specialist and diagnostician. After obtaining her certification in supervision, she was prepared to teach on the college level. However, she was offered a job as assistant principal and accepted it.

Sandra gives credit to several colleagues and classmates in the master's program for inspiring her pursuit of an administrative career. After one year as an assistant principal, she became principal of a small rural school.

Due to personnel shifting, she only stayed there two years and was moved to a much larger school. Her present school has over 500 students, and a staff of nearly 50. When asked whether the big change had created many problems. According to Sandra, there were a few sleepless nights, but she was quick to add that she eventually adjusted and now feels very comfortable being the principal at the larger school.

With 22 years of teaching experience and four years as a principal Sandra could retire very soon. However, she gives no signs of wanting to retire.

The feeling that she had about needing to help teachers and students continues to be a driving, motivational force for her.

QUESTION: Do you feel the extended length of time in the classroom has caused any problems for you as the principal?

RESPONSE: I found myself so indoctrinated with methods and techniques of teaching that I had the urge to take charge of a class and teach my way. I had to learn that my methods were not necessarily the best way and to be careful not to criticize or critique teachers based solely on my way of teaching.

QUESTION: Has teaching experience contributed to your success as a principal?

RESPONSE: Greatly. I have only been a principal for four years and if any success has been achieved, then it is due to my teaching experience. The many years of teaching places me in a better position to talk curriculum and instruction with the teachers. I readily share ideas with teachers and at the same time have a feeling for how my decisions are going to affect the human side of the teachers. Two things which have aided my success are an open climate and my ability to identify with the teachers.

QUESTION: Do you feel teachers view you as their instructional leader?

RESPONSE: As I said before, I feel that is my strongest area. I would like to think teachers view me as such. My attempts at leadership come in the area of instruction. When it comes to staff development in terms of instruction, I very seldom call on our general supervisor. Normally, I conduct workshops pertaining to instruction.

Under the heading of instructional leader, a principal has to be concerned about the students. Children are the first priority for me. Teachers

are important because they are responsible for the instruction. Parents are also important, for without their support and backing all the good things which took place in the six hours at school can be erased by lack of parental support. I see the instructional leader as one who has the ability to take these three groups, students, teachers, and parents, and create an environment conducive to harmonious participation in the educational process. By having harmony among all three groups, the principal can almost be certain that learning is taking place. I work toward those ends at this school; thus, I think I am perceived as an instructional leader.

QUESTION: Do you feel the central office views you as an instructional leader?

RESPONSE: I believe that the central office would like for me to think that I am the instructional leader. We are very often called the instructional leader of our schools; however, the duties and tasks given to us by the central office do not coincide with the title. For the duties and roles, I am asked to perform, I see myself more of a technical laborer. Most of our decisions are made for us; therefore, we only have the job of carrying them out. Principals are often included on committees for the purpose of shared decision making. However, more than often the committee merely "rubber stamps" the decision which was brought to the meeting by the central office representative. The input from the principals amounts to their signatures on a policy, a procedure, or a project, that was really decided at the central office level. I would just as soon not serve on committees for the aforementioned reasons.

QUESTION: Do you see the principal's position as essential in the school?

RESPONSE: The answer to this would depend upon the principal. If the principal is in the position merely to carry out mandates handed down by the central office then the position is not really that essential. On the other hand if the principal is in the position to make decisions and initiate ideas as well as carrying out mandates, then the position is essential. If the principal serves as a leader as opposed to just a manager then the position is necessary and important. The principalship should be a professional position which is distinct and essential.

QUESTION: Can you describe leadership and administration?

RESPONSE: As concepts, I find leadership more difficult than administration to describe.

Leadership is so broad, but I think a leader is one who makes decisions. A leader is one who accepts challenges and is not afraid of conflict. He must be able to set goals and rally enough support gained through respect of the individual and not necessarily the position. A leader does not have to rely solely on this position to get people to follow. Leaders have a certain way about them which causes people to want to follow. They are concerned about the human side of the enterprise and in initiating and setting goals and making decisions and they consider followers in all areas.

You cannot grow in an environment where you are told what and how to think. Principals who exercise leadership realize this and allow for growth in their teachers and at the same time work toward agreed upon goals. A leader is one who sees a need for change and is able to communicate this need effectively. An effective principal, thus a leader, is able to present certain

needs for change to his or her faculty in such a manner that they are willing to work cooperatively and successfully toward that change.

Administration is easier to describe because it involves carrying out duties or something which has already been established. In terms of decision making, an administrator does not have to worry about the decision but only how well or how poorly it was carried out. As principal, I am evaluated more on administrative behavior. This is the way I see my role in a realistic sense, as more of an administrator than a leader. I manage the school in a sense of seeing that everything runs smoothly. It is a great deal safer to be administrator than leader.

QUESTION: What type of climate would you say exists within your school, opened or closed?

RESPONSE: I would say open for one major reason. I am not intimidated by teachers making certain decisions that concern them.

My first year here, I immediately put forth a great deal of effort to gain the respect and trust of my faculty and staff. I realized that a new principal following a principal who had been here for fifteen years would be somewhat difficult. I listened a great deal the first year I was here. I established a principal's advisory committee and this group was a valuable resource for me within the school. As we discussed matters every month, I gradually gained their confidence and trust which filtered over into the general faculty and staff.

I put a great deal of emphasis on instruction. I realize from previous experience that teachers have ideas which are good and many of them would love to try them out but often they are not allowed to or are afraid because

they feel their ideas will not get the support needed from the principal. Having gone through this experience, I work hard at establishing a climate where teachers' creativity and professionalism can thrive.

CHAPTER V

INTERPRETIVE ANALYSIS OF CASE STUDIES

The case studies provided a valuable resource for further insight into the principalship. Part of understanding the profession is contingent upon the internalization of the views and perspectives of other principals. These seven cases provided that opportunity. Interpretive analysis is based on the practical knowledge, experience, and theoretical background gained through education, and training, on the part of the researcher. Consideration is given to the following premises deemed essential to the full understanding of the principalship.

- a. The principal is the key person to bring about change for improvement within the school, thus the position must be one of leadership.
- b. Leadership is "the initiation of a new structure or procedure for accomplishing an organization's goals and objectives. . . . the leader is concerned with initiating changes in established structures, procedures, or goals; he is disruptive to the state of the existing affairs" (Lipham, 1964 p. 122).
- c. The principalship is a bureaucratic position within the bureaucratically organized public school system.
- d. Administration is "the utilization of existing structures or procedures to achieve an organizational goal or objective. . .the administrator is concerned with maintaining, rather than changing established structures, procedures, or goals. Thus the administrator may be viewed as a stabilizing force" (Lipman, 1964, p. 122).

These premises establish the framework for analysis. There are many shared concerns about the principalship which need to be reexamine. This important position should have meaning and substance.

The World of the Principal: The Caretaker of the Enterprise

When reading the literature, attending state and national meetings, and discussing the position with present incumbents, one senses that the principal is being torn apart on the one hand by an intense interest and desire to concentrate on improving instruction and learning, and on the other hand by his responsibility to "keep school" through the proper administration and management of people and things as expected by the central administration. . . . Presently, the principal is primarily an administrator and manager. The instructional leadership talk is often lip-service to create greater self-respect. (Roe & Drake, 1974, p. 307)

Ideally, the position should be one of leadership. The principal, the instructional leader, should have vision and courage; he should be a risktaker. He should be sensitive to individual needs and provide a climate or environment which enhances growth and releases creative energies. When his school approaches, this ideal state, the principalship is indeed a position of leadership, for the principal is responsible.

A more realistic and less idealistic view of the principalship describes the job of the principal as administrator. The amount of time spent on administrative trivia reduces the position to a caretaker of the enterprise. The central office places primary emphasis on dispatching mandates and directives, maintaining time schedules, preparing and monitoring budgets, getting reports in on time, maintaining a well kept building and grounds, and efficient use and management of supplies and equipment.

Adam, one of the participants said that the principal has a dual role; "he has to wear two hats, one of administration and one of leadership". The interviews revealed that the administrative hat is worn too often. Very seldom does the principal have time and even the courage to take off this administrative hat and attempt to wear the hat of leadership.

Admittedly, certain administrative matters should be handled by the principal; an effective principal must be efficient in performing some administrative duties. However, when the process of administering becomes more important than the task, it is time to rethink priorities. Effectiveness should not be overlooked for the sake of efficiency.

That is a problem with bureaucracy. The central administration will establish specific goals to be achieved; however, accompanying the goals are a plethora of procedures and guidelines which most of the time cause one to forget the intent of the goal. The purpose is often lost while concentrating on how the goals are to be achieved. As one participant said, "if one has to be told constantly how the goal is to be achieved then let them (central office) do it".

The present state of affairs surrounding the principalship is caused primarily by the principals and by the structure of the school system. First, the principals remain silent about the conditions, either out of fear for their jobs or out of ambition to move into a central office position. These principals who can follow established policy and procedure and make others do the same are recognized very early.

Principals can become very comfortable and complacent sitting behind their desks shuffling reports and forms. While they may openly express resentment of too much paper work and lack of time to perform instructional leadership tasks, the truth is that they feel secure in performing administrative tasks and subconsciously are afraid to attempt any acts of leadership. They will always find administrative matters to attend to which is their way of avoiding an uncomfortable situation, leadership. This group is afraid to lead. To

compound the problem related to leadership, these principals find the necessary impetus for administrative behavior through the bureaucratic central administration.

Principals need only to get up from behind that "security blanket", the desk, and stop acting like a corporate executive in order to give new meaning to the position. They should fully understand that it is their position which serves to hold together the old, traditional, bureaucratic structure of public schools. Many of the changes needed in public schools, including the established roles and functions of principals, require changing the structure of schools to respond to a changing society. The stability and the rigor mortis of the educational bureaucracy are thus preserved by principals (English, 1982).

The other reason for the present state of affairs surrounding the principalship is the structural organization of our school system. It has been stated that the principal-administrator is the one most rewarded by the central administration. Administrative behavior is what local boards of education and central office bureaucrats facilitate. They will not deny that instructional leadership is important but when a school or principal deviate from the established, routinized methods and procedures of instruction, they become fearful and threatened. Immediately to counteract the threat or fear of change in the established structure, they develop additional policies, rules, and regulations to bring the deviant school and or principal back in line with the organization. Conformity is the life-sustaining substance of the bureaucratic organization.

There are two points of view from which all bureaucratic structures can be considered. The first is to view bureaucracy as a tool or mechanism designed to facilitate the accomplishment of instructional goals. The second view is to view bureaucracy as a means of exercising power and

control over persons. From the first point, bureaucracy can be seen as a rather flexible entity, subject to modification as either conditions or goals change. When examined from the second point of view, bureaucracy is a rather rigid structure which rebuffs attempts to influence its nature. To the extent that principals encourage the development of bureaucracies as control institutions, they diminish the probability that instructional personnel will be creative, independent persons who foster creativity and independence. . . .(Goldman, 1971, p. 136)

The system under study adheres more closely to the second viewpoint of bureaucracy. The central administration's power and control are threatened by principals who attempt leadership behavior.

Such an attempt takes courage and it means taking some risks. The majority of principals who dare to lead are labeled as "trouble makers, boat rockers, deviants". These principals often lose their jobs. It is far more difficult and challenging to deal with instructional leadership, ideas, and concepts, but the principal who is a leader welcomes this challenge. The conflict and controversy leadership may cause are viewed as sources of energy by principals who are leaders, whereas principals who are administrators attempt to reduce and suppress conflict and controversy. After all, the policies, the rules and regulations have been established to aid in this purpose. The good administrator will never hesitate to use these bureaucratic tools to control and justify many decisions made. Boards of education and the central administration are more concerned with instructional maintenance than instructional leadership.

The principal who initiates change within the school must realize that it is not an easy task. Quite often it involves more than just superficial maneuvering or "band-aid surgery". In order for the change to be lasting and have a fundamental impact on the organization, more than one of the following aspects must be altered: (1) its tasks or goal (2) its structure (3) its technology, or (4) its people (Owens & Steinhoff, 1976).

Beth, a participant, exemplifies one who perpetuates the traditional ideals of management. Her world of the principalship comes closer to representing the "way it is" and not "as it should be". She provides a classic example of a principal who has become a stabilizing force for the established bureaucracy in the public school system. Her philosophy of education and her typical administrative behavior can be substantiated with the following excerpts from the interview:

Leaders are able to manipulate tangible rewards in a manner to motivate their subordinates. . . . The principal is there to make sure things are done and done on time. Teachers do just enough to get by unless they have a little push. The principal is the one to provide that push. Having a business background, I would not think of having a business without a manager. School is a business and the principal is that manager.

Based on the preceding comments, Beth would certainly be considered an administrator. Her philosophy of education and the principalship is the kind which preserves the established bureaucratic structure in our schools.

Closely related to her manifested beliefs in the educational bureaucracy is her advocacy of the traditional management theory, referred to as Theory X, which assumes that

1. The average man is by nature indolent; he works as little as possible.
2. He lacks ambition, dislikes responsibility, prefers to be led.
3. He is inherently self centered, indifferent to organizational needs.
4. He is by nature resistant to change.
5. He is gullible, not very bright, the ready dope of the charlatan and the demagogue. (McGregor, 1957, p. 22)

Beth is not alone when it comes to her view of mankind. When the question, "Do you view man as economic or self-actualizing?", was presented to the participants, the responses were similar. John commented: "Man, sorry to say, is basically an economic individual. Applying this to my faculty, I have approximately 50 percent who are more interested in a pay check than qseeking

fulfillment from a job well done". Calvin maintained that "in terms of teachers, the percentages who seek self-actualization is small. . . . The larger percentage are happy to meet their survival level. The majority are working the clock."

While the bureaucratic structure which exists in the school system bears most of the blame, these principals are responsible as well. The self-fulfilling prophecy is at work in these schools. Certainly if these principals believe that teachers are only "economic creatures" then their behavior will certainly reflect that belief in the climate in the school, the tasks and responsibilities given teachers, and the amount of shared decision-making occurring.

It is basically through the behavior of the principal that the teachers will become economic creatures with no aspirations to excel or grow professionally. Consider Beth and how she thinks that manipulating rewards will motivate. It becomes apparent that she has labeled or identified all her teachers at the security level. Certainly there are those who are considered "hygiene seekers". However, this researcher is convinced that the majority of effective teachers have moved from this basic needs level and are seeking fulfillment at higher levels. The principal's philosophy plays an important role in establishing a climate that is growth-enhancing.

The other entity which shares the blame, the bureaucratic organization, is antithetical to a growth-enhancing environment. The structure tends to dehumanize individuals, ignoring their needs, especially that of self-actualization. No growth can occur in an environment that is mechanistic. No growth can occur in an environment where everyone "knows his place". The hierarchical structure suppresses and stifles individual growth. Teachers who are

professionals are considered technicians who deal in the dispensing of facts rather than setting the stage for children to develop intellectually and to think.

Professionals perform more effectively in an organic and open structure. The participants readily agreed that the climate in their schools was open. It was felt that this was more of a "learned" response than an honest one in some cases, but such dishonesty came out of guilt or ignorance as to what really constitutes an open, organic type of climate. Some participants made attempts at openness within their school but they still had the overall bureaucratic system with which to contend. This was seen as a point of frustration for these participants. They realized that the bureaucratic structure has a tendency to alienate teachers and principals. Furthermore, it was realized that as a part of the chain of command made it difficult for principals to become teacher advocates as they should.

Goodlad (1984, p. 180) posited that

The circumstances of teaching must provide optimum opportunity for teaching and learning to proceed. When teachers find themselves restrained and inhibited by problems of the work place that appear to them not to be within their control, it is reasonable to expect frustration and dissatisfaction to set in. Undoubtedly, teacher effectiveness is constrained and the very problems frustrating teachers are exacerbated.

Thus, to say one has an open climate and in the same breath say that all decisions must come across my desk is contradictory at the very least. To think that "dangling" rewards in front of teachers' faces will motivate to a level of effectiveness is to know very little of human behavior.

For the most part, the responses to the questions about climate and environment were nebulous and contradictory. The following participant's response was commonly heard on this issue:

"I have more of a participatory type climate where committees are set up to decide certain things." Participatory climate means very little. It is the types of activities and decisions teachers are allowed to share in which has meaning. Those decisions which are superficial and contribute to very little change or impact on the educational process should be handled by the administrator. Designing and implementing new curriculum, new teaching techniques, goals which effect children are decisions with substance. These decisions are made at the top level of the hierarchy and filtered down to the teachers. The principal is ever present to see that these decisions are executed, thus serving as the administrator or executive.

Many principals have been trained or brainwashed into thinking that the committee approach to decision making creates an environment that is participatory and open. This approach has been abused. The committee is a bureaucratic device often used to create a facade or give the false impression of shared decision making, especially when the decision has been made by one person and the others merely act as a "rubber stamp". Committees, when used in this fashion, are "a collection of the unfit appointed by by the unwilling to perform the unnecessary".

To be realistic, one must consider that most committees are made up of representatives from all authority levels. As in the totally bureaucratic organization the ones with the most authority will usually make the final decision, therefore, what is the point of wasting time and pretending that the decision was jointly made?

Most committees formulated in the schools are done so for the purpose of guidance, counsel, and advice. Therefore, they are acting in an

advisory or staff capacity. Seldom in the bureaucratic structure of the schools are teachers included on committees which make final decisions or act in a line capacity. That sanctity is reserved for the superordinates. Many teachers do not wish to serve on many of the committees formulated by the "bureaucrats" within the school system, for that only serves to exacerbate the feelings of inferiority and frustration.

It is time that the central administration remove the mask and admit what they are and what they represent. The truth is that they represent the established structure. One need only to disagree with a decision and the true bureaucratic colors will emerge.

To operate within a participatory-open climate where principals and teachers are allowed some freedom to decide and choose would be ideal. However, the real world of the principalship is filled with the colors of conformity, docility, control, and complacency. The artist who uses these colors is the bureaucrat, the right hand of the bureaucracy. Thus, having teaching experience before becoming a principal may be a "hidden agenda". Teaching is viewed not only as an educational enhancement to the profession but also as a screening device for boards of education to select the "good" teacher to become the "good" principal. Teachers are "good" if conformity and docility have set in, and if, having been socialized they are indoctrinated to the point of perpetuating the established structure. Thus, the system is insured. A teacher who has taught within the bureaucratic structure and is now a principal is less likely to change things than the principal who has been outside the system.

Thus, a pattern of contempt, frustration, and distaste is formed. Mitch, another participant, stated that principals are considered "caretakers of

the enterprise", and are treated as "hired hands", and since teachers are lower-ranking than principals, they do not even count.

The term, caretakers of the enterprise, evokes strong feelings among several of the participants who believe the profession should be otherwise. Their feelings are supported by their comments pertaining to which behavior, leadership or administrative, is endorsed and supported by the central administration:

As for the central office's perception of my major role, I would have to say that I am looked at as an administrator first and a leader second if at all. (John)

The central office places more emphasis on managerial-administrative behavior, but this is not their fault. The many external pressures and demands placed on the central office cause those people to behave in more of an administrative manner; thus it filters down to the schools and the principals. (Beth)

I know that I can come out here and not necessarily do much in instructional leadership and still maintain my job, whereas those administrative duties of budget preparation, supply orders, pupil accounting, and clean building have to be done because I know these things can be monitored and possibly get you fired tomorrow if not done well. (Al)

The system perceives my role as more managerial. I am made to feel more like a manager of the facilities. The (central administration) see me as the "caretaker of the enterprise". I perceive my role as being more leadership oriented. The principal is the one person at the school level who should give some philosophical meaning to the school and to education. Because of the two perceptions of the principal, the individual principal is more or less trapped or caught in the middle. (Mitch)

It is apparent from these comments that the administrative role of the principal is of most importance to the central office administration. These responses indicate some principals' perceptions of the central administration.

They articulate the fundamental bureaucratic principles. Principals should not expect a group with such perceptions to foster anything but administrative behavior. In fact, principals are mainly responsible for the

perpetuation of the bureaucratic structure. They may blame it on the "system", but they share the blame without realizing it. The world of the principal is filled with administrative trappings and the majority of principals find themselves trapped. As the position exists principals can be interchanged like machine parts, from school to school without much effect on the school.

The school is only affected when a principal there decides to bring about some change. Such a principal is on the road to exercising some leadership behavior.

The one area in which leadership is crucial is instruction. The term "instructional leader" has been abused to the point that it has little or no meaning. Of all the cases, Sandra, best approached a description of instructional leader: one who initiates changes and improvement within the area of instruction. A principal who is an instructional leader observes instruction in the classroom, evaluates teaching performance, and assists teachers in identifying and improving areas of weakness.

Sandra has 22 years of teaching experience, and has received additional preparation in the curriculum area. She readily admitted that administrative duties were her weakest area but felt very competent and confident in the area of instruction. She conducts most of her workshops for her school, and thus she provides for staff development and professional growth. Sandra has gained the respect of teachers while she respects their individuality. Her ability to identify with the teachers and their needs is considered one of her strongest areas.

Her description of instructional leader parallels responses from other participants. All of them placed children as the most important aspect of school.

Children are the first priority for me. (Sandra)

One of the big things with me is prior to students getting into any textbooks, teachers are reminded and encouraged to provide the classroom environment where children are turned on and desire to come to school. (Adam)

I am a child advocate. Students and their well being are of paramount importance to me. (Mitch)

Comments such as these indicate that these principals are in touch with the real purpose of schools, to educate children. Instructional leadership entails the improvement of instruction for none other than the children.

Another aspect found to be related to instructional leadership was that several principals attempted to provide for the professional growth and development of their teachers. John commented that he strives to provide for this growth through workshops, seminars, and meetings. The fact that he attends all of them indicates that he is concerned and sets an example for his teachers. Sandra maintained that workshops were a part of her plan for professional growth among teachers.

The delegation of responsibility is another area that Mich advocated. He saw this as an area where the effective principal knows his staff's capabilities and limitations. Being able to assess the different needs levels among teachers is a definite sign that the principal has knowledge of human behavior.

Al provided another aspect of instructional leadership. His uninterrupted time would be spent reading and "catching up" on the latest trends in education. The principal should be able to communicate with his or her faculty. Professional communication helps build confidence and respect for the principal as a leader. Most teachers appreciate the introduction of new ideas and current educational trends, and the principal is in a good position to do this. All principals should have built into their schedule time for reading articles relevant to education and the improvement of instruction.

Sandra provided a description of instructional leader which includes students, teachers, and parents. She realizes that improvement of instruction should involve parents, as parents are very important for the implementation of new curriculum and techniques. Conversely, their lack of support will attenuate the effectiveness of the change. Sandra believes that the harmonious relationship among the teacher, student, and parent is the key to a conducive climate for learning. Therefore, the effective principal is one who is able to communicate the goals of the school to all parties involved.

Based on the cases, instructional leadership is an area in which principals can make a difference. Their position can be made stronger if they take the initiative to be instructional leaders. The bureaucratic system is in place to block all attempts. However, the effective principals know how to maneuver around these blocks or use them to their advantage. These seven cases have revealed a dichotomy of principal behavior which is real. The more prevalent is the administrative behavior; however, I am convinced that the potential for leadership behavior is within each and every principal.

The principal is in a uniquely advantageous position to lead because he has the preparation and the first-hand experience to clearly perceive the

complexities of the educational setting and determine what will work and what will not. By avoiding the pitfalls not readily apparent to non-educators and by stimulating creative approaches to the solution of educational problems, the principal can promote greater effectiveness and, as a consequence, the improved morale and confidence essential to the achievement of the mission of the schools. . . . A school can be no better than its teachers, but it is the leadership of the principal that determines the extent to which the best of what teachers have to contribute is released within the school. (Guditus, 1976, p. 52)

Conclusions

The issue which gave impetus for this study was the following question: Is the principalship a position which facilitates leadership behavior or administrative behavior among principals?

To find the answer to the question one need only consider the job description for principals adopted by North Carolina.

The purpose of the principal is to serve as the chief administrator of a school in developing and implementing policies, programs, curriculum activities, and budgets in a manner that promotes the educational development of each student and the professional development of each staff member.

The written purpose serves as an example of the contradiction and ambiguity related to the principalship, as it contains the words "develop" and "implement". "To develop" is approaching leadership behavior and "to implement" is approaching administrative behavior. This study has attempted to show that the principal is more of an implementer than a developer, and descriptions of the two types of behavior show that they are contradictory. Based on this study, it is the investigator's opinion that because of the perceptions held by the central administration, the principalship is a position which facilitates administrative behavior.

The issue of whether the structural organization of our school system is conducive to education has many implications for principals. This study revealed that principals do not thoroughly understand the concept of education. They do not view education as a broad, nonspecific process which encompasses the development of children mentally, physically, and morally. The majority of principals view education as specific and measurable. They do not realize that the specificity and measurability currently being employed in our schools cause a great deal of our time to be spent on administrative matters.

The implication for the principal and leadership behavior is that the purpose of education should be examined and thus through leadership behavior the intended purpose of education will become a reality. Just as there is a relationship between schooling and administrative behavior, there exists a relationship between education and leadership behavior.

The entire issue of instructional leadership was addressed and it was determined that this is indeed a secondary role as viewed by the central office. It was found that when some principals do attempt leadership behavior, it is short-lived due in part to the demands and priorities of the central administration.

The study provided an opportunity to share in honest and open dialogue with other principals. It served as a means of ventilation for the writer as a principal, and thus as a release for frustration and anxiety. The dilemma facing the principal is the desire to lead which is constrained by a bureaucratic structure.

It is safe to conclude at this moment in history that principals as a group are relatively unimportant as a vital force in making American education the kind of dynamic, creative vehicle for maximizing human potential it is capable of becoming. . . that in the present conventional managerial

(administrative) climate which surrounds the superintendency a person entering the principalship usually has three choices: First, he can play the togetherness game (with the structure) and be reasonably comfortable as an administrative manager. Second, he can seek employment among that relatively small number of superintendents whose collective behavior and values are the antithesis of the climate described. Third, the principal can attempt by his own behavior to change the climate and direction of the superintendency. The desired and necessary behavior in such a setting may be termed constructive abrasiveness. (Scott, 1968, p. 21)

The principal who accepts the third choice has rough roads ahead. The present structure is very difficult to change and causes a great deal of frustration among those principals who choose to exert leadership behavior. Despite this, principals are challenged to take a chance at leading and become spokespersons for the profession.

Recommendations for Future Study

Through qualitative means almost any facet of the principalship is open to further research. This methodology has a tendency to generate more questions than answers. Several questions follow which might provide some stimulus for further investigation:

Are principals perceived as instructional leaders of schools by parents?

Is child or student advocacy related to the frequency of engaged leadership behavior by the principal?

Compared to other professionals, should the principalship be considered a profession?

Can a principal be considered a leader in one school and not in another?

Do leadership seminars and workshops for principals exist for the purpose of developing leadership behavior?

If these questions do not provide the stimulus needed for further research, one needs only to sit down and have an open and honest dialogue with a principal. This most assuredly will provide the impetus needed to explore the complex world of the principalship.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, M. J. (1977). Reforming education. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Argyris, C. (1957). Personality and organization: The conflict between system and the individual. New York: Harper and Row.
- Argyris, C. (1964). Integrating the individual and the organization. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Arnstine, D. (1971). Freedom and bureaucracy in the schools. In V. F. Haubrich (Ed.), Freedom, bureaucracy, and schooling. (1971 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development). Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Barnard, C. I. (1938). The functions of the executive. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Barnard, C.I. (1948). Organizations and management. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bender, J. (1950). The technique of executive leadership. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bennis, W. (1975). The problem: Integrating the organization and the individual. In W. G. Monahan (Ed.), Theoretical dimensions of educational administration. New York: Macmillan.
- Bierstedt, R. (1965). The social order (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Blau, P. M. (1965). The dynamics of bureaucracy: A study of interpersonal relations in two governmental agencies (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Blau, P., & Meyer, M. (1971). Bureaucracy in modern society. New York: Random House.
- Bremer, J. & Von Maschzisker, M. (1971). The school without walls. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. (1980). The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Briner, C., & Stroufe, G. E. (1971). Educational futurism 1985. Berkley: McCutchan.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper and Row.
- Byrne, D. R. et al. (1978). The senior high school principalship: Vol. I: The national survey. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

- Callahan, R. (1962). Education and the cult of efficiency. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Callahan, R. E., & Button, H. W. (1964). Historical change of the role of the man in the organization: 1865-1950. In D. Griffiths (Ed.), Behavioral Science and educational administration. (63rd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Campbell, R. F., et al. (1975). The organization and control of American schools (3rd ed.). Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.
- Cashburn, E. H. (1976). Bureaucracy vs. shared decision making. NASSP Bulletin, 60, 62-68.
- Cross, R. (1981). What makes an effective principal. NASSP Bulletin, 60, 19-22.
- Cubberly, E. P. (1916). Public school administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Cubberly, E. P. (1934). Public education in the United States. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Davis, K. (1962). Human relations at work. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Dessler, G. (1980). Organization theory: Integrating structure and behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Eisner, E. (1981). On difference between scientific and artistic approaches to qualitative research. Educational Researcher, pp. 5-9.
- English, F. (1968). The ailing principalship. Phi Delta Kappan, 50, 159.
- Etzioni, A. (1964). Modern organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Etzioni, A. (1971). Schools as a guidable system. In V. F. Haubrich (Ed.), Freedom, bureacuracy, and schooling. (1971 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development). Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Fallon, B. J. (1979). Principals are instructional leaders: Hit or myth? NASSP Bulletin, 63, 67-71.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967) A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Foskett, J. M. (1967). The normative world of the elementary school principal. Eugene, OR: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon.

- Fiedler, F. E., & Chemers, M.M. (1974). Leadership and effective management. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- Getzels, J. (1958). Administration as a social process. In A. Halpin (Ed.), Administrative theory in education. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago.
- Getzels, J. W., & Guba, E. G. (1957). Social behavior and the administrative process. School Review, 65, 436.
- Gibb, C. (1969). Leadership. In G. Lindsey & E. Aronson (Eds.), Handbook of social psychology. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Goldman, H. (1971). Educating the administrators. In V. F. Haubrich (Ed.), Freedom, bureaucracy, and schooling. (1971 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development). Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Gorton, R. (1976). Schools administration: Challenge and opportunity for leadership. Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.
- Griffiths, et al. (1964). The theme. In D. Griffiths (Ed.), Behavioral science and educational administration (63rd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gross, N., & Herriott, R. E. (1965). Staff leadership in public schools: A sociological inquiry. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Guba, E. (1960). Research in internal administration: What do we know? In R. Campbell & J. Lipman (Eds.), Administrative theory as a guide to action. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Guditus, C. W. (1976). The return of the principal. NASSP Bulletin, 60, 49-57.
- Halpin, A. W. (1957). The leadership behavior of school superintendents. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Hamilton, D. et al. (Eds.). (1977). Ethnographic techniques in educational research. In beyond the numbers game. Berkeley: McCutchan.
- Hemphill, J. D. (1958). Administration as problem solving. In Andrew W. Halpin (Ed.), Administrative theory in education. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago.
- Howell, B. (1981). Profile of the principalship. Educational Leadership, 38, 333-336.
- Howes, K. (1976). Pathways and pitfalls in introducing change. NASSP Bulletin, 60, 43-51.

- Jacobsen, P., et al. (1973). The principalship: New perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kliebard, H. M., (1971). Bureaucracy and curriculum theory. In V. F. Haubrich (Ed.), Freedom, bureaucracy, and schooling. (1971 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development). Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Lawless, D. J. (1972). Effective management: Social psychological approach. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lewin, K., & Lippitt, R. (1938). An experimental approach to the study of autocracy and democracy: A preliminary note. Sociometry, 1, 292-300.
- Likert, R. (1961). New patterns of management. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Lipham, J. M. (1964). Leadership and administration. In Daniel Griffiths (Ed.), Behavioral science and educational administration. (63rd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lipham, J. M., & Hoeh, J. A. Jr. (1974). The principalship: Foundations and functions. New York: Harper and Row.
- Lippitt, R., & White, R.K. (1943). The social climate of children's groups. In R. G. Baker, J. S. Kounin, & H. F. Wright. Child behavior and development. New York; McGraw-Hill.
- Litterer, J. (1965). The analysis of organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Lonsdale, R. C. (1964). Maintaining the organization in dynamic equilibrium. In D. Griffiths (Ed.), Behavioral science and educational administration. (63rd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- MacDonald, J. B. (1971) The school as a double agent. In V. F. Haubrich (Ed.), Freedom, bureaucracy, and schooling. (1971 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development). Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- March, J. G. (1978). American public school administration: A short analysis. School Review, 86, 217-50.
- McGregor, D. (1957). The human side of enterprise. The Management Review, 46, 22.
- Merton, R. K. (1940). Bureaucratic structure and personality. Social Forces, 18 560-568.
- Monahan, W. G. (1975). (Ed.). Theoretical dimensions of educational administration. New York: Macmillan.

- Nash, P. (1966). Authority and freedom in education. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- National Association of Elementary School Principals. (1978). The elementary school principalship in 1978: A research study. Arlington, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.
- Newel, C. (1978). Human behavior in educational administration. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- O'Kane, R. (1975). A time to be tentative. Urban Review, 8, 313-320.
- Owens, R. G. (1979). Organizational behavior in schools. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Owens, R., & Steinhoff, C. R. (1976). Administering change in schools. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Parsons, T. (1951). The social system. New York: The Free Press.
- Pellicer, L. (1982). Providing instructional leadership: A principal challenge. NASSP Bulletin, 60, 27-31.
- Pierce, P. R. (1934). The origin and development of the public school principalship. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Pierce, P. R. (1935). The origin and development of the public school principalship. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Porter, L., et al. (1975). Behavior in organizations. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Presthus, R. (1962). The organizational society: An analysis and a theory. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Ray, J. O. (1980). Priorities of major tasks of South Carolina high school principals as perceived by selected referent groups of the school community. Ph. D. Dissertation, University of South Carolina.
- Rist, R. C. (1982). On the application of ethnographic inquiry to educate: Procedures and possibilities. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 19, 439-450.
- Roe, W., & Drake, T. L. (1974). The principalship. New York: Macmillan.
- Rogers, R. E. (1975). Organizational theory. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ross, M., & Hendry, C. E. (1957). New understandings of leadership. New York: Associated Press.

- Seifert, E. H. & Beck, J. J. (1981). Elementary principals: Instructional leaders or school managers. Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 528.
- Shaheen, T. A. (1974). A choice: Bureaucracy or curricular renaissance. Education Leadership, 494-495.
- Sikula, A. (1973). (Ed). Essays in management and administration. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Silberman, C. E. (1970). Crisis in the classroom: The remaking of American education. New York: Random House.
- Silverman, D. (1971). The theory of organizations: A sociological framework. New York: Basic Books.
- Simon, H. (1976). administrative behavior. New York: Free Press.
- Sommerville, J. G. (1971). Leadership that rocks the boat, a boat that needs rocking! Educational Leadership, 29, 45-49.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974). Handbook of leadership. New York: The Free Press.
- Stone, T. B. (1968). The elementary school principalship: Toward the twenty-first century. In selected articles for elementary school principals, National Education Association, Washington, DC.
- Tannenbaum, Robert and Davis, S. A. (1971). Values, man, and organizations. In W. C. French & D. Hellsiegel (Eds.), Personnel management and organization development: Fields in transition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, W. (1958). How to choose a leadership pattern. Harvard Business Review, 36, 95-101.
- Tesconi, C. A. Jr. (1975). Schooling in America: A social philosophical perspective. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Wasserman, M. (1974). Demystifying school: Writings and experiences. New York: Praeger.
- Weber, M. (1947). The theory of social and economic organization (A. M. Henderson and T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- White, R. K., & Lippitt, R. (1960). Autocracy and democracy: An experimental inquiry. New York: Harper.
- Wiggins, T. (1975). The influence of role and organizational climate upon principal behavior: A systems analysis. In W. G. Monahan (Ed.), Theoretical dimensions of educational administration. New York: Macmillan.

APPENDIX A

Quantitative Research Design

Job History Chart

Teacher Rating Scale

Teacher Questionnaire

APPENDIX A

Phase One: Quantitative-Research Design

Subjects

The study was conducted in Cumberland County, one of the 142 school systems of North Carolina. The Cumberland County school system has a student population of 36,000, a teaching staff over 2,000, 52 principals (35 elementary, 11 junior high, and 6 senior high), and is the fourth largest system in the state.

Twenty elementary schools were selected to provide a balanced group of sites: rural and urban; East, West, North and South within the county; racially and economically diverse. Student and faculty populations ranged from small to large. Using these factors in the selection process enabled the investigator to obtain a cross-section of teachers as well as principals.

Variables

The independent variable (X) was years of teaching experience. This variable cited in Chapter I is used as a prerequisite by most school boards and superintendents as one of the selection criteria for the administrative position of principal, based on the assumption that the more successful years in teaching, the better a principal's chance is of being an effective administrator. Thus, the assumption and general statement could be tested statistically.

The dependent variable (Y) was the administrative behavior of principals as perceived by his or her subordinates (teachers). Of the multitude of behavioral scales and charts developed by many researchers, the Executive Professional Leadership (EPL) scale developed and used by Gross & Herriott (1965) was chosen. This instrument will be discussed in the next section.

Instruments

In keeping with the quantitative-scientific approach, and as a model for this part of the research, Gross and Herriott's (1965) principalship study was the primary resource.

The Job History Chart and the EPL Teacher Questionnaire (Gross & Herriott, 1965) were the two formal instruments used to gather data. The Job History Chart contained space for principals to list their job experience from the time of graduation from college up their present position. The EPL Teacher Questionnaire measured the classroom teacher's perception of administrative behavior exhibited by the principal by means of 18 statements.

These 18 factors conform to the definition of "executive professional leadership", which is the "efforts of an executive of a professionally staffed organization to conform to a definition of his obligation to improve the quality of staff performance" (Gross & Herriott, 1965 p.22).

Procedures

Collection of Data

Permission was granted by the superintendent of the Cumberland County School System to conduct this study utilizing the personnel employed by the Cumberland County Board of Education.

This investigator was allowed during a county-wide administrative meeting to verbally state the purpose of the study and to ask for fellow principals' cooperation and support.

The selected schools were sent the EPL Teacher Rating Scale (see appendix C) with the approval of each principal. Each participating principal was asked not to distribute these questionnaires, but to ask for a nonadministrative person to distribute them, collect them once completed, and to return them to the investigator through courier mail system.

Scoring

After receiving the completed EPL Teacher Rating Scales from each participating school, the investigator had the task of scoring each scale and transforming the data into numerical indices to be used later.

The teachers were instructed to answer all 18 questions above responses. Each answer had been assigned a numerical value. Using only the 12 factored out, as performed by Gross and Herriott (1965), the investigator totaled questions and responses and computed a mean score yielding an EPL-Score for each returned rating scale. To obtain an overall EPL Score for each principal, the individual mean scores were totaled and computed again for an arithmetic mean. This mean score was used as the index by which principals were rated, with a possible 6 as "most effective" to 1 as the "least effective" administrative behavior. This method was supported by Gross and Herriott (1965) who maintained that if a summary measure of a leader's performance on some specified dimension is required and if there is good reason to expect that his behavior would vary in the different context in which his subordinates observe him, the best measure of his behavior on the dimension may in fact be the arithmetic average of their varied observations.

Analysis

The statistical analysis used for this portion of the study was of a descriptive nature. After scoring the returned rating scales and obtaining an index score for each participating principal, the investigator used the principals' individual score and his or her years of teaching experience as the dependent and independent variables, respectively, to obtain a correlation coefficient for the total sample population (N=18). The method used to calculate the coefficient used was the Pearson R.

Various other descriptive statistics were performed and included in the study. The mean, standard deviation, standard error, variance, and range were performed in terms of each variable using the Advanced Statistical Analysis (ASA) program on a TRS 80 Model 4 microcomputer.

To enhance the statistical observations, the investigator utilized the scattergram or scatter plot technique to provide a visual and graphic picture of the possible correlation between teaching experience and the principal's administrative behavior in terms of his or her EPL mean score.

JOB HISTORY CHART

PART I.

NAME: _____ STUDENT MEMBERSHIP: _____

SCHOOL: _____

NUMBER OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS: _____

HIGHEST DEGREE HELD AT PRESENT: _____

PART II.

JOB HISTORY (Please list all full-time jobs you have held in chronological order starting with your first job after undergraduate college. Include years in military service.)

Job Title	Years (From - To)	School Level (i.e., E, JH, SH) if Revelant	Approximate Size of School or Organization	Grades or Subjects Taught or Chief Duties	Name of School & System or Type of Organization	System
	19— to 19—					
	19— to 19—					
	19— to 19—					
	19— to 19—					
	19— to 19—					
	19— to 19—					
	19— to 19—					
	19— to 19—					
	19— to 19—					
	19— to 19—					

* Gross, Neal & Robert E. Herriott. Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.

EPL TEACHER RATING SCALE

1. SCHOOL _____

2. GRADE TAUGHT _____

3. RACE

American Indian	_____
Black	_____
White	_____
Hispanic	_____
Other	_____

4. SEX _____ Male _____ Female

5. AGE

_____ 20-25	_____ 36-40	_____ 52-56
_____ 26-30	_____ 41-45	_____ 57-61
_____ 31-35	_____ 46-51	_____ 62 and Over

6. TEACHING EXPERIENCE _____

7. HIGHEST DEGREE ATTAINED _____

Dear Fellow Educator,

I am presently working on a study which involves the classroom teacher. My dissertation, Teaching Experience and Its Relationship to Effective Administrative Behavior, requires that I solicit an evaluation of your principal from you.

I am asking that you fill out the following questionnaire and return it to Brentwood Elementary School through the courier system. I have received permission from your principal to conduct this survey. All the information returned is confidential and shall not be shared with anyone. If possible, please return by August 31, 1983.

Thank you,

Paris Jones

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS

Please answer for each statement listed below as it applies to the principal of your school. In answering the question, please write in each box the one letter that best describes the behavior of your principal.

To what extent does your Principal engage in the following kinds of behavior?

A=Always	C=Frequently	E=Almost Never
B=Almost Always	D=Occasionally	F=Never
N=I Do Not Know		

STATEMENTS

1. Gives teachers the feeling that their work is an "important" activity. _____
2. Gets teachers to upgrade their performance standards in their classrooms. _____
3. Gives teachers the feeling that they can make significant contributions to improving the classroom performance of their students. _____
4. Stresses "political" rather than professional considerations in his decisions. _____
5. Makes teachers' meetings a valuable educational activity. _____
6. Has constructive suggestions to offer teachers in dealing with their major problems. _____
7. Takes a strong interest in my professional development. _____
8. Treats teachers as professional workers. _____
9. Attempts to reward teachers who are doing an outstanding job. _____
10. Discourages teachers who want to try out new educational ideas. _____
11. Utilizes research evidence when considering solutions to educational problems. _____
12. Considers "what is best for all the children" in his decisions affecting educational programs. _____
13. Helps to eliminate weaknesses in his school. _____

14. Reprimands teachers whose educational ideas disagree with his own. _____
15. Maximizes the different skills found in his facility. _____
16. Brings to the attention of teachers educational literature that is of value to them in their jobs. _____
17. Helps teachers to understand the sources of important problems they are facing. _____
18. Displays a strong interest in improving the quality of the educational program. _____

* Gross, Neal & Robert E. Herriott. Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.

APPENDIX B

RAW DATA

COMPOSITE PRINCIPAL RATING

Variable X & Y Measure of Central Tendency

Frequency Distribution: Variable X & Y

Scattergram

COMPOSITE PRINCIPAL RATING (N-18)

VARIABLE X YEARS TEACHING	PRINCIPAL	EPL INDEX SCORE
20 YEARS	A	4.57
14 YEARS	B	4.92
12 YEARS	C	5.49
12 YEARS	D	5.40
11 YEARS	E	5.12
10 YEARS	F	5.63
10 YEARS	G	5.33
10 YEARS	H	5.06
8 YEARS	I	4.76
7 YEARS	J	5.31
7 YEARS	K	4.86
6 YEARS	L	5.60
6 YEARS	M	5.61
5 YEARS	N	5.29
4.5 YEARS	O	5.42
4 YEARS	P	5.14
4 YEARS	Q	5.08
3 YEARS	R	5.56

TABLE 1

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

VARIABLE X: TEACHING EXPERIENCE SAMPLE SIZE (N) = 18

SAMPLE STATISTICS:

MEAN	= 8.5556	RANGE	= 17
VARIANCE	= 17.3581	MINIMUM	= 3
STD. DEV.	= 4.16631	MAXIMUM	= 20

UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION PARAMETERS:

VARIANCE	= 18.3792	STD. DEV.	= 4.28709
----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS:

SKEWNESS	= .97882	KURTOSIS	= .797239
----------	----------	----------	-----------

TABLE 2

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

VARIABLE Y: ADM BHV (EPL-SCORE) SAMPLE SIZE (N) = 18

SAMPLE STATISTICS:

MEAN = 5.23056 RANGE = 1.06

VARIANCE = .0924269 MINIMUM = 4.57

STD. DEV. = .304018 MAXIMUM = 5.63

UNBIASED ESTIMATES OF POPULATION PARAMETERS:

VARANCE = .0978638 STD. DEV. = .312832

DATA DISTRIBUTION COEFFICIENTS:

SKEWNESS = -.491007 KURTOSIS = -.707359

TABLE 3

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

DISTRIBUTION OF VARIABLE X: TEACHING EXPERIENCE

INTERVAL	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE %
3.000 TO 6.399	7	38.9	38.9
6.400 TO 9.799	3	16.7	55.6
9.800 TO 13.199	6	33.3	88.9
13.200 TO 16.599	1	5.6	94.4
16.600 TO 20.000	1	5.6	100.0
TOTAL	18	100.0	

TABLE 4

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

DISTRIBUTION OF VARIABLE Y: ADM BEHV (EPL-SCORE)

INTERVAL	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE %
4.500 TO 4.699	1	5.6	5.6
4.700 TO 4.899	2	11.1	16.7
4.900 TO 5.199	5	27.8	44.4
5.200 TO 5.399	3	16.7	61.1
5.400 TO 5.630	7	38.9	100.0
TOTAL	18	100.0	

SCATTERGRAM
X BY Y PLOT

